



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





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
Cross et al. (2011) United States of America (California, Florida, Louisiana, New Jersey, North Carolina, Pennsylvania + two metropolitan areas: Atlanta, Georgia and Detroit, Michigan) End of 2006	494 979; Men and women, aged 5–71 years, enrolled in 1995–1996. The following individuals were excluded: duplicates, participants who died or moved before the baseline questionnaire was received or withdrew from the study, who did not return the baseline questionnaire, whose baseline questionnaire was filled in by someone else on their behalf, who had prevalent cancer according to the cancer registry or self-report, those with extreme daily total energy intake. Exposure assessment method: Questionnaire; Dietary intake of various food items was assessed through a 124-item food frequency questionnaire (usual frequency of consumption and portion size information of foods over the previous twelve months). Portion sizes and daily nutrient intakes were calculated from the 1994–1996 US Department of Agriculture's Continuing Survey of Food Intakes by Individuals. "Red Meat" = all types of beef, pork and lamb, including bacon, beef, cold cuts, ham, hamburger, hotdogs, liver, pork, sausage and steak. Meat added to complex food mixtures, such as pizza, chili, lasagna, and stew, contributed to the relevant meat type.	Squamous cell carcinoma: (ICD-O-3 C15.0–C15.9); Q2 (21.9) (histology codes 8050–8076) Q3 (32.2) Q4 (44.1) Q5 (64.8) All – Red Me Continuous (jg/1000kcals)	Q2 (21.9) Q3 (32.2) Q4 (44.1) Q5 (64.8) All – Red Meat – Continuous (per 10	28 35 42 41 69 NR	0kcals) 1 1.18 (0.71–1.96) 1.34 (0.8–2.22) 1.19 (0.7–2.01) 1.79 (1.07–3.01) 1.06 (1–1.13)	Age, sex, body mass index, education, ethnicity, tobacco smoking, alcohol drinking, usual physical activity at work, vigorous physical activity, daily intake of fruit, daily intake of vegetables, daily intake of saturated fat, daily intake of calories
		Oesophagus Adenocarcinoma: (ICD-O-3 C15.0– C15.9); (histology codes 8140, 8141, 8190–8231, 8260– 8263, 8310, 8430, 8480–8490, 8560, 8570–8572)	Red meat, Quintile in Q1 (10.0) Q2 (21.9) Q3 (32.2) Q4 (44.1) Q5 (64.8) All – Red Meat – Continuous (per 10 g/1000kcals) Trend-test p-value:	median (μg/1000 74 112 113 154 177 NR	0kcals) 1 1.18 (0.87–1.59) 1 (0.74–1.37) 1.17 (0.87–1.59) 1.15 (0.84–1.57) 1.01 (0.98–1.06)	Same as above

Reference, location nrolment/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
	A risk factor questionnaire sent six months	Oesophagus Squamous cell carcinoma: (ICD- O-3 C15.0–C15.9) – (histology codes 8050–8076)	Heme Iron, Quintile median (µg/1000kcals)			Same as above
	later to a subcohort of 303 165 persons elicited detailed information on meat intake and cooking preferences.		Q1 (48.8)	17	1	
			Q2 (102.9)	25	1.38 (0.74–2.58)	
			Q3 (154.2)	31	1.6 (0.87–2.96)	
			Q4 (218.7)	27	1.33 (0.7–2.53)	
			Q5 (347.7)	28	1.25 (0.64–2.42)	
			All – Heme Iron – Continuous (per 100 μg/1000kcals)	NR	1.02 (0.89–1.17)	
			Trend-test p-value: (0.944		
		Oesophagus Adenocarcinoma: (ICD-O-3 C15.0– C15.9); (histology codes 8140, 8141, 8190–8231, 8260– 8263, 8310, 8430, 8480–8490, 8560,	Heme Iron, Quintile median (µg/1000kcals)			Same as above
			Q1 (48.8)	39	1	
			Q2 (102.9)	55	1.12 (0.74–1.7)	
			Q3 (154.2)	81	1.4 (0.94–2.07)	
			Q4 (218.7)	88	1.32 (0.89–1.97)	
		8570–8572)	Q5 (347.7)	114	1.47 (0.99–2.2)	

Trend-test p-value: 0.063

 $All-Heme\ Iron-$

Continuous (per 100 µg/1000kcals)

NR

1.04 (0.96–1.12)

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
Keszei et al. (2012) Netherland 1986–2002	120 852 were recruited and finally, 3923 subcohort members were used in the analysis (Case-cohort design); The sample was selected from 204 municipal population registries throughout the Netherlands by gender-stratified random sampling. Exposure assessment method: Questionnaire; FFQ	Oesophagus: oesophagus carcinomas included squamous cell carcinomas (ESCC) C15, histology codes: 8050–8076, and adenocarcinomas (EAC) C15, histology codes: 8140, 8141, 8190– 8231, 8260–8263, 8310, 8430, 8480– 8490, 8560, and 8570–8572.	Risk by quintile ESCC, men Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4 Q5 Trend-test p-value:	6 12 13 11 17 0.06	1 1.86 (0.65–5.33) 1.83 (0.64–5.28) 2.15 (0.76–6.11) 2.66 (0.94–7.48)	Adjusted for age (years), smoking status (current versus non-current smoker), years of cigarette smoking, number of cigarettes smoked per day, total energy intake (kjoules/day), body mass index (categories: < 20, 20–24.9, 25–29.9, and ≥ 3kg/m2), alcohol intake (grams/day), vegetable intake (grams/day), fruit intake (grams/day), levels of education (four categories), and non-occupational physical activity (four categories). For EAC, models are additionally adjusted for use of lower oesophageal sphincter relaxing medications.
		EAC	men, Q1	21	1	Same as above
			Q2	23	1.06 (0.56–2.03)	
			Q3	22	0.98 (0.52-1.85)	

Trend-test p-value: 0.2

32

16

1.37 (0.76–2.47)

0.57 (0.28–1.19)

Q4

Q5

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		
		ESCC	women, T1	16	1	Same as above		
			T2	15	0.84 (0.39–1.84)			
			Т3	17	0.87 (0.42–1.79)			
					Trend-test p-value: 0.73			
		EAC	women, T1	9	1	Same as above		
			T2	9	0.74 (0.29–1.94)			
			T3	13	1.09 (0.44–2.75)			
			Trend-test p-value: 0.76					
akszyn et al. (2013)	472 538 participants. A total of 521 457	Oesophagus	Red meat (25 g/200kcal)			Sex, Smoking status		
	subjects (153,447men), aged mostly 35–70 years in 23 centres from 10 European countries Exposure assessment method: Questionnaire; Models for the continuous variables of meat (unprocessed red and processed)(for 25 g/2,000 kcal)	Adenocarcinoma: (ICD10)	Tertile 1	36	1	(never, former, smoker and unknown), Time since quitting smoking (y), Number of cigarettes (cig/d), Body mass index		
nvestigation into			Tertile 2	40	0.91 (0.57–1.47)			
Cancer and Nutrition (EPIC) 1992–11 years			Tertile 3	61	1 (0.6–1.66)			
			Trend-test p-value: 0.911			(BMI)(kg/m2), Total energy intake(kcal/day), Fresh fruits (g/2,000 kcal) Vegetables intake (g/2,00 kcal), Educational levels		
		Oesophagus Adenocarcinoma: (ICD10)	Heme Iron (mg/2000kcal)			Same as above		
			Tertile 1	43	1			
			Tertile 2	34	0.96 (0.6–1.53)			
			Tertile 3	59	1.67 (1.05–2.68)			
			Trend-test p-value:	t-test p-value: 0.048				

References

- Cross AJ, Freedman ND, Ren J, Ward MH, Hollenbeck AR, Schatzkin A, et al. (2011). Meat consumption and risk of esophageal and gastric cancer in a large prospective study. Am J Gastroenterol. 106(3):432–42. PMID:20978481 http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/ajg.2010.415
- Jakszyn P, Luján-Barroso L, Agudo A, Bueno-de-Mesquita HB, Molina E, Sánchez MJ, et al. (2013). Meat and heme iron intake and esophageal adenocarcinoma in the European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition study. Int J Cancer. 133(11):2744–50. PMID:23728954
- Keszei AP, Schouten LJ, Goldbohm RA, van den Brandt PA (2012). Red and processed meat consumption and the risk of esophageal and gastric cancer subtypes in The Netherlands Cohort Study. Ann Oncol. 23(9):2319–26. PMID:22351741 http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/annonc/mdr615

