Radboud Repository

Radboud University Nijmegen

PDF hosted at the Radboud Repository of the Radboud University Nijmegen

The following full text is a publisher's version.

For additional information about this publication click this link.
http://hdl.handle.net/2066/24761

Please be advised that this information was generated on 2021-01-17 and may be subject to change.

RE: "OCCUPATIONAL RISK FACTORS FOR PROSTATE CANCER: RESULTS FROM A CASE-CONTROL STUDY IN MONTRÉAL, QUÉBEC, CANADA"

Recently, Aronson et al. (1) reported the results of a case-control study of occupational risk factors for prostate cancer. They referred to only a small number of studies to find additional evidence. It might be of interest, therefore, to compare the presented results with the main conclusions of two recent reviews of work-related risk factors for prostate cancer (2, 3). In most of the reviewed studies, a slight increase of prostate cancer was found among farmers and farm workers (2). Several studies showed an elevated risk in relation to the use of pesticides, herbicides, and the like (2). Slightly elevated odds ratios for workers in agriculture and for those exposed to pesticides were also detected by Aronson et al. Most of the studies (3) showed a slight excess of prostate cancer among several categories of metal workers and repairmen. This agrees with the results of the study by Aronson et al. In the review, the hardest evidence is found of a relation with the use of cutting oils or other metalwork liquids (3); Aronson et al. demonstrated an association with lubricating oils and greases. They also noticed an association with exposure to liquid fuel combustion products and to diesel engine emissions (such as those that occur during repair work or during the use of trucks and (agricultural) machinery). They found a weak association with polyaromatic hydrocarbons, which are known to be mutagenic and carcinogenic compounds in diesel exhaust fumes, but not with benzo(*a*)pyrine. In some other studies, exposure to exhaust fumes has been identified as a possible risk factor, but in most studies no association was detected (2). Since metal workers seem to be a risk group, the identification of metallic dust, aluminum alloy dust, chromium dust, and nickel compounds as possible risk factors is an interesting finding (1). So far, however, literature provides insufficient corroboration for firm conclusions to be drawn about the role of specific metals or metallic compounds (3).

In most of the reviewed studies, the quality of information about work-related exposure that could be obtained was rather poor. Therefore, it is recommended that nested case-control studies be conducted with a methodology sufficient for accurate assessment of work-related exposure within cohorts of workers in specific occupations. Current knowledge suggests that studies among farmers, metal workers, and repairmen seem to be the most promising.

References

1. Aronson KJ, Siemiatycki J, Dewar R, et al. Occupational risk factors for prostate cancer: results from a case-control study in Montréal, Québec, Canada. Am J Epidemiol 1996;143: 363–73.
2. Van der Gulden JWJ, Vogelzang PFJ. Farmers at risk for prostate cancer. Br J Urol 1996;77:6–14.
3. Van der Gulden JWJ. Metal workers and repairmen at risk for prostate cancer. Prostate (in press).

J. W. J. van der Gulden
Department of Occupational Medicine
University of Nijmegen
6500 HB Nijmegen
the Netherlands

Editor's note: *In accordance with* Journal *policy, Dr. Aronson and her coauthors were asked if they wished to respond, but they chose not to do so.*