The lung is the most common target for workplace carcinogens and burden of cancer projects have produced a range of attributable fraction (AF) estimates (6%–14.5%). Various approaches, available data, and contexts of these different studies contribute to sometimes incongruent final estimates.

We recently completed a Canadian burden project (CBD) and compared its results to burden studies from UK (UKBD), US (USBD), Finland (FinBD), and the Global Burden of Disease (GBD) to illustrate the impact of new epidemiologic data, availability of exposure data, differences in industry composition, inclusion of a broader set of carcinogens and/or cancer sites, and differences in the overall methodological approach on AF estimates.

The number of lung carcinogens considered by the different studies ranges from 8 in the GBD to 21 in the CBD and UKBD. More well-established carcinogens such as silica, which are driven by similar patterns of exposure (especially in construction) across countries, have more consistent estimates (2.4% in both the CBD and UKBD). Others such as asbestoses have significant challenges in historical exposure assessment, as well as differences in exposure context between countries, leading to variability between estimates (5.9%–8.0%). Differing methods and assumptions regarding radon also led to variable estimates (0.6%–1.3%). Relatively recent epidemiologic evidence for diesel exhaust and lung cancer incorporated into the Canadian estimates led to higher AFs than previous estimates.

Changing evidence, differences in context, and variability in methods mean that burden estimates are not strictly comparable across projects, and continuing to assess the burden for different countries remains relevant.