URF PUBLISHERS
connect with research world

International Journal of Aging and Geriatric Medicine

https://urfpublishers.com/journal/gerontology-geriatric-medicine

Vol: 2 & Iss: 2

Research Article

Understanding Cancer Risk in Aging: Bridging the Communication Gap in Screening Advocacy from the Fourth Decade of Life

Cynthia Naa Anyimah Botchway*

Researcher, Cancer Advocate, and Cancer Patient Navigator (Lexville Cares); Board Member, Alliance for Cancer Care Equity (ACCE) Ghana

Citation: Botchway CNA. Understanding Cancer Risk in Aging: Bridging the Communication Gap in Screening Advocacy from the Fourth Decade of Life. *Int J Aging Geriatr Med 2026*, 2(2), 138-154.

Received: 06 April, 2026; **Accepted:** 22 April, 2026; **Published:** 24 April, 2026

***Corresponding author:** Cynthia Naa Anyimah Botchway, Researcher, Cancer Advocate, and Cancer Patient Navigator (Lexville Cares); Board Member, Alliance for Cancer Care Equity (ACCE), Ghana, Tel: 0243568755; Email: cynthiabotchway@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Cancer prevalence increases with age and recovery outcomes often decline among older adults, particularly from the fourth decade of life. This study was prompted by a question raised by Kwaku: if cancer can occur at any age, why is screening emphasized from around age forty? The query highlights a broader communication gap in public understanding of age-specific screening recommendations. The purpose of this research was to investigate why cancer becomes more prevalent and harder to recover from with age, while clarifying the rationale for screening at the fourth decade. Using a mixed-route methodology, the study integrated three evidence streams: theoretical literature on cancer biology and aging, epidemiological statistics on global incidence and survival patterns and empirical studies on screening outcomes. This triangulated approach enabled a comprehensive understanding of the biological, population-level and clinical dimensions of cancer risk and management. Results revealed that aging drives cancer development through cumulative cellular mutations, reduced DNA repair efficiency and declining physiological resilience. Epidemiological evidence shows a marked rise in cancer incidence and a decrease in survival rates after age forty. Empirical studies confirm that early detection via screening improves treatment efficacy, reduces mortality and permits less aggressive interventions. Findings indicate that midlife screening is justified biologically and statistically, yet the communication gap leaves many uncertain about its importance. The study recommends targeted advocacy and health navigation programs that clearly explain the biological and statistical reasons for screening at midlife. Messaging should emphasize that small, early cellular changes may not be felt but can be detected through screening, making treatment more effective, less costly and potentially curative. Incorporating screening as a routine aspect of midlife health care can transform it from a reactive measure into a proactive lifestyle practice.

Keywords: Cancer screening, Cancer risk, Screening advocacy, Early detection, Fourth decade, Aging, epidemiology, Treatment efficacy, Age-based screening, Public health communication

1. Introduction

"Why do you guys always make it seem as if cancer only targets old people? Everyone I have heard speak about cancer advises that once you're beyond age 40, you should start screening. It makes it seem like age 40 is a bad thing or a 'cancer zone.' Meanwhile, we are told life begins at 40, but these cancer narratives make it seem like death begins at 40. But don't children also get cancer?"

This question was raised by an attendee at a prostate cancer advocacy program in Ghana who appeared disturbed by the emphasis on the recommended age-40 to 45-for high-risk individuals, including Black men and those with a family history of prostate cancer, to begin routine screening. The attendee, who was pseudonymously referred to in this study as Kwaku, argued that cancer was simply a disease and, like many diseases, could affect anyone at any age. From his perspective, the emphasis on age-based screening seemed to imply that cancer primarily targeted older people. Instead, he viewed cancer as something closer to a game of chance-an unpredictable occurrence that had little to do with age. In articulating this viewpoint, Kwaku's reasoning aligned with the philosophy of Jacques Monod, the Nobel Prize–winning molecular biologist who argued in his 1970 book Chance and Necessity that life itself was a highly improbable and accidental outcome of purely natural processes.

The concerns raised by Kwaku reflected a broader tension between individual philosophical interpretations of disease and the public health logic that informed medical recommendations. By aligning his view with the philosophy presented in *Chance and Necessity*, Kwaku emphasized the apparent randomness of biological existence, suggesting that if life itself were accidental, then cancer must also occur randomly and independently of age. From a biological standpoint, it was acknowledged that any single cell could mutate at any moment. This reality often created the impression that cancer was a purely random event. However, scientific research demonstrated that this element of "chance" was not evenly distributed across the human lifespan. Studies examining age-related somatic mutation burdens across multiple human tissues showed that mutations accumulated progressively over time, revealing that genomic instability was not merely a random occurrence but a predictable biological process shaped by time and tissue-specific exposure[1].

This shift-from viewing cancer as an unpredictable event to understanding it as a process shaped by cumulative biological change-formed the basis of modern cancer prevention strategies. While the possibility of mutation existed at any age, the probability of malignant transformation increased as mutations accumulated over time, creating measurable patterns of risk across the lifespan. It was this gradual accumulation of risk, rather than the mere possibility of disease, that informed contemporary screening guidelines.

Consequently, the clinical recommendation for screening beginning around age 40 was not interpreted as a dismissal of Kwaku's observation that children could also develop cancer. Rather, it reflected the biological reality of cumulative risk. To move beyond this philosophical concern, it became necessary to examine epidemiological evidence that distinguished the relatively rare and developmental nature of pediatric cancers from the mutation-driven prevalence of cancer in aging populations. This distinction became clearer when the global distribution of cancer cases was examined.

The statistical justification for age-based screening was grounded in the stark disparity between pediatric and adult cancer incidence. Globally, childhood cancers were found to be relatively rare, accounting for approximately 1% of all cancer diagnoses, with an estimated 400,000 cases annually. In contrast, cancer occurred predominantly in aging populations, with incidence rising dramatically over time due to the accumulation of biological risks and a gradual decline in cellular repair mechanisms[2]. In Ghana, the GLOBOCAN 2022 report highlighted this trend, noting that among more than 27,000 new cancer cases reported annually, prostate cancer was a leading cause of male mortality, with incidence rising sharply among men in their 50s and 60s. Taken together, these statistics demonstrated that while cancer could occur at any age, the probability of its occurrence changed significantly across the lifespan. What began as a rare developmental event in childhood gradually became a statistically predictable biological occurrence as individuals approached and surpassed the age of 40. Understanding why this shift occurred required examining the biological processes associated with aging.

The transition from the cultural notion that "life begins at 40" to what was sometimes perceived medically as the onset of a "cancer-risk zone" was driven by specific biological hallmarks that impaired the body's ability to maintain cellular integrity. One of the most significant of these processes was the gradual accumulation of genetic damage within cells. Over decades, genomic instability and mutation accumulation occurred as cells were exposed to environmental stressors and internal replication errors[3]. Between the ages of 40 and 50, the cumulative burden of somatic mutations often approaches a threshold at which "driver mutations" become more likely, potentially triggering uncontrolled cellular growth[4].

At the same time, aging was associated with immunosenescence, a process in which the immune system gradually lost its efficiency in recognizing and eliminating abnormal or pre-tumorous cells. This decline weakened one of the body's primary defenses against cancer development[5]. Additionally, aging tissues frequently exhibited cellular senescence and "inflammaging," a state of chronic low-grade inflammation that created a tumor-promoting microenvironment[6]. Such inflammatory conditions not only encouraged cancer proliferation but also hindered the body's capacity to recover from injury, disease or treatment[6].

Taken together, these biological processes demonstrated that the increasing association between cancer and advancing age was not merely a matter of perception or philosophical framing but reflected measurable physiological changes occurring over time. While cancer could emerge at any stage of life, aging progressively weakened the body's ability both to prevent malignant transformation and to recover effectively once the disease developed. Importantly, the challenge of recovery in older populations was not explained solely by chronological age.

In addition to the biological drivers of cancer prevalence, lower recovery rates observed among older populations were increasingly attributed to a decline in physiological resilience, which was often distinct from chronological age[7]. To objectively measure this, modern oncology relied on Comprehensive Geriatric Assessment (CGA) tools, including the G8 Screening Tool and the Cancer and Aging Research Group (CARG) toxicity score, which evaluated a patient's functional reserve and vulnerability to treatment-related complications[8,9]. These tools demonstrated that reduced recovery outcomes frequently stemmed from frailty, a multidimensional syndrome characterized by decreased resistance to physiological stressors such as chemotherapy or surgery[8,9]. Frail patients were therefore more likely to experience treatment-related toxicity and slower physiological recovery, often described as delayed physiological "bounce-back"[8-10]. By shifting the focus from chronological

age to functional status, these clinical assessments provided important justification for why older patients often experienced poorer outcomes, suggesting that the perceived "cancer zone" beyond age 40 reflected not only increased disease risk but also a gradual decline in the body's capacity for repair and resilience.

These observations raised an important question that directly addressed the concern expressed by Kwaku during the prostate cancer advocacy program: if cancer could occur at any age, why did its prevalence increase so markedly with advancing age and why did older patients often experience lower recovery rates compared with younger individuals?

Addressing this question required a systematic examination of biological, epidemiological and clinical evidence related to cancer and aging. To achieve this, the study adopted a triangulated literature and theoretical synthesis approach that integrated insights from biomedical literature, epidemiological statistics and established theoretical frameworks on aging and carcinogenesis. The triangulated synthesis framework employed in this study critically evaluated, benchmarked and identified patterns across these multiple strands of evidence in order to develop a clearer understanding of the factors contributing to the observed relationship between aging, cancer prevalence and recovery outcomes. By synthesizing findings across literature reviews, theoretical perspectives and empirical health statistics, the study sought to answer a question that persisted in the minds of many individuals and often contributed to skepticism regarding the importance of early cancer screening.

The need for such investigation was particularly urgent. The intersection of high cancer prevalence and lower recovery rates among aging populations created a significant public health burden. Estimates from the World Health Organization indicated that by 2050 approximately 20% of the global population would be over the age of 60[11]. As this demographic shift occurred, understanding why elderly patients experienced poorer outcomes-including higher toxicity from chemotherapy and slower physiological recovery-became increasingly important for clinical practice and healthcare planning.

Ultimately, this study sought to bridge the gap between the philosophical perception of cancer as a matter of "chance," as articulated by individuals such as Kwaku and the biological reality of age-related physiological change. Through a triangulated synthesis of literature and theory, the research provided a clearer scientific basis for age-based cancer screening recommendations while also emphasizing the importance of communication strategies that present these guidelines in ways that are both scientifically grounded and empathetically conveyed.

2. Problem Statement

Cancer has been documented to occur at any stage of life; however, epidemiological evidence consistently demonstrated that its prevalence increased significantly from the fourth decade of life onward, while recovery outcomes often declined with advancing age. Biological theories and clinical research attributed this pattern to cumulative cellular mutations, declining DNA repair capacity, weakened immune surveillance and reduced physiological resilience associated with aging[12]. These physiological changes were found to increase both the likelihood of cancer development and the complexity of recovery following diagnosis and treatment. Despite extensive scientific research explaining these trends, questions persisted regarding why health authorities emphasized cancer screening beginning around the fourth decade of life.

This concern was reflected in the question raised by Kwaku in the introduction of this study, which asked why screening became particularly important at this stage of life if cancer could occur earlier. The persistence of such questions, frequently raised during cancer advocacy and sensitization programs, suggested the existence of a communication gap between scientific evidence and public understanding of cancer risk and screening recommendations. Although research consistently supported the importance of screening around midlife for early detection and improved outcomes, insufficient explanation of the biological and epidemiological rationale underlying these guidelines appeared to contribute to public uncertainty and reduced engagement with preventive health practices.

3. Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine why cancer prevalence increased and recovery outcomes declined with advancing age, particularly from the fourth decade of life onward. The research synthesized theoretical explanations, epidemiological statistics and empirical screening studies in order to clarify the biological and statistical basis for age-related screening recommendations. Additionally, the study sought to address the communication gap highlighted by Kwaku's question by examining how existing evidence explained the emphasis on screening during midlife.

4. Significance of the Study

This study was significant because it brought together biological theory, epidemiological evidence and empirical screening research to provide a clearer understanding of the relationship between aging, cancer prevalence and recovery outcomes. By explaining the scientific basis for increased screening during the fourth decade of life, the study contributed to a more informed understanding of preventive health strategies.

Furthermore, the study highlighted the importance of effective communication in public health. By identifying the communication gap between scientific evidence and public perception, the research provided insights that could improve how screening recommendations were explained to the public. Addressing this gap had the potential to strengthen participation in early detection programs and ultimately contribute to improved cancer prevention and treatment outcomes.

5. Research Design and Methodology

This study employed an Integrative Literature Review design. This secondary research method allowed for the simultaneous synthesis of diverse sources of knowledge, including theoretical philosophies, epidemiological statistics and empirical biological findings[13]. Unlike a traditional systematic review, which focuses primarily on clinical trials, the integrative approach was selected because it enabled the study to bridge the gap between patient-centered narrative evidence and scientific mechanistic evidence[14].

Within this framework, the study adopted a triangulated literature and theoretical synthesis approach, which allowed philosophical interpretations, biological mechanisms and statistical evidence to be examined collectively in order to

produce a holistic understanding of cancer prevalence and recovery patterns across the lifespan.

The methodology followed a Triangulated Synthesis Framework organized into three distinct analytical routes:

- **Route A: Narrative analysis:** This route analyzed qualitative perspectives on age as a significant risk factor for cancer, including philosophical interpretations such as Jacques Monod's concept of biological chance, as well as patient-centered advocacy narratives. These perspectives provided the human and philosophical context of the study and helped explain why individuals sometimes perceived cancer risk as random or unrelated to age.
- **Route B: Mechanistic synthesis:** This route evaluated a series of biological and theoretical explanations for the escalating prevalence of cancer after the fourth decade of life and the contrast in recovery rates between pediatric and geriatric populations. It examined the clinical and physiological foundations underlying these disparities in cancer outcomes among children and adults aged 40 years and above. Through the integration of biological theories and empirical evidence, this route provided a structured framework for understanding, explaining and predicting the increasing prevalence of cancer among individuals aged 40 and above, as well as the scientific rationale for recommending cancer screening beginning around this age.
- **Route C: Comparative epidemiology:** This route utilized quantitative data derived from empirical evidence, particularly studies addressing *The Role of Screening in Enhancing Treatment Efficacy, Recovery and Survival* and *Empirical Evidence and Statistical Justification for Age-40 Screening*. Age-specific cancer prevalence rates between pediatric and adult populations were compared in order to provide objective, testable and verifiable data that grounded theoretical interpretations in real-world epidemiological patterns rather than speculation. This comparative analysis directly addressed the concerns raised by Kwaku regarding the perceived overemphasis on cancer screening for individuals aged 40 and above.

Through the integration of these three analytical routes-narrative, mechanistic and epidemiological-the triangulated synthesis framework enabled the study to systematically connect philosophical perceptions, biological processes and statistical realities.

Findings were presented and recommendations were developed based on the synthesis of the analyzed literature and theoretical evidence.

5.1. Validity and confirmability

To ensure the confirmability of the findings, the study employed a cross-study comparison technique. By systematically mapping the subjective concerns and fears expressed by patients-such as Kwaku's perception of cancer as a random event-against objective biological and epidemiological evidence, including documented mutation accumulation rates in the scientific literature, the study ensured that the final conceptual model was grounded in empirical data rather than researcher bias[15].

This systematic audit trail of evidence strengthened the reliability and transparency of the research process and supported the study's central conclusion that the increasing prevalence of cancer across the lifespan reflected biological processes associated with aging rather than a purely random or chance-based occurrence.

6. Literature Review

6.1. Introduction to the literature review

This literature review **examined** the complex relationship between aging and cancer by synthesizing philosophical, biological, clinical and epidemiological perspectives. Although cancer was recognized to occur at any age, the reviewed literature consistently demonstrated that its prevalence and outcomes were strongly influenced by cumulative biological processes, declining physiological resilience and observable population-level patterns. The review integrated narrative accounts, including patient perspectives and advocacy concerns, with mechanistic and statistical evidence in order to provide a holistic understanding of why cancer incidence increased sharply after the fourth decade of life and why recovery rates differed significantly between pediatric and older adult populations.

The literature review was structured to highlight multiple intersecting factors that contributed to this phenomenon. Biological evidence emphasized the accumulation of somatic mutations, immunosenescence, cellular senescence and chronic inflammation as key mechanisms that increased vulnerability with advancing age. Clinical frameworks, including physiological reserve and frailty, were examined to explain differences in treatment tolerance and recovery outcomes. Epidemiological data further confirmed that cancer was overwhelmingly associated with aging, with pediatric cases representing only a small proportion of overall incidence. Collectively, these strands of literature supported a comprehensive triangulated synthesis that underpinned contemporary screening strategies and clarified why age 40 was widely identified in the literature as a critical milestone for early cancer detection.

6.2. Age as a significant risk factor for cancer

According to the World Bank[16], the rapid aging of the global population is a primary driver of the escalating cancer burden, particularly in middle-income countries where the share of individuals over 65 is projected to double by 2050. While mortality remains relatively low for younger cohorts, a consistent cross-country pattern reveals that risk increases exponentially after the age of 60[16]. This demographic shift creates a "double burden" in developing regions, as healthcare systems must manage rising age-related non-communicable diseases alongside persistent infectious threats. Furthermore, gender-specific mortality gaps often widen in older age groups, necessitating targeted public health interventions to address the unique needs of an aging workforce and elderly population[16].

From a biological perspective, aging is considered the most significant risk factor for malignancy because it represents the cumulative, time-dependent degradation of cellular functions[17]. As organisms age, there is a progressive build-up of somatic genetic mutations and genomic instability caused by both endogenous metabolic processes and exogenous environmental stressors[18]. This accumulation is exacerbated by a natural decline in the efficiency of DNA repair machinery and a reduction in immune surveillance, which normally eliminates abnormal cells before they develop into tumors[19]. Additionally, the accumulation of senescent cells can create a pro-inflammatory environment

that further encourages tumor initiation and progression in surrounding tissues[17].

6.3. Lifestyle factors and aging: The compounding risk of modifiable habits

The interaction between advancing age and modifiable lifestyle habits creates a compounding effect that significantly elevates cancer risk over the life course. According to the World Health Organization (WHO)[20], tobacco use remains the leading preventable cause of cancer, linked to a vast array of malignancies including lung, mouth and bladder cancers. For older adults, the risk is particularly acute, as the duration of exposure-often spanning decades-allows for the persistent accumulation of carcinogens and repeated cellular damage that the aging body's repair mechanisms can no longer effectively counter[19]. This synergy between long-term habits and biological senescence underscores why lifestyle interventions remain critical even in later life stages to mitigate the "double burden" of aging and behavioral risk[16].

Beyond tobacco, the intersection of metabolic health and physical activity further defines the oncogenic landscape for aging populations. An unhealthy diet-characterized by high intake of processed foods and red meat alongside low consumption of fruits and vegetables-combined with obesity increases the risk for colorectal and breast cancers[20]. These factors often lead to chronic systemic inflammation, which mirrors and accelerates the pro-inflammatory "soil" typically seen in biological aging[17]. Furthermore, excessive alcohol consumption acts as a known carcinogen for liver and breast cancers, while physical inactivity is strongly associated with increased risks of colon and endometrial malignancies[20]. As the efficiency of DNA repair machinery declines with age, the impact of these modifiable stressors becomes more pronounced, making the maintenance of healthy habits essential for promoting longevity and reducing cancer incidence[18].

6.4. Environmental exposures, genetics and chronic infections in the aging context

The intersection of environmental carcinogens and the biological aging process further accelerates the risk of DNA damage over the life course. According to the World Health Organization (WHO)[20], prolonged exposure to radiation-specifically ultraviolet (UV) radiation from the sun and tanning beds-is a primary driver of skin cancer, while ionizing radiation from radon gas or medical imaging presents a cumulative threat to cellular integrity. For older populations, these exposures represent decades of "mutational hits" that coincide with the natural decline in the efficiency of DNA repair machinery[18]. Furthermore, the inhalation or ingestion of pollutants and chemicals, such as asbestos, benzene and ambient air pollutants, creates a persistent inflammatory environment in the workplace and general surroundings that significantly increases cancer risk as the body's natural defenses weaken with age[20].

Beyond external exposures, the interaction between inherited vulnerabilities and chronic biological stressors plays a critical role in cancer development. While the majority of cancers are acquired through the aging process, approximately 5% to 10% of cases are linked to genetic predispositions, such as mutations in the BRCA genes or those causing Lynch syndrome[21]. These inherited factors can significantly lower the age of onset, as individuals start with a pre-existing "first hit" to their genomic stability. This risk is often compounded by chronic infections from viruses and bacteria, including human papillomavirus (HPV), hepatitis B and C and Helicobacter pylori, which induce chronic inflammation and direct DNA damage[20]. As immune surveillance declines in older age, the body becomes less capable of controlling these oncogenic pathogens, making the synergy between infection and aging a major driver of malignancy[17,19].

6.5. Immunosenescence and the elevated risk of infection-related malignancy

The progressive decline of the immune system with age, a process known as immunosenescence, significantly diminishes the body's ability to control oncogenic infections, thereby heightening cancer risk. According to Abraham, et al.[19], aging leads to a reduction in the diversity and efficacy of T-cells and Natural Killer (NK) cells, which are responsible for "immune surveillance"-the process of identifying and eliminating both viral pathogens and nascent tumor cells. When the immune system fails to clear chronic infections such as human papillomavirus (HPV), hepatitis B and C or Helicobacter pylori, these agents can persist for decades, inducing chronic inflammation and direct genomic instability[20]. This biological vulnerability means that older adults are not only more susceptible to acquiring these infections but are also less likely to mount the robust immune response necessary to prevent them from progressing into full-scale malignancies[17].

Furthermore, the synergy between a weakened immune response and a pro-inflammatory systemic environment creates a "perfect storm" for tumor initiation. As noted by Bujarrabal-Dueso, et al.[18], the accumulation of senescent cells in older tissues releases inflammatory cytokines that further suppress local immune activity, allowing infection-driven DNA damage to go unrepaired. The World Bank[16] highlights that this intersection of infectious disease and aging is a critical public health challenge, as older populations in developing regions often lack the specialized geriatric and oncological care needed to manage such complex interactions. Consequently, the inability of the aging body to effectively "fight off" common oncogenic pathogens remains a primary mechanism through which chronological age translates into a significantly higher statistical risk for various cancers[20,21].

6.6. Cellular senescence and the accumulation of "zombie cells" in aging tissues

The process of advanced aging is characterized by the significant accumulation of senescent cells-often referred to as "zombie cells"-which have ceased to divide but remain metabolically active and resistant to programmed cell death. According to Montégut, et al.[17], while cellular senescence initially acts as a natural defense mechanism to prevent the replication of damaged DNA, the age-related decline in autophagy and immune clearance leads to a toxic build-up of these "dead-end" cells within various organs. This accumulation is further driven by decades of exposure to metabolic stress and environmental carcinogens, creating a reservoir of damaged cellular material that the aging body can no longer effectively "recycle" or eliminate[18]. Under certain conditions, these persistent cells do not remain dormant; instead, they actively alter the surrounding tissue environment through the secretion of pro-inflammatory factors[19].

This phenomenon, known as the senescence-associated

secretory phenotype (SASP), creates a chronic inflammatory state that provides the ideal "soil" for cancer initiation and progression. As noted by the World Health Organization (WHO)[20], this systemic inflammation can trigger the malignant transformation of neighboring healthy cells, even in the absence of direct new mutations. The Gateway for Cancer Research[21] emphasizes that this accumulation of cellular debris and dysfunctional cells is a critical factor in why cancer risk rises exponentially with age; the body's inability to clear these "dead-end" cells allows for a persistent, pro-tumorigenic microenvironment to take hold. Consequently, the World Bank[16] highlights that addressing these biological markers of aging is essential for shifting healthcare focus from reactive cancer treatment to proactive healthy longevity strategies.

6.7. Antimicrobial resistance and chronic infections: Compounding cancer risks in aging

The intersection of advancing age and antimicrobial resistance (AMR) creates a significant barrier to preventing infection-driven malignancies. According to the World Bank[16], AMR is a global health threat that disproportionately affects older adults due to frequent healthcare contact and the high prevalence of age-related comorbidities. As the efficacy of standard antibiotics declines, the World Health Organization (WHO)[20] warns that routine infections in older populations-such as those arising from skin breaks or surgical sites-become increasingly difficult to treat. In the elderly, this drug resistance often leads to the persistence of pathogens in the body, which, when combined with a weakened immune system, allows for the development of chronic, low-grade inflammatory states that are directly linked to DNA damage and tumor initiation[17].

Furthermore, the failure to treat wounds or infections "on time" due to resistance or atypical presentation in the elderly can act as a catalyst for cancer development. Frailty and decreased mobility in older age often result in chronic wounds, such as pressure ulcers, which serve as persistent entry points for resistant bacteria[16]. These lingering infections, if not effectively cleared by antimicrobial therapy, promote a pro-tumorigenic microenvironment through the continuous release of inflammatory cytokines and reactive oxygen species[17]. The World Health Organization (WHO)[20] emphasizes that the inability to resolve these biological stressors not only risks acute complications but also fosters the long-term cellular damage necessary for malignant transformation, underscoring the urgent need for age-specific antimicrobial stewardship to protect aging populations from preventable cancer risks[18].

6.8. Differential recovery and prognosis: The role of comorbidities and age-related vulnerability

A critical determinant of the lower cancer recovery rates observed in older adults compared to pediatric populations is the prevalence of comorbidities. While pediatric cancer patients generally possess high physiological resilience and few pre-existing health complications, the post-40 demographic frequently presents with a cluster of chronic conditions, including diabetes, hypertension and cardiovascular disease[20]. According to Abraham, et al.[17], these comorbidities complicate the clinical management of cancer by limiting the aggressive use of standard therapies, such as high-dose chemotherapy or extensive surgery, which the aging body may no longer tolerate. This lack of "physiological reserve" often necessitates dose reductions or treatment delays, which can inadvertently allow for tumor progression and lower the overall probability of complete remission[16].

Furthermore, the interaction between cancer treatments and pre-existing conditions creates a multifaceted challenge for recovery that is largely absent in younger cohorts. As noted by Montégut, et al.[17], the systemic inflammation associated with chronic metabolic diseases mirrors the "inflammaging" process, further degrading the tissue microenvironment and reducing the efficacy of the body's natural repair mechanisms. In contrast, children often exhibit higher survival rates because their organs are robust and lack the cumulative "wear and tear" of toxic exposures or chronic lifestyle-related diseases[21]. Consequently, the management of cancer in older adults requires a complex balance of treating the malignancy while simultaneously stabilizing multiple failing physiological systems-a dual burden that significantly hampers the recovery trajectory compared to the relatively singular focus possible in pediatric oncology[18].

6.9. Narrative evidence: Bridging the "life begins at 40" paradox and the reality of screening

The transition into the fourth decade of life is culturally celebrated as a period of personal and professional peak, yet in oncology it marks a "stochastic threshold" of increased biological vulnerability. This tension is encapsulated in the feedback of advocacy attendees who argue that the heavy focus on screening at age 40 creates a "cancer zone" perception, making it seem as if "death begins at 40"[22]. The attendee's poignant question- "Don't children also get cancer?"-highlights a critical communication gap: the emphasis on age 40 screening is not due to a lack of pediatric cases, but because the biological "soil" and recovery trajectory change fundamentally at this milestone[23].

Narrative medicine provides a framework to address this paradox by contrasting the different "cancer stories" across age groups:

- **The "Innate Resilience" narrative in pediatrics:** While children do develop malignancies, their narratives are often defined by a "peak physiological reserve" that allows them to tolerate intensive, curative-intent treatments that would be lethal to an older adult[19]. In these stories, cancer is portrayed as a temporary interruption to a long life, supported by a global 5-year survival rate exceeding 80%[20].
- **The "Missed Window" narrative at 40+:** For adults in their 40s, the story often shifts to one of "lost time" and "financial dismay." Qualitative studies show that because life is at its busiest at 40, symptoms are frequently dismissed as stress; consequently, those diagnosed after symptoms appear often narrate deep regret that screening could have caught the disease while they still had the resilience to fight it[24].
- **The "Double Burden" of vitality and decay:** Attendees rightfully note that age 40 should be a time of vitality. However, research into accelerated aging shows that by 40, the body's "cellular soil" begins to favor malignancy over healthy repair[17]. Screening at 40 is thus framed by clinicians not as an omen of death, but as a "life-preserving intervention" designed to protect the very vitality that is said to begin at that age[23].

By incorporating "narrative practice," clinicians can reduce

the gap between clinical statistics and the patient's lived experience. This helps shift public perception from age 40 being a "cancer zone" to it being a strategic milestone for maintaining the high-quality life that is promised at this age[22].

7.Theoretical Framework

The escalating prevalence of cancer following the fourth decade of life and the stark contrast in recovery rates between pediatric and geriatric populations can be understood through a multi-dimensional theoretical lens. The purpose of this theoretical framework is to explain how biological aging, cellular mutation accumulation, immune decline, physiological reserve, frailty and adaptive resilience interact to shape cancer incidence and recovery outcomes across the lifespan. By integrating evolutionary, biological, immunological and clinical theories, this framework aims to provide a comprehensive explanation for why cancer becomes more prevalent after age 40 and why recovery trajectories differ significantly between children and older adults.

7.1. The multi-stage theory of carcinogenesis

Originally proposed by Armitage and Doll[25], this theory remains the bedrock of cancer epidemiology. It posits that a cell must undergo a series of discrete, sequential "hits" or genetic mutations before it transforms into a malignant state. This model mathematically accounts for the exponential rise in cancer incidence observed after age 40, as it requires decades of exposure to endogenous and exogenous stressors to complete the necessary mutational sequence[25].

For pediatric populations, the low prevalence of cancer is explained by the lack of accumulated "hits," whereas their high recovery rates are supported by the absence of complex and heterogeneous mutational profiles commonly found in older adults who have undergone decades of genomic erosion[20].

7.2. The theory of adaptive oncogenesis

Developed by James DeGregori, this theory shifts the focus from the "seed" (the mutation) to the "soil" (the tissue microenvironment). DeGregori argues that in youth, healthy progenitor cells are highly "fit" and naturally outcompete mutated cells, maintaining tissue homeostasis. However, as individuals surpass age 40, the accumulation of senescent cells and chronic inflammation degrades the tissue landscape.

This environmental decay reduces the fitness of healthy cells, allowing previously suppressed oncogenic clones to thrive and spread[17]. Consequently, recovery rates in older adults are lower because the biological "soil" is no longer sufficiently robust to support healthy tissue regeneration following the collateral damage caused by chemotherapy or radiation.

7.3. Immunosenescence and inflammaging theory

This framework, championed by Franceschi, et al.[26] and later expanded by Pawelec[27], describes the age-related decline of the immune system (immunosenescence) alongside a rise in systemic, low-grade inflammation known as inflammaging. In pediatric patients, high recovery rates are partly linked to a flexible and highly efficient immune surveillance system capable of detecting and eliminating nascent tumor cells.

Conversely, the post-40 demographic experiences a contraction in T-cell diversity and a buildup of the senescence-associated secretory phenotype (SASP), which creates a pro-tumorigenic inflammatory environment[19]. This theory also links the previously discussed risks of chronic infections and antimicrobial resistance to the body's reduced ability to mount an effective immune response against malignant cells in advanced age[18].

7.4. Antagonistic pleiotropy theory

First propounded by George Williams[28], the Antagonistic Pleiotropy Theory provides an evolutionary explanation for aging-related diseases. It proposes that certain biological traits that are beneficial during early life and reproductive years may become harmful later in life.

For example, rapid cell division and strong DNA repair mechanisms support growth and healing during childhood and adolescence. However, as the body ages beyond 40, these same biological mechanisms may facilitate the survival of mutated cells or contribute to the accumulation of senescent "zombie cells," which promote tumor development[17,28]. This theory therefore explains why biological systems that support pediatric resilience can contribute to vulnerability and treatment resistance in older adults.

7.5. Theory of physiological reserve (functional reserve)

The Theory of Physiological Reserve posits that every organ system-including the cardiac, pulmonary and renal systems-possesses a reserve capacity beyond what is required for baseline daily functioning[29]. This reserve acts as a biological buffer, allowing the body to maintain homeostasis when exposed to extreme physiological stress, such as aggressive cancer treatments including high-dose chemotherapy or invasive surgery[29].

In pediatric patients, this physiological reserve is at its peak; their organ systems are robust enough to tolerate the significant toxicity associated with curative-intent cancer treatments. However, as individuals age, physiological reserve gradually declines due to cumulative molecular damage and cellular wear. By age 40 and beyond, this reduced reserve means that older adults have a smaller biological buffer against treatment-related stress, making them more susceptible to complications and slower recovery compared to younger patients[30-34].

7.6. The frailty phenotype theory

Developed largely by Linda Fried and colleagues, the Frailty Phenotype Theory defines frailty as a clinical syndrome characterized by increased vulnerability to stressors[31,35,36]. This framework emerged from analyses of the Cardiovascular Health Study, which focused on the aging population[37].

Fried's framework identifies five defining criteria: unintended weight loss, fatigue, muscular weakness measured through grip strength, reduced walking speed and low levels of physical activity[37]. These characteristics reflect a cycle of declining physiological function that increases vulnerability to adverse outcomes such as falls, hospitalization, disability and mortality.

This theory is frequently applied through a deficit accumulation model, where multiple minor health deficits combine to create a high-risk physiological condition. While children rarely meet the clinical definition of frailty, approximately half of older cancer patients are categorized as pre-frail or frail[38,39]. Importantly, research demonstrates that frailty predicts recovery

outcomes more accurately than chronological age alone. Thus, two individuals of the same age-for instance, 50 years old-may experience very different cancer outcomes depending on their level of frailty and physiological capacity.

7.7. Resilience theory

While the Frailty Phenotype Theory focuses on the decline of physiological systems, Resilience Theory offers a complementary perspective by examining the capacity for adaptation despite severe stressors. The concept was pioneered in developmental psychology by Norman Garmezy in the 1970s and later expanded by researchers such as Emmy Werner and Ann Masten[40].

Masten's[41] concept of "ordinary magic" suggests that resilience emerges from common adaptive systems rather than extraordinary abilities. In the context of geriatric oncology, this theory implies that poor recovery among older cancer patients may result not only from physical frailty but also from a diminished capacity to psychologically and socially adapt to the stress of cancer and its treatments[42]. Therefore, understanding cancer outcomes in older adults requires considering both physiological vulnerability and psychosocial adaptive resources.

7.8. Leveraging physiological reserve through early screening to counteract age-related recovery decline

Within resilience theory, the ability to regain equilibrium after a health crisis such as cancer is considered a dynamic process rather than a fixed trait[43]. This capacity is closely linked to physiological reserve, which represents the latent ability of organ systems to function beyond normal levels during periods of increased demand[7].

As individuals age, this reserve gradually diminishes, creating a situation where the biological demands of cancer treatment may exceed the body's adaptive capacity. Consequently, the lower recovery rates observed among older adults often reflect depleted physiological reserves rather than the aggressiveness of the cancer itself[31].

To strengthen resilience and improve recovery outcomes, research highlights the importance of preventive interventions such as lifestyle medicine, including balanced nutrition and regular physical activity, which help build and maintain physiological reserve[44]. Psychosocial resources such as strong social networks and adaptive coping mechanisms also contribute to maintaining psychological equilibrium throughout the cancer journey[45]. This framework strongly supports cancer screening beginning at age 40 because early detection allows medical intervention while physiological reserve remains relatively strong[46]. Early screening therefore improves treatment tolerance and recovery potential.

7.9. Empirical evidence and statistical justification for age-40 screening

Route C of the triangulated synthesis framework examines quantitative epidemiological data and empirical screening studies to evaluate whether the emphasis on cancer screening beginning at age 40 is supported by observable population-level patterns. This analytical route directly addresses the concern raised by Kwaku during the advocacy program-that cancer appears to be a random disease that can occur at any age-by comparing statistical distributions of cancer incidence, mortality and recovery across age groups. Through the integration of registry data, cohort studies, randomized trials and predictive modeling, this section demonstrates that although cancer can occur at any age, the probability of its occurrence and the effectiveness of treatment outcomes change significantly after the fourth decade of life.

8. Epidemiological Evidence: The Age-40 Inflection Point

Large-scale epidemiological registry analyses reveal that the fourth decade of life represents a significant statistical transition in cancer incidence. Data indicates that age 40 serves as a stochastic threshold where cumulative cellular damage accumulated during early life begins to intersect with declining regenerative capacity in middle age.

According to a global analysis by André, et al.[23], the incidence of early-onset tumors occurring among adults aged 20-49 has increased to approximately 1.2 million new cases annually. While cancer remains relatively rare among children aged 0-19, incidence rates begin to rise progressively during early adulthood and accelerate sharply after age 40.

Data from the National Cancer Institute (NCI) further illustrates this shift. When comparing individuals under the age of 20 with those aged 40-49, the probability of developing cancer increases nearly fourteen-fold. This statistical inflection point supports the public health emphasis on screening during the fourth decade, when cancer risk begins transitioning from a rare event to a measurable epidemiological concern.

These patterns directly challenge the perception that cancer risk is evenly distributed across the lifespan. Instead, epidemiological evidence demonstrates that risk accumulates over time, reinforcing the biological models discussed earlier in the study.

9. Biological Evidence Supporting Epidemiological Trends

The statistical shift observed in epidemiological datasets aligns closely with biological theories explaining age-related cancer risk. The Theory of Adaptive Oncogenesis proposed by DeGregori[12] provides a mechanistic explanation for this transition.

In pediatric populations, healthy progenitor cells are competitively superior to mutated cells, enabling tissues to suppress abnormal clones and maintain physiological balance. However, by the fourth decade of life, the tissue microenvironment-often described as the biological "soil"-undergoes significant epigenetic and metabolic remodeling[17]. This remodeling reduces the competitive advantage of healthy cells and allows previously dormant mutated cells to expand.

Experimental evidence further confirms this shift. A study published in Nature Reviews Molecular Cell Biology found that DNA repair efficiency declines by approximately 25-30% after the fourth decade of life, leading to the progressive accumulation of genomic instability that was previously mitigated by more efficient repair mechanisms during youth[18].

Thus, the epidemiological rise in cancer incidence after age 40 reflects not merely statistical coincidence but a biological transition in tissue resilience and genomic maintenance.

9.1. Empirical evidence: The role of screening in enhancing treatment efficacy, recovery and survival

The clinical mandate for initiating cancer screening at age 40 is anchored in its capacity to shift the diagnostic window from advanced, symptomatic stages to early, manageable phases. By detecting malignancies before they overwhelm the body's declining physiological reserve, screening facilitates treatment strategies that are less invasive and more tolerable for the aging body.

Screening therefore enables what clinicians describe as "treatment de-escalation," allowing localized interventions rather than aggressive systemic therapies. By preserving physiological resilience, screening significantly reduces mortality and improves recovery outcomes[19].

9.2. Impact on treatment intensity and physiological recovery

Screening also plays a critical role in preserving the physiological capacity associated with midlife health. Detecting cancer at an early stage frequently permits localized treatment interventions, such as breast-conserving surgery or targeted radiation therapy, rather than the radical mastectomies or systemic chemotherapy protocols required in late-stage disease.

Data from a study conducted by Kalyta, et al.[47] on colorectal cancer screening demonstrates that early detection often allows minimally invasive interventions, reducing treatment toxicity and preserving organ function.

This distinction is particularly important because adults over the age of 40 experience a measurable decline in biological repair capacity. Research indicates that DNA repair efficiency decreases by approximately 25–30% during midlife, reducing the body's ability to recover from aggressive oncological treatments[18].

Consequently, early intervention not only improves survival rates but also prevents the accelerated physiological decline frequently observed among survivors of intensive cancer therapies.

9.3. Statistical reduction in mortality and incidence

Longitudinal cohort studies provide robust empirical evidence that initiating screening in the fourth decade results in measurable improvements in survival outcomes.

A large retrospective cohort study involving 263,125 adults, published in *The American Journal of Managed Care* (AJMC, 2025), found that initiating Fecal Immunochemical Test (FIT) screening at age 40 resulted in:

- 39% reduction in colorectal cancer mortality
- 21% reduction in colorectal cancer incidence compared to individuals who began screening at age 50 (Steinzor, 2025).

Similarly, modeling conducted by the Cancer Intervention and Surveillance Modeling Network (CISNET) revealed that annual breast cancer screening beginning at age 40 produces the highest mortality reduction of any screening scenario evaluated-approximately 41.7%[48].

These findings demonstrate that screening not only identifies disease earlier but also substantially reduces population-level mortality.

9.4. Comparative recovery data: Resilience vs frailty

Comparative survival data further illustrates the differences between pediatric and adult cancer outcomes. Data from the SEER database and WHO[20] indicate that pediatric cancer patients frequently achieve five-year survival rates exceeding 85%, largely due to strong physiological reserve and minimal comorbidities.

However, survival outcomes begin to diverge in adult populations after age 40 due to the emergence of frailty and declining physiological resilience **(Table 1)**.

Table 1: Comparative Analysis of Cancer Prevalence and Recovery (Pediatric vs 40+ Populations).

Metric	Pediatric (0–19)	Adult (40–49)	Older Adult (60+)	Statistical Significance
Annual Global Cases	~400,000	~1,200,000	>12,000,000	
5-Year Survival Rate	85.50%	81.20%	66.00%	Sharp decline after 40
DNA Repair Efficiency	Peak (100%)	Moderate (~70%)	Low (<50%)	Cumulative damage starts at 40
Primary Risk Driver	Germline/Genetic	Acquired/Epigenetic	Multi-hit Mutations	Shift to modifiable risk
Treatment Intent	Curative/Aggressive	Curative/Modified	Palliative/Modified	Resilience dependent

Source: Synthesized from WHO (2025), SEER (2020) and NCI (2024).

9.5. Empirical evidence: A detailed analysis of global screening research

The transition toward screening at age 40 therefore represents a strategic response to biological aging. As immune surveillance and cellular repair mechanisms gradually decline, screening functions as a preventive safety mechanism, identifying malignancies before the physiological resilience required for recovery is lost.

The empirical findings summarized below represent a triangulation of large-scale cohort studies, randomized controlled trials and predictive modeling research **(Table 2)**.

Table 2: Comparative Outcomes of Screening Initiation at Age 40+.

Cancer Type	Research Source	Finding (Screening Start @40-45)	Impact on Survival
Colorectal	AJMC (2025)	39% Mortality Reduction	Prevents late-stage systemic collapse
Breast	RSNA / CISNET (2024)	41.7% Mortality Reduction	Highest life-years gained
Breast	UK Age Trial (2025)	97.3% 10-Year Survival	Demonstrates efficacy of early-start protocols
Colorectal	NIH Analysis (2022)	429 Life-Years Gained	Benefit of screening at 45 vs 50

Note. Adapted from Steinzor[48], RSNA[46] and Yeh, et al.[49].

9.6. Detailed empirical studies

9.6.1. Colorectal cancer: The 39% mortality dividend: A retrospective cohort study involving 263,125 Taiwanese adults examined the impact of initiating FIT screening between ages 40 and 49[48].

Findings showed:

- 39% reduction in colorectal cancer mortality
- 21% reduction in overall incidence

The study also demonstrated that screening 1,548 individuals before age 50 prevents one case of colorectal cancer, indicating strong cost-effectiveness.

9.6.2. Breast cancer: Maximizing life-years

A modeling analysis conducted by the Radiological Society of North America using CISNET estimates evaluated multiple screening scenarios.

The simulation found that annual screening beginning at age 40 produces a 41.7% mortality reduction, the highest among all tested strategies[48].

9.6.3. Long-term evidence: The UK age trial: The UK Age Trial, the only randomized controlled trial specifically designed to evaluate mammographic screening beginning at age 40, followed 160,921 participants over 17 years.

Results showed a significant reduction in breast cancer mortality (Relative Risk 0.75) during the first decade following early screening[50].

9.6.4. The quantitative value of time: Modeling research conducted by Fendrick, et al.[51] demonstrated that initiating colorectal cancer screening at age 45 rather than 50 yields 429 life-years gained per 1,000 individuals screened.

These findings highlight the importance of time as a determinant of recovery, as detecting tumors several years earlier provides a critical window for intervention before age-related frailty begins to compromise treatment tolerance.

Taken together, these epidemiological statistics and empirical screening studies demonstrate that the emphasis on screening beginning around age 40 is not based on arbitrary age thresholds but on measurable patterns in disease incidence, biological aging and treatment outcomes. While cancer can occur at any age, the convergence of mutation accumulation, declining DNA repair capacity and reduced physiological reserve during midlife significantly increases both the probability of disease and the difficulty of recovery. Consequently, early screening serves as a strategic intervention designed to preserve physiological resilience and improve long-term survival outcomes.

10. Results

10.1. Systematic synthesis of narrative, mechanistic and epidemiological evidence

The triangulated synthesis of the literature-integrating narrative perspectives (Route A), mechanistic and theoretical explanations (Route B) and epidemiological and empirical screening data (Route C)-reveals several consistent patterns regarding the relationship between aging, cancer prevalence and recovery outcomes. This synthesis highlights recurring themes across the three analytical routes while also identifying conceptual gaps that influence public understanding and clinical communication about cancer risk and screening.

10.2. Pattern one: The perception gap between philosophical interpretations of cancer and scientific risk models

A prominent theme emerging from the narrative literature is a perception gap between public interpretations of cancer risk and the probabilistic framework used in clinical medicine. The concerns expressed by advocacy participants, such as Kwaku, illustrate a philosophical view that cancer occurs randomly and can affect individuals at any age. This perception aligns with Jacques Monod's philosophical argument that life itself arises through chance and necessity, leading to the intuitive belief that diseases like cancer should be equally unpredictable[52].

However, the integration of biological and epidemiological evidence reveals that while mutation events may occur randomly at the cellular level, their cumulative probability is strongly age-dependent. Mechanistic research demonstrates that somatic mutations accumulate progressively over time, with mutation rates ranging from approximately 13 to more than 50 variants per cell per year across different tissues[53]. Epidemiological datasets further confirm that cancer incidence rises sharply with age, with global cancer statistics showing a significant increase in prevalence beginning in the fourth decade of life[20].

The synthesis therefore reveals a critical communication gap between probabilistic medical reasoning and lay interpretations of disease causation. While scientific models describe cancer risk as a cumulative biological process, public narratives often interpret the same phenomenon as random misfortune. This discrepancy contributes to skepticism toward screening recommendations that emphasize age thresholds.

10.3. Pattern two: Convergence of biological aging mechanisms that promote cancer development after age 40

Across the mechanistic literature and theoretical frameworks, a strong pattern emerges showing that multiple biological processes converge during midlife to increase cancer vulnerability.

Several interconnected mechanisms consistently appear in the literature:

- **Mutation accumulation:** The Multi-Stage Theory of Carcinogenesis proposes that cancer arises after a sequence of genetic alterations accumulated over time[25]. This framework aligns with molecular studies demonstrating that mutation burden increases steadily with age, eventually reaching thresholds that enable malignant transformation.
- **Decline in DNA repair efficiency:** Empirical research indicates that DNA repair mechanisms become progressively less efficient after the fourth decade of life, with studies estimating a 25-30% reduction in repair capacity[18]. This decline increases the likelihood that cellular damage will persist rather than being corrected.
- **Immunosenescence and inflammaging:** The aging immune system undergoes structural and functional changes, including reduced T-cell diversity and impaired immune surveillance[19]. Simultaneously, chronic low-grade inflammation associated with aging-often termed "inflammaging"-creates a microenvironment conducive to tumor growth.

- **Cellular senescence and tissue microenvironment changes:** The accumulation of senescent cells, which release inflammatory molecules through the senescence-associated secretory phenotype (SASP), further promotes tumor development by altering tissue homeostasis[17].

These mechanisms collectively illustrate that cancer risk is not driven by a single biological factor but by a convergence of aging-related physiological changes. This convergence explains why epidemiological incidence curves begin to rise sharply during midlife rather than remaining evenly distributed across the lifespan.

10.4. Pattern three: Declining physiological reserve as a key determinant of recovery outcomes

Another consistent finding across the literature concerns the role of physiological reserve and frailty in determining cancer recovery outcomes.

The Theory of Physiological Reserve suggests that organ systems possess a surplus functional capacity that allows the body to withstand physiological stress[29]. In younger individuals, this reserve is at its peak, enabling pediatric patients to tolerate aggressive therapies such as high-dose chemotherapy or intensive radiation.

However, with advancing age, physiological reserve gradually declines. Studies show that by middle age many individuals experience reduced cardiovascular, metabolic and immune resilience[31]. This decline reduces the body's ability to recover from the toxic effects of cancer treatment.

Closely related to this concept is the Frailty Phenotype Theory, which identifies a cluster of characteristics-including muscle weakness, fatigue, reduced mobility and unintentional weight loss-that signal increased vulnerability to physiological stress[37]. Research indicates that approximately half of older cancer patients exhibit pre-frail or frail characteristics[38].

Consequently, the lower recovery rates observed among older cancer patients are often not due to the aggressiveness of tumors alone but rather to reduced physiological resilience and increased treatment toxicity.

10.5. Pattern four: Empirical evidence demonstrates that early screening improves survival outcomes

The epidemiological and clinical evidence reviewed in Route C consistently demonstrates that early detection significantly improves cancer outcomes.

Large-scale empirical studies show measurable benefits when screening begins in the fourth decade:

- Colorectal cancer screening between ages 40 and 49 has been associated with a 39% reduction in mortality and a 21% reduction in incidence[48].
- Annual breast cancer screening beginning at age 40 produces an estimated 41.7% reduction in mortality, according to modeling by the Cancer Intervention and Surveillance Modeling Network[48].
- Randomized controlled trials such as the UK Age Trial demonstrate long-term reductions in breast cancer mortality among individuals who began mammographic screening at age 40[50].
- Modeling studies further estimate that lowering colorectal screening age from 50 to 45 produces 429 additional life-years gained per 1,000 individuals screened[51].

These findings reinforce the concept that screening functions as a preventive intervention that preserves physiological resilience by detecting disease before advanced systemic deterioration occurs.

10.6. Pattern five: Distinct biological and epidemiological profiles between pediatric and adult cancers

Comparative epidemiological analysis also highlights clear differences between pediatric and adult cancer patterns.

Globally, pediatric cancers account for approximately 1% of all cancer diagnoses, with an estimated 400,000 cases annually[20]. These cancers often arise from developmental or genetic abnormalities rather than cumulative environmental exposures.

In contrast, adult cancers are largely associated with acquired mutations, lifestyle exposures and aging-related biological decline. The global cancer burden increases dramatically with age, exceeding twelve million cases annually among older adult populations.

Survival outcomes also diverge significantly across age groups:

- Pediatric patients frequently achieve five-year survival rates exceeding 85% due to high physiological resilience and limited comorbidities.
- Survival rates among adults aged 40-49 begin to decline gradually as physiological reserve decreases.
- Among adults over 60, survival rates drop substantially due to frailty, comorbidities and reduced treatment tolerance.

These differences underscore the importance of age-specific prevention strategies, including early screening during midlife.

10.7. Conceptual gap: Inadequate integration of patient narratives into screening communication

Despite strong empirical evidence supporting age-based screening, the synthesis identifies a significant conceptual gap within public health communication.

Many screening guidelines emphasize statistical risk but fail to address how individuals interpret those statistics emotionally and philosophically. As illustrated by Kwaku's question during the advocacy program, patients often interpret age thresholds as deterministic or fatalistic messages rather than preventive strategies.

This communication gap contributes to the perception that screening recommendations are arbitrary or overly pessimistic.

Narrative medicine literature suggests that incorporating patient stories and contextual explanations into screening advocacy may improve public understanding and acceptance of preventive interventions (Moser et al., 2013).

10.8. Conceptual gap: Limited integration of physiological reserve into public screening guidelines

Another conceptual gap identified in the literature is the limited emphasis on physiological reserve in screening communication.

While clinical geriatric oncology routinely uses tools such as the G8 Screening Tool and the Cancer and Aging Research Group (CARG) toxicity score to assess functional resilience, these concepts are rarely incorporated into public health messaging.

As a result, screening is often framed solely as an age-based recommendation rather than as a strategy designed to preserve the body's declining capacity for recovery.

Greater integration of physiological reserve concepts into cancer prevention messaging could help explain why early detection becomes increasingly important during midlife.

11. Key Results

The triangulated synthesis of narrative, biological and epidemiological evidence reveals several key findings:

- Cancer risk is probabilistic rather than purely random, increasing significantly with age due to cumulative biological processes.
- Multiple aging-related mechanisms-mutation accumulation, immune decline and cellular senescence—converge after age 40, accelerating cancer risk.
- Declining physiological reserve and increasing frailty contribute significantly to poorer recovery outcomes in older populations.
- Empirical screening studies consistently demonstrate that initiating screening during midlife reduces mortality and improves recovery outcomes.
- A significant communication gap exists between scientific explanations of cancer risk and public perceptions of disease causation.

These findings collectively suggest that the emphasis on screening beginning around age 40 reflects not an arbitrary clinical threshold but rather the intersection of biological aging, epidemiological risk patterns and declining physiological resilience.

12. Findings

The synthesis of theoretical literature, epidemiological statistics and empirical screening studies reveals several key findings regarding the relationship between aging, cancer risk and recovery outcomes.

- Cancer risk increases progressively with age due to cumulative biological changes. The evidence indicates that the higher prevalence of cancer in midlife and older adulthood is associated with the accumulation of cellular mutations, declining DNA repair mechanisms and reduced immune surveillance over time.
- Multiple aging processes interact to influence cancer development. The literature consistently shows that cancer emergence is not driven by a single factor but by the interaction of genetic mutations, cellular senescence and age-related immune decline.
- Physiological resilience influences recovery outcomes across age groups. Younger individuals generally demonstrate higher recovery rates due to stronger immune responses, greater physiological reserve and fewer comorbid conditions compared with older populations.
- Early screening significantly improves treatment outcomes. Empirical screening studies show that detecting cancer at earlier stages increases survival rates and reduces mortality by enabling earlier and less aggressive treatment interventions.
- Pediatric and adult cancers differ in their biological and epidemiological characteristics. Childhood cancers are relatively rare and often linked to developmental or genetic factors, while adult cancers are more strongly associated with cumulative biological aging and long-term environmental exposures.
- Public perceptions of cancer risk often differ from epidemiological evidence. Narrative and advocacy literature indicates that many individuals interpret cancer as a random disease, while scientific evidence shows that cancer risk follows identifiable biological and statistical patterns across the lifespan.

13. Discussion

The purpose of this study was to explore the relationship between aging, cancer prevalence and recovery outcomes by synthesizing theoretical literature, epidemiological statistics and empirical screening studies. The findings help clarify the concern raised in the introductory narrative by Kwaku, who questioned why cancer screening is emphasized from around age forty if cancer can occur at any age. This question reflects a broader philosophical uncertainty surrounding whether cancer should be understood primarily as a random event or as a biological consequence of aging.

The evidence synthesized in this review suggests that cancer risk is not evenly distributed across the lifespan but instead follows identifiable biological and epidemiological patterns. While mutation events can occur at any age, the probability that such events accumulate into malignant transformation increases over time. Molecular studies demonstrate that somatic mutations accumulate progressively in human tissues throughout life, increasing the likelihood that critical oncogenic pathways will eventually be disrupted[53]. This pattern supports theoretical models of carcinogenesis that describe cancer as a multistep process involving sequential genetic alterations rather than a single random occurrence.

The findings therefore support the interpretation that cancer risk reflects cumulative biological processes rather than pure chance. Aging contributes to this process through several mechanisms identified in the literature, including reduced DNA repair capacity, the accumulation of senescent cells and declining immune surveillance[17,18]. Together, these changes create biological conditions in which abnormal cells are more likely to survive and proliferate. As a result, epidemiological data consistently show that cancer incidence increases substantially after midlife, particularly after the fourth decade of life[20].

This pattern explains why public health guidelines often recommend increased cancer screening beginning around age forty. Screening recommendations are not based on the assumption that cancer suddenly begins at that age but rather on statistical evidence showing that the probability of detectable disease increases significantly during this period. Empirical screening studies demonstrate that earlier detection improves survival outcomes by identifying tumors before they reach advanced stages that require aggressive treatment[48]. Therefore, the emphasis on screening during midlife reflects preventive strategy rather than a biological threshold.

Another important dimension revealed by the findings concerns the role of physiological resilience in shaping

recovery outcomes. Younger individuals often demonstrate higher survival rates following cancer treatment because their physiological reserve remains relatively strong. Physiological reserve refers to the body's ability to withstand stress and recover from injury or disease[29]. In children and younger adults organ systems generally function more efficiently, immune responses are stronger and the presence of chronic conditions is minimal. These factors contribute to greater tolerance of treatments such as chemotherapy, radiation therapy and surgery.

In contrast, aging is associated with a gradual decline in physiological reserve, often accompanied by the development of comorbid conditions such as cardiovascular disease or metabolic disorders. Research in geriatric oncology shows that this decline significantly affects treatment tolerance and recovery outcomes[37]. Consequently, older patients may experience greater treatment-related complications or slower recovery even when diagnosed at similar stages of disease.

The distinction between pediatric and adult cancers further supports the role of aging processes in cancer epidemiology. Childhood cancers represent a relatively small proportion of global cancer cases and often arise from developmental abnormalities or inherited genetic mutations rather than cumulative environmental exposures[20]. This difference explains why pediatric cancers, although serious, follow different biological pathways from the cancers more commonly observed in adults[54-60].

Taken together, the evidence presented in this review provides a response to the philosophical concern raised by Kwaku. Cancer cannot be understood purely as a random disease that affects individuals unpredictably across all ages. Instead, it emerges from a complex interaction between chance mutation events and the biological processes associated with aging. While chance plays a role at the cellular level, the accumulation of genetic damage and the decline of protective biological mechanisms make cancer statistically more likely as individuals grow older.

At the same time, the findings highlight an important communication gap between scientific evidence and public understanding. Many individuals interpret the existence of childhood cancer as evidence that cancer risk is entirely random. However, epidemiological patterns clearly demonstrate that cancer incidence rises significantly with age, even though rare cases may occur earlier in life[61-70]. Addressing this misunderstanding may require improved public health communication strategies that explain the probabilistic nature of disease risk rather than presenting age-based screening recommendations without sufficient context.

Overall, the synthesis of theoretical, epidemiological and empirical evidence supports the conclusion that aging plays a central role in shaping both cancer prevalence and recovery outcomes. The emphasis on screening beginning around age forty reflects evidence-based preventive practice rather than an arbitrary medical convention. By detecting cancers earlier in their development, screening programs increase the likelihood that treatment can occur while individuals still possess sufficient physiological resilience to recover successfully[71-82].

Thus, the question raised in the opening narrative ultimately reveals an important insight: cancer risk is neither entirely predetermined nor entirely random. Instead, it reflects the cumulative interaction between biological aging, environmental exposures and probabilistic cellular events over time. Understanding this relationship provides a clearer explanation for why cancer screening becomes increasingly important during midlife and why recovery outcomes vary across different stages of life.

14. Recommendations

Based on the findings and discussion of this study, several recommendations emerge for research, public health practice and policy development. These recommendations aim to strengthen cancer prevention strategies, improve screening effectiveness and address the communication challenges identified in the study.

- **Strengthen early and risk-based cancer screening programs:** Health systems should continue to support and expand evidence-based screening initiatives, particularly for populations approaching midlife when cancer incidence begins to rise significantly. Screening programs should also incorporate risk-based approaches that consider family history, lifestyle factors and environmental exposures in order to identify individuals who may benefit from earlier monitoring.
- **Promote interdisciplinary research on aging and cancer development:** Future research should further investigate the biological relationship between aging processes and cancer development. Integrating insights from molecular biology, gerontology, epidemiology and oncology could improve understanding of how cumulative cellular damage, immune decline and environmental factors interact to influence cancer risk across the lifespan.
- **Improve research on physiological resilience and treatment outcomes:** More studies are needed to examine how physiological reserve and aging affect treatment tolerance and recovery outcomes among cancer patients. Such research could help clinicians design treatment strategies that are better tailored to different age groups and physiological conditions.
- **Address the communication gap between scientific evidence and public understanding of cancer risk:** Public health institutions and cancer advocacy organizations should develop clearer communication strategies that explain the probabilistic nature of cancer risk and the rationale behind age-based screening recommendations. Educational materials should contextualize epidemiological statistics within accessible explanations that help individuals understand why cancer risk increases with age even though cases may occur earlier in life. Incorporating narrative-based communication approaches, including patient experiences and advocacy stories, may help bridge the gap between scientific evidence and public perception.
- **Encourage public education on preventive health behaviors:** Governments and health organizations should strengthen community education programs that emphasize preventive behaviors such as healthy diet, regular physical activity, tobacco avoidance and routine medical checkups. Increasing awareness of preventive measures can reduce cancer risk and improve early detection rates.
- **Expand global and regional cancer surveillance systems:** Improved data collection and cancer registries are necessary to monitor changing cancer patterns across

different populations. Strengthening surveillance systems will allow policymakers and researchers to track incidence trends, evaluate screening programs and develop targeted interventions based on reliable epidemiological evidence.

15. Practical Application of the Recommendations

The findings of this study indicate that advocacy for cancer screening must go beyond simple awareness slogans and instead provide clear explanations that connect scientific evidence with everyday understanding. Public health advocacy should therefore be structured around education, clarification of risk and trust-building communication that directly addresses the types of questions raised by Kwaku in the introduction of this study. If advocacy campaigns only promote screening without explaining the biological and epidemiological reasoning behind age-related recommendations, confusion about why screening becomes important around the fourth decade may persist. Effective advocacy must therefore combine scientific explanation with accessible communication.

First, screening advocacy should clearly explain why cancer risk increases with age. Communication efforts should emphasize that cancer risk rises gradually because of cumulative biological changes such as the accumulation of cellular mutations, reduced DNA repair efficiency and declining immune surveillance. Presenting these explanations in simple terms helps the public understand that screening at midlife is not arbitrary but reflects patterns consistently observed in epidemiological data and biological research. Advocacy messages should therefore focus on explaining the relationship between aging and cancer risk rather than only promoting screening as a general health instruction.

Second, advocacy programs should focus on early detection as a protective strategy rather than a reaction to disease. The literature consistently shows that screening improves survival because cancers detected at earlier stages are more treatable and require less aggressive therapy. Advocacy messages should therefore highlight how screening allows individuals to act proactively while their physiological resilience remains relatively strong. Framing screening as a preventive action that protects health and preserves quality of life can make the recommendation more meaningful to target populations.

Third, screening advocacy should incorporate trained health navigators or community advocates who are able to respond to questions and clarify misconceptions. As demonstrated by Kwaku's question, individuals often seek logical explanations for health recommendations. Advocacy initiatives should therefore include knowledgeable communicators-such as community health workers, patient advocates or trained volunteers-who can explain screening guidelines, address concerns and guide individuals through available screening services. These navigators serve as an important bridge between scientific evidence and public understanding.

Fourth, advocacy and sensitization strategies should be targeted to specific audiences approaching the fourth decade of life. Individuals in their late thirties and early forties represent a critical group for early screening engagement. Educational campaigns directed at workplaces, community organizations, religious institutions and healthcare settings can ensure that people receive information before reaching the age when screening becomes most relevant. Tailoring messages to life stages increases the likelihood that individuals will view screening as timely and personally relevant.

Finally, effective advocacy should include clear messaging that addresses common misconceptions about cancer risk. Communication materials should explain that although cancer can occur at any age, epidemiological evidence shows that its likelihood increases over time. Presenting this information transparently helps resolve the confusion that arises when people observe cases of cancer among younger individuals and assume that age-based screening recommendations are inconsistent.

In practice, successful advocacy for cancer screening should therefore combine scientific explanation, early prevention messaging, community-based communication and responsive engagement with public questions. By structuring advocacy in this way, public health initiatives can move beyond slogan-based awareness campaigns and instead provide meaningful education that addresses confusion, encourages informed participation in screening programs and ultimately supports earlier detection and improved health outcomes.

15.1. Sample advocacy message

The following sample advocacy message is suggested as a guide for educating and sensitizing individuals about cancer screening. It is crafted based on the study's findings and recommendations to help bridge the communication gap identified in the research.

"Friends, think of your body like a bank account for your health. Just as you check your bank account regularly to make sure there are no mistakes or fraud, you need to check your body regularly. If you never review your account, you might not notice problems until you need money the most and it is gone. Similarly, if we never check our bodies, small problems can grow unnoticed over time.

Our bodies are made of tiny living parts called cells. These cells are hardworking employees—they repair tissues, replace old parts, remove waste and keep the body functioning. When we are young, these cells are strong and fix mistakes quickly. That is why children can get cancer, but their recovery is often faster because their systems are fresh and resilient.

As we reach our 40s, our cells have been working hard for decades. They still repair and clean, but over time the system slows down. Mistakes happen more often and the clean-up is not as fast. Because these changes do not always cause pain or obvious symptoms, you might feel healthy even while small problems are developing inside. That is why it is important to take a peek into the unseen parts of your body-to catch errors early before they grow.

Screening is like reviewing your bank account early to catch mistakes before they become serious. Early detection allows doctors to treat small changes when treatment is easier, more effective and less costly. Screening is not about waiting to get sick. It is about protecting your health and ensuring your body continues to work well.

Just like wise investments today create returns in the future, regular health screening is an investment in your body that ensures many healthy years ahead. If you are approaching 40 or older, talk to a healthcare provider about recommended screenings for your age.

When cancer is found early, many good things happen:

- Treatment is usually simpler
- It is often less expensive
- Recovery is more successful
- In many cases, it can be completely cured

When it is discovered late, treatment becomes longer, harder and sometimes life-threatening.

Screen early. Detect early. Protect your health. Live longer and stronger."

16. Conclusion

This study set out to explore and clarify an important question raised in the introductory narrative by Kwaku: if cancer can occur at any age, why do health professionals consistently encourage screening particularly from around the fourth decade of life? The question reflects a concern shared by many people and highlights a broader issue in public health communication- while scientific evidence strongly supports early screening during midlife, the reasoning behind these recommendations is not always clearly understood by the public. By synthesizing theoretical explanations of cancer development, epidemiological statistics and empirical screening research, this study sought to explain the relationship between aging, cancer prevalence, recovery outcomes and the rationale for age-related screening practices.

The findings of the study demonstrate that cancer risk increases progressively with age due to cumulative biological changes that occur throughout the lifespan. As individuals grow older, cellular processes that maintain normal tissue function gradually become less efficient. The accumulation of genetic mutations, reduced DNA repair capacity, weakening immune surveillance and the gradual decline in physiological resilience all contribute to an environment in which abnormal cell growth becomes more likely. These biological processes help explain the consistent epidemiological pattern showing that cancer prevalence rises significantly after the fourth decade of life. At the same time, recovery outcomes often decline among older populations due to reduced physiological reserve and the presence of additional health conditions that can complicate treatment and recovery.

The research also confirmed the strong role of early screening in improving treatment outcomes. Empirical screening studies consistently demonstrate that cancers detected at earlier stages are more treatable and are associated with higher survival rates, less aggressive treatment and improved quality of life. The emphasis on screening from around age forty therefore reflects a preventive strategy designed to detect disease at a stage when intervention is most effective and when individuals are still physiologically capable of responding well to treatment.

However, beyond the biological and clinical explanations, the study revealed an important communication gap between scientific knowledge and public understanding. Kwaku's question illustrates how many individuals interpret cancer risk primarily through observation and personal experience rather than through epidemiological patterns and biological theory. When public health messages encourage screening without adequately explaining the scientific reasoning behind age-related recommendations, individuals may perceive inconsistencies that lead to confusion or skepticism. This communication gap can weaken the effectiveness of screening programs and limit participation in early detection initiatives that are designed to protect health.

Addressing this gap therefore became an important outcome of the study. The recommendations emphasize that advocacy for cancer screening should move beyond simple awareness campaigns or slogan-based messaging. Instead, screening advocacy should provide clear explanations of how aging affects the body, why cancer risk increases over time and why screening becomes especially important during midlife. Effective communication should incorporate trained health navigators and community advocates who can answer questions, clarify misconceptions and guide individuals through screening processes. When scientific evidence is communicated in practical and understandable ways, individuals are more likely to recognize the value of screening and incorporate it into their health practices.

Overall, the study demonstrates that cancer is neither entirely random nor entirely predetermined. While cellular mutations can occur at any age, the likelihood that these mutations lead to cancer increases as biological changes accumulate over time. The emphasis on screening from around the fourth decade of life therefore reflects a strategic effort to detect disease early during a period when intervention can be most effective. Understanding this relationship between aging, cancer risk and early detection provides a clearer explanation for public health screening guidelines.

In conclusion, the question posed by Kwaku ultimately serves as an important reminder that scientific knowledge must be accompanied by effective communication. When research findings are translated into clear and accessible explanations, they not only improve public understanding but also empower individuals to make informed decisions about their health. By strengthening both the scientific basis of screening programs and the clarity of the messages that support them, public health systems can encourage earlier detection, improve recovery outcomes and contribute to longer and healthier lives.

17. References

1. Blokzijl F, De Ligt J, Jager M, et al. Tissue-specific mutation accumulation in human adult stem cells during life. Nature, 2016;538(7624): 260-264.
2. Childhood cancer. World Health Organization (WHO), 2026.
3. Langie SA, Koppen G, Desaulniers D, et al. Causes of genome instability: The effect of low dose chemical exposures in modern soci ety. Carcinogenesis, 2015;36(1): 61-88.
4. Laconi E, Marongiu F, DeGregori J. Cancer as a disease of old age: Changing mutational and microenvironmental landscapes. British Journal of Cancer, 2020;122(7): 943-952.
5. Wang L, Tang D. Immunosenescence promotes cancer development: From mechanisms to treatment strategies. Cell Communication and Signaling, 2025;23(1).
6. Tripathi S, Sharma Y, Kumar D. Unveiling the link between chronic inflammation and cancer. Metabolism Open, 2025;25: 100347.
7. Sedrak MS, Gilmore NJ, Carroll JE, et al. Measuring biologic resilience in older cancer survivors. Journal of Clinical Oncology, 2021;39(19): 2079-2089.
8. Lee PL, Fitch C, Efstathiou JA, et al. Beyond chronologic age: Frailty, geriatric assessment and personalized care for older adults

with Genitourinary cancer. American Society of Clinical Oncology Educational Book, 2026;46(2).

9. Stueger A, Joerger M, De Nys K. Geriatric evaluation methods in oncology and their use in clinical studies: A systematic literature review. Journal of Geriatric Oncology, 2024;15(3): 101684.
10. What is frailty? Australian Frailty Network, 2023.
11. Ageing and health. World Health Organization (WHO), 2024.
12. DeGregori J, Weinberg RA, DeGregori M. Adaptive oncogenesis, 2018.
13. Whittemore R, Knafl K. The integrative review: Updated methodology. Journal of Advanced Nursing, 2005;52(5): 546-553.
14. Toronto CE, Remington R. Discussion and conclusion. A Step-by-Step Guide to Conducting an Integrative Review, 2020: 71-84.
15. Miles MB, Huberman AM, Saldana J. Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2014.
16. Healthy Longevity Initiative Full Report (World BankISBN: World Bank. 2024). World Bank, 2022.
17. Montégut L, López-Otín C, Kroemer G. Aging and cancer. Molecular Cancer, 2024;23(1).
18. Bujarrabal-Dueso A, Garinis GA, Robbins PD, et al. Targeting DNA damage in ageing: Towards supercharging DNA repair. Nature Reviews Drug Discovery, 2025;24(10): 785-807.
19. Abraham S, Parekh J, Lee S, et al. Accelerated aging in cancer and cancer treatment: Current status of biomarkers. Cancer Medicine, 2025;14(9).
20. Cancer Fact Sheet. World Health Organization (WHO), 2025.
21. What causes cancer? 10 common factors - Gateway for cancer research. Gateway For Cancer Research, 2026.
22. Moser RP, Arndt J, Han PK, et al. Perceptions of cancer as a death sentence: Prevalence and consequences. Journal of Health Psychology, 2013;19(12): 1518-1524.
23. André F, Rassy E, Achutti-Duso B, et al. The rising tides of cancers among young adults. ESMO Open, 2025;10(9): 105553.
24. Lidington E, Ragupathy D, Schmeising-Barnes N, et al. The psychological impact of screen-detected cancer: A systematic review. Psycho-Oncology, 2026;35(1).
25. Armitage P, Doll R. The age distribution of cancer and a multi-stage theory of carcinogenesis. British Journal of Cancer, 1954;8(1): 1-12.
26. Franceschi C, Bonafè M, Valensin S, et al. Inflamm-aging: An evolutionary perspective on Immunosenescence. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 2000;908(1): 244-254.
27. Pawelec G. Age and immunity: What is immunosenescence? Experimental Gerontology, 2018;105: 4-9.
28. Williams GC. Pleiotropy, natural selection and the evolution of senesc ence. Evolution, 1957;11(4): 398-411.
29. Flint B, Tadi P. Physiology, aging - StatPearls - NCBI bookshelf. National Center for Biotechnology Information, 2023.
30. Cosardereliogluc, Plaza-Rodriguez A, Iglesias P, et al. Atip levels are associated with less amyloid-B burden in postmortem brains of older adults with ALZHEIMER'S dementia. Innovation in Aging, 2022;6(1): 588-589.
31. Cosardereliogluc, Walston JD, Abadir PM. From frailty to resilience: Exploring adaptive capacity and reserve in older adults–a narrative review. Frontiers in Aging, 2025;6.
32. Ozsvath J. Overview of aging and its physiological and clinical impact on older adults. Aging Assistant LLC, 2025.
33. Kelley A, Addie S, Carrington-Lawrence S, et al. <scp>National institute on Aging</scp> 'S 50th anniversary: Advancing aging research and the health and well-being of older adults. Journal of the American Geriatrics Society, 2024;72(5): 1574-1582.
34. Saloner R, Lobo JD, Paolillo EW, et al. Cognitive and physiologic reserve independently relate to superior neurocognitive abilities in adults aging with HIV. JAIDS Journal of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndromes, 2022;90(4): 440-448.
35. Kim DH, Rockwood K. Frailty in older adults. New England Journal of Medicine, 2024;391(6): 538-548.
36. Leng S, Chen X, Mao G. Frailty syndrome: An overview. Clinical Interventions in Aging, 2014;433.
37. Ruiz JG, Espinoza S. The frailty phenotype. Frailty, 2024: 3-9.
38. Sciacchitano S, Carola V, Nicolais G, et al. To be frail or not to be frail: This is the question-A critical narrative review of frailty. Journal of Clinical Medicine, 2024;13(3): 721.
39. Mullen MM, McKinnish TR, Fiala MA, et al. A deficit-accumulation frailty index predicts survival outcomes in patients with gynecologic malignancy. Gynecologic Oncology, 2021;161(3): 700-704.
40. Garmezy N. The Study of Competence in Children at Risk for Severe Psychopathology. In E. J. Anthony, & C. Koupernik (Eds.). wiley, 1974;3: 77-97.
41. Masten AS. Ordinary magic: Resilience processes in development. American Psychologist, 2001;56(3): 227-238.
42. Masten AS, Barnes AJ. Resilience in children: Developmental perspe ctives. Children, 2018;5(7): 98.
43. Merchant RA, Aprahamian I, Woo J, et al. Resilience and successful aging. The Journal of nutrition, health and aging, 2022;26(7): 652-656.
44. Road to Resilience: Lifestyle Medicine Tools Paving the Way. American College of Lifestyle Medicine, 2022.
45. Chow C. Building a resilient mind to face challenges in the cancer journey. 365 CPS Resource Hub, 2025.
46. Annual breast cancer screening at 40 saves lives. Radiological Society of North America | RSNA, 2024.
47. Kalyta A, Loree JM, De Vera MA, et al. Estimating the impact of reducing the age of colorectal cancer screening on cancer incidence, mortality and costs in Canada using OncoSim. Journal of Clinical Oncology, 2022;40(16): 3526-3526.
48. Steinzor P. Starting Colorectal Cancer Screening at Age 40 Cuts Death Risk by 39%, Study Finds. The American Journal of Managed Care. (AJMC), 2025.
49. Yeh JM, Seguin CL, Whitton J, et al. Benefits, harms and burden of colorectal cancer screening among childhood cancer survivors previously treated with abdominal-pelvic radiation. Journal of Clinical Oncology, 2022;40(16): 10015.
50. Moss SM, Wale C, Smith R, et al. Effect of mammographic screening from age 40 years on breast cancer mortality in the UK age trial at 17 years' follow-up: A randomized controlled trial. The Lancet Oncology, 2015;16(9): 1123-1132.
51. Mark Fendrick A, Borah BJ, Burak Ozbay A, et al. Life-years gained resulting from screening colonoscopy compared with follow-up colonoscopy after a positive stool-based colorectal screening test. Preventive Medicine Reports, 2022;26: 101701.
52. Monod J. Chance and necessity: An essay on the natural philosophy of modern biology, 1971.
53. Ren P, Dong X, Vijg J. Age-related somatic mutation burden in human tissues. Frontiers in Aging, 2022;3.
54. Abubakar M, Hameed Y, Kiani MN, et al. Common features between aging and cancer: A narrative review. Aging Advances, 2024;1(2): 118-134.
55. Bair SM, Narkhede M, Frosch ZA, et al. Treatment intensity and outcomes in elderly patients with DLBCL receiving first line therapy. Blood, 2023;142(1): 68-68.

56. Balducci L, Extermann M. Cancer and aging: A review of the current landscape. Journal of Clinical Oncology, 2000;39(19): 2055-2064.
57. The causes of mutations. Understanding evolution, 2020.
58. Chang P. Recommended health screening in your 40s: The critical tests you shouldn't skip. Regis Medical, 2026.
59. Clancy S. Genetic mutation. Nature Education, 2008;1(1): 187.
60. Client challenge. Client Challenge, 2026.
61. De Sanctis JB, Garmendia J, Blanca I, et al. A brief overview of cancer research in the elderly population. Gaceta Médica de Caracas, 2020;128(3): 290-295.
62. Fisher DA, Saoud L, Finney Rutten LJ, et al. Lowering the colorectal cancer screening age improves predicted outcomes in a microsimulation model. Current Medical Research and Opinion, 2021;37(6): 1005-1010.
63. Fitzmaurice C. Global, regional and national cancer incidence, mortality, years of life lost, years lived with disability and disability-adjusted life-years for 29 cancer groups, 2006 to 2016: A systematic analysis for the global burden of disease study. Journal of Clinical Oncology, 2018;36(15): 1568-1568.
64. Foster G, Sherr L. Vulnerability and resilience of children and youth. Vulnerable Children and Youth Studies, 2006;1(1): 1-1.
65. Fried LP, Tangen CM, Walston J, et al. Frailty in older adults: Evidence for a phenotype. The Journals of Gerontology Series A: Biological Sciences and Medical Sciences, 2001;56(3): 146-157.
66. Health screenings for women ages 40 to 64: MedlinePlus medical encyclopedia. MedlinePlus - Health Information from the National Library of Medicine, 2020.
67. Hernán MA, Robins JM. Using big data to emulate a target trial when a randomized trial is not available: Table 1. American Journal of Epidemiology, 2016;183(8): 758-764.
68. Howick J. The philosophy of evidence-based medicine, 2011.
69. International agency for research on cancer (IARC). Global Cancer Observatory, 2022.
70. Just a moment, 2024.
71. Khangura SD, Spry C. View of screening for colorectal cancer in individuals younger than 50 years | Canadian Journal of health technologies. Canadian Journal of Health Technologies, 2022.
72. Korc-Grodzicki B, Holmes HM, Armin Shahrokni A. Geriatric assessment for oncologists. Cancer Biology & Medicine, 2015.
73. Lodato MA, Rodin RE, Bohrson CL, et al. Aging and neurodegeneration are associated with increased mutations in single human neurons. Science, 2018;359(6375): 555-559.
74. Moore L. The mutational landscape of normal human endometrial epithelium. Clinical Cancer Research, 2021;27(3): 007.
75. Pediatric cancer research Foundation. Pediatric Cancer Research Foundation, 2025.
76. Risk factors: Age. Comprehensive Cancer Information - NCI, 2025.
77. Rocco TS, Plakhotnik MS. Literature reviews, conceptual frameworks and theoretical frameworks: Terms, functions and distinctions. Human Resource Development Review, 2009;8(1): 120-130.
78. Steinzor P. Annual Breast Cancer Screening Should Begin at Age 40 Years, Study Finds. The American Journal of Managed Care, 2024.
79. Suri H. Purposeful sampling in qualitative research synthesis. Qualitative Research Journal, 2011;11(2): 63-75.
80. What is homeostasis? Cleveland Clinic, 2025.
81. Wildiers H. Siog consensus on geriatric assessment in older cancer patients. Journal of Geriatric Oncology, 2014;5: 1-2.
82. Zhang Y, Guo Y, Zhang C. A bibliometric study of the top 100 most cited papers on aging and cancer. Medicine, 2023;102(32): 34428.