CORRESPONDENCE

Risk of myelogenous leukaemia and multiple myeloma in workers exposed to benzene

Editor—The recent report by Wong presents valuable new analyses concerning benzene and lymphohaematopoietic cancers among workers in the Plofilm cohort.¹ In spite of a series of analyses of this population,²⁻⁶ no previous analyses have provided specific risk estimates for acute myeloid leukaemia (AML) although the cohort has been widely viewed as providing evidence most pertinent to that outcome. The effort to examine patterns associated with leukaemia subtypes is clearly worthwhile, for the reasons presented by Wong.¹

However, we would like to challenge two aspects of this report: (a) the claim that "Specificity is one of the major criteria for causation analysis" (page 383); and (b) the assertion that "by lumping all cell types into a single category, the misconception that benzene can increase the risk of other cell types of leukaemia may be created." (page 382).

Specificity was proposed by Hill some years ago as one of several considerations in evaluating causality,⁷ but even then with strong caveats: "We must not, however, overemphasise the importance of the characteristic" (page 297). Subsequent experience and evolution of epidemiological methods has led to virtual abandonment of this as a useful criterion for causality⁸ except insofar as it suggests a pattern of bias in self reported exposure data or incomplete follow up for disease. Given the established multiplicity of consequences of ionising radiation, tobacco smoke, asbestos, oral contraceptives, physical activity, and fruit and vegetable consumption, for example, it is actually rather difficult to identify any biologically active exposure that is specific in its consequences.

With inferences from the Plofilm cohort pertaining to leukaemias other than AML, Wong correctly asserts that the numbers of cases of individual cell types are so small as to preclude meaningful analysis, but the number of total non-AML cases (admittedly, a heterogeneous group) is sufficient to analyse. To examine whether the association between benzene exposure and total leukaemia observed previously in this cohort⁵ is driven by AML cases, we integrated the results from the two reports (table).^{1,5}

These data indicate that the association is stronger for AML than for total leukaemia, but the differences in association for AML, non-AML, and total leukaemia are modest. Also, movement of a single case from AML to another cell type would considerably diminish this pattern and movement of two cases would obliterate it, which serves as a reminder of just how imprecise these standardised mortality ratios are. Wong empha-

sises the distinction in dose-response patterns found for AML *v* total leukaemia, but the numbers of cases available from this study preclude making such subtle distinctions. Given these results, the claim that they point specifically towards AML as the only type of leukaemia associated with benzene exposure in this cohort is unwarranted.

DAVID A SAVITZ
KURTIS W ANDREWS
The University of North Carolina
at Chapel Hill,
CB 7400,
McGavran-Greenberg Hall,
Chapel Hill,
NC 27599-7400, USA

- 1 Wong O. Risk of acute myeloid leukaemia and multiple myeloma in workers exposed to benzene. *Occup Environ Med* 1995;52:380-4.
- 2 Infante PF, Rinsky RA, Wagoner JK, Young RJ. Leukaemia in benzene workers. *Lancet* 1977;ii:76-8.
- 3 Rinsky RA, Young RJ, Smith AB. Leukemia in benzene workers. *Am J Ind Med* 1981;2:217-45.
- 4 Rinsky RA, Smith AB, Homung R, Filloon TG, Young RJ, Okun AH, Landrigan PJ. Benzene and leukemia, an epidemiologic risk assessment. *N Engl J Med* 1987;316:1044-50.
- 5 Paxton MB, Churchill VM, Brett SM, Rodricks JV. Leukemia risk associated with benzene exposure in the Plofilm cohort. I. Mortality update and exposure distribution. *Risk Anal* 1994;14:147-54.
- 6 Paxton MB, Churchill VM, Brett SM, Rodricks JV. Leukemia risk associated with benzene exposure in the Plofilm cohort. II. Risk estimates. *Risk Anal* 1994;14:155-7.
- 7 Hill AB. The environment and disease: association or causation? *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Medicine* 1965;58:295-300.
- 8 Rothman KJ. *Modern epidemiology*. Boston: Little, Brown: 1986.

Author's reply—Savitz and Andrews raised two points about my recent paper "Risk of acute myeloid leukaemia and multiple myeloma in workers exposed to benzene."¹ Firstly, they questioned whether specificity of disease should be included as a criterion for causation analysis. Secondly, they argued that the data from the Plofilm cohort indicated that exposure to benzene could result in an increased risk of leukaemia cell types as well as acute myeloid leukaemia (AML).

With regard to the first point, Savitz and Andrews might have misunderstood what "specificity" means. Specificity of disease refers to being "distinct," and does not imply "non-multiplicity" or "exclusiveness." In my paper, I did not claim that because benzene can cause AML, therefore benzene cannot cause other types of leukaemia or other diseases. Certainly we know that, given sufficient exposure, benzene can cause both AML and aplastic anaemia. However, both AML and aplastic anaemia are *specific* (or distinct) diseases. Therefore, specificity does not contradict multiplicity, as long as the diseases involved

are specific and meaningful diagnostic entities.

To support their first point, Savitz and Andrews cited a statement in Hill's 1965 paper on causation that we must not over emphasise the importance of specificity.² What Savitz and Andrews have omitted from their citation is the example given by Hill on this issue. Hill provided an example that occupational exposure to nickel can cause lung as well as nasal cancer (page 297). Again, both lung and nasal cancers are specific diagnostic entities recognised by the medical professions. Thus, Hill's paper was hardly an endorsement for the practice of combining heterogeneous disease categories for statistical analysis.

Most importantly, specificity of disease is not a statistical issue, but should be based on the biology of the disease. It makes little sense to lump different diseases into a single category for causation analysis. Before any statistical analysis, one must review and consider the underlying biological mechanisms of the disease process. As stated in my paper, it has become increasingly evident that the diseases collectively known as leukaemia are several distinct malignancies.³⁻⁵ Based on their letter, Savitz and Andrews themselves seem to recognise the heterogeneity of various leukaemia cell types. Given this recognition, it is not clear why Savitz and Andrews would endorse combining heterogeneous leukaemia cell types for analysis.

With regard to the second point, Savitz and Andrews provided a risk estimate for non-AML. Such a statistical analysis is meaningless, as non-AML is not a recognised diagnostic entity. Although Savitz and Andrews themselves admitted that such a category was heterogeneous, they nevertheless justified such a statistical analysis on the ground that "the number of non-AML cases in aggregate (admittedly, a heterogeneous group) is sufficient to analyse." Mere sufficiency of cases does not validate an analysis. Any statistical analysis which totally disregards our current understanding of the underlying biological mechanisms is meaningless.

Finally Savitz and Andrews concluded: "the claim that these results (results which I provided in my paper) point specifically toward AML as the only type of leukaemia associated with benzene exposure in this cohort (the Plofilm cohort) is unwarranted." I did not claim in my paper that the data from the Plofilm cohort showed that benzene did not cause other types of leukaemia besides AML. I simply stated the following: "For cell types other than AML, the Plofilm study does not provide sufficient cases for any meaningful analysis. The specific cell type with the second largest number of cases in the Plofilm study was chronic myeloid leukaemia (CML), consisting of only two deaths. One of the two deaths from CML was employed at the plant for one month in 1948, and died two years later in 1950 at the age of 29. His cumulative exposure was 0.10 ppm-years. Clearly this case could not have been associated with exposure at the plant." Therefore, the Plofilm study offers little useful information on the relation between benzene exposure and leukaemia cell types other than AML.

The evidence for the lack of an association between benzene and other leukaemia cell types comes from recent laboratory investigations⁴⁻⁸ and other

Results for AML, non-AML, and total leukaemia in Plofilm cohort study

Cause of death	Observed deaths	Expected deaths	SMR (95% CI)
Total leukaemia	14	3.89	3.60 (1.97-6.04)
AML	6	1.19	5.03 (1.84-10.97)
Non-AML	8	2.70	2.96 (1.25-5.84)