

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article:

Breast and prostate cancer mortality and industrial pollution.

García-Pérez J, Pérez-Abad N, Lope V, Castelló A, Pollán M, González-Sánchez M, Valencia JL, López-Abente G, Fernández-Navarro P.

Environ Pollut. 2016 Jul;214:394-399

which has been published in final form at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2016.04.027>

## **Breast and prostate cancer mortality and industrial pollution**

### **Authors:**

Javier García-Pérez<sup>1,2,\*</sup>, Natalia Pérez-Abad<sup>3</sup>, Virginia Lope<sup>1,2</sup>, Adela Castelló<sup>2,1</sup>, Marina Pollán<sup>1,2</sup>, Mario González-Sánchez<sup>1,2</sup>, José Luis Valencia<sup>3</sup>, Gonzalo López-Abente<sup>1,2</sup>, and Pablo Fernández-Navarro<sup>1,2</sup>.

### **Authors' affiliations:**

<sup>1</sup>Cancer and Environmental Epidemiology Unit, National Center for Epidemiology, Carlos III Institute of Health, Avda. Monforte de Lemos, 5, 28029 Madrid, Spain.

<sup>2</sup>Consortium for Biomedical Research in Epidemiology and Public Health (CIBER Epidemiología y Salud Pública - CIBERESP), Spain.

<sup>3</sup>Faculty of Statistical Studies, Complutense University of Madrid, Madrid, Spain.

### **\*Corresponding author:**

Javier García-Pérez

Área de Epidemiología Ambiental y Cáncer

Centro Nacional de Epidemiología

Instituto de Salud Carlos III

Avda. Monforte de Lemos, 5, 28029 Madrid, Spain

Tel.: +34-918222643

E-mail: [jgarcia@isciii.es](mailto:jgarcia@isciii.es)

### **E-mail addresses:**

JG-P: [jgarcia@isciii.es](mailto:jgarcia@isciii.es)

NP-A: [natalia\\_perezabad@hotmail.com](mailto:natalia_perezabad@hotmail.com)

VL: [vicarvajal@isciii.es](mailto:vicarvajal@isciii.es)

AC: [acastello@isciii.es](mailto:acastello@isciii.es)

MP: [mpollan@isciii.es](mailto:mpollan@isciii.es)

MG-S: [mariogonzalez@isciii.es](mailto:mariogonzalez@isciii.es)

JLV: [joseval@estad.ucm.es](mailto:joseval@estad.ucm.es)

GL-A: [glabente@isciii.es](mailto:glabente@isciii.es)

PF-N: [pfernandezn@isciii.es](mailto:pfernandezn@isciii.es)

**Abbreviations:**

PAHs: Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons

EDCs: Endocrine disrupting chemicals

NSI: National Statistics Institute

ICD: International Classification of Diseases

IPPC: Integrated Pollution Prevention and Control

E-PRTR: European Pollutant Release and Transfer Register

RRs: Relative risks

95%CrIs: 95% credible intervals

BYM: Besag, York and Mollié

INLAs: Integrated nested Laplace approximations

POPs: Persistent organic pollutants

## **Abstract**

We investigated whether there might be an excess of breast and prostate cancer mortality among the population residing near Spanish industries, according to different categories of industrial groups. An ecologic study was designed to examine breast and prostate cancer mortality at a municipal level (period 1997-2006). Population exposure to pollution was estimated by means of distance from town of residence to industrial facilities. Using Besag-York-Mollié regression models with Integrated Nested Laplace approximations for Bayesian inference, we assessed the relative risk of dying from these tumors in 2-, 3-, 4-, and 5-kilometer zones around installations, and analyzed the effect of category of industrial group. For all sectors combined, no excess risk was detected. However, excess risk of breast cancer mortality (relative risk, 95% credible interval) was detected near mines (1.10, 1.00-1.21 at 4 km), ceramic industries (1.05, 1.00-1.09 at 5 km), and ship building (1.12, 1.00-1.26 at 5 km), and excess risk of prostate cancer was detected near aquaculture for all distances analyzed (from 2.42, 1.53-3.63 at 2 km to 1.63, 1.07-2.36 at 5 km). Our findings do not support that residing in the vicinity of pollutant industries as a whole (all industrial sectors combined) is a risk factor for breast and prostate cancer mortality. However, isolated statistical associations found in our study with respect to specific industrial groups warrant further investigation.

### **Capsule abstract:**

Isolated associations were found in our study between breast cancer and mines, ceramic industries, and ship building, and prostate cancer in relation to aquaculture installations.

**Key Words:** Breast cancer; prostate cancer; industrial pollution; BYM model; INLA; PRTR register

## **1. Introduction**

In 2012, breast cancer was the leading tumor, in terms of new cases and deaths, in women worldwide, whereas prostate cancer ranked second in incidence and fifth as cause of cancer death among men worldwide (Torre et al., 2015). In Spain, there were 6264 deaths due to breast cancer in 2012 (accounting for 15.4% of all female cancer-related deaths) and 6038 prostate cancer deaths in the same year (which accounts for 9.1% of all cancer-related deaths in men) (Carlos III Institute of Health, 2016).

Both tumors are “hormone-dependent cancers”, being influenced by steroid hormones that regulate the growth and development of both the mammary and prostate glands (Mokarram et al., 2016; Omoto and Iwase, 2015). They share similar characteristics, such as genetic abnormalities that could contribute to the acquisition of the malignant phenotype by both mammary and prostatic epithelial cells (Wu et al., 2015), and are both influenced by several lifestyle and environmental factors (Lopez-Abente et al., 2014b; Lopez-Otin and Diamandis, 1998; Risbridger et al., 2010).

With regard to industrial pollution, residential proximity to industries that release pollutants to air and water is a source of exposure to a high number of toxic substances, inasmuch as many types of industries release known or suspected carcinogens – such as dioxins, metals, and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), which have been related to breast and prostate cancer risk (Mitra and Faruque, 2004; Rybicki et al., 2006) –, as well as endocrine disrupting chemicals (EDCs), substances that alter functions of the endocrine system and are related with the increase in incidence of these tumors (Rachon, 2016; Sweeney et al., 2016). Also, industrial installations generate large amounts of toxic waste, such as metalworking fluids and mineral oils, related to prostate cancer risk (Agalliu et al., 2005; Rybicki et al., 2006). Accordingly, it would seem necessary to assess the relationship between industries and the frequency of breast and prostate cancer in their environs.

The aim of this study was to assess possible excess mortality due to breast and prostate cancer among the Spanish population residing in the environs of industrial installations.

## **2. Materials and methods**

We designed an ecologic study to evaluate the association between breast and prostate cancer mortality and proximity to industrial installations at a municipal level (8,098 Spanish towns), over the period 1997-2006.

### **2.1 Mortality data**

Observed municipal mortality data were drawn from the records of the National Statistics Institute (NSI) for the study period, and corresponded to deaths coded as: malignant neoplasm of female breast – codes 174 (International Classification of Diseases-9<sup>th</sup>/ICD-9) and C50 (ICD-10); and malignant neoplasm of prostate – codes 185 (ICD-9) and C61 (ICD-10). Expected cases were calculated by taking the specific rates for Spain as a whole, broken down by age group (18 groups) and five-year period (1997-2001, 2002-2006), and multiplying these by the person-years for each town, broken down by the same strata. Person-years for each quinquennium were calculated by multiplying the respective populations by 5 (with data corresponding to 1999 and 2004 being taken as the estimator of the population at the midpoint of the study period).

### **2.2 Industrial pollution exposure data**

Population exposure to industrial pollution was estimated by taking the distance from the centroid of town of residence to the industrial facility. We used the industrial database – industries governed by the Integrated Pollution Prevention and Control (IPPC) Directive and facilities pertaining to industrial activities not subject to IPPC but included in the European Pollutant Release and Transfer Register (E-PRTR) – provided by the Spanish Ministry for Agriculture, Food & Environment in 2009. Bearing in mind the minimum induction period for solid tumors, generally 10 years (UNSCEAR,

2006), we selected the 1970 installations which released emissions into air, water, land, or generated toxic waste in 2009, and came into operation prior to 1993 (10 years before the mid-year of the study period). The year of commencement of the respective industrial activities was provided by the industries themselves and, owing to the presence of errors in the initial location of industries, their geographic coordinates were previously validated (Garcia-Perez et al., 2008; Garcia-Perez et al., 2013).

Finally, each of the installations was classified into one of the 27 categories of industrial groups created by us, on the basis of the similarity of their pollutant emission patterns.

### **2.3 Statistical analysis**

Two types of analysis were performed to assess possible excess breast and prostate cancer mortality in towns lying near ("near") versus those lying far ("far") from pollutant industries, known as a "near vs. far" analysis. In all cases, several distances of 2, 3, 4 and 5 km were taken as the area of proximity ("exposure") to industrial installations:

- 1) in a first phase, we conducted a "near vs. far" analysis to estimate the relative risks (RRs) of towns situated at each one of the above-defined distances from industries as a whole (all sectors). The variable, "exposure", was coded as: a) exposed or proximity area ("near"): towns at  $\leq 2, 3, 4$  and 5 km from any facility; and, b) unexposed area ("far"): towns having no (IPPC+E-PRTR)-registered industry within each one of the above-defined distances of their municipal centroid (reference group); and,
- 2) lastly, we analyzed the risk according to the different categories of industrial groups. To this end, we created a variable of "exposure" for each industrial group in which the exposed area was stratified into the following levels: a) exposed or proximity area ("near"): towns at  $\leq 2, 3, 4$  and 5 km from any installation belonging to the industrial group in question; b) intermediate area: towns lying at the above-defined distances from any industrial installation other than the



group analyzed; and, c) unexposed area ("far"): towns having no (IPPC+E-PRTR)-registered industry within each one of the above-defined distances of their municipal centroid (reference group);

For the above analyses, RRs and their 95% credible intervals (95%CrIs) were estimated on the basis that the number of deaths per stratum followed a Poisson distribution, using a Bayesian conditional autoregressive model proposed by Besag, York and Mollié (BYM) (Besag et al., 1991), with explanatory variables:

$$O_i \sim \text{Poisson}(\mu_i), \text{ with } \mu_i = E_i \lambda_i$$

$$\log(\lambda_i) = \alpha \text{Expos}_i + \sum_j \beta_j \text{Soc}_{ij} + h_i + b_i \Rightarrow \log(\mu_i) = \log(E_i) + \alpha \text{Expos}_i + \sum_j \beta_j \text{Soc}_{ij} + h_i + b_i$$

$$\text{Soc}_{ij} = ps_i + ill_i + far_i + unem_i + pph_i + inc_i$$

$$i = 1, \dots, 8098 \text{ towns}, \quad j = 1, \dots, 6 \text{ potential confounders}$$

$$h_i \sim \text{Normal}(\theta, \tau_h)$$

$$b_i \sim \text{Car. Normal}(\eta_i, \tau_b)$$

$$\tau_h \sim \text{Gamma}(1, 0.01)$$

$$\tau_b \sim \text{Gamma}(1, 0.001)$$

with  $\lambda_i$ =RR in town  $i$ ;  $O_i$ =number of observed deaths (dependent variable); and  $E_i$ =number of expected deaths (offset). All estimates for the variable of "exposure" ( $\text{Expos}_i$ ) were adjusted for the following standardized, sociodemographic indicators ( $\text{Soc}_{ij}$ ), chosen as potential confounders for their availability at a municipal level, potential explanatory ability vis-à-vis certain geographic mortality patterns (Lopez-Abente et al., 2014a) and because they have proven to be useful in other studies (Alavanja et al., 2005; Awadalla et al., 2007; Halbert et al., 2005; Shirley et al., 2014): population size ( $ps_i$ ), percentage of illiteracy ( $ill_i$ ), percentage of farmers ( $far_i$ ), and percentage of unemployed ( $unem_i$ ), and average persons per household ( $pph_i$ ) according to the 1991 census; and mean income

( $inc_i$ ) as reported by the Spanish Market Yearbook (Ayuso Orejana et al., 1993). The variable of "exposure" and potential confounding covariates were fixed-effects terms in the models.

To enable the positive spatial autocorrelation problem to be assessed (presence of geographic patterns in contiguous spatial data), this was estimated by applying Moran's I statistic to the Standardized Mortality Ratios at a municipal level (Bivand et al., 2013). The BYM Bayesian autoregressive model takes this problem into account, thanks to the inclusion of two random effects components: a spatial term containing municipal contiguities ( $b_i$ ), and the municipal heterogeneity term ( $h_i$ ). Integrated nested Laplace approximations (INLAs) (Rue et al., 2009) were used as a tool for Bayesian inference. For this purpose, we used R-INLA (The R-INLA project, 2016), with the option of "Gaussian" estimation of the parameters. A total of 8098 towns were included, and the spatial data on municipal contiguities were obtained by processing the official NSI maps.

### **3. Results and discussion**

From 1997 to 2006 there were 57,830 and 55,772 deaths due to breast and prostate cancer, respectively, in Spain. Table 1 shows the RRs and 95%CrIs for breast and prostate cancer in towns near pollutant industries, by industrial group. Firstly, spatial autocorrelation in the distribution of breast (Moran's I test statistic=0.018,  $p$ -value=0.041) and prostate (Moran's I test statistic=0.024,  $p$ -value=0.006) cancer mortality was detected, and it thus seemed appropriate to use the BYM model in order to take this spatial autocorrelation into account. For all sectors combined, excess risk was not detected in any of the distances analyzed. Insofar as the specific industrial groups were concerned, there was a slight statistically significant excess risk of breast cancer near 'Mining industry' (RR=1.10; 95%CrI=1.00-1.21 at 4 km), 'Ceramic' (RR=1.05; 95%CrI=1.00-1.09 at 5 km), and 'Ship building' (RR=1.12; 95%CrI=1.00-1.26 at 5 km). For prostate cancer, however, a high excess risk was detected near 'Aquaculture' (RR=2.42, 95%CrI=1.53-3.63 at 2 km; RR=2.07,

95%CrI=1.33-3.07 at 3 km; RR=2.08, 95%CrI=1.33-3.08 at 4km; and RR=1.63, 95%CrI=1.07-2.36 at 5 km), although with only four installations.

In summary, our results indicate: a) a weak association between breast cancer mortality and proximity to mines (4 km), ceramic industries (5 km), and ship building (5 km); and, b) a strong association between prostate cancer mortality and proximity to aquaculture for all distances analyzed.

Ecologic studies, such as that reported here, are proposing new hypothesis and lines of research with respect to population exposure to industrial pollution, and industrial pollution emission registers, such as E-PRTR, afford a very useful tool for the surveillance and monitoring of the possible effects of industrial pollution on the health of neighboring populations (Wine et al., 2014).

### **3.1 Breast cancer**

In relation to exposure to environmental pollution, some authors have found associations between breast cancer and ambient air pollution (Brody et al., 2007; Wei et al., 2012), traffic-related air pollution (Hystad et al., 2015), and exposure to environmental chemicals (Mitra and Faruque, 2004), specifically to cadmium (Gallagher et al., 2010), persistent organic pollutants (POPs) (Ghisari et al., 2014) or pesticides (Boada et al., 2012). However, Reding et al. (Reding et al., 2015) found no significant associations between air pollution and breast cancer risk overall. Regarding exposure to industrial pollution, literature about breast cancer and proximity to specific industrial sectors is sparse. Pan et al. (Pan et al., 2011) conducted a population-based case-control study in Canada, and their results suggested possible weak associations between breast cancer and proximity to steel mills, pulp mills, petroleum refineries, and thermal power plants. Lewis-Michl et al. (Lewis-Michl et al., 1996), in a case-control interview study in New York (USA), observed a significantly elevated risk of breast cancer among postmenopausal women who were ever potentially exposed to chemical facilities. Other studies have focused attention on waste management: whereas some authors have found associations

between breast cancer and proximity to incinerators (Ranzi et al., 2011) and hazardous waste sites (Griffith et al., 1989; O'Leary et al., 2004), other authors did not find evidence of breast cancer risk near a solid waste landfill site in Montreal (Canada) (Goldberg et al., 1995).

With regard to the industrial groups with statistically significant results in our study, there are very few studies about breast cancer risk and proximity to mines, ceramic industries, or ship building, even though these facilities are known to release carcinogens and EDCs, such as asbestos, metals, particulate matter, benzene, and PAHs. Previous studies about cancer risk in the vicinity of mines did not support any statistically significant association (Fernandez-Navarro et al., 2012; Mueller et al., 2015). On the other hand, Cambra et al. (Cambra et al., 2011) found an excess risk of breast cancer near ( $\leq 2$  km) mineral industries, including mines and ceramic industries. Our findings about these industrial sectors, with results bordering the limit of statistical significance, should be interpreted with caution, and support the need for more detailed exposure assessment and health risk analysis of certain toxic substances near these industrial facilities.

### **3.2 Prostate cancer**

Insofar as exposure to environmental and industrial pollution is concerned, the few studies existing in the literature about prostate cancer risk and proximity to industrial are inconsistent. Whereas some authors have found evidence of associations between prostate cancer and proximity to metal industries (Ramis et al., 2011) or a municipal solid waste landfill site (Goldberg et al., 1995) in specific geographic areas, a French study did not find any association between this tumor and exposure to pesticides, metals or pollutants from industry (Multigner et al., 2008).

With regard to the industrial groups with excess risk in our study, the growth of aquaculture sector over the past few years has been accompanied by some practices potentially damaging to human health, which include intensive use of antibiotics (Cabello, 2004; Cabello, 2006; Mo et al., 2015),

misuse of antimicrobial agents (Heuer et al., 2009), inappropriate fish discards management with high concentration of POPs (Antelo et al., 2012), and chemical wastes produced by intentional and unintentional use of many chemicals (Haya et al., 2001). Regarding the use antibiotics in aquaculture, they have been used mainly for therapeutic purposes and as prophylactic agents, and these substances released into the environment may have a serious ecological impact, since their residues may contaminate surface waters, groundwaters, sediments, and biota (Kummerer, 2009; Pereira et al., 2015). Moreover, antibiotics are leached from the food and feces and, diffused into the sediment, they can be washed by currents to distant sites (Cabello, 2006). Some antibiotics and antimicrobial agents authorized for use in aquaculture, such as sulfonamides, macrolides, and quinolones, had been associated with an increased risk of prostate cancer (Boursi et al., 2015; Tamim et al., 2010), something that could be related to the significant excess risk of this tumor detected by our study in the proximity of aquaculture installations. On the other hand, some studies have found high levels of arsenic in aquacultural ponds (Huang et al., 2014; Kar et al., 2011), a carcinogen related to prostate cancer risk (Hong et al., 2014).

Aside from the limitations inherent in all ecologic studies, in our case mention should also be made of the following: the non-inclusion of possible confounding factors that might be associated with distance (though adjustment for socioeconomic variables goes some way to mitigating this lack of information, since many life-style-related risk factors, such as smoking, alcohol consumption or type of diet, show a distribution correlated with socioeconomic status (Prattala et al., 2009; Woitas-Slubowska et al., 2010)); the use of distance from town to industrial facilities as a "proxy" of population exposure to industrial pollution, based on the assumption of an isotropic model, since real exposure may depend on prevailing wind patterns or geographical landforms (though this would limit the capacity for detecting positive results, without invalidating the associations found); the use of mortality

rather than incidence data, due to the absence of a national population-based incidence register; and the non-inclusion in the analysis of possible clusters of morbidity in some regions, which might indicate high risk of exposure.

One of the principal strengths of our study resides in the completeness of its exploratory analysis, which consisted of an in-depth examination of breast and prostate cancer mortality with reference to 27 industrial groups. Another strength is the use of a Bayesian hierarchical methodological approach to perform the statistical analysis, in which the use of spatial terms, not only meant that it was less susceptible to the presence of the ecological fallacy (Clayton et al., 1993), but also ensured that the geographic heterogeneity of the distribution of mortality was taken into account. On the other hand, the method of estimation afforded by INLA amounts to a qualitative leap in the use of hierarchical models with explanatory variables (Rue et al., 2009). Further advantages of the study are: its high statistical power, thanks to the inclusion of a great number of reported deaths, a factor that enables it to identify excess mortality of a lower magnitude, in line with the expected effects of environmental exposures; the good quality of the information in terms both of diagnostic accuracy of cause of death (Perez-Gomez et al., 2006) and validity of geographic coordinates of the industries (Garcia-Perez et al., 2008; Garcia-Perez et al., 2013); and elimination for study purposes of those installations that had come into operation more recently, and whose possible influence on tumor development is debatable if the minimum latency period is taken into account.

#### **4. Conclusion**

Our findings do not support that residing in the vicinity of pollutant industries as a whole (all industrial sectors combined) is a risk factor for breast and prostate cancer mortality. However, isolated statistical associations between breast cancer risk and mines, ceramic industries, and ship building, and prostate cancer risk and aquaculture, need to be confirmed by other type of studies that improve

exposure assessment. For example, it would be of great interest to analyze cancer incidence – which was not included in this study – and clusters of cases and/or deaths close to the industrial installations using spatial clustering techniques, and to assess the possibility of using better exposure markers for studying what is happening in the environs of each specific installation. Despite the above-mentioned limitations, the design of the present study could be a useful tool for studying point-source environmental pollution and cancer.

**Acknowledgments:**

This study was funded by Spain's Health Research Fund (FIS CP11/00112 and FIS PI080662). Mortality data were supplied by the Spanish National Statistics Institute in accordance with a specific confidentiality protocol.

## References

- Agalliu I, Eisen EA, Kriebel D, Quinn MM, Wegman DH. A biological approach to characterizing exposure to metalworking fluids and risk of prostate cancer (United States). *Cancer Causes Control* 2005;16:323-331.
- Alavanja MC, Sandler DP, Lynch CF, Knott C, Lubin JH, Tarone R, et al. Cancer incidence in the agricultural health study. *Scand J Work Environ Health* 2005;31 Suppl 1:39-45.
- Antelo LT, Lopes C, Franco-Uria A, Alonso AA. Fish discards management: pollution levels and best available removal techniques. *Mar Pollut Bull* 2012;64:1277-1290.
- Awadalla AW, Ohaeri JU, Gholoum A, Khalid AO, Hamad HM, Jacob A. Factors associated with quality of life of outpatients with breast cancer and gynecologic cancers and their family caregivers: a controlled study. *BMC Cancer* 2007;7:102.
- Ayuso Orejana J, Fernández Cuesta JA, Plaza Ibeas JL. *Anuario del Mercado Español*. 1993;Madrid: Banco Español de Crédito;
- Besag J, York J, Mollié A. Bayesian image restoration, with two applications in spatial statistics (with discussion). *Ann Inst Stat Math* 1991;43:1-59.
- Bivand RS, Pebesma E, Gomez-Rubio V. *Applied spatial data analysis with R*. Second Edition. New York: User! Series, Springer, 2013.
- Boada LD, Zumbado M, Henriquez-Hernandez LA, Almeida-Gonzalez M, Alvarez-Leon EE, Serra-Majem L, et al. Complex organochlorine pesticide mixtures as determinant factor for breast cancer risk: a population-based case-control study in the Canary Islands (Spain). *Environ Health* 2012;11:28.
- Boursi B, Mamtani R, Haynes K, Yang YX. Recurrent antibiotic exposure may promote cancer formation - Another step in understanding the role of the human microbiota? *Eur J Cancer* 2015;51:2655-2664.
- Brody JG, Moysich KB, Humblet O, Attfield KR, Beehler GP, Rudel RA. Environmental pollutants and breast cancer: epidemiologic studies. *Cancer* 2007;109:2667-2711.
- Cabello FC. [Antibiotics and aquaculture in Chile: implications for human and animal health]. *Rev Med Chil* 2004;132:1001-1006.
- Cabello FC. Heavy use of prophylactic antibiotics in aquaculture: a growing problem for human and animal health and for the environment. *Environ Microbiol* 2006;8:1137-1144.
- Cambra K, Martinez-Rueda T, Alonso-Fustel E, Cirarda FB, Ibanez B, Esnaola S, et al. Mortality in small geographical areas and proximity to air polluting industries in the Basque Country (Spain). *Occup Environ Med* 2011;68:140-147.



- Carlos III Institute of Health. Mortality from cancer and other causes in Spain. Year 2012; 2016. Available: <http://www.isciii.es/ISCIII/es/contenidos/fd-servicios-cientifico-tecnicos/fd-vigilancias-alertas/fd-epidemiologia-ambiental-y-cancer/Mortal2012.pdf> [accessed 7 April 2016].
- Clayton DG, Bernardinelli L, Montomoli C. Spatial correlation in ecological analysis. *Int J Epidemiol* 1993;22:1193-1202.
- Fernandez-Navarro P, Garcia-Perez J, Ramis R, Boldo E, Lopez-Abente G. Proximity to mining industry and cancer mortality. *Sci Total Environ* 2012;435-436:66-73.
- Gallagher CM, Chen JJ, Kovach JS. Environmental cadmium and breast cancer risk. *Aging (Albany NY)* 2010;2:804-814.
- Garcia-Perez J, Boldo E, Ramis R, Vidal E, Aragonés N, Perez-Gomez B, et al. Validation of the geographic position of EPER-Spain industries. *Int J Health Geogr* 2008;7:1.
- Garcia-Perez J, Fernandez-Navarro P, Castello A, Lopez-Cima MF, Ramis R, Boldo E, et al. Cancer mortality in towns in the vicinity of incinerators and installations for the recovery or disposal of hazardous waste. *Environ Int* 2013;51:31-44.
- Ghisari M, Eiberg H, Long M, Bonfeld-Jorgensen EC. Polymorphisms in phase I and phase II genes and breast cancer risk and relations to persistent organic pollutant exposure: a case-control study in Inuit women. *Environ Health* 2014;13:19.
- Goldberg MS, al Homsy N, Goulet L, Riberdy H. Incidence of cancer among persons living near a municipal solid waste landfill site in Montreal, Quebec. *Arch Environ Health* 1995;50:416-424.
- Griffith J, Duncan RC, Riggan WB, Pellom AC. Cancer mortality in U.S. counties with hazardous waste sites and ground water pollution. *Arch Environ Health* 1989;44:69-74.
- Halbert C, Kessler L, Collier A, Paul Wileyto E, Brewster K, Weathers B. Psychological functioning in African American women at an increased risk of hereditary breast and ovarian cancer. *Clin Genet* 2005;68:222-227.
- Haya K, Burrige LE, Chang Bd. Environmental impact of chemical wastes produced by the salmon aquaculture industry. *ICES Journal of Marine Science* 2001;58:492-496.
- Heuer OE, Kruse H, Grave K, Collignon P, Karunasagar I, Angulo FJ. Human health consequences of use of antimicrobial agents in aquaculture. *Clin Infect Dis* 2009;49:1248-1253.
- Hong YS, Song KH, Chung JY. Health effects of chronic arsenic exposure. *J Prev Med Public Health* 2014;47:245-252.
- Huang JY, Liao CM, Lin KH, Lee CH. Management of groundwater in farmed pond area using risk-based regulation. *Environ Monit Assess* 2014;186:5763-5775.
- Hystad P, Villeneuve PJ, Goldberg MS, Crouse DL, Johnson K. Exposure to traffic-related air pollution and the risk of developing breast cancer among women in eight Canadian provinces: a case-control study. *Environ Int* 2015;74:240-248.

- Kar S, Maity JP, Jean JS, Liu CC, Liu CW, Bundschuh J, et al. Health risks for human intake of aquacultural fish: Arsenic bioaccumulation and contamination. *J Environ Sci Health A Tox Hazard Subst Environ Eng* 2011;46:1266-1273.
- Kummerer K. Antibiotics in the aquatic environment--a review--part I. *Chemosphere* 2009;75:417-434.
- Lewis-Michl EL, Melius JM, Kallenbach LR, Ju CL, Talbot TO, Orr MF, et al. Breast cancer risk and residence near industry or traffic in Nassau and Suffolk Counties, Long Island, New York. *Arch Environ Health* 1996;51:255-265.
- Lopez-Abente G, Aragonés N, Perez-Gomez B, Pollán M, Garcia-Perez J, Ramis R, et al. Time trends in municipal distribution patterns of cancer mortality in Spain. *BMC Cancer* 2014a;14:535.
- Lopez-Abente G, Mispireta S, Pollán M. Breast and prostate cancer: an analysis of common epidemiological features in mortality trends in Spain. *BMC Cancer* 2014b;14:874.
- Lopez-Otin C, Diamandis EP. Breast and prostate cancer: an analysis of common epidemiological, genetic, and biochemical features. *Endocr Rev* 1998;19:365-396.
- Mitra AK, Faruque FS. Breast cancer incidence and exposure to environmental chemicals in 82 counties in Mississippi. *South Med J* 2004;97:259-263.
- Mo WY, Chen Z, Leung HM, Leung AO. Application of veterinary antibiotics in China's aquaculture industry and their potential human health risks. *Environ Sci Pollut Res Int* 2015.
- Mokarram P, Alizadeh J, Razban V, Barazeh M, Solomon C, Kavousipour S. Interconnection of Estrogen/ Testosterone Metabolism and Mevalonate Pathway in Breast and Prostate Cancers. *Curr Mol Pharmacol* 2016.
- Mueller GS, Clayton AL, Zahnd WE, Hollenbeck KM, Barrow ME, Jenkins WD, et al. Manuscript title: Geospatial analysis of Cancer risk and residential proximity to coal mines in Illinois. *Ecotoxicol Environ Saf* 2015;120:155-162.
- Multigner L, Ndong JR, Oliva A, Blanchet P. [Environmental pollutants and prostate cancer: epidemiological data]. *Gynecol Obstet Fertil* 2008;36:848-856.
- O'Leary ES, Vena JE, Freudenheim JL, Brasure J. Pesticide exposure and risk of breast cancer: a nested case-control study of residentially stable women living on Long Island. *Environ Res* 2004;94:134-144.
- Omoto Y, Iwase H. Clinical significance of estrogen receptor beta in breast and prostate cancer from biological aspects. *Cancer Sci* 2015;106:337-343.
- Pan SY, Morrison H, Gibbons L, Zhou J, Wen SW, DesMeules M, et al. Breast cancer risk associated with residential proximity to industrial plants in Canada. *J Occup Environ Med* 2011;53:522-529.

Pereira AM, Silva LJ, Meisel LM, Pena A. Fluoroquinolones and Tetracycline Antibiotics in a Portuguese Aquaculture System and Aquatic Surroundings: Occurrence and Environmental Impact. *J Toxicol Environ Health A* 2015;78:959-975.

Perez-Gomez B, Aragonés N, Pollán M, Suarez B, Lope V, Llacer A, et al. Accuracy of cancer death certificates in Spain: a summary of available information. *Gac Sanit* 2006;20 Suppl 3:42-51.

Prattala R, Hakala S, Roskam AJ, Roos E, Helmert U, Klumbiene J, et al. Association between educational level and vegetable use in nine European countries. *Public Health Nutr* 2009;12:2174-2182.

Rachon D. Endocrine disrupting chemicals (EDCs) and female cancer: Informing the patients. *Rev Endocr Metab Disord* 2016.

Ramis R, Diggle P, Cambra K, Lopez-Abente G. Prostate cancer and industrial pollution Risk around putative focus in a multi-source scenario. *Environ Int* 2011;37:577-585.

Ranzi A, Fano V, Erspamer L, Lauriola P, Perucci CA, Forastiere F. Mortality and morbidity among people living close to incinerators: a cohort study based on dispersion modeling for exposure assessment. *Environ Health* 2011;10:22.

Reding KW, Young MT, Szpiro AA, Han CJ, DeRoo LA, Weinberg C, et al. Breast Cancer Risk in Relation to Ambient Air Pollution Exposure at Residences in the Sister Study Cohort. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev* 2015;24:1907-1909.

Risbridger GP, Davis ID, Birrell SN, Tilley WD. Breast and prostate cancer: more similar than different. *Nat Rev Cancer* 2010;10:205-212.

Rue H, Martino S, Chopin N. Approximate Bayesian Inference for Latent Gaussian Models Using Integrated Nested Laplace Approximations (with discussion). *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B* 2009;71:319-392.

Rybicki BA, Neslund-Dudas C, Nock NL, Schultz LR, Eklund L, Rosbalt J, et al. Prostate cancer risk from occupational exposure to polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons interacting with the GSTP1 Ile105Val polymorphism. *Cancer Detect Prev* 2006;30:412-422.

Shirley MH, Barnes I, Sayeed S, Finlayson A, Ali R. Incidence of breast and gynaecological cancers by ethnic group in England, 2001-2007: a descriptive study. *BMC Cancer* 2014;14:979.

Sweeney MF, Hasan N, Soto AM, Sonnenschein C. Environmental endocrine disruptors: Effects on the human male reproductive system. *Rev Endocr Metab Disord* 2016.

Tamim HM, Hajeer AH, Boivin JF, Collet JP. Association between antibiotic use and risk of prostate cancer. *Int J Cancer* 2010;127:952-960.

The R-INLA project. 2016. Available: <http://www.r-inla.org/> [accessed 7 April 2016].

Torre LA, Bray F, Siegel RL, Ferlay J, Lortet-Tieulent J, Jemal A. Global cancer statistics, 2012. *CA Cancer J Clin* 2015;65:87-108.

UNSCEAR. UNSCEAR 2006 Report: Volume I - Annex A: Epidemiological studies of radiation and cancer; 2006. Available: <http://www.unscear.org/unscear/en/publications.html> [accessed 7 April 2016].

Wei Y, Davis J, Bina WF. Ambient air pollution is associated with the increased incidence of breast cancer in US. *Int J Environ Health Res* 2012;22:12-21.

Wine O, Hackett C, Campbell S, Cabrera-Rivera O, Buka I, Zaiane O, et al. Using pollutant release and transfer register data in human health research: a scoping review. *Environmental Reviews* 2014;22:51-65.

Woitak-Slubowska D, Hurnik E, Skarpanska-Stejnborn A. Correlates of smoking with socioeconomic status, leisure time physical activity and alcohol consumption among Polish adults from randomly selected regions. *Cent Eur J Public Health* 2010;18:179-185.

Wu Y, Sarkissyan M, Vadgama JV. Epigenetics in breast and prostate cancer. *Methods Mol Biol* 2015;1238:425-466.