## **SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES**

Supplementary Table 1. Outcomes and covariates of the studies included in the meta-analysis.

Study		Risk estimates	Adjustment factors			
Arthur et al. (2019)	NCEP ATP III	Age  Smoking  Hormone therapy use  Hormone therapy use (excluding women from the hormone therapy intervention)  BMI  Type I: 2.49 (1.77-3	< 65 years: 2.55 (1.66-3.92) ≥ 65 years: 1.92 (1.24-2.98) never: 1.73 (1.16-2.59) ever: 3.45 (1.10-5.69) never: 2.38 (1.62-3.49) ever: 1.83 (1.03-3.25) never: 2.61 (1.71-3.99) ever: 1.72 (0.88-3.35) < 25: 1.83 (0.61-5.46) 25-29.9: 1.31 (0.62-2.76) ≥ 30: 1.57 (1.04-2.36) .50)	With the exception of the stratifying variable, models were adjusted for age, pack-years of smoking, alcohol intake, physical activity, hormone therapy use, oral contraceptive use, menopausal status, education, ethnicity, allocation to the observational study or intervention/placebo/control arm of each clinical trial		
	IDF	Total: 2.27 (1.67-3.0 Type I: 2.22 (1.55-3 Total: 2.05 (1.51-2.7)	)9) ´ .12)	intake, physical activity, hormone therapy ever, oral contraceptive ever, menopausal status, education, ethnicity, family history of endometrial cancer and allocation to		
Trabert et al. (2015)	NCEP ATP III	Endometrioid grade Endometrioid grade Adenocarcinoma: 1. Serous: 1.41 (1.19-1 Clear cell: 1.46 (1.0 Mucinous: 1.69 (1.1 Carcinosarcoma: 1.3 Sarcoma: 1.34 (0.94 Other: 1.31 (1.08-1. Type I: 1.41 (1.32-1 Type II: 1.42 (1.22-Total: 1.21 (1.14-1.2 Endometrioid grade Endometrioid grade Adenocarcinoma: 1.	.41 (1.27-1.56) 1.67) 6-2.02) 4-2.50) 14 (0.94-1.38) 1-1.92) 58) .50) 1.65) 29) 1-2: 2.09 (1.83-2.40) 3: 2.02 (1.57-2.59) .99 (1.67-2.38)	the observational study or intervention/placebo/control arm of each clinical trial  Diagnosis date, age, race/ethnicity, registry area, tobacco use, and additionally adjusted for overweight/obesity for all cases		
	IDF	Serous: 2.29 (1.74-3 Clear cell: 2.03 (1.1 Mucinous: 4.06 (2.3 Carcinosarcoma: 1.5 Sarcoma: 2.17 (1.22 Other: 2.34 (1.72-3. Type I: 2.03 (1.83-2 Type II: 2.24 (1.74-7 Total: 1.17 (0.99-1.3)	5-3.60) 66-6.99) 58 (1.12-2.24) 2-3.85) 17) .26) 2.88)	Account of managers and have of		
Friedenreich et al. (2011)	Harmonized definition	Pre/perimenopausal: 1.3  BMI < 25: 1.84 (0.9  BMI 25-29.9: 2.04 (  BMI > 30: 1.71 (1.1  Total: 1.53 (1.17-2.0	39 (1.03-1.89) 2-3.67) 1.33-3.11) 3-2.58)	Age, age at menarche, number of pregnancies $\geq 20$ weeks gestation Age, age at menarche, number of pregnancies $\geq 20$ weeks gestation, hormone therapy use type Age, age at menarche, number of pregnancies $\geq 20$ weeks gestation, hormone therapy use type Age, age at menarche, number of		
	IDF: 1.46 (1.	I: 1.56 (1.20-2.03)	pregnancies ≥ 20 weeks gestation, hormone therapy use type, adiponectin, insulin, and leptin			

Rosato et al. (2011)	NCEP ATP III: 1.98 (1.14-3.44)	Age, study center, year of interview, education, age at menarche, parity, menopausal status, oral contraceptive			
,	IDF: 1.67 (0.99-2.81)	use, and hormone replacement therapy use			
Russo et al. (2008)	NCEP ATP III: 1.56 (0.95-2.41)	No adjustment			
	NCEP ATP III: 1.62 (1.08-2.41)	The analysis was matched on study center, baseline menopausal status, age at blood collection, time of day of blood collection, fasting status,			
Cust et al. (2007)	IDF: 1.20 (0.82-1.75)	and in premenopausal women, phase of menstrual cycle; and the model was additionally adjusted for waist circumference			

BMI, body mass index; CI, confidence interval; IDF, International Diabetes Federation; MetS, metabolic syndrome; NCEP ATP-III, Adult Treatment Panel III of the National Cholesterol Education Program.

## Supplementary Table 2. Results of the critical evaluation of included studies using the Newcastle-Ottawa Quality Assessment Scale for cohort studies

	Selection				Comparability		Outcome		
Study	Representativeness of exposed cohort	Selection of non- exposed cohort ☆	Exposure ascertainment ☆	No history of disease ☆	Comparable on confounders ☆☆	Outcome Assessment	Adequate follow-up (≥10y)		Total Score
Arthur et al. (2019)	¥	☆	¥	☆	<b>##</b>	☆	☆		8
Russo et al. (2008)	☆	☆	☆	☆		☆			5

## Supplementary Table 3. Results of the critical evaluation of included studies using the Newcastle–Ottawa Quality Assessment Scale for case-control studies.

Study	Selection				Comp	arability		Outcome			
	Adequate case definition	Representativeness of cases	Selection of controls ☆	Definition of controls	conf	parable on ounders ☆☆	Exposure ascertainment	Ascertainment for cases and controls ☆	Non- response rate ☆	Total Score	
Trabert et al. (2015)	☆	☆	☆	☆	☆		☆	☆		7	
Friedenreich et al. (2011)	☆		$\stackrel{\wedge}{\sim}$	*	☆	$\stackrel{\wedge}{\Rightarrow}$	$\stackrel{\sim}{\omega}$	☆	☆	8	
Rosato et al. (2011)	☆	$\stackrel{\wedge}{\sim}$		☆		☆	*		☆	6	
Cust et al. (2007)	☆	☆	☆	☆	☆	☆	☆	☆		8	