

HHS Public Access

JAm Acad Dermatol. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2020 October 01.

Published in final edited form as:

Author manuscript

JAm Acad Dermatol. 2019 October; 81(4): 1015–1018. doi:10.1016/j.jaad.2019.02.024.

Skin cancer risk factors and screening among sexual minority and heterosexual women

Howa Yeung, MD¹, Marissa L.H. Baranowski, BS¹, Suephy C. Chen, MD MS^{1,2}

¹Department of Dermatology, Emory University School of Medicine, Atlanta, GA

²Regional Telehealth Services, VA Southeast Network VISN 7, Decatur, Georgia, USA

To the editor:

Sexual minority persons – including lesbian, gay, bisexual persons – face unequal cancer risks and are a National Institutes of Health-designated health disparity population.¹ While multiple studies demonstrated higher prevalence of skin cancer and associated risk factors in gay and bisexual men,^{2–4} two studies showed that sexual minority women (SMW) had lower prevalence of indoor tanning and skin cancers as compared with heterosexual women.^{4,5} Scant data exist on additional skin cancer risk behaviors among sexual minority women.

To address this critical knowledge gap, our study examines the prevalence of multiple skin cancer risk factors and screening in SMW using the 2015 National Health Interview Survey, a cross-sectional survey representative of the US civilian population. Emory University institutional review exemption was obtained. We restricted analysis to adult women age 18 self-identifying as "lesbian or gay" or "bisexual" (SMW) and as "straight, that is, not lesbian or gay" (heterosexual women). Prevalence of 1 sunburns, indoor tanning device use, and skin cancer screening examination within the past 12 months were compared between SMW and heterosexual women using Rao-Scott χ^2 tests and benchmarked against Healthy People 2020 targets. Survey sample weights were applied and all estimates met *a priori* reliability standards. Multivariable logistic regression adjusted for significant sociodemographic

Correspondence: Howa Yeung, MD. Department of Dermatology, Emory University School of Medicine, 1525 Clifton Road NE, Atlanta, GA 30322. Phone: (404) 727-9838. Fax: (404) 778-5395. howa.yeung@emory.edu.

Author Contributions: Dr. Yeung had full access to all of the data in the study and takes responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis. *Study concept and design:* Yeung. *Acquisition, analysis, and interpretation of data:* All authors. *Drafting of the manuscript:* Yeung, Baranowski. *Critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content:* All authors. *Statistical analysis:* Yeung. *Obtained funding:* Yeung. *Administrative, technical, or material support:* Yeung, Baranowski. *Study supervision:* Yeung, Chen.

Prior Presentation: The abstract is presented in part at the International Investigative Dermatology in Orlando, FL on May 16–19, 2018.

Financial Disclosure:

¹⁾ Relevant to this manuscript: None reported.

²⁾ All other relationships: Dr. Yeung received honorarium from InVentiv Health. Dr. Chen received honorarium from EB Research Partnership and Leo Pharma and royalties from Unilever, BiopharmX, Trevi, Dermecular, and Phoenix Repair. Ms. Baranowski had no potential conflicts of interest to disclose.

Publisher's Disclaimer: This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

Yeung et al.

confounders. Two-sided tests with Bonferroni-corrected P<.005 were considered significant for 9 outcomes (STATA software, version 12.1; StataCorp).

Among 18,601 women respondents, 464 SMW (2.5%; 263 [1.4%] gay or lesbian and 201 [1.1%] bisexual) and 17,340 (93.2%) heterosexual women were identified. SMW were more likely to report younger age, non-Hispanic ethnicity, obesity, current or former smoker, heavy alcohol use, and lower income level than heterosexual women (Table 1). No significant difference in geographic region, educational attainment, health insurance status, and personal or family history of skin cancers were found. Although SMW reported more sunburns on univariate analysis, there was no statistically significant difference in reported sunburns after adjustment for sociodemographic differences (Table 2). No differences in indoor tanning, skin cancer screening examinations, and frequent sun-protective behaviors were noted by sexual minority status. Healthy People 2020 prevalence targets were met for sunburns (33.8%) in heterosexual women but not in SMW; targets for indoor tanning (3.6%) and sun-protective behaviors (73.7%) remain unmet for both groups.

In contrast with prior indoor tanning data,⁴ the prevalence of skin cancer risk behaviors among sexual minority women are not significantly different from that of heterosexual women in 2015. This may be due to additional adjustments for income, smoking, and alcohol use as potential confounders. Decreasing trends of indoor tanning use seen in heterosexual women may also differ in SMW. Despite the large study sample size, it did not allow further sub-analyses comparing lesbian and bisexual women. Self-reported survey outcomes were subject to information bias. Our results highlighted current unmet targets for skin cancer prevention among SMW and heterosexual women. Future studies are needed to evaluate ongoing public health interventions to reduce indoor tanning and promote sunprotective behaviors in SMW to achieve national skin cancer prevention goals in all women.

Acknowledgments

Funding/Support: Supported in part by the Dermatology Foundation and the National Center for Advancing Translational Sciences (NCATS) of the National Institutes of Health under award number UL1TR002378 and KL2TR002381 (H.Y.). The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the National Institutes of Health.

Funding/Sponsor was involved?

Design and conduct of the study Yes_ No_X_

Collection, management, analysis and interpretation of data Yes_ No_X_

Preparation, review, or approval of the manuscript Yes_ No_X_

Decision to submit the manuscript for publication Yes_ No_X_

Abbreviations and Acronyms:

SMW

sexual minority women

References:

- Griggs J, Maingi S, Blinder V, et al. American Society of Clinical Oncology Position Statement: Strategies for Reducing Cancer Health Disparities Among Sexual and Gender Minority Populations. J Clin Oncol. 2017;35(19):2203–2208. [PubMed: 28368670]
- 2. Yeung H, Chen SC. Sexual Orientation and Indoor Tanning Device Use: A Population-Based Study. JAMA Dermatol. 2016;152(1):99–101. [PubMed: 26244279]
- 3. Gao Y, Arron ST, Linos E, Polcari I, Mansh MD. Indoor Tanning, Sunless Tanning, and Sun-Protection Behaviors Among Sexual Minority Men. JAMA Dermatol. 2018.
- Mansh M, Katz KA, Linos E, Chren MM, Arron S. Association of Skin Cancer and Indoor Tanning in Sexual Minority Men and Women. JAMA Dermatol. 2015;151(12):1308–1316. [PubMed: 26444580]
- Blashill AJ. Indoor Tanning and Skin Cancer Risk Among Diverse US Youth: Results From a National Sample. JAMA Dermatol. 2017;153(3):344–345. [PubMed: 28030714]

Table 1.

Sociodemographic characteristics of sexual minority and heterosexual women.

N (weight prevalence %)	Sexual minority women (N = 464)	Heterosexual women (N = 17,340)	Р
Age			
18–39	263 (59.8%)	5,618 (36.6%)	< 0.001
40–64	158 (32.4%)	7,054 (42.5%)	
65+	43 (7.8%)	4,668 (20.9%)	
Race/ethnicity			
Non-Hispanic White	307 (67.6%)	10,645 (65.2%)	0.048
Non-Hispanic Black	77 (16.0%)	2,576 (12.6%)	
Hispanic	56 (10.5%)	2,944 (15.2%)	
Other	24 (5.9%)	1,175 (7.0%)	
Educational attainment			
Below high school	48 (9.5%)	2,365 (12.1%)	0.15
High school or equivalent	83 (19.4%)	4,199 (23.9%)	
Some college	161 (36.1%)	5,606 (32.3%)	
College graduate or above	172 (35.1%)	5,096 (31.7%)	
Family income level			
200% federal poverty level	247 (57.9%)	9,661 (61.8%)	< 0.001
200% federal poverty level	205 (39.9%)	6,541 (31.1%)	
Missing	12 (2.2%)	1,138 (7.1%)	
Geographic region			
Northeast	78 (14.1%)	2,925 (17.9%)	0.47
Midwest	87 (22.4%)	3,568 (21.8%)	
South	167 (38.5%)	6,179 (38.1%)	
West	132 (25.0%)	4,668 (22.2%)	
Smoking status			
Never smoker ^a	238 (55.8%)	11,429 (67.7%)	0.001
Former smoker	111 (19.8%)	2,436 (13.4%)	
Current smoker	114 (24.4%)	3,450 (18.9%)	
Heavy alcohol use ^b	176 (35.3%)	2,887 (17.1%)	< 0.001
Body mass index			
Underweight / Normal	159 (36.4%)	6,631 (42.2%)	0.003
Overweight	118 (23.4%)	4,826 (28.5%)	
Obese	179 (40.2%)	5,173 (29.3%)	
Has health insurance	411 (89.9%)	15,692 (90.5%)	0.70
Personal history of skin cancer	11 (2.2%)	496 (2.7%)	0.54
Family history of skin cancer	41 (9.4%)	1,346 (7.6%)	0.36

JAm Acad Dermatol. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2020 October 01.

Yeung et al.

^{*a*}Defined as smoking fewer than 100 cigarettes in lifetime

^bDefined as reporting any day with 5+ drinks in the past year

JAm Acad Dermatol. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2020 October 01.

Table 2.

Prevalence of sunburns, indoor tanning, skin cancer screening, and frequent sun-protective behaviors among sexual minority and heterosexual women.

Outcomes ^a	Sexual minority women (N = 464)	Heterosexual women (N = 17,340)	P Value	HP 2020 Target ^b
Sunburn in the past 12 months				
Prevalence, % (95% CI)	43.3 (37.2–49.7)	33.2 (32.1–34.4)	0.001	33.9
aOR (95% CI) ^C	1.08 (0.80–1.48)	1 [reference]	0.61	
Indoor tanning in the past 12 months				
Prevalence, % (95% CI)	6.6 (4.1–10.3)	5.2 (4.7–5.8)	0.34	3.6
aOR (95% CI)	0.88 (0.52-1.48)	1 [reference]	0.63	
Skin cancer screening exam in the past 12 months				
Prevalence, % (95% CI)	12.5 (9.0–16.9)	11.6 (11.0–12.3)	0.68	N/A
aOR (95% CI)	1.51 (1.03–2.20)	1 [reference]	0.03	
Frequent sun-protective behaviors d				
Prevalence, % (95% CI)	70.3 (64.5–75.4)	70.1 (69.1–71.1)	0.97	73.7
aOR (95% CI)	1.18 (0.89–1.56)	1 [reference]	0.26	
1. Seeking shade				
Prevalence, % (95% CI)	41.4 (35.6–47.5) <	43.2 (42.2–44.3)	0.57	N/A
aOR (95% CI)	1.03 (0.79–1.33)	1 [reference]	0.85	
2. Long sleeves				
Prevalence, % (95% CI)	8.6 (5.7–12.8)	11.5 (10.8–12.2)	0.16	N/A
aOR (95% CI)	1.06 (0.66–1.68)	1 [reference]	0.82	
3. Long pants				
Prevalence, % (95% CI)	25.1 (20.0–31.0)	22.7 (21.8–23.6)	0.38	N/A
aOR (95% CI)	1.41 (1.03–1.94)	1 [reference]	0.03	
4. Wide-brimmed hat				
Prevalence, % (95% CI)	12.6 (9.1–17.2)	14.1 (13.3–14.9)	0.50	N/A
aOR (95% CI)	1.19 (0.8–1.76)	1 [reference]	0.39	
5. SPF 15+ sunscreen use				
Prevalence, % (95% CI)	39.7 (33.3–46.5)	39.7 (38.6–40.9)	0.99	N/A
aOR (95% CI)	1.07 (0.80–1.42)	1 [reference]	0.66	

Abbreviations: HP 2020, Healt hy People 2020; aOR, adjusted prevalence odds ratio; CI, confidence interval; N/A, not available; SPF, sun protection factor

^{*a*}Complete case analysis excluded up to 1,498 (8.4%) participants with missing outcomes (4.7%) or covariates (4.2%). Missing data were less common in sexual minority women (5.2% vs. 8.5%, P = 0.01).

^bHP 2020 targets are federal public health goals for year 2020, aimed to reduce the prevalence of sunburns and indoor tanning in the past 12 months and to increase frequent sun-protective behaviors. Skin cancer-related HP 2020 targets are measured by the questions in the National Health Interview Survey. HP 2020 targets have not been set for skin cancer screen or individual sun-protective behaviors.

JAm Acad Dermatol. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2020 October 01.

Yeung et al.

^CMultivariable logistic regression models adjusted for age group, race/ethnicity, income level, smoking status, heavy alcohol use, and body mass index. First-order interaction terms between race/ethnicity and sexual minority status were not significant and not included in the final model.

 $d_{\text{Composite measure defined as "always" or "most of the time" use of staying in the shade, wearing a long-sleeved shirt, long pants, wide-brimmed hat, and/or SPF 15+ sunscreen when going outside on a warm sunny day for more than one hour. Respondents who report they "do not go out into the sun" were not considered to engage in frequent sun-protective behaviors as per the Healthy People 2020 target definitions.$