



Published in final edited form as:

*Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev.* 2017 May ; 26(5): 663–665. doi:10.1158/1055-9965.EPI-16-0940.

## Excess weight as a risk factor common to many cancer sites: words of caution when interpreting meta-analytic evidence

Melina Arnold<sup>1</sup>, Andrew G Renehan<sup>2</sup>, and Graham Colditz<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Section of Cancer Surveillance, International Agency for Research on Cancer, Lyon, France

<sup>2</sup>Division of Molecular and Clinical Cancer Sciences, Faculty of Biology, Medicine and Health, University of Manchester, Manchester, United Kingdom

<sup>3</sup>Division of Public Health Sciences, Washington University School of Medicine, St Louis, USA

### Keywords

body mass index; meta-analysis; cancer risk

For over a decade, excess body weight, commonly categorized as overweight (body mass index, BMI: 25.0 to 29.9 kg/m<sup>2</sup>) and obesity (BMI: ≥ 30 kg/m<sup>2</sup>) has been an established incidence risk factor for several adult cancers (1). For 2012, the burden of disease attributed to elevated BMI was estimated as nearly half-million new cancers worldwide, making this the third highest ranked cancer risk factor globally after smoking and infections (ranked second in most western populations) and an important public health problem (2, 3). In recent years, scientific evidence on BMI-cancer associations has continued to accumulate and reveal positive associations for even more and more cancer sites. Among the most comprehensive and systematic evaluations undertaken on these associations have been through the World Cancer Research Fund (WCRF) continuous update project, which now links excess weight or body fatness to 11 cancers (4). In 2016, an expert working group of 21 scientists from eight countries, gathered under the auspices of the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC), to evaluate the preventive effects of avoidance of excess body fatness on cancer risk. This group extended the list of obesity-related cancers, for which *sufficient* evidence exists, to thirteen as follows: cancers of the colon and rectum, esophagus (adenocarcinoma), kidney (renal cell), breast (post-menopausal), endometrium, gastric cardia, liver, gallbladder, pancreas, ovary, thyroid, multiple myeloma and meningioma (5). Considering that excess body adiposity is related to a vast array of metabolic and physiological dysfunctions, underlying biological mechanisms have been identified explaining many of these associations (6). Furthermore, these cancer sites together represent more than one third of the total global cancer burden (7), suggesting a large prevention potential.

The identification and extraction of summary risk estimates from systematic reviews and meta-analyses evaluating anthropometric measures and cancer risk constitute an important

part of the total integration of evidence judged in the aforementioned overviews. Indeed, there has been a near exponential expansion of meta-analyses in this field. In general terms, updating or refining of existing meta-analyses or building a meta-analysis on a previously under-studied area is a positive thing. Thus, for example, where interventions (e.g. drug administration) have been tested in randomized controlled trials (RCTs), the meta-analysis of several small trials might reveal a more precise estimate of effect and build a greater degree of certainty that that intervention is clinically effective. Ultimately, a threshold number of RCTs might be reached at which the evidence of effect is convincingly strong, and no further RCTs are required – this is known as *cumulative meta-analysis* (8).

However, this principle might not apply for the evaluation of obesity-cancer associations as analyses in many observational studies are well-powered. The main methodological issue is generally not the need to increase estimate precision (as for RCTs) but rather to explore sources of between-study heterogeneity. During the IARC handbook writing group evidence evaluation (5), the present authors (as part of that group) encountered some new pitfalls regarding meta-analyses that evaluated obesity-cancer associations, and use this commentary to share these cautions when interpreting these lines of evidence.

First, meta-analyses conducted as part of systematic reviews can be subject to a form of publication bias, which we have termed as *same framework differential study identification bias*. Here, ‘same framework’ might refer to same timeframe or same population (for example, a systematic review might be restricted to a specific race). Thus, during evaluation, the IARC working group referred to the WCRF bladder cancer report based on 22 prospective cohort studies, which reported no significant association with between obesity and bladder cancer incidence (9). But two additional meta-analyses of prospective cohort studies (10, 11), searching very similar timeframes, identified substantially different study numbers. These analyses reported significant positive associations and (and in contrast to the WCRF analysis) concluded that BMI was associated with an increased risk of bladder cancer (Table 1). On closer scrutiny, these differences partly reflect obscure decisions about study inclusion (despite that the design type was restricted to prospective studies) and, in the meta-analysis by Sun and colleagues (11), the summary estimate may have been disproportionately influenced by an incorrect data extraction of risk estimates from one study (12). In addition, one large analysis from the EPIC cohort (13), reporting a mildly elevated risk of bladder cancer in overweight when compared with normal weight men, was not included in the systematic review by Sun and colleagues (11) that searched within the timeframe of this publication (epub date: 29 April 2014). In a similar manner, a recently published meta-analysis (14) evaluating the association between BMI and cervical cancer risk identified only nine studies (Table 1), yet the IARC handbook group search, over a similar timeframe, identified fourteen studies (listed in supplemental material). Based on arguably an under-captured number of studies, the former concluded that obesity might be associated with increased risk of cervical cancer.

Second, the above illustrated publications raise the concern that in addition to the typical study-level publication bias normally assessed within a systematic review, there is the potential for *review-level publication bias*. This can be partly tested for within the context to umbrella reviews and the use of excess statistical significance testing. Thus, for example,

this approach has demonstrated an excess of statistically significant findings in meta-analyses of insulin-like growth factor (IGF)/insulin and inflammation systems and cancer risk (15), suggesting reporting biases. There is, therefore, a need for a more robust methodological framework other than significant p value (and confidence intervals) and strengths of association for assessing evidence from meta-analyses. The nine Bradford-Hill criteria (strength of association; consistency; specificity; temporality; biological gradient; plausibility; coherence; experimental evidence; and analogy) offer a starting point; the Bristol criteria (16) (appropriate adjustment for key confounding factors; measurement error; assessment of residual confounding; and lack of alternative explanations) add a further dimension for assessing the causality of the evidence. Set within these principles, pathways for the association between excess adiposity and both bladder and cervical cancers are ill-understood and mechanistic evidence is lacking, such that significant summary estimate after meta-analyses (on their own) amount to inadequate evidence of association.

Third, as cancer is frequently a multi-causal disease, other common risk factors may modify or obscure an apparent relationship with obesity. One striking example of this is smoking status (17). Simple adjustment for smoking within a regression model may inadequately control for BMI-smoking inter-relationships. Within meta-analyses and pooled analyses, there are more consistent approaches to test for confounding or effect modification (smoking may be both a confounder and effect modifier). Thus, for example, when the IARC handbook group (5) examined smoking-stratified analyses of the inverse associations between BMI and smoking-related cancers like lung cancer and esophageal squamous cell carcinoma, null associations were generally observed in the never smoker strata. If study-level data are not reported by strata, an alternative approach might be to perform meta-regression of study-level hazards against the proportion of ever smokers per given population (1).

Meta-analyses of obesity-cancer associations have made important contributions to the understanding of cancer etiology and informing public health priorities. For this process to continue to move forward, investigators, peer-reviewers and editors need to be alert to the above biases and spurious associations. Continuing refinement to methods of reporting literature searches and article inclusion may be helpful, as advocated through reporting guidance for meta-analyses like PRISMA statement (18). The value of pooled analysis of individual participant data, used commonly with clinical trials, shows promise to refine understanding when important confounders are present in the underlying data (19).

## Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

## References

1. Renehan A, Tyson M, Egger M, Heller RF, Zwahlen M. Body mass index and incidence of cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis of prospective observational studies. *Lancet* (London, England). 2008; 371:569–578.
2. Arnold M, Leitzmann M, Freisling H, Bray F, Romieu I, Renehan A, et al. Obesity and cancer: An update of the global impact. *Cancer Epidemiol*. 2016; 41:8–15. [PubMed: 26775081]

3. Arnold M, Pandeya N, Byrnes G, Renehan AG, Stevens GA, Ezzati M, et al. Global burden of cancer attributable to high body-mass index in 2012: a population-based study. *Lancet Oncol.* 2015; 16:36–46. [PubMed: 25467404]
4. World Cancer Research Fund. [accessed 8 August 2016] Weight and Cancer. <http://www.wcrf.org/int/cancer-facts-figures/link-between-lifestyle-cancer-risk/weight-cancer>
5. Lauby-Secretan B, Scoccianti C, Loomis D, Grosse Y, Bianchini F, Straif K. Body Fatness and Cancer--Viewpoint of the IARC Working Group. *The New England journal of medicine.* 2016; 375:794–798. [PubMed: 27557308]
6. Renehan AG, Zwahlen M, Egger M. Adiposity and cancer risk: new mechanistic insights from epidemiology. *Nat Rev Cancer.* 2015; 15:484–498. [PubMed: 26205341]
7. Ferlay, J., Soerjomataram, I., Ervik, M., Dikshit, R., Eser, S., Mathers, C., et al. GLOBOCAN 2012 v1.0, Cancer Incidence and Mortality Worldwide: IARC CancerBase No. 11. Lyon, France: International Agency for Research on Cancer; 2013.
8. Egger M, Smith GD, Sterne JA. Uses and abuses of meta-analysis. *Clinical medicine (London, England).* 2001; 1:478–484.
9. World Cancer Research Fund International/American Institute for Cancer Research. Continuous Update Project Report: Diet, Nutrition, Physical Activity and Bladder Cancer. 2015 Available at: [wcrf.org/bladder-cancer-2015](http://wcrf.org/bladder-cancer-2015).
10. Qin Q, Xu X, Wang X, Zheng XY. Obesity and risk of bladder cancer: a meta-analysis of cohort studies. *Asian Pacific journal of cancer prevention : APJCP.* 2013; 14:3117–3121. [PubMed: 23803089]
11. Sun JW, Zhao LG, Yang Y, Ma X, Wang YY, Xiang YB. Obesity and risk of bladder cancer: a dose-response meta-analysis of 15 cohort studies. *PLoS one.* 2015; 10:e0119313. [PubMed: 25803438]
12. Song X, Pukkala E, Dyba T, Tuomilehto J, Moltchanov V, Mannisto S, et al. Body mass index and cancer incidence: the FINRISK study. *European journal of epidemiology.* 2014; 29:477–487. [PubMed: 24997743]
13. Roswall N, Freisling H, Bueno-de-Mesquita HB, Ros M, Christensen J, Overvad K, et al. Anthropometric measures and bladder cancer risk: a prospective study in the EPIC cohort. *International journal of cancer.* 2014; 135:2918–2929. [PubMed: 24771290]
14. Poorolajal J, Jenabi E. The association between BMI and cervical cancer risk: a meta-analysis. *European journal of cancer prevention : the official journal of the European Cancer Prevention Organisation (ECP).* 2016; 25:232–238. [PubMed: 25932869]
15. Tsilidis KK, Papatheodorou SI, Evangelou E, Ioannidis JP. Evaluation of excess statistical significance in meta-analyses of 98 biomarker associations with cancer risk. *Journal of the National Cancer Institute.* 2012; 104:1867–1878. [PubMed: 23090067]
16. Lawlor DA, Davey Smith G, Kundu D, Bruckdorfer KR, Ebrahim S. Those confounded vitamins: what can we learn from the differences between observational versus randomised trial evidence? *Lancet (London, England).* 2004; 363:1724–1727.
17. Song M, Giovannucci E. Estimating the Influence of Obesity on Cancer Risk: Stratification by Smoking Is Critical. *Journal of clinical oncology : official journal of the American Society of Clinical Oncology.* 2016
18. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *Annals of internal medicine.* 2009; 151:264–269. W64. [PubMed: 19622511]
19. Riley RD. Commentary: like it and lump it? Meta-analysis using individual participant data. *International journal of epidemiology.* 2010; 39:1359–1361. [PubMed: 20660642]

**Table 1**

Summary of meta-analyses evaluating the association between body mass index and incident bladder and cervical cancers

Authors et al. Publication year	Search period	No. of studies	Summary risk estimates (95% confidence intervals)	Conclusions
<b>Bladder cancer</b>				
Qin et al. 2013 (10)	To 10 <sup>th</sup> March 2013	11 prospective	Obese v normal: 1.10 (1.06–1.16)	“...obesity is associated with the increased risk of bladder cancer”
Sun et al. 2015 (11)	To 30 <sup>th</sup> Sept 2014	15 prospective	O’weight v normal: 1.07 (1.01–1.14) <sup>*</sup> Obese v normal: 1.10 (1.06–1.14) <sup>*</sup>	“.....obesity is associated with linear increased risk of bladder cancer”
WCRF report 2015 (9)	To 9 <sup>th</sup> July 2014	22 prospective	per 5 kg/m <sup>2</sup> : 1.03 (0.97 – 1.09)	Limited evidence – no conclusion
<b>Cervical cancer</b>				
Poorolajai & Jenabi 2016 (14)	To February 2016	2 cohorts 5 case-control 2 x-sectional	<b>Overweight v normal:</b> Case-control: 1.03 (0.81 – 1.25) Cohorts: 1.10 (1.03 – 1.17) <b>Obese v normal:</b> Case-control: 1.40 (1.08 – 1.71) Cohorts: 1.08 (0.60 – 1.52)	“ ..... overweight is not associated with an increased risk of cervical cancer, but obesity is weakly associated with an increased risk of cervical cancer”

<sup>\*</sup> In the Sun et al. (11) meta-analysis, the extracted point estimates relative to normal weight from Song et al. (12) for BMI categories 25.0 to 27.4; 27.5 to 29.9; 30.0 to 34.9; and greater than or equal to 35.0 kg/m<sup>2</sup> for men were: 1.48; 1.95; 1.47, 1.91 and for women were: 2.59, 2.69; 2.63, 1.93. Yet, the continuous BMI plots in Figure 1 of Song et al. (12) indicate that the BMI-risk relation was absolutely null with risk near 1.00 across the full BMI range.