Published in final edited form as:

Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev. 2014 January ; 23(1): 47–54. doi:10.1158/1055-9965.EPI-13-0913.

Personal history of diabetes, genetic susceptibility to diabetes, and risk of brain glioma: a pooled analysis of observational studies

Cari M. Kitahara¹, Martha S. Linet¹, Alina V. Brenner¹, Sophia S. Wang², Beatrice S. Melin³, Zhaoming Wang^{1,4}, Peter D. Inskip¹, Laura E. Beane Freeman¹, Melissa Z. Braganza¹, Tania Carreón⁵, Maria Feychting⁶, J. Michael Gaziano^{7,8,9}, Ulrike Peters^{10,11}, Mark P. Purdue¹, Avima M. Ruder⁵, Howard D. Sesso^{7,8}, Xiao-Ou Shu¹², Martha A. Waters⁵, Emily White^{1,11}, Wei Zheng¹², Robert N. Hoover¹, Joseph F. Fraumeni Jr¹, Nilanjan Chatterjee¹, Meredith Yeager^{1,4}, Stephen J. Chanock^{1,4}, Patricia Hartge¹, and Preetha Rajaraman¹

¹Division of Cancer Epidemiology and Genetics, National Cancer Institute, Rockville, MD, USA

²Division of Cancer Etiology, Department of Population Sciences, City of Hope and the Beckman Research Institute, Duarte, CA, USA

³Department of Radiation Sciences, Oncology, Umeå University, Umeå, Sweden

⁴Core Genotyping Facility, National Cancer Institute, SAIC-Frederick, Inc., Gaithersburg, MD, USA

⁵Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, Cincinnati, OH, USA

⁶Institute of Environmental Medicine, Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden

⁷Division of Preventive Medicine, Brigham and Women's Hospital, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, USA

⁸Division of Aging, Brigham and Women's Hospital, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, USA

⁹Massachusetts Veterans Epidemiology, Research and Information Center, Geriatric Research Education and Clinical Center, VA Boston Healthcare System, Boston, MA, USA

¹⁰Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center, Seattle, WA, USA

¹¹Department of Epidemiology, University of Washington, Seattle, WA, USA

¹²Vanderbilt University Medical Center, Nashville, TN, USA

Abstract

Background—Brain glioma is a relatively rare and fatal malignancy in adulthood with few known risk factors. Some observational studies have reported inverse associations between diabetes and subsequent glioma risk, but possible mechanisms are unclear.

Methods—We conducted a pooled analysis of original data from five nested case-control studies and two case-control studies from the U.S. and China that included 962 glioma cases and 2,195

To whom correspondence should be addressed: Cari Meinhold Kitahara, PhD, MHS, Division of Cancer Epidemiology and Genetics, 9609 Medical Center Drive, Rm. 7E-566, Bethesda, MD 20892, P: 240-276-7406, F: 240-276-7874.

Conflicts of interest: None

Financial disclosures: This work was supported in part by the Intramural Research Program of the National Cancer Institute, National Institutes of Health.

controls. We examined self-reported diabetes history in relation to glioma risk, as well as effect modification by seven glioma risk-associated single-nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs). We also examined the associations between 13 diabetes risk-associated SNPs, identified from genome-wide association studies, and glioma risk. Odds ratios (ORs) and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) were calculated using multivariable-adjusted logistic regression models.

Results—We observed a 42% reduced risk of glioma for individuals with a history of diabetes (OR=0.58, 95% CI: 0.40–0.84). The association did not differ by sex, study design, or after restricting to glioblastoma, the most common histological sub-type. We did not observe any significant per-allele trends among the 13 diabetes-related SNPs examined in relation to glioma risk.

Conclusion—These results support an inverse association between diabetes history and glioma risk. The role of genetic susceptibility to diabetes cannot be excluded, and should be pursued in future studies together with other factors that might be responsible for the diabetes-glioma association.

Impact—These data suggest the need for studies that can evaluate, separately, the association between type 1 and type 2 diabetes and subsequent risk of adult glioma.

Keywords

diabetes mellitus; brain cancer; glioma; cancer; epidemiology

INTRODUCTION

Glioma, the most common type of malignant brain tumor in adulthood, is a relatively uncommon and highly fatal malignancy, with a five-year survival rate of only 34% (1). The most common and aggressive subtype of glioma, glioblastoma, has a five-year survival of less than 5% (1). Currently, there are no effective means of glioma prevention apart from avoiding unnecessary exposure to ionizing radiation, particularly during childhood (2).

Several studies (3–9), though not all (10–13), have suggested that elevated blood glucose levels or a previous history of diabetes are inversely associated with risk of glioma or other brain tumors. Diabetes, particularly type 2, has been associated with an increased risk of several other types of malignancies, possibly mediated by inflammatory markers or elevated levels of glucose, insulin, or insulin-like growth factor-1 (14). The potential biological mechanisms that could explain an inverse association between diabetes and risk of glioma remain unclear, though immune response may play a role (15). Similar to diabetes, a personal history of allergies has consistently been associated with an approximately 40% reduced risk of glioma (16).

To further our understanding of the relationship between diabetes and glioma and possible underlying biological mechanisms, we combined questionnaire-based and genotyping data from five cohort and two case-control studies to examine the association between self-reported history of diabetes and subsequent risk of glioma and possible effect modification by seven glioma-related single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs). We additionally examined whether an association between diabetes and glioma risk might be explained by genetic mechanisms using genotyping data from 13 diabetes risk-associated SNPs.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study population

The study population included glioma cases and controls from the previously-conducted genome-wide association study (GWAS) in the GliomaScan Consortium (17). This collaborative project included 1,856 incident cases and 4,955 controls from three case-control studies, one population-based case-only study, and 14 case-control studies nested within cohort studies. For the current analysis, we restricted the study population to the five nested case-control studies (Agricultural Health Study [AHS], Physicians' Health Study I–II [PHS], Prostate, Lung, Colorectal and Ovarian Cancer Screening Trial [PLCO], Shanghai Men's and Women's Health Study [SMWHS], Vitamins and Lifestyle Study [VITAL]) and two case-control studies (Multicenter Study of Environment and Health-National Cancer Institute- Adult Brain Tumor Study [NCI-BTS] and National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health-Upper Midwest Health Study [NIOSH-UMHS]) in which one or more glioma cases and controls reported a history of diabetes (18–26). Six of these studies were conducted in the United States, and one in China (SMWHS). Four studies collected information on age at diabetes diagnosis (NCI-BTS, AHS, PHS, and SMWHS). We excluded one case and two controls under the age of 18, 13 cases and 31 controls with missing questionnaire data on history of diabetes, and one case and one control from SMWHS whose self-reported ages at diagnosis of diabetes occurred after the age or referent age at glioma diagnosis. The final study population consisted of 962 glioma cases (557 males and 405 females) and 2,195 controls (1,196 males and 999 females). Brief descriptions of studies and participant characteristics are shown in Table 1.

Outcome definition

Glioma cases were defined as primary malignant brain tumors with ICD-O-3 histology codes 9380–9480 (or equivalent). We further classified the following mutually-exclusive subgroups of glioma according to histology: glioblastoma including gliosarcoma (ICD-O-3 codes 9440–9442), astrocytoma (ICD-O-3 codes 9384, 9400–9401, 9410–9411, 9420–9421, 9424), and oligodendroglioma/oligoastrocytoma/oligodendroblastoma (ICD-O-3 codes 9382, 9450, 9451, 9460). Cases with histology codes outside of these ranges were classified as “other and unspecified gliomas.” Controls from cohort studies were originally chosen from a subset of the full cohort for the purposes of previous GWAS, or were matched to cases on age or year of birth, sex, race, and/or other factors (Table 1), and were glioma-free at the time of glioma diagnosis. Controls from case-control studies were frequency-matched by age, sex, and other factors, and were glioma-free at the time of interview.

Questionnaire data

All variables included in this analysis were combined across studies using standardized definitions and categories. Demographic characteristics, including dates of birth, sex, race/ethnicity (White, Black, American Indian/Alaskan Native, Asian/Pacific Islander, other), education (less than high school graduate, high school graduate or equivalent, some college or vocational school post-high school, college graduate or post-graduate), personal history of allergies including asthma, hay fever, eczema, other allergy, or allergic skin condition (yes, no), hormone replacement therapy (ever, never), and smoking status (never, former, current) were self-reported in study-specific questionnaires and provided by all seven studies. Height and weight were measured by study personnel in the SMWHS study and self-reported in all other studies. Questionnaire data on personal history of diabetes (yes, no) and other factors were ascertained at study enrollment in most of the cohort studies (AHS, PHS, PLCO, VITAL), apart from one (SMWHS) which assigned diabetes status using questionnaire information from both baseline and follow-up. Case-control studies (NCI-BTS, NIOSH-UMHS) ascertained this information soon after diagnosis among cases and at the

corresponding referent age among controls (i.e., the age at time of interview). Missing data for any of the covariates (<1% for race, education, smoking, and body mass index; 14% for history of allergies; 34% for hormone replacement therapy use in women) were handled by including missing indicator variables in the models.

Genotyping

Blood, saliva, or buccal samples were provided by each of the studies (apart from SMWHS, which did not contribute to the genetic analyses) to use for the extraction of DNA for genotyping. Genotyping was performed using the Illumina 660-W Human BeadChip for all glioma cases. Genotyping for controls was conducted using various platforms (see Table 1). To account for differences in the assays used, SNP data for the control samples were imputed if necessary, as described by Marchini et al (27). Thirteen SNPs that have been associated with diabetes and seven SNPs that have been associated with glioma, based on statistical significance after correction for multiple testing in previous GWAS (17, 28–35), were selected to evaluate the association for diabetes-related genetic polymorphisms on risk of glioma and the potential for effect modification of the diabetes-glioma association by genetic susceptibility to glioma, respectively. We computed a genetic risk score for the diabetes and glioma SNPs by assigning 0, 1, or 2 for homozygous for the non-susceptible allele, heterozygous, or homozygous for the susceptible allele, respectively, and summing these values.

Statistical analysis

We calculated pooled odds ratios (OR) and 95% confidence intervals (CI) for glioma using unconditional logistic regression models adjusted for study, age (at baseline for cohort studies or at time of diagnosis/pseudodiagnosis for case-control studies), and birth year (<1930, 1930–1939, 1940–1949, 1950–1959, 1960). Models that combined male and female subjects were further adjusted for sex. Adjustment for other potential confounders, including race, education, body mass index (weight in kg divided by height in meters squared), smoking status, menopausal hormone replacement therapy, and history of allergies did not meaningfully change the beta coefficients for diabetes (<10% change), so these covariates were not retained in the final models.

We also examined the possible effect modification by sex, current and early-adulthood BMI, history of allergies, and seven recently identified glioma risk-associated variants by comparing the magnitude of the associations for diabetes and glioma risk across categories of these potential effect modifiers. Tests for interaction were conducted by comparing the fit of a model with an additional cross-product term for diabetes and the potential effect modifier to a model without this term using the likelihood ratio test. Between-study heterogeneity was evaluated using the Mantel-Haenszel chi-squared test.

Pooled ORs were additionally estimated for 13 diabetes-associated single nucleotide polymorphisms using the most common genotype among controls as the referent genotype. Trend tests were conducted by modeling the genotypes (categorized as 0, 1, and 2, corresponding to the number of variant alleles) as continuous variables, and statistical significance was evaluated by comparing the fit of a model with the continuous term to one without using the likelihood ratio test.

All statistical analyses were conducted using Stata/SE 11.0 (StataCorp, College Station, TX).

RESULTS

Of the 962 total glioma cases, 517 (311 male and 206 female) were classified as glioblastoma, 200 (119 male and 81 female) as astrocytoma, and 152 (74 male and 78 female) as oligodendroglioma/oligoastrocytoma/oligodendroblastoma. The median age at glioma diagnosis was 57 years (interquartile range: 42–69; range: 18–91).

We observed a 42% reduced risk of glioma (OR=0.58, 95% CI: 0.40–0.84) for individuals with a history of diabetes versus those without (Table 2). Similar ORs were observed in men and women (P -interaction=0.91) and by case-control and nested case-control design (P -heterogeneity=0.87). Results were similar after excluding each individual study. The association between diabetes history and glioma risk was more strongly inverse among participants with current BMI values of 18.5–24.9 (OR=0.48, 95% CI: 0.24–0.96) and 25.0–29.9 (OR=0.43, 95% CI: 0.22–0.85) compared to those with BMI ≥ 30 (OR=1.16, 95% CI: 0.61–2.20), but these differences were not statistically significant (P -interaction=0.12). Among 210 glioma cases and 1,027 controls with data on BMI in early-adulthood (age 18–21), there was no clear variation in ORs for diabetes history within strata of early-adult BMI (P -interaction=0.72). We found no evidence of a multiplicative interaction by history of allergies (P -interaction=0.21). The inverse association was statistically significant for diabetes diagnosed before age 50 but not for diabetes diagnosed at older ages (Table 2). After additionally excluding two cases and seven controls diagnosed with diabetes within two years of glioma diagnosis, the ORs for history of diabetes versus no history (OR=0.59, 95% CI: 0.40–0.86) and for history of diabetes by age at diagnosis (ORs=0.34, 0.55, and 0.52 for diabetes diagnosis at <50, 50–59, and ≥ 60 years old, respectively; P -trend=0.24) did not change materially. Similar results were observed when we restricted the analysis to glioblastoma while keeping the same controls (based on 25 cases with diabetes and 492 without, OR=0.58, 95% CI: 0.37–0.92). Although the number of cases was small, we also observed reduced risks associated with a diabetes history for astrocytoma (based on six cases with diabetes and 194 without, OR=0.56, 95% CI: 0.24–1.31) and oligodendroglioma (based on two cases with diabetes and 157 without, OR=0.28, 95% CI: 0.07–1.18).

Within the population subset with genetic data, we did not observe any significant per-allele trends among the 13 diabetes-related SNPs examined in relation to glioma risk (Table 3). Nonetheless, the TT genotype for rs2237892 on the *KCNQ1* gene (OR=4.46, 95% CI: 1.19–16.70) was associated with significantly increased risk of glioma compared to the CC genotype. Among controls, however, only rs7480010 and rs1113132 were significantly associated with self-reported history of diabetes. The diabetes genetic risk score was not significantly associated with risk of glioma (ORs [95% CIs] for risk scores of ≥ 11 –<13, 13–<15, and ≥ 15 versus ≤ 11 = 1.00 [0.72–1.38], 1.13 [0.83–1.55], and 1.18 [0.86–1.62]), respectively; P -trend=0.22), nor with self-reported diabetes among controls (ORs [95% CIs]=0.95 [0.41–2.20], 0.79 [0.35–1.80], and 1.60 [0.75–3.42]; P -trend=0.27). Additional adjustment for the diabetes genetic risk score had little influence on the OR for history of diabetes (OR=0.57 and 0.55 before and after adjustment, respectively). None of the seven glioma risk-associated SNPs individually modified the association between history of diabetes and glioma risk (Supplementary Table 1); however, the inverse association for diabetes was non-significantly greater among individuals with a lower versus higher glioma genetic risk score (ORs [95% CIs] for risk scores of 0–<7, 7–<9, and ≥ 9 –14 were 0.39 [0.18–0.86], 0.59 [0.30–1.18], and 0.96 [0.38–2.42], respectively; P -interaction=0.11).

DISCUSSION

We observed a 42% reduced risk of glioma for individuals with a history of diabetes versus those without (OR=0.58, 95% CI: 0.40–0.84). Results were similar by sex, study design

(case-control versus nested case-control), and after restricting the outcome to glioblastoma, the most common histological subtype. The risks for other glioma subtypes were also reduced for those with versus without diabetes, albeit non-significantly. Diabetes-associated SNPs identified from GWAS were generally not associated with glioma risk, nor did these SNPs explain the inverse association we observed between glioma risk and diabetes history.

A lower risk of glioma associated with diabetes was first reported in a 1965 study reporting a lower frequency of intracranial gliomas among diabetics versus non-diabetics but no difference in the frequency of meningiomas and pituitary neoplasms (36). Our finding of an inverse association between diabetes and glioma risk is consistent with results from previous case-control studies on glioma, all reporting relative risks below 1.0 for individuals with a prior diagnosis versus those without (range: 0.3 to 0.82) (3–7). Like our study, these studies did not distinguish between type 1 versus type 2 diabetes. One case-control study showed a stronger inverse association for diabetes diagnosed at younger versus older ages (6), which could act as a proxy for type 1 versus type 2 diabetes, but this study was among those included in the current pooled analysis. Results from prospective cohort studies, which have lower potential for biases due to the reliance on proxy respondents or differential recall or selection of cases and controls, have been lacking. The California Seven-Day Adventists cohort, which included only 21 incident cases of glioma, did not show a clear association between self-reported history of diabetes and glioma risk (relative risk=1.84, 95% CI: 0.28–7.38) (10). A larger record-linkage study in Denmark found no association between hospital discharge records for diabetes and subsequent brain and central nervous system cancers in either men (standardized incidence ratio [SIR]=1.1, 95% CI: 0.9–1.4) or women (SIR=1.1, 95% CI: 0.8–1.3), based on 80 and 79 cases, respectively (11).

An inverse association between history of diabetes and risk of adult glioma may reflect a protective effect of heightened immune response, as has been hypothesized to underlie the relationship between allergies and glioma risk (16). History of allergies was also inversely associated with risk of glioma in this population (data not shown), but this association was independent of diabetes. Studies with more specific information on diabetes history, including type 1 versus type 2, and specific biomarkers of immune function and insulin resistance could provide additional insight on biological mechanisms that may underlie the inverse association between diabetes and glioma risk. Alternatively, our results could be explained by long-term suppression of diabetes-related symptoms, particularly those related to immune response, during glioma development (37). However, assuming that glioma (and, particularly, glioblastoma) has a relatively short natural history due to its relatively aggressive nature, reverse causation is unlikely to explain the significant inverse association we observed for diabetes diagnosed at younger ages.

Our pooled analysis combined original data across a diverse set of studies which allowed an examination of the consistency of the association between men and women and case-control and case-control studies nested within prospective cohort studies. We applied a standard format for the categorization of variables and standard methods for statistical analysis, which reduced the potential for methodological heterogeneity across studies. We also had information on potential confounding factors, including race/ethnicity, education, and history of allergies, as well as data to assess potential effect modification by genetic susceptibility to glioma. Nevertheless, our results were based on a relatively small number of cases reporting a previous diagnosis of diabetes. Self-reported diabetes diagnoses were not validated in any of the studies included in the current analysis, and the number of individuals with a history of diabetes may have been underestimated. Assuming random misclassification of this exposure, our results may have been biased toward the null. Furthermore, apart from age at diabetes diagnosis, we lacked sufficient data to more accurately distinguish between type 1 and type 2 diabetes. Participants from nested case-

control studies were originally selected from the full cohorts for the purposes of genetic analyses. This could have biased our results if the controls had been selected on factors associated with diabetes history; however, the pooled ORs did not differ after individually excluding each nested case-control study. Thus, our findings should be confirmed in larger studies, preferably full prospective cohort studies, with medically validated data on diabetes history. Although we found no significant interactions between diabetes and seven glioma risk-associated SNPs on glioma risk, statistical power to detect such interactions was limited. Of the 13 SNPs previously strongly associated with diabetes, we found that the TT genotype for rs2237892 on the *KCNQ1* gene was associated with a more than 4-fold increased risk of glioma compared to the CC genotype, an association opposite to those observed for risk of type 2 diabetes, higher fasting glucose levels, and reduced beta-cell function (31). This finding, should it replicate in other studies, may provide some clues about the role of insulin resistance in the etiology of glioma. While we did not observe significant associations with glioma in log-additive models for this SNP or 12 other diabetes-associated SNPs, it is possible that as yet undetermined genetic loci may contribute to the protective effect on glioma.

In summary, our international pooled study revealed an inverse association between diabetes and glioma risk, which is consistent with previous case-control studies. The role of genetic susceptibility cannot be excluded and should be pursued in future studies together with other factors that might be responsible for the diabetes-glioma association. Identification of these factors may help to improve our understanding of glioma pathogenesis and identify possible avenues for prevention of this highly fatal disease.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank all investigators who contributed data for the GliomaScan study. **For PHS:** The PHS is supported by grants CA 97193, CA 34944, CA 40360, HL 26490, and HL 34595 from the National Institutes of Health.

For PLCO: This research was supported by the Intramural Research Program of the Division of Cancer Epidemiology and Genetics and by contracts from the Division of Cancer Prevention, National Cancer Institute, NIH, DHHS.

For NIOSH: This research was supported by NIOSH operating funds. The contributions of former laboratory director Mary Ann Butler are gratefully acknowledged. The findings and conclusions in this report are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily represent the views of the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health.

For VITAL: Grant K05CA154337 is funded by the National Cancer Institute (NCI) and the NIH Office of Dietary Supplements (ODS).

References

1. CBTRUS. Statistical Report: Primary brain and central nervous system tumors diagnosed in the United States in 2004–2008. Hinsdale, IL: Central Brain Tumor Registry of the United States; 2012.
2. Braganza MZ, Kitahara CM, Berrington de González A, Inskip PD, Johnson KJ, Rajaraman P. Ionizing radiation and the risk of brain and central nervous system tumors: a systematic review. *Neuro Oncol*. 2012; 14(11):1316–24. [PubMed: 22952197]
3. Cicuttini FM, Hurley SF, Forbes A, Donnan GA, Salzb erg M, Giles GG, et al. Association of adult glioma with medical conditions, family and reproductive history. *Int J Cancer*. 1997; 71(2):203–7. [PubMed: 9139843]

4. Schlehofer B, Blettner M, Preston-Martin S, Niehoff D, Wahrendorf J, Arslan A, et al. Role of medical history in brain tumour development. Results from the international adult brain tumour study. *Int J Cancer*. 1999; 82(2):155–60. [PubMed: 10389745]
5. Schlehofer B, Blettner M, Becker N, Martinsohn C, Wahrendorf J. Medical risk factors and the development of brain tumors. *Cancer*. 1992; 69(10):2541–7. [PubMed: 1568177]
6. Brenner AV, Linet MS, Fine HA, Shapiro WR, Selker RG, Black PM. History of allergies and autoimmune diseases and risk of brain tumors in adults. *Int J Cancer*. 2002; 99(2):252–9. [PubMed: 11979441]
7. Schwartzbaum J, Jonsson F, Ahlbom A, Preston-Martin S, Malmer B, Lönn S, et al. Prior hospitalization for epilepsy, diabetes, and stroke and subsequent glioma and meningioma risk. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev*. 2005; 14(3):643–50. [PubMed: 15767344]
8. Stocks T, Rapp K, Bjørge T, Manjer J, Ulmer H, Selmer R, et al. Blood glucose and risk of incident and fatal cancer in the metabolic syndrome and cancer project (me-can): analysis of six prospective cohorts. *PLoS Med*. 2009; 6(12):e1000201. [PubMed: 20027213]
9. Swerdlow AJ, Laing SP, Qiao Z, Slater SD, Burden AC, Botha JL, et al. Cancer incidence and mortality in patients with insulin-treated diabetes: a UK cohort study. *Br J Cancer*. 2005; 92(11):2070–5. [PubMed: 15886700]
10. Mills PK, Preston-Martin S, Annegers JF, Beeson L, Phillips RL, Fraser GE. Risk factors for tumors of the brain and cranial meninges in Seventh-Day Adventists. *Neuroepidemiology*. 1989; 8(5):266–75. [PubMed: 2812186]
11. Wideroff L, Gridley G, Møller J, Chow WH, Linet M, Keehn S, et al. Cancer incidence in a population-based cohort of patients hospitalized with diabetes mellitus in Denmark. *J Natl Cancer Inst*. 1997; 89(18):1360–5. [PubMed: 9308706]
12. Jee SH, Ohrr H, Sull JW, Yun JE, Ji M, Samet JM. Fasting serum glucose level and cancer risk in Korean men and women. *JAMA*. 2005; 293(2):194–202. [PubMed: 15644546]
13. Campbell PT, Newton CC, Patel AV, Jacobs EJ, Gapstur SM. Diabetes and cause-specific mortality in a prospective cohort of one million U.S. adults. *Diabetes Care*. 2012; 35(9):1835–44. [PubMed: 22699290]
14. Giovannucci E, Harlan DM, Archer MC, Bergenstal RM, Gapstur SM, Habel LA, et al. Diabetes and cancer: a consensus report. *Diabetes Care*. 2010; 33(7):1674–85. [PubMed: 20587728]
15. Norkov NJ, Rewers M, Cree Green M. The interplay of autoimmunity and insulin resistance in type 1 diabetes. *Discov Med*. 2012; 13(69):115–22. [PubMed: 22369970]
16. Chen C, Xu T, Chen J, Zhou J, Yan Y, Lu Y, et al. Allergy and risk of glioma: a meta-analysis. *Eur J Neurol*. 2011; 18(3):387–95. [PubMed: 20722711]
17. Rajaraman P, Melin BS, Wang Z, McKean-Cowdin R, Michaud DS, Wang SS, et al. Genome-wide association study of glioma and meta-analysis. *Hum Genet*. 2012; 131(12):1877–88. [PubMed: 22886559]
18. Alavanja MC, Sandler DP, McMaster SB, Zahm SH, McDonnell CJ, Lynch CF, et al. The Agricultural Health Study. *Environ Health Perspect*. 1996; 104:362–9. [PubMed: 8732939]
19. Hatch EE, Linet MS, Zhang J, Fine HA, Shapiro WR, Selker RG, et al. Reproductive and hormonal factors and risk of brain tumors in adult females. *Int J Cancer*. 2005; 114:797–805. [PubMed: 15609304]
20. Ruder AM, Waters MA, Carreon T, Butler MA, Davis-King KE, Calvert GM, et al. The Upper Midwest Health Study: a case-control study of primary intracranial gliomas in farm and rural residents. *J Agric Saf Health*. 2006; 12:255–74. [PubMed: 17131948]
21. Steering Committee of the Physicians' Health Study Research Group. Final report of the aspirin component of the ongoing Physicians' Health Study. *N Engl J Med*. 1989; 321:129–135. [PubMed: 2664509]
22. Sesso HD, Christen WG, Bubes V, Smith JP, MacFadyen J, Schvartz M, et al. Multivitamins in the prevention of cardiovascular disease in men: the Physicians' Health Study II randomized controlled trial. *JAMA*. 2012; 308(17):1751–60. [PubMed: 23117775]
23. Hayes RB, Reding D, Kopp W, Subar AF, Bhat N, Rothman N, et al. Etiologic and early marker studies in the Prostate, Lung, Colorectal and Ovarian (PLCO) Cancer Screening Trial. *Control Clin Trials*. 2000; 21:349S–55S. [PubMed: 11189687]

24. Zheng W, Chow WH, Yang G, Jin F, Rothman N, Blair A, et al. The Shanghai Women's Health Study: rationale, study design, and baseline characteristics. *Am J Epidemiol.* 2005; 162:1123–31. [PubMed: 16236996]
25. Cai H, Zheng W, Xiang YB, Xu WH, Yang G, Li H, et al. Dietary patterns and their correlates among middle-aged and elderly Chinese men: a report from the Shanghai Men's Health Study. *Br J Nutr.* 2007; 98:1006–13. [PubMed: 17524168]
26. White E, Patterson RE, Kristal AR, Thornquist M, King I, Shattuck AL, et al. VITamins and Lifestyle cohort study: study design and characteristics of supplement users. *Am J Epidemiol.* 2004; 159:83–93. [PubMed: 14693663]
27. Marchini J, Howie B, Myers S, McVean G, Donnelly P. A new multipoint method for genome-wide association studies by imputation of genotypes. *Nat Genet.* 2007; 39:906–13. [PubMed: 17572673]
28. Sladek R, Rocheleau G, Rung J, Dina C, Shen L, Serre D, et al. A genome-wide association study identifies novel risk loci for type 2 diabetes. *Nature.* 2007; 445(7130):881–5. [PubMed: 17293876]
29. Scott LJ, Mohlke KL, Bonnycastle LL, Willer CJ, Li Y, Duren WL, et al. A genome-wide association study of type 2 diabetes in Finns detects multiple susceptibility variants. *Science.* 2007; 316(5829):1341–5. [PubMed: 17463248]
30. Saxena R, Voight BF, Lyssenko V, Burtt NP, de Bakker PI, Chen H, et al. Genome-wide association analysis identifies loci for type 2 diabetes and triglyceride levels. *Science.* 2007; 316:1331–6. [PubMed: 17463246]
31. Yasuda K, Miyake K, Horikawa Y, Hara K, Osawa H, Furuta H, et al. Variants in KCNQ1 are associated with susceptibility to type 2 diabetes mellitus. *Nat Genet.* 2008; 40(9):1092–7. [PubMed: 18711367]
32. Rung J, Cauchi S, Albrechtsen A, Shen L, Rocheleau G, Cavalcanti-Proenca C, et al. Genetic variant near IRS1 is associated with type 2 diabetes, insulin resistance and hyperinsulinemia. *Nat Genet.* 2009; 41(10):1110–5. [PubMed: 19734900]
33. Shete S, Hosking FJ, Robertson LB, Dobbins SE, Sanson M, Malmer B, et al. Genome-wide association study identifies five susceptibility loci for glioma. *Nat Genet.* 2009; 41(8):899–904. [PubMed: 19578367]
34. Wrensch M, Jenkins RB, Chang JS, Yeh RF, Xiao Y, Decker PA, et al. Variants in the CDKN2B and RTEL1 regions are associated with high-grade glioma susceptibility. *Nat Genet.* 2009; 41(8):905–8. [PubMed: 19578366]
35. Sanson M, Hosking FJ, Shete S, Zelenika D, Dobbins SE, Ma Y, et al. Chromosome 7p11. 2 (EGFR) variation influences glioma risk. *Hum Mol Genet.* 2011; 20(14):2897–904. [PubMed: 21531791]
36. Aronson SM, Aronson BE. Central nervous system in diabetes mellitus: lowered frequency of certain intracranial neoplasms. *Arch Neurol.* 1965; 12:390–8. [PubMed: 14264870]
37. Turner MC, Krewski D, Armstrong BK, Chetrit A, Giles GG, Hours M, et al. Allergy and brain tumors in the INTERPHONE study: pooled results from Australia, Canada, France, Israel, and New Zealand. *Cancer Causes Control.* 2013; 24(5):949–60. [PubMed: 23443320]

Table 1
Descriptive characteristics of the seven studies included in the GliomaScan Consortium Study

Study	Study Acronym	Study Type	Control Selection	Platform used for genotyping (controls)	Study period (recruitment)	Location	Study sample		Mean age at diagnosis, (yrs)	Mean age at interview/study entry, (yrs)	
							Cases	Controls		Cases	Controls
Agricultural Health Study (18)	AHS	Nested case-control	Frequency-matched 2:1 by year of birth, sex, race	Illumina 660W	1993–1997	USA (IA, NC)	20	41	59	53	52
Multicenter Study of Environment and Health - National Cancer Institute Adult Brain Tumor Study (19)	NCI-BTS	Case-control	Hospital controls frequency-matched 2:1 by hospital, age, sex, race, residential distance from hospital	Illumina 660W	1994–1998	USA (AZ, MA, PA)	364	478	51	51	49
Upper Midwest Health Study -National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (20)	NIOSH- UMHS	Case-control	Population-based controls frequency-matched 1.5:1 by age, sex, state	Illumina 660W	1995–1997	USA (IA, MI, MN, WI)	326	581	48	49	60
Physician's Health Study I and II (21, 22)	PHS	Nested case-control	Glioma-free controls with previous GWAS data	Illumina 550K	1982 – 1984, 1997 – 2001	USA (several states)	39	54	73	57	55
Prostate, Lung, Colorectal and Ovarian Screening Trial (23)	PLCO	Nested case-control	Glioma-free controls with previous GWAS data	Illumina 550K	1992–2001	USA (several states)	115	843	70	63	64
Shanghai Men's and Women's Health Study (24, 25)	SMWHS	Nested case-control	Glioma-free controls with previous GWAS data	Illumina 550K ^a	1996–2000 (women), 2001–2006	China (urban communities in Shanghai)	38	78	59	56	63
Vitamins and Lifestyle (26)	VITAL	Nested case-control	Matched on age, sex, race, time to diagnosis	Illumina 660W	2000–2002	USA (WA)	60	120	69	65	65

Study	Study Acronym	Study Type	Control Selection	Platform used for genotyping (controls)	Study period (recruitment)	Location	Study sample	Mean age at diagnosis, (yrs)	Mean age at interview/study entry, (yrs)
								Cases	Controls
Total								962	2,195

Excluded from genetic analyses due to <80% European ancestry

Odds ratios (ORs) and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) for the association between diabetes history and risk of glioma

Table 2

	Men		Women		Total	
	Cases/controls	OR (95% CI) ^a	Cases/controls	OR (95% CI) ^a	Cases/controls	OR (95% CI) ^b
Diabetes history						
No	536/1,115	1.00 (Reference)	387/923	1.00 (Reference)	923/2,038	1.00 (Reference)
Yes	21/81	0.59 (0.35–0.99)	18/76	0.57 (0.33–0.99)	39/157	0.58 (0.40–0.84)
Case-control studies						
Diabetes history						
No	372/499	1.00 (Reference)	290/481	1.00 (Reference)	662/980	1.00 (Reference)
Yes	14/40	0.56 (0.29–1.07)	14/39	0.65 (0.35–1.24)	28/79	0.60 (0.38–0.94)
Nested case-control studies						
Diabetes history						
No	164/616	1.00 (Reference)	97/442	1.00 (Reference)	261/1,058	1.00 (Reference)
Yes	7/41	0.68 (0.29–1.60)	4/37	0.41 (0.14–1.21)	11/78	0.54 (0.28–1.05)
Age at diabetes diagnosis ^c						
No diagnosis						
4–49					437/588	1.00 (Reference)
50–59					6/21	0.38 (0.15–0.95)
60–77					8/19	0.52 (0.22–1.22)
P-trend [*]					8/23	0.45 (0.19–1.04)
						0.43

^{*} Calculated by modeling the age at diabetes diagnosis categories as continuous and excluding the “no diagnosis” group

^a Adjusted for age at enrollment (cohort studies) or diagnosis/pseudodiagnosis (case-control studies), birth year, and study

^b Additionally adjusted for sex

^c Restricted to studies that collected this information; results not shown for men and women separately due to a small number of glioma cases in each category of age at diabetes diagnosis (5)

Table 3

The association of diabetes-related single-nucleotide polymorphisms and glioma risk

SNP	Gene	Diabetes risk allele	Genotype	Controls	Cases	OR (95% CI) ^a
rs13266634	<i>SLC30A8</i>	C	CC	915	364	1.00 (Reference)
			CT	834	337	1.04 (0.86–1.25)
			TT	160	71	1.23 (0.89–1.70) <i>P</i> -trend=0.29
rs7754840	<i>CDKALI</i>	C	GG	449	286	1.00 (Reference)
			GC	401	277	1.12 (0.90–1.39)
			CC	104	58	0.89 (0.62–1.27) <i>P</i> -trend=0.99
rs7903146	<i>TCF7L2</i>	T	CC	968	403	1.00 (Reference)
			CT	770	299	0.97 (0.80–1.17)
			TT	172	70	1.05 (0.76–1.46) <i>P</i> -trend=0.98
rs1111875	<i>HHEX</i>	G	GG	633	256	1.00 (Reference)
			GA	944	402	1.03 (0.84–1.25)
			AA	332	114	0.80 (0.61–1.05) <i>P</i> -trend=0.20
rs7923837	<i>HHEX</i>	G	GG	702	300	1.00 (Reference)
			GA	943	365	0.90 (0.74–1.09)
			AA	263	107	0.89 (0.67–1.18) <i>P</i> -trend=0.29
rs7480010	<i>LOC387761</i>	G	AA	991	399	1.00 (Reference)
			AG	744	298	0.97 (0.80–1.17)
			GG	174	74	1.07 (0.78–1.47) <i>P</i> -trend=0.89
rs1113132	<i>EXT2</i>	C	CC	507	315	1.00 (Reference)
			CG	359	249	1.10 (0.89–1.37)
			GG	85	51	0.98 (0.67–1.44) <i>P</i> -trend=0.67
rs8050136	<i>FTO</i>	A	CC	668	254	1.00 (Reference)
			CA	947	385	1.04 (0.86–1.27)

SNP	Gene	Diabetes risk allele	Genotype	Controls	Cases	OR (95% CI) ^a
rs4402960	<i>IGF2BP2</i>	T	AA	294	132	1.10 (0.85–1.44) <i>P</i> -trend=0.47
			GG	906	362	1.00 (Reference)
			GT	795	310	1.00 (0.83–1.21)
			TT	201	97	1.23 (0.92–1.64) <i>P</i> -trend=0.29
rs1470579	<i>IGF2BP2</i>	C	AA	907	363	1.00 (Reference)
			AC	798	309	0.99 (0.82–1.20)
			CC	203	98	1.23 (0.93–1.65) <i>P</i> -trend=0.29
rs5219	<i>KCNJ11/ABCC8</i>	T	CC	395	246	1.00 (Reference)
			CT	426	283	1.06 (0.85–1.32)
			TT	133	92	1.13 (0.82–1.54) <i>P</i> -trend=0.43
rs2237892	<i>KCNQ1</i>	C	CC	1,662	676	1.00 (Reference)
			CT	242	90	0.88 (0.67–1.16)
			TT	5	6	4.46 (1.19–16.70) <i>P</i> -trend=0.92
rs2943641	<i>IRS1</i>	C	CC	774	335	1.00 (Reference)
			CT	897	347	0.89 (0.73–1.07)
			TT	237	90	0.91 (0.68–1.22) <i>P</i> -trend=0.31

^a Adjusted for age at diagnosis/pseudodiagnosis, sex, and study