Why ovarian cancer is still diagnosed late, despite decades of screening research

Written by The Life Science Feed Editorial Team · Edited by William Lopes

Ovarian cancer remains a formidable challenge in oncology, largely due to its insidious nature and the persistent difficulty in early detection. For decades, clinicians have grappled with the reality that most patients present with advanced disease, a factor that profoundly impacts prognosis and treatment outcomes.
The absence of effective, widely implementable screening strategies means that by the time symptoms manifest, the cancer has often spread beyond the ovaries, making curative intervention significantly harder. This late diagnosis drives the high mortality rates associated with the disease.

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- The Pivot: Despite ongoing efforts, no population-wide screening method has demonstrated a clear mortality benefit for ovarian cancer.
- The Data: The majority of ovarian cancer diagnoses occur at advanced stages (III or IV), when the disease has already metastasized.
- The Action: Clinicians must maintain a high index of suspicion for vague symptoms in at-risk women and counsel patients on genetic testing where appropriate.

Ovarian cancer is often termed a 'silent killer' because its early symptoms are non-specific and easily mistaken for less serious conditions, such as irritable bowel syndrome or menstrual discomfort. These vague symptoms include bloating, pelvic or abdominal pain, difficulty eating or feeling full quickly, and urinary symptoms like urgency or frequency. When these symptoms do become persistent and severe enough to prompt medical attention, the cancer has typically progressed to a stage where it is much harder to treat effectively.
The disease itself is heterogeneous, encompassing several distinct histological subtypes, with high-grade serous ovarian cancer (HGSOC) being the most common and aggressive. This biological diversity complicates the development of a universal screening approach. The goal of any cancer screening program is to detect disease at an early, asymptomatic stage, thereby improving survival outcomes. For ovarian cancer, this has proven exceptionally difficult.

The Elusive Quest for Early Detection

Efforts to develop an effective screening strategy for ovarian cancer have focused primarily on two modalities: transvaginal ultrasound (TVUS) and serum cancer antigen 125 (CA-125) testing. CA-125 is a glycoprotein often elevated in the blood of women with ovarian cancer, but its utility as a standalone screening marker is limited. Many benign conditions, such as endometriosis, uterine fibroids, and pelvic inflammatory disease, can also elevate CA-125 levels, leading to a high rate of false positives. Conversely, early-stage ovarian cancers, particularly non-epithelial subtypes,

may not produce elevated CA-125, resulting in false negatives.

TVUS can detect ovarian masses, but distinguishing between benign and malignant lesions often requires invasive procedures. The high prevalence of benign ovarian cysts and other non-cancerous conditions means that a screening program based solely on TVUS would lead to an unacceptable number of unnecessary surgeries, with their associated risks and costs. The challenge lies in finding a balance between sensitivity and specificity, avoiding both missed cancers and over-diagnosis.

Large-scale randomized controlled trials have investigated the efficacy of combining CA-125 and TVUS for population screening. These trials, conducted over many years and involving tens of thousands of women, aimed to determine if such a strategy could reduce ovarian cancer mortality. The results have consistently shown no significant reduction in mortality from ovarian cancer in the screened groups compared to control groups. This lack of mortality benefit has led major medical organizations to recommend against routine screening for ovarian cancer in asymptomatic women of average risk.

Why Biomarkers and Imaging Fall Short

The inherent biology of ovarian cancer contributes significantly to the failure of current screening methods. The disease often originates in the fallopian tube fimbriae, not directly from the ovarian surface epithelium, and can spread rapidly within the peritoneal cavity before forming a palpable mass or causing significant symptoms. This rapid dissemination means that by the time a tumor is large enough to be detected by imaging or to consistently elevate biomarkers, it may have already metastasized.

The natural history of ovarian cancer is not fully understood. It is unclear whether all early-stage lesions progress to advanced, aggressive disease, or if some indolent forms exist that would be over-diagnosed and over-treated by an effective screening program. This uncertainty complicates the interpretation of screening trial results and the development of new strategies. The justification for not screening for prostate cancer, for example, shares some of these complexities regarding over-diagnosis.

Newer biomarkers, such as HE4, and multi-marker panels have been explored, but none have yet demonstrated the necessary sensitivity and specificity to be effective for population-wide screening. These markers may have a role in risk stratification for women with an ovarian mass or in monitoring disease recurrence, but they do not solve the fundamental problem of early asymptomatic detection. The search for a reliable biomarker continues, but it is a complex undertaking given the diverse nature of the disease.

Genetic Risk and Targeted Screening

For a subset of women, genetic predisposition significantly increases the risk of ovarian cancer. Mutations in genes such as BRCA1 and BRCA2 are the most well-known, conferring a substantially elevated lifetime risk. For these high-risk individuals, current guidelines recommend enhanced surveillance or risk-reducing salpingo-oophorectomy (RRSO). Enhanced surveillance typically involves annual or semi-annual CA-125 testing and TVUS, starting at an earlier age than the general population. But even in this high-risk group, the efficacy of surveillance in reducing mortality is not definitively established. RRSO, the surgical removal of the ovaries and fallopian tubes, is the most effective risk-reducing strategy, but it induces surgical menopause and is not suitable for all women.

Genetic testing for BRCA mutations and other hereditary cancer syndromes is a critical component of risk assessment,

particularly for women with a strong family history of ovarian or breast cancer. Identifying these high-risk individuals allows for personalized risk management strategies, which, while not perfect, offer the best current approach to mitigating risk. This targeted approach contrasts with the broader population screening efforts that have largely failed.

The Path Forward: Symptom Awareness and Research

Given the current limitations of screening, symptom awareness remains paramount. Educating both clinicians and the public about the persistent, non-specific symptoms of ovarian cancer is essential for improving early diagnosis and patient outcomes. While these symptoms are vague, their persistence and new onset in women, particularly post-menopausal women, should trigger further investigation. A thorough clinical history, physical examination, and appropriate imaging or CA-125 testing are essential when ovarian cancer is suspected.

Research continues into novel screening approaches, including liquid biopsies that detect circulating tumor DNA (ctDNA) or other cancer-specific molecular signatures. These technologies hold promise for detecting cancer at its earliest stages, but they are still in experimental phases and face significant hurdles in terms of sensitivity, specificity, and cost-effectiveness for population screening. The complexity of the disease means that a single, simple solution is unlikely.

The development of new diagnostic tools must also consider the economic and psychological impact of false positives and unnecessary interventions. Any new screening test must demonstrate a clear benefit in terms of reduced mortality, without causing undue harm or anxiety. This is a high bar, and one that has not yet been met for ovarian cancer. For clinicians navigating complex diagnostic pathways, having a reliable reference like the Oxford Handbook of Oncology can be invaluable for quick, evidence-based decisions.

The ongoing challenge of ovarian cancer diagnosis highlights the need for sustained research funding and innovative thinking. The focus must shift from simply detecting masses to understanding the earliest molecular changes that precede clinical disease. Only then might a truly effective screening strategy emerge. Until then, vigilance for symptoms and appropriate risk stratification remain the cornerstones of management. The experience with cervical cancer screening registries shows that even with effective screening, implementation challenges can persist.

> **CLINICAL IMPLICATIONS**
>
> The persistent failure to develop effective ovarian cancer screening means clinicians must remain acutely aware of the disease's subtle presentation. We cannot rely on a magic bullet for early detection; instead, a high index of suspicion for persistent, vague abdominal or pelvic symptoms in at-risk women is the best defense. This places a significant burden on primary care and general gynaecology, where these non-specific symptoms are first encountered. Genetic counseling and testing for BRCA1/2 and other hereditary cancer syndromes are not optional extras for women with a family history; they are integral to risk stratification and guiding preventative strategies.
>
> For the pharmaceutical industry, the lack of a screening breakthrough means the focus remains on improving treatments for advanced disease. But this also highlights the immense unmet need for truly early diagnostics. Any company that can crack the code of asymptomatic ovarian cancer detection will fundamentally alter the market.
>
> Patients, unfortunately, bear the brunt of this diagnostic gap. They need clear, consistent messaging about

> symptoms that warrant investigation, without inducing undue anxiety over every minor ache. The current reality is that early diagnosis often depends on their persistence and a clinician's astute interpretation of subtle cues.

EDITORIAL & AI STANDARDS

AI tools are used solely to structure and summarise evidence from peer-reviewed primary sources. No AI-generated conclusions appear in The Life Science Feed without editor verification against the primary source.

REFERENCES

1. 1. Stewart C, Ralyea C, Lockwood S. Ovarian Cancer: An Integrated Review. Semin Oncol Nurs. 2019;35(2):151-156. doi:10.1016/j.soncn.2019.02.001
2. 2. Koonings PP, Campbell K, Mishell DR Jr, Grimes DA. Relative frequency of primary ovarian neoplasms: a 10-year review. Obstet Gynecol. 1989;74(6):921-6. doi:10.1016/0020-7292(90)90378-x
3. 3. Lala SV, Strubel N. Ovarian neoplasms of childhood. Pediatr Radiol. 2019;49(11):1463-1475. doi:10.1007/s00247-019-04456-8
4. 4. Morice P, Scambia G, Abu-Rustum NR, et al. Fertility-sparing treatment and follow-up in patients with cervical cancer, ovarian cancer, and borderline ovarian tumours: guidelines from ESGO, ESHRE, and ESGE. Lancet Oncol. 2024;25(11):e602-e610. doi:10.1016/S1470-2045(24)00262-6
5. 5. Tanha K, Mottaghi A, Nojomi M, et al. Investigation on factors associated with ovarian cancer: an umbrella review of systematic review and meta-analyses. J Ovarian Res. 2021;14(1):153. doi:10.1186/s13048-021-00911-z
6. 6. Talerman A. Ovarian pathology. Curr Opin Obstet Gynecol. 1992;4(4):608-15. PMID:1504280

LICENCE & RIGHTS

MEDICAL DISCLAIMER

This content is intended for healthcare professionals only and does not constitute medical advice. Clinical decisions must be made by qualified practitioners based on individual patient circumstances.

FOLLOW THE LIFE SCIENCE FEED