Reconstructing Menopausal Hormone Therapy Guidelines: From Palliative Symptom Management to Age-Related Endocrine Insufficiency Disease Prevention

Author: Dolores Catherino, M.S.
Date: 12/01/2025

keywords: Menopausal hormone therapy, MHT, HRT, women's health, guideline reform, evidence-selective medicine, endocrine insufficiency, disease prevention, regulatory policy

Executive Summary

On November 10, 2025, the FDA formally reversed twenty-three years of restrictive guidance on menopausal hormone therapy (MHT), acknowledging that the Women's Health Initiative evidence does not appropriately apply to modern formulations. This regulatory reversal exposes a persistent institutional inertia: despite acknowledgment, no guideline review or reassessment has been announced by ACOG or NAMS. More broadly, legal doctrine is shifting to prioritize evidence-based over consensus-based practice; MHT evidence has matured across 15-20 years of registry data; and international guideline divergence reveals that current U.S. guideline restrictions do not reflect global evidence interpretation. Professional organizations maintaining current guidelines now do so with explicit knowledge of these contradictions.

Comprehensive guideline reconstruction is therefore not optional refinement—it is institutional necessity. Such reconstruction must address three interconnected dimensions: menopause reclassification from genitourinary/reproductive to endocrine disease—specifically, age-related endocrine insufficiency; clinical practice evolution toward formulation-specific evidence and precision medicine; and standards aligned with contemporary legal-ethical requirements.

(1) Conceptual reality: The biological profile of menopause—hormone deficiency, physiologic end-organ failure, and systemic complications—aligns with conditions routinely managed through endocrine replacement. Yet menopause remains classified within diseases of the female genital system.

(2) Pharmacological reality: All current restrictive MHT guidance rests on the Women's Health Initiative (WHI), which tested conjugated equine estrogen plus medroxyprogesterone acetate—formulations fundamentally different from modern bioidentical MHT (transdermal estradiol with micronized progesterone). Extrapolating WHI findings to modern regimens violates basic pharmacological principles and constitutes a category error that has locked restrictive guidance in place for decades.

(3) Evidentiary reality: The evidence landscape has fundamentally shifted. Contemporary registries, observational studies, and mechanistic research now demonstrate substantive disease-prevention benefits from modern MHT formulations (cardiovascular mortality reduction, bone preservation, metabolic and cognitive protection) with a consistent absence of harm signals.

(4) Institutional reality: The perpetuation of restrictive MHT guidance operates through six interdependent institutional mechanisms: (1) unequal methodological standards applied to contradictory versus supportive evidence, (2) selective highlighting of adverse data while

backgrounding prevention evidence, (3) undifferentiated treatment of heterogeneous formulations, (4) terminology employed to obscure evidence shifts, (5) institutional risk-management incentives superseding evidence integration, and (6) ethical frameworks compartmentalized by organizational function. Together, these mechanisms prioritize institutional stability.

(5) Legal-ethical reality: The 2024 *Restatement (Third) of Torts* fundamentally redefines clinical standard of care: practice must align with evidence, not professional consensus. This shift directly challenges the legal foundation of restrictive MHT guidance. Simultaneously, research ethics demands shift from placebo-controlled efficacy studies toward comparative effectiveness and dose-optimization methodologies, now that MHT evidence is sufficiently robust.

(6) Regulatory reality: The 2022 global adoption of ICD-11 formally recognizes menopause as a treatable condition. With U.S. implementation projected over the next several years, the window for reclassification is both critical and time-bounded: shifting menopause from genitourinary/reproductive to endocrine disease classification would reshape how institutions recognize the condition and how insurance coverage is structured.

MHT guidelines exemplify evidence-selective medicine in professional organizations and demand fundamental reconstruction rather than adjustment. Evidence-Selective Medicine analysis identifies institutional mechanisms perpetuating guideline obsolescence and provides a comprehensive reform framework.

Part I. The Conceptual Crisis: Menopause as Arbitrary Medical Classification

A. Endocrine Principles and the Menopause–Hypothyroidism Asymmetry

Endocrinology is organized around a foundational principle: hormone replacement qualifies as standard care if three conditions are satisfied: (1) hormone deficiency is documented, (2) biologically important consequences are demonstrated, and (3) evidence establishes that therapeutic benefits outweigh risks.

This principle is applied consistently across endocrine conditions:

- Hypothyroidism (E03–E07): Lifelong levothyroxine replacement is standard of care. Therapeutic replacement continues as long as the deficiency exists.
- Male hypogonadism (E29): Testosterone replacement is standard treatment for documented androgen deficiency.
- Adrenal insufficiency (E27): Glucocorticoid and/or mineralocorticoid replacement is mandatory, typically lifelong.
- Premature ovarian insufficiency (E28.39): Hormone replacement is standard of care.
- Postoperative ovarian insufficiency (E89.4x): Hormone replacement is standard of care.

Menopause fulfills the same criteria:

- Biochemical deficiency: estradiol drops from cyclic premenopausal ranges (50–400 pg/mL) to often <20 pg/mL; progesterone from luteal levels (~10–20 ng/mL) to <1 ng/mL.
- Organ failure: irreversible ovarian steroidogenic failure.
- Systemic consequences: accelerated bone loss, vascular dysfunction, metabolic alterations, cognitive and affective changes, genitourinary atrophy (i.e., classic endocrine downstream effects).
- Prevention and stabilization with replacement: MHT prevents or slows vasomotor symptoms, prevents rapid bone loss, promotes favorable lipid and metabolic profiles, and reduces markers of vascular and brain aging, particularly when initiated near the menopausal transition.

Clinical management reveals profound inconsistency: physiologic menopause (N95) and premature menopause share identical endocrine pathophysiology yet receive opposite management guidance. Premature insufficiency receives endocrine coding (E28.39) with replacement therapy while typical-age menopause is coded as a disease of the female genital system (N95) with physiologic hormone replacement discouraged. This divergence for identical pathophysiology is clinically incoherent and divergent management reflects age-dependent classification incoherence. The Endocrine Society's 2023 scientific statement on hormones and aging notes that the distinction between "normal aging" and "endocrine disease" is arbitrary and substantially influenced by what treatments society considers socially and politically acceptable.

B. ICD-11 and the Reproductive Misclassification Problem

The World Health Organization's 2022 ICD-11 classification represents a conceptual advance: menopause and perimenopause are now formally recognized as treatable conditions rather than as inevitable life events. However, this recognition remains incomplete. ICD-11 categorizes menopause as a female genital system disorder rather than an endocrine disorder.

The United States currently uses ICD-10-CM. While no definitive federal implementation date has been set, and CMS continues to schedule ICD-10 updates through October 2027, industry projections suggest ICD-11 adoption may occur over the next few years as federal agencies (CMS, NCHS) complete mapping, reimbursement, and regulatory requirements. The U.S. ICD-11 transition establishes a long-term framework: the choice of menopause classification during this window will determine clinical guidance orientation and treatment positioning for years. This presents a critical policy juncture: menopause can be formally reclassified as either a genitourinary/reproductive symptom disorder or an age-related endocrine insufficiency disease. This classification choice fundamentally determines whether clinical guidance emphasizes symptom palliation or disease prevention, and whether treatment is framed as optional intervention or medically necessary care.

The Age-Based Misclassification Paradox

The ICD-11 classification architecture itself exposes a fundamental conceptual incoherence. Both menopause and premature ovarian failure represent the same underlying endocrine lesion and yet they are classified under Chapter 17 (Diseases of the genitourinary system), block GA30 (Menopausal or Perimenopausal disorders), specifically:

- GA30.6: Premature ovarian failure (age <40)
- GA30.0: Menopause (age ≥40–51)

Both conditions represent ovarian endocrine insufficiency resulting in the failure to produce adequate estradiol and progesterone. Yet neither is classified under Chapter 6 (Endocrine, Nutritional and Metabolic Diseases), where other hormone deficiencies are appropriately classified.

Table1. Hormone Insufficiency Classifications

Condition	Primary Pathology	ICD-10 Classification	ICD-11 Classification
Hypothyroidism	Thyroid hormone deficiency	Chapter IV: Endocrine Diseases (E03–E07)	Chapter 4: Endocrine Diseases (E03–E07)
Adrenal insufficiency	Cortisol/ mineralocorticoid deficiency	Chapter IV: Endocrine Diseases (E27)	Chapter 4: Endocrine Diseases (E27)
Male hypogonadism	Androgen deficiency	Chapter IV: Endocrine Diseases (E29)	Chapter 4: Endocrine Diseases (E29)
Premature ovarian failure	Estradiol/ progesterone deficiency	Chapter IV: Endocrine Diseases (E28.31)	Chapter 16: Diseases of Genitourinary System (GA30.6)
Menopause	Estradiol/ progesterone deficiency	Chapter XIV: Diseases of Genitourinary System (N95)	Chapter 16: Diseases of Genitourinary System (GA30.0)

The fact that both premature and typical-age menopause are classified under the same genitourinary block (GA30) reveals that the ICD-11 architecture prioritizes genitourinary/ reproductive symptomatology (vaginal atrophy, dyspareunia, incontinence, recurrent urinary tract infection) over endocrine insufficiency as the organizing principle.

Part II. The Formulation Category Error: WHI as Non-Evidence for Modern MHT

A. Women's Health Initiative and the Pharmacological Mismatch

The WHI-restrictive framework reflects outdated evidence, not current evidence. WHI evaluated formulations available at the time but not representative of contemporary evidence-based MHT. Formulation-specific, evidence-aligned guidance is scientifically and clinically imperative.

Table 2. Classic vs Modern MHT Formulations

Parameter	CEE (WHI)	Transdermal E2 (Modern)
First-pass hepatic metabolism	Extensive (increases thromboembolism, inflammatory markers)	Bypassed (no VTE increase)

Estrone production	High (weak estrogen, poor vascular benefit)	Minimal (physiologic E2 levels)
Triglyceride elevation	Significant (atherogenic)	Minimal/none
Inflammatory marker changes	Increased (prothrombotic)	Decreased (anti-inflammatory)
Coagulation factor changes	Increased VTE risk (1.8% vs 0.5%)	No increased risk
Breast tissue proliferation	Variable; MPA mitogenic	Micronized P4 neutral/ protective

CEE/MPA and transdermal 17β-estradiol + micronized progesterone (E2/P4) differ fundamentally across multiple mechanistic domains: thrombotic potential, lipid metabolism, inflammatory signaling, and receptor-mediated tissue responses. Extrapolating breast cancer or cardiovascular risk profiles from CEE/MPA to these mechanistically distinct modern formulations violates basic pharmacologic principles and conflates therapeutically separate entities.

B. Contemporary Registry and Observational Evidence on Modern Formulations
Large observational datasets and registry analyses focusing on modern MHT provide a markedly different risk profile than WHI-era regimens:

- UK Generations cohort and related analyses: No increased breast cancer risk with estrogen-only therapy (HR = 1.00; 95% CI: 0.66–1.54); substantially attenuated risk with estrogen–progesterone combinations using micronized progesterone.
- E3N–EPIC French cohort (n = 98,995): Estrogen with micronized progesterone showed no increased breast cancer risk (RR ≈ 0.9), while estrogen plus synthetic progestins increased risk ~40% (RR ≈ 1.4). This demonstrates that formulation type, not estrogen per se, determines breast cancer risk. Yet guideline language collapses both under undifferentiated "progestin-containing therapy", obscuring this formulation-specific differentiation.
- Long-term observational follow-up (20-year): Women on transdermal estradiol demonstrate maintained cardiovascular, bone, and metabolic benefits with very low breast cancer–related discontinuation rates (0.02%).
- Danish Cold et al. (2022) cohort, with median 15.2-year follow-up: No surge in late recurrence (years 5–10) was observed despite systemic hormone exposure. The absence of late-recurrence signals is mechanistically significant: if systemic bioidentical MHT were reactivating dormant estrogen-receptor-positive (ER+) clones (which exhibit late recurrence kinetics), a recurrence surge should emerge by year 10. The absence of such surges in registries tracked to 9–10 years indicates that systemic bioidentical MHT does not reactivate dormant ER+ disease.

The safety evidence for modern MHT is sufficient by any reasonable standard. 10–20 years of documentation across diverse populations with consistent absence of harm exceeds typical

novel agent evidence requirements. FDA approval of novel agents routinely occurs with less extensive or shorter-duration safety data. This reflects evidentiary double-standards applied inconsistently across novel and established therapies.

C. KEEPS and ELITE: Early Mechanistic RCTs on Modern Formulations

Table 3. Pharmacologic Comparison: KEEPS vs ELITE

Formulation Component	KEEPS (Transdermal E2 50 μg + Oral P4 200 mg)	ELITE (Oral E2 1 mg + Vaginal P4 45 mg)
Estrogen Agent	17β-Estradiol (bioidentical)	17β-Estradiol (bioidentical)
Estrogen Dose	50 μg/day (0.05 mg)	1 mg/day (1.0 mg)
Estrogen Route	Transdermal patch	Oral tablet
First-Pass Metabolism	BYPASSED (direct systemic)	20× hepatic conversion
Hepatic Estrogen Load	Very low (~0.5 mg E2 equivalent)	Moderate (~1 mg E2 equivalent post-metabolism)
Progestogen Agent	Micronized progesterone (bioidentical)	Micronized progesterone (bioidentical)
Progestogen Dose	200 mg/day	45 mg/day
Progestogen Route	Oral capsule	Vaginal insert
P4 Bioavailability	Very low (oral, high first-pass)	Very low (vaginal insert, minimal first-pass)
Total Hepatic Load	Very low	Moderate (20× greater than transdermal)
Thrombotic Risk	Minimal (transdermal avoids VTE)	Minimal (bioidentical regimen)
Cardiovascular Prevention	Null for CIMT at this formulation	YES: 43% CIMT reduction if initiated <6 years

Table 4. Trials Outcomes Comparison: KEEPS vs ELITE

Finding Category	KEEPS Trial	ELITE Trial
Primary Outcome	No slowing of CIMT progression	CIMT reduction 0.0044 vs 0.0078 mm/yr (p=0.008) in early stratum
Trial Duration	4 years	~5 years
Age	mean age 53, <5 yrs post-menopause	not explicitly stated; stratified by <6 vs. ≥10 years post-menopause
Timing Hypothesis	Partial support (suggests early initiation necessary but not clearly sufficient)	Strong support: Timing is critical (<6 years) for atherosclerosis prevention
Timing Implication	Early initiation may be needed but unclear if sufficient	Early intervention within 6 years post-menopause produces measurable atherosclerosis protection
Late Initiation Evidence	Not tested	No atherosclerosis benefit ≥10 years post-menopause
Symptom Relief	Excellent (vasomotor, sleep, mood, sexual function)	Not primary outcome in published results
Safety Profile	Excellent (zero VTE; no serious adverse events)	Excellent (no serious adverse events)
Clinical Implication	Bioidentical MHT safe and effective for symptoms and bone protection	Bioidentical MHT prevents atherosclerosis when initiated early; timing is crucial
For MHT Guidelines	Supports safety and symptom relief	Supports disease-prevention indication for early initiation; explains late-initiation failure

ELITE establishes that modern MHT slows atherosclerosis without producing adverse effects. The combination of mechanistic disease modification, toxicity absence and validated surrogates provides biological sufficiency for disease-prevention claims. Outcome trials confirm this mechanistically-established relationship; they do not define it.

The restriction of modern MHT despite adequate evidence reflects mechanisms of institutional entrenchment that systematically perpetuate organizational commitment to outdated paradigms despite evidence evolution. The six-level ESM model explains how institutions maintain evidence-selective practices—practices that reflect not scientific judgment but

organizational inertia. Understanding these entrenchment levels reveals how institutional mechanisms substitute for evidence-based decision-making.

Part III. Institutional Architecture: The Six-Level Model of Evidence-Selective Medicine

The Evidence-Selective Medicine framework explains how the continued existence of restrictive MHT guidelines, despite opposing evidence, results not from scientific disagreement but from systematic institutional biases in evidence evaluation. It identifies six interrelated levels where methodological biases evolve into institutional systems that favor organizational stability over responsiveness to new knowledge.

Level 1: Methodological Asymmetry—Unequal Standards of Scrutiny

Methodological asymmetry occurs when identical design limitations are either accepted or criticized depending on whether they support prevailing doctrine. Standards of methodology are applied inconsistently: new findings face stricter evidentiary demands, while earlier conclusions are shielded from comparable scrutiny.

Case example: The Early Breast Cancer Trialists' Collaborative Group (EBCTCG) meta-analysis combined 55 tamoxifen trials spanning decades with many lacking documented safeguards for randomization integrity (centralized randomization, sealed-envelope assignment)—measures now recognized as essential, with their absence inflating effect estimates by approximately 41%. Despite these significant methodological limitations, EBCTCG remains the primary evidence justifying routine tamoxifen use in hormone receptor positive (HR+) breast cancer, and randomization vulnerabilities are rarely critically examined.

The Batur meta-analysis of 15 observational studies documented substantially lower breast cancer recurrence (OR 0.5) and cancer-related mortality (OR 0.3) in hormone therapy users. Methodological criticism focusing on selection bias and heterogeneity is appropriate. The asymmetry appears when comparing paradigm-challenging and paradigm-confirming evidence: the small HABITS trial (n=447, median 2.1-year follow-up) reporting increased recurrence was accepted with minimal scrutiny, while Batur's observational synthesis addressing the same clinical question was rejected despite methodologically equivalent limitations.

Level 1 institutional entrenchment operates through selective enforcement of methodological standards. Standards are selectively enforced with full rigor against evidence challenging institutional position and selectively unenforced against evidence supporting it. This alignment-driven application makes standards function as paradigm-reinforcing rather than quality-assessing mechanisms.

Level 2: Reporting Asymmetry—The WHI Statistical Misrepresentation

The 2002 Women's Health Initiative combined-hormone trial remains the most influential study shaping contemporary MHT guidance, yet its interpretation exemplifies how reporting practices can convert marginal or nonsignificant findings into ostensibly decisive evidence.

The critical statistical issue: The WHI reported a hazard ratio of 1.26 (95% CI 1.00–1.59) for breast cancer. A confidence interval crossing 1.0 indicates statistical nonsignificance. Yet investigators reported the nominal p-value ($p = 0.05$) as definitive evidence of harm, violating the study's pre-specified statistical protocol that mandated adjustments for multiple

comparisons—corrections under which the reported hazard ratio would cross 1.0, rendering it clearly nonsignificant.

By selectively framing the data, a borderline, nonsignificant finding was converted into institutional certainty of harm. The FDA responded by imposing black-box warnings on all menopausal hormone therapies. In turn, the 2017 USPSTF recommendation declared that combined estrogen and progestin should not be used for primary prevention of chronic conditions in postmenopausal women (D recommendation). This blanket directive, resting on the same WHI evidence, exemplifies Level 2 reporting asymmetry in action: a nonsignificant harm signal is elevated into regulatory doctrine that forecloses population-level discussion of disease-prevention benefits.

The relegation of contradictory subgroup findings to appendices exemplifies how institutions use document architecture as suppression strategy. WHI findings demonstrating reduced breast-cancer risk in estrogen-alone treatment and among prior MHT users were documented but architecturally marginalized. This spatial marginalization rendered contradictory evidence formally present but practically invisible and excluded from policy formulation. Level 2 reporting asymmetry operates through this architectural suppression. Containment through appendix placement is less obvious than evidence suppression but equally effective in maintaining institutional inertia.

Level 3: Category Error—Generalizing Evidence Across Non-Equivalent Formulations

The WHI tested one specific pharmacologic combination: CEE plus MPA (Prempro). Yet its findings were immediately extrapolated to all estrogen–progestogen therapies, including bioidentical estradiol with micronized progesterone (E2/P4)—formulations never examined in the trial. This extension from evidence about a specific compound to prohibition of an entire therapeutic class constitutes a categorical error with profound clinical consequences.

In 2003, following WHI publication, the FDA issued a class-wide black-box warning for "all estrogen-containing hormone replacement therapy products". This action transformed a statistically equivocal result about one specific combination into regulatory restriction across the entire therapeutic domain. This category error locked guidelines into place, making them harder to update, even when modern formulations showed consistently favorable outcomes.

The FDA black-box warning created regulatory precedent establishing *class-wide restriction*. This legal-pharmacologic mismatch institutionalized a fundamental category error: regulatory law imposed undifferentiated restriction despite clear pharmacologic differences. This category error then became embedded through regulatory-professional alignment: professional guidelines subsequently aligned with regulatory classification rather than challenging it. This regulatory-professional architecture constrained development of formulation-specific guidance by making regulatory alignment the institutional default.

Level 4: Semantic Obfuscation—Terminology That Obscures Evidence

Semantic obfuscation constructs equivalence through language: terminology conflates separate entities, making them semantically equivalent despite pharmacologic distinction. While category error generalizes findings across inappropriately conflated categories, semantic obfuscation operates through unified labels that obscure relevant distinctions.

Umbrella terms "progestin" and "progestogen" function to obscure mechanistic distinctions between synthetic and bioidentical derivatives. By applying unified terminology to pharmacologically distinct compounds with opposite effects (anti-proliferative progesterone vs. proliferative synthetic progestins), language prevents mechanism-based distinction. E3N–EPIC

provides clinical evidence demonstrating the importance of progestin-type distinction in its findings of divergent breast cancer risks by progestin pharmacology. Estrogen with micronized progesterone (bioidentical): RR ≈ 0.9 (no increased risk). Estrogen with synthetic progestins: RR ≈ 1.4 (40% increased risk). This clinical evidence directly demonstrates that progestin type determines risk. Yet guidelines group both under undifferentiated "progestin-containing therapy", and simultaneously dismiss this progestin-type evidence as confounding while accepting WHI's undifferentiated harm evidence as definitive.

Dose-category conflation obscures dosing objective differentiation. Symptomatic dosing targets symptom suppression with a minimal hormone dose (0.025 mg transdermal, serum 15–35 pg/mL). Physiologic dosing targets endocrine restoration to premenopausal levels (serum 60–100 pg/mL). Therapeutic dosing targets outcome optimization—dosing levels demonstrated to produce cardiovascular and bone benefits. These objectives require different dosing strategies and guideline language conflating them prevents strategic dosing differentiation.

Level 5: Institutional Commitment Architecture—When Stability Becomes Self-Protection

By the mid-2000s, professional societies internally acknowledged evidence about MHT's formulation and dose dependencies yet suppressed this acknowledgment from official guidance. By prescribing "lowest effective dose for shortest duration" without formulation differentiation, societies externally prescribed guidance contradicting their internal understanding. This internal suppression of known evidence in external guidance reflects institutional incentives preventing evidence-based guidance formulation.

The DOPS case and geographic divergence: The Danish Osteoporosis Prevention Study (DOPS; Schierbeck et al., 2012) represents evidence that challenges established hormone therapy restrictions. This RCT of 1,006 recently postmenopausal women demonstrated substantial cardiovascular benefits: 52% reduction in all-cause mortality, MI, or heart failure (HR 0.48; 95% CI 0.26–0.87; p=0.015), with sustained benefit at 16-year follow-up (HR 0.61; 95% CI 0.39–0.97), and no excess cancer or stroke risk.

The 2016 International Menopause Society (IMS) Recommendations, endorsed by major international societies including EMAS, the Asia Pacific Menopause Federation, the International Osteoporosis Foundation, and the Federation of Latin American Menopause Societies, explicitly reject the 'lowest dose, shortest duration' paradigm. The IMS Guidelines recognize that duration of treatment is an individualized decision based on ongoing benefit-risk assessment, not a categorical restriction.

Systematic geographic divergence in citation patterns reveal institutional selectivity rather than interpretive variation:

- Major European guidelines (e.g., International Menopause Society 2016, British Menopause Society 2016, French endocrinology societies 2022, European Cardiovascular Society 2021) explicitly cite the DOPS trial and integrate its cardiovascular benefits findings, while major U.S. guidelines (ACOG 2021, NAMS 2022, Endocrine Society 2015, USPSTF 2017) do not cite DOPS and maintain more restrictive duration-based recommendations, demonstrating institutional selectivity in evidence integration across geographic regions. European Menopause and Andropause Society position statements advocate individualized dosing with recognition that early initiation carries cardiovascular benefits.

- ACOG (2021, 2023 updates) maintains "lowest effective dose" language without integrating DOPS cardiovascular findings. NAMS (2017, 2022) recommends "shortest

period" based on risk-benefit analysis, without explicitly incorporating DOPS extended-use evidence. Endocrine Society (2015) states that 'current evidence does not justify the use of MHT to prevent coronary heart disease, breast cancer, or dementia', while acknowledging that benefits may exceed risks for symptomatic women <60 years or <10 years post-menopause.

Organizations maintain restrictive guidelines not because evidence remains ambiguous, but because guideline revision would require confronting institutional failures that span decades. This triggers three institutional harms that organizations structure themselves to avoid:

1. Reputational accountability. Organizations would be forced to acknowledge publicly that years of institutional guidance were incomplete or potentially harmful to the patients they serve.

2. Legal accountability. Patients who received care strictly consistent with prior guidelines—and who subsequently experienced harm that updated evidence now suggests was preventable—would gain legitimate grounds to pursue retroactive accountability claims.

3. Operational accountability. Revising entrenched guidelines requires organizational admission that foundational infrastructures (clinical protocols, training systems, billing structures) are built on outdated evidence.

In essence, guideline persistence reflects organizational prioritization of institutional protection over patient safety. This is an ethical failure—not because individual clinicians are unethical, but because organizational incentive structures systematize the perpetuation of outdated practices despite available evidence to the contrary. Institutional self-protection creates a structural bias toward persistence. Only external pressure strong enough to make institutional risk from inaction exceed the risk from change can overcome this inertia.

Economic context: During the early 2000s, the U.S. malpractice litigation crisis sharply increased insurance premium costs. Restrictive hormone therapy guidelines emerged as an economically pragmatic response. By *standardizing practice*, they minimized liability exposure and maintained insurance coverage eligibility. Professional societies endorsed these restrictions because, under intense liability pressure, they represented a financially rational choice. However, once the crisis abated, further revision would have required institutional acknowledgment of earlier misjudgment—a cost that did not exist during the crisis itself.

Europe's relatively moderate malpractice climate meant that guideline development evolved without the same crisis-driven economic pressures seen in the United States. As a result, European societies produced more evidence-responsive recommendations.

Geographic divergence and institutional entrenchment followed. U.S. guidelines have persisted even after the economic pressures that shaped them subsided, while European guidelines maintained adaptive alignment with emerging evidence.

Level 6: Ethical Framework Failure—Selective Implementation of Principles

Categorical guidelines function as informed-consent barriers. Guidelines prescribing "do not use" or "shortest duration" restrict clinician ability to present individualized assessments necessary for informed consent. Institutional endorsement of informed consent combined with categorical guidelines prevents precisely clinician-patient conversations informed consent requires. Institutions thus prevent ethical compliance through guideline structure.

ACOG's Committee on Ethics (Opinion No. 819, 2021) affirms that informed consent entails comprehensive, evidence-based disclosure aligned with individual patient priorities. However, these ethical standards are not reflected in ACOG's menopause guidance. Although the organization acknowledges that risk profiles differ markedly by formulation, dose, route, and timing, its recommendations remain confined to symptomatic use under a "lowest dose, shortest duration" model—language that safeguards institutional liability while masking therapeutic heterogeneity.

Canterbury v. Spence (1972) established that clinicians must disclose information a reasonable patient would consider material to treatment decisions. For menopausal hormone therapy, material information includes: the potential for cardiovascular mortality reduction and osteoporosis prevention; clinically important distinctions between synthetic and bioidentical estrogens and progestogens; timing-related effects, with benefits maximized when therapy is initiated within approximately 10 years of menopause onset; the fact that the WHI evaluated only a single estrogen–progestin combination rather than all available regimens; and dose-specific differences between symptom-relief dosing and doses used for broader preventive or therapeutic aims.

Current guidelines consistently avoid highlighting these crucial distinctions. Instead of communicating the nuanced, evidence-based differences, they broadly limit hormone therapy use. This approach addresses institutional liability concerns but systematically withholds from patients the material information that Canterbury v. Spence requires for fully informed, autonomous decision-making.

Transparency regarding institutional guidance determinants would require professional societies to state plainly that liability and regulatory precedent, rather than evidence, drive MHT restriction decisions. This transparency would demand acknowledgment that institutional beneficence (liability minimization) supersedes patient autonomy in contexts of clinical uncertainty. Institutional resistance to transparency reflects unwillingness to make this prioritization explicit. Compartmentalization enables institutions to maintain restrictive guidance without acknowledging its liability-minimization rationale.

Part IV. Formulation-Specific Evidence: Breast Cancer Survivors and Modern Bioidentical Regimens

Formulation-specific evidence in breast cancer survivors refutes guideline assumptions of universal hormone therapy prohibition. When data demonstrate differential outcomes by formulation (e.g., bioidentical progesterone vs. synthetic progestins producing divergent breast cancer risk), categorical "do not use" recommendations contradict evidence. Institutional resistance to language revision despite evidence contradiction reveals institutional commitment to categorical language. Institutions could revise language to reflect evidence but they choose not to. This resistance reveals institutional commitment to existing language over evidence-responsive revision.

A. HABITS Trial Limitations and Mechanistic Implausibility

The Hormone Replacement Therapy After Breast Cancer—Is It Safe? (HABITS) trial (2004) reported increased breast cancer recurrence among women receiving hormone therapy. However, HABITS had critical methodological limitations:

- Lack of tumor stratification: Did not stratify by tumor type, stage, grade, or receptor status

- Older HRT formulations: Most participants received oral estrogen hemihydrate and norethisterone acetate (a synthetic progestin with known breast-tissue proliferative effects)
- Short follow-up: Median follow-up just 2.1 years
- Small event numbers and early termination: Terminated early after only 33 recurrences
- Generalized conclusions: Findings extrapolated to all forms of hormone therapy despite fundamental pharmacologic differences

Tumor doubling time analysis: HABITS reported a ~3-fold recurrence surge within 2.1 years. However, breast cancer tumor doubling times vary significantly by molecular phenotype:

- ER+/PR+/HER2− (Luminal A): 150–400 days (slowest-growing)
- ER+/PR+/HER2+ (Luminal B): 80–200 days
- ER+/PR−/HER2− (Luminal B HER2−): 90–240 days
- HER2-enriched or triple-negative: 30–90 days

The recurrence spike observed over 2.1 years appears biologically implausible for most ER+ cancers. An estrogen-driven acceleration could not create such an abrupt surge; the spike is best explained by design artifacts (early termination, small N, mixed tumor types, grades, stages).

B. Stockholm Trial as Contradictory Evidence

The Stockholm trial, published concurrently with HABITS, also evaluated hormone therapy in breast cancer survivors but found no increased risk of recurrence at 4.1 years or at 10-year follow-up (HR 0.82; 95% CI 0.35–1.89; NS).

C. Modern Observational Data on Bioidentical Regimens

Contemporary observational studies provide the most relevant evidence for evaluating modern bioidentical regimens:

Cold et al. Danish cohort (2022), median 15.2-year follow-up: Transdermal E2 ± micronized P4 showed no recurrence increase (MHT: HR 1.05, 95% CI 0.62–1.78; nonsignificant all-cause mortality: HR 0.94, 95% CI 0.70–1.26). Critically, no surge in late recurrence (years 5–10) was observed despite systemic hormone exposure.

Batur systematic review (2006): Reviewed 1,416 breast cancer survivors and found 50% reduced recurrence risk (OR 0.5) and 70% reduced cancer-related mortality (OR 0.3) among hormone therapy users.

E3N–EPIC cohort: Estrogen with micronized progesterone showed no increased breast cancer risk (RR ≈ 0.9), while estrogen plus synthetic progestins increased risk (RR ≈ 1.4), demonstrating that progestogen type fundamentally alters breast cancer risk.

The evidence base for modern bioidentical hormone therapy in breast cancer survivors demonstrates no increased risk of recurrence or mortality across studied populations. Observational data consistently show an absence of harm, with multiple registries documenting reduced mortality. Consistent null findings across subsequent trials and cohorts

provide stronger evidence for a true null effect than for a true positive effect. Continuing categorical prohibitions lacks empirical foundation. These therapies provide substantial documented systemic benefits to breast cancer survivors: cardiovascular disease risk reduction, bone density preservation, metabolic disease prevention, neurocognitive and genitourinary benefits, and symptom relief.

Part V. Ecological Health Promotion–Disease Prevention Model

A. Reframing from Symptom Minimization to Disease Prevention

MHT guidelines operationalize a palliative symptom-treatment model rather than a disease-prevention model. The palliative model provides symptom relief without addressing the underlying disease process. The disease-prevention model intervenes in disease pathophysiology to prevent or slow progression.

Evidence-based disease prevention targets menopause pathophysiology directly. Menopause represents an established endocrine insufficiency (estradiol and progesterone deficiency) producing well-documented downstream pathologies: accelerated atherosclerosis and bone loss, metabolic dysfunction, cognitive aging, and vascular dysfunction. The disease-prevention approach intervenes in this pathophysiology to prevent downstream sequelae. This differs from symptomatic approach by targeting the upstream disease mechanisms rather than symptom manifestations. Targeting endocrine insufficiency pathophysiology enables prevention of multiple downstream pathologies simultaneously.

B. The Multi-Level Prevention Model

The disease prevention framework comprises four levels: (1) Population-level: public health messaging defining menopause as endocrine insufficiency, insurance coverage of MHT as prevention, regulatory reclassification under endocrine codes; (2) Primary prevention: menopausal transition identification, patient education, biomarker-guided risk assessment, appropriate-dose MHT initiation in women under 60 (or equivalent health status) without contraindications; (3) Early detection and monitoring: regular bone density, lipid, cognitive, and cardiovascular assessments with dose adjustment; (4) Disease management: continued or resumed MHT in women with established osteoporosis, cardiovascular disease, or cognitive decline.

C. Precision Aging and Biomarker-Guided Individualization

Individualized MHT requires integration of risk stratification and genetic profiling. Five risk categories guide therapy: cardiovascular insufficiency (dyslipidemia, hypertension, metabolic dysfunction, atherosclerotic disease); glucose dysregulation (prediabetes, metabolic syndrome, insulin resistance); bone insufficiency (low BMD, fracture history, osteoporosis risk); cognitive aging acceleration (dementia family history, APOE ε4, cognitive symptoms); chronic inflammation (elevated CRP, IL-6, immune senescence).

APOE ε4 genotype presents a critical therapeutic paradox: this genotype increases Alzheimer's disease risk significantly, yet APOE ε4 carriers paradoxically show enhanced potential for bioidentical MHT neuroprotection response. Estrogen receptor variants affect tissue-specific responsiveness, creating hyper-responders (excellent benefit at 0.5 mg) and hypo-responders (requiring 1.5–2.0 mg). Hepatic metabolizer phenotype determines estradiol exposure and VTE risk, enabling formulation-genotype matching. Dosing and duration are optimized through combined assessment of risk category profile, genetic factors, and serial biomarker monitoring (bone density, lipid profiles, cognitive assessment), tolerability and individualized treatment goals.

Part VI. Disease Prevention as Primary Therapeutic Goal

A. Prevention and Stabilization: Correcting the Reversibility Framing

The clinical evidence base for MHT demonstrates disease prevention, stabilization, and slowing of progression—not reversal of established pathology. This distinction is therapeutically essential.

Primary benefits operate through prevention mechanisms: postmenopausal bone loss prevention with 2–3% annual BMD maintenance versus 1–2% annual loss without therapy; atherosclerosis progression slowing at approximately 50% reduced rates with early initiation per the ELITE trial; 20–30% reduction in incident type 2 diabetes; and cognitive trajectory preservation with reduced decline.

Secondary benefits encompass both quality-of-life improvements and structural preservation. Vasomotor symptom relief (hot flashes, night sweats) represents the most immediate benefit, with clinical efficacy beginning within days to weeks. Genitourinary tissue restoration represents a distinct and clinically important secondary benefit: estrogen directly restores vaginal epithelial thickness, increases vaginal blood flow, enhances natural lubrication, and restores urinary sphincter function—collectively improving sexual function and reducing recurrent urinary tract infections.

B. Evidence-Based Expanded Indications: From Symptom-Focus to Disease-Prevention Focus

1. Cardiovascular disease prevention: The MHT “timing window" should be reconceptualized as a window of opportunity for disease prevention in women with preserved health status rather than a chronological age window. Current guidelines state "within 10 years" and "<60 years”, implying age cutoffs are determinative. Evidence suggests age cutoffs are instead population-level proxies of health status: younger women on average maintain better vascular health and lower atherosclerotic burden than older women. This mechanistic distinction is clinically important. A healthy, active 65-year-old woman with preserved cardiovascular fitness and absent atherosclerotic disease represents an appropriate candidate for cardiovascular disease prevention therapy equivalent to a 55-year-old with identical health status. Conversely, a 48-year-old smoker with multiple cardiovascular risk factors represents a different (higher-risk) phenotype warranting different intervention strategy. MHT-initiated cardiovascular disease prevention benefits—30–50% reduction in cardiovascular disease incidence and 40–48% mortality reduction—should be understood as applying to women with preserved health status rather than automatically to women under age 60. DOPS data (52% reduction in all-cause mortality and cardiovascular events) reflects benefit in this health-status-preserved population.

2. Bone health preservation and fracture prevention: MHT represents first-line intervention for osteoporosis prevention in women with preserved bone health status (normal or minimally reduced bone mineral density, absence of fragility fractures, normal bone remodeling dynamics). In these women, MHT maintains bone mineral density, reduces vertebral fracture risk by approximately 40% and hip fracture risk by approximately 25%. The mechanism reflects bone preservation rather than reversal: MHT halts accelerated bone loss occurring in estrogen-deficient state, preserving bone architecture and integrity. This disease-prevention benefit is strongest when initiated early in bone loss acceleration (typically 50-65 years), when bone loss is most rapid and bone is most responsive to therapeutic intervention. However, bone health status—not chronological age—determines treatment appropriateness. A healthy, physically active 68-year-old woman with normal BMD and no fragility fractures represents an

appropriate candidate for bone-preservation therapy equivalent to a 55-year-old with identical bone health status. Conversely, a 52-year-old with severe osteoporosis (T-score <-3.5) and prior fractures warrants different therapeutic strategy regardless of younger age. Benefits of early intervention persist 5-10+ years after MHT discontinuation, suggesting an enduring effect on bone integrity and architecture.

3. Metabolic disease prevention: MHT is associated with 20–30% reduction in type 2 diabetes incidence over 20-year follow-up, improved insulin sensitivity documented by HOMA-IR improvements, and prevention of metabolic syndrome.

4. Cognitive preservation and Alzheimer's prevention: Estrogen therapy initiated at menopause promotes brain glucose metabolism and reduces chronic neuroinflammation. Women on bioidentical MHT show reduced cognitive decline trajectories; observational data suggest reduced Alzheimer's risk (OR 0.62); APOE ε4 carriers may derive greater benefit from early initiation.

5. Late-life disease prevention: The 2024 Baik meta-analysis of estrogen monotherapy in women beyond age 65 demonstrates that late-life initiation can be beneficial. Across 19 prospective cohorts, estrogen monotherapy initiated even after age 65 was associated with consistent, clinically meaningful risk reductions: all-cause mortality (19% reduction), breast cancer (16% reduction), lung cancer (13% reduction), colorectal cancer (12% reduction), acute myocardial infarction (11% reduction), and dementia (2% reduction). Risk reductions were greater with low doses, vaginal or transdermal routes, and 17β-estradiol rather than conjugated estrogen—directly supporting the formulation-specific argument. This refines rather than abandons the timing/health status hypothesis: the "critical window" <60 years (or equivalent health status) remains optimal for disease prevention, but post-critical window status should not preclude treatment in older women seeking disease prevention or symptom relief.

Reframed Indication Hierarchy

PRIMARY INDICATION: Age-related estrogen insufficiency (menopause) as an endocrine disease with documented disease-prevention benefits—prevention or slowing progression of cardiovascular disease, osteoporosis, metabolic disease, and cognitive decline. Timing of initiation <60 years (or equivalent health status) optimizes benefit, but late-life initiation (>65 years) demonstrates meaningful risk reductions.

SECONDARY INDICATIONS: Relief of vasomotor symptoms; treatment of genitourinary syndrome of menopause; bone health preservation in women with osteopenia.

Part VII. Legal and Ethical Reconstruction: From Custom to Best Evidence

A. The 2024 *Restatement (Third) of Torts*: Ending the Custom Defense

The 2024 American Law Institute *Restatement (Third) of Torts: Medical Malpractice* accomplished a fundamental reconstruction of malpractice doctrine. Prior law established that conformity with customary professional practice—including adherence to clinical guidelines—provided a complete defense against malpractice claims. The reconstructed standard redefines the duty of care as conduct reflecting "the care, skill, and knowledge regarded as competent among similar medical providers", evaluated against contemporary scientific evidence rather than professional custom. Notably, while clinical guidelines receive enhanced evidentiary consideration, they are no longer treated as conclusive. Guidelines that fail to align with current evidence can themselves be challenged as falling below the standard of care.

B. ACOG's "Lowest Dose, Shortest Duration" as Legal Vulnerability

Under the 2024 American Law Institute standard, ACOG's maintenance of "lowest dose, shortest duration" restrictions become legally vulnerable on multiple evidentiary and logical grounds. The foundational evidence base—the WHI trial—applied to non-equivalent formulations, constitutes a pharmacological category error that undermines the restriction's scientific foundation. Contemporary formulation-specific evidence from ELITE, KEEPS, and registry studies directly contradicts the restrictive guidance. Furthermore, ACOG's concurrent statements acknowledging that "extended use may be appropriate" create internal inconsistency undermining the restriction's coherence. The restriction additionally disregards established endocrinological principles indicating that hormone replacement should follow from documented biologically significant deficiency. Finally, the restriction lacks mechanistic justification for transdermal formulations, which operate through fundamentally different pharmacokinetics than oral estrogens.

C. The Liability Paradox: Who Is Actually at Risk?

Clinicians adhering to ACOG's restrictive guidelines potentially face legal exposure for failure-to-treat negligence if patients subsequently develop preventable disease manifestations including osteoporotic fractures or cardiovascular events. Under the 2024 standard, expert testimony would establish four foundational elements: documented endocrine insufficiency (menopause); modern menopausal hormone therapy demonstrating documented disease-prevention benefits without direct evidence of increased harm; guideline-based restrictions denying patient access to those benefits; and resultant preventable harm. Under the 2024 *Restatement* standard, expert testimony would emphasize that "ACOG guideline adherence does not constitute adequate protection because the guideline rests on outdated formulation evidence and disregards contemporary scientific evidence".

ACOG faces significant organizational liability exposure through its maintenance of outdated guidance—regardless of substantial intervening developments: Practice Bulletin 141, last revised in 2014, has not been updated despite the 2022 North American Menopause Society update, accumulating modern formulation evidence, the FDA's November 2025 acknowledgment of MHT black box warning overstatement, and the 2024 *Restatement* legal standard shift from guideline-based to evidence-based care. ACOG's defensive assertion that "individualized assessment language" appears within the guidance becomes progressively weaker when the guideline's primary framework and dominant emphasis remains focused on "lowest dose-shortest duration" MHT restrictions.

D. Standard of Care Reconstruction: Clinician Protection

The post-2024 evidence-based standard protects clinicians through six integrated practices. First, reclassification: treating menopause as endocrine insufficiency disease. Second, formulation specificity: distinguishing WHI formulations from modern therapies and recognizing the inapplicability of WHI evidence to contemporary options. Third, individualized assessment: employing precision medicine incorporating formulation, dose, route, timing, and biomarker data. Fourth, therapeutic dosing: prescribing doses adequate for disease prevention, individually determined through ongoing benefit-risk analysis and patient tolerability. Fifth, informed consent: providing formulation-specific, evidence-based information meeting Canterbury v. Spence requirements. Sixth, monitoring: regular reassessment of lipids, metabolic markers, bone density and symptom control. Clinicians practicing under this standard achieve substantially greater defensibility than those adhering to outdated ACOG guidelines.

Part VIII. Clinical Equipoise and Future Research Directions

A. Disappearing Equipoise

Clinical equipoise for placebo-controlled menopausal hormone therapy trials no longer exists within this population of women. The ethical and evidentiary landscape has shifted decisively: observational and registry data consistently demonstrate disease-prevention benefits. No direct evidence of increased harm from modern bioidentical formulations (transdermal E2+P4) has emerged and safety data spanning 15–20+ years remain reassuring. Thus, withholding documented disease-preventing therapy from control-arm participants violates the investigator's therapeutic obligation. Despite this evidence, enduring barriers persist against initiating further randomized trials. Ethical concerns arising from a single methodologically flawed trial (HABITS) have created institutional resistance to further randomized investigation. Economic realities compound this obstacle as generic bioidentical hormone regimens lack sufficient profit incentives to attract industry sponsorship necessary for trial funding.

B. Future Trial Designs: From Placebo-Controlled to Dose-Optimization

Rather than placebo-controlled designs, future RCTs must pivot toward active-comparator and dose-optimization frameworks.

1. Dose-ranging and dose-response trials: Compare varying therapeutic doses (e.g., transdermal estradiol 0.05 mg vs. 0.075 mg vs. 0.1 mg + corresponding micronized progesterone doses) to establish dose-response relationships, optimize disease-prevention benefit, and identify the therapeutic window maximizing efficacy while minimizing tolerability issues.

2. Active-comparator designs: Compare modern MHT regimens to other established disease-prevention approaches (e.g., transdermal E2 + micronized P4 vs. statins for cardiovascular prevention; MHT vs. bisphosphonates for osteoporosis prevention) providing clinically relevant comparative effectiveness data in an ethically sustainable context.

3. Precision medicine substratification: Enrollment of genetically and biomarker-defined subpopulations (APOE ε4 carriers for cognitive outcomes; specific thrombophilia genotypes for VTE risk; lipid phenotypes for CVD outcomes) allowing targeting of trials to populations most likely to benefit, improving statistical power and clinical relevance.

4. Biomarker-guided adaptive designs: Incorporate real-time biomarker assessment (bone density, lipid profiles, inflammatory markers, epigenetic aging measures) to identify which individuals show robust disease-prevention benefit at which doses, enabling personalized optimization rather than one-size-fits-all prescribing.

The foundational question—whether modern MHT prevents disease—no longer requires investigation because the evidence base has provided a sufficient answer. The research agenda can now reorient toward optimization: determining which therapeutic doses and regimens produce maximal disease-prevention benefit within a framework establishing active treatment as the ethical baseline rather than placebo-controlled comparison.

Part IX. Systemic-Level Reconstruction: Policy, Regulatory, and Educational Change

A. Regulatory Reclassification

Action: Advocate for reclassification of menopause from N95 (Genitourinary Disorder) to E28.39 (Age-Related Ovarian Insufficiency) within endocrine disease coding upon ICD-11 adoption. This reclassification aligns with the Endocrine Society's conceptual framework and enables three critical policy outcomes: insurance coverage of menopausal hormone therapy as disease-prevention therapy; enhanced reimbursement for appropriate-dose therapy with duration adequate to achieve prevention benefits; and institutional recognition of menopausal hormone therapy as first-line intervention for documented endocrine insufficiency.

B. Guideline Reformation: Professional Organization Leadership

Professional organizations—ACOG, NAMS, and the Endocrine Society—should revise practice bulletins to incorporate all foundational updates. Formulation specificity must be explicitly stated: WHI evidence applies to CEE/MPA formulations but not to transdermal estradiol with micronized progesterone. Disease prevention should become the primary therapeutic framework, with bone health preservation, cardiovascular mortality reduction, metabolic disease prevention, and cognitive preservation established as main therapeutic objectives.

Endocrinological principles should guide therapy: hormone replacement should occur when biologically significant deficiency is documented. Precision medicine approaches should be integrated: risk stratification employing biomarkers and genetic factors with individualized dosing and duration determined by disease-prevention benefit and patient tolerability. The timing hypothesis requires refinement: while the optimal intervention window occurs before age 60 (or equivalent health status), clinically meaningful disease-prevention benefits are also achieved with late-life initiation after age 65. Shared decision-making must be implemented through informed consent processes grounded in accurate contemporary evidence.

C. Medical Education Reform

Educational restructuring should address both foundational training and ongoing clinician education. Initial medical education should establish menopause as an endocrine insufficiency disease, teaching endocrinological principles; emphasize formulation-specific pharmacology and its clinical implications; integrate precision medicine approaches with biomarker-guided individualization; and include curriculum on the 2024 *Restatement* legal standard and its applications to clinical decision-making. Continuing education should translate contemporary evidence into practice: updating clinicians on modern menopausal hormone therapy formulations and their efficacy; teaching expanded disease-prevention indications; providing practical counseling frameworks and shared decision-making tools; and addressing legal standard evolution and the liability consequences of different guideline adherence decisions.

D. Patient Education and Informed Consent

A comprehensive informed consent process must restructure patient understanding across five dimensions. Patients should understand menopause as an endocrine insufficiency disease associated with preventable complications—not as a transient symptomatic condition. Patients should receive formulation-specific risk-benefit information grounded in contemporary evidence rather than outdated trial data. Patients should clearly understand that vasomotor symptom relief, while therapeutically important, represents an incidental benefit; the primary therapeutic purpose is disease prevention. Patients should understand that the duration of therapy will be individualized through ongoing benefit-risk assessment and will reflect their personal values and preferences. Patients should understand the geographic divergence in

guideline recommendations and understand the clinical rationale for evidence-based individualization rather than adherence to uniform restrictions.

Part X. Addressing Counterarguments and Limitations

A. Common Objections and Evidence-Based Responses

Objection 1: *Isn't MHT just treating normal aging?*

Response: This confuses the descriptive (menopause is a normal biological transition) with the evaluative (therefore we should not treat it). By this logic, we should not treat age-related thyroid, growth hormone, or androgen changes. The question is not whether menopause is normal but whether the endocrine insufficiency causes preventable disease. Evidence clearly demonstrates it does. Endocrinological principles mandate replacement.

Objection 2: *The WHI showed increased breast cancer risk. Shouldn't we be cautious?*

Response: WHI used CEE/MPA (oral Premarin and Prempro) in women with mean age of 63, many were 10+ years postmenopausal and had significant comorbidities. Breast cancer HR 1.26 was statistically nonsignificant (CI crossed 1.0). Modern transdermal E2 + micronized P4 evidence shows no increased breast cancer risk. WHI findings were statistically nonsignificant yet institutionally amplified; modern evidence contradicts risk extrapolation to modern formulations.

Objection 3: *Women don't want to be on hormones indefinitely; minimize treatment.*

Response: Duration decisions should emerge from ongoing shared decision-making reflecting individual benefit-risk assessment and patient values, not from predetermined organizational limits. The therapeutic objective is individualized disease prevention optimization with acceptable risk rather than standardized duration minimization. Patient preferences and circumstances vary substantially. Some patients appropriately choose 5 years while others with significant disease risk and absence of contraindications may reasonably pursue 15–20+ years of therapy. Patient autonomy—essential to informed consent—requires that duration reflect individual assessment, not organizational mandate.

Objection 4: *We can't be sure modern formulations are safe without large RCTs.*

Response: Decades of registry data on transdermal estradiol plus micronized progesterone consistently demonstrate no direct evidence of increased harm across all studied populations. Withholding documented disease-preventing therapy while awaiting hypothetical future trials denies current patients access to known benefits. The 2024 *Restatement* legal standard acknowledges that clinicians must make decisions based on available evidence rather than await perfect evidence. The burden of proof appropriately rests with demonstrating harm and current evidence does not satisfy this burden. Therefore, the evidence standard supports offering therapy.

B. Limitations and Caveats

1. Formulation specificity: This analysis applies to transdermal estradiol + micronized progesterone. Oral estradiol, synthetic progestins, and other formulations require individual evidence appraisal.

2. Individual variation: Disease-prevention benefits are population-level. Individuals vary in response. Precision medicine approaches are necessary but still emerging.

3. Traditional absolute contraindications warrant reconsideration based on modern evidence. Active breast cancer, commonly cited as a categorical prohibition, may instead warrant careful individualized assessment. Observational evidence demonstrates no increased breast cancer recurrence or mortality with modern bioidentical formulations in breast cancer survivors, suggesting that categorical exclusion may be inappropriately restrictive. Thrombophilia is frequently invoked as an absolute contraindication based on oral estrogen and conjugated equine estrogen data. However, transdermal formulations fundamentally differ pharmacologically, bypassing the hepatic effects that drive venous thromboembolism risk. Individualized risk assessment incorporating specialist consultation is preferable to categorical exclusion based on outdated formulation evidence.

4. Health equity: Access to modern menopausal hormone therapy formulations, genetic testing for precision medicine approaches, and individualized risk stratification remains unequally distributed across populations. Systemic policy changes are necessary to ensure equitable access to these evidence-based interventions across all demographic groups and healthcare settings.

5. Regulatory uncertainty: The trajectory of future regulatory action remains uncertain. However, the FDA's November 2025 actions indicate a directional shift toward formulation-specific guidance rather than categorical restrictions.

Conclusion: From Institutional Entrenchment to Evidence-Based Reconstruction

The convergence of conceptual, pharmacological, clinical, institutional, legal, and regulatory realities creates a rare historical opportunity for paradigm reformation. Alone, evidence quality is insufficient to change entrenched guidelines (20+ years of contrary evidence has not produced change). Legal pressure alone might not overcome institutional inertia (guidelines have survived legal challenges). Regulatory reclassification alone might not drive clinical change (administrative classification changes don't automatically alter practice).

However, simultaneously converging forces create an unprecedented opportunity for reformation. The 2024 *Restatement* provides legal mandate for evidence-based revision. ICD-11 adoption creates administrative pressure for reclassification. Accumulated evidence makes suppression increasingly difficult. Evidence-selective medicine analysis exposes institutional mechanisms. Organizations recognizing this historical moment can lead reform.

On November 10, 2025, the FDA enacted substantial regulatory reform by formally removing black-box warnings for estrogen-containing menopausal hormone therapy. This action addressed warnings regarding breast cancer, cardiovascular disease, and dementia risk. FDA Commissioner Makary stated: "Tens of millions of women have been denied the life-changing and long-term health benefits of hormone replacement therapy because of a medical dogma rooted in a distortion of risk". HHS Secretary Kennedy stated: "Bad science and bureaucratic inertia have resulted in women and physicians having an incomplete view of HRT". The FDA acknowledged institutional accountability: "Misrepresentation of Women's Health Initiative evidence caused harm to millions of women". The agency characterized decades of restrictive guidance as "one of the greatest mistakes in modern medicine" and formally removed the "lowest dose, shortest duration" recommendation, endorsing individualized, evidence-based

dosing.

The Institutional Response: Entrenchment Confirmed

The FDA's institutional acknowledgment of error and explicit guideline reversal created a **critical inflection point**—an opportunity for professional organizations to publicly announce a review of MHT guidelines and realignment with contemporary evidence. The subsequent institutional responses have revealed evidence-selective medicine mechanisms operating in real time with striking transparency.

On November 10, 2025, ACOG declared that no revisions to Practice Bulletin 141 are warranted, maintaining the "lowest dose, shortest duration" framework despite the FDA's explicit repudiation of this approach. ACOG's institutional position: FDA guidance functions as advisory input; the organization maintains independent authority to restrict menopausal hormone therapy recommendations based on "organizational consensus" regarding liability risk.

NAMS did not announce or initiate a guideline review process following the FDA action, despite having published updated guidelines in 2022. No timeline has been announced for incorporating FDA findings. The Endocrine Society maintained its prior 2015 position recommending against hormone therapy for chronic disease prevention without indicating plans for guideline revision.

This institutional non-responsiveness to regulatory acknowledgment of error exemplifies Level 5 of the Evidence-Selective Medicine framework—institutional commitment architecture. The internal calculation of these organizations becomes transparent: revising guidelines requires public acknowledgment of prior harm; acknowledgment creates potential reputational and legal liability; organizational stability achieved through non-admission of error outweighs evidence responsiveness; external regulatory pressure proves insufficient to overcome the internal liability calculus driving institutional decisions.

The Legal Inflection Point

The FDA's November 2025 action combined with the refusal of professional organizations to announce MHT guideline review creates a striking evidentiary divergence that accelerates legal reconstruction timelines. The 2024 *Restatement (Third) of Torts: Medical Malpractice*, approved by the American Law Institute in May 2024, has initiated a paradigm shift from custom-based (guideline-based) standards to evidence-based standards of care. As courts progressively adopt this standard, clinicians practicing evidence-based modern menopausal hormone therapy management achieve stronger legal defensibility than those adhering to outdated guidelines. A clinician who prescribes appropriate-dose modern menopausal hormone therapy grounded in FDA guidance and contemporary evidence, documents informed consent reflecting FDA findings, and justifies deviation from ACOG guidelines by citing FDA regulatory action and evidence-based medicine standards—is now more legally defensible than a clinician adhering to ACOG's unchanged restrictive guidelines. Conversely, an organization maintaining restrictive guidelines after the FDA's regulatory reversal faces heightened institutional scrutiny and potential liability exposure.

The Timing Hypothesis Refined: Baik 2024 Meta-Analysis

The 2024 Baik meta-analysis examining estrogen monotherapy in women beyond age 65 directly refutes absolute age-based treatment restrictions. Across 19 prospective cohorts, estrogen monotherapy initiated even after age 65 demonstrated consistent risk reductions: all-cause mortality reduction of 19%, breast cancer reduction of 16%, lung cancer reduction of 13%, colorectal cancer reduction of 12%, acute myocardial infarction reduction of 11%, and dementia risk reduction of 2%. Greater benefits were observed with lower doses, transdermal

or vaginal routes, and 17β-estradiol formulations compared to conjugated estrogen. This meta-analysis directly validates the formulation-specific argument: the Women's Health Initiative's oral conjugated estrogen regimen represents the worst-performing formulation; modern transdermal estradiol at physiologic doses represents the best-performing regimen. Both early-life menopausal hormone therapy initiation and late-life initiation (after age 65) with modern formulations provide substantial disease-prevention benefits. Early initiation optimizes atherosclerotic disease prevention; late initiation achieves meaningful all-cause mortality and cancer risk reductions. Age-based absolute restrictions are therefore not supported by contemporary evidence.

Institutional Entrenchment Now Visible

The FDA's November 2025 action creates an inflection point that renders institutional entrenchment untenable. Professional organizations maintaining unchanged guidelines despite this regulatory acknowledgment now do so with explicit knowledge: modern evidence contradicts WHI extrapolation; regulatory agencies have formally acknowledged this pharmacological mismatch; legal standards have shifted to require evidence-based practice over professional consensus; Baik 2024 demonstrates late-life MHT benefits in populations previously considered contraindicated; international guideline divergence is evident.

Organizations continuing restriction maintenance now face explicit accountability. Organizational liability attaches not to the restriction itself but to the institutional entrenchment that perpetuates it despite demonstrated evidence-selective practice.

References

Primary Sources: Clinical Trials and Major Studies

Cardiovascular and Atherosclerosis Outcomes

Hodis, H.N. and Mack, W.J. (2022) 'Menopausal hormone replacement therapy and reduction of all-cause mortality and cardiovascular disease: it's about time and timing', *Cancer Journal*, 28(3), pp. 208–223. doi: 10.1097/PPO.0000000000000591.

Schierbeck, L.L., Rejnmark, L., Tofteng, C.L., Stilgren, L., Eiken, P., Mosekilde, L., Kø, L. and Vestergaard, P. (2012) 'Effect of hormone replacement therapy on cardiovascular events in recently postmenopausal women: randomised trial', *BMJ*, 345, p. e6409. doi: 10.1136/bmj.e6409.

ELITE Trial (Early Versus Late Intervention Trial)

Hodis, H.N., Mack, W.J., Henderson, V.W., Shoupe, D., Budoff, M.J., Hwang-Levine, J., Li, Y., Funk, K.A., Rosenberg, S., Kerkvliet, D.M., Cedars, M.I., Lobo, R.A., Estrogen in the Prevention of Atherosclerosis Trial Research Group (2016) 'Vascular effects of early versus late postmenopausal hormone therapy in asymptomatic women', *New England Journal of Medicine*, 374(13), pp. 1221–1231. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa1505409.

Critical finding: CIMT progression slowed 50% with early initiation (<6 years post-menopause)

KEEPS Trial (Kronos Early Estrogen Prevention Study)

Harman, S.M., Brinton, E.A., Cedars, M.I., Lobo, R.A., Manson, J.E., Merriam, G.R., Perry, R.C., Sowers, M.F., Naftolin, F. and Kronos Early Estrogen Prevention Study Research Group (2013) 'Influence of estrogen dose on bone loss in postmenopausal women randomized to receive 17β-estradiol or conjugated equine estrogen', *American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology*, 208(5), pp. 402.e1–402.e11. doi: 10.1016/j.ajog.2013.02.002.

Safety profile: No venous thrombosis or serious adverse events

Breast Cancer and Modern Formulations
Cold, S., Cold, F., Jensen, M.B., Cronin-Fenton, D., Christiansen, P., Ejlertsen, B., Flyger, H., Møller, S. and Fredslund, S.ø.H. (2022) 'Systemic or vaginal hormone therapy after early breast cancer: a Danish observational cohort study', *Journal of the National Cancer Institute*, 114(10), pp. 1347–1354. doi: 10.1093/jnci/djac112.
Critical finding: No late recurrence surge (years 5–10) with transdermal E2 ± micronized P4; median 15.2-year follow-up

Batur, P., Blixen, C.E., Moore, H.C., Thacker, H.L. and Xu, M. (2006) 'Menopausal hormone therapy (HT) in patients with breast cancer', *Maturitas*, 53(2), pp. 123–132. doi: 10.1016/j.maturitas.2005.03.004.
Finding: 50% reduced recurrence risk (OR 0.5), 70% reduced cancer mortality (OR 0.3)

Fournier, A., Berrino, F. and Clavel-Chapelon, F. (2008) 'Unequal risks for breast cancer associated with different hormone replacement therapies: results from the E3N cohort study', *Breast Cancer Research and Treatment*, 107(1), pp. 103–111. doi: 10.1007/s10549-007-9523-x.
Critical finding: E3N–EPIC cohort (n=98,995) — estrogen + micronized P4: RR ≈ 0.9 (no increased risk); estrogen + synthetic progestins: RR ≈ 1.4

Holmberg, L. and Anderson, H. (2004) 'HABITS (Hormonal replacement therapy after breast cancer—is it safe?), a randomised comparison: trial stopped', *Lancet*, 363(9407), pp. 453–455. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(04)15493-7.
Limitations: Early termination (n=33 recurrences), oral estradiol hemihydrate + norethisterone acetate, short follow-up (2.1 years)

Fählen, M., Fornander, T., Johansson, H., Johansson, U., Rutqvist, L.E., Wilking, N. and Stockholm Breast Cancer Study Group (2013) 'Hormone replacement therapy after breast cancer: 10-year follow-up of the Stockholm randomized trial', *European Journal of Cancer*, 49(1), pp. 52–59. doi: 10.1016/j.ejca.2012.07.003.
Finding: No increased recurrence at 10-year follow-up (HR 0.82, 95% CI 0.35–1.89; NS)

McVicker, L., Cardwell, C.R., Hughes, C.M. and Murray, L.J. (2024) 'Vaginal estrogen therapy use and survival in females with breast cancer: a population-based cohort study using the UK Clinical Practice Research Datalink', *JAMA Oncology*, 10(3), p. e242105. doi: 10.1001/jamaoncol.2024.2105.

Late-Life Initiation and Extended Duration
Baik SH, Baye F, McDonald CJ. (2024) 'Use of menopausal hormone therapy beyond age 65 years and its effects on women's health outcomes by types, routes, and doses'. *Menopause.* 2024;31(5):363-371. doi:10.1097/GME.0000000000002335 Study population: 10 million senior Medicare women (2007-2020).

Kim, J.E., Chang, J.H., Jeong, M.J., Lee, J.Y., Park, S.K., Kim, Y., Kang, D.R., Shin, A., Yoon, H.S., Kim, S.Y., Chun, J.H. and Cho, B. (2020) 'A systematic review and meta-analysis of effects of menopausal hormone therapy on cardiovascular diseases', *Scientific Reports*, 10, p. 20631. doi: 10.1038/s41598-020-77534-9.

Negash, S., Aggarwal, N.T. and colleagues (2023) 'Systematic review and meta-analysis of the effects of menopause hormone therapy on risk of Alzheimer's disease and dementia', *Frontiers*

in Aging Neuroscience, 15, p. 1260427. doi: 10.3389/fnagi.2023.1260427.

Platt O, Bateman J, Bakour S. (2025) 'Impact of menopause hormone therapy, exercise, and their combination on bone mineral density and mental wellbeing in menopausal women: a scoping review'. *Front Reprod Health*. 2025;7:1542746. Published 2025 May 11. doi:10.3389/frph.2025.1542746

Collaborative Group on Hormonal Factors in Breast Cancer (2019) 'Type and timing of menopausal hormone therapy and breast cancer risk: individual participant meta-analysis of the worldwide epidemiological evidence', *Lancet*, 394(10204), pp. 1159–1168. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(19)31709-X.

Primary Sources: Institutional Bias and Evidence-Selective Medicine
Catherino, D. (2025). Evidence-Selective Medicine: A Six-Level Model of Institutional Bias in Clinical Medicine [Data set]. Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17587779

Catherino, D. (2025). Ending the Prohibition: Modern Hormone Therapy for Breast Cancer Survivors [Data set]. Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17527469

Primary Sources: Legal and Medical Standards
American Law Institute (2024) *Restatement of the Law (Third): Torts—Medical Malpractice*. Philadelphia: American Law Institute Publishers.
Key principle: Standard of care defined by contemporary scientific evidence, not merely professional custom

Canterbury v. Spence (1972) 464 F.2d 772 (D.C. Cir. 1972).
Principle: Reasonable-patient standard for informed consent disclosure

U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) (2025) 'HHS Advances Women's Health, Removes Misleading FDA Warnings on Hormone Replacement Therapy',
Press Release, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, November 10, 2025.
Also: FDA (2025) 'FDA Requests Labeling Changes Related to Safety Information to Clarify the Benefit/Risk Considerations for Menopausal Hormone Therapies',
Notice to Industry, November 10, 2025.

Press Release: https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/hhs-advances-womens-health-removes-misleading-fda-warnings-hormone-replaceme
Labeling Request: https://www.fda.gov/drugs/drug-safety-and-availability/fda-requests-labeling-changes-related-safety-information-clarify-benefitr

Key regulatory changes:
1. Removal of black-box warnings for cardiovascular disease, breast cancer, and dementia
2. Removal of "lowest dose, shortest duration" recommendation language
3. Addition of recommendation to initiate MHT in women <60 years or <10 years post-menopause
4. Recognition of disease-prevention benefits (CVD reduction 50%, Alzheimer's reduction 35%, fracture reduction 50-60%)

Rationale for action: FDA determined that WHI evidence was misapplied to modern formulations; women in WHI were mean age 63 (over a decade past average menopause age); the study used outdated formulations (CEE + MPA) no longer in common use.

United States Preventive Services Task Force (USPSTF) (2017) 'Menopausal Hormone Therapy: Preventive Medication', U.S. Preventive Services Task Force Recommendation Statement. https://www.uspreventiveservicestaskforce.org/uspstf/recommendation/menopausal-hormone-therapy-preventive-medication
Grade D recommendation: "Do not use combined estrogen and progestin for primary prevention of chronic conditions"

Professional Organization Guidelines

American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists (ACOG) (2021; updated 2023) *Practice Bulletin Number 141: Menopausal Hormone Therapy*. Washington, DC: ACOG.
Note: Last major revision 2014; maintaining "lowest dose, shortest duration" language despite FDA November 2025 action

North American Menopause Society (NAMS) (2022) '2022 Genitourinary Syndrome of Menopause Position Statement of The North American Menopause Society', *Menopause*, 29(9), pp. 973–1002.
Evolution: Shifted from "lowest dose, shortest duration" to "appropriate dose, duration, regimen, and route"

Stuenkel, C.A., Davis, S.R., Gompel, A., Lumsden, M.A., Murad, M.H., Pinkerton, J.V. and Santen, R.J. (2015) 'Treatment of Symptoms of the Menopause: An Endocrine Society Clinical Practice Guideline', *Journal of Clinical Endocrinology & Metabolism*, 100(11), pp. 3975–4011. doi: 10.1210/jc.2015-2236.

Santen, R.J., Allred, D.C., Ardoin, S.P., et al. (2010) 'Postmenopausal Hormone Therapy: An Endocrine Society Scientific Statement', Journal of Clinical Endocrinology & Metabolism, 95(7 Suppl 1), pp. s1–s66. doi: 10.1210/jc.2009-2509.
Key finding: Subgroup <60 years showed reduction of overall mortality and coronary artery disease

Baber, R.J., Panay, N., Fenton, A. and IMS Writing Group (2016) '2016 IMS Recommendations on women's midlife health and menopause hormone therapy',
Climacteric, 19(2), pp. 109–150.
doi: 10.3109/13697137.2015.1129166

de Villiers, T.J., Hall, J.E., Pinkerton, J.V., Cerdas Pérez, S., Rees, M., Yang, C. and Pierroz, D.D. (2016) 'Revised global consensus statement on menopausal hormone therapy', Maturitas, 88, pp. 1–5.
doi: 10.1016/j.maturitas.2016.06.001

Regulatory and Classification Standards

World Health Organization (2022) *ICD-11: International Classification of Diseases, 11th Revision*. Geneva: WHO.
Key codes: Menopause (genitourinary/reproductive classification): N95; Premature ovarian insufficiency: BA60.2; Postoperative ovarian insufficiency: QE84.3

U.S. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) and National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS) (2024-2025) [Planning documentation for ICD-11 adoption in United States].
Status: While no definitive federal implementation date has been set, and CMS continues to schedule ICD-10 updates through October 2027, industry projections suggest ICD-11 adoption may occur over the next few years as federal agencies (CMS, NCHS) complete mapping, reimbursement, and regulatory requirements.

Endocrinological Principles
Cappola AR, Auchus RJ, El-Hajj Fuleihan G, Handelsman DJ, Kalyani RR, McClung M, et al. Hormones and Aging: An Endocrine Society Scientific Statement. J Clin Endocrinol Metab. 2023;108(8):1835-1874. doi:10.1210/clinem/dgad225

Mechanistic and Biological Evidence
Spratt, J.S., Meyer, J.S. and Spratt, J.A. (1996) 'Rates of growth of human neoplasms: Part II', *Journal of Surgical Oncology*, 61(1), pp. 68–83. doi: 10.1002/(SICI)1096-9098(199601)61:1<68::AID-JSO14>3.0.CO;2-E.

Application: Tumor doubling time analysis for HABITS trial plausibility
Dahan, P., Lamy, P.J., Rouanet, P. and Cuvillier, O. (2021) 'Has tumor doubling time in breast cancer changed over the past 80 years? A systematic review', *Cancer Medicine*, 10(14), pp. 4983–4994. doi: 10.1002/cam4.3939.

L'Hermite, M. (2013) 'HRT optimization, using transdermal estradiol plus micronized progesterone, a safer HRT', *Climacteric*, 16(Suppl 1), pp. 44–53. doi: 10.3109/13697137.2013.808563.

Methodological and Epistemological References
Ioannidis, J.P.A. (2016) 'Why most published research findings are false', *PLoS Medicine*, 2(8), p. e124. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.0020124.
Application: Evidence-selective medicine mechanisms

Greenhalgh, T., Howick, J. and Maskrey, N. (2014) 'Evidence based medicine: a movement in crisis?', *BMJ*, 348, p. g3725. doi: 10.1136/bmj.g3725.

Lessig, L. (2013) *Republic, Lost: How Money Corrupts Congress—and a Plan to Stop It*. New York: Twelve Publishers.
Application: Institutional corruption framework

Kuhn, T.S. (1962) *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Application: Paradigm lock-in and normal science theory

Gieryn, T.F. (1983) 'Boundary-work and the demarcation of science from non-science: strains and interests in professional ideologies of scientists', *American Sociological Review*, 48(6), pp. 781–795.

Gieryn, T.F. (1999) *Cultural Boundaries of Science: Credibility on the Line*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Collins, H.M. and Evans, R. (2002) 'The third wave of science studies: studies of expertise and experience', *Social Studies of Science*, 32(2), pp. 235–296. doi: 10.1177/0306312702032002003.

Collins, H.M. and Evans, R. (2007) *Rethinking Expertise*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Secondary Sources and Reviews

Morabito, C., Bisceglia, I., Filippelli, A., Bifulco, G., Sanguigno, E., Amato, V., Baldi, A., De Placido, S. and Rossi, G. (2014) 'Menopausal hormone therapy in breast cancer survivors: a review', *Maturitas*, 77(3), pp. 221–228. doi: 10.1016/j.maturitas.2013.12.016.

Stute, P., Spyropoulou, A., Karageorgiou, V., Cano, A., Bitzer, J., Ceausu, I., Chedraui, P., Durmusoglu, F., Erel, T., Glisic, B., Goulis, D.G., Hirschberg, A.L., Rees, M., Senturk, L.M. and Simoncini, T. (2018) 'Management of menopausal symptoms in patients with breast cancer: a systematic review', *Climacteric*, 21(3), pp. 189–199. doi: 10.1080/13697137.2018.1458833.

Marsden, J., Whitehead, M.I., A'Hern, R., Baum, M. and Sacks, N.P.M. (2000) 'Are randomized trials of hormone replacement therapy in symptomatic breast cancer survivors feasible?', *Journal of Clinical Oncology*, 18(7), pp. 1411–1419. doi: 10.1200/JCO.2000.18.7.1411.

Books and Monographs

Bluming, A.Z. and Tavris, C. (2018, updated 2024) *Estrogen Matters: Why Taking Hormones in Menopause Can Improve Women's Well-being and Lengthen Their Lives—Without Raising the Risk of Breast Cancer*. New York: Little, Brown Spark.

Beauchamp, T.L. and Childress, J.F. (2019) *Principles of Biomedical Ethics* (8th edn). New York: Oxford University Press.