Supplemental Figure 5- Forest-plot of the prevalence of endometrial neoplasia diagnosis during follow-up (without considering time-to-event data). Cases with hysterectomy at diagnosis were excluded. Case series with less than five cases and individual case reports were aggregated.

Study	Cancer	Cases		Proportion	CI 95%	Weight
Level = Aggregated						
Aggregated case reports 1985–2018	6	24		0.25	[0.10; 0.47]	16.0%
Random effects model	6	24		0.25	[0.12; 0.46]	16.0%
Heterogeneity: not applicable						
Level = Non–aggregated						
Bo 2018	0	34		0.00	[0.00; 0.10]	5.7%
Chen 2017	1	10		0.10	[0.00; 0.45]	8.5%
Chiyoda 2018	7	35		0.20	[0.08; 0.37]	16.8%
Fukunaga 1995	0	5		0.00	[0.00; 0.52]	5.4%
Grimbizis 2017	1	9		0.11	[0.00; 0.48]	8.4%
Longacre 1996	0	44		0.00	[0.00; 0.08]	5.7%
Nemejcova 2015	0	6		0.00	[0.00; 0.46]	5.5%
Nomura 2016	9	18		0.50	[0.26; 0.74]	16.0%
Young 1986	2	23		0.09	[0.01; 0.28]	12.1%
Random effects model	20	184		0.12	[0.05; 0.25]	84.0%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 62\%$, $\chi_8^2 = 21.19$ ($p < 0.01$)						
Random effects model	**26**	**208**		**0.14**	**[0.07; 0.26]**	**100.0%**
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 58\%$, $\chi_9^2 = 21.60$ ($p = 0.01$)						

0   0.1 0.2 0.3 0.4 0.5 0.6 0.7
Proportion