# ARC MONOGRAPHS

# RED MEAT AND PROCESSED MEAT VOLUME 114

This publication represents the views and expert opinions of an IARC Working Group on the Evaluation of Carcinogenic Risks to Humans, which met in Lyon, 6–13 October 2015

LYON, FRANCE - 2018

IARC MONOGRAPHS ON THE EVALUATION OF CARCINOGENIC RISKS TO HUMANS

International Agency for Research on Cancer



Table 2.7.2 Cohort studies: Press	rocessed meat and cancer	of the lung (web only)
-----------------------------------	--------------------------	------------------------

Reference, location enrolment/follow-up period, study design	Population size, description, exposure assessment method	Organ site	Exposure category or level	Exposed cases/deaths	Risk estimate (95% CI)	Covariates controlled
Breslow et al. (2000) US Initial interview in 1987 and matched to mortality data through to 31 December 1995	20 195 individuals; Households eligible for the National Health Interview Survey in 1987 <b>Exposure assessment</b> <b>method:</b> Questionnaire	Lung	Processed meats (servings/weel	Age, gender, smoking		
			0–0.5	54	1	duration (years), packs per day smoked
			0.5–1.2	36	0.8 (0.5–1.3)	
			1.2–2.9	34	1 (0.6–1.6)	
			> 3.0	34	0.8 (0.5–1.4)	
			Trend-test p-value: 0.721			
Tasevska et al. (2009) US 1995–2003	278 380 men and 189 596 women; NIH-AARP Diet and Health Study: men and women aged 50–71 y from 8	Lung	Processed meat (g/1000 kcal) Men:			BMI, Smoking, race, education, physical activity intake of alcohol, energy- adjusted vegetable and frui servings, saturated fat
			Q1: ≤ 4.0	NR	1	
	US states		$Q2: > 4.0 \le 7.3$	NR	1.17 (1.05–1.31)	
	Exposure assessment method: Questionnaire; Self- administered semiquantitative 124-item FFQ. Meat-cooking module in a second FFQ 6 months after baseline		Q3: < 7.3 ≤ 11.4	NR	1.13 (1.01–1.26)	
			Q4: > 11.4 ≤ 18.2	NR	1.16 (1.04–1.29)	
			Q5: > 18.2	NR	1.23 (1.1–1.37)	
			Trend-test p-value: 0.003			
		Lung	Processed meat (g/1000 kcal) Women:			Same as above
			Q1: ≤ 2.3	NR	1	
			Q2: > $2.3 \le 4.5$	NR	0.89 (0.77–1.03)	
			Q3: $< 4.5 \le 7.3$	NR	1.05 (0.91–1.2)	
			Q4: $< 7.3 \le 12.5$	NR	0.95 (0.82–1.1)	
			Q5: > 12.5	NR	1 (0.87–1.15)	
			Trend-test p-value: 0.58			
		Lung	Processed meat (g/1000 kcal) Men:			Same as above
			Never smokers: 90th percentile	137	1.06 (0.69–1.64)	

## 1

Reference, location enrolment/follow-up period, study design	Population size, description, exposure assessment method	Organ site	Exposure category or level	Exposed cases/deaths	Risk estimate (95% CI)	Covariates controlled
			compared to 10th percentile			
			Trend-test p-value: 0.79			
		Lung	Red meat (g/1000 kcal) Women:			Same as above
			Never smokers: 90th percentile compared to 10th percentile	166	0.89 (0.62–1.29)	
			Trend-test p-value: 0.55			
Linseisen et al. (2011) Europe enrollment early 1900s	142 602 men, 335 825 women; EPIC: men and women age 25–70 in 10 European countries, <b>Exposure assessment</b> <b>method:</b> Questionnaire; self- administered FFQ, 300–350 items. 24-hour recalls or 7- day diaries in subcohorts	Lung: ICD-O C34	Continuous model per 50 g: processed meat	NR	1.13 (0.95–1.34)	Age, sex, centre, smoking, body weight, height, energy intake, alcohol, fruits and vegetables, physical activity education
Tasevska et al. (2011)48 229 men and 51 350USAwomen; PLCO Cancer1993–2006Screening Trial: volunteersaged 55–74 yearsExposure assessmentmethod:Questionnaire; Self- administered semiquantitative 124-itemFFQ	women; PLCO Cancer Screening Trial: volunteers aged 55–74 years <b>Exposure assessment</b>	Lung: 34.0–34.9	Men processed meat g/1000 kcal, 2 vs 1	NR	0.85 (0.62–1.18)	Age, detailed smoking history, race, education, tota energy intake, fruits and vegetables, fats, alcohol
			Same 3 vs 1	NR	1.04 (0.76–1.41)	
			Same 4 vs 1	NR	0.97 (0.7–1.33)	
			Same 5 vs 1	NR	1.12 (0.83–1.53)	
		Women processed meat g/1000 kcal, 2 vs 1	NR	1.22 (0.86–1.73)		
	UTU YITU		Same 3 vs 1	NR	1.09 (0.76–1.57)	
			Same 4 vs 1	NR	0.83 (0.56–1.22)	
		Same 5 vs 1	NR	0.98 (0.68–1.41)		

2

### 3

### References

- Breslow RA, Graubard BI, Sinha R, Subar AF (2000). Diet and lung cancer mortality: a 1987 National Health Interview Survey cohort study. Cancer Causes Control. 11(5):419–31. PMID:10877335 http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1008996208313
- Linseisen J, Rohrmann S, Bueno-de-Mesquita B, Büchner FL, Boshuizen HC, Agudo A, et al. (2011). Consumption of meat and fish and risk of lung cancer: results from the European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition. Cancer Causes Control. 22(6):909–18. PMID:21479828 http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10552-011-9764-1
- Tasevska N, Cross AJ, Dodd KW, Ziegler RG, Caporaso NE, Sinha R (2011). No effect of meat, meat cooking preferences, meat mutagens or heme iron on lung cancer risk in the prostate, lung, colorectal and ovarian cancer screening trial. Int J Cancer. 128(2):402–11. PMID:20232386 http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/ijc.25327
- Tasevska N, Sinha R, Kipnis V, Subar AF, Leitzmann MF, Hollenbeck AR, et al. (2009). A prospective study of meat, cooking methods, meat mutagens, heme iron, and lung cancer risks. Am J Clin Nutr. 89(6):1884–94. PMID:19369370 http://dx.doi.org/10.3945/ajcn.2008.27272