

1 Genital powder use and risk of ovarian cancer: a pooled analysis of 8,525 cases and 9,859
2 controls

3 Kathryn L. Terry^{1,2}, Stalo Karageorgi³, Yurii B. Shvetsov⁴, Melissa A. Merritt², Galina Lurie⁴,
4 Pamela J. Thompson⁵, Michael E. Carney⁴, Rachel Palmieri Weber⁶, Lucy Akushevich⁶, Wei-
5 Hsuan Lo-Ciganic⁷, Kara Cushing-Haugen⁸, Weiva Sieh⁹, Kirsten Moysich¹⁰, Jennifer A.
6 Doherty^{8,11}, Christina M. Nagle¹², Australian Cancer Study (Ovarian Cancer)¹², Australian
7 Ovarian Cancer Study Group¹², Andrew Berchuck¹³, Celeste L. Pearce¹⁴, Malcolm Pike^{14,15},
8 Roberta B. Ness¹⁶, Penelope M. Webb¹², Mary Anne Rossing⁸, Joellen Schildkraut⁶, Harvey
9 Risch¹⁷, Marc T. Goodman⁵ on behalf of the Ovarian Cancer Association Consortium

10 ¹Obstetrics and Gynecology Epidemiology Center, Brigham and Women's Hospital; Department
11 of Obstetrics, Gynecology and Reproductive Biology, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA,
12 USA

13 ²Department of Epidemiology, Harvard School of Public Health, Boston, MA, USA

14 ³Channing Laboratory, Department of Medicine, Brigham and Women's Hospital and Harvard
15 Medical School, Boston, MA

16 ⁴Cancer Center, University of Hawaii, Honolulu, HI, USA

17 ⁵Samuel Oschin Comprehensive Cancer Institute, Cedars-Sinai Medical Center, Los Angeles,
18 CA

19 ⁶Department of Community and Family Medicine, Duke University Medical Center, Durham,
20 NC, USA

21 ⁷Department of Epidemiology, Graduate School of Public Health, University of Pittsburgh,
22 Pittsburgh, PA, USA

23 ⁸Program in Epidemiology, Division of Public Health Sciences, Fred Hutchinson Cancer
24 Research Center, Seattle, WA, USA

25 ⁹Department of Health Research and Policy, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA

26 ¹⁰Department of Cancer Prevention and Control, Roswell Park Cancer Institute, Buffalo, NY,
27 USA

28 ¹¹Department of Community and Family Medicine, Section of Biostatistics & Epidemiology,
29 Dartmouth Medical School, NH, USA

30 ¹²Gynaecological Cancers Group, Queensland Institute of Medical Research, Brisbane,
31 Queensland, Australia

32 ¹³Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Duke University Medical Center, Durham, North
33 Carolina, USA

34 ¹⁴Department of Preventive Medicine, Keck School of Medicine, University of Southern
35 California Norris Comprehensive Cancer Center, Los Angeles, CA, USA

36 ¹⁵Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center, New
37 York, NY, USA

38 ¹⁶University of Texas, School of Public Health, Houston, TX, USA

39 ¹⁷Department of Chronic Disease Epidemiology, Yale University School of Public Health, New
40 Haven, CT, USA

41

42 Corresponding author:

43 Kathryn L. Terry, ScD

44 Obstetrics and Gynecology Epidemiology Center

45 221 Longwood Avenue, RFB 368, Boston, MA 02115

46 Phone: (617) 732-8596 Fax: (617) 732-4899

47 Email: kterry@partners.org

48

49 Running title: Genital powder use and ovarian cancer risk

50 Keywords: ovarian cancer, powder, talc, epidemiology

51

52 The authors have no conflict of interest to disclose.

53

54

55 **Abstract (word count: 243)**

56 Genital powder use has been associated with risk of epithelial ovarian cancer in some, but not all,
57 epidemiologic investigations, possibly reflecting the carcinogenic effects of talc particles found
58 in most of these products. Whether risk increases with number of genital-powder applications
59 and for all histologic types of ovarian cancer also remains uncertain. Therefore, we estimated
60 the association between self-reported genital powder use and epithelial ovarian cancer risk in
61 eight population-based case-control studies. Individual data from each study was collected and
62 harmonized. Lifetime number of genital-powder applications was estimated from duration and
63 frequency of use. Pooled odds ratios were calculated using conditional logistic regression
64 matched on study and age and adjusted for potential confounders. Subtype-specific risks were
65 estimated according to tumor behavior and histology. 8,525 cases and 9,859 controls were
66 included in the analyses. Genital powder use was associated with a modest increased risk of
67 epithelial ovarian cancer (odds ratio 1.24, 95% confidence interval 1.15-1.33) relative to women
68 who never used powder. Risk was elevated for invasive serous (1.20, 1.09-1.32), endometrioid
69 (1.22, 1.04-1.43), and clear cell (1.24, 1.01-1.52) tumors, and for borderline serous tumors (1.46,
70 1.24-1.72). Among genital powder users, we observed no significant trend ($p=0.17$) in risk with
71 increasing number of lifetime applications (assessed in quartiles). We noted no increase in risk
72 among women who only reported non-genital powder use. In summary, genital powder use is a
73 modifiable exposure associated with small-to-moderate increases in risk of most histologic
74 subtypes of epithelial ovarian cancer.

75 **INTRODUCTION**

76 Powders that are commonly applied either directly to the genital, perineal, or rectal area after
77 bathing or indirectly to underwear, sanitary napkins, tampons, or stored contraceptive devices
78 may contain talc because of its softness, absorbency, and lack of clumpiness (1). However, the
79 presence of talc in commercially available powder formulations has varied over time, even
80 within particular brands of products, limiting the ability of most epidemiologic studies to
81 measure genital talc exposure accurately. Despite this, genital powder use, but not use on other
82 parts of the body, has been linked to increased risk of ovarian cancer, suggesting that powder
83 particles ascending the genital tract may predispose to ovarian cancer development (2-4). Meta-
84 analyses of observational studies show 33-35% increased risk of ovarian cancer among women
85 who have used genital powders (1, 4, 5), but evidence for a dose-response relationship has been
86 inconsistent. Though dose response was not addressed in previous meta-analyses(1, 4, 5) some
87 individual studies have reported significant dose-response (4, 6-10) while others have not (9, 11-
88 15).

89

90 Epidemiologic and biologic studies show differences in risk-factor profiles and molecular
91 characteristics between ovarian cancer subtypes defined by histology (serous, endometrioid,
92 mucinous, clear cell) and behavior (borderline, invasive) (16). For instance, serous tumors are
93 characterized by p53 mutations, while mucinous tumors have a high prevalence of KRAS
94 mutations (17) and are not generally associated with reproductive risk factors (16, 18). Since
95 most early studies of powder use and ovarian cancer did not include analysis by histologic
96 subgroups (3, 6, 11, 19-21), histology-specific estimates were not available from these studies

97 for meta-analysis. Most (2, 4, 8, 9, 22), but not all (10, 14, 15, 23), epidemiologic studies of
98 genital powder use and risk of ovarian cancer that have evaluated histologic subgroups have
99 found the association to be strongest for serous invasive tumors. Such tumors comprise the most
100 common variety of ovarian cancer and few previous studies have had sufficient statistical power
101 to evaluate the association between genital powder use and risk of other histologic subtypes. In
102 the present study, we evaluated associations between genital powder use and risk of ovarian
103 cancer overall, by invasiveness and by histologic type in a pooled analysis of eight population-
104 based case-control studies with relevant data from the Ovarian Cancer Association Consortium
105 (OCAC), a consortium founded in 2005 to validate promising genetic associations in
106 epidemiologic studies of ovarian cancer.

107

108 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

109 **Participating studies**

110 Studies participating in the OCAC consortium as of April 2010 that collected data on powder use
111 were included. Each study was approved by an institutional ethics committee and all participants
112 provided informed consent. Detailed description of the OCAC consortium is available elsewhere
113 (24). Characteristics of the eight case-control studies contributing data to this analysis are
114 presented in Table 1. Six studies were conducted in the USA (DOV (14), HAW (25), HOP (26),
115 NCO (27), NEC (4), USC (28)) one study in Australia (AUS (7)) and one study in Canada (SON
116 (15)). Overall, our analyses included 8,525 cases of ovarian, fallopian tube or peritoneal cancer
117 and 9,859 controls. Five studies previously reported on powder use (AUS (7), DOV (14), NCO
118 (27), NEC (4), SON (15),) three of which provided data for this analysis that had not been

119 included in their previous powder-related publication (DOV, NEC, AUS). The remaining three
120 studies have not previously published their genital powder-use data (HAW, HOP, USC).

121

122 **Exposure and covariate data**

123 Data collected from participants regarding genital powder use varied between studies.
124 Harmonized analytic exposure variables were developed by comparing questionnaires between
125 the eight participating studies. The majority of the studies have obtained information on duration
126 and frequency of powder use, age at first powder use, use by sexual partners, and non-genital use
127 (Table 1). We defined genital powder use as any type of powder (talc, baby, deodorizing,
128 cornstarch, or unspecified/unknown) applied directly or indirectly (by application to sanitary
129 pads, tampons, underwear) to the genital, perineal, or rectal area. Since study specific powder
130 questions included varying degrees of detail regarding type and method of application, genital
131 powder definitions differ between studies. Criteria for regular genital powder use varied
132 between studies from “ever use” (AUS) to “one year or longer” (DOV); the specific wording for
133 this question is provided in Table 1. Use of body powders on sites other than the genital area
134 was defined as non-genital powder use. Women who reported both genital and non-genital
135 powder use were classified as genital users. Two studies (DOV, SON) did not collect data on
136 non-genital use and therefore women assigned to “no powder use” for these studies could have a
137 history of non-genital powder exposure. Extensive information on known and suspected risk
138 factors for ovarian cancer was collected in each study, including oral contraceptive (OC) use,
139 parity, tubal ligation history, body mass index (BMI), race, and ethnicity.

140

141 **Statistical methods**

142 Participants missing case/control status (n=17) or tumor histology (n=19) were excluded from
143 the analysis. We also excluded 1,119 participants who answered “do not know” or were missing
144 data on genital powder use; most of these were from the NCO study which did not include
145 genital powder questions for the first 720 participants. Furthermore, we excluded participants
146 missing tubal ligation (n=55), OC duration (n=100), parity (n=3), or height or weight (BMI)
147 (n=179). To examine differences in characteristics between cases and controls, we evaluated
148 two-sample t-statistics (age, BMI) and chi square statistics (OC use, nulliparity, tubal ligation,
149 race/ethnicity, powder use).

150

151 Study-specific odds ratios (ORs) and 95% confidence intervals (CI) were estimated using
152 unconditional logistic regression and were summarized by forest plots, including study
153 heterogeneity based on Cochran’s Q statistic. As no significant heterogeneity was observed
154 between studies, we calculated pooled ORs and 95% CIs across the studies using conditional
155 logistic regression matched on 5-year age groups and study. All analyses were adjusted for
156 potential confounders: age (continuous), duration of oral contraceptive (OC) use (never use, use
157 <2yrs, 2-<5yrs, 5-<10yrs, \geq 10yrs), parity (0, 1, 2, 3, \geq 4 children), tubal ligation history, BMI
158 (quartiles based on distribution in controls), and race/ethnicity (non-Hispanic white, Hispanic
159 white, black, Asian, other). Family history of breast or ovarian cancer were also considered as
160 covariates but were not included in the final model.

161

162 Subtype-specific estimates were calculated for subgroups of ovarian cancer defined by behavior
163 (invasive, borderline) and histology (serous, mucinous, endometrioid, clear cell) by comparing

164 each case group to all controls. As borderline endometrioid and clear cell tumors are rare, we
165 did not have sufficient numbers to evaluate those types separately.

166

167 In order to measure cumulative dose of genital-powder use, we estimated lifetime number of
168 powder applications by multiplying total months of use by frequency of use per month, for all
169 direct and indirect genital-powder applications. Women who reported multiple types of genital
170 powder exposure (on underwear, on sanitary napkins or pads, directly to genital area) during the
171 same time period were assigned the number of genital powder applications equal to the most
172 commonly used type rather than the sum of applications across all types of genital powder
173 exposure. We reasoned that contemporaneous powder applications were unlikely to be
174 independent events and therefore should not be treated cumulatively.. Analyses of estimated
175 lifetime number of applications excluded participants in the HOP study as data on age and
176 frequency of use were not collected (n=2,224); genital powder users missing information on
177 duration or frequency of use were omitted in the remaining studies (n=394). Never regular users
178 of genital powders and women who only reported non-genital use were coded as having zero
179 lifetime genital powder applications and comprised the reference group for this analysis.

180 Categories were determined based on age-specific quartile cutpoints in controls (25th, 50th and
181 75th percentile cutpoints are 612, 1,872, and 5,400 for participants < 40 years old; 612, 2,160,
182 and 7,200 for 41-50 years; 720, 3,600, and 10,800 for 51-60 years; 1,440, 5,760, and 14,440 for
183 61-70; 840, 7,200, and 18,000 for > 70 years). Trends were evaluated based on the median
184 lifetime number of genital-powder applications for controls in each age-specific quartile using
185 the Wald statistic and were performed both including and excluding never users of genital
186 powders.

187

188 We estimated the association between genital powder use and ovarian cancer risk within strata to
189 evaluate potential modification of effect defined using a cutpoint BMI of 30 based on the World
190 Health Organization's definition of obesity, endometriosis, parity, tubal ligation/hysterectomy,
191 and menopausal status. We used likelihood-ratio statistics comparing models with and without
192 interaction terms to determine statistically significant interactions. To estimate calendar year of
193 first use, we subtracted the years since first use (age at study entry minus age at first genital
194 powder use) from median calendar year of the participant's study.

195 All analyses were performed in SAS v9.2 (SAS, Cary, NC) and Stata v9.2 (StataCorp, College
196 Station, TX). All p-values are two-sided. Analyses have been independently verified by two
197 separate study groups (HAW and NCO).

198

199

200 **RESULTS**

201 This pooled analysis of eight case-control studies included 9,859 controls and 8,525 ovarian
202 cancer cases. Genital powder use was reported by 2,511 (25%) of the controls and 2,600 (31%)
203 of the cases, while powder use only on other (non-genital) parts of the body was reported by
204 1,533 (16%) of the controls and 1,282 (15%) of the cases (Table 2). The prevalence of genital
205 powder use in controls varied widely between study sites, highest in AUS (45%) and lowest in
206 HAW (15%, Table 3).

207

208 In the pooled analysis, ever regular use of genital powder was associated with a modest increase
209 in risk of ovarian cancer (OR=1.24, 95% CI=1.15-1.33, Table 3) relative to women who reported
210 no powder use (AUS, HAW, HOP, NCO, NEC, USC) or no genital powder use (DOV, SON).
211 We observed no heterogeneity in the risk associated with genital powder use between studies
212 regardless of the reference group ($p=0.61$, Figure 1). Results were similar for genital powder
213 users compared to a combined reference group including never users and women whose use of
214 powder was exclusively non-genital (covariate-adjusted OR=1.25, 95% CI= 1.16-1.34; data not
215 shown), reflecting the absence of an association between powder use on other parts of the body
216 with ovarian cancer risk (Table 3).

217

218 Genital powder use was associated with a similar increased risk of borderline and invasive
219 ovarian cancer overall (Table 4). For borderline tumors, the association was stronger for the
220 serous subtype (OR=1.46, 95% CI=1.24-1.72; Table 4) and non-significant for the mucinous
221 subtype. For invasive ovarian cancer, we observed small increases in risk of serous (OR=1.20,
222 95% CI=1.09-1.32), endometrioid (OR=1.22, 95% CI=1.04-1.43), and clear cell (OR=1.24, 95%
223 CI=1.01-1.52) cancer but no significant increase in risk of mucinous cancer (OR=1.09, 95% CI=
224 0.84-1.42). Similarly, we observed no significant increase in risk when borderline and invasive
225 mucinous tumors were considered together (data not shown). Risk associated with genital
226 powder use was consistent across studies for borderline and invasive tumors as well as invasive
227 serous, endometrioid, and clear cell subtypes (p for heterogeneity >0.1 ; Figures 2 a,b,c,d,e), but
228 not for mucinous tumors ($p=0.08$; Figure 2f). Genital powder use was associated with increased
229 risk of invasive mucinous tumors in SON, HOP (significantly), and USC (non-significantly)

230 while in the remaining studies (HAW, NCO, AUS, DOV, and NEC) genital powder use was
231 non-significantly associated with reduced risk.

232

233 We evaluated cumulative genital-powder exposure as a composite variable of frequency and
234 duration of use. We observed similar increased risks of all non-mucinous subtypes of epithelial
235 ovarian cancer combined across quartiles of genital powder compared to non-use: $OR_{Q1}=1.18$,
236 $95\% CI=1.02-1.36$, $OR_{Q2}=1.22$, $95\% CI=1.06-1.41$, $OR_{Q3}=1.22$, $95\% CI=1.06-1.40$, $OR_{Q4}=1.37$,
237 $95\% CI=1.19-1.58$ (Table 5). Although a significant increase in risk with an increasing number
238 of genital powder applications was found for non-mucinous epithelial ovarian cancer when non-
239 users were included in the analysis ($p\text{-trend}<0.0001$), no trend in cumulative use was evident in
240 analyses restricted to ever-users of genital powder ($p\text{-trend}=0.17$; Table 5). Taken together,
241 these observations suggest that the significant trend test largely reflects the comparison of ever
242 regular use to never use. Since tubal ligation or hysterectomy would block the transport of
243 powder through the genital tract to the ovaries, we performed a sensitivity analysis excluding
244 women who started genital powder use after these procedures. We observed similar associations
245 when we excluded the 65 cases and 79 controls who started genital powder use for the first time
246 after surgery ($OR_{Q1}=1.19$, $95\% CI=1.03-1.38$, $OR_{Q2}=1.19$, $95\% CI=1.03-1.38$, $OR_{Q3}=1.21$, 95%
247 $CI=1.04-1.39$, $OR_{Q4}=1.36$, $95\% CI=1.18-1.57$). For studies that collected data on timing of
248 powder use and tubal ligation/hysterectomy, we were able to identify timing of genital powder
249 exposure in relation to surgery based on age of powder use and age at surgery. Restricting our
250 exposure to genital powder applications that occurred before tubal ligation or hysterectomy made
251 no substantive difference in the results.

252

253 The association between any genital-powder use and ovarian cancer risk was stronger among
254 women with BMI < 30 kg/m² (OR=1.28, 95% CI=1.17-1.39) than for women with BMI ≥ 30
255 (OR=1.14, 95% CI=0.98-1.32, p-interaction=0.01). We observed no significant interactions
256 between genital powder use and parity, reported history of endometriosis, tubal
257 ligation/hysterectomy, or menopausal status (all p-interaction > 0.1). The association between
258 genital powder use and ovarian cancer risk was similar for women who started use between 1952
259 and 1961 (OR=1.36, 95% CI=1.19-1.56), between 1962 and 1972 (OR=1.27, 95% CI=1.11-
260 1.46), and after 1972 (OR=1.31, 95% CI=1.15-1.51). However, we observed an attenuated
261 association for women who started genital powder use before 1952 (OR=1.08, 95% CI=0.93-
262 1.25).

263

264 **DISCUSSION**

265 This pooled analysis of eight case-control studies suggests that genital powder use is associated
266 with a modest 20-30% increase in risk of developing epithelial ovarian cancer, including serous,
267 endometrioid, and clear cell tumors, but is less relevant to invasive mucinous tumors. Our
268 findings are consistent with and extend the findings of three meta-analyses that have reported an
269 increased risk of epithelial ovarian cancer with genital-powder use (1, 4, 5) by including dose
270 response and histology specific analyses. Our estimate of the overall association between genital
271 powder use and ovarian cancer risk was slightly attenuated compared to previous estimates from
272 meta-analyses. Possible reasons for the difference include the lack of restriction to published
273 results, data harmonization between studies that allowed similar definitions for the exposure and

274 covariates, and chance. Based on the consistency in the epidemiologic literature on talc-based
275 powder and ovarian cancer risk, the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC)
276 classified talc-based body powder as a class 2b carcinogen “possibly carcinogenic to human
277 beings” (29).

278

279 The biologic plausibility for the observed association between genital-powder use and ovarian
280 cancer risk has been challenged because evidence for dose-response has been inconsistent (2, 4,
281 5, 9, 10, 15, 22). The lack of significant dose-response may reflect the difficulty inherent in
282 accurate recollection of specific details of frequency and duration of genital-powder use. Also,
283 because not all powder products contain talc, various products may differ in their potential
284 carcinogenic effects. Alternatively, the association between genital-powder exposure and
285 ovarian cancer risk may not be linear and a modest exposure may be sufficient to increase cancer
286 risk. Talc-containing powders are hypothesized to promote cancer development by ascending
287 the female genital tract and interacting directly with the ovarian surface epithelium, leading to
288 local inflammation characterized by increased rates of cell division, DNA repair, oxidative
289 stress, and elevated inflammatory cytokines (13). Particles in solution easily ascend the genital
290 tract (30, 31). Our finding of slightly attenuated associations following exclusion of women with
291 powder exposure after tubal ligation or hysterectomy are not supportive of this hypothesis, but
292 risk estimates in this subgroup analysis may have randomly differed from those including all
293 women because of the reduction in sample size. Talc particles have been observed in the ovaries
294 of humans (32) and in rodent models (33, 34), but little is known about the biologic effects of
295 genital powder use.

296

297 In the current analyses of the various histological subtypes of ovarian cancer, we confirmed
298 previous reports of increased risk of serous invasive tumors with genital-powder use (2, 4, 8, 9,
299 22). We also observed significantly increased risk of both endometrioid and clear cell invasive
300 ovarian tumors with use of genital powder, and this finding was consistent across studies. It has
301 been suggested that both endometrioid and clear cell ovarian tumors may originate from ectopic
302 uterine endometrium (endometriosis) implanted on the ovary (17). In contrast, we observed no
303 significant associations between genital powder use and either borderline or invasive mucinous
304 ovarian cancer. The lack of a significant association for mucinous tumors may be due to the
305 relatively small number of these tumors or could be an indication that powder exposure is not
306 relevant to the pathogenesis of this histologic type. Studies have noted that ovarian cancer risk
307 factors and molecular characteristics differ for mucinous tumors (16-18, 23, 35-39).

308

309 Limitations of our pooled analysis include differences in the wording of questions about genital
310 powder use between studies and the retrospective nature of the exposure ascertainment. Women
311 who were classified as genital-powder users varied from “ever” use (AUS) or “ever regular” use
312 (SON) to powder use for at least six months (HAW, HOP, NCO, NEC, USC) or at least one year
313 (DOV). Differences in genital powder questions result in varying levels of misclassification of
314 true genital powder exposure. However, since exposure definitions are the same for cases and
315 controls within each study, misclassification genital powder exposure due to the question
316 wording would be non-differential, leading to an underestimate of the true association for any
317 given study. These studies were retrospective in nature and therefore potentially susceptible to

318 bias if cases were more likely to report genital-powder use than controls. Although non-genital
319 powder use was not associated with ovarian cancer risk, it is nevertheless possible that any
320 overreporting of powder use by cases might have been limited to reporting of genital powder.
321 Our analyses were also limited by missing data on genital powder use; however, missingness
322 was not associated with the distribution of any of the ovarian cancer risk factors examined and
323 was thus not likely to bias our results. Strengths of our analysis include a large sample size and
324 pooled analysis of individual data, allowing evaluation of the association of genital powder use
325 with less common histologic subgroups of ovarian cancer, careful harmonization of the data
326 based on comparison of study questionnaires, the use of a composite variable combining duration
327 and frequency to assess dose-response relationships.

328

329 In conclusion, our large pooled analysis of case-control studies shows a small-to-moderate (20-
330 30%) increased risk of ovarian cancer with genital-powder use, most clearly pertaining to non-
331 mucinous epithelial ovarian tumors. More work is needed to understand how genital powders
332 may exert a carcinogenic effect, and which constituents (e.g. talc) may be involved. Since there
333 are few modifiable risk factors for ovarian cancer, avoidance of genital powders may be a
334 possible strategy to reduce ovarian cancer incidence.

335

336 **Acknowledgments**

337 Support for the Ovarian Cancer Association Consortium was provided by donations from family
338 and friends of the Kathryn Sladek Smith to the Ovarian Cancer Research fund. In addition, these
339 studies were supported by National Institutes of Health (R01-CA54419, R01-CA112523, R01-

340 CA87538, R01-CA95023, RO1-CA76016, R01-CA58598, R01-CA17054, R01-CA14089, R01-
341 CA61132, R03-CA113148, R03-CA115195, N01-CN25403, N01-PC-67010, N01-CN55424,
342 N01-PC67001, P50-CA105009, P01-CA17054), the U.S. Department of Defense (DAMD17-01-
343 1-0729, DAMD17-02-1-0669, DAMD17-02-1-0666), National Health & Medical Research
344 Council of Australia (199600), Cancer Council of Tasmania, Cancer Foundation of Western
345 Australia; California Cancer Research Program (00-01389V-20170, 2II0200), and National
346 Health Research and Development Program, Health and Welfare Canada 6613-1415-53.
347 Individual investigators are supported by National Institutes of Health (K07-CA143047 (WS),
348 R25-CA098566 (MAM)), Department of Defense (W81XWH-10-1-02802 (KLT)), and the
349 National Health and Medical Research Council of Australia (PMW, CMN). No funding bodies
350 had any role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of
351 the manuscript.

352 We thank all the individuals who participated in these studies as well as the researchers,
353 clinicians, and support staff who contributed to this work. The Australian Ovarian Cancer Study
354 Management Group (D. Bowtell, G. Chenevix-Trench, A. deFazio, D. Gertig, A. Green, P.
355 Webb) and Australian Cancer Study Investigators (A. Green, P. Parsons, N. Hayward, P. Webb,
356 D. Whiteman) thank all the clinical and scientific collaborators (see <http://www.aocstudy.org/>)
357 and the women for their contribution.

358

359 **References**

360 1. Langseth H, Hankinson SE, Siemiatycki J, Weiderpass E. Perineal use of talc and risk of
361 ovarian cancer. *J Epidemiol Community Health*. 2008 Apr;62(4):358-60. PubMed PMID:
362 18339830. Pubmed Central

- 363 2. Merritt MA, Green AC, Nagle CM, Webb PM. Talcum powder, chronic pelvic
364 inflammation and NSAIDs in relation to risk of epithelial ovarian cancer. *Int J Cancer*. 2007 Jan
365 1;122(1):170-6. PubMed PMID: 17721999. Pubmed Central
- 366 3. Ness RB, Cottreau C. Possible role of ovarian epithelial inflammation in ovarian cancer.
367 *J Natl Cancer Inst*. 1999 Sep 1;91(17):1459-67. PubMed PMID: 10469746. Pubmed Central
- 368 4. Cramer DW, Liberman RF, Titus-Ernstoff L, Welch WR, Greenberg ER, Baron JA, et al.
369 Genital talc exposure and risk of ovarian cancer. *Int J Cancer*. 1999 May 5;81(3):351-6.
370 PubMed PMID: 10209948. Pubmed Central
- 371 5. Huncharek M, Geschwind JF, Kupelnick B. Perineal application of cosmetic talc and risk
372 of invasive epithelial ovarian cancer: a meta-analysis of 11,933 subjects from sixteen
373 observational studies. *Anticancer Res*. 2003 Mar-Apr;23(2C):1955-60. PubMed PMID:
374 12820486. Pubmed Central
- 375 6. Booth M, Beral V, Smith P. Risk factors for ovarian cancer: a case-control study. *Br J*
376 *Cancer*. 1989 Oct;60(4):592-8. PubMed PMID: 2679848. Pubmed Central
- 377 7. Merritt M, Green A, Nagle C, Webb P, Group ACSaAOCS. Talcum powder, chronic
378 pelvic inflammation and NSAIDs in relation to risk of epithelial ovarian cancer. *International*
379 *Journal of Cancer*. 2008;122(1):170-6. Pubmed Central
- 380 8. Wu AH, Pearce CL, Tseng CC, Templeman C, Pike MC. Markers of inflammation and
381 risk of ovarian cancer in Los Angeles County. *Int J Cancer*. 2009 Mar 15;124(6):1409-15.
382 PubMed PMID: 19065661. Pubmed Central
- 383 9. Cook LS, Kamb ML, Weiss NS. Perineal powder exposure and the risk of ovarian
384 cancer. *Am J Epidemiol*. 1997 Mar 1;145(5):459-65. PubMed PMID: 9048520. Pubmed Central
- 385 10. Mills PK, Riordan DG, Cress RD, Young HA. Perineal talc exposure and epithelial
386 ovarian cancer risk in the Central Valley of California. *Int J Cancer*. 2004 Nov 10;112(3):458-64.
387 PubMed PMID: 15382072. Pubmed Central
- 388 11. Whittemore AS, Wu ML, Paffenbarger RS, Jr., Sarles DL, Kampert JB, Grosser S, et al.
389 Personal and environmental characteristics related to epithelial ovarian cancer. II. Exposures to
390 talcum powder, tobacco, alcohol, and coffee. *Am J Epidemiol*. 1988 Dec;128(6):1228-40.
391 PubMed PMID: 3195564. Pubmed Central
- 392 12. Wong C, Hempling RE, Piver MS, Natarajan N, Mettlin CJ. Perineal talc exposure and
393 subsequent epithelial ovarian cancer: a case-control study. *Obstet Gynecol*. 1999
394 Mar;93(3):372-6. PubMed PMID: 10074982. Pubmed Central
- 395 13. Ness RB, Grisso JA, Cottreau C, Klapper J, Vergona R, Wheeler JE, et al. Factors
396 related to inflammation of the ovarian epithelium and risk of ovarian cancer. *Epidemiology*. 2000
397 Mar;11(2):111-7. PubMed PMID: 11021606. Pubmed Central
- 398 14. Rosenblatt KA, Weiss NS, Cushing-Haugen KL, Wicklund KG, Rossing MA. Genital
399 powder exposure and the risk of epithelial ovarian cancer. *Cancer Causes Control*. 2011
400 May;22(5):737-42. PubMed PMID: 21516319. Pubmed Central
- 401 15. Chang S, Risch HA. Perineal talc exposure and risk of ovarian carcinoma. *Cancer*. 1997
402 Jun 15;79(12):2396-401. PubMed PMID: 9191529. Pubmed Central
- 403 16. Risch HA, Marrett LD, Jain M, Howe GR. Differences in risk factors for epithelial ovarian
404 cancer by histologic type. Results of a case-control study. *Am J Epidemiol*. 1996 Aug
405 15;144(4):363-72. PubMed PMID: 8712193. Pubmed Central
- 406 17. Gilks CB. Molecular abnormalities in ovarian cancer subtypes other than high-grade
407 serous carcinoma. *J Oncol*. 2010:Article ID: 740968. PubMed PMID: 20069115. Pubmed
408 Central
- 409 18. Purdie DM, Webb PM, Siskind V, Bain CJ, Green AC. The different etiologies of
410 mucinous and nonmucinous epithelial ovarian cancers. *Gynecol Oncol*. 2003 Jan;88(1 Pt
411 2):S145-8. PubMed PMID: 12586107. Pubmed Central

- 412 19. Chen Y, Wu PC, Lang JH, Ge WJ, Hartge P, Brinton LA. Risk factors for epithelial
413 ovarian cancer in Beijing, China. *Int J Epidemiol*. 1992 Feb;21(1):23-9. PubMed PMID:
414 1544753. Pubmed Central
- 415 20. Harlow BL, Weiss NS. A case-control study of borderline ovarian tumors: the influence of
416 perineal exposure to talc. *American journal of epidemiology*. 1989 Aug;130(2):390-4. PubMed
417 PMID: 2750733. Pubmed Central
- 418 21. Tzonou A, Polychronopoulou A, Hsieh CC, Rebelakos A, Karakatsani A, Trichopoulos D.
419 Hair dyes, analgesics, tranquilizers and perineal talc application as risk factors for ovarian
420 cancer. *International journal of cancer Journal international du cancer*. 1993 Sep 30;55(3):408-
421 10. PubMed PMID: 8375924. Pubmed Central
- 422 22. Gertig DM, Hunter DJ, Cramer DW, Colditz GA, Speizer FE, Willett WC, et al.
423 Prospective study of talc use and ovarian cancer. *J Natl Cancer Inst*. 2000 Feb 2;92(3):249-52.
424 PubMed PMID: 10655442. Pubmed Central
- 425 23. Gates MA, Rosner BA, Hecht JL, Tworoger SS. Risk factors for epithelial ovarian cancer
426 by histologic subtype. *Am J Epidemiol*. 2010 Jan 1;171(1):45-53. PubMed PMID: 19910378.
427 Pubmed Central
- 428 24. Berchuck A, Schildkraut JM, Pearce CL, Chenevix-Trench G, Pharoah PD. Role of
429 genetic polymorphisms in ovarian cancer susceptibility: development of an international ovarian
430 cancer association consortium. *Adv Exp Med Biol*. 2008;622:53-67. PubMed PMID: 18546618.
431 Pubmed Central
- 432 25. Goodman MT, Lurie G, Thompson PJ, McDuffie KE, Carney ME. Association of two
433 common single-nucleotide polymorphisms in the CYP19A1 locus and ovarian cancer risk.
434 *Endocr Relat Cancer*. 2008 Dec;15(4):1055-60. PubMed PMID: 18667686. Pubmed Central
- 435 26. Lo-Ciganic WH, Zgibor JC, Bunker CH, Moysich KB, Edwards RP, Ness RB. Aspirin,
436 nonaspirin nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs, or acetaminophen and risk of ovarian cancer.
437 *Epidemiology*. 2012 Mar;23(2):311-9. PubMed PMID: 22252409. Pubmed Central
- 438 27. Moorman PG, Palmieri RT, Akushevich L, Berchuck A, Schildkraut JM. Ovarian cancer
439 risk factors in African-American and white women. *Am J Epidemiol*. 2009 Sep 1;170(5):598-606.
440 PubMed PMID: 19605513. Pubmed Central
- 441 28. Pike MC, Pearce CL, Peters R, Cozen W, Wan P, Wu AH. Hormonal factors and the risk
442 of invasive ovarian cancer: a population-based case-control study. *Fertil Steril*. 2004
443 Jul;82(1):186-95. PubMed PMID: 15237010. Pubmed Central
- 444 29. Baan R, Straif K, Grosse Y, Secretan B, El Ghissassi F, Coglianò V. Carcinogenicity of
445 carbon black, titanium dioxide, and talc. *Lancet Oncol*. 2006 Apr;7(4):295-6. PubMed PMID:
446 16598890. Pubmed Central
- 447 30. Egli GE, Newton M. The transport of carbon particles in the human female reproductive
448 tract. *Fertil Steril*. 1961 Mar-Apr;12:151-5. PubMed PMID: 13725928. Pubmed Central
- 449 31. deBoer CH. Transport of particulate matter through the human female genital tract. *J*
450 *Reprod Fert*. 1972;28:295-7. Pubmed Central
- 451 32. Heller DS, Gordon RE, Katz N. Correlation of asbestos fiber burdens in fallopian tubes
452 and ovarian tissue. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 1999 Aug;181(2):346-7. PubMed PMID: 10454680.
453 Pubmed Central
- 454 33. Fleming JS, Beaugie CR, Haviv I, Chenevix-Trench G, Tan OL. Incessant ovulation,
455 inflammation and epithelial ovarian carcinogenesis: Revisiting old hypotheses. *Mol Cell*
456 *Endocrinol*. 2006 Mar 9;247(1-2):4-21. PubMed PMID: 16297528. Pubmed Central
- 457 34. Heller DS, Westhoff C, Gordon RE, Katz N. The relationship between perineal cosmetic
458 talc usage and ovarian talc particle burden. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 1996 May;174(5):1507-10.
459 PubMed PMID: 9065120. Pubmed Central
- 460 35. Chiapparino F, Parazzini F, Bosetti C, Franceschi S, Talamini R, Canzonieri V, et al. Risk
461 factors for ovarian cancer histotypes. *Eur J Cancer*. 2007 May;43(7):1208-13. PubMed PMID:
462 17376671. Pubmed Central

- 463 36. Heintzelmann-Schwarz VA, Gardiner-Garden M, Henshall SM, Scurry JP, Scolyer RA,
464 Smith AN, et al. A distinct molecular profile associated with mucinous epithelial ovarian cancer.
465 British journal of cancer. 2006 Mar 27;94(6):904-13. PubMed PMID: 16508639. Pubmed Central
466 37. Kurian AW, Balise RR, McGuire V, Whittemore AS. Histologic types of epithelial ovarian
467 cancer: have they different risk factors? Gynecol Oncol. 2005 Feb;96(2):520-30. PubMed PMID:
468 15661246. Pubmed Central
469 38. Kurman RJ, Shih le M. The origin and pathogenesis of epithelial ovarian cancer: a
470 proposed unifying theory. Am J Surg Pathol. 2010 Mar;34(3):433-43. PubMed PMID: 20154587.
471 Pubmed Central
472 39. Kurman RJ, Shih le M. Molecular pathogenesis and extraovarian origin of epithelial
473 ovarian cancer--shifting the paradigm. Hum Pathol. 2011 Jul;42(7):918-31. PubMed PMID:
474 21683865. Pubmed Central

475

476

477

478

479

480 **Figure legends**

481 Figure 1. Association between genital powder use and ovarian cancer risk in eight studies, p-
482 heterogeneity=0.61. Adjusted for age (continuous), oral contraceptive duration (never use,
483 <2yrs, 2-<5yrs, 5-<10yrs, >=10yrs), parity (0, 1, 2, 3, 4+ children), tubal ligation history, BMI
484 (quartiles), race/ethnicity (non-Hispanic white, Hispanic white, black, Asian, other). Studies
485 listed in decreasing order of effect size standard error (funnel plot). No evidence of heterogeneity
486 based on Conchran's Q statistic (p=0.61). AUS=Australian Cancer Study, DOV=Diseases of the
487 Ovary and their Evaluation Study, HAW=Hawaii Ovarian Cancer Study, HOP=Hormones and
488 Ovarian Cancer Prediction Study, NCO=North Carolina Ovarian Cancer Study, NEC=New
489 England Case-Control Study of Ovarian Cancer, SON=Southern Ontario Ovarian Cancer Study

490

491 Figure 2. Association between genital powder use and subgroups of ovarian cancer defined by
492 behavior and histology. Estimates are adjusted for the same covariates as in the model presented
493 in figure 1.

494

Table 1. Characteristics of eight studies included in the analysis of genital powder use and ovarian cancer

Study*	Diagnosis			Histology [†]				Behavior [‡]		Question used to define genital powder use
	Years	Controls	Cases	Serous	Mucinous	Endometrioid	Clear cell	Invasive	Borderline	
AUS ^{††}	2002-2006	1449	1432	889 (62%)	174 (12%)	132 (9%)	78 (5%)	1158 (81%)	274 (19%)	Have you ever used any sort of powder or talc on your genital area, in your underwear or on a sanitary pad or diaphragm?
DOV ^{††}	2002-2009	1841	1565	905 (58%)	186 (12%)	201 (13%)	87 (6%)	1153 (74%)	412 (26%)	Before (reference date) did you ever use any of the following products routinely during one month or more? Powder on sanitary napkins or pads? Vaginal deodorant spray? Before (reference date) did you usually apply any powder to your genital (perineal) area after bathing? We are only interested in times when you did this for at least one year or longer. [§]
HAW	1993-2008	755	481	222 (46%)	87 (18%)	69 (14%)	47 (10%)	392 (82%)	89 (19%)	Prior to (month/year of diagnosis) did you ever use talc, baby, or deodorizing powder dusted or sprayed on your body? By regularly I mean at least once a month for 6 months or more. Did you ever use talc, baby or deodorizing powder as a dusting powder to the genital or rectal area? As a dusting powder to sanitary napkins? As a dusting powder to underwear? On a diaphragm or cervical cap?
HOP	2003-2008	1489	735	433 (59%)	53 (7%)	75 (10%)	47 (6%)	568 (88%)	80 (12%)	As an adult and prior to (reference month/year) did you ever use talc or baby powder or deodorizing powder with talc at least once a month for 6 months or

more in any of the following ways: As a dusting powder or deodorizing spray to your genital or rectal areas? On your sanitary napkin? On your underwear?

On your diaphragm or cervical cap?

NCO ^{††}	1999-2008	650	786	489 (62%)	71 (9%)	100 (13%)	65 (8%)	636 (81%)	148 (19%)	Did you ever regularly use cornstarch, talc, baby or deodorizing powders (dusted or sprayed) at least 1 time per month for at least 6 months? If yes, please tell me if you used cornstarch, talc, baby or deodorizing powders in any of the following ways: directly to your genital or rectal areas? Applied to your sanitary napkins or tampons? Applied to birth control devices such as cervical cap or diaphragm? applied to your underwear?
NEC ^{††}	1992-2008	2329	2305	1234 (54%)	281 (12%)	352 (15%)	276 (12%)	1659 (77%)	486 (23%)	Did you ever regularly use powder on your body or your underwear (at least once per month for any amount of time)? If yes, did you apply powder directly to your genital or rectal areas? To your sanitary napkins or tampons? To your underwear?
SON ^{††}	1989-1992	564	449	254 (57%)	80 (18%)	71 (16%)	29 (6%)	365 (81%)	84 (19%)	Have you ever used sanitary napkins/tampons? If yes, could you tell me over what ages you've used them, for how many years, what percent of periods you've used them for, the usual number you've used for each period, whether they were deodorant pads/tampons, and if you used talcum powder or starch on them? Have you ever regularly used talcum powder or starch on your vaginal area after showering or bathing?
USC	1993-1997	782	772	396 (52%)	131 (17%)	75 (10%)	32 (4%)	549 (73%)	205 (27%)	Prior to (reference month/year), did you ever regularly use talc, baby, or deodorizing powder dusted or sprayed on your body? By regularly I mean at least once a month for 6 months or more. Did you ever use talc, baby, or deodorizing powder as a dusting powder to the genital or rectal area? as a

dusting powder to sanitary napkins? as a dusting powder to underwear? on a diaphragm or cervical cap?

* AUS = Australia Ovarian Cancer Study and Australian Cancer Study (Ovarian Cancer), DOV = Diseases of the Ovary and their Evaluation, HAW = Hawaiian Ovarian Cancer Study, HOP = Hormones and Ovarian Cancer Prediction, NCO = North Carolina Ovarian Cancer Study, NEC = New England Case-Control Study of Ovarian Cancer, SON = Southern Ontario Ovarian Cancer Study, USC = University of Southern California Study of Lifestyle and Women's Health

† Cases listed by histology do not sum because mixed, other, undifferentiated, and unknown are not included.

‡ Cases listed by behavior do not sum to the total number of cases because 267 cases are missing behavior information.

§ In a separate series of questions, participants were asked about powder use with diaphragm storage. Duration was calculated from ages of use. Information on duration, frequency, and timing of use was only collected on genital/perineal powder use after bathing.

|| Controls were asked "Have you ever regularly used..."

** NEC question varied slightly between the three study phases. Between 1992-1997 participants were asked, "As an adult and prior to (reference month/year), did you regularly use talc, baby, or deodorizing powders dusted or sprayed to your body in any of the following ways:". Between 1998-2003, women were asked "Did you regularly apply cornstarch, talc, baby, or deodorizing body powder at least one time per month for six months or longer? If yes, please tell me if you regularly applied cornstarch, talc, baby or deodorizing body powders in any of the following ways:" Between 2003-2008 participants were asked the question listed above.

†† These studies previously published on genital powder use and ovarian cancer risk. AUS, DOV, and NEC provided new data to the pooled analyses presented here that were not included in previous publications.

Table 2. Characteristics of cases and controls included in the pooled analysis*

	Controls (N=9,859)	Cases (N=8,525)
	Mean (std) or N (%)	Mean (std) or N (%)
Age	55 (12)	55 (12)
OC use		
Never	2995 (30)	3411 (40)
Ever	6864 (70)	5114 (60)
Parous		
No	1468 (15)	2196 (26)
Yes	8391 (85)	6329 (74)
Tubal Ligation		
No	7359 (75)	6994 (82)
Yes	2500 (25)	1531 (18)
Body Mass Index	26.5 (6.1)	27.0 (6.6)
Race/Ethnicity		
Non-Hispanic White	8629 (88)	7433 (87)
Hispanic White	197 (2)	214 (3)
Black	273 (3)	268 (3)
Asian	350 (4)	313 (4)
Other †	407 (4)	291 (4)

Powder use[‡]

Never use	5815 (59)	4643 (54)
Non-genital use only	1533 (16)	1282 (15)
Genital use	2511 (25)	2600 (31)

* All characteristics listed except age differed significantly (<0.01) between cases and controls. Cases include both borderline and invasive ovarian cancers.

† There are six cases and three controls missing race/ethnicity information.

‡ Categories for non-genital and genital powder use are mutually exclusive.

Table 3. Association between powder use and risk of ovarian cancer (borderline and invasive combined) by study site

Site	Controls		Age -adjusted OR	Multivariate OR
	(%) (N= 9,859)	Cases (%) (N= 8,525)	(95% CI)*	(95% CI)*
AUS				
No powder use	305 (21)	300 (21)	1.00	1.00
Non-genital use only	486 (34)	427 (30)	0.85 (0.69-1.05)	0.92 (0.74-1.14)
Genital use	658 (45)	705 (49)	1.04 (0.85-1.26)	1.13 (0.92-1.38)
DOV [†]				
No powder use	1544 (83)	1293 (83)	1.00	1.00
Genital use	297 (16)	272 (17)	1.14 (0.95-1.37)	1.13 (0.93-1.36)
HAW				
No powder use	489 (65)	326 (68)	1.00	1.00
Non-genital use only	154 (20)	81 (17)	0.79 (0.58-1.07)	0.69 (0.50-0.96)
Genital use	112 (15)	74 (15)	0.99 (0.72-1.37)	0.99 (0.70-1.41)
HOP				
No powder use	989 (66)	439 (60)	1.00	1.00
Non-genital use only	184 (13)	102 (14)	1.23 (0.94-1.61)	1.23 (0.93-1.62)
Genital use	316 (21)	194 (26)	1.37 (1.11-1.69)	1.34 (1.07-1.67)
NCO				
No powder use	391 (60)	469 (60)	1.00	1.00
Non-genital use only	137 (21)	122 (16)	0.75 (0.57-0.99)	0.74 (0.56-0.99)
Genital use	122 (19)	195 (25)	1.33 (1.03-1.74)	1.37 (1.05-1.80)
NEC				

No powder use	1239 (53)	1129 (49)	1.00	1.00
Non-genital use only	454 (19)	421 (18)	1.02 (0.87-1.19)	1.04 (0.88-1.22)
Genital use	636 (27)	755 (33)	1.30 (1.14-1.49)	1.28 (1.12-1.47)
SON [†]				
No powder use	364 (65)	252 (56)	1.00	1.00
Genital use	200 (35)	197 (44)	1.43 (1.11-1.85)	1.35 (1.03-1.76)
USC				
No powder use	494 (63)	435 (56)	1.00	1.00
Non-genital use only	118 (15)	129 (17)	1.25 (0.94-1.66)	1.14 (0.85-1.52)
Genital use	170 (22)	208 (27)	1.39 (1.10-1.77)	1.36 (1.06-1.74)
Pooled [‡]				
No powder use	5815 (59)	4643 (54)	1.00	1.00
Non-genital use only	1533 (16)	1282 (15)	0.98 (0.90-1.07)	0.98 (0.89-1.07)
Genital use	2511 (25)	2600 (31)	1.25 (1.16-1.34)	1.24 (1.15-1.33)

* Study-specific estimates were determined using unconditional logistic regression and pooled ORs were estimated using conditional logistic regression conditioned on 5yr age groups and study. Multivariate models are adjusted for age (continuous), oral contraceptive duration (never use, <2yrs, 2-<5yrs, 5-<10yrs, >=10yrs), parity (0,1,2,3,4+ children), tubal ligation history (no, yes), BMI (quartiles), race/ethnicity (non-Hispanic white, Hispanic white, black, Asian, other).

[†] Information on non-genital powder use was not collected in the SON and DOV study

[‡] p-value for heterogeneity between multivariate study specific ORs equal to 0.61;

calculated using Conchran's Q statistic test

Table 4. Association between powder use and risk of ovarian cancer by behavior and histology

	Model 1*			Model 2*		
	No powder use	Genital powder use	OR (95% CI) [†]	No genital powder use	Genital powder use	OR (95% CI) [†]
	n (%)	n (%)		n (%)	n (%)	
Controls	5815 (59)	2511 (25)		7348 (75)	2511 (25)	
All borderline cases	1035 (58)	504 (28)	1.29 (1.14-1.48)	1247 (72)	504 (28)	1.30 (1.15-1.47)
Serous	567 (57)	300 (30)	1.46 (1.24-1.72)	700 (70)	300 (30)	1.45 (1.24-1.69)
Mucinous	409 (60)	184 (27)	1.17 (0.96-1.42)	502 (73)	184 (27)	1.19 (0.98-1.43)
All invasive cases	3470 (54)	2009 (31)	1.21 (1.12-1.32)	4471 (69)	2009 (31)	1.23 (1.14-1.32)
Serous	1952 (53)	1197 (32)	1.20 (1.09-1.32)	2519 (68)	1197 (32)	1.24 (1.13-1.35)
Mucinous	206 (57)	94 (26)	1.09 (0.84-1.42)	269 (74)	94 (26)	1.06 (0.82-1.36)
Endometrioid	568 (55)	304 (30)	1.22 (1.04-1.43)	723 (70)	304 (30)	1.20 (1.03-1.40)
Clear Cell	327 (54)	187 (31)	1.24 (1.01-1.52)	420 (69)	187 (31)	1.26 (1.04-1.52)

* In model 1, the reference group is restricted to women with no powder use except for the DOV and SON studies as these did not collect data on non-genital powder use. The number of cases who reported non-genital powder use was 212 (13%) of all borderline cases, 133 (13%) serous borderline, 93 (14%) mucinous borderline, 1001 (15%) of all invasive, 567 (15%) serous invasive, 63 (17%)

mucinous invasive, 155 (15%) endometrioid invasive, 93 (15%) clear cell invasive. In model 2, the reference group includes all women who did not use genital powders (non-users and non-genital users combined).

† ORs were estimated using conditional logistic regression conditioned on 5yr age groups and adjusted for age (continuous), oral contraceptive duration (never use, <2yrs, 2-<5yrs, 5-<10yrs, >=10yrs), parity (0,1,2,3,4+ children), tubal ligation history (no, yes), BMI (quartiles), race/ethnicity (non-Hispanic white, Hispanic white, black, Asian, other).

Table 5. Association between estimated lifetime applications of genital powder and risk of ovarian cancer (borderline and invasive combined)

Lifetime number of applications*	All Cases (N= 7,587)			Non-mucinous cases (N= 6,361)	
	Controls (%)	Cases (%)	OR [†] (95 % CI)	Cases (%)	OR [†] (95 % CI)
		5384			
Never users	6175 (76)	(71)	1.00	4472 (70)	1.00
Quartile 1	509 (6)	534 (7)	1.14 (1.00-1.31)	467 (7)	1.18 (1.02-1.36)
Quartile 2	512 (6)	541 (7)	1.23 (1.08-1.41)	456 (7)	1.22 (1.06-1.41)
Quartile 3	497 (6)	542 (7)	1.22 (1.07-1.40)	457 (7)	1.22 (1.06-1.40)
Quartile 4	486 (6)	586 (8)	1.32 (1.16-1.52)	509 (8)	1.37 (1.19-1.58)
p-trend [‡]			0.17		0.17

* Age specific 25th, 50th and 75th percentile cutpoints are 612, 1,872, and 5,400 for participants < 40 years old; 612, 2,160, and 7,200 for 41-50 years; 720, 3,600, and 10,800 for 51-60 years; 1,440, 5,760, and 14,440 for 61-70; 840, 7,200, and 18,000 for > 70 years.

[†] ORs were estimated using conditional logistic regression conditioned on 5yr age groups and adjusted for age (continuous), oral contraceptive duration (never use, <2yrs, 2-<5yrs, 5-<10yrs, >=10yrs), parity (0,1,2,3,4+ children), tubal ligation history (no, yes), BMI (quartiles), race/ethnicity (non-Hispanic white, Hispanic white, black, Asian, other).

[‡] Trend excludes never users.

Figure 1.









Figure 2.














Cancer Prevention Research

Genital powder use and risk of ovarian cancer: a pooled analysis of 8,525 cases and 9,859 controls

Kathryn L. Terry, Stalo Karageorgi, Yurii B. Shvetsov, et al.

Cancer Prev Res Published OnlineFirst June 12, 2013.

Updated version	Access the most recent version of this article at: doi:10.1158/1940-6207.CAPR-13-0037
Author Manuscript	Author manuscripts have been peer reviewed and accepted for publication but have not yet been edited.

E-mail alerts [Sign up to receive free email-alerts](#) related to this article or journal.

Reprints and Subscriptions To order reprints of this article or to subscribe to the journal, contact the AACR Publications Department at pubs@aacr.org.

Permissions To request permission to re-use all or part of this article, use this link <http://cancerpreventionresearch.aacrjournals.org/content/early/2013/06/12/1940-6207.CAPR-13-0037>.
Click on "Request Permissions" which will take you to the Copyright Clearance Center's (CCC) Rightslink site.