Mortality from cardiovascular diseases and exposure to inorganic mercury

Paolo Boffetta and his coworkers presented a comprehensive cohort study comprising 6784 male and 265 female workers from four mercury mines and mills in Spain, Sweden, Italy, and the Ukraine. The expected number of deaths were derived from the national rates specific for sex, age, and calendar period. Sweden was the only country with an increased mortality of ischaemic heart disease among men (SMR 1.66, 95% CI 1.35 to 2.02). In the Slovenian mine, dust measurements among men (SMR 1.66, 95% CI 1.35 to 2.02).

The second highest risk was found among workers after a workshift with a dust exposure in general and silica exposure in tunnel construction workers. Mortality among sulfide ore miners.

A cohort comprised 68 241 miners as well as pottery workers from south central China. The participants were employed between 1972 and 1974 and followed until 1989.

There was an increased mortality due to IHD (SMR 1.25, 95% CI 1.05 to 1.45). Smoking habit was unlikely to be responsible for this risk as the mortality from lung cancer was lower than expected (SMR 0.8, 95% CI 0.7 to 0.9). There was no significant trend regarding mortality due to IHD when medium and high dust exposed workers (RR 1.16) were compared with low dust exposed workers (RR 0.65). Silicotuberculosis did not have an increased mortality due to IHD (RR 1.1, 95% CI 0.7 to 1.8).

A general hypothesis about exposure to inhaled particles and the occurrence of IHD can be expressed in the following way. Long term inhalation of particles retained in the lungs will create a low grade inflammation which will increase the likelihood for blood clotting and thereby the risk for myocardial infarction and IHD. A high concentration of fibrinogen in plasma is an established risk factor for IHD.

An increased concentration of fibrinogen has been observed among tunnel construction workers after a workshift with a dust exposure of less than 2 mg/m³. Thus dust exposure in general and silica exposure in particular could be interesting to discuss in relation to ischaemic heart disease in this study by Boffetta and coworkers.

B Sjögren
Work Environment Toxicology, Institute of Environmental Medicine, Karolinska Institutet, SE-171 77 Stockholm, Sweden
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Department of Occupational Medicine, University Hospital of Trondheim, N-7006 Trondheim, Norway
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Joint action of smoking and asbestos exposure on lung cancer

This subject has long been bedevilled by confusion and circular argument. Why should there be only two possible hypotheses of interaction (additive and multiplicative)? Theory expects multiplicative; epidemiology can seldom reject this hypothesis; so theory is “accepted,” and deviations from multiplicity must be explained away. Resolution is made especially difficult because the nature of the data imposes very large errors: also it has to be assumed that the exposed smoked as many cigarettes as the unexposed, and that smokers and non-smokers were exposed equally.

Thus the “comprehensive” review by Lee’ was to be welcomed. However, discrepancies, particularly with another review,’ demanded discussion: this letter is the result.

From almost 40 “results” in 25 reports, Lee makes two selections to confirm the well known facts that asbestos can increase lung cancer risk in non-smokers and that the additive theory (of independent action) does not explain many of the data. Then, for 16 results, Lee calculates a statistic V; for an observed multiplicative interaction, V = 1. The weighted average V = 0.90 (95% CI: 0.67 to 1.20) breaks the rule of independence; in another,’ asbestos had a minuscule (protective) effect on lung cancer in both non-smokers and smokers (that is, no action, so no interaction); and in a Chinese study, risks from cigarette smoke were dramatically lower than in the West. After exclusion, the cohorts’ V = 0.54 (95% CI: 0.35–0.82), and the difference in types is much wider (p = 0.017).

Problems with case–referent designs are well known; here they are compounded by impure definitions of non-smokers and by retrospective assessment of exposure. It is clear from personal experience over five
decades that, unless obtained from employers’ records, job histories can be quite unreliable, even in basic facts, especially when reported by proxies. The assumption that the interactions between smoking and exposure to asbestos plus other carcinogens and between smoking and asbestos alone take the same form is untested and so indefensible. Thus, Lee’s grounds for his unprecedented incorporation of the Italian study in which all concerned were exposed to PAHs, namely, that subjects in many studies would have been exposed to “other” carcinogens, far from justifying inclusion, provide strong additional reasons for excluding all such studies, the major source of the case-referent studies in particular. It becomes obvious that inferences from the latter cannot overthrow conclusions from the cohorts.

The potential risks from dusty coal reinforce the need to exclude the Chinese cohort. Undoubtedly, the North American insulation workers were not exposed only to 4–12 fibres/ml of chrysotile, so there is a good case for discarding this result, although it forms a cornerstone of the evidence for multiplicativity. On the other hand, the study of crocidolite miners forms a cornerstone of the evidence for multiplicativity. Evidently, interaction takes several forms. For example, smoking and asbestos alone take the same proportions of the Italian study in which all concerned were exposed to PAHs, whereas in the North American study, the risk of lung cancer among asbestos workers was multiplied by about the same factor in smokers as in non-smokers, as 0.90 (95% CI: 0.67 to 1.20). Omitting estimate 18 was an unfortunate error, and I also agree with Liddell that it is better to include estimate 17 and replace estimate 13 by estimate 19.

Author’s reply

Having read Liddell’s paper and the comments he expressed in his letter and at a recent meeting, it is useful to clarify where we agree and disagree. Originally I included estimates 1–16 shown in table 1, and estimated V, the ratio of the asbestos relative risk in smokers to that in non-smokers, as 0.90 (95% CI: 0.67 to 1.20). Omitting estimate 18 was an unfortunate error, and I also agree with Liddell that it is better to include estimate 17 and replace estimate 13 by estimate 19. Accounting for this reduces V to 0.85 (95% CI: 0.63 to 1.08).

Liddell also suggests excluding estimates 4, 11, 12, and 14, but for reasons I consider unconvincing. He would exclude estimate 4 as the population was exposed to PAHs. However, virtually all populations have exposure to carcinogens other than asbestos or tobacco smoke and anyway exposure to other carcinogens may simply multiply risk by about the same factor in each of the four groups being studied, little affecting the nature of the joint relation of asbestos and smoking to lung cancer. He would exclude estimate 11 because of low smoking risks, but these are typical of smokers and do not invalidate the study. He would exclude estimate 12 as no asbestos effect was seen, but doing so based on

Table 1 Assessing the multiplicative relationship of smoking and asbestos in lung cancer risk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimate*</th>
<th>Study type</th>
<th>V (95% CI)</th>
<th>Heterogeneity χ²</th>
<th>Degrees of freedom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. DeKlerk</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>1.25 (0.19 to 8.08)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Marksching</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>2.89 (0.87 to 9.62)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Pastirano, no PAH</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>0.64 (0.10 to 4.06)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Pastirano, PAH</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>1.01 (0.13 to 7.94)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Bovenzi</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>0.86 (0.31 to 2.39)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Kyus</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>1.52 (0.39 to 5.93)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Blot, Georgia</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>1.26 (0.54 to 2.93)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Blot, Virginia</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>0.84 (0.39 to 1.81)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Blot, Florida</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>0.72 (0.22 to 2.36)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. McDonald</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>0.61 (0.25 to 1.49)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Zhu</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>1.60 (0.43 to 5.90)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Meurman</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>1.19 (0.07 to 20.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Berry, 1960–70 M+F</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>0.61 (0.10 to 25.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Selikoff and Hammond</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>1.22 (0.32 to 10.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Selikoff</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>0.19 (0.07 to 0.61)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Hammond</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>0.90 (0.47 to 2.21)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Berry, 1971–80 M+F</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>0.33 (0.13 to 1.25)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Liddell*</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>0.56 (0.20 to 1.56)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Berry, 1960–70 F</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>1.47 (0.22 to 30.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Original analysis
Estimates 1–16
V = 0.90 (0.67 to 1.20) 14.88 15

Revised analysis
Estimates 1–12, 14–19
All 0.83 (0.63 to 1.08) 18.39 17
Estimates 1–9
CC 1.08 (0.74 to 1.60) 4.33 8
Estimates 10–12, 14–19
P 0.63 (0.43 to 0.92) 10.17 8

Revised analysis with exclusions
Estimates 1–3, 5–10, 15–19
All 0.79 (0.59 to 1.05) 17.00 13
Estimates 1–3, 5–9
CC 1.09 (0.74 to 1.60) 4.33 7
Estimates 10, 15–19
P 0.54 (0.35 to 0.82) 6.95 5
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*References and fuller details given elsewhere except where stated.
C, case-control; P, prospective.
V is the ratio of the asbestos relative risk in smokers to that in non-smokers.
observed results can cause bias. He would exclude estimate 14 as the study population is a subset of that for estimate 15. However, the follow up period was much longer for estimate 14 (1943–74) than for estimate 15 (1967–76), so omitting it would have lost data. Anyhow, omitting estimates 11, 12, and 14 only has a minor effect, V reducing to 0.79 (95% CI: 0.59 to 1.05) (table 1).

At face value, the combined data appear reasonably homogeneous and compatible with the multiplicative model. However, as Liddell notes, estimates for prospective and case–control studies differ. Using my revised statistical analysis, prospective studies give V = 0.63 (95% CI: 0.43 to 0.92) and case–control studies V = 1.08 (95% CI: 0.74 to 1.59), a statistically significant difference (p = 0.049). With Liddell’s four suggested exclusions, V = 0.54 (95% CI: 0.35 to 0.82) for prospective studies and V = 1.00 (95% CI: 0.74 to 1.60) for case–control studies, with p = 0.017.

He stresses this significant difference, rejects the case–control data due to data unreliability, use of proxies, and inclusion of ex or long-term employees in the reference group and argues that inferences should be drawn only from the prospective studies. I regard these arguments as dubious. The significance of the difference is not great and is not removed (p = 0.049 for the revised data) by the estimate of V for the one study (estimate 15) showing a very low value is revised based on “best available evidence” rather than on death certificate diagnosis (though this revision is itself questionable). Prospective studies may be limited by failure to record changes in smoking status after follow up starts. The Quebec prospective study’s obtained data from prospective studies may show different features (for an overview see Black). The authors do not even mention the number of cases of different tumour types, let alone why they feel that all these completely different entities could be affected by a single cause.

Another crucial point is latency. The only essential criterion of causation in the assessment of epidemiological evidence is “temporal relation”. It is crucial that provisions are made to allow for biologically reasonable latencies. Instead the authors report on estimates based on the most recent (5) five years of exposure (plus choosing an exposure metric that has nothing to do with the vast majority of brain tumours that have latencies of at least five (but many 20 or more) years (for example, Strojan et al). Most of the brain tumours will have been already initiated before the point in time the exposure was accumulated to give the indicator the authors have chosen. At least the last 10 years prior to diagnosis of the tumour have to be truncated in computation of the exposure metric and all cases occurring earlier than 10 years after onset of exposure have to be omitted.

To choose Tesla-years as the exposure variable is also questionable because we do not know whether or not risk is cumulative. A more sophisticated exploitation of information on exposure could be expected from the authors. For example, time spent under peak exposures (e.g. exceeding 10% of the exposure limit) would be a meaningful surrogate. Tesla-years introduces an equivalence that has never shown to be meaningful: that exposure duration and intensity are commutative (that is, 10 years exposure to 1 µT is equivalent to one year exposure to 10 µT).

Overall the study in its presented form cannot be considered to contribute to the assessment of a relation between ELF EMF exposure and brain tumours.
these ancient concepts and terminology have led many to consider Chinese medicine as primitive, ritualistic, and unchanging. Such negative connotations have deterred many from studying Chinese medicine. Even if they did they felt they had to forego its theories and use the Western scientific paradigm to explain their treatment.

Elisabeth Hsu and the other authors in this book aimed to challenge this stereotype of Chinese medicine. They did so using selected examples to explain how evolution occurred in different aspects of Chinese medicine over time and the factors which motivated these changes. They showed that such changes could be brought about by the prevailing cosmological theories at the time, such as the incorporation of the system of five circulatory phases and six seasonal influences around the tenth century. Some changes were brought about by the political ideology at the time, such as the development of the new acupuncture theory in early communist China. But many are down to individuals’ intuition, such as the new system of cataloguing natural pharmaceuticals by Li Shizhen in Bencao gangmu compiled in the sixteenth century.

Many of the examples were chosen because they had far reaching consequences but some, notably one that was brought about for the sake of political correctness, did not have any sustainable influence.

The style of writing used in this book is one of its strengths. The reference text from which main arguments were based is cited both in Chinese and in English to avoid quoting out of context. Detailed footnote and extensive cross referencing underpin and expand the author’s line of argument. Readers with scientific and medical background will appreciate such “evidence based” approach.

Its method of translation deserves to be noted separately. Chinese medicine terms have been notoriously difficult to have a standard translation, partly because they represent abstract concepts and their meaning can be different, depending on the context. Hsu used the official transcription system pinyin and Chinese characters alongside the English translation. These minimise confusion and allow readers to cross reference these terms with texts from other sources.

As well as achieving the author’s objective, this book shows that Chinese medicine is not illusive and does not defy investigation. The author has shown how this could be done and her approach is different and innovative. The logical arguments in this book will appeal to professionals within the scientific community and can be a useful way to evaluate Chinese medicine.

Gilbert Shia

CORRECTIONS

We apologise for the following errors. In the paper “Low level cadmium exposure and kidney damage—the OSCAR study” (Järup et al) published in 2000 (Occup Environ Med 2000; 57:668–72) the following errors were made:

1. In the second paragraph, page 670, and at the fourth row, page 671, the text reads “1.6 nmol/mmol creatinine”. It should read “1.0 nmol/mmol creatinine” at both places.

2. In Table 1, “n” for age for the women should be 542 and not 544.

In the paper “Upper airway inflammation and respiratory symptoms in domestic waste collectors” (Wouters et al) published in February 2002 (Occup Environ Med 2002; 59:106–12), the following errors were made:

1. On page 108, right hand column, lines 5–7, part of the sentence was omitted. It should have read: “Estimated within and between subjects variance components of exposure concentrations were 0.51 and 0.34 for dust, 1.08 and 0.22 for endotoxin, and 1.49 and 0.14 for glucan.”

2. Table 2 heading: “from microbial agents” should have been omitted.

Gilbert Shia