

Table 15. Explanatory notes on cohort data*

Cohort code	Lung cancer mortality	Average cumulative exposure (f/ml y)	Lung cancer risk coefficient		Mesothelioma risk coefficient K_M in HEI model
			SMR regression slope	Regression Slope — internal	
1		From Berry (1995)	Coefficient for exposure group covering cohort mean in Berry (1991)	Inferred from analyses in Armstrong <i>et al.</i> (1989) and de Klerk <i>et al.</i> (1991)	From de Klerk <i>et al.</i> (1992)
2m		Table 5	Given in text of main reference; Stayner <i>et al.</i> (1997) give an overall estimate of 2.19		
2f					
3	Excl. 4 mesotheliomas	Table 2	Reported value of 0.56, conversion factor 3		
4	Excl. an estimated 4 mesotheliomas		Exposure specific rates inconsistent, wide range of slopes can be fitted.		
5a	Excluding 1 mesothelioma	Tables 8, 10 and 11			
5b					
6	Data for asbestos factory cannot be consistently excluded, but impact on risk estimate is minor	Table 8	Poisson regression (data in Table 8)	From Liddell <i>et al.</i> (1998) (Table 3)	Fitted value $\times 33/38$ to adjust for factory cases
7	Smoking adjusted data for 20+ yr latency from Neuberger and Kundi (1993)	Estimated from Fig. 4 in Neuberger and Kundi (1991)			
8	Excluding an estimated 42 mesotheliomas (half the difference between DC and BE mesothelioma numbers)	The range of exposure conditions likely to have been met by this group, and the long time period over which these exposures were accrued means that any estimate of the levels of exposure will be very approximate. Other reviews have adopted notional values of average exposure level as 15–30 f/ml and average exposure duration as 25 yr, implying a mean cumulative exposure around 500 f/ml.yr, this is likely to be very uncertain estimate.			
9	Excluding workers with <1 yr employment	Overall mean is 73 f/ml.yr (Table 16); mean exposure duration 7.9 yr (Table 7); thus mean level around 10 f/ml; half the man years contributed by short term men (Table 8); assuming exposures of 5 f/ml.yr for short term men implies exposure of 138 f/ml.yr for men with >1 yr exposure.			
10		From Table 3: the result is sensitive to the choice of mean dose in the highest category (which covers 30% of men). With the top dose mean set at 500 f/ml.yr the overall mean is 250, increasing to 400 if the top dose mean is set at 1000 f/ml.yr. A value of 300 has been adopted for this review.			
		Reported dose specific data has not been used here, since comparison of the man-years in the dose specific categories of Table 3 of Piolatto <i>et al.</i> (1990) with the number of men in these category strongly suggests that all the man-years of follow-up for men in each category has been assigned to the dose category they eventually achieve, the exposure response is thus biased downwards by an unknown amount.			

(Continued on next page)