

## ORIGINAL ARTICLE

# Interactions between occupational exposure to extremely low frequency magnetic fields and chemicals for brain tumour risk in the INTEROCC study

Michelle C Turner,<sup>1,2,3,4</sup> Geza Benke,<sup>5</sup> Joseph D Bowman,<sup>6</sup> Jordi Figuerola,<sup>1,2,3</sup> Sarah Fleming,<sup>7</sup> Martine Hours,<sup>8</sup> Laurel Kincl,<sup>9</sup> Daniel Krewski,<sup>4,10</sup> Dave McLean,<sup>11</sup> Marie-Elise Parent,<sup>12</sup> Lesley Richardson,<sup>13</sup> Siegal Sadetzki,<sup>14,15</sup> Klaus Schlaefer,<sup>16</sup> Brigitte Schlehofer,<sup>16</sup> Joachim Schüz,<sup>17</sup> Jack Siemiatycki,<sup>13</sup> Martie van Tongeren,<sup>18</sup> Elisabeth Cardis<sup>1,2,3</sup>

► Additional material is published online only. To view, please visit the journal online (<http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/oemed-2016-104080>).

For numbered affiliations see end of article.

## Correspondence to

Dr Michelle C Turner, Barcelona Institute for Global Health (ISGlobal), Parc de Recerca Biomèdica de Barcelona, Barcelona 08003, Spain; [michelle.turner@isglobal.org](mailto:michelle.turner@isglobal.org)

Received 9 September 2016  
Revised 2 May 2017  
Accepted 10 May 2017  
Published Online First  
9 June 2017

## ABSTRACT

**Objectives** In absence of clear evidence regarding possible effects of occupational chemical exposures on brain tumour aetiology, it is worthwhile to explore the hypothesis that such exposures might act on brain tumour risk in interaction with occupational exposure to extremely low frequency magnetic fields (ELF).

**Methods** INTEROCC is a seven-country (Australia, Canada, France, Germany, Israel, New Zealand and UK), population-based, case-control study, based on the larger INTERPHONE study. Incident cases of primary glioma and meningioma were ascertained from 2000 to 2004. Job titles were coded into standard international occupational classifications and estimates of ELF and chemical exposures were assigned based on job-exposure matrices. Dichotomous indicators of cumulative ELF ( $\geq 50$ th vs  $< 50$ th percentile, 1–4 year exposure time window) and chemical exposures (ever vs never, 5-year lag) were created. Interaction was assessed on both the additive and multiplicative scales.

**Results** A total of 1939 glioma cases, 1822 meningioma cases and 5404 controls were included in the analysis, using conditional logistic regression. There was no clear evidence for interactions between ELF and any of the chemical exposures assessed for either glioma or meningioma risk. For glioma, subjects in the low ELF/metal exposed group had a lower risk than would be predicted from marginal effects. Results were similar according to different exposure time windows, to cut-points of exposure or in exposed-only analyses.

**Conclusions** There was no clear evidence for interactions between occupational ELF and chemical exposures in relation to glioma or meningioma risk observed. Further research with more refined estimates of occupational exposures is recommended.

## INTRODUCTION

There are few well-established risk factors for brain tumours beyond ionising radiation exposure.<sup>1 2</sup> Studies investigating other environmental and occupational risk factors have generally reported inconsistent findings. Some studies reported positive associations of various occupations or industries

## What this paper adds

- There are few well-established risk factors for brain tumours. Occupational chemical exposures may act on brain tumour risk in interaction with extremely low frequency magnetic fields (ELF); however, the epidemiological literature is sparse.
- Occupational exposure to 29 different chemical agents and ELF were assigned to the lifetime occupational histories of participants in the seven-country INTEROCC study based on job-exposure matrices.
- Results revealed no clear evidence for interactions between occupational ELF and various metals, solvents or other chemical agents in either glioma or meningioma risk.
- Further research with more refined estimates of occupational chemical and electromagnetic field exposures is recommended.

including farming,<sup>3</sup> satellite or aerospace electromechanical manufacturing,<sup>4 5</sup> pulp and paper production,<sup>6</sup> engineering/architecture,<sup>7</sup> nursing,<sup>8</sup> textile industry maintenance<sup>9</sup> and food production or processing<sup>7 10 11</sup>; some studies suggest that automotive body painters, designers and decorators, managers, military occupations, production managers, teachers, computer programmers, inspectors and physicians may also be at increased risk of developing brain tumours.<sup>10 12</sup>

There are also studies reporting associations with specific occupational exposure to metals,<sup>11 13–15</sup> metalworking fluids,<sup>16</sup> pesticides,<sup>17–19</sup> asphalt,<sup>20</sup> formaldehyde,<sup>21</sup> vinyl chloride,<sup>22</sup> petroleum products, oil mist and aromatic and aliphatic hydrocarbons.<sup>13 14</sup> However, the overall strength of evidence supporting these associations is limited due to inconsistent findings across studies, small numbers of study subjects, uncertainties in occupational exposure assessment and a lack of knowledge on possible interactions between occupational exposures.



CrossMark

**To cite:** Turner MC, Benke G, Bowman JD, et al. *Occup Environ Med* 2017;**74**:802–809.

Potential health risks associated with occupational exposure to extremely low frequency magnetic fields (ELF) have also been investigated. A 2008 meta-analysis reported a significant positive association between occupational ELF exposure and brain tumour risk (relative risk=1.14, 95% CI 1.07 to 1.22), although there was little evidence for an exposure/response relationship.<sup>23</sup> Studies published since that time have reported conflicting findings. A US study based on a job-exposure matrix (JEM) supplemented with job modules reported no association between occupational ELF and either glioma or meningioma risk.<sup>24</sup> A French study reported a significant positive, though imprecise, association between occupational ELF, as assessed using expert judgement, and meningioma risk (OR 3.02, 95% CI 1.10 to 8.25).<sup>25</sup> Recent cohort studies in the Netherlands and the UK also reported no evidence for associations of occupational ELF and brain tumour risk.<sup>26 27</sup>

Few studies examined occupational ELF in different exposure time windows (ETW). In the international INTEROCC study, a large-scale, population-based, case-control study including data on nearly 2000 cases of both glioma and meningioma, based on the larger INTERPHONE study, we recently reported no association between lifetime cumulative ELF exposure and glioma or meningioma risk, although positive associations with ELF were noted in the most recent ETW, 1–4 years prior to the diagnosis/reference date (OR $\geq$ 90th percentile vs <25th percentile for glioma=1.67, 95% CI 1.36 to 2.07; for meningioma=1.23, 95% CI 0.97 to 1.57) possibly suggesting an aetiological role of ELF in brain tumour promotion or progression.<sup>28</sup> Although there was no clear evidence for associations between occupational exposure to combustion products, dusts and other chemical agents<sup>29</sup> or solvents<sup>30</sup> and either glioma or meningioma risk in INTEROCC, we recently observed evidence for positive associations between occupational metal exposures, particularly iron exposure in women, as well as oil mist exposure overall, and meningioma risk (Ref. 31 and McElvenny *et al*, personal communication, 2017).

There may also be interactions among occupational exposures for brain tumours, but the epidemiological literature on possible interactions is sparse. In a Swedish population-based study in which all males recorded as employed in the 1970 census (~1.5 million) were followed for 19 years through linkage with the cancer registry (2029 brain tumours), Navas-Acien *et al*<sup>32</sup> observed a positive association between ELF and glioma risk only with a concomitant chemical exposure. Similarly, solvent, lead and pesticide exposure were associated with glioma only with moderate to high ELF exposure (>0.13  $\mu$ T work day average exposure). No clear interactions were observed between occupational ELF and chemical exposures for meningioma, though there were few cases in some exposure groups.

The purpose of this analysis is to examine possible interactions between occupational exposures for brain tumours, more specifically, between occupational ELF and metals, solvents and other chemicals in the INTEROCC study. INTEROCC presents a unique opportunity to examine such interactions within the context of a large, well-established study, with detailed occupational history data collected for study participants.

## METHODS

### Study population

INTEROCC is a seven-country (Australia, Canada, France, Germany, Israel, New Zealand and UK), population-based, case-control study based on data that was collected for the larger INTERPHONE study of potential cancer risk associated

with cellular telephone use.<sup>33</sup> Incident cases of primary glioma and meningioma were recruited from treatment centres in major population areas from the year 2000 to 2004 with completeness of case ascertainment assessed through secondary sources. Cases were between 30 and 59 years of age, although an extended age range was included in Germany (30–69 years), Israel (18+ years) and the UK (18–69 years). All cases were confirmed histologically or by unequivocal diagnostic imaging. Population controls were selected through different recruitment procedures in different countries (mainly from population registries and electoral lists, as well as from general practitioner patient lists in the UK and random digit dialling in Ottawa). One control was randomly selected (two in Germany) for each case of glioma and meningioma in each study centre and was frequency matched or individually matched to cases by sex and year of birth (5 year age categories). To maximise statistical power, all eligible glioma and meningioma controls recruited as part of INTERPHONE were included here.<sup>34</sup> A total of 3978 cases (2054 glioma cases and 1924 meningioma cases) and 5601 controls were interviewed from 5399 eligible cases (3017 glioma cases and 2382 meningioma cases) and 11 112 controls. Participation rates were 68% (ranging from 56% to 86% across INTEROCC study countries) for glioma cases, 81% (62%–90%) for meningioma cases and 50% (31–74%) for controls. The control reference date for INTEROCC was set as the date of interview minus the median difference between case diagnosis and interview by country.

Ethics approval was obtained from local research ethics boards, as well as from the ethical review board of the International Agency for Research on Cancer (Lyon) for INTERPHONE and the Municipal Institute for Medical Investigation Barcelona for INTERPHONE and INTEROCC. Participants were asked to provide written informed consent prior to being interviewed.

### Data collection

Computer-assisted personal interviews were conducted with study participants by trained interviewers. Proxy respondents, mainly for glioma cases (19% overall, ranging from 8% to 46% across INTEROCC study countries), were used when necessary. The interview captured data on demographic, family, medical and other personal characteristics, including an occupational calendar for all jobs held for 6 months or longer. Detailed occupational data included job title, company name and description, as well as start and end year for all jobs held.

### Occupational ELF and chemical exposure assessment

Following exclusion of a small number of jobs due to invalid start/stop dates (n=622), a total of 35 240 jobs were retained for analysis. Job titles were coded into standard occupational and industrial classification systems (International Standard Classification of Occupations 1968 (ISCO68) (n=1142 three or five-digit codes), International Standard Classification of Occupations 1988 (ISCO88) (n=413 four-digit codes) and the International Standard Industrial Classification 1971 (n=211 four-digit codes)). The number of jobs held by cases and controls was similar, with a mean (SD) of 3.9 (2.6) jobs held by glioma cases, 3.6 (2.6) by meningioma cases and 3.8 (2.5) by controls. A small number of cases (n=103, 5.0% glioma cases and n=95, 4.9% meningioma cases) and controls (n=122, 2.2%) were excluded as reporting never having been employed.

Estimates of mean workday ELF exposure were assigned to each job based on an updated measurement-based JEM linked primarily to ISCO88 codes and to more specific ISCO68 codes for electrical jobs where possible.<sup>28 35 36</sup> Included studies in the

## Workplace

JEM used personal monitors with bandwidths from 3 to 1000 Hz to measure the full-shift time-weighted average ELF exposures to the magnetic flux density in microtesla. Estimates of geometric mean ELF exposure were used and were available from the JEM for the majority of jobs (92%).<sup>28 37</sup> For the remaining jobs, ELF exposures were assigned based on those from similar codes (5%), expert judgement (3%) or study centre specific control mean values for unknown occupations (0.3%).

Occupational exposure to 29 different metals, solvents or other chemical agents selected a priori were assigned to each job based on a modified version of the Finnish job-exposure matrix (FINJEM), covering the time period 1945–2003.<sup>38</sup> A crosswalk was developed between the FINJEM and ISCO68 coding systems. Updates to the FINJEM included dividing the 1960–1984 time period in two periods (1960–1973 and 1974–1984); modifying some entries to enhance their consistency and specificity, as well as generalisability to different study countries; and updating entries for benzo(a)pyrene and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons to include occupational exposure to environmental tobacco smoke.<sup>38 39</sup> Estimates of the proportion of exposed workers (P) and arithmetic mean exposure level (L) were assigned to each job. When P was <5%, the level in FINJEM was set to 0. Ever exposure was defined as a probability of exposure  $\geq 25\%$  for at least 1 year, with a 5-year lag. Where  $5\% \leq p < 25\%$ , individuals were considered of 'uncertain' exposure status and were excluded here, as were jobs held for <1 year. Indicators of lifetime cumulative exposure were constructed based on the sum over all jobs of the products  $P \times L \times \text{job duration}$ .

### Statistical analysis

Conditional logistic regression models were used to obtain adjusted ORs and 95% CIs for glioma or meningioma risk according to dichotomous categories of occupational ELF ( $\geq 50$ th percentile (0.46  $\mu\text{T}$ -years) vs <50th percentile of the control exposure distribution) and chemical exposures (ever vs never) in all seven countries combined relative to a common reference category of low ELF/never chemical exposure. For analysis of any metal or individual metals, the reference category comprised participants with no exposure to any metal; similarly, the reference category for individual solvents was participants with no exposure to any solvent.<sup>30 31</sup> Models were stratified by country-region, sex and 5 year age groups and were adjusted for level of education. The main analysis focused on interactions between cumulative occupational ELF in the 1–4 year ETW, since we were interested in assessing potential promotion or progression effects of ELF, and the strongest independent effects of ELF were observed with this metric in this time window in previous work.<sup>28</sup> Occupational chemical exposures were considered with a 5-year lag, also as in previous work.<sup>29–31</sup> Sensitivity analyses were conducted according to level of ELF exposure ( $\geq 75$ th percentile vs <25th percentile of the control exposure distribution), to examine a greater exposure contrast, as well as among exposed subjects only (using the cut-point of the 50th percentile of the cumulative control exposure distribution for each chemical), and to address potential differences by employment/exposure status in chemically exposed versus never exposed and by level of chemical exposure.

Interaction was assessed on both the additive and multiplicative scales under the assumption that no bias was present.<sup>40</sup> On the additive scale, estimates of the relative excess risk due to interaction and associated 95% CIs were calculated where appropriate.<sup>41</sup> On the multiplicative scale, product terms were entered into conditional logistic regression models and their

**Table 1** Characteristics of case and control participants at enrolment: INTEROCC study, 2000–2004, Australia, Canada, France, Germany, Israel, New Zealand and UK

Characteristic	Glioma cases (n=1939)	Meningioma cases (n=1822)	Controls* (n=5404)
	Mean (SD) or %	Mean (SD) or %	Mean (SD) or %
Mean (SD) age at reference date	51.0 (12.3)	54.7 (11.6)	51.8 (11.3)
Sex			
Male	62.0	27.5	45.2
Female	38.0	72.5	54.8
Education			
High school or less	52.4	59.1	53.6
Greater than high school	47.7	40.9	46.4
Country			
Australia	14.2	13.9	12.3
Canada	8.6	5.1	11.6
France	4.8	7.6	8.5
Germany	18.6	20.3	27.5
Israel	20.5	36.8	17.3
New Zealand	3.4	2.7	2.7
UK	30.0	13.5	20.1

\*Glioma and meningioma controls combined.

significance was assessed according to the likelihood ratio test. All statistical tests were two sided. Analyses were conducted using SAS V.9.3.<sup>42</sup>

### RESULTS

A total of 1939 glioma cases, 1822 meningioma cases and 5404 controls were retained for analysis following exclusion of participants with no occupational history or missing data on covariates of interest. Whereas glioma cases were predominantly male (62.0%), the majority of meningioma cases were female (72.5%) (table 1). The mean (SD) age of participants was 51.0 (12.3) years for glioma cases, 54.7 (11.6) years for meningioma cases and 51.8 (11.3) years for controls. A minority of glioma (47.7%) and meningioma cases (40.9%) and controls (46.4%) had a greater than high school level of education compared with a high school education or less. The UK and Israel contributed 50.5% of glioma cases; Israel and Germany contributed 57.1% of meningioma cases.

A listing of the most frequent jobs held among participants classified into categories of cumulative ELF exposure in the 1–4 year ETW and any metal exposure (5-year lag) is presented in table 2. The most frequent jobs among participants with low (<50th percentile) cumulative ELF and no metal exposure were secretaries, secondary education teaching professionals and shop salespersons and demonstrators. In contrast, the most frequent jobs among participants with high ( $\geq 50$ th percentile) cumulative ELF and any metal exposure were machine tool setters and setter operators, motor vehicle mechanics and fitters and plumbers and pipe fitters. Online supplementary table S1 provides the most frequent jobs for categories of ELF and solvent exposure.

Results examining possible interactions between occupational ELF and chemical exposures are presented separately for glioma and meningioma in a series of tables grouped according to those concerning metals and others for results concerning solvents and other chemical agents. While most tables present results relative

**Table 2** Most frequent jobs among participants categorized into categories of cumulative occupational ELF exposure in the 1–4 year ETW and metal exposure (5-year lag): INTEROCC study, 2000–2004, Australia, Canada, France, Germany, Israel, New Zealand and UK

ISCO88	Job title	Frequency (n)
<i>Low ELF—never metal</i>		
4115	Secretaries	341
2320	Secondary education teaching professionals	182
5220	Shop salespersons and demonstrators	151
5131	Child-care workers	118
2411	Accountants	111
<i>High ELF—never metal</i>		
4190	Other office clerks	236
5220	Shop salespersons and demonstrators	226
9132	Helpers and cleaners in offices, hotels and other establishments	127
3415	Technical and commercial sales representatives	119
2230	Nursing and midwifery professionals	117
<i>Low ELF—any metal</i>		
8324	Heavy-truck and lorry drivers	34
7223	Machine tool setters and setter operators	29
1222	Production and operations department managers in manufacturing	21
5169	Protective services workers not elsewhere classified	15
5220	Shop salespersons and demonstrators	15
<i>High ELF—any metal</i>		
7233	Machine tool setters and setter operators	83
7231	Motor vehicle mechanics and fitters	59
7136	Plumbers and pipe fitters	43
7212	Welders and flame cutters	40
7222	Tool makers and related workers	27

Note: out of a total number of 9681 jobs.  
ELF, extremely low frequency magnetic fields.

to a common reference category of low ELF/never chemical exposure, others present results relative to low ELF/low chemical exposure. The latter are referred to as ‘exposed-only analysis’.

The prevalence of any metal exposure was 17% overall and 11% for both any metal and high ELF ( $\geq 50$ th percentile) exposure in analysis of glioma (table 3). The OR (95% CI) for high ELF exposure compared with low ELF exposure in the 1–4 year ETW prior to the index date with no metal exposure was 1.31 (95% CI 1.14 to 1.51). The OR for any versus never metal exposure (5-year lag) in the low ELF exposure group was significantly reduced (OR=0.71, 95% CI 0.54 to 0.95). The OR for both high ELF and any metal exposure was 1.29 (95% CI 1.05 to 1.59), similar to the OR for ELF alone. Although there was a positive interaction on the multiplicative scale of borderline significance ( $p=0.06$ ), its direction was driven by the significantly reduced OR in the low ELF/metal exposed group. Similar results were observed across individual metal exposures or exposure to welding fumes with positive and, in some cases, significant, multiplicative interactions driven by reduced ORs in the low ELF/metal exposed group.

The prevalence of any solvent exposure was 9% overall and 6% for both any solvent and high ELF exposure (see online supplementary table S2). There was an OR of 1.36 (95% CI 1.19 to 1.56) for high ELF exposure in the 1–4 year ETW with no solvent exposure, an OR of 0.73 (95% CI 0.50 to 1.06) for any solvent exposure with low ELF and a combined OR of 1.31 (95% CI

1.00 to 1.71) for both exposures, again similar to the OR for ELF alone, compared with the low ELF/no solvent exposure reference group. There was no significant interaction observed on the multiplicative scale ( $p=0.22$ ). Results were generally similar for specific solvents.

For other exposures, there were significant positive interactions observed for asbestos, benzo(a)pyrene and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons on the multiplicative scale ( $p<0.05$ ), though they were driven—as for metals—by significantly reduced ORs in the chemical exposed groups among those with low ELF; for both benzo(a)pyrene and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, a large number of participants were also considered of ‘uncertain’ exposure status ( $5\% \leq p < 25\%$ ) and were excluded from analysis,<sup>38</sup> and ORs in all exposure categories were  $<1$  (see online supplementary table S2). There was no clear evidence of interaction with other specific chemicals with the OR in the high ELF/chemical exposed group generally  $\leq$  expected. There was no clear evidence for interaction on the additive scale between ELF and any of the chemical agents assessed for glioma.

For meningioma, the prevalence of any metal exposure was 14% overall and 9% for both any metal and high ELF exposure (table 4). There was a small positive association between high ELF exposure in the 1–4 year ETW of OR=1.15 (95% CI 1.00 to 1.33). The OR for any metal exposure in the low ELF group was close to null of OR=0.96 (95% CI 0.67 to 1.38). The OR among those with both high ELF and any metal exposure was significantly elevated (OR=1.46, 95% CI 1.11 to 1.91) and there was a positive, though non-significant, interaction (multiplicative scale) ( $p=0.21$ ). Results for individual metals were generally similar, with slightly increased ORs among those with both high ELF and metal exposure, though there were also reduced, but non-significant, ORs for lead and welding fume exposure in the low ELF group.

For solvents, the prevalence of any solvent exposure was low (7% overall and 4% for both any solvent and high ELF exposure) (see online supplementary table S3). There was an OR of 1.19 (95% CI 1.03 to 1.37) for high ELF exposure in the 1–4 year ETW, an OR of 0.91 (95% CI 0.57 to 1.46) for any solvent exposure (driven by the reduced OR for ever aromatic hydrocarbon exposure) and a combined OR of 1.40 (95% CI 0.98 to 2.00) for both exposures, compared with the low ELF/no solvent exposure reference group ( $p$  interaction multiplicative scale=0.38). For specific solvents, there were some positive ORs for aliphatic and alicyclic hydrocarbons, other organic solvents and toluene exposure in the low ELF group, though ORs in the high ELF and chemical exposed groups were not greater than expected.

There were also significant positive multiplicative interactions with benzo(a)pyrene and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons ( $p<0.007$ ) for meningioma, with reduced ORs in both the ELF and chemical exposure groups alone and a small positive OR among those with both exposures, though again, this was in a reduced analytic subgroup, with a large number of participants excluded from analysis due to ‘uncertain’ exposure (see online supplementary table S3). For other specific exposures, there was no clear evidence for interaction (multiplicative scale). There was also no clear evidence for interaction on the additive scale between ELF and any of the chemical agents assessed for meningioma.

In sensitivity analysis according to the 75th (0.58  $\mu$ T-years) and 25th (0.34  $\mu$ T-years) percentiles of ELF, though ORs in the high ELF group were increased (OR high ELF/never metal exposure for glioma=1.59, 95% CI 1.30 to 1.96; meningioma=1.24, 95% CI 1.00 to 1.55 for example), the general pattern in results

## Workplace

**Table 3** Adjusted ORs (95% CIs) for glioma in relation to categorical indicators of cumulative occupational ELF (1–4 year ETW) and any metal (5-year lag) exposure: INTEROCC study, 2000–2004, Australia, Canada, France, Germany, Israel, New Zealand and UK\*

Metal exposure	Low ELF (<50th percentile)		High ELF (≥50th percentile)		High versus low ELF in stratum of metal	Interaction term (multiplicative)†
	Cases/controls	OR (95% CI)	Cases/controls	OR (95% CI)	OR (95% CI)	OR (95% CI)
Never metal	557/1791	1.00 (ref)	672/1687	1.31 (1.14 to 1.51)	1.33 (1.16 to 1.53)	1.38 (0.98 to 1.94)
Ever metal	77/242	0.71 (0.54 to 0.95)	229/401	1.29 (1.05 to 1.59)	1.50 (1.07 to 2.10)	
Ever vs never metal in stratum of ELF		0.71 (0.53 to 0.96)		0.99 (0.80 to 1.23)		
Never cadmium	557/1788	1.00 (ref)	672/1682	1.32 (1.15 to 1.52)	1.33 (1.16 to 1.53)	1.62 (0.65 to 3.99)
Ever cadmium	10/29	0.71 (0.34 to 1.50)	26/42	1.51 (0.90 to 2.55)	1.69 (0.46 to 6.20)	
Ever versus never cadmium in stratum of ELF		0.66 (0.29 to 1.48)		1.17 (0.68 to 2.01)		
Never chromium	557/1791	1.00 (ref)	672/1687	1.32 (1.15 to 1.52)	1.33 (1.16 to 1.53)	1.37 (0.87 to 2.16)
Ever chromium	40/107	0.77 (0.52 to 1.15)	132/209	1.40 (1.08 to 1.82)	1.61 (0.97 to 2.67)	
Ever versus never chromium in stratum of ELF		0.76 (0.50 to 1.14)		1.05 (0.80 to 1.37)		
Never iron	557/1791	1.00 (ref)	672/1687	1.32 (1.15 to 1.51)	1.33 (1.16 to 1.53)	1.47 (0.99 to 2.17)
Ever iron	55/169	0.68 (0.48 to 0.95)	171/286	1.31 (1.04 to 1.66)	1.70 (1.15 to 2.53)	
Ever versus never iron in stratum of ELF		0.67 (0.47 to 0.95)		0.99 (0.78 to 1.27)		
Never lead	557/1791	1.00 (ref)	672/1687	1.32 (1.15 to 1.52)	1.33 (1.16 to 1.53)	1.69 (1.05 to 2.74)
Ever lead	32/122	0.56 (0.37 to 0.85)	114/216	1.25 (0.96 to 1.64)	1.70 (1.00 to 2.86)	
Ever versus never lead in stratum of ELF		0.53 (0.35 to 0.82)		0.95 (0.72 to 1.25)		
Never nickel	557/1791	1.00 (ref)	672/1687	1.32 (1.15 to 1.51)	1.33 (1.16 to 1.53)	1.48 (0.98 to 2.23)
Ever nickel	50/146	0.71 (0.50 to 1.02)	152/235	1.39 (1.09 to 1.78)	1.53 (0.99 to 2.34)	
Ever versus never nickel in stratum of ELF		0.72 (0.50 to 1.05)		1.04 (0.81 to 1.35)		
Never welding fumes	557/1791	1.00 (ref)	672/1687	1.32 (1.15 to 1.52)	1.33 (1.16 to 1.53)	1.81 (1.13 to 2.90)
Ever welding fumes	33/118	0.57 (0.38 to 0.87)	137/221	1.38 (1.06 to 1.78)	2.04 (1.24 to 3.35)	
Ever versus never welding fumes in stratum of ELF		0.55 (0.36 to 0.85)		1.04 (0.79 to 1.36)		

\*Conditional logistic regression models were stratified by country-region, sex and 5 year age groups and were adjusted for level of education. The 50th percentile of ELF among the control distribution was 0.46  $\mu$ T-years.

†p Values for interaction (multiplicative scale) were as follows: metal (0.06), cadmium (0.30), chromium (0.18), iron (0.05), lead (0.03), nickel (0.06) and welding fumes (0.01). ELF, extremely low frequency magnetic fields.

was similar to the main analysis (not shown), and the available sample size was substantially reduced. Results excluding proxy respondents or participants who were judged by the interviewer to be uninterested in the interview were also similar.

When examining categories of high versus low chemical exposure (ie, exposed-only analysis), ORs in the low ELF/high metal exposure group for glioma and meningioma were generally >1, in contrast to the reduced ORs observed in the main analysis, though they were imprecise (see online supplementary tables S4 and S5). There was no clear evidence of interaction for either glioma or meningioma in exposed-only analysis for most chemical agents (see online supplementary tables S4–S7). There was a significant negative interaction (p multiplicative scale=0.04) with high iron for meningioma, with the OR in the joint exposure group lower than the product of the individual effects.

In sensitivity analyses according to different ETWs, there was also no clear evidence for interaction for either glioma or meningioma on examination of ELF in the 5–9 year ETW, and ORs for high ELF were weak/null (OR high ELF/never metal exposure for glioma=1.07, 95% CI 0.94 to 1.23; meningioma=0.98, 95% CI 0.85 to 1.13 for example) (not shown). There was also no evidence for interaction when examining both ELF and chemical exposures overall (1-year lag for both), though the reduced ORs for any metal exposure were no longer apparent in the low ELF group (OR=1.00, 95% CI 0.75 to 1.34 glioma; OR=1.32,

95% CI 0.92 to 1.89 meningioma), and for meningioma, they were significantly elevated for iron (OR=1.65, 95% CI 1.03 to 2.63) and nickel (OR=1.70, 95% CI 1.03 to 2.78) specifically (not shown). ORs for ELF were ~1.0. We further examined potential interactions between a distal ELF exposure (10+ years) followed by a more recent chemical exposure (<10 years), and again, there was no clear evidence for interactions observed (not shown).

In analyses of potential interactions for meningioma risk among women only, ORs for ELF in the 1–4 year ETW, any metal exposure (5-year lag) and the combined effect were 1.21 (95% CI 1.02 to 1.43), 0.93 (95% CI 0.50 to 1.74) and 1.86 (95% CI 1.09 to 3.15), respectively, with a multiplicative interaction term of 1.65 (95% CI 0.73 to 3.72) (p=0.23). However, there were insufficient numbers of exposed women to examine potential interactions with individual metals.

## DISCUSSION

Overall, there was no clear evidence for interactions between occupational ELF and any of the chemical exposures examined, including metals, solvents, dusts and other chemical agents for either glioma or meningioma risk. For glioma, there was a positive significant interaction on the multiplicative scale between ELF and any metal exposure, as well as with exposure to specific

**Table 4** Adjusted ORS (95% CIs) for meningioma in relation to categorical indicators of cumulative occupational ELF (1–4 year ETW) and any metal (5-year lag) exposure: INTEROCC study, 2000–2004, Australia, Canada, France, Germany, Israel, New Zealand and UK\*

Metal exposure	Low ELF (<50th percentile)		High ELF (≥50th percentile)		High versus low ELF in stratum of metal	Interaction term (multiplicative)†
	Cases/controls	OR (95% CI)	Cases/controls	OR (95% CI)	OR (95% CI)	OR (95% CI)
Never metal	542/1728	1.00 (ref)	563/1627	1.15 (1.00 to 1.33)	1.18 (1.02 to 1.37)	1.32 (0.86 to 2.03)
Ever metal	45/214	0.96 (0.67 to 1.38)	109/366	1.46 (1.11 to 1.91)	1.32 (0.81 to 2.15)	
Ever versus never metal in stratum of ELF		0.85 (0.58 to 1.24)		1.37 (1.03 to 1.81)		
Never cadmium	–	–	–	–	–	–
Ever cadmium	–	–	–	–	–	–
Ever versus never cadmium in stratum of ELF		–		–		
Never chromium	542/1689	1.00 (ref)	563/1579	1.17 (1.01 to 1.35)	1.18 (1.02 to 1.37)	0.89 (0.48 to 1.65)
Ever chromium	21/95	1.26 (0.75 to 2.13)	47/181	1.31 (0.91 to 1.91)	1.22 (0.56 to 2.64)	
Ever versus never chromium in stratum of ELF		1.16 (0.67 to 2.03)		1.26 (0.84 to 1.87)		
Never iron	542/1703	1.00 (ref)	563/1590	1.16 (1.01 to 1.35)	1.18 (1.02 to 1.37)	1.26 (0.75 to 2.13)
Ever iron	28/152	0.96 (0.61 to 1.50)	69/255	1.41 (1.02 to 1.94)	1.29 (0.72 to 2.29)	
Ever versus never iron in stratum of ELF		0.84 (0.53 to 1.35)		1.32 (0.93 to 1.85)		
Never lead	542/1700	1.00 (ref)	563/1605	1.17 (1.01 to 1.35)	1.18 (1.02 to 1.37)	1.42 (0.76 to 2.65)
Ever lead	19/103	0.78 (0.46 to 1.33)	50/192	1.30 (0.91 to 1.85)	1.86 (0.79 to 4.38)	
Ever versus never lead in stratum of ELF		0.69 (0.40 to 1.19)		1.18 (0.82 to 1.72)		
Never nickel	542/1695	1.00 (ref)	563/1583	1.16 (1.01 to 1.35)	1.18 (1.02 to 1.37)	1.10 (0.63 to 1.91)
Ever nickel	26/130	1.05 (0.66 to 1.68)	55/209	1.34 (0.95 to 1.90)	1.49 (0.78 to 2.84)	
Ever versus never nickel in stratum of ELF		0.95 (0.58 to 1.55)		1.26 (0.87 to 1.83)		
Never welding fumes	542/1699	1.00 (ref)	563/1590	1.17 (1.01 to 1.35)	1.18 (1.02 to 1.37)	1.55 (0.82 to 2.92)
Ever welding fumes	17/106	0.81 (0.47 to 1.42)	52/192	1.46 (1.02 to 2.10)	1.47 (0.73 to 2.99)	
Ever versus never welding fumes in stratum of ELF		0.69 (0.39 to 1.23)		1.35 (0.92 to 1.99)		

\*Conditional logistic regression models were stratified by country-region, sex and 5 year age groups and were adjusted for level of education. The 50th percentile of ELF among the control distribution was 0.46  $\mu$ T-years.

†p Values for interaction (multiplicative scale) were as follows: metal (0.21), chromium (0.71), iron (0.38), lead (0.27), nickel (0.75) and welding fumes (0.18). ELF, extremely low frequency magnetic fields.

metals, though its direction was driven by a reduced OR in the low ELF/metal exposed group.

To our knowledge, there has been only one previous epidemiological study examining interactions between ELF and chemical exposures for brain tumours. In a 19-year follow-up based on Swedish registry data, Navas-Acien *et al*<sup>32</sup> observed a positive association between ELF and glioma in men with a simultaneous chemical exposure. However, results were based on occupation at the beginning of the study period (in the year 1970) and changes in occupation over time were not assessed. In contrast, in the current study, detailed occupational histories were obtained for study participants throughout their working lifetimes (beginning at age 14 years), allowing us to examine both ELF and chemical exposures in specific time windows of interest.

The main analysis of the current study was based on dichotomised categories of ELF exposure in the 1–4 year ETW (according to the 50th percentile), since ELF is suspected of playing a role in brain tumour promotion or progression and chemical exposures with a 5-year lag (never versus any exposure).<sup>28</sup> However, we also considered alternate ETWs for both ELF (1-year lag, 5–9 year ETW and 10-year lag) and chemical exposures (1-year lag, 1–9 year ETW) in sensitivity analyses. It is unclear whether the reduced ORs observed for chemicals in the low ELF group in the 1–4 year ETW, particularly for glioma and

metals, were due to chance or some sort of bias. The reduced ORs were generally attenuated using alternate ETWs; further, in analysis overall (1-year lag), significant positive associations were observed for some metals for meningioma.<sup>31</sup> There were also multiple tests performed, raising the possibility of a false significant finding. In exposed-only analysis, ORs in the low ELF/high metal group were also not reduced as in the main analysis. There were, however, few subjects in some exposure groups or, in some cases, inadequate numbers of exposed participants to consider level of chemical exposure. Results were also similar using alternate cut-points for ELF (according to the 25th and 75th percentiles). The previous study by Navas-Acien *et al*<sup>32</sup> was unable to consider level of occupational chemical exposure due to small numbers of subjects.

There was also no clear evidence of interactions for meningioma risk in sensitivity analysis including women only and an insufficient number of women exposed to individual metals to permit further analysis by gender. Navas-Acien *et al*<sup>32</sup> included only men in their study.

Other potential limitations include disentangling the effects of individual chemical exposures due to their correlated nature<sup>30 31</sup> and misclassification of occupational exposures based on the use of JEMs. However, such misclassification is likely non-differential, in terms of case/control status, and

likely leads to attenuated risk estimates. There is also Berkson's bias due to group-based exposure estimates. There may also be differences in occupational exposures across study countries and time periods. The ELF JEM used here was recently updated<sup>28 36</sup> as was the chemical FINJEM modified for use in INTEROCC.<sup>38</sup> The use of more refined exposure assessment approaches including expert assessment and more detailed job-specific information may be useful to better detect interactions.<sup>43</sup> Ongoing work as part of INTEROCC on the application of source-based, rather than job-based, exposure matrices for occupational electromagnetic field exposure may be useful in this regard.<sup>44 45</sup> Finally, participation rates were low, ranging from 68% to 81% in cases to 50% in controls. Though participation may be related with socioeconomic and employment status,<sup>46</sup> level of educational attainment and occupational prestige (based on the standard international occupational prestige scale) were generally similar across groups of interviewed participants here.<sup>28</sup> The somewhat lower participation rate for glioma as compared with meningioma cases was expected due to the severity of disease and poorer prognosis.

Results of this study provide no clear evidence for interactions between ELF and chemical exposures from an epidemiological perspective. Results of experimental studies examining potential co-carcinogenic effects of ELF with other chemical and physical agents are reviewed elsewhere.<sup>47-49</sup> The Scientific Committee on Emerging and Newly Identified Health Risks concluded that results from the limited number of experimental studies of co-exposure, both in vivo and in vitro, are inconsistent and difficult to compare due to a range of divergent protocols used.<sup>48</sup>

In conclusion, this large-scale, population-based study provides no clear evidence for interactions between occupational ELF and chemical exposures in relation to glioma or meningioma risk. Further research with more refined estimates of occupational exposures is recommended. Additionally, only potential interactions with occupational ELF were examined here. It may also be worthwhile to examine interactions with other electromagnetic frequency bands including occupational exposure to radiofrequency fields (RF). The recent International Agency for Research on Cancer monograph on the carcinogenicity of RF noted increased cancer risk in experimental animals in four of six included co-carcinogenicity studies, although there were questions in some studies regarding the experimental model used, the study design and in reporting.<sup>50</sup> Future examination of interactions between different types of electromagnetic frequency fields, including RF, intermediate frequency and ELF, may also be useful.<sup>48</sup>

#### Author affiliations

<sup>1</sup>Barcelona Institute for Global Health (ISGlobal), Barcelona, Spain

<sup>2</sup>Universitat Pompeu Fabra (UPF), Barcelona, Spain

<sup>3</sup>CIBER Epidemiología y Salud Pública (CIBERESP), Madrid, Spain

<sup>4</sup>McLaughlin Centre for Population Health Risk Assessment, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Canada

<sup>5</sup>Monash University, Melbourne, Australia

<sup>6</sup>National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, Cincinnati, OH, USA

<sup>7</sup>University of Leeds, Leeds, UK

<sup>8</sup>Université de Lyon, Université Lyon 1/IFSTTAR, Unité Mixte de Recherche Epidémiologique Transport Travail Environnement, Lyon, France

<sup>9</sup>Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR, USA

<sup>10</sup>School of Epidemiology, Public Health and Disease Prevention, Faculty of Medicine, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Canada

<sup>11</sup>Massey University, Wellington, New Zealand

<sup>12</sup>INRS-Institut Armand-Frappier, Université du Québec, Laval, Canada

<sup>13</sup>University of Montreal Hospital Research Centre, Montreal, Canada

<sup>14</sup>The Cancer & Radiation Epidemiology Unit, The Gertner Institute, Chaim Sheba Medical Center, Ramat Gan, Israel

<sup>15</sup>Sackler Faculty of Medicine, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv, Israel

<sup>16</sup>Unit of Environmental Epidemiology, German Cancer Research Center, Heidelberg, Germany

<sup>17</sup>International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC), Section of Environment and Radiation, Lyon, France

<sup>18</sup>Institute of Occupational Medicine, Edinburgh, UK

**Correction notice** This paper has been amended since it was published Online First. Owing to a scripting error, some of the publisher names in the references were replaced with 'BMJ Publishing Group'. This only affected the full text version, not the PDF. We have since corrected these errors and the correct publishers have been inserted into the references.

**Acknowledgements** The authors would like to thank Rodrigo Villegas of CREAL for conducting preliminary analyses of ELF data and Avital Jarus-Hakak (Israel), Louise Nadon (Canada), Hélène Tardy (France), Florence Samkange-Zeeb (Germany) and Anne Sleenwenhoek (UK), who coded the occupations or assisted in the data clean-up. We are grateful to Mary McBride (Canada) and Drs Bruce Armstrong (Australia), Maria Blettner (Germany), Alistair Woodward (New Zealand) and Patricia McKinney (UK) for the use of the occupational data from their INTERPHONE study centres for the INTEROCC project, as well as Michael Kelsh (USA), Kjell Hansson Mild (Sweden) and Michael Yost (USA) who provided expert judgments of ELF for some job titles.

**Contributors** Study conception and design: MCT and EC. Acquisition of data: GB, SF, MH, DK, DM, MEP, LR, SS, KS, BS, JoS and JaS. Exposure assessment: JDB, JF, LK and MVT. Statistical analysis: MCT. Drafting of manuscript: MCT. All authors participated in the interpretation of data and revision and approval of the manuscript.

**Funding** MCT was funded by a Government of Canada Banting Post doctoral Fellowship. The INTEROCC study was funded by the National Institutes for Health (NIH) Grant No 1R01CA124759 (PI E Cardis). Coding of the French occupational data was in part funded by AFSSET (Convention No ST-2005-004). The INTERPHONE study was supported by funding from the European Fifth Framework Program, 'Quality of Life and Management of Living Resources' (contract 100 QLK4-CT-1999901563) and the International Union against Cancer (IICC). The IICC received funds for this purpose from the Mobile Manufacturers'Forum and GSM Association. In Australia, funding was received from the Australian National Health and Medical Research Council (EME Grant 219129) with funds originally derived from mobile phone service license fees; a University of Sydney Medical Foundation Program; the Cancer Council NSW and The Cancer Council Victoria. In Canada funding was received from the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (project MOP-42525); the Canada Research Chair programme; the Guzzo-CRS Chair in Environment and Cancer; the Fonds de la recherche en santé du Québec; the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR), the latter including partial support from the Canadian Wireless Telecommunications Association; the NSERC Chair in Risk Science at the University of Ottawa. In France, funding was received by l'Association pour la Recherche sur le Cancer (ARC) (ContratN85142) and three network operators (Orange, SFR, Bouygues Telecom). In Germany, funding was received from the German Mobile Phone Research Program (Deutsches Mobilfunkforschungsprogramm) of the German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nuclear Safety, and Nature Protection; the Ministry for the Environment and Traffic of the state of Baden-Württemberg; the Ministry for the Environment of the state of North Rhine-Westphalia; the MAIFOR Program (Mainzer Forschungsförderungsprogramm) of the University of Mainz. In New Zealand, funding was provided by the Health Research Council, Hawkes Bay Medical Research Foundation, the Wellington Medical Research Foundation, the Waikato Medical Research Foundation and the Cancer Society of New Zealand. Additional funding for the UK study was received from the Mobile Telecommunications, Health and Research (MTHR) programme, funding from the Health and Safety Executive, the Department of Health, the UK Network Operators (O2, Orange, T-Mobile, Vodafone, '3') and the Scottish Executive. All industry funding was governed by contracts guaranteeing the complete scientific independence of the investigators.

**Competing interests** MCT reports personal fees from ICF Incorporated, outside this work. DK reports to serving as Chief Risk Scientist and CEO at Risk Sciences International (<http://www.risksciences.com>), a Canadian company established in 2006 in partnership with the University of Ottawa conducting work in risk assessment, management and communication of health and environmental risks and their broader impacts on both public and private interests. He also holds an Industrial Research Chair in Risk Science under a peer-reviewed university-industry partnership programme administered by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada.

**Patient consent** Obtained.

**Ethics approval** Ethics approval was obtained from local research ethics boards, as well as from the Ethical Review Board of IARC (Lyon) for INTERPHONE and the Municipal Institute for Medical Investigation (IMIM) Barcelona for INTERPHONE and INTEROCC.

**Provenance and peer review** Not commissioned; externally peer reviewed.

© Article author(s) (or their employer(s) unless otherwise stated in the text of the article) 2017. All rights reserved. No commercial use is permitted unless otherwise expressly granted.

## REFERENCES

- Ostrom QT, Bauchet L, Davis FG, *et al.* Response to "the epidemiology of glioma in adults: a 'state of the science' review". *Neuro Oncol* 2015;17:896–913.
- Wiemels J, Wrensch M, Claus EB. Epidemiology and etiology of meningioma. *J Neurooncol* 2010;99:307–14.
- Khuder SA, Mutgi AB, Schaub EA. Meta-analyses of brain cancer and farming. *Am J Ind Med* 1998;34:252–60.
- McLaughlin JK, Mumma MT, Sonderman JS, *et al.* Cancer mortality among workers at a satellite manufacturing facility. *J Occup Environ Med* 2011;53:427–33.
- Park RM, Silverstein MA, Green MA, *et al.* Brain cancer mortality at a manufacturer of aerospace electromechanical systems. *Am J Ind Med* 1990;17:537–52.
- Andersson E, Nilsson R, Torén K. Gliomas among men employed in the Swedish pulp and paper industry. *Scand J Work Environ Health* 2002;28:333–40.
- Ruder AM, Waters MA, Carreón T, *et al.* The Upper Midwest Health Study: industry and occupation of glioma cases and controls. *Am J Ind Med* 2012;55:747–55.
- Kjaer TK, Hansen J. Cancer incidence among large cohort of female Danish registered nurses. *Scand J Work Environ Health* 2009;35:446–53.
- Gold LS, De Roos AJ, Ray RM, *et al.* Brain tumors and occupational exposures in a cohort of female textile workers in Shanghai, China. *Scand J Work Environ Health* 2006;32:178–84.
- De Roos AJ, Stewart PA, Linet MS, *et al.* Occupation and the risk of adult glioma in the United States. *Cancer Causes Control* 2003;14:139–50.
- Schlehofer B, Hettlinger I, Ryan P, *et al.* Occupational risk factors for low grade and high grade glioma: results from an international case control study of adult brain tumours. *Int J Cancer* 2005;113:116–25.
- Rajaraman P, De Roos AJ, Stewart PA, *et al.* Occupation and risk of meningioma and acoustic neuroma in the United States. *Am J Ind Med* 2004;45:395–407.
- Wesseling C, Pukkala E, Neuvonen K, *et al.* Cancer of the brain and nervous system and occupational exposures in Finnish women. *J Occup Environ Med* 2002;44:663–8.
- Navas-Acién A, Pollán M, Gustavsson P, *et al.* Occupation, exposure to chemicals and risk of gliomas and meningiomas in Sweden. *Am J Ind Med* 2002;42:214–27.
- Bhatti P, Stewart PA, Hutchinson A, *et al.* Lead exposure, polymorphisms in genes related to oxidative stress, and risk of adult brain tumors. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev* 2009;18:1841–8.
- Eisen EA, Bardin J, Gore R, *et al.* Exposure-response models based on extended follow-up of a cohort mortality study in the automobile industry. *Scand J Work Environ Health* 2001;27:240–9.
- Provost D, Cantagrel A, Lebailly P, *et al.* Brain tumours and exposure to pesticides: a case-control study in Southwestern France. *Occup Environ Med* 2007;64:509–14.
- Samanic CM, De Roos AJ, Stewart PA, *et al.* Occupational exposure to pesticides and risk of adult brain tumors. *Am J Epidemiol* 2008;167:976–85.
- Waggoner JK, Kullman GJ, Henneberger PK, *et al.* Mortality in the agricultural health study, 1993–2007. *Am J Epidemiol* 2011;173:71–83.
- Pan SY, Ugnat AM, Mao Y, *et al.* Occupational risk factors for brain cancer in Canada. *J Occup Environ Med* 2005;47:704–17.
- Bosetti C, McLaughlin JK, Tarone RE, *et al.* Formaldehyde and cancer risk: a quantitative review of cohort studies through 2006. *Ann Oncol* 2008;19:29–43.
- Boffetta P, Matisane L, Mundt KA, *et al.* Meta-analysis of studies of occupational exposure to vinyl chloride in relation to cancer mortality. *Scand J Work Environ Health* 2003;29:220–9.
- Kheifets L, Monroe J, Vergara X, *et al.* Occupational electromagnetic fields and leukemia and brain cancer: an update to two meta-analyses. *J Occup Environ Med* 2008;50:677–88.
- Coble JB, Dosemeci M, Stewart PA, *et al.* Occupational exposure to magnetic fields and the risk of brain tumors. *Neuro Oncol* 2009;11:242–9.
- Baldi I, Coureau G, Jaffré A, *et al.* Occupational and residential exposure to electromagnetic fields and risk of brain tumors in adults: a case-control study in Gironde, France. *Int J Cancer* 2011;129:1477–84.
- Koeman T, van den Brandt PA, Slotte P, *et al.* Occupational extremely low-frequency magnetic field exposure and selected cancer outcomes in a prospective Dutch cohort. *Cancer Causes Control* 2014;25:203–14.
- Sorahan T. Magnetic fields and brain tumour risks in UK electricity supply workers. *Occup Med* 2014;64:157–65.
- Turner MC, Benke G, Bowman JD, *et al.* Occupational exposure to extremely low-frequency magnetic fields and brain tumor risks in the INTEROCC study. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev* 2014;23:1863–72.
- Lacourt A, Cardis E, Pintos J, *et al.* INTEROCC case-control study: lack of association between glioma tumors and occupational exposure to selected combustion products, dusts and other chemical agents. *BMC Public Health* 2013;13:340.
- McLean D, Fleming S, Turner MC, *et al.* Occupational solvent exposure and risk of meningioma: results from the INTEROCC multicentre case-control study. *Occup Environ Med* 2014;71:253–8.
- Sadetzki S, Chetrit A, Turner MC, *et al.* Occupational exposure to metals and risk of meningioma: a multinational case-control study. *J Neurooncol* 2016;130:505–15.
- Navas-Acién A, Pollán M, Gustavsson P, *et al.* Interactive effect of chemical substances and occupational electromagnetic field exposure on the risk of gliomas and meningiomas in Swedish men. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev* 2002;11:1678–83.
- Cardis E, Richardson L, Deltour I, *et al.* The INTERPHONE study: design, epidemiological methods, and description of the study population. *Eur J Epidemiol* 2007;22:647–64.
- Cardis E, Armstrong BK, Bowman JD, *et al.* Risk of brain tumours in relation to estimated RF dose from mobile phones: results from five interphone countries. *Occup Environ Med* 2011;68:631–40.
- Bowman JD, Touchstone JA, Yost MG. A population-based job exposure matrix for power-frequency magnetic fields. *J Occup Environ Hyg* 2007;4:715–28.
- ELFJEM. Available from: <http://www.crealradiation.com/index.php/en/databases?id=55>. accessed 31 May 2015.
- Oraby T, Sivaganesan S, Bowman JD, *et al.* Berkson error adjustment and other exposure surrogates in occupational case-control studies, with application to the Canadian INTEROCC study. *J Expo Sci Environ Epidemiol* 2017. Epub ahead of print.
- van Tongeren M, Kincl L, Richardson L, *et al.* Assessing occupational exposure to chemicals in an international epidemiological study of brain tumours. *Ann Occup Hyg* 2013;57:610–26.
- Lavoué J, Pintos J, Van Tongeren M, *et al.* Comparison of exposure estimates in the Finnish job-exposure matrix FINJEM with a JEM derived from expert assessments performed in Montreal. *Occup Environ Med* 2012;69:465–71.
- Greenland S, Rothman KJ, Lash TL. Concepts of interaction. In: Greenland S, Rothman KJ, Lash TL, eds. *Modern Epidemiology*. 3rd edn. Philadelphia: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins, 2008:71–83.
- Zou GY. On the estimation of additive interaction by use of the four-by-two table and beyond. *Am J Epidemiol* 2008;168:212–24.
- SAS. Version 9.3. Cary, NC: SAS Institute, Inc. 2010.
- Bhatti P, Stewart PA, Linet MS, *et al.* Comparison of occupational exposure assessment methods in a case-control study of lead, genetic susceptibility and risk of adult brain tumours. *Occup Environ Med* 2011;68:4–9.
- Vila J, Bowman JD, Richardson L, *et al.* A source-based measurement database for occupational exposure assessment of electromagnetic fields in the INTEROCC study: a literature review approach. *Ann Occup Hyg* 2016;60:184–204.
- Vila J, Bowman JD, Figuerola J, *et al.* Development of a source-exposure matrix for occupational exposure assessment of electromagnetic fields in the INTEROCC study. *J Expo Sci Environ Epidemiol* 2016. Epub ahead of print.
- Wigertz A, Lönn S, Hall P, *et al.* Non-participant characteristics and the association between socioeconomic factors and brain tumour risk. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2010;64:736–43.
- Juutilainen J. Do electromagnetic fields enhance the effects of environmental carcinogens? *Radiat Prot Dosimetry* 2008;132:228–31.
- SCENIHR Scientific Committee on Emerging and Newly Identified Health Risks. Potential health effects of exposure to electromagnetic fields. 2015 [http://ec.europa.eu/health/scientific\\_committees/emerging/docs/scenih\\_r\\_o\\_041.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/health/scientific_committees/emerging/docs/scenih_r_o_041.pdf) (accessed 13 Feb 2017).
- Poullietier de Gannes F, Lagroye I, Veyret B. D3 – Report on the analysis of risks associated to exposure to EMF: in vitro and in vivo (animals) studies. 2010. European Health Risk Assessment Network on Electromagnetic Fields Exposure. Available from: [http://efhran.polimi.it/docs/IMS-EFHRAN\\_09072010.pdf](http://efhran.polimi.it/docs/IMS-EFHRAN_09072010.pdf) (accessed 30 Jun 2014).
- International Agency for Research on Cancer. *Non-ionizing radiation, Part II: radiofrequency electromagnetic fields*. IARC. Lyon, France, 2013.



## Interactions between occupational exposure to extremely low frequency magnetic fields and chemicals for brain tumour risk in the INTEROCC study

Michelle C Turner, Geza Benke, Joseph D Bowman, Jordi Figuerola, Sarah Fleming, Martine Hours, Laurel Kincl, Daniel Krewski, Dave McLean, Marie-Elise Parent, Lesley Richardson, Siegal Sadetzki, Klaus Schläefer, Brigitte Schlehofer, Joachim Schüz, Jack Siemiatycki, Martie van Tongeren and Elisabeth Cardis

*Occup Environ Med* 2017 74: 802-809 originally published online June 9, 2017

doi: 10.1136/oemed-2016-104080

---

Updated information and services can be found at:

<http://oem.bmj.com/content/74/11/802>

---

*These include:*

### References

This article cites 42 articles, 9 of which you can access for free at:

<http://oem.bmj.com/content/74/11/802#BIBL>

### Email alerting service

Receive free email alerts when new articles cite this article. Sign up in the box at the top right corner of the online article.

---

### Notes

---

To request permissions go to:

<http://group.bmj.com/group/rights-licensing/permissions>

To order reprints go to:

<http://journals.bmj.com/cgi/reprintform>

To subscribe to BMJ go to:

<http://group.bmj.com/subscribe/>