Biological aging measures based on blood DNA methylation and risk of cancer: a prospective study

Pierre-Antoine Dugué,[1,2,3,*] Julie K Bassett,[2] Ee Ming Wong,[1,4] JiHoon E Joo,[4] Shuai Li,[3,5] Chenglong Yu,[1] Daniel F Schmidt,[3] Enes Makalic,[3] Nicole Wong Doo,[2] Daniel D Buchanan,[6,7,8] Allison M Hodge,[2,3] Dallas R English,[2,3] John L Hopper,[3] Graham G Giles,[1,2,3] Melissa C Southey,[1,2,4,] Roger L Milne,[1,2,3]

[1] Precision Medicine, School of Clinical Sciences at Monash Health, Monash University, Clayton, VIC, Australia

[2] Cancer Epidemiology Division, Cancer Council Victoria, Melbourne, VIC, Australia

[3] Centre for Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Melbourne School of Population and Global Health, The University of Melbourne, Parkville, VIC, Australia

[4] Department of Clinical Pathology, Melbourne Medical School, The University of Melbourne, Parkville, VIC, Australia

[5] Centre for Cancer Genetic Epidemiology, Department of Public Health and Primary Care, University of Cambridge, Cambridge CB1 8RN, United Kingdom

[6] Colorectal Oncogenomics Group, Department of Clinical Pathology, Melbourne Medical School, The University of Melbourne, Parkville, Victoria, Australia

[7] University of Melbourne Centre for Cancer Research, Victorian Comprehensive Cancer Centre, Parkville, Victoria Australia

[8] Genomic Medicine and Family Cancer Clinic, Royal Melbourne Hospital, Parkville, Victoria, Australia

***** Correspondence to: Pierre-Antoine Dugué, Precision Medicine, School of Clinical Sciences at Monash Health, Monash University, 246 Clayton Rd, Clayton, VIC 3168, Australia

Email: pierre-antoine.dugue@monash.edu

Keywords: biological age, epigenetic aging, epigenetic clock, colorectal cancer, gastric cancer, kidney cancer, lung cancer, B-cell neoplasms, prostate cancer, urothelial cancer

Words: 1,940

Tables: 2 **| References:** 25 **| Supplementary File:** Methods and 4 Tables

ABSTRACT

We previously investigated the association between five 'first-generation' measures of epigenetic aging and cancer risk in the Melbourne Collaborative Cohort Study. The present study assesses cancer risk associations for three recently developed methylation-based measures of aging: *PhenoAge*, *GrimAge*, and predicted telomere length. We estimated rate ratios (RRs) for risk of colorectal (N=814), gastric (N=166), kidney (N=139), lung (N=327), mature B-cell (N=426), prostate (N=847) and urothelial (N=404) cancer, using conditional logistic regression models. We observed relatively strong associations of *PhenoAge* with risk of colorectal, kidney, lung, mature B-cell, and urothelial cancers (RR per standard deviation ~ 1.2-1.3). Similar findings were obtained for *GrimAge*, but the association with lung cancer risk was remarkably stronger (RR ~ 1.8 after adjustment for smoking status, pack-years, starting age, time since quitting and other cancer risk factors). The methylation-based measures *PhenoAge* and *GrimAge* may provide insights into the relationship between biological aging and cancer.

INTRODUCTION

DNA methylation is one of the key mechanisms thought to underlie the association between aging and cancer **[1, 2]**. Biological aging measures derived from blood DNA methylation - taking advantage of varying rates of age-associated methylation changes between individuals - have gained considerable popularity as tools to better understand and predict disease **[3-5]**. We previously investigated the association between five 'first-generation' measures of epigenetic aging **[6-8]** and the risk of seven cancer types using data from the Melbourne Collaborative Cohort Study (MCCS) **[9]**. The observed associations were relatively weak compared with those obtained for all-cause mortality **[8]**; cancer risk overall was increased by 4% to 9% per five-year increase in methylation 'age acceleration', although these estimates varied by cancer type.

Two novel methylation-based measures of biological aging, called *PhenoAge* **[10]** and *GrimAge* **[11],** have been developed based on associations of DNA methylation with, for *PhenoAge*, age, mortality and clinical biomarkers, and for *GrimAge*, smoking pack-years and plasma concentrations of adrenomedullin, beta-2 microglobulin, cystatin C, growth differentiation factor 15, leptin, plasminogen activation inhibitor 1, and tissue inhibitor metalloproteinase 1. These new measures have proved to be more strongly associated with mortality **[10]** than the first-generation measures. Telomere length is another widely used biomarker of aging, which shows unclear associations with cancer risk **[2, 12, 13]**. A methylation-based predictor of telomere length was recently developed **[14]**.

In this study, we aimed to assess the association of the three aforementioned measures of biological aging, calculated using DNA methylation data from the HM450 assay, and the risk of seven cancer types: colorectal, gastric, kidney, lung, prostate and urothelial cancers, and mature B-cell neoplasms. We used a prospective design and 3,123 incident cancer cases and matched controls were included in the analysis.

METHODS

Study sample and blood collection

We used data collected from participants in the MCCS, a prospective study of 41,513 adult volunteers (24,469 women) aged between 27 and 76 years (99.3% aged 40–69 years) when recruited between 1990 and 1994 **[15]**. DNA samples were collected from peripheral blood drawn at the time of recruitment (1990-1994) or at the wave 2 follow-up visit (2003-2007). The DNA source was dried blood spots, peripheral blood mononuclear cells or buffy coats for 70%, 28% and 2% of participants, respectively (**Supplementary Material**).

Study participants provided informed consent in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki and the study was approved by Cancer Council Victoria's Human Research Ethics Committee.

Cancer case-control studies nested in the MCCS

A series of case-control studies nested within the MCCS of colorectal (N=835 pairs), gastric (N=170), kidney (N=143), lung (N=332), prostate (N=869), and urothelial cancers (N=428) mature B-cell neoplasms (N=439) were conducted **[16-19]**. Cancer diagnoses were identified by linkage with the Victorian Cancer Registry and the Australian Cancer Database (Australian Institute of Health and Welfare). For each nested case–control study, controls were individually matched to incident cases (diagnosed after blood sample collection) on age using incidence density sampling (i.e. they had to be free of the cancer of interest up to the age at diagnosis of the corresponding case), sex, country of birth (Australia/New-Zealand, Southern Europe, Northern Europe), blood DNA source (dried blood spots, peripheral blood mononuclear cells or buffy coat) and collection period (baseline or wave 2, the latter applicable to 151 case-control pairs of the urothelial cancer study). Controls were also matched to cases on year of birth, except for the colorectal cancer study where controls were matched on year of baseline attendance. For the lung cancer study, controls were also matched on smoking history (never; former, quitting <10 years; former, quitting ≥10 years; current, smoking <15 cigarettes/day; current smoking ≥15 cigarettes/day) at the time of blood collection.

DNA extraction and bisulfite conversion, and DNA methylation data processing

Methods relating to DNA extraction and bisulfite conversion, and DNA methylation data processing have been described previously **[20]** and are detailed in Supporting Information.

Methylation-based measures of biological aging

PhenoAge, *GrimAge* and methylation-predicted telomere length, and their respective age-adjusted measures were obtained using Horvath's online calculator at https://dnamage.genetics.ucla.edu/new **[6, 10, 11]**.

Statistical analysis

Spearman correlations of the three aging measures with each other and with age were calculated for participants selected as controls. We used conditional logistic regression to estimate rate ratios (RRs) for the associations between age-adjusted biological aging measures, per standard deviation (1SD), and the risk of cancer. In Model 1, no covariates were included. In Model 2, we adjusted for smoking status (current / former / never), smoking pack-years, age at starting smoking (never smoked; age 16 or less; between age 17 and 21; after age 21 years); years since quitting smoking (never smoked; more than 10 years without smoking, between 5 and 10 years without smoking; less than 5 years without smoking), BMI (in kg/m2), height (in metres), alcohol intake in the past week (in grams/day), physical activity (categorised score based on time spent doing vigorous/less vigorous activities **[21]**), dietary quality (Alternative Healthy Eating Index 2010, **[22]**), socioeconomic status (deciles of the relative socioeconomic disadvantage of area of residence index **[23]**), education (ordinal variable ranging from 1: "primary school only" to 8:"tertiary or higher university degree"), **Table 1**. These models were used to analyse each cancer type separately, and all seven cancers combined; for the combined analysis, where an individual was diagnosed with several cancers, we included the first diagnosis only (respecting the incidence density sampling procedure), so that participants did not contribute twice to the pooled estimate. Case-control pairs with any missing values for the confounders (Model 2) measured at baseline were excluded and missing values at follow-up (urothelial cancers) were replaced by baseline values; 3% of the initial sample was excluded due to missing values. The same models were used to calculate associations: i) expressed for a five-year increase, for *PhenoAge* and *GrimAge* (**Supplementary Table 3**); ii) expressed per a 1SD increase, for the first-generation measures (**Supplementary Table 4**).

In secondary analyses, we assessed the association between biological aging measures and risk of the following cancer subtypes, as defined in previous publications: colon / rectal cancer; mature B-cell neoplasm subtypes: multiple myeloma / follicular lymphoma / low-grade non-Hodgkin's lymphoma (including chronic lymphocytic leukemia) / high-grade non-Hodgkin's lymphoma **[19]**, aggressive / non-aggressive prostate cancer **[17]**, and invasive / superficial urothelial cancers **[18]**.

RESULTS

The correlation with chronological age was 0.65, 0.78 and -0.56 for *PhenoAge*, *GrimAge* and methylation-predicted telomere length, respectively. For the age-adjusted measures, the correlation between *PhenoAge* and *GrimAge* was 0.34, and their correlations with methylation-predicted telomere length were -0.23 and -0.29, respectively (**Supplementary Table 1**).

Hereafter, the age-adjusted measures are referred to as *PhenoAge*, *GrimAge* and telomere length. Their associations with cancer risk are presented in **Table 2**. In models without adjustment other than that provided by the matching variables, increased *PhenoAge* was associated with increased risk of several types of cancer, including colorectal cancer (per 1SD RR=1.21, 95%CI: 1.09-1.34), kidney cancer (RR=1.25, 95%CI: 0.96-1.63), lung cancer (RR=1.23, 95%CI: 1.06-1.44), mature B-cell neoplasms (RR=1.23, 95%CI: 1.06-1.44), urothelial cancer (RR=1.21, 95%CI: 1.05-1.40), and cancer overall (RR=1.13, 95%CI: 1.07-1.19). These RR were virtually the same after adjustment for a comprehensive set of cancer risk factors; point estimates for colorectal cancer: RR=1.13, kidney cancer: RR=1.18, lung cancer: RR=1.15, mature B-cell neoplasms: RR=1.16, urothelial cancers RR=1.11, and cancer overall: RR=1.09. *GrimAge* biological aging showed similar associations to PhenoAge for risk of colorectal, kidney cancer and cancer overall. The association with risk of lung cancer was much stronger (per 1SD RR=1.81, 95%CI: 1.45-2.26). A possible inverse association with risk of prostate cancer was also observed (RR=0.88, 95%CI: 0.79-0.98). These associations were virtually the same in comprehensively adjusted models (lung cancer RR=1.82), except for urothelial cancer for which estimates showed substantial attenuation, while remaining quite strong (RR=1.22). We found no association between methylation-predicted telomere length and risk of any type of cancer or cancer overall (all P>0.1).

Associations were generally consistent across cancer subtypes (**Supplementary Table 2**). Evidence of heterogeneity was observed for the association of *PhenoAge* with B-cell lymphoma subtypes (P=0.01, being stronger for low-grade non-Hodgkin lymphoma: RR=1.74, 95%CI: 1.31-2.31). Weak evidence of heterogeneity was observed for *PhenoAge* and colorectal cancer risk (P=0.06; colon: RR=1.13, rectum: RR=1.38). The inverse association observed between *GrimAge* and prostate cancer risk was only apparent for non-aggressive disease, RR=0.77 (95%CI: 0.60-0.97), P-heterogeneity=0.17. No association was found between methylation-predicted telomere length and risk of cancer subtypes.

DISCUSSION

In this prospective study, including a total of 3,123 incident cancer cases, we observed relatively strong associations of *PhenoAge* and *GrimAge* with risk of several cancer types; these appeared to be greater than in our study of first-generation epigenetic aging measures for risk of colorectal, lung and urothelial cancer (**Supplementary Table 4**) **[9]**. For *GrimAge*, a very strong association was observed with risk of lung cancer, independently of several questionnaire-collected variables relating to smoking. An association stronger than with *PhenoAge* was also observed with risk of urothelial cancer. A possible inverse association was observed between *GrimAge* and (non-aggressive) prostate cancer. No association was observed between methylation-predicted telomere length and any cancer type or subtype.

PhenoAge and *GrimAge* integrate methylation measures at CpG sites associated with age, mortality, key disease risk factors and biomarkers, which are also involved in the aetiology of cancer. That *GrimAge* is enriched for smoking-associated methylation measures likely explains the very strong association observed with lung cancer risk; of note, however, case-control pairs were matched on smoking history in the lung cancer study and the estimates were robust to further adjustment for questionnaire-collected variables. In the case of urothelial cancer, for which smoking is a strong risk factor, the association was partially attenuated after adjustment for smoking status, which was not a matching variable in that study. However, for both *PhenoAge* and *GrimAge*, there was overall little attenuation of risk estimates after adjustment for a comprehensive set of sociodemographic and lifestyle cancer risk factors. To our knowledge, no data exist on the association of *PhenoAge* and *GrimAge* with risk of cancers other than breast cancer, for which the Sister Study revealed a reasonably

strong association with *PhenoAge* **[24]** (hazard ratio per 5-year: 1.13, which is of similar magnitude to our findings for colorectal, kidney, lung, mature B-cell and urothelial cancers, **Supplementary Table 3**) but not with *GrimAge* **[25]**.

We also used DNA methylation measures at a set of 140 CpGs to estimate telomere length. The correlation of this predictor with measured telomere length in independent data has been shown to be moderate (r ~ 0.40), but its correlation with age appeared stronger than was the case for measured telomere length (r ~ -0.75 vs -0.35), which is consistent with our findings (correlation with age r = -0.56). Our findings of no association between telomere length and cancer risk are consistent with those reported in a Danish prospective study of 3,142 cancer cases of any type **[13]**. In a Mendelian randomization study and meta-analysis by Haycock et al. which included a larger number of cancer cases and types; genetically-predicted telomere length was strongly positively associated with risks of lung and bladder cancers, which is inconsistent with our findings. Our results were nevertheless consistent with Mendelian randomization estimates for other cancer types and with estimates from prospective studies for all cancer types, all showing null or weak associations with cancer risk **[12, 13]**.

We conclude that biological aging, as defined by the methylation-based measures *PhenoAge* and *GrimAge*, is associated with risk of several cancer types, including colorectal, lung, kidney and urothelial cancers, and mature B-cell neoplasms, independently of key demographic, lifestyle and socioeconomic variables. These measures, derived using a limited number of methylation sites across the genome, have the potential to improve cancer risk prediction, particularly in contexts where relevant cancer biomarkers have not been extensively measured.

FUNDING

This work was supported by the Australian National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC) grants 1164455. MCCS cohort recruitment was funded by VicHealth and Cancer Council Victoria. The MCCS was further supported by Australian NHMRC grants 209057, 251553 and 504711 and by infrastructure provided by Cancer Council Victoria. The nested case-control methylation studies were supported by the NHMRC grants 1011618, 1026892, 1027505, 1050198, 1043616 and 1074383. M.C.S. is an NHMRC Senior Research Fellow (1061177). This work also received funding from Monash University, Melbourne, Australia.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Cases were ascertained through the Victorian Cancer Registry (VCR) and the Australian Cancer Database (Australian Institute of Health and Welfare).

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

None declared.

REFERENCES

1. Lopez-Otin C, Blasco MA, Partridge L*, et al.* The hallmarks of aging. Cell 2013;153(6):1194-217.
2. Aunan JR, Cho WC, Soreide K. The Biology of Aging and Cancer: A Brief Overview of Shared and Divergent Molecular Hallmarks. Aging Dis 2017;8(5):628-642.
3. Field AE, Robertson NA, Wang T*, et al.* DNA methylation clocks in aging: categories, causes, and consequences. Molecular cell 2018;71(6):882-895.
4. Horvath S, Raj K. DNA methylation-based biomarkers and the epigenetic clock theory of ageing. Nature Reviews Genetics 2018;19(6):371.
5. Dugué PA, Bassett JK, Joo JE*, et al.* Association of DNA Methylation-Based Biological Age With Health Risk Factors and Overall and Cause-Specific Mortality. Am J Epidemiol 2018;187(3):529-538.
6. Horvath S. DNA methylation age of human tissues and cell types. Genome Biol 2013;14(10):R115.
7. Hannum G, Guinney J, Zhao L*, et al.* Genome-wide methylation profiles reveal quantitative views of human aging rates. Mol Cell 2013;49(2):359-67.
8. Chen BH, Marioni RE, Colicino E*, et al.* DNA methylation-based measures of biological age: meta-analysis predicting time to death. Aging (Albany NY) 2016;8(9):1844-1865.
9. Dugué PA, Bassett JK, Joo JE*, et al.* DNA methylation-based biological aging and cancer risk and survival: Pooled analysis of seven prospective studies. Int J Cancer 2018;142(8):1611-1619.
10. Levine ME, Lu AT, Quach A*, et al.* An epigenetic biomarker of aging for lifespan and healthspan. Aging (Albany NY) 2018;10(4):573-591.
11. Lu AT, Quach A, Wilson JG*, et al.* DNA methylation GrimAge strongly predicts lifespan and healthspan. Aging (Albany NY) 2019;11(2):303-327.
12. Haycock PC, Burgess S, Nounu A*, et al.* Association Between Telomere Length and Risk of Cancer and Non-Neoplastic Diseases: A Mendelian Randomization Study. JAMA Oncol 2017;3(5):636-651.
13. Weischer M, Nordestgaard BG, Cawthon RM*, et al.* Short telomere length, cancer survival, and cancer risk in 47102 individuals. J Natl Cancer Inst 2013;105(7):459-68.
14. Lu AT, Seeboth A, Tsai P-C*, et al.* DNA methylation-based estimator of telomere length. Aging (Albany NY) 2019;11(16):5895.
15. Milne RL, Fletcher AS, MacInnis RJ*, et al.* Cohort Profile: The Melbourne Collaborative Cohort Study (Health 2020). Int J Epidemiol 2017;46(6):1757-1757i.
16. Baglietto L, Ponzi E, Haycock P*, et al.* DNA methylation changes measured in pre-diagnostic peripheral blood samples are associated with smoking and lung cancer risk. Int J Cancer 2017;140(1):50-61.
17. FitzGerald LM, Naeem H, Makalic E*, et al.* Genome-Wide Measures of Peripheral Blood Dna Methylation and Prostate Cancer Risk in a Prospective Nested Case-Control Study. Prostate 2017;77(5):471-478.
18. Dugué PA, Brinkman MT, Milne RL*, et al.* Genome-wide measures of DNA methylation in peripheral blood and the risk of urothelial cell carcinoma: a prospective nested case-control study. Br J Cancer 2016;115(6):664-73.
19. Wong Doo N, Makalic E, Joo JE*, et al.* Global measures of peripheral blood-derived DNA methylation as a risk factor in the development of mature B-cell neoplasms. Epigenomics 2015; 10.2217/epi.15.97.
20. Dugué PA, English DR, MacInnis RJ*, et al.* Reliability of DNA methylation measures from dried blood spots and mononuclear cells using the HumanMethylation450k BeadArray. Sci Rep 2016;6:30317.
21. MacInnis RJ, English DR, Hopper JL*, et al.* Body size and composition and colon cancer risk in men. Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev 2004;13(4):553-9.

22. Chiuve SE, Fung TT, Rimm EB, *et al.* Alternative dietary indices both strongly predict risk of chronic disease. J Nutr 2012;142(6):1009-18.
23. Pink B. Socio-economic indexes for areas (SEIFA). In. 2011 ed. Canberra: Australian Bureau of Statistics; 2013.
24. Kresovich JK, Xu Z, O'Brien KM, *et al.* Methylation-based biological age and breast cancer risk. J Natl Cancer Inst 2019; 10.1093/jnci/djz020.
25. Kresovich JK, Xu Z, O'Brien KM, *et al.* Epigenetic mortality predictors and incidence of breast cancer. Aging (Albany NY) 2019;11(24):11975-11987.

Table 1. Characteristics of the study sample, seven case-control studies nested within the Melbourne Collaborative Cohort Study (N=41,513)

	Controls	**Cases**
Cancer type (N)		
Colorectal cancer	814	814
Gastric cancer	166	166
Kidney cancer	139	139
Lung cancer	327	327
Mature B-cell neoplasms	426	426
Prostate cancer	847	847
Urothelial cancers	404	404
Matching variables		
Age at blood draw (years), median [IQR]	61 [54-66]	61 [54-66]
Sex: male, N (%)	2,163 (61%)	2,163 (61%)
Sex: female, N (%)	1,366 (39%)	1,366 (39%)
Country of birth: Australia/NZ, N (%)	2,400 (68%)	2,416 (68%)
Northern Europe, N (%)	237 (7%)	230 (7%)
Southern Europe, N (%)	892 (25%)	883 (25%)
Blood sample type: Dried blood spots, N (%)	2,463 (70%)	2,463 (70%)
Peripheral blood mononuclear cells, N (%)	877 (25%)	877 (25%)
Buffy coats, N (%)	189 (5%)	189 (5%)
Potential confounders		
Smoking: current, N (%)	485 (14%)	406 (15%)
Smoking: former, N (%)	1,345 (38%)	1,392 (39%)
Smoking: never, N (%)	1,699 (48%)	1,625 (46%)
Smoking pack-years, median [IQR]	11 [0-500]	39 [0-580]
Age at starting: never smoked, N (%)	1,699 (48%)	1,625 (46%)
Age at starting: ≤16 years, N (%)	682 (19%)	697 (20%)
Age at starting: 17-21 years, N (%)	815 (23%)	899 (25%)
Age at starting: ≥22 years, N (%)	333 (9%)	308 (9%)
Time since quitting: never smoked, N (%)	1,699 (48%)	1,625 (46%)
Time since quitting: <5 years, N (%)	672 (19%)	725 (21%)
Time since quitting: 5-10 years, N (%)	932 (26%)	938 (27%)
Time since quitting: >10 years, N (%)	226 (6%)	241 (7%)
Body mass index (kg/m^2), median [IQR]	27 [24-29]	27 [24-30]
Height (m), median [IQR]	167 [160-174]	167 [161-174]
Alcohol consumption (g/day), median [IQR]	4 [0-17]	4 [0-18]
Diet quality: AHEI-2010, median [IQR]	64 [56-72]	64 [56-73]
Physical activity score, median [IQR]	2 [1-4]	2 [1-4]
Education score, median [IQR]	4 [4-6]	4 [4-6]
Socioeconomic status: SEIFA-10, median [IQR]	5 [3-8]	6 [3-9]

Table 2. Association (Rate Ratios, 95% confidence intervals) between three methylation-based measures of aging (per one standard deviation) and cancer risk in the Melbourne Collaborative Cohort Study

			PhenoAge			***GrimAge***			**Telomere length**		
Cancer type	**N cases**		**RR**	**95% CI**	**P**	**RR**	**95% CI**	**P**	**RR**	**95% CI**	**P**
Colorectal cancer	814	Model 1	1.21	1.09-1.34	0.0005	1.20	1.07-1.34	0.001	0.98	0.89-1.09	0.76
		Model 2	1.20	1.08-1.34	0.0008	1.19	1.03-1.36	0.02	1.00	0.90-1.11	0.98
Gastric cancer	166	Model 1	0.94	0.76-1.17	0.60	1.02	0.83-1.27	0.84	1.11	0.89-1.38	0.37
		Model 2	0.95	0.75-1.21	0.69	1.04	0.77-1.39	0.81	1.17	0.91-1.50	0.21
Kidney cancer	139	Model 1	1.25	0.96-1.63	0.09	1.27	0.98-1.65	0.07	1.07	0.80-1.43	0.65
		Model 2	1.28	0.94-1.76	0.12	1.32	0.91-1.91	0.15	1.11	0.78-1.57	0.57
Lung cancer	327	Model 1	1.23	1.06-1.44	0.007	1.81	1.45-2.26	$1x10^{-7}$	0.90	0.76-1.06	0.19
		Model 2	1.23	1.05-1.45	0.011	1.82	1.44-2.30	$6x10^{-7}$	0.88	0.74-1.04	0.13
Mature B-cell neoplasms	426	Model 1	1.23	1.07-1.40	0.003	0.94	0.80-1.10	0.45	0.94	0.83-1.07	0.35
		Model 2	1.25	1.08-1.44	0.002	0.94	0.77-1.15	0.56	0.93	0.81-1.06	0.29
Prostate cancer	847	Model 1	0.97	0.88-1.07	0.58	0.88	0.79-0.98	0.02	1.07	0.96-1.19	0.23
		Model 2	0.98	0.89-1.09	0.74	0.88	0.76-1.01	0.07	1.05	0.94-1.17	0.37
Urothelial cancers	404	Model 1	1.21	1.05-1.40	0.01	1.39	1.19-1.61	$2x10^{-5}$	0.90	0.77-1.04	0.14
		Model 2	1.17	1.00-1.36	0.05	1.22	1.00-1.48	0.05	0.95	0.81-1.10	0.48
All types	3,086	Model 1	1.13	1.07-1.19	$3x10^{-6}$	1.12	1.06-1.19	$5x10^{-5}$	0.98	0.93-1.04	0.53
		Model 2	1.13	1.07-1.19	$9x10^{-6}$	1.12	1.04-1.19	0.002	0.99	0.94-1.04	0.68

Model 1: No adjustment other than that provided by the matching variables (age, sex, country of birth (Australia / Northern Europe / Southern Europe), sample type (peripheral blood mononuclear cells / dried blood spots / buffy coats); lung cancer study: additional matching for smoking status (never; former, quitting <10 years; former, quitting ≥10 years; current, smoking <15 cigarettes/day; current smoking ≥15 cigarettes/day)
Model 2: Additional adjustment for smoking (current / former / never), smoking pack-years, age at starting smoking (4 categories), time since quitting smoking (4 categories), BMI (in kg/m^2), height (in m), alcohol consumption (in grams/day), physical activity (categorised score), dietary quality (Alternative Healthy Eating Index 2010, Chiuve et al., J Nutr, 2012), socioeconomic status score (at the local area level, ranging from 1 to 10), education score (ordinal variable ranging from 1: "primary school" to 8:"postgraduate degree")