

ehp

Environmental Health

P E R S P E C T I V E S

Published by the National Institute of
Environmental Health Sciences

ehponline.org

Dioxin revisited: developments since the 1997
IARC classification of dioxin as a human
carcinogen

Steenland K, Bertazzi P, Baccarelli A, and Kogevinas M
doi:10.1289/ehp.7219 (available at <http://dx.doi.org/>)
Online 10 June 2004



The National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences
National Institutes of Health
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services

Steenland K, Bertazzi P, Baccarelli A, Kogevinas M, Dioxin revisited: developments since the 1997 IARC classification of dioxin as a human carcinogen

¹ 1518 Clifton Rd, Rollins School of Public Health, Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia 30306 (corresponding author), email nsteenl@sph.emory.edu, phone 404 712 8277, FAX 404 727 8744

² Department of Occupational and Environmental Health, EPOCA Research Center for Occupational, Clinical, and Environmental Epidemiology, University of Milan, Milan, Italy

³ Respiratory and Environmental Health Research Unit, Municipal Institute of Medical Research (IMIM), Barcelona, Spain

running head: dioxin revisited

key words: dioxin, TCDD, carcinogen

word count: 2624 (excluding title, abstract, tables, references)

June 2, 2004

Abbreviations

2,3,7,8-TCDD (also simply TCDD)	tetrachlorodibenzo-para-dioxin
IARC	International Agency for Research on Cancer
AhR	Aryl-hydrocarbon Receptor
JEM	Job-exposure matrix
NIOSH	National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health
BMI	body mass index
RR	rate ratio
CI	confidence interval
WHO	World Health Organization
ARNT	aromatic hydrocarbon nuclear translocator
RIP	receptor interacting protein
AIP	AhR interacting protein
SMR	Standardized mortality ratio

XAP2, Rb protein, P450a, CYP1A, HIF-1B, RelA NF-kb subunit, SRC-1, p23 refer to genes and have no corresponding text

Abstract

In 1997 the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) classified 2,3,7,8-TCDD (tetrachlorodibenzo-*para*-dioxin, the most potent dioxin congener, hereafter referred to as simply TCDD) as a Group 1 carcinogen based on limited evidence in humans, sufficient evidence in experimental animals, and extensive mechanistic information indicating that TCDD acts through a mechanism involving the Ah receptor which is present in both humans and animals. The judgment of limited evidence in humans was based primarily on an elevation of all cancers combined in four industrial cohorts. The Class 1 classification has been somewhat controversial, and has been challenged in the literature in recent years. Here we review the epidemiologic and mechanistic evidence which has emerged since 1997. New epidemiologic evidence consists primarily of positive exposure-response analyses in several of the industrial cohorts, as well as evidence of excesses from several specific cancers in the Seveso accident cohort. There are also new data regarding how the Ah receptor functions in mediating the carcinogenic response to TCDD. We conclude that the new evidence generally supports the 1997 IARC classification.

The 1997 IARC evaluation

In 1997 IARC classified TCDD (tetrachlorodibenzo-*para*-dioxin, the most potent dioxin congener) as a Group 1 carcinogen based on limited evidence in humans, sufficient evidence in animals, and extensive mechanistic information indicating that TCDD acts through a mechanism involving the Aryl-hydrocarbon Receptor (AhR) which is present in both humans and animals. The 1997 IARC evaluation updated an older, obsolete, evaluation that had classified TCDD as a 2B (possible) human carcinogen. IARC's criteria for 'limited' for the epidemiologic studies requires that a causal interpretation is "credible", but that chance, bias, or confounding cannot be ruled out as the source of the observed association. TCDD was unprecedented in that it was judged to cause an increase in cancers at all sites rather than a few specific sites. This judgment was supported both by the epidemiologic and animal data. In animals there were no "hallmark" sites that were elevated, instead different tumor sites were elevated in different species in different studies. Furthermore tissue concentrations were similar both in heavily exposed human populations in which increased overall cancer risk was observed, and in rats exposed to carcinogenic dosage regimen in bioassays. At the 1997 IARC meeting there was consensus that the epidemiological evidence was at least "limited", with some consideration that it was "sufficient". The main discussion and division of opinions concerned the use of mechanistic data to interpret cancer risk in humans.

In 1997 the epidemiologic evidence consisted of studies of 1) several industrial cohorts of chemical workers producing chlorophenol and phenoxyherbicides, 2) cohorts of civilian or military pesticide applicators, 3) the Seveso accident cohort, and 4) numerous community based studies. The IARC Working Group on dioxins summarized all the available data, but based the

epidemiologic evaluation on studies of four highly exposed sub-cohorts within the industrial cohorts, and on the Seveso cohort. The main criteria for relying on these studies were principally two: the cohorts included subjects with clearly higher levels than background, and exposure was well characterized. The four industrial cohorts are listed in Table 1. Table 1 gives the definition of the sub-cohort and its all cancer mortality in reference to external populations. Exposure information is also given in Table 1, in terms of parts per trillion (ppt) in serum. To put this in context, the general population has serum levels of approximately 5 ppt or lower; levels have been gradually decreasing in recent decades (Alyward and Hays 2002, IARC 1997, Schechter et al. 2003). The four industrial sub-cohorts were consistent in showing significant though moderate elevations of cancer mortality. When the data were combined, the SMR for all four sub-cohorts was 1.40 (95% CI 1.1-1.7). An exposure-response analysis was available in 1997 for two of the four cohorts (Flesch-Janys et al. 1995, Ott and Zober 1996), and both these analyses showed a significant positive exposure-response for all cancers. Confounding by smoking or by other chemicals was judged to be unlikely to explain the observed consistent all cancer excess.

Evidence published after 1997

1. New exposure-response analyses

Since the 1997 IARC monograph on dioxins, there have been several new exposure-response analyses using the industrial cohorts (Table 1). These analyses have used similar techniques to develop estimates of serum TCDD levels for all workers in the cohort.

Using a newly developed job-exposure matrix (JEM)(Piacitalli et al. 2000), Steenland et al. (1999) analyzed exposure-response analysis in the US NIOSH (National Institute for Occupational Safety

and Health) cohort using cumulative exposure scores. The JEM was based on knowledge of the amount of TCDD contamination in the chemicals produced in each of eight plants in the study, knowledge of plant processes over time, and knowledge of what the job of each worker was across time. Each job in each plant was assigned an exposure score by the JEM. The exposure score represented a relative ranking of exposure for each worker. The rate ratios for all cancers (mortality) by septile of cumulative exposure score (15 year lag) were 1.00, 1.00, 1.29, 1.38, 1.43, 1.88, and 1.76 (p trend<0.001). These same investigators used data on exposure scores and serum level, which were available for 170 workers, to determine the relationship between exposure score and serum level. This enabled assignment of estimated serum level, based on the exposure score, for all workers (n=3,538) in the study (Steenland et al. 2001). Analyses by septile of estimated cumulative serum level resulted in rate ratios for all cancers of 1.00, 1.26, 1.02, 1.43, 1.46, 1.82, 1.62 (p trend=0.003).

Additional analyses of the Dutch cohort (Hooiveld et al. 1998) used a similar approach. Serum TCDD levels from 144 workers were used to build a model to predict serum levels based on duration of exposure, exposure during an accident, and exposure before 1970. Predicted serum TCDD values from the model were assigned to the whole cohort of 1,031 workers. Workers were then classified as low, medium, and high-exposed based on predicted serum TCDD values. Medium and high-exposed worker had significant 5-fold increases in cancer mortality compared to workers at the same plant with low dioxin exposure.

Becher et al. (1998) and Flesch-Janys et al. (1998) used a similar approach to further analyze a German cohort in detailed exposure-response analyses. TCDD levels from a sample of 275

workers were used to construct a model based on job, age, and body mass index (BMI). This model predicted TCDD values over time for all 1,189 members of the cohort. These authors then used these data to estimate time-dependent cumulative exposure to TCDD in the serum for each cohort member. Prior analyses had been restricted to a fixed estimate of serum TCDD at the end of exposure. Rate ratios for all cancer mortality by categorized ppt-years of TCDD were 1.00, 1.12, 1.42, 1.77, 1.63, and 2.19 (p trend=0.03)(Becher et al. 1998).

Crump et al. (2003) have conducted a meta-analysis of three of these cohorts (Flesch-Janys 1998, Steenland et al. 1999, Ott and Zober 1996) and found a positive and significant exposure-response trend for all cancers. Crump et al also showed that the slope of the dose response was not dependent on the pattern of the risk in heavily exposed workers and that, by contrast, the slope was slightly steeper at lower doses.

Harking back to Bradford-Hill, positive exposure-response analyses are important in supporting the assessment of causality. Furthermore the dose-response analyses are internal comparisons among workers, and are unlikely to be affected by confounding from occupational, lifestyle, or other factors related to socio-economic status. These positive exposure-response analyses for TCDD since the 1997 IARC classification strengthen the decision by IARC to label TCDD a human carcinogen.

2. New results from Seveso

Besides the new exposure-response findings, there has been new information from the Seveso cohort, which was exposed during an accident in Italy in 1976 (Bertazzi and DiDomenico 2003).

This cohort was exposed at one time to quite high levels of TCDD. People in Zone A (the most highly exposed zone), had a median serum TCDD levels of 72 ppt in 1992-1993 (back extrapolated level to 1976, 379 ppt). In Seveso exposure to nearly “pure” TCDD was well documented and affected all ages and both sexes. The exposed and reference populations both lived in a fairly homogeneous area and shared environmental, occupational, social and cultural features. The limitations of the cohort are that there are a relatively small number of highly exposed subjects, and that there has been a relatively short duration of follow-up. However, recent data have shown significant cancer excesses which were not previously evident in this cohort

Among those with relatively high exposure at Seveso (zones A+B), all-cancer mortality in the 20-year post-accident period, and all-cancer incidence in the 15-year post-accident period, failed to exhibit significant departures from the expected (Bertazzi et al. 2001, Pesatori et al. 2003). Among men, however, after 20-years of follow-up, both all-cancer (166 deaths) and lung cancer mortality (57 deaths) tended to be higher than expected (RR=1.1, 95% CI 1.0-1.3, and RR=1.3; 95% CI 1.0-1.7, respectively). Furthermore, some specific cancer sites were significantly elevated.

Lymphopoietic neoplasms were significantly increased in mortality (20 years, RR=1.7, 95% CI 1.2-2.5) and morbidity (15 years latency, RR=1.8, 95% CI 1.2-2.6) analyses, consistent in both genders. Furthermore, there was an increase in rectal cancer mortality in men (RR=2.4; 95% CI 1.2-4.6); a corresponding increase was seen for incidence. Among women liver cancer incidence was elevated in the 15-year post-accident period (RR=2.4; 95%CI 1.1-5.1). Finally, in a separate analysis of 981 women in Zone A who had stored serum, breast cancer incidence was significantly related to serum TCDD levels (a 2 fold increase for a 10-fold increased in serum TCDD), based on a limited number of cases(n=15)(Warner et al. 2002).

3. Other new studies

Another cohort with well documented exposure, based on serum TCDD levels, is the Ranch Hand cohort of Air Force personnel who sprayed Agent Orange in Vietnam. This cohort was not exposed to TCDD at the high levels of the industrial cohorts, but nonetheless was exposed to levels considerably beyond background. For example, the mean serum TCDD level in the mid-1980s was 46 ppt (geometric mean 15), compared to a mean of 233 ppt among the NIOSH cohort in the late 1980s. Until recently the Ranch Hand cohort had not shown any cancer excesses, and the number of cancers was small. While there is still no overall cancer excess (SIR 1.07), in the most recent update (through 1999) of this cohort, Akhtar et al. (2004) found a significant excess of melanoma (SIR 2.57 (95% CI 1.52-4.09) when comparing Ranch Hand personnel to the general population (16 cases)). This excess did not appear among other Air Force personnel who were also in S.E. Asia in the 1960s but did not spray Agent Orange. Furthermore, there appeared to be an exposure-response trend, using several different measures of exposure. There were also excesses of prostate cancer incidence, but these occurred in both exposed and nonexposed Air Force personnel and may have been due to increased cancer surveillance in both groups; both are subject to intense medical follow-up.

Other dioxin studies published since 1997 include a study of the Army Chemical Corps veterans who did or did not serve in Vietnam (Dalager et al. 1997), and an update of a sub-cohort contained within the NIOSH cohort (Bodner et al. 2003). The studies are largely uninformative because the numbers are quite small or because exposure is uncertain (Army Chemical Corps).

Dioxin risk assessments

A separate issue is whether the findings that high levels of TCDD exposure lead to cancer has relevance for those exposed at low doses, ie, the general public. The classification of TCDD as a human carcinogen in 1997 strengthened the pressure to lower human exposure and was followed by subsequent WHO risk assessments that lowered considerably the accepted tolerable daily intake (TDI) from previously set limits (WHO 1998, WHO 2001). There have also been several cancer risk assessment efforts to date (Becher et al. 2000, Steenland et al. 2001, Crump et al. 2003, Starr 2001, EPA 2000) using data on the high exposure industrial cohorts to estimate risk at low doses. It should be noted that some of the high exposure cohorts did have a fair number of low-exposed subjects, so that the usual problem of extrapolating findings from high dose to low dose is not as pronounced as for some other agents for which risk assessment has been based on occupational cohorts. Nearly all these assessments concur in showing an appreciable excess risk of cancer due to relatively small increases above background levels. In the general population such increases would be due to increased TCDD in the diet.

New evidence on the Ah receptor

Apart from new epidemiological data since 1997, there are also new experimental studies (some of them used in the recent WHO risk assessments) and advances in the understanding of mechanisms of action of dioxins, particularly concerning the AhR. The AhR is a nuclear receptor and transcription factor. In presence of TCDD, it forms an active heterodimer with the aromatic hydrocarbon nuclear translocator (ARNT/HIF-1 β) and induces (or suppresses) the transcription of numerous genes, including P4501A1 (CYP1A1)(Whitlock 1999). In the last few years, additional components of the AhR complex have been identified, including the AhR repressor (AhRR), AhR

interacting protein (AIP, also known as XAP2), Rb protein, receptor interacting protein 140 (RIP140), SRC-1, p23, and the RelA NF- κ B subunit (Petrucci and Perdev 2002, Kumar and Perdev 1999, Mimura 1999, Carlson and Perdev 2002). Molecular mechanisms occurring downstream of AhR and possibly associated with cancer development, such as changes in cytosolic signaling proteins, calcium mobilization, tumor suppressor proteins, growth factors, oncogene or cell cycle proteins have been characterized (Enan 1998, Carlson and Perdev 2002, Matsumura 2003).

Recently, molecular epidemiology investigations have been conducted on a random samples of the Seveso population highly exposed to TCDD (zone A+B) and of the reference non-contaminated area (non-ABR) to evaluate how TCDD exposure impacts upon the AhR pathway in human subjects *in vivo* (Landi et al. 2003, Baccarelli et al. 2004). Because of the extremely long biological half-life of TCDD, plasma TCDD levels were still substantially elevated in the exposed subjects, particularly in females and older subjects (Landi et al. 1997). Experimental studies indicate that, after a transient increase, cellular levels of AhR decrease following TCDD binding (Pollenz et al. 2002). Nearly 20 years after the Seveso accident, the levels of AhR transcripts, measured in uncultured peripheral blood lymphocytes, were decreased in the exposed subjects and negatively correlated with current plasma TCDD levels (Landi et al. 2003). These results show that TCDD exposure causes a persistent alteration of the AhR pathway in human subjects and are consistent with down-regulation of this receptor, comparable to that observed in several other receptor-mediated systems (Pollenz 2002). The impact on the health of exposed individuals of the persistent decrease of AhR transcripts, which in turn may affect any AhR-regulated biological function, is to be clarified. Down-regulation tends to decrease the amount of receptor available for

ligand binding and to attenuate the resulting biological responses. Thus, the AhR, as most receptor systems, may have high initial sensitivity to the ligand, while, in the presence of high amounts of TCDD, down-regulation would buffer against excessive ligand-induced responses. High initial levels of exposure, rather than low persisting exposures, may be associated with the highest effects. In the industrial cohorts, cumulative exposure predicts cancer excess. However, it is likely that cumulative and peak exposures are highly correlated among industrial workers. The new evidence from animal studies and on the AhR should be used to refine quantitative risk assessment of TCDD and could modify estimates on tolerable intake in humans. This evidence put together, supports the approach taken by IARC to consider the animal and mechanistic data in the evaluation of carcinogenicity of these compounds in humans.

Conclusion

The IARC classification of TCDD as a Group 1 carcinogen has stirred some controversy. For example, Cole et al. (2003) argue that the original IARC 1997 classification of epidemiologic evidence for TCDD as “limited” was incorrect, claiming that “inadequate” would have been more appropriate (ie, a causal interpretation was not “credible”). However, these authors ignore the original IARC focus on high exposure sub-cohorts, ignore the positive exposure-response analyses, and raise the issue of possible confounding by smoking and other chemical carcinogens without any serious consideration of whether such possible confounding is likely, or whether it could account for the observed elevation of all cancer mortality in those with higher TCDD exposure.

In our view the epidemiologic and toxicologic evidence since the IARC 1997 classification of TCDD as a human carcinogen has strengthened the case for IARC’s decision. Furthermore, the

dose-response assessments for TCDD and cancer indicate that TCDD exposure levels close to those in the general population may be carcinogenic, and, and argue for caution in setting the upper ranges of long-term permissible exposure to dioxins.

References

Akhtar F, Garabrant D, Ketchum N, Michalek J. 2004. Cancer in US Air Force Veterans of the Vietnam war. *J Occup Env Med* 46:123-136.

Aylward L, Hays S. 2002. Temporal trends in human TCDD body burden: Decreases over three decades and implications for exposure levels. *J Expo Anal Environ Epidemiol* 12:319-328.

Baccarelli A, Pesatori A, Master S, Patterson D, Needham L, Mocarelli P et al.. 2004. Aryl-hydrocarbon receptor-dependent pathway and toxic effects of TCDD in humans: a population-based study in Seveso, Italy. *Toxicology Lett* 149: 287-293.

Becher H, Flesch-Janys D, Kauppinen T, Kogevians M, Steindorf K, Manz A, et al.. 1996. Cancer mortality in German male workers exposed to phenoxy herbicides and dioxins. *Cancer Causes Control* 7:302-304.

Becher H, Steindorf K, Flesch-Janys D. 1998. Quantitative cancer risk assessment for dioxins using an occupational cohort. *Environ Health Perspect* 106(suppl 2), 663-670.

Bertazzi P, Consonni D, Bachetti S, Rubagotti M, Baccarelli A, Zocchetti C et al.. 2001. Health effects of dioxin exposure: a 20-year mortality study. *Am J Epidemiol*. 153:1031-44.

Bertazzi P, Di Domenico A. 2003. Health consequences of the Seveso, Italy, accident. In: A. Schecter & TA Gasiewicz eds. *Dioxins and Health*. John Wiley and Sons, Inc, NJ: 827-853.

Bodner K, Collins J, Bloemen L, Carson M. 2003. Cancer risk for chemical workers exposed to 2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin. *Occup Environ Med* 60: 672-5.

Carlson D, Perdew G. 2002. A dynamic role for the Ah receptor in cell signaling? Insights from a diverse group of Ah receptor interacting proteins. *J Biochem Mol Toxicol* 16:317-25.

Cole P, Trichopoulos D, Pastides H, Starr T, Mandel J. 2003. Dioxin and cancer: a critical review. *Reg Tox Pharmacol* 38:378-388.

Crump K, Canady R, Kogevinas M. 2002. Meta-analysis of dioxin cancer dose response for 3 occupational cohorts. *Env Health Perspect* 111: 681-687

Enan E, El-Sabeawy F, Scott M, Overstreet J, Lasley B. 1998. Alterations in the growth factor signal transduction pathways and modulators of the cell cycle in endocervical cells from macaques exposed to TCDD. *Toxicol Appl Pharmacol* 151:283-93.

Fingerhut M, Halperin W, Marlow D, Piacitelli L, Honchar P, Sweeney M et al.. 1991, Cancer mortality in workers exposed to 2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin. *N Engl J Med* 324:212-8.

Flesch-Janys D, Steindorf K, Gern P, Becher H. 1996. Estimation of cumulated exposure to dioxins/furans and SMR analysis of by dose in an occupational exposed cohort. *Environ Health Perspect* 106(suppl 2): 655-662.

Flesch-Janys D, Berger J, Gurn P, Manz A, Nagel S, Waltsgott et al.. 1995. Exposure to PCDD/F and mortality in a cohort of workers from a herbicide-producing plant in Hamburg Germany. *Am J Epidemiol* 142:1165-1175.

Hooiveld M, Heederik D, Kogevinas M, Boffetta P, Needham L, Patterson D et al.. 1998. Bueno-de-Mesquita H, Second follow-up of a Dutch cohort occupationally exposed to phenoxy herbicide, chlorophenols, and contaminants. *Am J Epidemiol* 147:891-901.

Hooiveld M, Heederik D, Bueno de Mesquita H. 1996. Preliminary results of the second follow-up of a Dutch cohort of workers occupationally exposed to phenoxy herbicides. *Organohalogen Compounds* 30:185-189.

International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC). 1997. Monographs on the Evaluation of Carcinogenic Risks to Humans, Vol. 69, Polychlorinated dibenzo-*para*-dioxins and polychlorinated dibenzofurans, Lyon, IARC

Kumar M and Perdew G. 1999. Nuclear receptor coactivator SRC-1 interacts with the Q-rich subdomain of the AhR and modulates its transactivation potential. *Gene Expr* 8:273-86.

Landi M, Bertazzi P, Baccarelli A, Consonni D, Masten S, Lucier G et al.. 2003. TCDD-mediated alterations in the AhR-dependent pathway in Seveso, Italy 20 years after the accident. *Carcinogenesis* 24:673-680.

Landi M, Needham L, Lucier G, Mocarelli P, Bertazzi P, Caporaso N. 1997. Concentrations of dioxin 20 years after Seveso (letter). *Lancet* 1997;349: 1811

Matsumura F. 2003. On the significance of the role of cellular stress response reactions in the toxic actions of dioxin, *Biochem Pharmacol*;66:527-40

Mimura J, Ema M, Sogawa K, Fujii-Kuriyama Y. 1999. Identification of a novel mechanism of regulation of Ah (dioxin) receptor function. *Genes Dev* 13:20-5

Ott M and Zober A.1996. Cause-specific mortality and cancer incidence among employees exposed to 2,3,7,8-TCDD after a 1953 reactor accident. *Occup Environ Med* 53: 606-612.

Pesatori A, Consonni D, Bachetti S, Zocchetti C, Bonzini M, Baccarelli A, et al.. 2003.. Short and long-term morbidity and mortality in the population exposed to dioxin after the "Seveso accident". *Ind Health* 41:127-38.

Petrulis J, Perdew G. 2002. The role of chaperone proteins in the aryl hydrocarbon receptor core complex. *Chem Biol Interact* 141:25-40.

Piacitelli L, Marlow D, Fingerhut M, Steenland K, Sweeney M. 2000. A retrospective job exposure matrix for estimating exposure to 2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin. *Am J Ind Med* 38:28-39.

Pollenz R. 2002. The mechanism of AH receptor protein down-regulation (degradation) and its impact on AH receptor-mediated gene regulation. *Chem Biol Interact* 141:41-61.

Schechter A, Pöpke O, Pavuk M, Tobey R. 2003. Exposure assessment: measurement of dioxins and related chemicals in human tissues. In: A Schechter & TA Gasiewicz eds. *Dioxins and Health*. John Wiley and Sons, Inc: 629-678.

Steenland K, Piacitelli L, Deddens J, Fingerhut M, Chang L. 1999. Cancer, heart disease, and diabetes in workers exposed to 2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin (TCDD): an update and exposure-response analysis of the NIOSH TCDD cohort. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 91: 779-786.

Steenland K, Deddens J, Piacitelli L. 2001. Risk assessment for 2,3,7,8-p-dioxin (TCDD) based on an epidemiologic study. *Am J Epidemiol* 451-458.

Starr T. 2003. Significant shortcomings of the US EPA latest draft risk characterization for dioxin-like compounds, *Toxicological Sciences* 111: 1443-1447.

U.S. EPA (Environmental Protection Agency). 2000. Health assessment of 2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin (TCDD) and related compounds. Draft 9/18/2000, www.cfpub.epa.gov/ncea/ (accessed 6.2.04, Kyle Steenland, Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia).

Warner M, Eskenazi B, Mocarelli P, Gerthoux P, Samuels S, Needham L et al.. 2002. Serum dioxin concentrations and breast cancer risk in the Seveso Women's Health Study. *Environ Health Perspect* 110:625-8.

Whitlock P. 1999. Induction of cytochrome P4501A1. *Annu Rev Pharmacol. Toxicol* 39:103–125.

WHO (World Health Organization). 1998. Assessment of the health risk of dioxins: re-evaluation of the Tolerable Daily Intake (TDI). <http://www.who.int/pcs/docs/dioxin-exec-sum/exe-sum-final.doc> (accessed 6.2.04, Kyle Steenland, Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia).

WHO (World Health Organization). 2001. PCDDs, PCDFs, and coplanar PCBs, Safety evaluation of certain food additives and contaminants, WHO Food Additive Series. www.inchem.org/documents/jecfa/jecmono/v48je20.htm#1.0 (accessed 6.2.04, Kyle Steenland, Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia).

Table 1. Four industrial sub-cohorts which served as a basis for 1997 IARC TCDD determination
(post 1997 findings in bold)

Study originally Available to IARC in 1997 ^a	SMR cancer and definition of sub-cohort	# cancer deaths	Estimated TCDD at end of exposure ^b	Exposure-Response data for TCDD (new data in bold)
Fingerhut et al 1987	1.5 (1.2-1.8), >1 year exp, 20 yrs latency (59% of cohort)	114	Mean 418 ppt (n=119)	Positive significant trend (p<0.001, p=0.003) in Steenland et al. 1999 and Steenland et al. 2001, based on job-exposure matrix and serum levels
Becher et al. 1996	1.3 (1.0-1.5), workers in 2 plants with documented chloracne and high serum TCDD levels	105	Mean 141 ppt (n=190, plant 1) and mean 402 ppt (n=20, plant 2)	Positive significant trend (p<0.01) in Flesch-Janys et al. 1995, in Flesch-Janys et al. 1998 (p=0.01), and in Becher et al.1998 (p=0.03), based on job-exposure matrix and serum levels
Hooiveld et al. 1996	1.5 (1.3-1.9), workers in Plant A, more highly exposed plant (n=549)	51	Geometric mean 286 ppt (n=48)	Medium and high groups elevated (RRs 4.7, 4.1) vs. low (Hooiveld et al. 1998), based on work history and serum levels
Ott and Zober 1996	1.9 (1.1-3.0), chloracne and 20+ years latency (n=113)	18	Geometric mean 400 ppt (n=138),	Positive significant trend (p=0.05) in original 1996. publication, based on body burden

^a Table 38, IARC 1997

^b Table 22, IARC 1997

SMR=standardized mortality ratio

IARC=International Agency for Research on Cancer

NIOSH=National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health