Combined oral contraceptives containing chlormadinone acetate and breast cancer: results of a case-control study

K. Ebeling¹, R. Ray², P. Nischan¹, D.B. Thomas², D. Kunde⁴ & H. Stalsberg³

¹Clinic for Oncology, Department of Medicine, Humboldt University, Schumannstrasse 20–21, 0–1040 Berlin, Germany; ²Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Centre, 1124 Columbia Street, Seattle, 98104, USA; ³University of Tromso, Institute of Medical Biology, PO Box 977, N-9001 Tromso, Norway; ⁴Central Institute of Cancer Research, Lindenberger Weg 80, 0–1115 Berlin, Germany.

Summary The main subject of this hospital-based case-control study was the possible relationship between use of combined oral contraceptives (OCs) containing chlormadinone acetate and breast cancer. Analyses were based on data from 490 cases with newly diagnosed breast cancer and 1,223 controls and were separately performed for combined OCs with and without chlormadinone. For either of the combined OCs, risk was not elevated in ever users, did not increase with duration of use and did not change with time since initial exposure or with time since most recent use. However, the relative risk was increased in current users: RR = 1.72 (0.88, 3.36) for combined OCs with chlormadinone and RR = 1.42 (1.01, 2.00) for combined OCs without chlormadinone as a screening effect. These results show that chlormadinone as a constituent of combined OCs does not influence breast cancer risk.

The possible influence of oral contraceptives (OCs) on breast cancer risk has been investigated in numerous epidemiologic studies. The results have recently been reviewed (Prentice & Thomas, 1987). Most studies found no significant alteration in overall breast cancer risk. Despite these consistent and reassuring findings, there remains some concern that different OC formulations or OCs taken at different times in a woman's reproductive life may enhance the risk of breast cancer (McPherson *et al.*, 1987). Among other questions are the possible effects on risk of formulations of varying progestogen potency (Pike *et al.*, 1983) or with different types of oestrogens (Schlesselman *et al.*, 1988).

This study concerns chlormadinone acetate (hereafter referred to as chlormadinone) as the progestogen component of OCs. Following treatment with megestrol acetate or chlormadinone acetate, breast nodules have been observed in female beagle dogs (Nelson *et al.*, 1972, 1973; Nelson & Kelly, 1976; IARC, 1979). Although the conclusions based on these experiments have been disputed, they led to a widespread discontinuation of the use of chlormadinone in OCs. In the former German Democratic Republic (GDR) only OCs containing chlormadinone were in use up to 1971 when different types were introduced (Nischan & Ebeling, 1984).

This paper reports the results of a case-control study which is part of the WHO Collaborative Study of Neoplasia and Steroid Contraceptives (1990) and which was conducted in the GDR specifically to further investigate the possible role of OCs containing chlormadinone in the aetiology of breast cancer.

Material and methods

This investigation, carried out between November 1982 and July 1986, followed the methods used in the WHO study, which have been described in detail elsewhere (WHO Collaborative Study of Neoplasia and Steroid Contraceptives, 1985). Breast cancer cases were detected by monitoring all new admissions to the Central Institute of Cancer Research, Berlin. Cases included all women diagnosed histologically as having a malignant breast tumour and who were born after 1930. Controls were selected from among women admitted to the ear, nose and throat (26%), eye (10%), orthopaedic (49%) and skin (15%) wards of the district hospital Klinikum Berlin-Buch, who met the same age criteria as the cases and who were not admitted for treatment of conditions considered a priori to possibly alter contraceptive practices (i.e. circulatory and cardiovascular diseases, diabetes, chronic renal disease, benign breast disease, previously diagnosed malignancy, chronic liver disease, and any obstetrical or gynaecological condition). Controls were not matched to individual cases, but a sampling procedure was developed to assure that sufficient controls were included to give a cumulative ratio of approximately two controls per case in each 5-year age group.

A standardised questionnaire was used to obtain information on the known and suspected risk factors for breast cancer, and a complete obstetric and contraceptive history. A calendar and samples of OCs available in the GDR were used to facilitate recall of times of use and products taken. Medical records were reviewed to validate selected items in the questionnaire, including use of steroid contraceptives. A pathologist was responsible for diagnosing the cases, and providing information on the extent of disease at diagnosis and gross pathology. Slides from all cases were sent to the WHO reference pathologist (H. Stalsberg, Norway) for of diagnosis confirmation and uniform histologic classification according to the WHO Histological Typing of Breast Tumours (World Health Organisation, 1981).

Questionnaires and forms from the local and reference pathologists were key entered and edited at the coordinating centre in Seattle, where statistical analyses were also performed. Combined OCs were classified according to chlormadinone content. Relative risks and 95% confidence intervals were computed utilising unconditional logistic regression (Breslow & Day, 1980). All relative risks were adjusted for age and, where appropriate, for other variables and use of OCs of types other than that under consideration.

Results

A total of 502 cases and 1,316 controls were accrued. Three cases and 93 controls were not interviewed, mainly because of a short stay in hospital, and nine cases were excluded because of a prior history of breast cancer. Thus, 490 cases and 1,223 controls were included in the analysis.

In Table I, relative risks of breast cancer in relation to various previously recognised risk factors for this disease are shown. As expected, risk is seen to increase in women with a

Correspondence: K. Ebeling, Clinic for Oncology, Department of Medicine, Humboldt University, Schumannstrasse 20-21, 0-1040 Berlin, Germany.

Received 19 June 1990; and in revised form 21 December 1990.

$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		Level	N	o. of subied	ets	Rela	tive risk ^a	
Age at interview20-241(0.2%)0(0.0%) $25 - 29$ 10(2.0%)14(1.1%) $30 - 34$ 25(5.1%)83(6.8%) $35 - 39$ 37(7.6%)123(10.1%) $40 - 44$ 131(26.7%)373(30.5%) $45 - 49$ 175(35.7%)355(29.0%) $50 - 54$ 106(21.6%)257(21.0%) $55 - 59$ 5(1.0%)18(1.5%)Total490(100%)1223(100%)Family history of cancerNo2617221.00CancerBreast44383.16(1.29, 5.00)Other1554031.04(0.82, 1.31)Unknown30601.41(0.88, 2.23)Benign breastNo42911311.00biopsiesYes61921.70Age at menarche<1311032413.142415741.222415741.22(0.93, 1.59)> 141393231.210.891.23(0.60, 1.06)> -4862440.80022Test for trend $P < 0.01$ Age at 1st live birthNone671610.94(0.56, 1.97) < 20 8424110020-24214272001.272891730.640.26, 0.28)<	Variable	of variable	Cases Controls			(95% CI)		
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Age at interview	20-24	1	(0.2%)	0	(0.0%)		
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		25-29	10	(2.0%)	14	(1.1%)		
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		30-34	25	(5.1%)	83	(6.8%)		
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		35-39	37	(7.6%)	123	(10.1%)		
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		40-44	131	(26.7%)	373	(30.5%)		
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		45-49	175	(35.7%)	355	(29.0%)		
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		50-54	106	(21.6%)	257	(21.0%)		
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		55-59	5	(1.0%)	18	(1.5%)		
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		Total	490	(100%)	1223	(100%)		
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Family history of	No	261		722	1.00		
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	cancer	Breast	44		38	3.16	(1.99, 5.00)	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		Other	155		403	1.04	(0.82, 1.31)	
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		Unknown	30		60	1.41	(0.88, 2.23)	
biopsiesYes61921.70 $(1.20, 2.39)$ Age at menarche<13	Benign breast	No	429		1131	1.00		
Age at menarche< 131103241.0013,142415741.22 $(0.93, 1.59)$ > 141393231.21 $(0.89, 1.63)$ Never menstruated02Test for trend $P < 0.05$ Total live birthNone67161 0.94 $(0.69, 1.29)$ 1-23267771.003-486244 0.80 $(0.60, 1.06)$ > 41141 0.59 $(0.30, 1.16)$ Test for trendPrev. pregnant, no live births1181.16 $(0.77, 1.76)$ $20 - 24$ 2145761.05 $(0.78, 1.41)$ $25 - 29$ 912001.27 $(0.89, 1.80)$ 29 34452.13 $(1.27, 3.56)$ Test for trendbPremenopausal 3918781.00Menopausal statusPremenopausal 3918781.00Age at menopauseS913918781.00Age at menopause1918781.00Age at menopause1918781.00Age at menopause291280.39 $(0.24, 0.62)$ $50 - 54$ 21400.89 $(0.49, 1.63)$ Unknown011Never menstruated02Test for trendb21280.39Test for trendbP20Test for trendbP2Test for trendbP2Test for trendb2Test for trendb<	biopsies	Yes	61		92	1.70	(1.20, 2.39)	
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Age at menarche	<13	110		324	1.00		
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	-	13,14	241		574	1.22	(0.93, 1.59)	
Never menstruated02Test for trend $P < 0.05$ Total live birthNone671-23267773-486>411410.590.30, 1.16)Fest for trend $P > 0.1$ Age at 1st live birthNever pregnant511181.16(0.77, 1.76)Prev. pregnant, no live births16431.05208420-2421420-2421420-2421425-29912001.27208421.3(1.27, 3.56)PPMenopausal statusPremenopausalAge at menopause3918781.00Artificial591730.640.25, 0.58)Unknown1Never menstruated245 - 49291280.3945 - 49291280.3945 - 49291280.3945 - 49291280.3945 - 49291280.3945 - 49214200.24214002Test for trendb2Test for trendb2Test for trendb2130141401691411691451401451401451		>14	139		323	1.21	(0.89, 1.63)	
Test for trend $P < 0.05$ Total live birthNone671610.94(0.69, 1.29) $1-2$ 3267771.00 $3-4$ 862440.80(0.60, 1.06)> 411410.59(0.30, 1.16)Test for trend $P > 0.1$ $P > 0.1$ Age at 1st live birthNever pregnant511181.16Prev. pregnant, no live births16431.05(0.56, 1.97) < 20 842411.00 $20-24$ 214 $25-29$ 912001.27(0.89, 1.80) > 29 34452.13(1.27, 3.56)Test for trendb $P < 0.01$ $P < 0.01$ Menopausal statusPremenopausal3918781.00Artificial591730.64(0.46, 0.89)Natural401690.39(0.25, 0.58)Unknown01Never menstruated2Age at menopausePremenopausal3918781.00 < 45 491740.55(0.39, 0.78) $45-49$ 291280.39(0.24, 0.62) $50-54$ 21400.89(0.49, 1.63)Unknown01Never menstruated02Test for trendb $P > 0.6$ 2		Never menstruated	0		2			
Total live birthNone671610.94 $(0.69, 1.29)$ $1-2$ 3267771.00 $3-4$ 862440.80 $(0.60, 1.06)$ > 4 11410.59 $(0.30, 1.16)$ Test for trend $P > 0.1$ $P > 0.1$ Age at 1st live birthNever pregnant, no live births118 1.16 $0.77, 1.76$ $Prev. pregnant,$ no live births1643 1.05 $20-24$ 214576 1.05 $(0.78, 1.41)$ $25-29$ 91200 1.27 $(0.89, 1.80)$ > 29 3445 2.13 $(1.27, 3.56)$ Test for trendb P $P < 0.01$ $P < 0.01$ Menopausal statusPremenopausal391 878 1.00 Artificial59173 0.64 $(0.46, 0.89)$ Natural40169 0.39 $(0.25, 0.58)$ Unknown01Never menstruated 2 Age at menopausePremenopausal391 878 1.00 < 45 49174 0.55 $(0.39, 0.78)$ $45 - 49$ 29128 0.39 $(0.24, 0.62)$ $50 - 54$ 2140 0.89 $(0.49, 1.63)$ Unknown01Never menstruated 0 2Test for trendb27 166	Test for trend					P<0.05		
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Total live birth	None	67		161	0.94	(0.69, 1.29)	
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		1-2	326		777	1.00		
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		3-4	86		244	0.80	(0.60, 1.06)	
Test for trend $P > 0.1$ Age at 1st live birthNever pregnant511181.16 $(0.77, 1.76)$ Prev. pregnant, no live births16431.05 $(0.56, 1.97)$ < 20 842411.00 $20-24$ 2145761.05 $(0.78, 1.41)$ $25-29$ 912001.27 $(0.89, 1.80)$ > 29 34452.13 $(1.27, 3.56)$ Test for trendbPremenopausal3918781.00Menopausal statusPremenopausal3918781.00Artificial591730.64 $(0.46, 0.89)$ Natural401690.39 $(0.25, 0.58)$ Unknown01Never menstruated0Age at menopausePremenopausal3918781.00 < 45 491740.55 $(0.39, 0.78)$ $45-49$ 291280.39 $(0.24, 0.62)$ $50-54$ 21400.89 $(0.49, 1.63)$ Unknown01Never menstruated0Never menstruated022Test for trendb $P > 0.6$ $P > 0.6$		>4	11		41	0.59	(0.30, 1.16)	
Age at 1st live birthNever pregnant511181.16 $(0.77, 1.76)$ Prev. pregnant, no live births16431.05 $(0.56, 1.97)$ < 20 842411.00 $20-24$ 2145761.05 $(0.78, 1.41)$ $25-29$ 912001.27 $(0.89, 1.80)$ ≥ 29 34452.13 $(1.27, 3.56)$ Test for trend ^b Premenopausal3918781.00Menopausal statusPremenopausal3918781.00Artificial591730.64 $(0.46, 0.89)$ Natural401690.39 $(0.25, 0.58)$ Unknown01Never menstruated0Age at menopausePremenopausal3918781.00 < 45 491740.55 $(0.39, 0.78)$ $45-49$ 291280.39 $(0.24, 0.62)$ $50-54$ 21400.89 $(0.49, 1.63)$ Unknown01Never menstruated0Never menstruated022Test for trend ^b $P > 0.6$	Test for trend					P > 0.1		
Prev. pregnant, no live births16431.05(0.56, 1.97) < 20 842411.00 $20-24$ 2145761.05(0.78, 1.41) $25-29$ 912001.27(0.89, 1.80) ≥ 29 34342.13(1.27, 3.56)Test for trendb $P < 0.01$ $P < 0.01$ Menopausal statusPremenopausal3918781.00Artificial591730.64(0.46, 0.89)Natural401690.39(0.25, 0.58)Unknown011Never menstruated02Age at menopausePremenopausal391878 $45-49$ 291280.39(0.24, 0.62) $50-54$ 21400.89(0.49, 1.63)Unknown011Never menstruated02Test for trendb $P > 0.6$	Age at 1st live birth	Never pregnant	51		118	1.16	(0.77, 1.76)	
no live births16431.05 $(0.56, 1.97)$ < 20 842411.00 $20-24$ 2145761.05 $(0.78, 1.41)$ $25-29$ 912001.27 $(0.89, 1.80)$ > 29 34342.13 $(1.27, 3.56)$ Test for trendb $P < 0.01$ $P < 0.01$ Menopausal statusPremenopausal391878 1.00 Artificial591730.64 $(0.46, 0.89)$ Natural401690.39 $(0.25, 0.58)$ Unknown011Never menstruated02Age at menopausePremenopausal391878 $45-49$ 291280.39 $(0.24, 0.62)$ $50-54$ 21400.89 $(0.49, 1.63)$ Unknown011Never menstruated02Test for trendb $P > 0.6$		Prev. pregnant,						
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		no live births	16		43	1.05	(0.56, 1.97)	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		< 20	84		241	1.00	(0.70.1.41)	
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		20-24	214		576	1.05	(0.78, 1.41)	
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		25-29	91		200	1.27	(0.89, 1.80)	
Test for trend $P < 0.01$ Menopausal statusPremenopausal 3918781.00Artificial591730.64(0.46, 0.89)Natural401690.39(0.25, 0.58)Unknown01Never menstruated02Age at menopausePremenopausal3918781.00 < 45 491740.55(0.39, 0.78) $45-49$ 291280.39(0.24, 0.62) $50-54$ 21400.89(0.49, 1.63)Unknown01Never menstruated0Never menstruated022Test for trend ^b $P > 0.6$	The contract of the	> 29	34		45	2.13	(1.27, 3.30)	
Menopausal statusPremenopausal 391 878 1.00 Artificial59 173 0.64 $(0.46, 0.89)$ Natural40 169 0.39 $(0.25, 0.58)$ Unknown01Never menstruated02Age at menopausePremenopausal391 878 1.00 <45 49 174 0.55 $(0.39, 0.78)$ $45-49$ 29 128 0.39 $(0.24, 0.62)$ $50-54$ 2140 0.89 $(0.49, 1.63)$ Unknown01Never menstruated0Never menstruated022Test for trendb $P > 0.6$	Test for trend	D	201		070	P<0.01		
Artificial59173 0.64 $(0.46, 0.89)$ Natural40169 0.39 $(0.25, 0.58)$ Unknown01Never menstruated02Age at menopausePremenopausal391878 1.00 <45 49174 0.55 $(0.39, 0.78)$ $45-49$ 29128 0.39 $(0.24, 0.62)$ $50-54$ 2140 0.89 $(0.49, 1.63)$ Unknown01Never menstruated0Never menstruated022Test for trendb $P > 0.6$	Menopausal status	Artificial	391		0/0	1.00	(0.46.0.90)	
Natural401090.39 $(0.23, 0.38)$ Unknown01Never menstruated022Age at menopausePremenopausal3918781.00 <45 491740.55 $(0.39, 0.78)$ $45-49$ 291280.39 $(0.24, 0.62)$ $50-54$ 21400.89 $(0.49, 1.63)$ Unknown011Never menstruated02Test for trendb $P > 0.6$		Artificial	39		1/3	0.04	(0.40, 0.69)	
Onknown01Never menstruated02Age at menopausePremenopausal3918781.00 <45 491740.55(0.39, 0.78) $45-49$ 291280.39(0.24, 0.62) $50-54$ 21400.89(0.49, 1.63)Unknown011Never menstruated02Test for trendb $P > 0.6$		Inatural	40		109	0.39	(0.23, 0.38)	
Age at menopausePremenopausal391 878 1.00 <45 49 174 0.55 $(0.39, 0.78)$ $45-49$ 29 128 0.39 $(0.24, 0.62)$ $50-54$ 2140 0.89 $(0.49, 1.63)$ Unknown011Never menstruated02Test for trendb $P > 0.6$		Virkiiowii Natar manatmustad	0		2			
Age at menopauseremenopausa 391 676 1.00 <45 49 174 0.55 $(0.39, 0.78)$ $45-49$ 29 128 0.39 $(0.24, 0.62)$ $50-54$ 2140 0.89 $(0.49, 1.63)$ Unknown011Never menstruated02Test for trendb $P > 0.6$	A so of monomouse	Promononau and	201		878	1.00		
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Age at menopause		371 40		174	0.55	(0.39 0.78)	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		~ 4 J 15 10	+7 20		179	0.33	(0.32, 0.78)	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$			27		40	0.39	(0.27, 0.02)	
$\frac{1}{\text{Never menstruated}} = 0 \qquad 2$ Test for trend ^b $P > 0.6$		Junknown	21 0			0.07	(0.77, 1.05)	
Test for trend ^b $P > 0.6$		Never menstruated	ň		2			
	Test for trend ^b	i to tor monou udual	0		-	P>0.6		

Table I Age distribution of cases and controls and relative risks of breast cancer in relation to various risk factors

^aControlled for age; ^bTest for trend based on exposed subjects.

family history of breast cancer, and in women who have had a prior benign breast biopsy. Women of high parity are at reduced risk of breast cancer and among parous women, risk is seen to increase with the age at which a woman gives birth to her first child. Women who have gone through the menopause are at lower risk of breast cancer than women of the same age who are still menstruating, and risk is seen to increase with age at menopause.

Use of any type of OCs (including sequential OCs) was associated with an age adjusted relative risk (RR) of 0.98 (95% CI = 0.77, 1.24). Risk is also not seen to be altered in women who ever used combined OCs that contain chlormadinone (Table II) and in women who ever used combined OCs that do not contain chlormadinone (Table III). None of these relative risk estimates was appreciably altered by controlling for any of the potentially confounding variables shown in Table I or for use of an IUD. Therefore, unless otherwise stated, all subsequent relative risk estimates are controlled only for age and other types of OCs.

As shown in Table II, no appreciable trends in risk were observed in relation to duration of use, months since first use, or months since last use of combined OCs that contain chlormadinone. Similarly, no significant trends in risk in relation to these features of use were observed for combined OCs without chlormadinone (Table III). Values for the relative risks in users of varying duration were not ap-

preciably altered by controlling for either duration of use of all other combined OCs, or by controlling separately for duration of use of other types of OCs.

The highest relative risks were observed in women who had used combined OCs of either type within the previous 3 months (including current users). The possible enhanced risk in current and recent users were observed for all sizes of tumour at diagnosis.

Relative risks (and 95% confidence intervals) in women less than 35 years of age at diagnosis, and in older women, were respectively 0.94 (0.43, 2.07) and 0.91 (0.73, 1.15) for those who ever used combined OCs with chlormadinone, and 1.28 (0.33, 4.96) and 1.03 (0.80, 1.32) for those who ever used combined OCs without chlormadinone.

As shown in Tables IV and V, respectively, neither use of combined OCs with nor without chlormadinone was associated with risk of breast cancer when used by nulliparous women, or by parous women either before or after the birth of their first child. Similarly, use of neither type of OCs at a young age was associated with an increased risk. A modest increase in risk was observed in women who first used combined products without chlormadinone after the age of 40. This association was observed in women with tumours of varying sizes at diagnosis. This relationship is not due to women over age 40 more frequently being recent users (not shown). No comparable increase in risk in users after age 40

 Table II
 Relative risks of breast cancer in relation to ever use, duration of use, time since first use, and time since last use of combined oral contraceptives with chlormadinone

	No. of subjects			lative risk ^a
Category of use	Cases	Controls	(95% CI)
Ever use				
No	297	705	1.00	
Yes	193	518	0.89	(0.71, 1.12)
Months of use				
None or <1	302	713	1.00	
1-12	50	138	0.87	(0.61, 1.24)
13-36	46	155	0.69	(0.48, 1.00)
37-60	40	98	0.98	(0.65, 1.47)
>60	49	110	1.04	(0.72, 1.52)
Unknown	3	9	0.75	(0.20, 2.85)
Test for trend			P > 0.2	
Months since first use				
No use	297	705	1.00	
1-120	25	74	0.79	(0.49, 1.29)
121-156	44	98	1.10	(0.74, 1.64)
157-180	51	122	1.06	(0.74, 1.54)
181-204	44	132	0.78	(0.53, 1.14)
>204	26	85	0.69	(0.43, 1.10)
Unknown	3	7	0.95	(0.24, 3.76)
Test for trend ^b			P > 0.4	l í í
Months since last use				
No use	297	705	1.00	
Current use or use ≤ 3				
mos ago	16	22	1.72	(0.88, 3.36)
4-96	42	128	0.80	(0.54, 1.18)
97-132	60	128	1.14	(0.80, 1.63)
133-156	37	98	0.95	(0.62, 1.44)
>156	37	134	0.63	(0.43, 0.94)
Unknown	1	- 8		(,
Test for trend ^b	-	-	P > 0.0)5

^aAdjusted for age and use of other types of oral contraceptives; ^bTest for trend based on exposed subjects.

Table	Ш	Relative	risks	of	breast	cancer	in	relation	to	ever	use,
durati	on of	use, time	since	firs	t use, ai	nd time	sinc	æ last use	of	comb	ined
		oral co	ntrace	ptiv	ves with	nout ch	lorn	nadinone			

	No. of	^c subjects	Relative risk ^a		
Category of use	Cases	Controls	(5	95% CI)	
Ever use					
No	256	624	1.00		
Yes	234	599	1.03	(0.81, 1.31)	
Months of use					
None or < 1	260	632	1.00		
1-12	30	97	0.79	(0.51, 1.25)	
13-36	35	123	0.72	(0.47, 1.10)	
37-60	48	105	1.21	(0.81, 1.79)	
61-96	69	131	1.38	(0.97, 1.97)	
>96	48	128	1.01	(0.69, 1.49)	
Unknown	0	7		,	
Test for trend			P>0.9		
Months since first use					
No use	256	624	1.00		
1- 96	76	162	1.21	(0.87, 1.68)	
97-120	62	138	1.22	(0.84, 1.76)	
121-144	58	158	0.98	(0.68, 1.40)	
>144	38	137	0.72	(0.48, 1.08)	
Unknown	0	4			
Test for trend ^b			P < 0.02	5	
Months since last use					
No use	256	624	1.00		
Current use or use ≤ 3					
mos ago	82	164	1.42	(1.01, 2.00)	
4-36	55	126	1.18	(0.81, 1.71)	
37-60	38	92	1.05	(0.69, 1.60)	
61-96	35	121	0.76	(0.50, 1.16)	
>96	24	91	0.67	(0.41, 1.09)	
Unknown	0	5			
Test for trend ^b			P < 0.0	1	

^aAdjusted for age and use of other types of oral contraceptives; ^bTest for trend based on exposed subjects.

 Table IV
 Relative risks of breast cancer in relation to age at first use and use before and after first live birth, of combined oral contraceptives with chlormadinone

	No. of	^r subjects	Relative risk ^a (95% CI)						
Category of use	Cases	Controls							
Age at first use									
No use	297	705	1.00						
15-24	29	98	0.79	(0.48, 1.30)					
25-29	51	177	0.70	(0.49, 1.02)					
30-34	63	128	1.07	(0.76, 1.53)					
>34	49	113	0.98	(0.67, 1.42)					
Unknown	1	2							
Test for trend ^b			P < 0.0	5					
First live birth									
No use	297	705	1.00						
Before 1st live birth	6	36	0.39	(0.16, 0.98)					
Only after 1st live birth	172	446	0.92	(0.73, 1.17)					
Users without live				,					
birth	15	35	0.97	(0.52, 1.82)					
Unknown	0	1		. , ,					

^aAdjusted for age and use of other types of oral contraceptives; ^bTest for trend based on exposed subjects.

Table V Relative risks of breast cancer in relation to age at first use and use before and after first live birth, of combined oral contraceptives without chlormadinone

	No. of	subjects	Relative risk ^a (95% CI)						
Category of use	Cases	Controls							
Age at first use									
No use	256	624	1.00						
15-29	54	176	0.73	(0.43, 1.24)					
30-34	61	165	0.99	(0.68, 1.44)					
35-39	66	169	0.90	(0.64, 1.26)					
>40	53	88	1.46	(1.00, 2.13)					
Unknown	0	1		,					
Test for trend ^b			P < 0.0	01					
First live birth									
No use	256	624	1.00						
Before 1st live birth	9	30	0.60	(0.24, 1.50)					
Only after 1st live birth	209	524	1.06	(0.83, 1.35)					
Users without live									
birth	16	44	0.77	(0.40, 1.45)					
Unknown	0	1							

*Adjusted for age and use of other types of oral contraceptives; ^bTest for trend based on exposed subjects.

was observed in association with chlormadinone-containing combined products.

The joint effect of combined OCs with and without chlormadinone on risk was considered, and the estimate of the risk relative to non-users of either type was not greater for women who ever used both types (RR = 0.97; 95% CI = 0.72, 1.13) than for women who used only combined products with chlormadinone (RR = 0.90; 95% CI = 0.62; 1.29) or for those who only used combined products without chlormadinone (RR = 1.01; 95% CI = 0.73; 1.41).

Discussion

Progestogens that are derivatives of 17-hydroxyprogesterone include medroxyprogesterone acetate and chlormadinone acetate. These compounds were shown in some studies to cause benign and malignant tumours in beagle dogs. Although both the results of these experiments and their relevance for human breast cancer have been questioned, these products were consequently withdrawn from public use as constituents of OCs in most countries (Vallance & Capel-Edwards, 1971; Giles *et al.*, 1978; Kwaplen *et al.*, 1980; El Etreby *et al.*, 1979, El Etreby & Neumann, 1980; Diszfalusy, 1982).

Most combined OCs contain progestogens that are 19-nortestosterone derivatives, and these compounds are likely the constituents that are responsible for the enhanced risk of thromboembolic phenomenon in users of OCs. Progestogens that are derived from 17-hydroxyprogesterone may not result in such adverse cardiovascular effects. If the influence of OCs that contain these compounds on risks of cancers in humans is not different or more favourable, than those associated with OCs that contain 19-nor-testosterone derivatives, then it would seem prudent to consider reintroducing such formulations for human use. Unfortunately, little information is available on the influence of such products on cancer risks in humans.

From 1966 to 1970, the only combined OC available in the GDR was a product that contained 3.0 mg chlormadinone and 100 μ g mestranol. A combined product containing 2.0 mg chlormadinone and 80 μ g mestranol was introduced in 1971. A sequential product containing 2.0 mg chlormadinone (taken for 7 days) and 100 μ g mestranol (taken for 21 days) was introduced in 1970. Combined products without chlormadinone were first marketed in 1971, and sequentials without chlormadinone were first marketed in 1971, and sequentials without chlormadinone were first marketed in 1976. From 1970 to 1978, the proportion of users who used products with chlormadinone decreased from 100% to 20% (Nischan & Ebeling, 1984). This variation in exposure provided a unique opportunity to investigate possible relationships between breast cancer and combined OCs with and without chlormadinone as the constituent progestogen.

The results from this study are quite likely to be valid. Selection bias is unlikely to have been a problem because few eligible cases or controls were not interviewed. Recall bias was minimised by selection of hospitalised controls, and by interviewing all study subjects in hospital. In addition, information on use of OCs that was obtained from interviews was supplemented by reviewing medical records for 80% of the women; and this proportion was similar for cases and controls, and for users of various types of OCs. The identification of associations between breast cancer and most of the generally accepted risk factors for this disease provides further reassurance as to the quality of the data. Furthermore, this study revealed no increased overall risk of breast cancer associated with use of all types of OCs combined, or of combined OCs without chlormadinone. This is in accordance with the findings from most recent investigations that have not been confined to specific ages or other subgroups of subjects (Lipnick et al., 1986; Ellery et al., 1986; Schlesselman et al., 1988; La Vecchia et al., 1986; Paul et al., 1986; Rosenberg et al., 1984; Vessey et al., 1983; Brinton et al., 1982).

References

- BRESLOW, N.E. & DAY, N.E. (1980). Statistical Methods in Cancer Research. Vol. 1: The analysis of case-control studies. IARC: Lyon (IARC Scient. Publ. No. 32).
- BRINTON, L.A., HOOVER, R., SZKLO, M. & FRAUMENI, J.F. (1982). Oral contraceptives and breast cancer. Int. J. Epidemiol., 11, 316.
- DICZFALUSY, E. (1982). Gregory Pincus and steroidal contraception revisited. Acta Obstet. Gynecol. Scand. Suppl., 105, 7.
- EL ETREBY, M.F., GRAF, K.-J., BEIER, S., ELGER, W., GUNZEL, P. & NEUMANN, F. (1979). Suitability of the Beagle dog as a test model for the tumorigenic potential of contraceptive steroids. A short review. *Contraception*, **20**, 237.
- EL ETREBY, M.F. & NEUMANN, F. (1980). Influence of sex steroids and steroid antagonists on hormone dependent tumours in experimental animals. In S. Iacobelli et al. (eds): Hormone and Cancer. New York: Raven Press, pp. 321-336.
- ELLERY, C., MACLENNAN, R., BERRY, G. & SHEARMAN, R.P. (1986). A case-control study of breast cancer in relation to the use of steroid contraceptive agents. *Med. J. Aust.*, **144**, 173.
- GILES, R.C., KWAPLEN, R.P., GEIL, R.G. & CASEY, H.W. (1978). Mammary nodules in Beagle dogs administered investigational oral contraceptive steroids. J. Natl Cancer Inst., 60, 1351.
- INTERNATIONAL AGENCY FOR RESEARCH ON CANCER (1979). Chlormadinone acetate. In IARC Monographs on the Evaluation of the Carcinogenic risk of Chemicals to Humans. Vol. 21. IARC: Lyon, pp. 365-375.
- KLOSKOWSKI, S. & EBELING, K. (1990a). Zum Nutzen der j\u00e4hrlichen \u00e4rztlichen Untersuchung der Brust f\u00fcr die Fr\u00fcherkennung des Mammakarzinoms. Z. \u00e4rztl. Fortbild., 84, 453.

Since the main subject of this investigation was the possible relationship between use of combined OCs with chlormadinone and breast cancer, separate analyses were performed to allow a comparison of results for products with and without this progestational agent. They showed that breast cancer risk did not increase with duration of use of combined OCs with or without chlormadinone. For either of these products, risk also did not change with time since initial exposure or with time since most recent use. However, there appeared to be an increase in risk in current users of both types of combined products. These findings, if not spurious, would be consistent with a promotional effect of OCs on the development of breast cancer.

The increase in risk for current users could, however, have resulted from a higher rate of screening for breast cancer among women who are users of OCs. Evidence against this explanation is the observation that the enhanced risk in recent users were observed for all sizes of tumour at diagnosis. On the other hand, routine mammographic examination with a higher detection rate of smaller tumours, had not been widely performed during the study period, and another study conducted in the GDR showed no statistically significant differences between size of tumours diagnosed by chance and by regular physical examination or regular monthly breast self examination (Kloskowski & Ebeling, 1990a; 1990b). Therefore, the fact that the enhanced risk could be observed for all sizes of tumours is not strong evidence against the observed associations being a result of more frequent breast examinations of users than non-users. In fact, in the GDR, guidelines of the Association of Obstetrics and Gynaecology advised all gynaecologists prescribing OCs to perform regular annual physical breast examinations on all users. Additionally, a higher proportion of cases than controls who were current users of combined OCs had recently started their use. Therefore, a screening effect seems to be a more likely explanation for the observed increase in risk in recent users than a causal relationship between recent use and breast cancer.

In conclusion, our investigation showed that chlormadinone as a constituent of combined OCs does not influence breast cancer risk.

This research received financial support from the Special Programme of Research, Development and Research Training in Human Reproduction, World Health Organisation.

- KLOSKOWSKI, S. & EBELING, K. (1990b). Zum Nutzen der monatlichen Selbstuntersuchung der Brust für die Früherkennung des Mammakarzinoms. Arch. Geschwulstforsch., 60, 5.
- KWAPLEN, R.P., GILES, R.C., GEIL, R.G. & CASEY, H.W. (1980). Malignant mammary tumors in Beagle dogs dosed with investigational oral contraceptive steroids. J. Natl Cancer Inst., 65, 137.
- LA VECCIA, C., DECARLI, A., FASOLI, M. & 5 others (1986). Oral contraceptives and cancers of the breast and of the female genital tract. Interim results from a case-control study. Br. J. Cancer, 54, 311.
- LIPNICK, R.J., BURING, J.E., HENNEKENS, C.H. & 7 others (1986). Oral contraceptives and breast cancer. J. Am. Med. Assoc., 255, 58.
- MCPHERSON, K., VESSEY, M.P., NEIL, A., DOLL, R., JONES, L. & ROBERTS, M. (1987). Early oral contraceptive use and breast cancer: Results of another case-control study. Br. J. Cancer, 56, 653.
- NELSON, L.W., CARLTON, W.W. & WEIKEL, J.H. (1972). Canine mammary neoplasms and progestogens. J. Am. Med. Assoc., 219, 1601.
- NELSON, L.W., WEIKEL, J.H. & RENO, F.E. (1973). Mammary nodules in dogs during four year's treatment with megestrol acetate or chlormadinone acetate. J. Natl Cancer Inst., 51, 1303.
- NELSON, L.W. & KELLY, W.A. (1976). Progestogen-related gross and microscopic changes in female Beagles. Vet. Pathol., 13, 143.

- NISCHAN, P. & EBELING, K. (1984). Oral contraceptives containing chlormadinone acetate and cancer incidence at selected sites in the German Democratic Republic. A correlation analysis. *Int. J. Cancer*, 34, 671.
- PAUL, C., SKEGG, D.C.G., SPEARS, G.F.S. & KALDOR, J.M. (1986). Oral contraceptives and breast cancer: A national study. Br. Med. J., 293, 723T.
- PIKE, M.C., HENDERSON, B.E., KRAILO, M.D., DUKE, A. & ROY, S. (1983). Breast cancer in young women and use of oral contraceptives: Possible modifying effect of formulation and age at use. *Lancet*, ii, 926.
- PRENTICE, R.L. & THOMAS, D.B. (1987). On the epidemiology of oral contraceptives and disease. Adv. Cancer Res., 49, 285.
- ROSENBERG, L., MILLER, D.R., KAUFMAN, D.W. & 4 others (1984). Breast cancer and oral contraceptive use. Am. J. Epidemiol., 119, 167.
- SCHLESSELMAN, J.J., STADEL, B.V., MURRARY, P. & LAI, S. (1988). Breast cancer in relation to early use of oral contraceptives. J. Am. Med. Assoc., 259, 1828.

- VALLANCE, D.K. & CAPEL-EDWARDS, K. (1971). Chlormadinone and mammary nodules. Br. Med. J., 24, 221.
- VESSEY, M., BARON, J., DOLL, R., MCPHERSON, K. & YEATES, D. (1983). Oral contraceptives and breast cancer: Final report of an epidemiological study. Br. J. Cancer, 47, 455.
- WHO COLLABORATIVE STUDY OF NEOPLASIA AND STEROID CONTRACEPTIVES (1985). Invasive cervical cancer and combined oral contraceptives. Br. Med. J., 290, 961.
 WHO COLLABORATIVE STUDY OF NEOPLASIA AND STEROID
- WHO COLLABORATIVE STUDY OF NEOPLASIA AND STEROID CONTRACEPTIVES (1990). Breast cancer and combined oral contraceptives: results from a multinational study. Br. J. Cancer, 61, 110.
- WORLD HEALTH ORGANISATION (1981). Histological typing of breast tumors, 2nd edn. WHO: Geneva.