



Perinatal and childhood factors and risk of prostate cancer in adulthood: MCC-Spain case-control study



Virginia Lope^{a,b,c,*}, Esther García-Esquinas^{b,d}, José Manuel Ruiz-Dominguez^e, Javier Llorca^{b,f}, José Juan Jiménez-Moleón^{b,g,h}, José L. Ruiz-Cerdáⁱ, Juan Alguacil^{b,j}, Adonina Tardón^{b,k}, Trinidad Dierssen-Sotos^{b,f}, Ángel Tabernero^{l,m}, Lourdes Mengual^{n,o}, Manolis Kogevinas^{b,p,q,r}, Nuria Aragonés^{a,b,c}, Gemma Castaño-Vinyals^{b,p,q,r}, Marina Pollán^{a,b,c,1}, Beatriz Pérez-Gómez^{a,b,c,1}

^a Cancer and Environmental Epidemiology Unit, National Center for Epidemiology, Carlos III Institute of Health, Avenida Monforte de Lemos 5, 28029, Madrid, Spain

^b Consortium for Biomedical Research in Epidemiology and Public Health (CIBER Epidemiología y Salud Pública, CIBERESP), Spain

^c Cancer Epidemiology Research Group, Oncology and Hematology Area, IIS Puerta de Hierro (IDIPHIM), Manuel de Falla 1, 28222, Madrid, Spain

^d Department of Preventive Medicine and Public Health, School of Medicine, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid/IdiPAZ, Arzobispo Morcillo 4, 28029, Madrid, Spain

^e Urology Department, Hospital Germans Trias i Pujol, Carretera de Canyet, S/N, 08916 Badalona, Barcelona, Spain

^f Universidad de Cantabria – IDIVAL, Avenida Cardenal Herrera Oria s/n, 39011, Santander, Spain

^g Instituto de Investigación Biosanitaria de Granada (ibs.GRANADA)-Granada Health Research Institute (ibs.GRANADA), Doctor Azpitarte 4 4^a Planta, Edificio Licio de la Fuente, 18012, Granada, Spain

^h Department of Preventive Medicine and Public Health, University of Granada, Avenida de la Investigación 11, 18016, Granada, Spain

ⁱ Urology Department, La Fe University Hospital, Avinguda de Fernando Abril Martorell 106, 46026 Valencia, Spain

^j Centro de Investigación en Salud y Medio Ambiente (CYSMA), Universidad de Huelva, Campus Universitario de El Carmen, 21071 Huelva, Spain

^k Instituto Universitario de Oncología, Universidad de Oviedo, Facultad de Medicina, Planta 7, Campus de El Cristo B, 33006, Oviedo, Asturias, Spain

^l Urology Department, La Paz University Hospital, Paseo de la Castellana 261, 28046, Madrid, Spain

^m Hospital La Paz Institute for Health Research (IdiPAZ), Paseo de la Castellana 261, 28046, Madrid, Spain

ⁿ Laboratory and Department of Urology, Hospital Clínic, Institut d'Investigacions Biomèdiques August Pi i Sunyer (IDIBAPS), Universitat de Barcelona, Carrer del Rosselló, 149, 08036, Barcelona, Spain

^o Centre de Recerca Biomèdica CELLEX, Carrer del Rosselló, 149, 08036, Barcelona, Spain

^p Centre for Research in Environmental Epidemiology (CREAL), Doctor Aiguader 88, 08003, Barcelona, Spain

^q IMIM (Hospital del Mar Medical Research Institute), Doctor Aiguader 88, 08003, Barcelona, Spain

^r Universitat Pompeu Fabra (UPF), Doctor Aiguader 88, 08003, Barcelona, Spain

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 13 April 2016

Received in revised form 22 June 2016

Accepted 27 June 2016

Available online 5 July 2016

Keywords:

Prostate cancer
Childhood factors
Perinatal factors
Early life factors
Puberty
Case-control study
Gleason score
MCC-Spain
Maternal age at birth

ABSTRACT

Background: In utero and early-life exposures are suspected to modulate the risk of prostate cancer. This study examines the influence of certain perinatal and childhood-related factors on prostate cancer risk overall and by Gleason score at biopsy.

Methods: MCC-Spain is a multicase-control study where 1088 histologically-confirmed incident prostate cancer cases (aged 42–85 years) and 1345 population-based controls (aged 38–85 years), frequency matched by age and province of recruitment, were recruited in 7 Spanish provinces. Self-reported perinatal and childhood-related characteristics were directly surveyed by trained staff. The association with prostate cancer risk, globally and according to Gleason score at biopsy, was evaluated using logistic and multinomial regression mixed models, adjusting for age, family history of prostate cancer, educational level and body mass index one year before the interview, and including the province as a random effect term.

Results: Most perinatal factors were not related to prostate cancer risk, with the exception of middle-high socioeconomic level at birth (OR for high grade tumors = 1.36; 95%CI = 1.09–1.68). Regarding puberty, risk rose by 6% for each year of delayed onset (OR = 1.06; 95%CI = 1.01–1.10; p trend = 0.016), with a clear excess

* Corresponding author at: Cancer and Environmental Epidemiology Unit, National Center for Epidemiology, Carlos III Institute of Health, Avda. Monforte de Lemos, 5, 28029 Madrid, Spain.

E-mail address: vicarvajal@isciii.es (V. Lope).

¹ Both authors contributed equally to the design of this work

of risk in men who reached puberty after age 15 (OR:1.35; 95%CI = 1.08–1.68). A borderline significant positive association with prepubertal height was also observed (p trend = 0.094).

Conclusion: Some exposures experienced in utero and during adolescence, when the prostate is still maturing, might be relevant for prostate cancer risk in adulthood.

© 2016 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Prostate cancer (PC), with an estimated 278,500 new cancer cases in Spain in 2012 [1], has registered a dramatic rise in incidence from 1990 onwards. This was particularly marked among men aged 45–64 years, and has mainly been attributed to opportunistic screening [2]. Regarding the clinical profile of newly diagnosed cases, data from a nationwide hospital-based registry showed that, in 2010, the mean age at diagnosis was 69 years and 56.5% of patients had a Gleason score ≤ 6 [3]. This tumor is the third cause of death by cancer in Spain, accounting for 8.8% of all cancer-related deaths in 2013 [4].

As in other hormone-dependent tumors, pre- and perinatal periods might constitute a “time window” of major importance for future PC risk [5–7]. However, epidemiological evidence on this hypothesis is still scarce and contradictory. Birthweight has been positively associated with the risk of PC in some studies [8–10], mainly with more aggressive tumors [9,10], although other studies described no association [11–13]. Longer gestational age [14], pre-eclampsia and eclampsia [15] have been associated with reduced PC risk, whereas advanced paternal [16], but not maternal [15–17], age at birth has been related to an increased risk.

There is strong evidence that developmental factors in childhood and adolescence that influence growth are linked to an increased risk of PC [7]. Although the association between PC and early life body size seems to be weak [18], recent studies have described a positive association with childhood obesity [19] and with childhood stature [20,21], as well as no association with energy restriction [22]. Puberty is also a critical period for prostate gland development. The increase in testosterone production is accompanied by a rapid growth and development of the prostate until the end of puberty, when it reaches approximately adult size and morphology [23].

The Gleason grading system—initially developed by Donald Gleason in 1966 [24] and afterwards revised by the International Society of Urological Pathology in 2005 [25] and 2014 [26], is the most common pathology scoring system used to classify prostate cancer according to its aggressiveness and prognosis. Low grade tumors (≤ 6) tend to grow slowly, while intermediate and high grade tumors (>6) tend to be fast-growing and aggressive cancers with worse prognosis. Epidemiologic studies have observed different associations of some risk factors between localized/non aggressive and advanced/aggressive tumors, suggesting etiologic heterogeneity [27]. This study sought to investigate whether perinatal and childhood sociodemographic and anthropometric factors influence the risk of adult PC by Gleason score in a large multicase control study in Spain.

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Study population

Multicase Control Spain (MCC-Spain) is a research project carried out between September 2008 and December 2013 to explore environmental and genetic factors associated with the risk of colorectal, breast, prostate, gastric tumors and chronic lymphocytic leukemia. It is a multicase-control study, with incident cases treated in the oncologic units of 23 hospitals and

population-based controls recruited in 12 Spanish provinces (Barcelona, Madrid, Navarra, Gipuzkoa, León, Asturias, Murcia, Huelva, Cantabria, Valencia, Granada and Girona). Participants had to be aged 20–85, should have resided in the catchment area for at least 6 months prior to recruitment, and had to be able to answer the epidemiological questionnaire. Each provincial research group recruited cases of two or more of the selected cancers and a single set of controls for all of them. We made an initial estimate of the expected age-sex distribution that cases, all combined, would have in each region, according to the tumors they recruited and to the cancer incidence rates from cancer registries. We applied these estimates to predefine age-sex distribution of our population-based controls, which were selected randomly from the general practitioner lists of the hospital catchment area. Research personnel invited potential controls via telephone, and those who agreed attended a personal interview. When the recruitment of cases ended, we compared, once again, the age-sex distribution of cases and controls. If needed, we recruited new participants to ensure that for each case in each region there was at least one control of the same 5-year age interval and sex. PC cases were recruited in Barcelona, Madrid, Asturias, Huelva, Cantabria, Valencia and Granada. For this purpose, our research personnel reviewed the hospital admission registries weekly and periodically (weekly or even daily) went to the collaborating hospital departments (i.e. urology, oncology, radiotherapy, and pathology) to find new cases and invite them to participate. The study was approved by the Ethics Committee of all hospitals and participant primary care centers. All participants signed an informed consent form. More details regarding the design of the study are provided elsewhere [28,29].

Fig. 1 shows a flow chart displaying the selection process of PC cases and their controls. Response rates were 52.2% for controls and 67.4% for PC cases respectively. We recruited a total of 1112 histologically-confirmed incident PC cases (International Classification of Diseases 10th Revision [ICD-10]: C61, D07.5) with no prior history of the disease, and diagnosed within the recruitment period, which differed by province. For this analysis, we selected male controls from our pool of controls, and excluded those with personal history of PC, those who resided in provinces that had not recruited PC cases, and in each province, those that were more than 5 years younger than the youngest PC case. In addition, we excluded both cases and controls with missing information of key covariates (body mass index (BMI) one year before the interview and family history of PC). Finally, a total of 1088 cases and 1345 male controls were included for the analyses.

2.2. Data collection

Trained interviewers administered a structured computerized epidemiological questionnaire in a face-to-face interview, including sociodemographic data, self-reported height and weight one year prior to the interview, family and personal history of cancer, medical, residential and occupational history, smoking and physical activity.

With respect to perinatal factors, our questionnaire used a series of comprehensive questions to collect self-reported information on relative socioeconomic status of the participants' parents at their birth, birthweight, maternal and paternal age at

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/2108819>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/2108819>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)