

OCCUPATIONAL EXPOSURE AS A FIREFIGHTER

VOLUME 132

This publication represents the views and expert opinions of an IARC Working Group on the Identification of Carcinogenic Hazards to Humans, which met in Lyon, France, 7–14 June 2022

LYON, FRANCE - 2023

IARC MONOGRAPHS
ON THE IDENTIFICATION
OF CARCINOGENIC HAZARDS
TO HUMANS

Table S2.10 Cohort and case-control studies only reporting ever having worked as a firefighter and cancers of the colon and rectum, oesophagus, stomach, and other sites

location, des	essment method	Cancer type (histopathology), incidence or mortality	Exposure category or level	Exposed cases or deaths	Risk estimate (95% CI)	Covariates controlled	Comments
(2015) [car France emp Enrolment, on 1 1 January 1979/ ider follow-up, adm 1979–2008 (939) Cohort Exp met firet	reer] firefighters ployed in France 1 January 1979, ntified from 89 French ministrative departments % of population) posure assessment thod: ever employed as efighter from employment ords	Lip, oral cavity, and pharynx, mortality Oesophagus, mortality Stomach, mortality Colon, mortality Rectum and anus, mortality Pancreas, mortality Liver (HCC), mortality Breast, mortality	SMR (French por Firefighters SMR (French por Firefighters	opulation re 40 opulation re 29 opulation re 29 opulation re 23 opulation re 42 opulation re 46 opulation re	1.15 (0.89–1.46) eferent): 0.93 (0.67–1.27) eferent): 1.15 (0.77–1.65) eferent): 0.73 (0.44–1.04) eferent): 1.36 (0.86–2.04) eferent): 1.27 (0.92–1.72) eferent): 1.10 (0.80–1.46) eferent):	Age, calendar year	Exposure assessment critique: Minimal quality. Exposure assessment at only one point in time. Employed as any type of paid [career] firefighter. May include municipal and rural firefighters. Strengths: cohort coverage at the national level; relatively large cohort with long follow- up; robust linkages. Limitations: probable healthy-worker selection bias; includes only the 16% who were career civilian firefighters (79% were volunteers and 5% were military); lack of information on exposure and potential
			Firefighters	1	0.76 (0.02–4.23)		confounders.

Table S2.10	(continued)						
Reference, location, enrolment/ follow-up period, study design	Population size, description, exposure assessment method	Cancer type (histopathology), incidence or mortality	Exposure category or level	Exposed cases or deaths	Risk estimate (95% CI)	Covariates controlled	Comments
Deschamps et al. (1995) Paris, France Enrolment, 1 January 1977/ follow-up, 1977 to 1 January 1991 Cohort	830; professional [career] male firefighters with ≥ 5 yr of service in the Paris Fire Brigade before 1977 Exposure assessment method: employed as firefighter with ≥ 5 yr of active fire combat duty from employment records	Pharynx, mortality Digestive (ICD-9, 150–159), mortality	SMR (French p Firefighters SMR (French p Firefighters	2	0.81 (0.10-2.93)	Age, calendar year	Exposure assessment critique: Satisfactory quality. Duration of active fire combat assessed only for deaths, not used in analyses. Municipal firefighters. Strengths: complete cohort enumeration. Limitations: small study size; probable healthy- worker selection bias; lack of information on exposure and potential confounders; probabilistic linkage of outcome data.
Ma et al. (2006) Florida, USA Enrolment, 1972–1999, follow-up, 1981–1999 Cohort	36 813; all male (34 796) and female (2017) professional [career] firefighters certified in Florida from 1972 to 1999; the certification date was considered to be the date of first exposure Exposure assessment method: ever career firefighter from professional certification records	Lip, oral cavity, and pharynx (ICD-10, C00-C14), incidence Oesophagus, incidence	SIR (Florida po Male firefighters Female firefighters SIR (Florida po Male firefighters Female firefighters	39	0.67 (0.47-0.91) 0 (NR)	Age, calendar year	Exposure assessment critique: Minimal quality. Only one point in time measure of exposure, no indication when exposure stopped. May include municipal and rural firefighters. Strengths: assesses cancer incidence; includes female firefighters; large male cohort. Limitations: probable healthyworker selection bias; small female cohort; young age at end of follow-up; lacks information on exposure and potential confounders.

Reference, location, enrolment/ follow-up period, study design	Population size, description, exposure assessment method	Cancer type (histopathology), incidence or mortality	Exposure category or level	Exposed cases or deaths	Risk estimate (95% CI)	Covariates controlled	Comments
Ma et al. (2006)		Stomach,	SIR (Florida po	pulation re	ferent):	Age, calendar	
(cont.)		incidence	Male firefighters	14	0.50 (0.25-0.90)	year	
			Female firefighters	0	0 (NR)		
		Colon, incidence	SIR (Florida po	pulation re	ferent):		
			Male firefighters	78	1.16 (0.92–1.45)		
			Female firefighters	2	2.27 (0.26-8.21)		
		Rectum, incidence	SIR (Florida po	pulation re	ferent):		
			Male firefighters	23	0.88 (0.56–1.32)		
			Female firefighters	1	5.26 (0.07–29.30)		
		Liver (HCC),	SIR (Florida po	pulation re	ferent):		
		incidence	Male firefighters	8	0.74 (0.32–1.46)		
			Female firefighters	0	0 (NR)		
		Pancreas,	SIR (Florida po	pulation re	ferent):		
		incidence	Male firefighters	12	0.57 (0.30-1.10)		
			Female firefighters	0	0 (NR)		
		Bone, incidence	SIR (Florida po	pulation re	ferent):		
			Male firefighters	4	1.02 (0.27–2.61)		
			Female firefighters	0	0 (NR)		

Table S2.10	(continued)						
Reference, location, enrolment/ follow-up period, study design	Population size, description, exposure assessment method	Cancer type (histopathology), incidence or mortality	Exposure category or level	Exposed cases or deaths	Risk estimate (95% CI)	Covariates controlled	Comments
Ma et al. (2006)		Breast, incidence	SIR (Florida po	pulation re	ferent):	Age, calendar	
(cont.)			Male firefighters	2	0.51 (0.06-1.84)	year	
			Female firefighters	10	0.96 (0.46–1.76)		
		Soft tissue	SIR (Florida po	pulation re	ferent):		
		sarcoma, incidence	Male firefighters	14	1.00 (0.55–1.69)		
			Female firefighters	1	5.56 (0.07–30.91)		
Ma et al. (2005)	36 813; all male (34 796) and female (2017) professional [career] firefighters certified	Buccal/pharynx, mortality	SMR (Florida population referent):			Age, calendar	Exposure assessment critique:
Florida, USA Enrolment,			Male firefighters	7	0.42 (0.17–0.87)	period	Minimal quality. Only one point in time measure of exposure, no indication when exposure stopped. May include municipal and rural firefighters.
1972–1999/ follow-up, 1972–1999 Cohort	in Florida from 1972 to 1999 Exposure assessment method: ever career firefighter from professional		Male firefighters certified 1972–1976	5	0.38 (0.12-0.89)		
	certification records		Female firefighters	0	0 (NR)		Strengths: includes female firefighters; large male cohort;
		Oesophagus,	SMR (Florida p	opulation r	eferent):		multiple linkages to assess vital status; conducted a
		mortality	Male firefighters	10	0.65 (0.31–1.20)		sensitivity analysis among firefighters with longest tenure (certified 1972–1976). <i>Limitations</i> : probable healthyworker selection bias; small female cohort; young age
			Male firefighters certified 1972–1976	7	0.55 (0.22–1.14)		
			Female firefighters	0	0 (NR)		at end of follow-up; lacks information on exposure and potential confounders.

Table S2.10	(continued)
-------------	-------------

Reference, location, enrolment/ follow-up period, study design	Population size, description, exposure assessment method	Cancer type (histopathology), incidence or mortality	Exposure category or level	Exposed cases or deaths	Risk estimate (95% CI)	Covariates controlled	Comments
Ma et al. (2005)		Stomach,	SMR (Florida p	opulation r	eferent):	Age, calendar	
(cont.)		mortality	Male firefighters	12	0.86 (0.52–1.42)	period	
			Male firefighters certified 1972–1976	10	0.92 (0.68–2.00)		
			Female firefighters	0	0 (NR)		
		Colon, mortality	SMR (Florida p	opulation r	eferent):		
			Male firefighters	38	1.14 (0.81–1.56)		
			Male firefighters certified 1972–1976	33	1.22 (0.84–1.72)		
			Female firefighters	1	2.27 (0.03–12.7)		
		Rectum, mortality	SMR (Florida p	opulation r	eferent):		
		·	Male firefighters	7	0.94 (0.38-1.93)		
			Male firefighters certified 1972–1976	6	1.04 (0.38–2.26)		
			Female firefighters	0	0 (NR)		

Reference, location, enrolment/ follow-up period, study design	Population size, description, exposure assessment method	Cancer type (histopathology), incidence or mortality	Exposure category or level	Exposed cases or deaths	Risk estimate (95% CI)	Covariates controlled	Comments
Ma et al. (2005)		Liver (HCC),	SMR (Florida 1	opulation r	eferent):	Age, calendar	
(cont.)		mortality	Male firefighters	10	0.85 (0.41–1.56)	period	
			Male firefighters certified 1972–1976	7	0.83 (0.33–1.71)		
			Female firefighters	0	0 (NR)		
		Pancreas,	SMR (Florida 1	opulation r			
		mortality	Male firefighters	12	0.57 (0.29-0.99)		
			Male firefighters certified 1972–1976	12	0.7 (0.36–1.22)		
			Female firefighters	0	0 (NR)		
		Bone, mortality	SMR (Florida	opulation r	eferent):		
		,	Male firefighters	1	0.52 (0.01–2.91)		
			Male firefighters certified 1972–1976	1	1.06 (0.01–5.92)		
			Female firefighters	0	0 (NR)		

Table \$2.10 (continued)
----------------	-----------	---

Reference, location, enrolment/ follow-up period, study design	Population size, description, exposure assessment method	Cancer type (histopathology), incidence or mortality	Exposure category or level	Exposed cases or deaths	Risk estimate (95% CI)	Covariates controlled	Comments
Ma et al. (2005)		Breast, mortality	SMR (Florida p	opulation r	eferent):	Age, calendar	
(cont.)			Male firefighters	4	7.41 (1.99–19.0)	period	
			Male firefighters certified 1972–1976	3	6.98 (0.65–1.68)		
			Female firefighters	1	0.51 (0.01–2.82)		
Grimes et al.	205 deaths; all male	ers with ≥ 1 yr mortality All e in the City of Cau u Fire Department [W] e assessment death certificate fusual accumption Hav	PMR (state pop	ulation refe	erent):	NR	Exposure assessment critique:
<u>(1991)</u>	firefighters with $\geq 1 \text{ yr}$		All firefighters	[4]	0.79 (0.30-2.09)		Minimal quality. Crude,
Honolulu, Hawaii, USA 1969–1988	of service in the City of Honolulu Fire Department Exposure assessment		Caucasian [White] firefighters	[1]	1.17 (0.17–8.20)		relying on knowledge of usual occupation by death certifier. Possible differential misclassification from missing occupation on death certificates. May
Cohort	coding of usual occupation		Hawaiian firefighters	[2]	0.76 (0.19–3.01)		
		Colon, mortality	PMR (state pop	PMR (state population referent):			on death certificates. May include municipal and rural
		•	All firefighters	[5]	0.91 (0.37-2.20)		firefighters.
			Caucasian [White] firefighters	[1]	0.71 (0.10-5.02)	Strengt examir group (Limitat worker if unde that PM SMR is PMRs v by age o inform potenti Other co of deatl	Strengths: long follow-up; examined risk by ethnic group (White/Hawaiian). Limitations: probable healthy-worker selection bias; unclear if underlying assumption that PMR will estimate an SMR is valid in this cohort; PMRs were not standardized by age or calendar period; no information on exposure and potential confounders. Other comments: number of deaths calculated by the Working Group.
			Hawaiian firefighters	[0]	0 (NR)		

Table S2.10	(continued)						
Reference, location, enrolment/ follow-up period, study design	Population size, description, exposure assessment method	Cancer type (histopathology), incidence or mortality	Exposure category or level	Exposed cases or deaths	Risk estimate (95% CI)	Covariates controlled	Comments
Musk et al. (1978) Boston, Massachusetts, USA Follow-up, 1915–1975 Cohort	5655 male professional [career] firefighters employed by the Boston Fire Department for ≥ 3 yr since 1915 Exposure assessment method: employed as municipal firefighter ≥ 3 yr from employment records	Digestive (ICD-7, 150–159), mortality	SMR: Firefighters vs Massachusetts male population Firefighters vs US White male population	153 153	[0.80 (0.68-0.93)] [0.99 (0.84-1.16)]	Age, calendar period	Exposure assessment critique: Satisfactory quality. Ever employed as municipal firefighter. Other comments: Death certificates lacked for 7.9% (194) of confirmed deaths. Strengths: long follow-up. Limitations: probable healthy- worker selection bias; lack of information on cause for a proportion of deaths; lack of information on exposure and potential confounders.
Giles et al. (1993) Melbourne, Victoria, Australia Enrolment, 1917–1989/ follow-up 1980–1989 Cohort	2865 operational active male firefighters employed between 1917 and 1989 by the Metropolitan Fire Brigade in Melbourne, Australia Exposure assessment method: ever employed from employment records	Upper aerodigestive tract, incidence Colon and rectum, incidence Colon and rectum, incidence Pancreas, incidence	SIR (Victoria por Firefighters SIR (Victoria por Firefighters Attained age (Some referent): ≥ 65 yr SIR (Victoria por Firefighters	6 opulation re 9 IR, Victoria	1.46 (0.53–3.18) eferent): 1.36 (0.62–2.59) a population 3.65 (1.13–7.94)	Age, calendar period	Exposure assessment critique: Minimal quality. Only ever municipal firefighter exposure. Strengths: assesses cancer incidence. Limitations: probable healthy- worker selection bias; small cohort size; no description of registry linkage methods; lack of information on exposure and potential confounders.

Reference, location, enrolment/ follow-up period, study design	Population size, description, exposure assessment method	Cancer type (histopathology), incidence or mortality	Exposure category or level	Exposed cases or deaths	Risk estimate (95% CI)	Covariates controlled	Comments
Eliopulos et al. (1984) Western Australia Follow-up, 1939–1978 Cohort	990; all men employed as permanent full-time firefighters by the Western Australian Fire Brigade between October 1939 and December 1978 Exposure assessment method: ever employed as a permanent full-time firefighter, and categorical employment duration (years) as firefighters from	All cancers except respiratory organs, mortality Stomach, mortality Intestinal cancer, mortality Other digestive cancers, mortality	SMR (Western Employment as firefighter PMR (Western Employment as firefighter PMR (Western Employment as firefighter PMR (Western Employment	23 Australia re 5 Australia re 4	1.21 (0.77–1.82) eferent): 2.02 (0.65–4.70) eferent): 1.59 (0.43–4.07)	Age, calendar period	Exposure assessment critique: Satisfactory quality. Unsure if permanent full-time status was maintained throughout study period. Municipal firefighters. Strengths: long follow-up time; low loss to follow-up. Limitations: probable healthy- worker selection bias; small study size; no personal information on exposure or
Zhao et al. (2020) Spain Enrolment, 2001/follow-up, 2001–2011 Cohort	employment records 9 579 759 (27 365 firefighters); men identified as residing in Spain on 1 November 2001, employed on the census date, and aged 20–64 yr; followed for mortality using a national death registry Exposure assessment method: employed as firefighter in week before census	Oral/pharyngeal combined, mortality Oesophagus, mortality Stomach, mortality Colon, mortality	as firefighter Occupation (M All other occupations Firefighters Occupation (M All other occupations Firefighters Occupation (M All other occupations Firefighters Occupation (M All other occupation (M All other occupations Firefighters Occupation (M All other occupations Firefighters Occupation (M All other occupation (M All other occupations Firefighters	RR): 5015 18 RR): 4427 13 RR): 7443 26 RR): 9778	1 1.34 (0.81–2.21) 1 1.11 (0.64–1.92) 1 1.32 (0.88–1.98) 1 0.62 (0.37–1.02) 1	Age	potential confounders. Exposure assessment critique: Minimal quality. Firefighting self-reported at one point in time. Years of firefighting. May include municipal and rural firefighters. Strengths: large study size; low loss to follow-up; cohort coverage at the national level. Limitations: occupation determined by self-report at baseline; short follow-up and young cohort age; lack of information on exposure and potential confounders.

Reference, location, enrolment/ follow-up period, study design	Population size, description, exposure assessment method	Cancer type (histopathology), incidence or mortality	Exposure category or level	Exposed cases or deaths	Risk estimate (95% CI)	Covariates controlled	Comments
Zhao et al. (2020) (cont.)		Liver (HCC), mortality	Occupation (M All other occupations Firefighters	5937 14	1 1.01 (0.59–1.74)	Age	
		Pancreas, mortality	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,				
		Bone, mortality	Occupation (M All other occupations Firefighters	(RR): 396	1 1.11 (0.16–7.92)		
	1	Breast, mortality	Occupation (M All other occupations		1		
			Firefighters	1	3.04 (0.42-21.78)		
Pukkala et al.	16 422 male professional	Lip, incidence Oral cavity,	SIR (national re				Exposure assessment critique:
(2014) Denmark,	[career] firefighters in the NOCCA cohort (a registry-		Firefighters SIR (national re	17 eferent):	0.80 (0.46–1.28)	age, calendar period	Satisfactory quality. Self- reported firefighter as current
Finland, Iceland, Norway,	based cohort study of Nordic country residents who participated in any	incidence Pharynx, incidence	Firefighters SIR (national re	11 eferent):	0.80 (0.40-1.43)		job. Includes municipal and rural firefighters. Strengths: large study
Sweden 1961–2005	computerized population census (1960, 1970,	Oesophagus,	Firefighters SIR (national re	19 eferent):	1.00 (0.60–1.57)		size; long follow-up time; assesses cancer incidence
Cohort	1980–1981 or 1990) and were followed up through	incidence	Firefighters	31	0.98 (0.66–1.39)		using high-quality outcome data; contrasts by country,
	linkage to national cancer registries), aged 30–64 yr, alive, and in the country in the year following census participation Exposure assessment method: employed as firefighter at time of census	national cancer aged 30–64 yr, n the country in lowing census on ssessment nployed as	SIR (national re Firefighters SIR (national re	128	1.09 (0.91–1.30)	r <i>I</i> v i	observation period, and age; multiple sensitivity analyses. <i>Limitations</i> : probable healthyworker selection bias; lack of information on exposure and potential confounders.
			Firefighters	198	1.14 (0.99–1.31)		

Reference, location, enrolment/ follow-up period, study design	Population size, description, exposure assessment method	Cancer type (histopathology), incidence or mortality	Exposure category or level	Exposed cases or deaths	Risk estimate (95% CI)	Covariates controlled	Comments
Pukkala et al. (2014) Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway, Sweden 1961–2005 Cohort		Rectum, incidence Liver and bile ducts, incidence Bile duct/ gallbladder, incidence Pancreas, incidence	SIR (national refirefighters SIR (national refirefighters SIR (national refirefighters SIR (national refirefighters	119 eferent): 25 eferent): 18 eferent):	0.99 (0.82–1.19) 0.91 (0.59–1.34) 1.45 (0.86–2.29)	Country, age, calendar period	
		Soft tissue sarcoma, incidence	Firefighters SIR (national refighters	87 eferent): 18	1.17 (0.94–1.45) 1.16 (0.69–1.84)		
Sritharan et al. (2022) Ontario, Canada	2 368 226 (firefighters, 13 642; police, 22 595); workers aged ≥ 15 yr who submitted lost-time	Lip, incidence	Referent (HR): Firefighters vs all other workers	11	1.61 (0.89–2.92)	Age at start of follow-up, birth year, sex	Exposure assessment critique: Minimal quality. Duration of firefighter work unclear. May include full-time, part-
Enrolment, 1983–2019/ follow-up, 1983–2020	workers' compensation injury and disease claims to the Workplace Safety and Insurance Board with	Oral/pharyngeal combined,	Firefighters vs police Referent (HR): Firefighters	11 56	1.35 (0.57–3.22)		time, municipal, and rural firefighters. Strengths: large study size; long follow-up time; includes
Cohort	known sex, birth date, claim date, and occupation and industry information; incident cases identified	incidence	vs all other workers Firefighters vs	56	1.10 (0.84–1.43) 1.03 (0.72–1.46)		female firefighters; working population used as referent; assesses cancer incidence. <i>Limitations</i> : potential
	using the Ontario Cancer registry Exposure assessment method: records; employed as firefighter at time of	Oesophagus, incidence	police Referent (HR): Firefighters vs all other workers	29	1.06 (0.73–1.53)		selection bias into claims database, as compensation claims used to identify the cohort may differ by occupation; lack of
	workers' compensation claim		Firefighters vs police	29	0.93 (0.57–1.50)		information on exposure and potential confounders.

Table S2.10	(continued)						
Reference, location, enrolment/ follow-up period, study design	Population size, description, exposure assessment method	Cancer type (histopathology), incidence or mortality	Exposure category or level	Exposed cases or deaths	Risk estimate (95% CI)	Covariates controlled	Comments
Sritharan et al. (2022) (cont.)		Stomach, incidence	Referent (HR): Firefighters vs all other workers	34	0.78 (0.55–1.09)	Age at start of follow-up, birth year, sex	
			Firefighters vs police	34	0.79 (0.51–1.21)		
		Colon, incidence	Referent (HR): Firefighters vs all other workers	152	1.39 (1.19–1.63)		
			Firefighters vs police	152	0.97 (0.78–1.20)		
		Rectum, incidence	Referent (HR): Firefighters vs all other workers	66	1.18 (0.93–1.51)		
			Firefighters vs police	66	1.19 (0.85–1.68)		
		Liver (HCC), incidence	Referent (HR): Firefighters vs all other workers	25	0.72 (0.49–1.07)		
			Firefighters vs police	25	0.92 (0.54–1.56)		

Reference, location, enrolment/ follow-up period, study design	Population size, description, exposure assessment method	Cancer type (histopathology), incidence or mortality	Exposure category or level	Exposed cases or deaths	Risk estimate (95% CI)	Covariates controlled	Comments
Sritharan et al.		Pancreas,	Referent (HR):			Age at start	
(2022) (cont.)		incidence	Firefighters vs all other workers	53	1.34 (1.02–1.76)	of follow-up, birth year, sex	
			Firefighters vs police	53	1.09 (0.75–1.59)		
		Breast, incidence	Referent (HR): Female	7	0.07 (0.46, 2.03)		
			firefighters vs all other workers	7	0.97 (0.46–2.03)		
			Female firefighters vs police	7	0.78 (0.36–1.71)		
			Male firefighters	< 6	NR		
Harris et al.	CanCHEC: 1 108 410	Lip, incidence	Occupation (H	R):		Age, region,	Exposure assessment
(2018) Canada	(4535 firefighters); men participating in the long-		Non- firefighters	NR	1	education	critique: Minimal quality. Self-reported firefighter
Enrolment, 1991/follow-up,	form Canadian census in 1991, employed with a		Firefighters	5	2.09 (0.87–5.06)		as current or longest job. Includes municipal and rural
1992–2010	valid occupation and aged	Oral cavity,	Occupation (H				firefighters.
Cohort	25–74 yr at cohort entry; incident cancers identified	incidence	Non- firefighters	NR	1		Strengths: study size; long follow-up time; national
	using a national cancer		Firefighters	20	1.01 (0.63–1.62)		coverage of working
	registry	Oesophagus,	Occupation (H				population; assesses cancer
	Exposure assessment method: ever employed as	incidence	Non- firefighters	NR	1		incidence. Limitations: occupation
	firefighter data from census		Firefighters	5	1.31 (0.68–2.51)		determined at 1991 census based on self-report. Lack of
		Stomach,	Occupation (H				information on exposure and
		incidence	Non- firefighters	NR	1		potential confounders.
			Firefighter	10	0.64 (0.32–1.28)		

Table S2.10	(continued)						
Reference, location, enrolment/ follow-up period, study design	Population size, description, exposure assessment method	Cancer type (histopathology), incidence or mortality	Exposure category or level	Exposed cases or deaths	Risk estimate (95% CI)	Covariates controlled	Comments
Harris et al.		Colon, incidence	Occupation (F	HR):		Age, region,	
(2018) (cont.)			Non- firefighters	NR	1	education	
			Firefighters	40	0.90 (0.67-1.22)		
		Rectum, incidence	Occupation (F	IR):			
			Non- firefighters	NR	1		
			Firefighters	30	0.88 (0.61-1.27)		
		Liver (HCC),	Occupation (F	IR):			
		incidence	Non- firefighters	NR	1		
			Firefighters	5	0.54 (0.23-1.31)		
		Pancreas,	Occupation (F	HR):			
		incidence	Non- firefighters	NR	1		
			Firefighters	15	1.38 (0.83-2.29)		

Reference, location, description, exposure enrolment/ follow-up period, study design	Cancer type (histopathology), incidence or mortality	Exposure category or level	Exposed cases or deaths	Risk estimate (95% CI)	Covariates controlled	Comments
Lee et al. (2020) Florida, USA 1981–2014 Case-control Cases: firefighters, 3760 men, 168 women; non-firefighters, NR; cancer patients identified via linkage of FCDS and FMO records on firefighter certification as employment Controls: varied by cancer other cancer types excep the cancer of interest Exposure assessment method: employment as firefighter from employm and professional certification records	er all t Oesophagus, incidence	firefighters): Among men: Early-stage Lage-stage Group (OR fo firefighters): Men Women Tumour stage firefighters): Among men: Early-stage Late-stage Group (OR fo firefighters): Men Women	159 < 10 (OR for fire) 43 107 r firefighters 53 < 10 (OR for fire) < 10 37 r firefighters 46 < 10 c, men (OR for fire) < 10 30	0.85 (0.72–0.99) 1.26 (0.47–3.40) fighters vs non- 0.75 (0.55–1.01) 1.07 (0.88–1.30) vs non- 0.91 (0.69–1.19) NR fighters vs non- 0.48 (0.22–1.08) 1.16 (0.84–1.61) vs non- 0.78 (0.59–1.05) 1.85 (0.46–7.49) or firefighters vs 0.78 (0.42–1.45) 0.85 (0.59–1.22)	Age, year of diagnosis	Exposure assessment critique: Satisfactory quality. Ever firefighter exposure only. May include municipal and rural firefighters. Strengths: large study size (male firefighters); reliable information on firefighting status; includes female firefighters; assesses cancer incidence including tumour staging. Limitations: few female firefighters; cancer cases selected as controls (numerator-based analysis); limited information on exposure and potential confounders.
		Women	< 10	0.78 (0.32–1.90)		

Reference,	Population size,	Cancer type	Exposure	Exposed	Risk estimate	Covariates	Comments
location, enrolment/ follow-up period, study design	description, exposure assessment method	(histopathology), incidence or mortality	category or level	cases or deaths	(95% CI)	controlled	Comments
Lee et al. (2020) (cont.)		Colon, incidence	Tumour stage, non-firefighter		r firefighters vs	Age, year of diagnosis	
			Early-stage	79	0.91 (0.72-1.14)	-	
			Late-stage	144	1.19 (1.00-1.41)		
		Rectum, incidence	Group (OR for firefighters):	firefighters	vs non-		
			Men	110	0.97 (0.80-1.17)		
			Women	< 10	2.02 (0.90-4.58)		
		Rectum, incidence	Tumour stage, non-firefighter		r firefighters vs		
			Early-stage	52	1.05 (0.80-1.39)		
			Late-stage	53	0.97 (0.74-1.28)		
		Pancreas, incidence	Group (OR for firefighters):	firefighters	vs non-		
			Men	71	0.85 (0.68-1.08)		
			Women	< 10	0.47 (0.07-3.29)		
		Pancreas, incidence	Tumour stage, non-firefighter				
			Early-stage	< 10	0.84 (0.38-1.87)		
			Late-stage	53	0.91 (0.69-1.20)		
		Liver and bile ducts, incidence	Group (OR for firefighters):	firefighters	vs non-		
			Men	50	0.70 (0.54-0.92)		
			Women	< 10	1.03 (0.14-7.39)		
		Liver and bile ducts, incidence	Tumour stage, non-firefighter		r firefighters vs		
			Early-stage	NR	0.30 (0.16-0.56)		
			Late-stage	30	1.10 (0.76-1.58)		
		Bone, incidence	Group (OR for firefighters):	firefighters	vs non-		
			Men	< 10	0.72 (0.36-1.44)		
			Women	< 10	3.90 (0.97–15.71)		

Reference, location, enrolment/ follow-up period, study design	Population size, description, exposure assessment method	Cancer type (histopathology), incidence or mortality	Exposure category or level	Exposed cases or deaths	Risk estimate (95% CI)	Covariates controlled	Comments
Lee et al. (2020) (cont.)		Bone, incidence	non-firefighter	s):	r firefighters vs	Age, year of diagnosis	
			Early-stage	< 10	0.21 (0.03–1.46)		
			Late-stage	< 10	0.74 (0.24–2.30)		
		Soft tissue including heart,	Group (OR for firefighters):	firefighters	vs non-		
		incidence	Men	30	0.93 (0.65-1.34)		
			Women	< 10	0.69 (0.10-4.95)		
		Breast, incidence	Group (OR for firefighters):	firefighters	vs non-		
			Women	49	0.73 (0.53-1.03)		
McClure et al.	Cases: firefighters, 3760;	Digestive system,	Occupation (O	R):		Age, year of	Exposure assessment critique:
(2021) Florida, USA	non-firefighters, NR; cancer patients identified	incidence	Non- firefighters	NR	1	diagnosis	Minimal quality. Ever firefighter exposure only.
1981–2014 Case–control	via linkage of FCDS and FMO records on firefighter certification and employment Controls: varied by cancer site; control patients are all		Firefighters, FMO employment certification records	467	0.93 (0.85–1.03)		Incorporation of employment and certification records improvement for method 2. May include municipal and rural firefighters. Strengths: large study size;
	other cancer types except the cancer of interest Exposure assessment method: employment as firefighter from cancer registry records and employment and professional certification records		Firefighters, FCDS occupational data	235	0.96 (0.84–1.10)		assesses cancer incidence. Limitations: cancer cases selected as controls (numerator-based analysis); minimal information on exposure and potential confounders; completeness of occupation data (from registry records) varied by sociodemographic and diagnostic characteristics.

Table S2.10	(continued)						
Reference, location, enrolment/ follow-up period, study design	Population size, description, exposure assessment method	Cancer type (histopathology), incidence or mortality	Exposure category or level	Exposed cases or deaths	Risk estimate (95% CI)	Covariates controlled	Comments
Langevin et al.	Cases: 718 (230 oral cavity,	Head and neck	Firefighter occ	upational hi	story (OR):	Age, race,	Exposure assessment critique:
<u>(2020)</u>	321 oropharyngeal, 47	(SCC), incidence	Never	707	1	education,	Satisfactory quality. Possible
Boston, Massachusetts,	hypopharyngeal, 120 laryngeal); male head and		Ever	11	0.92 (0.40-2.13)	smoking status,	recall bias for duration of
USA 1999–2011	neck SCC cases from major teaching hospitals located		Per decade as firefighter	11	0.93 (0.67–1.27)	alcohol consumption,	active firefighter work. May include municipal and rural firefighters.
Case-control	in Boston and verified via cancer-registry records	Head and neck (SCC), incidence	Firefighter occupears of cigaret		story, < 18.4 pack- (OR):	residence	Strengths: assesses incident cancers; analysis adjusting for
	Controls: 905 controls with		Never	302	1		several important risk factors,
	no prior history of head		Ever	5	1.33 (0.37-4.74)		such as age, race, education,
	and neck cancers enrolled using Massachusetts		Per decade as firefighter	5	1.01 (0.56-1.81)		smoking and alcohol consumption, is a notable
	annual census records and frequency-matched on cases	Head and neck (SCC), incidence			story, > 18.4 pack- (OR):		strength. <i>Limitations</i> : few firefighters
	on age (± 3 yr), sex and	(===,,=================================	Never	405	1		participated in the study,
	residence		Ever	6	0.74 (0.23-2.38)		stratified analyses were
	Exposure assessment method: duration (years) of		Per decade as	6	0.92 (0.62–1.37)		adversely affected by small number; potential for bias
	employment as firefighter		firefighter		, ,		from self-report; potential
	from coded interview	Oral cavity (SCC),	Firefighter occ	upational hi	story (OR):		for selection bias given
		incidence	Never	228	1		firefighters were less likely to
			Ever	2	0.44 (0.09-2.04)		participate as controls.
			Per decade as firefighter	2	0.76 (0.41–1.40)		

Dral cavity (SCC), incidence (2020)	Reference, location, enrolment/ follow-up period, study design	Population size, description, exposure assessment method	Cancer type (histopathology), incidence or mortality	Exposure category or level	Exposed cases or deaths	Risk estimate (95% CI)	Covariates controlled	Comments
Never								
Ever 2 0.66 (0.12–3.46) status, alcohol firefighter			incidence			(OR):		
Per decade as 2	(COIII.)					1	•	
Per decade as 2 0.88 (0.48-1.63)								
Pharynx (hypopharynx) (SCC), incidence Ever 2 3.11 (0.63–15.39)					2	0.88 (0.48–1.63)	consumption,	
SCC), incidence Ever 2 3.11 (0.63-15.39) Per decade as 2 1.34 (0.84-2.14) firefighter Pharynx Firefighter occupational history (OR): (Oropharynx) Never 317 1 (SCC), incidence Ever 4 0.84 (0.27-2.67) Per decade as 4 0.88 (0.55-1.40) firefighter Pharynx Firefighter occupational history, < 18.4 pack-years of cigarette smoking (OR): (SCC), incidence Never 173 1 Ever 2 1.03 (0.19-5.51) Per decade as 2 0.84 (0.36-1.95) firefighter Pharynx Firefighter occupational history, > 18.4 pack-years of cigarette smoking (OR): (Oropharynx) (Oropharynx) (Oropharynx) (Oropharynx) (SCC), incidence SCC), incidence 144 1 Ever 2 0.76 (0.15-3.92) Per decade as 2 0.93 (0.53-1.64)				Firefighter occ	upational hi	story (OR):	residence	
Per decade as 2				Never	45	1		
Firefighter			(SCC), incidence	Ever	2	3.11 (0.63–15.39)		
(oropharynx) Never 317 1 Ever 4 0.84 (0.27-2.67) Per decade as 4 0.88 (0.55-1.40) firefighter Pharynx Firefighter occupational history, < 18.4 pack-					2	1.34 (0.84–2.14)		
(SCC), incidence Ever 4 0.84 (0.27–2.67) Per decade as 4 free fighter 0.88 (0.55–1.40) Pharynx (oropharynx) Firefighter occupational history, < 18.4 pack-years of cigarette smoking (OR):				Firefighter occ	upational hi	story (OR):		
Per decade as 4 0.88 (0.55-1.40) firefighter Pharynx Firefighter occupational history, < 18.4 pack-years of cigarette smoking (OR): (SCC), incidence Never 173 1 Ever 2 1.03 (0.19-5.51) Per decade as 2 0.84 (0.36-1.95) firefighter Pharynx Firefighter occupational history, > 18.4 pack-years of cigarette smoking (OR): (SCC), incidence Never 144 1 Ever 2 0.76 (0.15-3.92) Per decade as 2 0.93 (0.53-1.64)				Never	317	1		
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$			(SCC), incidence	Ever	4	0.84 (0.27-2.67)		
(oropharynx) years of cigarette smoking (OR): (SCC), incidence Never 173 1 Ever 2 1.03 (0.19–5.51) Per decade as 2 0.84 (0.36–1.95) firefighter Pharynx Firefighter occupational history, > 18.4 pack- (oropharynx) years of cigarette smoking (OR): (SCC), incidence Never 144 1 Ever 2 0.76 (0.15–3.92) Per decade as 2 0.93 (0.53–1.64)					4	0.88 (0.55–1.40)		
(SCC), incidence Never 173 Ever 2 1.03 (0.19–5.51) Per decade as 2 0.84 (0.36–1.95) firefighter Pharynx (oropharynx) (oropharynx) (SCC), incidence Never 144 Ever 2 0.76 (0.15–3.92) Per decade as 2 0.93 (0.53–1.64)			•					
Per decade as 2 0.84 (0.36–1.95) firefighter Pharynx Firefighter occupational history, > 18.4 pack- (oropharynx) years of cigarette smoking (OR): (SCC), incidence Never 144 1 Ever 2 0.76 (0.15–3.92) Per decade as 2 0.93 (0.53–1.64)			(SCC), incidence	Never	173	1		
firefighter Pharynx (oropharynx) (SCC), incidence Firefighter occupational history, > 18.4 pack- years of cigarette smoking (OR): Never 144 1 Ever 2 0.76 (0.15–3.92) Per decade as 2 0.93 (0.53–1.64)				Ever	2	1.03 (0.19-5.51)		
(oropharynx) years of cigarette smoking (OR): (SCC), incidence Never 144 1 Ever 2 0.76 (0.15–3.92) Per decade as 2 0.93 (0.53–1.64)					2	0.84 (0.36-1.95)		
(SCC), incidence Never 144 1 Ever 2 0.76 (0.15–3.92) Per decade as 2 0.93 (0.53–1.64)				Firefighter occ				
Per decade as 2 0.93 (0.53–1.64)					-	1		
Per decade as 2 0.93 (0.53–1.64)				Ever	2	0.76 (0.15-3.92)		
				Per decade as firefighter	2	` '		

Table S2.10	(continued)						
Reference, location, enrolment/ follow-up period, study design	Population size, description, exposure assessment method	Cancer type (histopathology), incidence or mortality	Exposure category or level	Exposed cases or deaths	Risk estimate (95% CI)	Covariates controlled	Comments
Muegge et al.	Cases: firefighters, 857;	Oral/pharyngeal	Death certifica	te occupatio	on (OR):	Sex, race,	Exposure assessment critique:
(2018) Indiana, USA	non-firefighters, 11 272; cancer as the underlying	combined, mortality	Non- firefighters	40	1	ethnicity, age at death, year	Minimal quality. Crude, relying on knowledge
1985–2013	cause of death in state death		Firefighters	21	2.15 (1.19-3.79)	of death	of usual occupation by death certifier. Possible
Case-control	registry among registrants with complete information	Pancreas,	Death certifica	te occupatio	on (OR):		differential misclassification
	on year of death, age at time of death, sex, race,	mortality	Non- firefighters	128	1		from missing occupation on death certificates. May
	ethnicity, industry code,		Firefighters	46	1.45 (1.01–2.06)		include municipal and rural
	and occupation code; all	Connective tissue,	Death certifica	te occupation	on (OR):		firefighters.
	firefighter cancers were included, but non-firefighter	mortality	Non- firefighters	16	1		Strengths: matching on race or ethnicity.
	cancers only observed among non-firefighter decedents matched 4:1 to firefighter decedents on age at death, sex, race, ethnicity, and year of death		Firefighters	10	2.50 (1.01–5.86)		Limitations: deaths used as controls (numerator-based analysis); lack of information on exposure and potential confounding.
	Controls: varied by cancer site; decedents with a cause of death other than the						
	one under study among all firefighter decedents and a sample of non-firefighter decedents matched 4:1 to						
	firefighter decedents on age at death, sex, race, ethnicity, and year of death						
	Exposure assessment method: death certificate						

coding of usual occupation

Table S2.10 (continued)

Case Case	Reference, location, enrolment/ follow-up period, study design	Population size, description, exposure assessment method	Cancer type (histopathology), incidence or mortality	Exposure category or level	Exposed cases or deaths	Risk estimate (95% CI)	Covariates controlled	Comments
	(2015) California, USA 1988–2007	all first malignant primary cancers in the registry restricted to adult male participants (aged 18–97 yr) with industry and occupation information available; cancer sites must have ≥ 10 firefighters among the cases to be analysed Controls: 48 725; cancers of the pharynx, stomach, liver, and pancreas in the registry restricted to men (aged 18–97 yr) with industry and occupation information available Exposure assessment method: employment as firefighter, coded as longest job held from cancer	Pharynx, incidence Oesophagus, incidence Oesophagus (adenocarcinoma), incidence Oesophagus (SCC), incidence Stomach, incidence	White Other Overall Race (OR, firefi White Other	17 1 19 ghters vs no 38 4 43 ghters vs no 63 5 68 ghters vs no 44 2 46 ghters vs no 10 2 12 ghters vs no 42 10 52 ghters vs no 317 30	1.36 (0.82–2.25) 6.56 (0.87–49.58) 1.44 (0.89–2.33) on-firefighters): 1.03 (0.71–1.48) 1.35 (0.45–4.05) 1.06 (0.75–1.50) on-firefighters): 1.59 (1.19–2.12) 2.14 (0.81–5.65) 1.59 (1.2–2.09) on-firefighters): 1.84 (1.32–2.56) 2.79 (0.66–11.87) 1.85 (1.34–2.55) on-firefighters): 0.94 (0.49–1.78) 1.44 (0.34–6.14) 0.96 (0.53–1.73) on-firefighters): 0.73 (0.52–1.03) 1.61 (0.71–3.65) 0.81 (0.59–1.11) on-firefighters): 1.08 (0.90–1.3)	diagnosis,	Minimal quality. Ever firefighter exposure only. May include municipal and rural firefighters. Strengths: large study size; assesses incident cancers, with subtypes reported for oesophagus; findings stratified by race/ethnicity. Limitations: no information on the population at risk (numerator-based analysis); occupation missing from nearly 50% of registry cases and more likely for people who were older or of Hispanic ethnicity; lack of information on exposure and potential

Reference, location, enrolment/ follow-up period, study	Population size, description, exposure assessment method	Cancer type (histopathology), incidence or mortality	Exposure category or level	Exposed cases or deaths	Risk estimate (95% CI)	Covariates controlled	Comments
design Tsai et al.		Liver and bile	Race (OR, firef	ighters vs no	on-firefighters):	Age, year of	
(2015)		ducts, incidence	White	34	1.21 (0.83–1.76)	diagnosis,	
(cont.)			Other	5	0.51 (0.19-1.39)	race	
			Overall	39	1.07 (0.75-1.53)		
		Pancreas,	Race (OR, firef	ighters vs no	on-firefighters):		
		incidence	White	74	1.14 (0.85-1.54)		
			Other	5	0.90 (0.33-2.45)		
			Overall	79	1.10 (0.83-1.46)		
		Soft tissue	Race (OR, firef	ighters vs no	on-firefighters):		
		including heart,	White	24	1.16 (0.75–1.82)		
		incidence	Other	2	1.39 (0.32-5.98)		
			Overall	26	1.16 (0.76-1.77)		

Reference, location, enrolment/ follow-up period, study design	Population size, description, exposure assessment method	Cancer type (histopathology), incidence or mortality	Exposure category or level	Exposed cases or deaths	Risk estimate (95% CI)	Covariates controlled	Comments
Kang et al.	Cases: NR overall	Lip, incidence	Referent (SMBC	OR):		Age, smoking	Exposure assessment critique:
(2008) Massachusetts,	(firefighters, 1881; non-firefighters, NR);		Firefighters vs	4	1.10 (0.24–5.06)	status	Minimal quality. Ever firefighter exposure only. May
USA 1987–2003 Case–control	White male residents of Massachusetts aged ≥ 18 yr with complete information		police Firefighters vs all other occupations	4	1.05 (0.33-3.30)		include municipal and rural firefighters. Strengths: large size; long
	on "usual occupation" and a diagnosis with one of 25	Oral cavity,	Referent (SMBC	OR):			study period; assesses incident cancers; smoking information available. Limitations: cancer cases used as controls (numeratorbased analysis); incomplete information on occupation (38% missing); lack of
	"cancers of concern" in the Massachusetts Cancer Registry Controls: NR overall (firefighters, 244;	incidence	Firefighters vs police	21	0.72 (0.37–1.41)		
			Firefighters vs all other occupations	21	0.66 (0.41–1.06)		
	non-firefighters, NR);	Pharynx	Referent (SMBC	OR):			
	White male residents of Massachusetts aged ≥ 18 yr	(nasopharynx), incidence	Firefighters vs police	3	1.17 (0.19–7.17)		information on exposure and potential confounders.
	with complete information on "usual occupation" and a cancer diagnosis not on the list of 25 "cancers of concern" in the cancer registry Exposure assessment method: employment as firefighter coded from longest job held from cancer registry		Firefighters vs all other occupations	3	1.31 (0.32–5.31)		
		Oesophagus,	Referent (SMBC		()		
		incidence	Firefighters vs police	57	0.93 (0.61–1.41)		
			Firefighters vs all other occupations	57	0.64 (0.47-0.87)		

Reference, location, enrolment/ follow-up period, study design	Population size, description, exposure assessment method	Cancer type (histopathology), incidence or mortality	Exposure category or level	Exposed cases or deaths	Risk estimate (95% CI)	Covariates controlled	Comments
<u>(ang et al.</u> 2008)		Oesophagus, incidence	Age at diagnosi police):	s (SMBOR,	firefighters vs	Age, smoking status	
(cont.)		meidence	18–54 yr	NR	1.30 (0.52-3.24)	status	
·=/			16-34 yr 55-74 yr	NR NR	0.70 (0.41–1.20)		
			$\geq 75 \text{ yr}$	NR	1.58 (0.56–4.42)		
		Stomach,	Referent (SMB)		1100 (0.00 1112)		
		incidence	Firefighters vs police	46	0.83 (0.53-1.29)		
			Firefighters vs all other occupations	46	0.97 (0.69–1.35)		
		Colon, incidence	Referent (SMB)	OR):			
		,	Firefighters vs police	200	1.36 (1.04–1.79)		
			Firefighters vs all other occupations	200	1.15 (0.93–1.43)		
		Colon, incidence	Age at diagnosi police):	s (SMBOR,	firefighters vs		
			18-54 yr	NR	1.05 (0.55-1.99)		
			55-74 yr	NR	1.24 (0.85-1.81)		
			≥ 75 yr	NR	1.73 (1.06-2.84)		
		Rectum, incidence	Referent (SMB0	OR):			
			Firefighters vs police	67	0.86 (0.58–1.26)		
			Firefighters vs all other occupations	67	1.03 (0.77–1.38)		

Table S2.10 (continued)
----------------------	-----------	---

Reference, location, enrolment/ follow-up period, study design	Population size, description, exposure assessment method	Cancer type (histopathology), incidence or mortality	Exposure category or level	Exposed cases or deaths	Risk estimate (95% CI)	Covariates controlled	Comments
<u>(ang et al.</u> 2008)		Rectum, incidence	Age at diagnosi police):	is (SMBOR,	firefighters vs	Age, smoking status	
(cont.)			18–54 yr	NR	0.97 (0.39-2.46)		
			55–74 yr	NR	0.94 (0.57–1.57)		
			≥ 75 yr	NR	0.70 (0.31-1.56)		
		Liver and bile	Referent (SMB)	OR):	,		
		ducts, incidence	Firefighters vs police	19	1.15 (0.55–2.14)		
			Firefighters vs all other occupations	19	1.19 (0.69–2.06)		
		Pancreas,	Referent (SMB0	OR):			
		incidence	Firefighters vs police	38	0.86 (0.53-1.40)		
			Firefighters vs all other occupations	38	0.84 (0.58-1.22)		
		Soft tissue	Referent (SMB0	OR):			
		sarcoma, incidence	Firefighters vs police	14	1.05 (0.46-2.37)		
			Firefighters vs all other occupations	14	1.06 (0.59–1.91)		
		Breast, incidence	Referent (SMB)	OR):			
		,	Firefighters vs		0.25 (0.03-2.31)		
			Firefighters vs all other occupations	4	1.28 (0.47–3.47)		

Table S2.10	(continued)						
Reference, location, enrolment/ follow-up period, study design	Population size, description, exposure assessment method	Cancer type (histopathology), incidence or mortality	Exposure category or level	Exposed cases or deaths	Risk estimate (95% CI)	Covariates controlled	Comments
Sama et al.	Cases: NR; White men aged	Colon, incidence	Referent (SMB0			Age	Exposure assessment critique:
(1990) Massachusetts,	≥ 18 yr with information setts, on usual occupation and	l occupation and osis with one of occurs of concern in sachusetts Cancer Rectum incidence	Firefighters vs police	33	1.04 (0.59–1.82)		Minimal quality. Ever firefighter exposure only. Use of secondary data sources confirmed occupation for
USA 1982–1986	a diagnosis with one of nine cancers of concern in		Firefighters vs state	33	1.20 (0.80-1.82)		
Case-control	l the Massachusetts Cancer		Referent (SMB)	OR):			some firefighters. May include municipal and rural
	Registry Controls: NR; White		Firefighters vs police	22	0.97 (0.50-1.88)		firefighters.
	men aged ≥ 18 yr with information on usual		Firefighters vs	22	1.35 (0.84–2.19)		Strengths: assesses incident cancers; smoking information
	occupation and a cancer diagnosis for all other	Pancreas,	Referent (SMB0	OR):			available. <i>Limitations</i> : small study;
	cancers, except those of the organ systems of concern	incidence	Firefighters vs police	6	3.19 (0.72–14.15)		cancer cases used as controls (numerator-based analysis);
(digestive, respi lymphatic/haen Exposure assess method: employ firefighter or fir	(digestive, respiratory, and lymphatic/haematopoietic) Exposure assessment method: employment as firefighter or fire chief from cancer registry records	stive, respiratory, and hatic/haematopoietic) sure assessment od: employment as ghter or fire chief from	Firefighters vs state	6	0.98 (0.42–2.26)		incomplete information on occupation; crude smoking status information; no smoking adjustment; lack of information on exposure and potential confounders.

Table S2.10 (continued)

Reference, location, enrolment/ follow-up period, study design	Population size, description, exposure assessment method	Cancer type (histopathology), incidence or mortality	Exposure category or level	Exposed cases or deaths	Risk estimate (95% CI)	Covariates controlled	Comments
Ma et al. (1998) USA 1984–1993	Cases: NR; all male cancer deaths with coded industry and occupation on death	Lip, mortality	Group (MOR): White firefighters	3	5.9 (1.9–18.3)	Year of death, age at death	Exposure assessment critique: Minimal quality. Crude, relying on knowledge
Case-control	certificates from 24 states captured in a NIOSH database	Pharynx	Black firefighters Group (MOR):	0	0 (NR)		of usual occupation by death certifier. Possible differential misclassification
	Controls: NR; all male non- cancer deaths in the NIOSH database	(nasopharynx), mortality Oesophagus, mortality	White firefighters	0	0 (NR)		from missing occupation on death certificates. May include municipal and rural
	Exposure assessment method: death certificate coding of usual occupation		Black firefighters Group (MOR):	1	7.6 (1.3–46.4)		firefighters. Strengths: large study size (includes 6607 male firefighter deaths); broad geographical population coverage. Limitations: small number of cancer deaths among
			White firefighters	37	0.9 (0.7–1.3)		
			Black firefighters	4	1.4 (NR)		
		Stomach, mortality Colon, mortality	Group (MOR): White firefighters	52	1.2 (0.9–1.6)		Black firefighters; non- cancer deaths used as controls (numerator-based
			Black firefighters	3	1.2 (NR)		analysis); lack of information on exposure and potential
			Group (MOR): White firefighters	149	1.0 (0.9–1.2)		confounders.
			Black firefighters	9	2.1 (1.1-4.0)		
		Rectum, mortality	Group (MOR):				
			White firefighters	27	1.1 (0.8–1.6)		
			Black firefighters	0	0 (NR)		

Table S2.10	(continued)						
Reference, location, enrolment/ follow-up period, study design	Population size, description, exposure assessment method	Cancer type (histopathology), incidence or mortality	Exposure category or level	Exposed cases or deaths	Risk estimate (95% CI)	Covariates controlled	Comments
Ma et al. (1998)		Liver and bile	Group (MOR):			Year of death,	
(cont.)		ducts, mortality	White firefighters	31	1.2 (0.9–1.7)	age at death	
			Black firefighters	0	0 (NR)		
		Pancreas,	Group (MOR):				
	mortality	mortality	White firefighters	88	1.2 (1.0-1.5)		
			Black firefighters	5	2.0 (0.9-4.6)		
		Bone, mortality	Group (MOR):				
			White firefighters	3	1.0 (NR)		
			Black firefighters	0	0 (NR)		
		Soft tissue	Group (MOR):				
		sarcoma, mortality	White firefighters	14	1.6 (1-2.7)		
			Black firefighters	0	0 (NR)		

Table S2.10	(continued	I)
-------------	------------	----

Reference, location, enrolment/ follow-up period, study design	Population size, description, exposure assessment method	Cancer type (histopathology), incidence or mortality	Exposure category or level	Exposed cases or deaths	Risk estimate (95% CI)	Covariates controlled	Comments
Burnett et al. (1994) USA 1984–1990 Mortality surveillance	5744 deaths among firefighters; White male firefighters identified by evaluation of coded occupation on death certificates from 27 states Exposure assessment method: death certificate coding of usual occupation	Rectum, mortality	Group (PMR): Firefighters Firefighters, age < 65 yr at death	37 18	1.48 (1.05–2.05) 1.86 (1.10–2.94)	Age	Exposure assessment critique: Minimal quality. Crude, relying on knowledge of usual occupation by death certifier. Possible differential misclassification from missing occupation on death certificates. May include municipal and rural firefighters. Strengths: large number of deaths; broad geographical population coverage. Limitations: numerator-only (PMR) analysis; errors in death-certificate occupation; lack of information on exposure or potential confounders.

CanCHEC, Canadian Census Health and Environment Cohort; CI, confidence interval; FCDS, Florida Cancer Data System; FMO, Office of the Florida State Marshal; HCC, hepatocellular carcinoma; HR, hazard ratio; ICD, International Classification of Diseases; MOR, mortality odds ratio; MRR, mortality rate ratio; NIOSH, National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health; NOCCA, Nordic Occupational Cancer study; NR, not reported; OR, odds ratio; PMR, proportionate mortality ratio; SCC, squamous cell carcinoma; SIR, standardized incidence ratio; SMBOR, standardized morbidity odds ratio; SMR, standardized mortality ratio; vs, versus; yr, year.

References

- Ahn YS, Jeong KS (2015). Mortality due to malignant and non-malignant diseases in Korean professional emergency responders. *PLoS One*. 10(3):e0120305. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0120305 PMID:25756281
- Ahn YS, Jeong KS, Kim KS (2012). Cancer morbidity of professional emergency responders in Korea. *Am J Ind Med.* 55(9):768–78. doi:10.1002/ajim.22068 PMID:22628010
- Amadeo B, Marchand JL, Moisan F, Donnadieu S, Gaëlle C, Simone MP, et al. (2015). French firefighter mortality: analysis over a 30-year period. *Am J Ind Med*. 58(4):437–43. doi:10.1002/ajim.22434 PMID:25708859
- Aronson KJ, Tomlinson GA, Smith L (1994). Mortality among fire fighters in metropolitan Toronto. *Am J Ind Med.* 26(1):89–101. doi:10.1002/ajim.4700260108 PMID:8074127
- Bates MN, Fawcett J, Garrett N, Arnold R, Pearce N, Woodward A (2001). Is testicular cancer an occupational disease of fire fighters? *Am J Ind Med*. 40(3):263– 70. doi:10.1002/ajim.1097 PMID:11598972
- Bigert C, Martinsen JI, Gustavsson P, Sparén P (2020). Cancer incidence among Swedish firefighters: an extended follow-up of the NOCCA study. *Int Arch Occup Environ Health*. 93(2):197–204. doi:10.1007/s00420-019-01472-x PMID:31463517
- Burnett CA, Halperin WE, Lalich NR, Sestito JP (1994). Mortality among fire fighters: a 27 state survey. *Am J Ind Med.* 26(6):831–3. doi:10.1002/ajim.4700260612 PMID:7892834
- Daniels RD, Bertke S, Dahm MM, Yiin JH, Kubale TL, Hales TR, et al. (2015). Exposure-response relationships for select cancer and non-cancer health outcomes in a cohort of US firefighters from San Francisco, Chicago and Philadelphia (1950–2009). *Occup Environ Med.* 72(10):699–706. doi:10.1136/oemed-2014-102671 PMID:25673342
- Daniels RD, Kubale TL, Yiin JH, Dahm MM, Hales TR, Baris D, et al. (2014). Mortality and cancer incidence in a pooled cohort of US firefighters from San Francisco, Chicago and Philadelphia (1950–2009). *Occup Environ Med.* 71(6):388–97. doi:10.1136/oemed-2013-101662 PMID:24142974
- Demers PA, Checkoway H, Vaughan TL, Weiss NS, Heyer NJ, Rosenstock L (1994). Cancer incidence among firefighters in Seattle and Tacoma, Washington (United States). *Cancer Causes Control*. 5(2):129–35. doi:10.1007/BF01830258 PMID:8167259
- Demers PA, Heyer NJ, Rosenstock L (1992a). Mortality among firefighters from three northwestern United States cities. *Br J Ind Med.* 49(9):664–70. doi:10.1136/oem.49.9.664 PMID:1390274

- Deschamps S, Momas I, Festy B (1995). Mortality amongst Paris fire-fighters. *Eur J Epidemiol*. 11(6):643–6. doi:10.1007/BF01720297 PMID:8861847
- Eliopulos E, Armstrong BK, Spickett JT, Heyworth F (1984). Mortality of fire fighters in Western Australia. *Br J Ind Med.* 41(2):183–7. doi:10.1136/oem.41.2.183 PMID:6722044
- Feuer E, Rosenman K (1986). Mortality in police and firefighters in New Jersey. *Am J Ind Med.* 9(6):517–27. doi:10.1002/ajim.4700090603 PMID:3488681
- Giles G, Staples M, Berry J (1993). Cancer incidence in Melbourne Metropolitan Fire Brigade members, 1980–1989. *Health Rep.* 5(1):33–8. PMID:8334236
- Glass DC, Del Monaco A, Pircher S, Vander Hoorn S, Sim MR (2016b). Mortality and cancer incidence at a fire training college. *Occup Med (Lond)*. 66(7):536–42. doi:10.1093/occmed/kqw079 PMID:27371948
- Glass DC, Del Monaco A, Pircher S, Vander Hoorn S, Sim MR (2017). Mortality and cancer incidence among male volunteer Australian firefighters. *Occup Environ Med.* 74(9):628–38. doi:10.1136/oemed-2016-104088 PMID:28391245
- Glass DC, Del Monaco A, Pircher S, Vander Hoorn S, Sim MR (2019). Mortality and cancer incidence among female Australian firefighters. *Occup Environ Med*. 76(4):215–21. PMID:30674605
- Glass DC, Pircher S, Del Monaco A, Hoorn SV, Sim MR (2016a). Mortality and cancer incidence in a cohort of male paid Australian firefighters. *Occup Environ Med.* 73(11):761–71. doi:10.1136/oemed-2015-103467 PMID:27456156
- Grimes G, Hirsch D, Borgeson D (1991). Risk of death among Honolulu fire fighters. *Hawaii Med J*. 50(3):82–5. PMID:2061032
- Guidotti TL (1993). Mortality of urban firefighters in Alberta, 1927–1987. *Am J Ind Med.* 23(6):921–40. doi:10.1002/ajim.4700230608 PMID:8328477
- Harris MA, Kirkham TL, MacLeod JS, Tjepkema M, Peters PA, Demers PA (2018). Surveillance of cancer risks for firefighters, police, and armed forces among men in a Canadian census cohort. *Am J Ind Med*. 61(10):815–23. doi:10.1002/ajim.22891 PMID:30073696
- Kang D, Davis LK, Hunt P, Kriebel D (2008). Cancer incidence among male Massachusetts firefighters, 1987–2003. *Am J Ind Med.* 51(5):329–35. doi:10.1002/ajim.20549 PMID:18306327
- Kullberg C, Andersson T, Gustavsson P, Selander J, Tornling G, Gustavsson A, et al. (2018). Cancer incidence in Stockholm firefighters 1958–2012: an updated cohort study. *Int Arch Occup Environ Health*. 91(3):285–91. doi:10.1007/s00420-017-1276-1 PMID:29164319
- Langevin SM, Eliot M, Butler RA, McClean M, Kelsey KT (2020). Firefighter occupation is associated with increased risk for laryngeal and hypopharyngeal squamous cell carcinoma among men from the

- Greater Boston area. *Occup Environ Med.* 77(6):381–5. doi:10.1136/oemed-2019-106271 PMID:32107319
- Lee DJ, Koru-Sengul T, Hernandez MN, Caban-Martinez AJ, McClure LA, Mackinnon JA, et al. (2020). Cancer risk among career male and female Florida firefighters: evidence from the Florida Firefighter Cancer Registry (1981–2014). *Am J Ind Med*. 63(4):285–99. doi:10.1002/ajim.23086 PMID:31930542
- Ma F, Fleming LE, Lee DJ, Trapido E, Gerace TA (2006). Cancer incidence in Florida professional firefighters, 1981 to 1999. *J Occup Environ Med.* 48(9):883–8. doi:10.1097/01.jom.0000235862.12518.04 PMID:16966954
- Ma F, Fleming LE, Lee DJ, Trapido E, Gerace TA, Lai H, et al. (2005). Mortality in Florida professional firefighters, 1972 to 1999. *Am J Ind Med.* 47(6):509–17. doi:10.1002/ajim.20160 PMID:15898094
- Ma F, Lee DJ, Fleming LE, Dosemeci M (1998). Race-specific cancer mortality in US firefighters: 1984–1993. *J Occup Environ Med.* 40(12):1134–8. PMID:9871891
- Marjerrison N, Jakobsen J, Demers PA, Grimsrud TK, Hansen J, Martinsen JI, et al. (2022b). A comparison of cancer incidence and mortality in the Norwegian Fire Departments Cohort, 1960–2018. *Occup Environ Med.* oemed-2022–108331. doi:10.1136/oemed-2022-108331 PMID:35589382
- Marjerrison N, Jakobsen J, Grimsrud TK, Hansen J, Martinsen JI, Nordby KC, et al. (2022a). Cancer incidence in sites potentially related to occupational exposures: 58 years of follow-up of firefighters in the Norwegian Fire Departments Cohort. *Scand J Work Environ Health*. 48(3):210–9. doi:10.5271/sjweh.4009 PMID:35015085
- Mastromatteo E (1959). Mortality in city firemen. II. A study of mortality in firemen of a city fire department. *AMA Arch Ind Health*. 20:227–33. PMID:14422193
- McClure LA, Koru-Sengul T, Hernandez MN, Caban-Martinez AJ, Kobetz EN, Lee DJ (2021). Comparing cancer risk estimates using occupational record linkage approaches in male Florida firefighters. *Am J Ind Med*. 64(2):78–83. doi:10.1002/ajim.23205 PMID:33283309
- Muegge CM, Zollinger TW, Song Y, Wessel J, Monahan PO, Moffatt SM (2018). Excess mortality among Indiana firefighters, 1985–2013. *Am J Ind Med.* 61(12):961–7. doi:10.1002/ajim.22918 PMID:30421827
- Musk AW, Monson RR, Peters JM, Peters RK (1978). Mortality among Boston firefighters, 1915–1975. *Br J Ind Med.* 35(2):104–8. doi:10.1136/oem.35.2.104 PMID:656333
- Petersen KU, Pedersen JE, Bonde JP, Ebbehoej NE, Hansen J (2018a). Long-term follow-up for cancer incidence in a cohort of Danish firefighters. *Occup Environ Med.* 75(4):263–9. doi:10.1136/oemed-2017-104660 PMID:29055884

- Petersen KU, Pedersen JE, Bonde JP, Ebbehøj NE, Hansen J (2018b). Mortality in a cohort of Danish firefighters; 1970–2014. *Int Arch Occup Environ Health*. 91(6):759–66. doi:10.1007/s00420-018-1323-6 PMID:29808435
- Pinkerton L, Bertke SJ, Yiin J, Dahm M, Kubale T, Hales T, et al. (2020). Mortality in a cohort of US firefighters from San Francisco, Chicago and Philadelphia: an update. *Occup Environ Med.* 77(2):84–93. doi:10.1136/oemed-2019-105962 PMID:31896615
- Pukkala E, Martinsen JI, Weiderpass E, Kjaerheim K, Lynge E, Tryggvadottir L, et al. (2014). Cancer incidence among firefighters: 45 years of follow-up in five Nordic countries. Occup Environ Med. 71(6):398–404. doi:10.1136/oemed-2013-101803 PMID:24510539
- Sama SR, Martin TR, Davis LK, Kriebel D (1990). Cancer incidence among Massachusetts firefighters, 1982–1986. *Am J Ind Med.* 18(1):47–54. doi:10.1002/ajim.4700180106 PMID:2378369
- Sritharan J, Kirkham TL, MacLeod J, Marjerrison N, Lau A, Dakouo M, et al. (2022). Cancer risk among fire-fighters and police in the Ontario workforce. *Occup Environ Med.* 79(8):533–539. doi:10.1136/oemed-2021-108146 PMID:35354650
- Stang A, Jöckel KH, Baumgardt-Elms C, Ahrens W (2003). Firefighting and risk of testicular cancer: results from a German population-based case-control study. *Am J Ind Med.* 43(3):291–4. doi:10.1002/ajim.10178 PMID:12594776
- Tornling G, Gustavsson P, Hogstedt C (1994). Mortality and cancer incidence in Stockholm fire fighters. *Am J Ind Med.* 25(2):219–28. doi:10.1002/ajim.4700250208 PMID:8147394
- Tsai RJ, Luckhaupt SE, Schumacher P, Cress RD, Deapen DM, Calvert GM (2015). Risk of cancer among fire-fighters in California, 1988–2007. *Am J Ind Med.* 58(7):715–29. doi:10.1002/ajim.22466 PMID:25943908
- Vena JE, Fiedler RC (1987). Mortality of a municipal-worker cohort: IV. Fire fighters. *Am J Ind Med.* 11(6):671–84. doi:10.1002/ajim.4700110608 PMID:3605104
- Webber MP, Singh A, Zeig-Owens R, Salako J, Skerker M, Hall CB, et al. (2021). Cancer incidence in World Trade Center-exposed and non-exposed male firefighters, as compared with the US adult male population: 2001–2016. *Occup Environ Med.* 78(10):707–14. doi:10.1136/oemed-2021-107570 PMID:34507965
- Zeig-Owens R, Webber MP, Hall CB, Schwartz T, Jaber N, Weakley J, et al. (2011). Early assessment of cancer outcomes in New York City firefighters after the 9/11 attacks: an observational cohort study. *Lancet.* 378(9794):898–905. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736 (11)60989-6 PMID:21890054
- Zhao G, Erazo B, Ronda E, Brocal F, Regidor E (2020). Mortality among firefighters in Spain: 10 years of follow-up. *Ann Work Expo Health*. 64(6):614–21. doi:10.1093/annweh/wxaa036 PMID:32253442