Menopausia, TRH y Ca de Seno: Consideraciones en su Investigación

Ricardo Martín O. MD MSc
Gineco-Obstetra-Epidemiólogo Clínico
Fundación Sta Fe de Bogotá
Facultad de Medicina-Universidad de los Andes

Aplicación de métodos epidemiológicos a enfermedades no infecciosas

1. Pocas enfermedades no infecciosas tienen causas únicas (cáncer, enf CV, osteoporosis, etc).
2. El intervalo entre exposición y Dx es largo y generalmente se necesita mucho tiempo de exposición (cigarrillo y Ca pulmón, Ca de Seno 6-9 años, Enf CV posiblemente décadas).
3. Si no es posible asegurar el momento de comienzo de la enfermedad, es muy difícil asegurar las exposiciones relevantes
4. Por ende, el estudio de la enfermedad no infecciosa es complejo y dificultoso.

Qué “sabemos”?

**Algunos factores asociados a Ca
de seno reportados en la prensa
y literatura médica en los
últimos 2 años**

20/03/06 - Women & family section

'Uneven breasts may increase cancer risk'

Women with different sized breasts are more likely to develop breast cancer say researchers.

They measured the difference in the breast size of 504 women and charted those who remained healthy and those who developed breast cancer.

The risk of contracting the disease rose by 50 per cent for each 100ml increase in breast difference. The average female breast in the study was about 500ml.

Study leader Dr Diane Scutt, said that uneven breasts was a significant predictor of breast cancer. However, she said women should treat this with caution:

'Uneven breasts may increase breast cancer risk'

Women with different sized breasts are more likely to develop breast cancer say researchers.

They measured the difference in the size of the breasts of 10,000 women and charted those who remained healthy and those who developed breast cancer.

The risk of contracting the disease increased by 50 per cent for each 100ml increase in breast size difference. The average difference in breast size in the study was about 500ml.

Study leader Dr Diana L. Duggan said that uneven breasts was a significant predictor of breast cancer. However, she said women should treat this with caution:

50% aumento en el riesgo por cada 100 ml de diferencia

From The Times

April 4, 2007

Eating red meat raises risk of breast cancer, says study

Marcus Leroux

Eating red meat can significantly increase women's chances of developing breast cancer, a study says.

As little as 2oz (57g) of red meat a day can raise the risk of breast cancer by up to 42 per cent, according to the University of Leeds findings. The effect was most pronounced on postmenopausal women, but younger women also had a raised risk if they ate red meat daily.

The study tracked 35,000 women aged between 35 and 69 for eight years, and took into account other factors such as smoking, alcohol intake and the use of hormone replacement therapy.

Janet Cade said that her team did not expect to see 2oz of red meat — the equivalent of half a lamb chop — to have as dramatic an effect.

ONLINE

...k of breast cancer,

Eating red meat...
says study

Marcus Leroux

Eating red meat can significantly increase women's chances

As little as 2oz (57g) of red meat a day can raise the risk of breast cancer according to the University of Leeds findings. The effect was most pronounced in postmenopausal women, but younger women also had a raised risk if they ate red meat daily.

The study tracked 35,000 women aged between 35 and 69 for eight years, and took into account factors such as smoking, alcohol intake and the use of hormone replacement therapy.

Janet Cade said that her team did not expect to see 2oz of red meat — the equivalent of half a lamb chop — to have as dramatic an effect.

42% aumento en el riesgo por cada porción de 57 gr de carne roja por día : Este efecto es mas pronunciado en mujeres pos-menopáusicas

TIMESONLINE

From The Times

October 13, 2006

Breast cancer linked to farm work

Charities criticise study saying women in agriculture, healthcare and car factories are at greater risk

By Lewis Smith

WOMEN who work or grow up on a farm triple their chances of getting breast cancer, a study suggests. The danger further increases if the women then go on to work either in the health sector or in car factories.

TIMES ONLINE

From The Times

October 13, 2006

Breast cancer linked to shift work

Charities criticise study saying women in agriculture, healthcare and car factories are at greater risk

By Lewis Smith

WOMEN who work or grow up on a shift have a higher risk of getting breast cancer, a study suggests. The danger further increases if the women then go on to work in the health sector or in car factories.

Riesgo Relativo 3.0

11 June 2007 17:12

- **Home**
- > News
- > Health

Virus spread by sex is linked to breast cancer

By Roger Dobson

Published: 10 June 2007

HPV, a virus that can be transmitted by sex, may be implicated in breast and a raft of other cancers, according to a series of new research findings.

Binge drinking raises cancer risk

Women who drink the equivalent of roughly two bottles of wine over a weekend more than double their risk of breast cancer, say Danish researchers.

A study of 17,647 nurses found twice the risk of breast cancer in women who drank 22-27 drinks a week compared with those who drank one to three drinks.

The risk was greatest when drinks were consumed in a short period, reported the European Journal of Public Health.

Experts said women should try and limit the amount of alcohol they drank.

Binge drinking and cancer risk

Women who drink the equivalent of four bottles of wine over a weekend more than double their risk of breast cancer, British researchers say.

A study of 17,647 nurses found twice the risk of breast cancer in those who drank 22-27 drinks a week compared with those who drank one to seven drinks a week.

The risk was greatest when drinks were consumed in a short period, the study reported the European Journal of Public Health.

Experts said women should try and limit the amount of alcohol they drank.

El riesgo se dobla si toma mucho!

TIMESONLINE

From The Times

August 19, 2005

Girls who eat chips more likely to get breast cancer

By Nigel Hawkes, Health Editor

EATING chips as a young child may increase the risk of contracting breast cancer as an adult, research in America has claimed.

Researchers at the Harvard Medical School say that for every portion of chips eaten per week in the pre-school years, the risk of breast cancer is increased. The data comes from a long-running study into the health of 80,000 nurses who have been followed for decades by a team from the research institute. The Nurses' Health Study has already produced many links between diet and disease, some disproved by further and better research.

The latest paper, in the *International Journal of Cancer*, used data from 582 women with breast cancer and 1,569 women without the disease in 1993.

TIMESONLINE

From The Times

August 19, 2005

Girls who eat chips more likely to get breast cancer

By Nigel Hawkes, Health Editor

EATING chips

Research in America has claimed.

Research in America has claimed. The study, published in the *Journal of Cancer*, used data from 582 women with breast cancer and those who had not in 1993. The study found that women who ate more than one serving of chips per week in the 1980s had a 27% higher risk of breast cancer than those who ate less than one serving per week. The study was led by a team from the research institute. The study also found that the risk of breast cancer was higher in women who ate more than one serving of chips per week in the 1980s than in those who ate less than one serving per week. The study also found that the risk of breast cancer was higher in women who ate more than one serving of chips per week in the 1980s than in those who ate less than one serving per week. The study also found that the risk of breast cancer was higher in women who ate more than one serving of chips per week in the 1980s than in those who ate less than one serving per week.

The study found that the risk of breast cancer was higher in women who ate more than one serving of chips per week in the 1980s than in those who ate less than one serving per week. The study also found that the risk of breast cancer was higher in women who ate more than one serving of chips per week in the 1980s than in those who ate less than one serving per week. The study also found that the risk of breast cancer was higher in women who ate more than one serving of chips per week in the 1980s than in those who ate less than one serving per week.

"El riesgo de Ca de seno a la edad de 60 se aumenta en un 27% en las pacientes que comieron papas fritas una vez a la semana antes de la edad de 5 años"

Antibiotic Use in Relation to the Risk of Breast Cancer

Christine M. Velicer, PhD

Susan R. Heckbert, MD, PhD

Johanna W. Lampe, PhD, RD

John D. Potter, MD, PhD

Carol A. Robertson, RPh

Stephen H. Taplin, MD, MPH

THE HYPOTHESIS THAT USE OF ANTIBIOTICS may increase risk of cancer was first proposed several decades ago.¹ Biological and epidemiologic studies of this associa-

Context Use of antibiotics may be associated with risk of breast cancer through effects on immune function, inflammation, and metabolism of estrogen and phytochemicals; however, clinical data on the association between antibiotic use and risk of breast cancer are sparse.

Objective To examine the association between use of antibiotics and risk of breast cancer.

Design, Setting, and Participants Case-control study among 2266 women older than 19 years with primary, invasive breast cancer (cases) enrolled in a large, non-profit health plan for at least 1 year between January 1, 1993, and June 30, 2001, and 7953 randomly selected female health plan members (controls), frequency-matched to cases on age and length of enrollment. Cases were ascertained from the Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results cancer registry. Antibiotic use was ascertained from computerized pharmacy records.

Antibiotic Use in Relation to the Risk of Breast Cancer

Christine M. Velicer, PhD

Susan R. Heckbert, MD, PhD

Johanna W. Lampe, PhD, RD

John D. Potter, MD, PhD

Carol A. Robertson, RPh

Stephen H. Taplin, MD, MPH

THE HYPOTHESIS THAT antibiotics may increase breast cancer risk was first proposed several decades ago.¹ Biological epidemiologic studies of the

Context Use of antibiotics may be associated with risk of breast cancer through effects on immune function, inflammation, and metabolism of estrogen and phytochemicals; however, clinical data on the association between antibiotic use and risk of breast cancer are sparse.

ESTIMATIVOS DEL RIESGO

	RR
1-10 fórmulas	1.5 (1.2, 1.7)
11-25 fórmulas	1.6 (1.3, 1.9)
26-50 fórmulas	2.1 (1.7, 2.6)
50+ fórmulas	2.3 (1.7, 3.2)

f breast
en older
e, non-
01, and
atched
Surveil-
rtained

Innate left handedness and risk of breast cancer: case-cohort study

Made K Ramadhani, Sjoerd G Elias, Paulus A H van Noord, Diederick E Grobbee, Petra H M Peeters, Cuno S P M Uiterwaal

Julius Center for Health Sciences and Primary Care, University Medical Center Utrecht, PO Box 85500, 3508 GA, Utrecht, Netherlands

Made K Ramadhani
epidemiologist
Sjoerd G Elias
epidemiologist
Paulus A H van Noord
assistant professor of

Among the proposed origins of breast cancer are intrauterine influences, such as exposure to sex hormones.¹ Such exposure may also influence cerebral lateralisation, with hand preference being one of its manifestations. We know only of one study on a putative common genetic origin of left handedness and breast cancer. We used a population based prospective study, middle aged women followed up for 10 years.

ascertained vital status. We used a random sample of 1000 women who had their birth date and date of death recorded. 55 women with incomplete data were excluded. 371 from outside the random sample had breast cancer (incidence of breast cancer 2.5 per 1000 person years). We used Prentice's method for Cox regression as recommended by Barlow and colleagues³ for analysis with the statistical software SAS (version 8.2, SAS Institute, NC, USA) and a dedicated macro (<http://lib.stat.cmu.edu/general/robphreg>). The random sample comprised 165 (11.6%) left

Zurdas con un RR de 2.2 (1.2, 4.2)

OTROS FACTORES QUE AFECTAN EL RIESGO DE CA DE SENO

Ser mujer

Aumento

Edad

Aumento

Menopausia temprana

Disminución

Menarquia temprana

Disminución

Parto en edad temprana

Disminución

Radiación Ionizante

Aumento

Historia familiar

Aumento

Obesidad

Aumento

Enf quística

Aumento

Si Ud llena las siguientes condiciones:

1. Ser mujer
2. Vivir en el campo
3. Tener senos asimétricos
4. Haber comido papas antes de los 5 años
5. Tener infección por H
6. Beber mucho alcohol
7. Haber consumido anticoncepcionales
8. Ser zurda
9. Etc etc etc etc etc etc etc

Qué se mide en los estudios epidemiológicos?

La mayoría de estudios están diseñados para detectar diferencias estadísticamente significativas en tasas de incidencias entre poblaciones que generalmente tienen diferencias en exposición o características personales

Esas diferencias se reportan en OR, HR o RR

Aquellos factores con un OR,HR o RR elevado se llaman Factores de Riesgo

Factores de Riesgo

- 1. La presencia de un factor de riesgo solo no siempre aumenta el riesgo de enfermedad en un individuo.**
- 2. No todos los factores de riesgo son evitables**
- 3. Los factores de riesgo no siempre son causales.**
- 4. Todos los agentes causales son factores de riesgo.**
- 5. La gran mayoría de enfermedades no infecciosas son el resultado de una combinación de factores de riesgo.**

No toda mujer que haya tomado TRH va a presentar Ca de Seno.

No toda mujer con Ca de Seno ha tomado TRH.

Consideraciones del diseño

Representación esquemática de la historia de Ca de Seno

Puntos clave en la investigación de Ca de Seno

1. El diagnóstico se da años después de iniciado el tumor.
2. El momento del diagnóstico, depende mucho del método dx empleado
3. Las exposiciones y eventos que ocurrieron ANTES de la iniciación del tumor pueden ser o no ser agentes causales
4. No todos los tumores se van a desarrollar en un Ca invasivo ni van a amenazar la vida de la paciente .

Criterios de Bradford Hill

- 1. El efecto es precedido por la causa
- 2. Fortaleza de la asociación
- 3. Relación dosis respuesta
- 4. Asociación reversible
- 5. Consistencia
- 6. Plausibilidad biológica
- 7. Especificidad
- 8. Analogía

F
o
r
t
a
l
e
z
a

Austin Bradford Hill, "The Environment and Disease: Association or Causation?,"
Proceedings of the Royal Society of Medicine, 58 (1965), 295-300

Criterios de Bradford Hill

- 1. El efecto es precedido por la causa
 - Casi imposible de demostrar
- 2. Fortaleza de la asociación
 - Estrógenos solos vs E + Progestinas
- 3. Relación dosis-respuesta:
 - Desde cuando medir esa dosis ?
- 4. Asociación reversible
 - No es posible y no se cumple

Austin Bradford Hill, "The Environment and Disease: Association or Causation?,"
Proceedings of the Royal Society of Medicine, 58 (1965), 295-300

Criterios de Bradford Hill

- 5. Consistencia:
 - No ha habido consistencia en los estudios observacionales vs experimentales
- 7. Especificidad
 - No puede cumplirse en la medida en que las terapias son muy diferentes una de otra
- 8. Analogía
 - En Ca de Próstata tampoco se ha podido comprobar que la T “produzca” Ca

Austin Bradford Hill, “The Environment and Disease: Association or Causation?,”
Proceedings of the Royal Society of Medicine, 58 (1965), 295-300

Criterios de Bradford Hill

- 6. Plausibilidad biológica
 - Los estudios clínicos muestran que las mujeres que consumen solo estrógenos no aumentan la incidencia de Ca de Seno, aunque los estudios no clínicos muestran lo contrario
 - Si se agrega MPA al parecer si se aumenta dicha incidencia.....
 - No hay estudios con diferentes estrógenos (no equinos conjugados) ni con otras progestinas
 - Hay evidencia de efecto quiescente con otras progestinas (Drospirenona)

Importa el tamaño del estudio?

Tamaño del estudio

1. Aumentar el tamaño de la muestra lleva a magnificar cualquier deficiencia en su diseño. NO las va a resolver
2. Aumentar el n lleva a acercar los IC del estimativo de riesgo
3. Un OR de 1.22 (0.88, 1.34) significa algo muy diferente de un OR de 1.22 (1.09, 1.65)? Ninguno de ellos es perfecto y cualquiera puede tener sesgos residuales y/o de confusión !

La tendencia debe ser específica del grupo
analizado.

La tendencia debe ser consistente

Trends in new breast cancer registrations 1992-2004 SEER data – 13 Registries

Breast cancer registration rates women aged 50 at diagnosis

Breast cancer registration rates women aged 53 at diagnosis

Breast cancer registration rates women aged 60 at diagnosis

Breast cancer registration rates women aged 64 at diagnosis

Breast cancer registration rates women aged 68 at diagnosis

Breast cancer registration rates 1992-2004 – Los Angeles
Women age 50-64 years (22.7% of available data)

Breast cancer registration rates 1992-2004 – Metropolitan Detroit
Women age 50-64 years (11.3% of available data)

Entonces qué?

- La disminución de la TRH NO ha cambiado la tendencia en la incidencia de Ca de seno
- La disminución en la práctica de mamografía es la gran responsable de dicha “tendencia”

Cómo deben ser interpretados los estudios epidemiológicos De TRH y Ca de Seno?

Con CAUTELA!

Conclusiones

1. No existe estudio perfecto .Tanto el sesgo residual como los confusores no controlados pueden llevar a resultados imprecisos
2. Los hallazgos deben ser consistentes con la biología conocida y no ser conflictivos con ella.
3. Casi todos los estudios de ca de seno se concentran en una exposición única .
4. Se necesita más trabajo para identificar los factores y exposición que diferencien un individuo con un factor de riesgo que desarrolla la enfermedad y aquellos con los mismos factores de riesgo que no la desarrollan .

Conclusiones

1. Es muy fácil demostrar asociación estadística .
2. Es muy difícil probar que la exposición es causal solamente por epidemiología.
3. La epidemiología es un método útil para la investigación de las causas de enfermedad .No es el único método y a veces no es el mejor.
4. A menos que seamos mas circunspectos en la interpretación de los estudios epidemiológicos disponibles, la metodología por si misma se deacreditará aún más

Factores asociados con Ca de seno

Zurdez
Senos asimétricos
Parto tardío
TRH
Edad
Ser mujer
Papas fritas durante la lactancia
Historia familiar
Trabajar en farmacia
Infección por HPV
Vivir en ciudad
Estrés
Uso de antibióticos
Anticonceptivos orales
Etc, etc, etc, etc, etc, etc ,etc

Si todo eso es cierto, cómo orientamos a las pacientes ?

Cómo pensar hacia el futuro?

- Los estrógenos y progestinas han mostrado claramente que son capaces de acelerar la diferenciación histológica de las lesiones de ca de seno, lo que lleva a hacerlas más evidentes a los métodos diagnósticos como la mamografía o el MRI
- Esta demostrado hace años que en el momento Dx, la diferenciación histológica es mayor y el estado del Ca es menor en pacientes con TRH, y la mortalidad por Ca de seno NO es mayor !

La paradoja:

Los estudios observacionales dicen:

- Aumento del riesgo

Al mismo tiempo indican:

- Menor mortalidad

Biología del Ca de seno en usuarias de TRH

Diagnóstico a edad más temprana

Menor grado histológico

Menor tamaño

Mas localizados

Sin diferencias en receptores

o adenopatías

40-60% reducción en mortalidad

Juicio Clínico

TRH posmenopáusica y riesgo de Ca de seno:

Las hormonas inician un nuevo tumor
o promueven el crecimiento de uno
pre-existente?

WHI: Updated Breast Cancer Report

	E/P	Placebo	Ratio
Invasive breast ca			
Year 1	12	19 cases	0.62 (0.29-1.23)
Year 2	26	32	0.77 (0.46-1.30)
Year 3	29	22	1.26 (0.73-2.20)
Year 4	44	27	1.54 (0.95-2.49)
Year 5	43	21	1.99 (1.18-3.35)
Year 6 +	45	29	1.35 (0.85-2.16)

Noninvasive 47 37

Deaths 4 4

JAMA 2003;289:3243

WHI: Updated E-Only Breast Cancer Report

Total : HR=0.80; CI=0.62-1.04

Ptes adherentes: HR=0.67 CI=0.47-0.97

No efecto en enfermedad in situ.

.

JAMA 2006;295:1647

Criterios de Bradford Hill

- 1. El efecto es precedido por la causa
 - La TRH diferencia lesiones ya existentes
- 2. Fortaleza de la asociación
 - En este caso, si existe evidencia suficiente que demuestra dicha asociación
- 3. Relación dosis-respuesta:
 - Bajo el anterior precepto, más fácilmente demostrable
- 4. Asociación reversible
 - Es muy posible

Criterios de Bradford Hill

- 5. Consistencia:
 - Si hay consistencia
- 7. Especificidad
 - Si se habría dado ya que todas las TRH contienen estrógenos
- 8. Analogía
 - En Ca de Próstata no se ha podido comprobar que la T “produzca” Ca, pero si que estimula el crecimiento de lesiones anteriores

Criterios de Bradford Hill

- 6. Plausibilidad biológica
 - Si el estrógeno y la progesterona “causan” Ca de seno, porqué la mayor incidencia del mismo se da en la época de la menopausia donde se da la falla ovárica?

**No se puede probar que no
hay efecto de una
exposición, ya que el
método está diseñado para
probar la hipótesis nula.
Por ello, una vez se sugiera
que existe un efecto, la duda
permanece**

Farmer R. IMS 2008

Todas las personas son diferentes !