



ORIGINAL RESEARCH

Disparities of birth cohort effects on pancreatic cancer incidence between the United States and urban China

S. Yang¹, K. W. Yeoh², M. C.-S. Wong¹, O. W.-K. Mang³ & L. A. Tse^{1*}

¹JC School of Public Health and Primary Care, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong, China; ²Department of Radiation Oncology, National Cancer Centre Singapore, Singapore; ³Hong Kong Cancer Registry, Hospital Authority, Hong Kong, China

Available online xxx

Background: Pancreatic cancer has been associated with lifestyle factors, but few comparative studies were conducted among countries of different culture and lifestyle habits. This study compared the trends of pancreatic cancer incidence and birth cohort effects in the United States and urban China and explored the potential discrepancies of risk patterns. **Materials and methods:** Age-standardized incidence rates (ASIRs) were calculated using data from national or regional cancer registries of the United States and two large cities of China (Shanghai, Hong Kong). The temporal trends of incidence were assessed by joinpoint regression. The effects of birth cohort and calendar period were identified through age—period—cohort modeling.

Results: The ASIR in the United States from 1976 to 2015 was 8.26/100 000, which was higher than that in Hong Kong (4.29/100 000) and Shanghai of China (6.63/100 000). Shanghai had lower incidence (4.41/100 000) in 1976-1980 but increased annually by 1.38% in males and 1.67% in females, with a sharper upward trend than the United States and Hong Kong. Males had higher risks than females, with a male-to-female ratio of 1.34, 1.44, and 1.37 in the United States, Hong Kong, and Shanghai, respectively. A significant and prominent increase in incidence rate was observed among successive generations in China particularly for Shanghai, but such a pattern was not apparent in the United States.

Conclusions: The differences in pancreatic cancer incidence by sex may be multi-factorial involving known risk factors like tobacco smoking and alcohol consumption. The significant birth cohort effects among recent and early generations in the Shanghai population were in line with a society in socioeconomic transition and adoption of Western lifestyle mainly including consumption of calorie-rich foods and physical inactivity. Differences in these risk patterns will have implications on health care efforts and policies for cancer control.

Key words: pancreatic cancer, incidence, age-period-cohort modeling, cohort effects, lifestyle factors

INTRODUCTION

Pancreatic cancer is one of the most lethal cancers worldwide, with a 5-year survival rate of ~10% in the United States and ~7.2% in China.^{1,2} According to the American Cancer Society, pancreatic cancer is projected to be the fourth leading cause of cancer-related deaths in the American population in 2021, accounting for 7.92% of cancer deaths.³ A higher incidence and mortality rate of pancreatic cancer has long been observed in developed countries such as the United States, but in recent years a sharply increased rate has also been reported in developing countries like China with no signs of plateau.^{4,5} Previous time trend studies on pancreatic cancer were restricted to one specific country or region, and there has been a lack of inter-geographical comparative studies to unfold the potential discrepancies of incidence rates between Western and Eastern countries and explain specific underlying reasons, which would guide further investigation. On the other hand, most of the pancreatic cancers are diagnosed at an advanced stage which are not amenable for curative surgery. With no effective cure being available for such an advanced disease, it impels continuous endeavors to identify novel risk factors and implement policy changes for primary prevention of pancreatic cancer worldwide.⁶

Lifestyle and environmental factors have been attributed to several cancers including pancreatic cancer.⁷⁻⁹ Some of these have been associated with Western lifestyle which is linked to an increased risk of pancreatic cancer, including alcohol consumption, high-energy food intake, and obesity.⁹⁻¹²

^{*}*Correspondence to*: Dr. Lap Ah Tse, JC School of Public Health and Primary Care, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, 4/F, School of Public Health, Prince of Wales Hospital, Shatin, N.T., Hong Kong. Tel: +852-2252-8791; Fax: +852-2606-3500

E-mail: shelly@cuhk.edu.hk (L. A. Tse).

^{2059-7029/© 2021} The Author(s). Published by Elsevier Ltd on behalf of European Society for Medical Oncology. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

The opening up of China in the 1980s led to a rapid transition from the traditional Chinese lifestyle to an industrialized westernized lifestyle. This epidemiological transition is hypothesized to have contributed to the striking upward trend of pancreatic cancer incidence in Chinese cities, especially metropolises. If this hypothesis holds true, the time trend of pancreatic cancer incidence in urban Chinese settings (such as Shanghai and Hong Kong) would mirror that of the highly developed countries with a lag phase. This important topic has never been reported previously. Therefore, the aim of this study was to compare the time trends of pancreatic cancer incidence between the United States and the two major Chinese cities (Shanghai and Hong Kong) and examine how the time trend was influenced by the effects of birth cohort and calendar period over time. Understanding of discrepancies of risk patterns between the United States, Hong Kong, and Shanghai may enlighten useful insights for cancer control and prevention policies for pancreatic cancer in the United States and China. In addition, this knowledge may also have the potential to be generalizable for other diseases and regions undergoing different states of social and economic transition.¹³

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study population and data source

The United States is a developed, high-income country. The incidence data of pancreatic cancer for the United States during the period 1976-2015 and the corresponding sexspecific mid-year population statistics were derived from the National Cancer Institute's Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results Program (SEER). SEER 9 has nine registries including Atlanta, Connecticut, Detroit, Hawaii, Iowa, New Mexico, San Francisco—Oakland, Seattle—Puget Sound, and Utah, covering ~9.5% of the American population. All SEER registries were obliged to meet the Gold Standard Registry Certification from the North American Association of Central Cancer Registries for completeness, accuracy, and timeliness of the data.¹⁴

Hong Kong is a special administrative region of China with a mixed culture of both East and West, which was governed by the UK until 1997. Hong Kong's incidence data for the period 1976-2015 were obtained from the Cancer Registry of Hong Kong's Hospital Authority, which is a population-based cancer registry covering all Hong Kong residents. All raw incidence data were validated by various cross-checking procedures and multiple quality control processes to assure good quality and high completeness of the cancer statistics presented.¹⁵ Sex-specific mid-year population statistics in Hong Kong were derived from the government's Census and Statistics Department.

Shanghai is the first city in China that opened up to the world following the 'opening-up policy' in 1978, and has since experienced unprecedented economic development, resulting in a rapid transition from a traditional Chinese way of living to a westernized lifestyle. In Shanghai, the incidence data during 1976-2015 were obtained from the Shanghai Cancer Registry, which covers the residents of urban areas of Shanghai. All cancer incidence data were collected, processed, and reported by standard procedures to ensure the high completeness and accuracy and met the criteria of the Cancer Incidence in Five Continents series.¹⁶ Age-specific end-year population statistics for the corresponding study period in Shanghai were obtained from the Shanghai Municipal Public Security Bureau, and the midyear population statistics for two average of end-year population statistics from two consecutive years.

Statistical analyses

We evaluated the annual age-standardized incidence rate (ASIR) for pancreatic cancer by the direct method using the world standard population published by the World Health Organization in 2001.¹⁷ Joinpoint regression analysis was carried out to identify the turn points when linear trends of incidence changed. This method delineates changes in outcome trends by linking several different linear segments on a log scale at joinpoints. The analysis started with a minimum of zero joinpoint indicating a straight line and tests to determine whether one or more joinpoints were statistically significant and hence subsequent incorporation into the model.¹⁸ Monte Carlo permutation method was used to test for significance.¹⁹ In the final model, each joinpoint represents a significant turn point in trends. Once the line segments were fortified, the annual percentage change (APC) with 95% confidence interval (CI) was used to describe the trends in the model. For each population, the average APC (AAPC) for the entire study period was also calculated.

Age-period-cohort analysis based on Poisson regression was conducted to further identify the effects on incidence trends accounting for age at diagnosis (age), date of diagnosis (period), and date of birth (cohort).^{20,21} Given that pancreatic cancer rarely presents in young persons under 40 years of age, only persons aged 40 years or above were included in the analysis to avoid statistical instability.²² Incidence data were laid out in the form of a quinaryguinguennial table by 5-year age groups and 5-year crosssections. Five submodels were obtained from the analysis, including age model, age-drift model, age-cohort model, age-period model, and age-period-cohort model. Age, calendar period, and birth cohort effects were derived from pairwise comparisons of the appropriate submodels using χ^2 test.²⁰ The goodness of fit of the models was assessed by deviance. The significant changes in deviance (Δ Dev) indicated a good fit of the model.

Joinpoint regression model was implemented using Joinpoint Regression Program (version 4.8.0.1) developed by the National Cancer Institute of the United States.²³ Age-period-cohort analyses were carried out using 'Epi' package in R (version 4.0.3).²⁴ A two-sided *P* value <0.05 was considered as statistically significant.

RESULTS

Overall pattern of incidence

During the period 1976-2015, a total of 114 670, 13 035, and 25 748 newly diagnosed cases of pancreatic cancer were recorded in the United States, Hong Kong, and Shanghai, respectively. Males had stably higher rates than females, with a male-to-female ratio of 1.34 (95% CI: 1.33-1.36), 1.44 (95% CI: 1.39-1.49), and 1.37 (95% CI: 1.34-1.41) for the United States, Hong Kong, and Shanghai, respectively (Table 1).

Time trends of incidence

ASIR of pancreatic cancer in the American population were consistently higher than those in Shanghai and Hong Kong during the period 1976-2015 (Table 1 and Figure 1). In the American population, there were fluctuations in ASIR, with a slight decrease from 9.82 (males)/7.16 (females) in 1981-1985 to 9.00 (males)/6.82 (females) per 100 000 in 1991-1995, and then increased gradually to 10.25 (males)/7.88 (females) per 100 000 in 2011-2015. A steady upward trend was observed in the Hong Kong and Shanghai populations from the rate of 4.01 (males, Hong Kong)/2.88 (females, Hong Kong) and 5.15 (males, Shanghai)/3.77 (females, Shanghai) per 100 000 in 1976-1980 to 5.86 (males, Hong Kong)/4.27 (females, Hong Kong) and 8.94 (males, Shanghai)/6.75 (females, Shanghai) per 100000 in 2011-2015, respectively. Overall, the incidence rates raised continuously with increasing age span among studied areas. The temporal variations were reflected in all age groups throughout the 40 years of the study period (Figure 1), although there was somewhat larger variation in Shanghai and Hong Kong.

These visual variations of secular trends of the ASIR and age-specific incidence rate were confirmed by calculating AAPCs and APCs stratified by sex (Table 2). In general, a significant increase in ASIR was observed in all study populations except for the American males, with the most rapid increase in Shanghai (males, AAPC = 1.38%, 95% CI: 0.91% to 1.86%; females, AAPC = 1.67%, 95% CI: 1.21% to 2.13%). When stratified analysis by sex was further carried out, there were geographic differences in the patterns of APC among studied subjects. Notably, the ASIR of the American males decreased before 1995 and increased afterward; in contrast, the ASIR of the American females increased until 1984, followed by a decline with a yearly rate of 0.71% before turning to rise after 1995. On the other hand, a rapid increase in ASIR was observed in both sexes in Shanghai during the period 1976-2004/2005, and the trend flattened afterward. For Hong Kong males and females, an annual upward trend of 0.72% and 0.86% was observed over the entire study period, respectively.

Age, calendar period, and birth cohort effects

Table 3 presents significant net drift, period effect, andbirth cohort effect for both sexes in the United States, HongKong, and Shanghai, except for Hong Kong males where the

cohort effect on its incidence rate was not significant after adjustment for period. Given the notable changes in deviance (Δ Dev), birth cohort effects seemed to explain most of the changes in incidence in Shanghai. On the contrary, in the United States and Hong Kong, the changes in incidence were relatively more attributed to the calendar period effect; however, both the calendar period and birth cohort effects seemed inapparent in males and females in Hong Kong.

The age-specific incidence rate of pancreatic cancer by successive birth cohorts and the estimated age, period, and birth cohort effects by sex and region were also plotted (Figures 2 and 3; Supplementary Table S1, available at https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esmoop.2021.100240). In Shanghai, both males and females showed a striking increasing trend of incidence for the 'young generations' born after 1950 and the 'elder generations' born before 1930. However, a slightly downward trend was observed among persons born between 1930 and 1950. For the young generations, the incidence rate increased more rapidly in males than in females, whereas the trend reversed in the elderly generations. Such a pattern was also observed in Hong Kong, but it tended to be inapparent. However, in the United States, females had a consistent steeper increase of pancreatic cancer incidence than males in successive generations for the entire study period.

DISCUSSION

A sharper upward trend in ASIR of pancreatic cancer was observed in Shanghai than in Hong Kong from 1976 to 2015. However, these rates were consistently lower than those in the United States, where the trend tended to plateau over a 40-year period. Overall, the ASIRs of pancreatic cancer among males in both the United States and urban China were higher than those among females, which was consistent with global patterns.²⁵

Birth cohort effects reflect exposures in early life. If the increase in these exposures occurs in the population over time, it would lead to a progressively increased risk of pancreatic cancer in the successive birth cohorts. A notable and significantly increased risk of pancreatic cancer was observed in the later birth cohorts in Shanghai for the recent generations, suggesting that changes in lifestyle and environmental factors are likely to be involved. The significantly increasing cohort effects among Shanghai male and female populations are more likely to be genuine as the age—cohort model fitted better than the age—period model.

Western lifestyle factors, such as alcohol drinking, consumption of calorie-rich foods, physical inactivity, and obesity, have been suggested as the contributing risk factors for pancreatic cancer,²⁶ which may explain the upward trend of its incidence among Shanghai males and females. These clustering factors related to lifestyle may interfere with pancreatic cellular physiology and contribute to the carcinogenesis of pancreas.^{9,11,27,28} The rapid economic transition and modernization of Shanghai over the last

Table 1. Count and ASIR per 100 000 of pancreatic cancer by region and sex for all ages									
	All		Male		Female		Standardized relative ratio ^a		
	Count	ASIR	Count	ASIR	Count	ASIR			
United States									
1976-1980	9999	8.11	5267	10.11	4732	6.65	1.52 (1.46-1.58)		
1981-1985	11 244	8.26	5534	9.82	5710	7.16	1.37 (1.32-1.42)		
1986-1990	11 780	7.95	5731	9.32	6049	6.97	1.34 (1.29-1.39)		
1991-1995	12 616	7.72	6073	9.00	6543	6.82	1.32 (1.27-1.37)		
1996-2000	13 819	7.82	6770	9.19	7049	6.83	1.34 (1.30-1.39)		
2001-2005	15 519	8.13	7662	9.41	7857	7.17	1.31 (1.27-1.35)		
2006-2010	18 497	8.72	9230	10.05	9267	7.71	1.30 (1.27-1.34)		
2011-2015	21 196	8.93	10 781	10.25	10 415	7.88	1.30 (1.27-1.34)		
Total	114 670	8.26	57 048	9.68	57 622	7.21	1.34 (1.33-1.36)		
Hong Kong									
1976-1980	632	3.37	324	4.01	308	2.88	1.39 (1.19-1.63)		
1981-1985	954	4.15	519	5.10	435	3.39	1.50 (1.32-1.71)		
1986-1990	1161	4.22	643	5.08	518	3.48	1.46 (1.30-1.64)		
1991-1995	1154	3.60	649	4.39	505	2.92	1.50 (1.34-1.69)		
1996-2000	1657	4.24	913	5.05	744	3.54	1.42 (1.30-1.57)		
2001-2005	1954	4.27	1070	5.05	884	3.59	1.40 (1.29-1.54)		
2006-2010	2372	4.37	1331	5.33	1041	3.56	1.49 (1.38-1.63)		
2011-2015	3151	5.00	1699	5.86	1452	4.27	1.37 (1.28-1.47)		
Total	13 035	4.29	7148	5.15	5887	3.58	1.44 (1.39-1.49)		
Shanghai									
1976-1980	1325	4.41	724	5.15	601	3.77	1.37 (1.23-1.52)		
1981-1985	1815	5.19	1021	6.40	794	4.17	1.53 (1.40-1.68)		
1986-1990	2383	5.66	1331	6.89	1052	4.62	1.49 (1.38-1.62)		
1991-1995	2653	5.68	1449	6.69	1204	4.80	1.39 (1.29-1.50)		
1996-2000	3198	6.83	1680	7.98	1518	5.89	1.35 (1.26-1.45)		
2001-2005	3874	7.54	2068	8.92	1806	6.41	1.39 (1.30-1.48)		
2006-2010	4779	7.63	2503	8.82	2276	6.64	1.32 (1.26-1.41)		
2011-2015	5721	7.75	3002	8.94	2719	6.75	1.32 (1.26-1.39)		
Total	25 748	6.63	13 778	7.77	11970	5.66	1.37 (1.34-1.41)		

ASIR, age-standardized incidence rate.

^a The ratio of ASIR in males and females with 95% confidence interval. Females were considered as reference.

century has triggered the westernization of lifestyle across successive generations, with more pronounced effect on the more recent generations.²⁹ Such an increased risk in successive birth cohorts among the Shanghai population was observed in other gastrointestinal cancers including colorectal cancer that has also been associated with lifestyle factors.^{30,31} We project that the birth cohort effects in recent generations of Shanghai may follow the footprints of the developed countries, where the effects become attenuated and even disappear in future generations as the socioeconomic transition has completed and stabilized, resembling the patterns seen in the United States and Hong Kong. In contrast, the slightly declining trend of pancreatic cancer incidence in generations born during the 1930s and 1940s may partially result from the caloric restriction in early life due to social unrest and conflict during the period of Japanese occupation from 1932 to 1945. Previous studies suggest that extreme population-level events, such as war or famine, may have an impact on cancer incidence.³² An analysis among Norwegian women in 2002 demonstrated a decreased incidence of breast cancer during World War II, lending to the suggestion that caloric restriction is protective against some cancers.³³ Social unrest during the occupied period limited the access to fat, meat, or milk, leading to a substantial reduction in food availability and energy intake, which in turn was associated with a decreased cohort effect for the generation born between 1930 and 1950.³⁴ The progressive harmful effects in more recent cohorts and protective effects in early birth cohorts among the Shanghai population imply that low energy intake during growth years has beneficial influence on the development of pancreatic cancer.

Our study demonstrated a stabilized male-to-female ratio of 1.34-1.44 times for pancreatic cancer during the 40-year period from 1976 to 2021 among people of the United States and urban China. Despite little being known about the exact cellular mechanisms resulting in this observed difference between sexes, female hormones have been shown to play a protective role in pancreatic cancer. This was supported by evidence from the Malmo Diet and Cancer Study which showed that a lower risk of pancreatic cancer was associated with a lower age at menarche, which means an earlier burst of estrogen level that represents more exposure to estrogen throughout the reproductive lifespan. A protective effect was also seen with women being put on hormone replacement therapy.³⁵ A higher pancreatic cancer incidence in males could be explained by alcohol consumption, as more males than females are alcohol drinkers regardless of the nation or geographic location of the populations. An analysis by pooling 10 casecontrol studies demonstrated a positive association between the incidence of pancreatic cancer and heavy alcohol



Figure 1. Age-specific pancreatic cancer incidence rates (per 100 000) from 1976 to 2015 by region, sex, and calendar period. (A) Males in the United States. (B) Males in Hong Kong. (C) Males in Shanghai. (D) Females in the United States. (E) Females in Hong Kong. (F) Females in Shanghai.

	Overall	Trend 1		Trend 2		Trend 3		
	AAPC (95% CI), %	Period	AAPC (95% CI), %	Period	AAPC (95% CI), %	Period	AAPC (95% CI), %	
United States								
Male	0.05 (-0.09 to 0.19)	1976-1995	-0.75 ^a (-0.98 to -0.52)	1995-2015	0.81 ^ª (0.64 to 0.99)	—	—	
Female	0.56 ^a (0.26 to 0.85)	1976-1984	1.27 ^ª (0.23 to 2.33)	1984-1995	-0.71 ^a (-1.39 to -0.03)	1995-2015	0.97 ^ª (0.76 to 1.18)	
Hong Kong								
Male	0.72 ^a (0.38 to 1.07)	1976-2015	0.72 ^a (0.38 to 1.07)	_	—	_	_	
Female	0.86 ^a (0.50 to 1.23)	1976-2015	0.86 ^a (0.50 to 1.23)	_	_	_	_	
Shanghai								
Male	1.38 ^a (0.91 to 1.86)	1976-2004	1.95 ^ª (1.49 to 2.41)	2004-2015	-0.04 (-1.28 to 1.22)	_	_	
Female	1.67 ^a (1.21 to 2.13)	1976-2005	2.21 ^ª (1.79 to 2.63)	2005-2015	0.11 (-1.26 to 1.51)	_	_	

AAPC, average annual percentage change; APC, annual percentage change; CI, confidence interval.

^a Change in rate is statistically significantly different from zero at the α level of 0.05. Some cells are left blank as only the model that best fits the observed incidence is presented.

consumption (odds ratio: 1.46, 95% CI: 1.16-1.83).¹² Given that more males are exposed to tobacco smoking, alcohol consumption, and/or occupational exposures to known or suspected carcinogens than females in adulthood, the differences in pancreatic cancer incidence by sex may be multi-factorial involving the known risk factors.^{9,36}

The major strength of our study is the long-term cancer incidence data with assured quality, and hence the secular patterns of incidence trend could be well identified. Cancer statistics of the United States and China may also be obtained from some other sources, such as SEER 18, SEER 21, or cancer registries of other Chinese cities, while these data may have better coverage of American and Chinese populations. However, the spans of these data were mostly <20 years, and thus may not sufficiently cover the earlier cohorts and represent the whole picture. Another strength is the low risk of recall or information bias in our study, as incidence data were collected prospectively and independently. On the other hand, there are also some limitations. Firstly, the population-based cancer incidence data derived from the registries may be underreported. Some patients with pancreatic cancer may be too ill to be diagnosed in a

	Table 3. Age-period-cohort models for pancreatic cancer incidence from 1976 to 2015 by region and sex, for those aged 40 years or above											
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Submodel	Goodness of fit			Model comparison							
United States—male . 1. Age 67 249.28 * 2. Age-drift 66 237.27 2 versus 1 Trend (drift) 1 12.01 0.001 3. Age-cohort 63 25.95 3 versus 2 Nonlinear cohort effect 3 91.84 * 5. Age-period—cohort 60 135.76 5 versus 3 Period effect adjusted for cohort 3 90.19 * United States—female * 2 versus 4 Cohort effect adjusted for cohort 3 9.67 0.022 United States—female * 2 versus 1 Trend (drift) 1 107.39 * 3. Age-cohort 63 186.19 4 versus 2 Nonlinear cohort effect 3 6.22 0.102 HK-male * 5 versus 4 Cohort effect adjusted for period 3 22.01 * 1. Age 67 155.78 * 2 22.01 * 1. Age 67 175.78 * 2 2 versus 1 Trend (drift)<		Residual df	Residual deviance	P value	Comparison	Interpretation	Δdf	Δ Dev	P value			
1. Age 66 237,27 2 versus 1 Trend (drift) 1 12.01 0.001 3. Age-cohort 63 145.42 4 versus 2 Nonlinear cohort effect 3 11.32 0.010 4. Age-period 63 145.42 4 versus 2 Nonlinear cohort effect 3 91.84 * 5. Age-cohort 60 135.76 5 versus 3 Period effect adjusted for cohort 3 90.19 * 1. Age 67 329.57 * - - versus 2 Nonlinear cohort effect 3 6.22 0.102 4. Age-period 63 125.97 * -	United States—male											
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	1. Age	67	249.28	*								
3. Age-cohort 63 225.95 * 3 versus 2 Nonlinear cohort effect 3 11.32 0.010 4. Age-period 63 145.42 * 4 versus 2 Nonlinear period effect 3 91.84 * 5. Age-period 60 135.76 * 5 versus 3 Period effect adjusted for cohort 3 90.19 * United States—female - - 5 versus 4 Cohort effect adjusted for cohort 3 9.67 0.022 United States—female - - - - - - - - - - - - 0.022 0.022 0.021 - - - - - - 0.022 0.021 - - - - 0.022 0.021 - - - - 0.022 0.023 - - - 0.022 0.021 - - - 0.022 0.021 0.021 - - - - 0.021 - - - - 0.021 - - - -	2. Age—drift	66	237.27	*	2 versus 1	Trend (drift)	1	12.01	0.001			
4. Age-period 63 145.42 • 4 versus 2 Nonlinear period effect 3 91.84 • 5. Age-period-cohort 60 135.76 • 5 versus 3 Period effect adjusted for cohort 3 90.19 • United States—female . . Cohort effect adjusted for period 3 96.77 0.022 United States—female .	3. Age—cohort	63	225.95	*	3 versus 2	Nonlinear cohort effect	3	11.32	0.010			
5. Age-period-cohort 60 135.76 * 5 versus 3 Period effect adjusted for cohort 3 90.19 * United Statesfemale 5 versus 4 Cohort effect adjusted for period 3 9.67 0.022 1. Age 67 329.57 * Cohort effect adjusted for period 3 9.67 0.022 2. Age-chrift 66 22.18 * 2 versus 1 Trend (drift) 1 107.39 * 3. Age-cohort 63 186.19 4 versus 2 Nonlinear cohort effect 3 36.00 * 5. Age-period-cohort 60 145.18 5 versus 3 Period effect adjusted for period 3 21.02 4. Age-period-cohort 63 186.19 4 versus 2 Nonlinear cohort effect 3 36.00 * 1. Age 67 155.78 * 2.003 3 versus 2 Nonlinear cohort effect 3 1.14 0.767 4. Age-period 63 93.36 0.008 4 versus 2 Nonlinear period effect 3 5.29 0.098 5. Age-period 63	4. Age—period	63	145.42	*	4 versus 2	Nonlinear period effect	3	91.84	*			
5 versus 4Cohort effect adjusted for period39.670.022United States—female <td< td=""><td>5. Age-period-cohort</td><td>60</td><td>135.76</td><td>*</td><td>5 versus 3</td><td>Period effect adjusted for cohort</td><td>3</td><td>90.19</td><td>*</td></td<>	5. Age-period-cohort	60	135.76	*	5 versus 3	Period effect adjusted for cohort	3	90.19	*			
United States—female 1. Age 67 329.57 * 2. Age—drift 66 222.18 2 versus 1 Trend (drift) 1 107.39 * 3. Age—cohort 63 215.97 * 3 versus 2 Nonlinear cohort effect 3 36.00 * 4. Age—period 63 186.19 * 4 versus 2 Nonlinear period effect 3 36.00 * 5. Age—period—cohort 63 186.19 * 4 versus 2 Nonlinear period effect 3 36.00 * 67 755.78 *					5 versus 4	Cohort effect adjusted for period	3	9.67	0.022			
1. Age 67 329.57 * 2. Age-drift 66 222.18 * 2 versus 1 Trend (drift) 1 107.39 * 3. Age-cohort 63 215.97 * 3 versus 2 Nonlinear cohort effect 3 6.22 0.102 4. Age-period 63 186.19 * 4 versus 2 Nonlinear period effect 3 36.00 * 5. Age-period-cohort 60 164.18 * 5 versus 3 Period effect adjusted for ochort 3 22.01 * HK-male * * 5 versus 4 Cohort effect adjusted for period 3 22.01 * 1. Age 67 155.78 *	United States—female											
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	1. Age	67	329.57	*								
3. Age-cohort 63 215.97 * 3 versus 2 Nonlinear cohort effect 3 6.22 0.102 4. Age-period 63 186.19 * 4 versus 2 Nonlinear period effect 3 36.00 * 5. Age-period-cohort 60 164.18 * 5 versus 3 Period effect adjusted for cohort 3 51.79 * HKmale - - - Cohort effect adjusted for period 3 22.01 * 1. Age 67 155.78 * - - - - - 3. Age-cohort 63 98.52 0.003 3 versus 2 Nonlinear cohort effect 3 6.29 0.098 5. Age-period-cohort 60 93.21 0.004 5 versus 3 Period effect adjusted for cohort 3 5.31 0.151 1. Age 67 174.30 * - - - - - - 0.408 * 4. Age-period-cohort 63 123.21 * 3 versus 2 Nonlinear period effect 3 1.14 0.240 . <td>2. Age—drift</td> <td>66</td> <td>222.18</td> <td>*</td> <td>2 versus 1</td> <td>Trend (drift)</td> <td>1</td> <td>107.39</td> <td>*</td>	2. Age—drift	66	222.18	*	2 versus 1	Trend (drift)	1	107.39	*			
4. Age - period 63 186.19 * 4 versus 2 Nonlinear period effect 3 36.00 * 5. Age - period - cohort 60 164.18 * 5 versus 3 Period effect adjusted for cohort 3 51.79 * HK—male * 5 versus 4 Cohort effect adjusted for period 3 22.01 * 1. Age 67 155.78 * Cohort effect adjusted for period 3 1.4 0.767 3. Age - cohort 63 93.36 0.005 2 versus 1 Trend (drift) 1 56.12 * 4. Age - period 63 93.36 0.008 4 versus 2 Nonlinear cohort effect 3 6.29 0.098 5. Age - period - cohort 60 93.21 0.004 5 versus 3 Period effect adjusted for cohort 3 5.31 0.151 1. Age 67 174.30 * 2 versus 4 Cohort effect adjusted for period 3 4.21 0.240 4. Age - period 63 112.80 * 3 versus 2 Nonlinear period effect 3 4.21 0.240 <td>3. Age—cohort</td> <td>63</td> <td>215.97</td> <td>*</td> <td>3 versus 2</td> <td>Nonlinear cohort effect</td> <td>3</td> <td>6.22</td> <td>0.102</td>	3. Age—cohort	63	215.97	*	3 versus 2	Nonlinear cohort effect	3	6.22	0.102			
5. Age-period-cohort 60 164.18 * 5 versus 3 Period effect adjusted for cohort 3 51.79 * HKmale 5 versus 4 Cohort effect adjusted for period 3 22.01 * 1. Age 67 155.78 * Cohort effect adjusted for period 3 22.01 * 3. Age-cohort 63 99.66 0.005 2 versus 1 Trend (drift) 1 56.12 * 4. Age-period 63 93.36 0.008 4 versus 2 Nonlinear cohort effect 3 6.29 0.098 5. Age-period-cohort 60 93.21 0.004 5 versus 3 Period effect adjusted for cohort 3 5.31 0.151 5 versus 4 Cohort effect adjusted for period 3 0.16 0.984 HK-female -	4. Age—period	63	186.19	*	4 versus 2	Nonlinear period effect	3	36.00	*			
HK—male Sversus 4 Cohort effect adjusted for period 3 22.01 * 1. Age 67 155.78 * - <	5. Age—period—cohort	60	164.18	*	5 versus 3	Period effect adjusted for cohort	3	51.79	*			
HK-male 1. Age 67 155.78 * 2. Age-drift 66 99.66 0.005 2 versus 1 Trend (drift) 1 56.12 * 3. Age-cohort 63 98.52 0.003 3 versus 2 Nonlinear cohort effect 3 1.14 0.767 4. Age-period 63 93.36 0.008 4 versus 2 Nonlinear period effect 3 6.29 0.098 5. Age-period-cohort 60 93.21 0.004 5 versus 3 Period effect adjusted for cohort 3 5.31 0.151 Fremale 1. Age 67 174.30 * 2 versus 1 Trend (drift) 1 46.88 * 3. Age-cohort 63 123.21 * 3 versus 2 Nonlinear cohort effect 3 4.21 0.240 4. Age-period 63 114.63 * 4 versus 2 Nonlinear period effect 3 12.80 0.005 5. Age-period-cohort 60 100.67 0.001 5 versus 3 Period effect adjusted for cohort 3 22.54 * <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>5 versus 4</td> <td>Cohort effect adjusted for period</td> <td>3</td> <td>22.01</td> <td>*</td>					5 versus 4	Cohort effect adjusted for period	3	22.01	*			
1. Age 67 155.78 * 2. Age-drift 66 99.66 0.005 2 versus 1 Trend (drift) 1 56.12 * 3. Age-cohort 63 98.52 0.003 3 versus 2 Nonlinear cohort effect 3 1.14 0.767 4. Age-period 63 93.36 0.008 4 versus 2 Nonlinear period effect 3 6.29 0.098 5. Age-period-cohort 60 93.21 0.004 5 versus 3 Period effect adjusted for cohort 3 5.31 0.151 0.004 5 versus 4 Cohort effect adjusted for period 3 0.16 0.984 HK-female	HK—male											
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	1. Age	67	155.78	*								
3. Agecohort 63 98.52 0.003 3 versus 2 Nonlinear cohort effect 3 1.14 0.767 4. Ageperiod 63 93.36 0.008 4 versus 2 Nonlinear period effect 3 6.29 0.098 5. Ageperiodcohort 60 93.21 0.004 5 versus 3 Period effect adjusted for cohort 3 5.31 0.151 Versus 4 Cohort effect adjusted for period 3 0.16 0.984 HK—female 1. Age 67 174.30 * 2. Age-drift 66 127.42 * 2 versus 1 Trend (drift) 1 46.88 * 3. Age-cohort 63 114.63 * 4 versus 2 Nonlinear cohort effect 3 4.21 0.240 4. Age-period-cohort 60 100.67 0.001 5 versus 3 Period effect adjusted for cohort 3 22.54 * 5 versus 4 Cohort effect adjusted for period 3 13.95 0.003 SH—male - - - 5 versus 1 Trend (drift) 1 213.50	2. Age—drift	66	99.66	0.005	2 versus 1	Trend (drift)	1	56.12	*			
4. Age-period 63 93.36 0.008 4 versus 2 Nonlinear period effect 3 6.29 0.098 5. Age-period-cohort 60 93.21 0.004 5 versus 3 Period effect adjusted for cohort 3 5.31 0.151 V 5 versus 4 Cohort effect adjusted for period 3 0.16 0.984 HKfemale 5 versus 4 Cohort effect adjusted for period 3 0.16 0.984 1. Age 67 174.30 * 2 versus 1 Trend (drift) 1 46.88 * 3. Age-cohort 63 123.21 * 3 versus 2 Nonlinear cohort effect 3 12.80 0.005 5. Age-period 63 114.63 * 4 versus 2 Nonlinear period effect 3 12.80 0.005 5. Age-period-cohort 60 100.67 0.001 5 versus 3 Period effect adjusted for period 3 13.95 0.003 SHmale - - 5 versus 4 Cohort effect adjusted for period 3 102.40 * . Age 67 450.48 * <td>3. Age—cohort</td> <td>63</td> <td>98.52</td> <td>0.003</td> <td>3 versus 2</td> <td>Nonlinear cohort effect</td> <td>3</td> <td>1.14</td> <td>0.767</td>	3. Age—cohort	63	98.52	0.003	3 versus 2	Nonlinear cohort effect	3	1.14	0.767			
5. Age-period-cohort 60 93.21 0.004 5 versus 3 Period effect adjusted for cohort 3 5.31 0.151 HK—female 5 versus 4 Cohort effect adjusted for period 3 0.16 0.984 HK—female 5 versus 4 Cohort effect adjusted for period 3 0.16 0.984 HK—female * 2 Age-drift 66 127.42 * 2 versus 1 Trend (drift) 1 46.88 * 3. Age-cohort 63 123.21 * 3 versus 2 Nonlinear cohort effect 3 12.80 0.005 5. Age-period 63 114.63 * 4 versus 2 Nonlinear period effect 3 12.80 0.005 5. Age-period-cohort 60 100.67 0.001 5 versus 3 Period effect adjusted for period 3 13.95 0.003 SH—male - - - 5 versus 4 Cohort effect adjusted for period 3 13.95 0.003 SH—male - - - - - - 2 versus 1 Trend (drift) 1 213.50	4. Age—period	63	93.36	0.008	4 versus 2	Nonlinear period effect	3	6.29	0.098			
5 versus 4 Cohort effect adjusted for period 3 0.16 0.984 HK—female 1. Age 67 174.30 * .	5. Age—period—cohort	60	93.21	0.004	5 versus 3	Period effect adjusted for cohort	3	5.31	0.151			
HK—female 1. Age 67 174.30 * 2. Age-drift 66 127.42 * 2 versus 1 Trend (drift) 1 46.88 * 3. Age-cohort 63 123.21 * 3 versus 2 Nonlinear cohort effect 3 4.21 0.240 4. Age-period 63 114.63 * 4 versus 2 Nonlinear period effect 3 12.80 0.005 5. Age-period-cohort 60 100.67 0.001 5 versus 3 Period effect adjusted for cohort 3 22.54 * S versus 4 Cohort effect adjusted for period 3 13.95 0.003 SH—male . Age 67 450.48 * 2. Age-drift 66 236.99 * 2 versus 1 Trend (drift) 1 213.50 * 3. Age-cohort 63 134.59 * 3 versus 2 Nonlinear cohort effect 3 102.40 * 4. Age-period 63 226.26 * 4 versus 2 Nonlinear period effect 3 10.73 <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>5 versus 4</td><td>Cohort effect adjusted for period</td><td>3</td><td>0.16</td><td>0.984</td></t<>					5 versus 4	Cohort effect adjusted for period	3	0.16	0.984			
1. Age 67 174.30 * 2. Age-drift 66 127.42 * 2 versus 1 Trend (drift) 1 46.88 * 3. Age-cohort 63 123.21 * 3 versus 2 Nonlinear cohort effect 3 4.21 0.240 4. Age-period 63 114.63 * 4 versus 2 Nonlinear cohort effect 3 12.80 0.005 5. Age-period-cohort 60 100.67 0.001 5 versus 3 Period effect adjusted for cohort 3 22.54 * SH-male Age 67 450.48 * 2 versus 1 Trend (drift) 1 213.50 * SH-male Age 67 450.48 * 2 versus 1 Trend (drift) 1 213.50 * 3. Age-cohort 63 134.59 * 3 versus 2 Nonlinear cohort effect 3 102.40 * 3. Age-period 63 226.26 * 4 versus 2 Nonlinear period effect 3	HK—female											
2. Age-drift 66 127.42 * 2 versus 1 Trend (drift) 1 46.88 * 3. Age-cohort 63 123.21 * 3 versus 2 Nonlinear cohort effect 3 4.21 0.240 4. Age-period 63 114.63 * 4 versus 2 Nonlinear cohort effect 3 12.80 0.005 5. Age-period-cohort 60 100.67 0.001 5 versus 3 Period effect adjusted for cohort 3 22.54 * SH-male · Age 67 450.48 * 2. Age-drift 66 236.99 * 2 versus 1 Trend (drift) 1 213.50 * 3. Age-cohort 63 134.59 * 3 versus 2 Nonlinear cohort effect 3 102.40 * 4. Age-period 63 226.26 * 4 versus 2 Nonlinear period effect 3 10.73 0.013 5. Age-period 60 127.38 * 5 versus 4 Period effect adjusted for cohort 3 10.73 0.013	1. Age	67	174.30	*								
3. Age-cohort 63 123.21 * 3 versus 2 Nonlinear cohort effect 3 4.21 0.240 4. Age-period 63 114.63 * 4 versus 2 Nonlinear period effect 3 12.80 0.005 5. Age-period-cohort 60 100.67 0.001 5 versus 3 Period effect adjusted for cohort 3 22.54 * Stersus 4 Age 67 450.48 * - - Cohort effect adjusted for period 3 13.95 0.003 SH-male . Age 67 450.48 * - - - - - - - - - - 0.003 -	2. Age—drift	66	127.42	*	2 versus 1	Trend (drift)	1	46.88	*			
4. Age - period 63 114.63 * 4 versus 2 Nonlinear period effect 3 12.80 0.005 5. Age - period - cohort 60 100.67 0.001 5 versus 3 Period effect adjusted for cohort 3 22.54 * SHmale 5 versus 4 Cohort effect adjusted for period 3 13.95 0.003 SHmale -	3. Age—cohort	63	123.21	*	3 versus 2	Nonlinear cohort effect	3	4.21	0.240			
5. Age - period - cohort 60 100.67 0.001 5 versus 3 Period effect adjusted for cohort 3 22.54 * SH - male . . Age 67 450.48 * . <t< td=""><td>4. Age—period</td><td>63</td><td>114.63</td><td>*</td><td>4 versus 2</td><td>Nonlinear period effect</td><td>3</td><td>12.80</td><td>0.005</td></t<>	4. Age—period	63	114.63	*	4 versus 2	Nonlinear period effect	3	12.80	0.005			
SH—male 5 versus 4 Cohort effect adjusted for period 3 13.95 0.003 SH—male . Age 67 450.48 * - <td>5. Age—period—cohort</td> <td>60</td> <td>100.67</td> <td>0.001</td> <td>5 versus 3</td> <td>Period effect adjusted for cohort</td> <td>3</td> <td>22.54</td> <td>*</td>	5. Age—period—cohort	60	100.67	0.001	5 versus 3	Period effect adjusted for cohort	3	22.54	*			
SH—male . Age 67 450.48 * 2. Age-drift 66 236.99 * 2 versus 1 Trend (drift) 1 213.50 * 3. Age-cohort 63 134.59 * 3 versus 2 Nonlinear cohort effect 3 102.40 * 4. Age-period 63 226.26 * 4 versus 2 Nonlinear period effect 3 10.73 0.013 5. Age-period 60 127.38 * 5 versus 3 Period effect adjusted for cohort 3 7.20 0.056					5 versus 4	Cohort effect adjusted for period	3	13.95	0.003			
Age 67 450.48 * 2. Age-drift 66 236.99 * 2 versus 1 Trend (drift) 1 213.50 * 3. Age-cohort 63 134.59 * 3 versus 2 Nonlinear cohort effect 3 102.40 * 4. Age-period 63 226.26 * 4 versus 2 Nonlinear period effect 3 10.73 0.013 5. Age-period 60 127.38 * 5 versus 3 Period effect adjusted for cohort 3 7.20 0.056	SH—male											
2. Age-drift 66 236.99 * 2 versus 1 Trend (drift) 1 213.50 * 3. Age-cohort 63 134.59 * 3 versus 2 Nonlinear cohort effect 3 102.40 * 4. Age-period 63 226.26 * 4 versus 2 Nonlinear period effect 3 10.73 0.013 5. Age-period 60 127.38 * 5 versus 3 Period effect adjusted for cohort 3 7.20 0.056	. Age	67	450.48	*								
3. Age – cohort 63 134.59 * 3 versus 2 Nonlinear cohort effect 3 102.40 * 4. Age – period 63 226.26 * 4 versus 2 Nonlinear period effect 3 10.73 0.013 5. Age – period – cohort 60 127.38 * 5 versus 3 Period effect adjusted for cohort 3 7.20 0.056	2. Age—drift	66	236.99	*	2 versus 1	Trend (drift)	1	213.50	*			
4. Age-period 63 226.26 * 4 versus 2 Nonlinear period effect 3 10.73 0.013 5. Age-period_cohort 60 127.38 * 5 versus 3 Period effect adjusted for cohort 3 7.20 0.055	3. Age—cohort	63	134.59	*	3 versus 2	Nonlinear cohort effect	3	102.40	*			
5 Age-period-cohort 60 127.38 * 5 versus 2 Period effect adjusted for cohort 2 7.20 0.066	4. Age—period	63	226.26	*	4 versus 2	Nonlinear period effect	3	10.73	0.013			
S. Age period construction to the table of t	5. Age—period—cohort	60	127.38	*	5 versus 3	Period effect adjusted for cohort	3	7.20	0.066			
5 versus 4 Cohort effect adjusted for period 3 98.87 *					5 versus 4	Cohort effect adjusted for period	3	98.87	*			
SH—female	SH—female											
1. Age 6/ 587.19 *	1. Age	67	587.19	*								
2. Age-drift 66 322.57 * 2 versus 1 Trend (drift) 1 264.62 *	2. Age—drift	66	322.57	*	2 versus 1	Irend (drift)	1	264.62	*			
3. Age-cohort 63 109.44 * 3 versus 2 Nonlinear cohort effect 3 213.12 *	3. Age—cohort	63	109.44	*	3 versus 2	Nonlinear cohort effect	3	213.12	*			
4. Age-period 63 303.17 * 4 versus 2 Nonlinear period effect 3 19.40 *	4. Age—period	63	303.17	*	4 versus 2	Nonlinear period effect	3	19.40	*			
5. Age-period-cohort 60 91.68 0.005 5 versus 3 Period effect adjusted for cohort 3 17.77 *	5. Age—period—cohort	60	91.68	0.005	5 versus 3	Period effect adjusted for cohort	3	17.77	*			
5 versus 4 Cohort effect adjusted for period 3 211.49 *					5 versus 4	Cohort effect adjusted for period	3	211.49	*			

 Δ Dev, change in deviance; df , degree of freedom; HK, Hong Kong; SH, Shanghai

timely manner. Although their diagnoses may be finally confirmed by autopsy, the autopsy is rarely conducted for natural death in China, and thus the registries may only receive notifications from the medical practitioners without further verification. This reporting process may result in potential underreporting and underestimation of pancreatic cancer incidence.^{37,38} Secondly, as there is geographic disparity in pancreatic cancer incidence, SEER 9, Hong Kong, and Shanghai may not be able to perfectly represent the whole United States and China. However, our study covers the longest time span ever reported in the literature.

CONCLUSIONS

This comparative study between the United States and urban China over 40 years has revealed the patterns of pancreatic cancer incidence between the two countries and has demonstrated significant birth cohort effects among the recent and early generations of Shanghai population. This is consistent with a society in socioeconomic transition with an increasing adoption of Western lifestyle, particularly in relation to the level of high-energy food intake. Given a reasonable latency, the pancreatic cancer incidence in the Shanghai population is projected to peak before plateauing, following the footprints of the United States and Hong Kong. These patterns will have implications on health care efforts and policies for cancer control.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank all the staff of Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results Program for their contributions to this research. We are also grateful for the help from the Hong Kong Cancer Registry and Shanghai Cancer Registry.

^{*} P < 0.001



Figure 2. Age-specific pancreatic cancer incidence rates (per 100 000) from 1976 to 2015 by region, sex, and birth cohort. (A) Males in the United States. (B) Males in Hong Kong. (C) Males in Shanghai. (D) Females in the United States. (E) Females in Hong Kong. (F) Females in Shanghai.



Figure 3. Age, period, and cohort effects of pancreatic cancer incidence from 1976 to 2015 by region and sex. (A) United States. (B) Hong Kong. (C) Shanghai.

FUNDING

None declared.

DISCLOSURE

The authors have declared no conflicts of interest.

DATA SHARING

The data of the United States underlying this article are available in Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results Program at https://seer.cancer.gov/, and can be accessed with SEER 9 Regs Custom Data, Nov 2019 Sub (1975-2017).

The data of Hong Kong underlying this article are available in Cancer Statistics Query Systems at https://www3.ha.org. hk/cancereg/allages.asp. The data of Shanghai underlying this article were provided by Shanghai Cancer Registry by permission. Data will be shared on a reasonable request to the corresponding author with permission of Shanghai Cancer Registry.

REFERENCES

- Mizrahi JD, Surana R, Valle JW, Shroff RT. Pancreatic cancer. Lancet. 2020;395(10242):2008-2020.
- Zhao C, Gao F, Li Q, Liu Q, Lin X. The distributional characteristic and growing trend of pancreatic cancer in China. *Pancreas*. 2019;48(3):309-314.
- 3. Siegel RL, Miller KD, Fuchs HE, Jemal A. Cancer statistics, 2021. CA Cancer J Clin. 2021;71(1):7-33.
- Jia X, Du P, Wu K, et al. Pancreatic cancer mortality in China: characteristics and prediction. *Pancreas*. 2018;47(2):233-237.
- Lin QJ, Yang F, Jin C, Fu DL. Current status and progress of pancreatic cancer in China. World J Gastroenterol. 2015;21(26):7988-8003.
- Mohammed S, Van Buren G 2nd, Fisher WE. Pancreatic cancer: advances in treatment. World J Gastroenterol. 2014;20(28):9354-9360.
- Parkin DM, Boyd L, Walker LC. 16. The fraction of cancer attributable to lifestyle and environmental factors in the UK in 2010. Br J Cancer. 2011;105(Suppl 2):S77-S81.
- Whiteman DC, Wilson LF. The fractions of cancer attributable to modifiable factors: a global review. *Cancer Epidemiol*. 2016;44:203-221.
- 9. Zanini S, Renzi S, Limongi AR, Bellavite P, Giovinazzo F, Bermano G. A review of lifestyle and environment risk factors for pancreatic cancer. *Eur J Cancer.* 2021;145:53-70.
- Pang Y, Holmes MV, Kartsonaki C, et al. Young adulthood and adulthood adiposity in relation to incidence of pancreatic cancer: a prospective study of 0.5 million Chinese adults and a meta-analysis. J Epidemiol Community Health. 2017;71(11):1059-1067.
- Zhang J, Zhao Z, Berkel HJ. Animal fat consumption and pancreatic cancer incidence: evidence of interaction with cigarette smoking. *Ann Epidemiol.* 2005;15(7):500-508.
- Lucenteforte E, La Vecchia C, Silverman D, et al. Alcohol consumption and pancreatic cancer: a pooled analysis in the International Pancreatic Cancer Case-Control Consortium (PanC4). Ann Oncol. 2012;23(2):374-382.
- 13. Bray F, Soerjomataram I. Chaptar 2: The changing global burden of cancer: transitions in human development and implications for cancer prevention and control. In: Gelband H, Jha P, Sankaranarayanan R, Horton S, editors. *Cancer: Disease Control Priorities*. 3rd ed. 3. Washington, DC: The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/The World Bank; 2015:23-44.
- Mathieu LN, Kanarek NF, Tsai HL, Rudin CM, Brock MV. Age and sex differences in the incidence of esophageal adenocarcinoma: results from the Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results (SEER) Registry (1973-2008). Dis Esophagus. 2014;27(8):757-763.
- Co M, Ngan RKC, Mang OWK, Tam AHP, Wong KH, Kwong A. Clinical outcomes of patients with ductal carcinoma in situ in Hong Kong: 10year territory-wide cancer registry study. *Hong Kong Med J*. 2020;26(6):486-491.
- Yang Y, Xie L, Zheng JL, Tan YT, Zhang W, Xiang YB. Incidence trends of urinary bladder and kidney cancers in urban Shanghai, 1973-2005. *PLoS One*. 2013;8(12):e82430.
- Ahmad OB, Boschi-Pinto C, Lopez AD, Murray CJ, Lozano R, Inoue M. Age standardization of rates: a new WHO standard. *Geneva: World Health Organization*. 2001;9(10):1-14.

- Eun SJ. Trends in mortality from road traffic injuries in South Korea, 1983-2017: joinpoint regression and age-period-cohort analyses. *Accid Anal Prev.* 2020;134:105325.
- Kim HJ, Fay MP, Feuer EJ, Midthune DN. Permutation tests for joinpoint regression with applications to cancer rates. *Stat Med.* 2000;19(3):335-351.
- 20. Clayton D, Schifflers E. Models for temporal variation in cancer rates. II: age—period—cohort models. *Stat Med.* 1987;6(4):469-481.
- Clayton D, Schifflers E. Models for temporal variation in cancer rates. I: age—period and age—cohort models. *Stat Med.* 1987;6(4):449-467.
- Ryan DP, Hong TS, Bardeesy N. Pancreatic adenocarcinoma. N Engl J Med. 2014;371(11):1039-1049.
- National Cancer Institute. Joinpoint Trend Analysis Software, Version 4. 8.0.1. Surveillance Research Program, Nation Cancer Institute. Updated April 22, 2020. Available at https://surveillance.cancer.gov/joinpoint/. Accessed January 20, 2021.
- 24. Carstensen B, Plummer M, Laara E, Hills M. Epi: a package for statistical analysis in epidemiology. *R Package Version*. 2008;1(8):1-190.
- 25. Bray F, Ferlay J, Soerjomataram I, Siegel RL, Torre LA, Jemal A. Global cancer statistics 2018: GLOBOCAN estimates of incidence and mortality worldwide for 36 cancers in 185 countries. CA Cancer J Clin. 2018;68(6):394-424.
- McKenzie F, Biessy C, Ferrari P, et al. Healthy lifestyle and risk of cancer in the European Prospective Investigation Into Cancer and Nutrition cohort study. *Medicine (Baltimore)*. 2016;95(16):e2850.
- Maisonneuve P, Lowenfels AB. Risk factors for pancreatic cancer: a summary review of meta-analytical studies. *Int J Epidemiol*. 2015;44(1): 186-198.
- Zhang ZQ, Li QJ, Hao FB, Wu YQ, Liu S, Zhong GC. Adherence to the 2018 World Cancer Research Fund/American Institute for Cancer Research cancer prevention recommendations and pancreatic cancer incidence and mortality: a prospective cohort study. *Cancer Med.* 2020;9(18):6843-6853.
- Lee SA, Xu WH, Zheng W, et al. Physical activity patterns and their correlates among Chinese men in Shanghai. *Med Sci Sports Exerc*. 2007;39(10):1700-1707.
- **30.** Wu H, Zhou P, Zhang W, et al. Time trends of incidence and mortality in colorectal cancer in Changning District, Shanghai, 1975-2013. *J Dig Dis*. 2018;19(9):540-549.
- Huxley RR, Ansary-Moghaddam A, Clifton P, Czernichow S, Parr CL, Woodward M. The impact of dietary and lifestyle risk factors on risk of colorectal cancer: a quantitative overview of the epidemiological evidence. *Int J Cancer.* 2009;125(1):171-180.
- Thompson B, Gehlert S, Paskett ED. Extreme population-level events: do they have an impact on cancer? *Cancer.* 2017;123(17):3226-3228.
- Robsahm TE, Tretli S. Breast cancer incidence in food- vs non-foodproducing areas in Norway: possible beneficial effects of World War II. *Br J Cancer*. 2002;86(3):362-366.
- Brundtland GH, Liestol K, Walloe L. Height, weight and menarcheal age of Oslo schoolchildren during the last 60 years. Ann Hum Biol. 1980;7(4):307-322.
- **35.** Andersson G, Borgquist S, Jirstrom K. Hormonal factors and pancreatic cancer risk in women: The Malmo Diet and Cancer Study. *Int J Cancer.* 2018;143(1):52-62.
- Lynch SM, Vrieling A, Lubin JH, et al. Cigarette smoking and pancreatic cancer: a pooled analysis from the pancreatic cancer cohort consortium. Am J Epidemiol. 2009;170(4):403-413.
- Kilander C, Mattsson F, Ljung R, Lagergren J, Sadr-Azodi O. Systematic underreporting of the population-based incidence of pancreatic and biliary tract cancers. *Acta Oncol.* 2014;53(6):822-829.
- Fest J, Ruiter R, van Rooij FJ, et al. Underestimation of pancreatic cancer in the national cancer registry—reconsidering the incidence and survival rates. *Eur J Cancer.* 2017;72:186-191.