**APPENDIX A** 

### Table S1: PRISMA checklist

Section/topic	#	Checklist item	Reported on page #
	T	TITLE	
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review, meta-analysis, or both.	1
	1	ABSTRACT	
Structured summary	2	Provide a structured summary including, as applicable: background; objectives; data sources; study eligibility criteria, participants, and interventions; study appraisal and synthesis methods; results; limitations; conclusions and implications of key findings; systematic review registration number.	2
		INTRODUCTION	
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known.	3-4
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of questions being addressed with reference to participants, interventions, comparisons, outcomes, and study design (PICOS).	4
		METHODS	
Protocol and registration	5	Indicate if a review protocol exists, if and where it can be accessed (e.g., Web address), and, if available, provide registration information including registration number.	5
Eligibility criteria	6	Specify study characteristics (e.g., PICOS, length of follow- up) and report characteristics (e.g., years considered, language, publication status) used as criteria for eligibility, giving rationale.	5
Information sources	7	Describe all information sources (e.g., databases with dates of coverage, contact with study authors to identify additional studies) in the search and date last searched.	5
Search	8	Present full electronic search strategy for at least one database, including any limits used, such that it could be repeated.	5
Study selection	9	State the process for selecting studies (i.e., screening, eligibility, included in systematic review, and, if applicable, included in the meta-analysis).	6
Data collection process	10	Describe method of data extraction from reports (e.g., piloted forms, independently, in duplicate) and any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators.	6
Data items	11	List and define all variables for which data were sought (e.g., PICOS, funding sources) and any assumptions and simplifications made.	6

Risk of bias in individual studies12 bescribe methods used for assessing risk of bias of individual studies (including specification of whether this was done at the study or outcome level), and how this information is to be used in any data synthesis.6Summary measures13State the principal summary measures (e.g., risk ratio, consistency (e.g., l <sup>2</sup> ) for each meta-analysis.7Synthesis of results14Describe the methods of handling data and combining results of studies, if done, including measures of consistency (e.g., l <sup>2</sup> ) for each meta-analysis.7Risk of bias across15Specify any assessment of risk of bias that may affect the cumulative evidence (e.g., publication bias, selective reporting within studies).7Additional analyses16Describe methods of additional analyses (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression), if done, indicating which were pre-specified.7Study selection17Give numbers of studies screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally with a flow diagram.8Study characteristics18For each study, present characteristics for which data were extracted (e.g., study size, PICOS, follow-up period) and provide the citations.9Risk of bias within studies19Present data on risk of bias of each marsh, present, individual9Risk of bias across19Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across ary outcome level assessment (see item 12).9Study characteristics21For all outcomes considered (benefits or harms),				
measures       difference in means).       r         Synthesis of results       14       Describe the methods of handling data and combining results of studies, if done, including measures of consistency (e.g., l <sup>2</sup> ) for each meta-analysis.       7         Risk of bias across       15       Specify any assessment of risk of bias that may affect the cumulative evidence (e.g., publication bias, selective reporting within studies).       7         Additional analyses       16       Describe methods of additional analyses (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression), if done, indicating which were pre-specified.       7         Study       17       Give numbers of studies screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally with a flow diagram.       8         Study       18       For each study, present characteristics for which data were extracted (e.g., study size, PICOS, follow-up period) and provide the citations.       9         Risk of bias       19       Present data on risk of bias of each study and, if available, any outcome level assessment (see item 12).       9         Results of individual studies       21       For all outcomes considered (benefits or harms), present, for each study: (a) simple summary data for each intervals, ideally with a forest plot.       9         Synthesis of results       21       Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies       9         Additional analysis       23	individual	12	individual studies (including specification of whether this was done at the study or outcome level), and how this	6
resultsresults of studies, if done, including measures of consistency (e.g., l <sup>2</sup> ) for each meta-analysis.7Risk of bias across studies15Specify any assessment of risk of bias that may affect the consistency (e.g., publication bias, selective reporting within studies).7Additional analyses16Describe methods of additional analyses (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression), if done, indicating which were pre-specified.7Study selection17Give numbers of studies screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally with a flow diagram.8Study characteristics18For each study, present characteristics for which data were extracted (e.g., study size, PICOS, follow-up period) and provide the citations.9Risk of bias studies19Present data on risk of bias of each study and, if available, any outcome level assessment (see item 12).9Results of individual studies20For all outcomes considered (benefits or harms), present, for each study: (a) simple summary data for each intervants, ideally with a forest plot.9Synthesis of results of euclids21Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies9Additional analysis22Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies (see Item 15).9-10Synthesis of evidence for each main findings including the strength of evidence for each main indicings including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (e.g., healthcare providers, user	-	13		7
across studiescumulative evidence (e.g., publication bias, selective reporting within studies).7Additional analyses16Describe methods of additional analyses (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression), if done, indicating which were pre-specified.7Study selection17Give numbers of studies screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally with a flow diagram.8Study characteristics18For each study, present characteristics for which data were extracted (e.g., study size, PICOS, follow-up period) and provide the citations.9Risk of bias tidiudal19Present data on risk of bias of each study and, if available, any outcome level assessment (see item 12).9Results of individual studies21Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence intervals indeally with a forest plot.9Synthesis of results21Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies (see Item 15).9Additional analysis23Give results of andy assessment of risk of bias across studies (see Item 15).9-10Madditional evidence24Summarize the main findings including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (e.g., healthcare providers, users, and policy makers).10Limitations25Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (e.g., risk of bias), and at review-level (e.g., incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias).11	•	14	results of studies, if done, including measures of	7
analysessubgroup analyses, meta-regression), if done, indicating which were pre-specified.7RESULTSStudy selection17Give numbers of studies screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally with a flow diagram.8Study characteristics18For each study, present characteristics for which data were extracted (e.g., study size, PICOS, follow-up period) and provide the citations.9Risk of bias studies19Present data on risk of bias of each study and, if available, any outcome level assessment (see item 12).9Results of individual studies20For all outcomes considered (benefits or harms), present, for each study: (a) simple summary data for each intervention group (b) effect estimates and confidence intervals, ideally with a forest plot.9Synthesis of results21Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence intervals and measures of consistency.9Risk of bias across studies22Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies (see Item 15).9Additional analysis23Give results of additional analyses, if done (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression [see Item 16]).9-10Summary of evidence24Summarize the main findings including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (e.g., healthcare providers, users, and policy makers).10Limitations25Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (e.g., risk of bias), and at review-level (	across	15	cumulative evidence (e.g., publication bias, selective	7
Study selection17Give numbers of studies screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally with a flow diagram.8Study characteristics18For each study, present characteristics for which data were extracted (e.g., study size, PICOS, follow-up period) and provide the citations.8Risk of bias within studies19Present data on risk of bias of each study and, if available, any outcome level assessment (see item 12).9Results of individual studies20For all outcomes considered (benefits or harms), present, for each study: (a) simple summary data for each intervals, ideally with a forest plot.9Synthesis of results21Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence intervals and measures of consistency.9Additional across studies23Give results of additional analyses, if done (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression [see Item 16]).9-10Summary of evidence24Summarize the main findings including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (e.g., healthcare providers, users, and policy makers).10Limitations25Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (e.g., risk of bias), and at review-level (e.g., incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias).11		16	subgroup analyses, meta-regression), if done, indicating	7
selectionand included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally with a flow diagram.8Study characteristics18For each study, present characteristics for which data were extracted (e.g., study size, PICOS, follow-up period) and provide the citations.8Risk of bias within studies19Present data on risk of bias of each study and, if available, any outcome level assessment (see item 12).9Results of individual studies20For all outcomes considered (benefits or harms), present, for each study: (a) simple summary data for each intervention group (b) effect estimates and confidence intervals, ideally with a forest plot.9Synthesis of results21Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence intervals and measures of consistency.9Risk of bias across22Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies (see Item 15).9Additional analysis23Give results of additional analyses, if done (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression [see Item 16]).9-10Summary of evidence24Summarize the main findings including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (e.g., healthcare providers, users, and policy makers).10Limitations25Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (e.g., risk of bias), and at review-level (e.g., incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias).11			RESULTS	
characteristicsextracted (e.g., study size, PICOS, follow-up period) and provide the citations.8Risk of bias within studies19Present data on risk of bias of each study and, if available, any outcome level assessment (see item 12).9Results of individual studies20For all outcomes considered (benefits or harms), present, for each study: (a) simple summary data for each intervention group (b) effect estimates and confidence intervals, ideally with a forest plot.9Synthesis of results21Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence intervals and measures of consistency.9Risk of bias across studies22Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies (see Item 15).9Additional analysis23Give results of additional analyses, if done (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression [see Item 16]).9-10Summary of evidence24Summarize the main findings including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (e.g., healthcare providers, users, and policy makers).10Limitations25Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (e.g., risk of bias), and at review-level (e.g., incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias).11	•	17	and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at	8
within studiesany outcome level assessment (see item 12).9Results of individual studies20For all outcomes considered (benefits or harms), present, for each study: (a) simple summary data for each intervention group (b) effect estimates and confidence intervals, ideally with a forest plot.9Synthesis of results21Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence intervals and measures of consistency.9Risk of bias across studies22Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies (see Item 15).9Additional analysis23Give results of additional analyses, if done (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression [see Item 16]).9-10Summary of evidence24Summarize the main findings including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (e.g., healthcare providers, users, and policy makers).10Limitations25Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (e.g., risk of bias), and at review-level (e.g., incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias).11		18	extracted (e.g., study size, PICOS, follow-up period) and	8
individual studiesfor each study: (a) simple summary data for each intervention group (b) effect estimates and confidence intervals, ideally with a forest plot.9Synthesis of results21Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence intervals and measures of consistency.9Risk of bias across studies22Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies (see Item 15).9Additional analysis23Give results of additional analyses, if done (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression [see Item 16]).9-10Summary of evidence24Summarize the main findings including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (e.g., healthcare providers, users, and policy makers).10Limitations25Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (e.g., risk of bias), and at review-level (e.g., incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias).11		19		9
resultsconfidence intervals and measures of consistency.9Risk of bias across studies22Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies (see Item 15).9Additional analysis23Give results of additional analyses, if done (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression [see Item 16]).9-10Summary of evidence24Summarize the main findings including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (e.g., healthcare providers, users, and policy makers).10Limitations25Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (e.g., risk of bias), and at review-level (e.g., incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias).11	individual	20	for each study: (a) simple summary data for each intervention group (b) effect estimates and confidence	9
across studiesstudies (see Item 15).9Additional analysis23Give results of additional analyses, if done (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression [see Item 16]).9-10DISCUSSIONSummary of evidence24Summarize the main findings including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (e.g., healthcare providers, users, and policy makers).10Limitations25Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (e.g., risk of bias), and at review-level (e.g., incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias).11	-	21		9
analysisor subgroup analyses, meta-regression [see Item 16]).9-10DISCUSSIONSummary of evidence24Summarize the main findings including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (e.g., healthcare providers, users, and policy makers).10Limitations25Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (e.g., risk of bias), and at review-level (e.g., incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias).11	across	22		9
Summary of evidence24Summarize the main findings including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (e.g., healthcare providers, users, and policy makers).10Limitations25Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (e.g., risk of bias), and at review-level (e.g., incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias).11		23		9-10
evidenceevidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (e.g., healthcare providers, users, and policy makers).10Limitations25Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (e.g., risk of bias), and at review-level (e.g., incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias).11			DISCUSSION	
bias), and at review-level (e.g., incomplete retrieval of 11 identified research, reporting bias).		24	evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (e.g., healthcare providers, users, and policy	10
Conclusions26Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context12-13	Limitations	25	bias), and at review-level (e.g., incomplete retrieval of	11
	Conclusions	26	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context	12-13

		of other evidence, and implications for future research.	
		FUNDING	
Funding	27	Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (e.g., supply of data); role of funders for the systematic review.	15

## Table S2: Literature search strategies

PUBMED: NIOSHTIC-2:	<ul> <li>(((("firefighter"[mesh] OR "firefighter"[tiab] OR "firefighter"[ot] OR "fire"[mesh] OR "fire"[tiab] OR "fire"[ot] OR"firefighting"[mesh] OR "firefighting"[tiab] OR</li> <li>"firefighting"[ot] OR "first responder"[mesh] OR "first responder"[tiab] OR</li> <li>"first responder"[ot]) AND (("cancer"[mesh] OR "cancer"[tiab] OR "cancer"[ot] OR "lymphoma"[mesh] OR "lymphoma"[tiab] OR "lymphoma"[ot] OR</li> <li>"mesothelioma"[mesh] OR "mesothelioma"[tiab] OR "mesothelioma"[ot] OR</li> <li>"myeloma"[mesh] OR "myeloma"[tiab] OR "myeloma"[ot] OR</li> <li>"melanoma"[mesh] OR "melanoma"[tiab] OR "melanoma"[ot] OR</li> <li>"leukemia"[mesh] OR "leukemia"[tiab] OR "melanoma"[ot] OR</li> <li>"melanoma"[mesh] OR "melanoma"[tiab] OR "melanoma"[ot] OR</li> <li>"leukemia"[mesh] OR "melanoma"[tiab] OR "melanoma"[ot] OR</li> <li>"melanoma"[mesh] OR "melanoma"[tiab] OR "melanoma"[ot] OR</li> <li>"leukemia"[mesh] OR "melanoma"[tiab] OR "melanoma"[ot] OR</li> <li>"carcinoma"[mesh] OR "malignancy"[tiab] OR "malignancy"[ot] OR</li> <li>"malignant"[mesh] OR "malignant"[tiab] OR "malignant"[ot] OR</li> <li>"carcinoma"[tiab] OR "carcinoma"[ot])) AND (("2009/01/01"[PDAT] : "2020/04/30"[PDAT])) AND (English[lang])</li> <li>fire OR firefighter OR firefighting AND cancer OR lymphoma OR</li> </ul>
	mesothelioma OR myeloma OR melanoma OR leukemia OR malignancy OR malignant OR tumor OR carcinoma AND (2009/01/01 to 2020/04/30)
GOOGLE SCHOLAR:	fire OR firefighter OR firefighting OR 'First Responder' AND cancer OR lymphoma OR mesothelioma OR myeloma OR melanoma OR leukemia OR malignancy OR malignant OR tumor OR carcinoma AND (2009/01/01 to 2020/04/30)

Code	Cancer Type
C00-C97	All cancers
C00-C14	Buccal cavity and pharynx
C15	Esophagus
C16	Stomach
C17	Small Intestine
C18	Large intestine
C17-C18 <sup>±</sup>	Colon
C19-C21	Rectum
C22-C23	Liver/Gallbladder
C25	Pancreas
C32	Larynx
C33-C34	Lung
C40-C41	Bone
C43	Malignant Melanoma
C44	Skin
C45	Pleura (mesothelioma)
C49	Soft tissue sarcoma
C50	Breast
C60, C63	Other male genital organs
C61	Prostate
C62	Testis
C64-C66	Kidney
C67	Bladder
C69	Eye
C47, C70-C72	Brain
C73	Thyroid
C46.3, C82-C85, C88.0, C88.3, C91.4, C96	Non-Hodgkin's lymphoma
C81	Hodgkin's Disease
C88.7, C88.9, C90	Multiple Myeloma
C91.0-C91.3, C91.5-C91.9, C92-C95	Leukemia

Table S3: Cancer types extracted from the studies included in the meta-analysis based on the ICD-10

<sup>±</sup>If not specified as either large (C18) or small (C17) intestine

First author,										I	ntern	atio	nal C	lassi	ificat	ion c	of Dis	sease	e Co	de (IQ	CD)-1	0									
year	C00-C97	C00-C14	C15	C16	C17	C18	C17-C18	C19-C21	C22-C23	C25	C32	C33-C34	C40-C41	C43	C44	C45	C49	C50	C60, C63	C61	C62	C64-C66	C67-C68	C69	C47, C70-C72	C73	C46.3, C82-C85, C88.0, C88.3, C91.4, C96	C81	C88.7, C88.9, C90	C91.0-C91.3, C91.5-C91.9, C92-95	Other Cancer
			I	I			I		1		1	I	Cas	e-Co	ntrol		1	I		1	I			1	 I				I	L	
Kang, 2008		$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$			$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$			$\checkmark$		$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$		$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$		$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	
Corbin, 2011												$\checkmark$																			
Villeneuve, 2011												$\checkmark$																			
Karami, 2012																						$\checkmark$									
Paget-Bailly, 2013																															$\checkmark$
Tsai, 2015		$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$			$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$		$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$		$\checkmark$		$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$			$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$		$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	~
Bigert, 2016												$\checkmark$																			$\checkmark$
Lee, 2019		$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$			$\checkmark$		$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$																		
Langevin, 2020		$\checkmark$																													
													(	Coho	rt											•					
Ahn, 2012	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$		$\checkmark$		$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$							$\checkmark$		$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$		$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$			$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$
Daniels, 2014*	$\checkmark$	1		1	$\checkmark$				$\checkmark$	1	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	1	✓		$\checkmark$		$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$								
Pukkala, 2014	$\checkmark$	~	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$		$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$		$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$		$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$		$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$		$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$
Glass, 2016*	$\checkmark$	~	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$			$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$		$\checkmark$		$\checkmark$		$\checkmark$		$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$		$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$
Kullberg, 2017	$\checkmark$	~	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$			$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$				$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$				$\checkmark$		$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$		$\checkmark$		$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$
Petersen, 2017	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$			$\checkmark$		$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$																		

#### Table S4: Extracted estimates on cancer incidence from case-control and cohort studies

Sritharan, 2018																$\checkmark$										
Harris, 2018	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$		$\checkmark$																				

\*Reported cancer incidence and mortality.

First author,										lı	ntern	atio	nal C	lassi	ificat	ion c	of Dis	sease	e Coo	de (IC	DC)-1	0									
year	C00-C97	C00-C14	C15	C16	C17	C18	C17-C18	C19-C21	C22-C23	C25	C32	C33-C34	C40-C41	C43	C44	C45	C49	C50	C60, C63	C61	C62	C64-C66	C67-C68	C69	C47, C70-C72	C73	C46.3, C82-C85, C88.0, C88.3, C91.4, C96	C81	C88.7, C88.9, C90	C91.0-C91.3, C91.5-C91.9, C92-95	Other Cancer
				<b></b>		<b></b>							Cas	e-Co	ntrol									<b></b>		<b></b>	<b>I</b>				
Muegge, 2018	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$								$\checkmark$							$\checkmark$					$\checkmark$			$\checkmark$						$\checkmark$
													(	Coho	rt																
Daniels, 2014*	$\checkmark$				$\checkmark$				$\checkmark$		$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$		$\checkmark$		$\checkmark$		$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$								
Brice, 2015	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$			$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$			$\checkmark$			$\checkmark$		$\checkmark$		$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$								$\checkmark$
Ahn, 2015	$\checkmark$			$\checkmark$			$\checkmark$		$\checkmark$			$\checkmark$																		$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$
Glass, 2016*	$\checkmark$																														
Petersen, 2018				$\checkmark$			$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$												$\checkmark$											$\checkmark$
Pinkerton, 2020	$\checkmark$		$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$			$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$				$\checkmark$			$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$		$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$		$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$		$\checkmark$		$\checkmark$		$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	

## Table S5: Extracted estimates on cancer mortality from case-control and cohort studies

\*Reported cancer incidence and mortality.

First Author,	Time	Sample	Study	Source of	Source of	Occupational	Exposure	Occupation	Type of	Covariates
Year –	period	size	design	cancer	occupation	focus	categories	identifier	measure	
Country*				data	data					
Kang, 2008 – US	1986-	2125	Case-	Tumor	Tumor registry	Multiple	AS, OT	Tumor registry	SMORs	Age, smoking
	2003		Control	registry		occupations				status
Corbin, 2011 – New	2007-	3	Case-	Tumor	Interview	Multiple	AS, DoE, OT	New Zealand	OR	Age, gender, Māori
Zealand	2008		Control	registry		occupations		Standard		ethnicity, smoking
								Classification of		status
								Occupations		
Villeneuve, 2011 –	1994-	22	Case-	Tumor	Questionnaire	Multiple	AS, CP, DoE,	Canadian Standard	OR	Age, province,
Canada	1997		Control	registry		occupations	OT, TADE	Occupational		cigarette pack-
								Classification,		years, exposure to
								Canada Standard		secondhand
								Industrial		smoke, exposure
								Classification		to silica and
										asbestos
Karami, 2012 – US	2002-	8	Case-	Tumor	Interview	Multiple	AS, DoE, OT	Standard Industry	OR	Age, geographic
	2007		Control	registry,		occupations		Classification,		area, alcohol
				Hospital				Standard		consumption,
				records				Occupational		tobacco
								Classification		consumption,
										smoking status
Paget-Bailly, 2013	2001-	25	Case-	Tumor	Questionnaire	Multiple	DoE	ISCO, The	OR	
– France	2007		Control	registry	information	occupations		Nomenclature		
Tsai, 2015 – US	1988-	3,996	Case-	Tumor	Tumor registry	Firefighters	ОТ	Code of Census	OR	Age, year of
	2007		Control	registry				Population		diagnosis, race

# Table S6: Characteristics of studies reporting on firefighting and cancer incidence

Bigert, 2016 –	1985-	190	Case-	Previous	Previous study	Firefighters	DoE, OT	ISCO	OR	Smoking status,
Europe, Canada,	2010		Control	study						work duration,
New Zealand,										cancer subtype
China										
Lee, 2019 – US	1982-	3,928	Case-	Tumor	Employment	Firefighters	AS	Florida State Fire	OR	Age and year at
	2014		Control	registry,	records, Florida			Marshall's Office		cancer diagnosis
				department	State Fire					
				information,	Marshall's					
				LexisNexis	Office,					
					LexisNexis					
Langevin, 2020 –	1999-	25	Case-	Tumor	Questionnaire	Firefighters	AS, DoE	Questionnaire	OR	Age, race,
US	2011		Control	registry,						smoking status,
				hospital						alcohol
				records						consumption,
										education
Ahn, 2012 – South	1980-	29,498	Cohort	Tumor	Employment	Multiple	OT, DoE	Organizational	SIR, SRR	Age, calendar
Korea	2007			registry,	records	occupations		classification		period
				Death						
				certificate						
Daniels, 2014 – US	1950-	29,993	Cohort	Tumor	Employment	Firefighters	DoE	Employment	SIR, SMR	Age, gender, race,
	2009			registry,	records,			records		calendar period
				death	previous study					
				certificate,						
				employment						
				records,						
				previous						
				study						
Pukkala, 2014 –	1961-	16,422	Cohort	Tumor	Census	Firefighters	AS, CP,	ISCO, National	SIR	Age, calendar
Denmark, Finland,	2005			registry	information		TADE	nomenclature		period

Iceland, Norway,										
Sweden										
Glass, 2016 –	1980-	30,057	Cohort	Tumor	Department	Firefighters	DoE, TADE,	Employment	SIR, SMR	Age, calendar
Australian	2011			registry,	information		TSE	records		period
				death						
				certificate						
Kullberg, 2017 –	1931-	1,080	Cohort	Tumor	Employment	Firefighters	AS, CP, DoE	Employment	SIR	Age
Sweden	1958			registry	records			records		
Petersen, 2017 -	1968-	9,061	Cohort	Tumor	Employment	Firefighters	AS, DoE,	Registration	SMR	Age, calendar
Denmark	2014			registry	records, Danish		TADE, TSE	systems		period
					Supplementary					
					Pension Fund					
					Register					
Sritharan, 2018 –	1991-	NA	Cohort	Tumor	Census info	Multiple	OT	NSCO	HR	Age, province,
Canada	2010			registry,		occupations				ethnicity,
				mortality						education, marital
				database						status
Harris, 2018 –	1992-	4,535	Cohort	Tumor	Census info	Multiple	ОТ	NSCO	HR	Age, region,
Canada	2010			registry		occupations				education

**Abbreviations:** AS = age-specific; CP = calendar period; DoE = duration of employment; HR = Hazard rate ratio; ISCO = International Standard Classification of Occupations; NSCO = National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health; OR = Odds ratio; OT = occupational title; RR = Risk ratio; SIR = Standard incidence ratio; SMR = Standard mortality ratio; TADE = task or activity during employment; TSE = time since employment

First Author, Year – Country*	Time period	Sample size	Study design	Source of cancer data	Source of occupation data	Occupational focus	Exposure categories	Occupation identifier	Type of measure	Covariates
Muegge, 2018 – US	1982- 2013	2,818	Case- Control	Death certificate	Death certificate	Firefighters	OT	NSCO	OR	Age, gender, race/ethnicity
Daniels, 2014 – US	1950- 2009	29,993	Cohort	SIR, SMR	Employment records, previous study	Firefighters	DoE	Employment records	SIR, SMR	Age, gender, race, calendar period
Brice, 2015 – Frace	1979- 2008	10,829	Cohort	Death certificate	Department information	Firefighters	OT	Employment records, Registration systems	SMR	Age, calendar period
Ahn, 2015 – South Korea	1980- 2007	29,453	Cohort	Death certificate	Employment records	Multiple occupations	OT, DoE	Organizational classification	SMR	Age, calendar period
Glass, 2016 – Australia	1980- 2011	30,057	Cohort	Tumor registry, death certificate	Department information	Firefighters	DoE, TSE, TADE	Employment records	SIR, SMR	Age, calendar period
Petersen, 2018 – Denmark	1970- 2014	11,775	Cohort	Death certificate	Employment records, Danish Civil Registration system	Firefighters	DoE	Registration systems	SMR	Age, calendar period
Pinkerton, 2020 – US	1950- 2016	29,992	Cohort	Tumor registry, death certificate, employment records, previous study	Employment records, previous study	Firefighters	OT, DoE, TADE (included exposed- days, fire- runs, fire- hours, department location)	Organizational classification	SMR	Age, gender, race, calendar period

**Abbreviations:** AS = age-specific; CP = calendar period; DoE = duration of employment; HR = Hazard rate ratio; ISCO = International Standard Classification of Occupations; NSCO = National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health; OR = Odds ratio; OT = occupational title; RR = Risk ratio; SIR = Standard incidence ratio; SMR = Standard mortality ratio; TADE = task or activity during employment; TSE = time since employment

First author, Year	Selection	Comparability	Exposure or	Total Score	Quality
		Incid	outcome		
Kang 2008	***	·····································	ence 卷 卷	7	Good
Kang, 2008	***	**	·····································	7	-
Corbin, 2011				1	Good
Villeneuve, 2011	**	**	***	1	Good
Karami, 2012	**	**	*	5	Fair
Paget-Bailly, 2013	***	**	**	7	Good
Tsai, 2015	***	**	张张	7	Good
Bigert, 2016		**		2	Poor
Lee, 2019	***	**	**	7	Good
Langevin, 2020	<b>**</b> **	柴 帝	発	7	Good
Ahn, 2012	<b>**</b> **	柴 帝	<b>举荣荣</b>	9	Good
Daniels, 2014*	<b>**</b> *	**	**	7	Good
Pukkala, 2014	****	**	* *	8	Good
Glass, 2016*	****	**	* *	8	Good
Kullberg, 2017	***	**	* *	7	Good
Petersen, 2017	<b>**</b> **	柴 帝	※ ※	8	Good
Sritharan, 2018	****	**	* *	8	Good
Harris, 2018	****	**	* * *	9	Good
		Mort	ality		
Muegge, 2018	<b>**</b> *	柴 帝	※ ※	7	Good
Daniels, 2014*	***	**	※ ※	7	Good
Brice, 2015	**	**	※ ※	6	Good
Ahn, 2015	****	**	张张	8	Good
Glass, 2016*	****	**	※ ※	8	Good
Petersen, 2018	****	**	**	8	Good
Pinkerton, 2020	****	**	张张	8	Good

#### Table S8: Quality assessment of 22 individual studies on cancer incidence and mortality among firefighters

\*Reported cancer incidence and mortality.