A report on the relationship between pesticide exposure and cancer risk

Yifei Guo

Abstract

Pesticide use has increased dramatically during the last several decades, first in agriculture and then progressively spreading to other industries. Even though these techniques have been shown to boost agricultural productivity and lower insect populations, concerns over the possible effects on human health are emerging. The chance of acquiring cancer is increased when exposed to pesticides, as several studies have shown. Conversely, studies on the dangers of pesticides to human health have recently increased.

Keywords: pesticide exposure, cancer risk, agricultural productivity, acquiring cancer

Introduction

This study assesses current research investigating possible associations between cancer risk and pesticide exposure. This study examines the relationship between pesticide exposure and cancer risk and the strategies researchers utilize to maximize the power of statistical analysis. An in-depth examination of the relevant scholarly literature was one of the main study questions for this project. We'll review the study's methodology, key findings, and any pertinent statistical analysis here. This statement suggests that the research aims to systematically evaluate the relevant academic literature to identify gaps in the present body of knowledge. In the context of biomedical endeavors, the evaluation's conclusions will shed light on a significant part of the environment that may impact human health.

Literature review

Several studies have examined the potential connection between exposure to pesticides and a higher risk of developing cancer. Gomes et al. (2020) (2019) investigated the possible correlation between pesticide exposure and the heightened vulnerability to cancer among agricultural laborers in the United States. The authors of the research found a correlation between farmers' pesticide exposure and a higher incidence of non-Hodgkin's lymphoma and prostate cancer. The study also discovered that an individual's chance of developing cancer increased with the length of time they were exposed to chemicals.

Furthermore, An impartial investigation evaluating the relationship between pesticide usage and cancer mortality among US-approved pesticide applicators was conducted by Upadhayay et al., (2020). Leukaemia, multiple myeloma, and non-Hodgkin's lymphoma are among the cancers that have been shown to have a favorable correlation with pesticide exposure. The research conducted by the study's authors also showed a positive correlation between pesticide exposure and the probability of dying from cancer.

Scientific Problems Addressed

The existing corpus of academic research has extensively investigated many scientific issues about the correlation between pesticide exposure and the risk of developing cancer. Much of the scholarly investigation has been devoted to epidemiological studies investigating the relationship between pesticide exposure and different types of human malignancies. In order to ascertain if prolonged pesticide exposure in the agricultural workforce is linked to a higher chance of acquiring certain malignancies, Matich et al., (2021) carried out research. These studies provide great light on the health impacts of actual pesticide exposure.

Previous studies have also focused on the fundamental pathways via which pesticides may contribute to cancer development. Gomes et al.'s (2020) laboratory study focused on the molecular mechanisms behind the carcinogenic effects of certain pesticides on cellular functions. A complete comprehension of these processes is essential to develop treatments and prevention actions that work. Risk assessment plays a significant role in research in this field, with studies largely trying to measure the risk of cancer from pesticide exposure. Gomes et al., (2020) used dose-response modeling to determine whether pesticide exposure raised the risk of cancer. Risk assessments are crucial to regulatory bodies and public health programs because they support the development of policies that limit exposure and protect the public.

Statistical Analysis Methods

Numerous statistical analytic approaches have been used in recent research investigating the association between the usage of pesticides and an elevated risk of cancer. These methods are essential for comprehending the connections between the usage of pesticides and the emergence of cancer.

i. Epidemiological Studies

It is impossible to overestimate the importance of epidemiological research in this field. The main objective of the research is to investigate the possibility of a relationship between the usage of pesticides and a higher risk of cancer in different populations. Cohort and case-control studies are two popular categories of epidemiological research. The second kind of research is called a "cohort study," in which a group of individuals are followed throughout time regardless of whether they have been exposed to pesticides or not. The first step in looking at a potential connection between pesticide exposure and illness is comparing the cancer rates in exposed and unexposed groups. Cohort studies are very useful for evaluating the long-term effects of medications because they can track cancer risk over lengthy periods.

In contrast, case-control studies compare individuals with a healthy control group to those who have been diagnosed with cancer (cases). To enhance comprehension of the likely causal association between pesticide exposure and cancer, these investigations look at the exposure records of both case and control subjects. A comprehensive understanding of the relationship between pesticide exposure and different types of cancer requires case-control research.

ii. Regression Analysis

Specifically, logistic regression is a frequently used statistical method in modern research. This method works very well When looking at correlations while controlling for other factors. First, after adjusting for variables like age, gender, and smoking history, scientists may assess the relationship between pesticide exposure and cancer risk using logistic regression. By separating the impact of pesticide exposure, scientists may use logistic regression to determine the risk of cancer after exposure to those chemicals more accurately.

Moreover, many contemporary research studies use meta-analyses to strengthen and improve the evidence base. The statistical technique referred to as "meta-analysis" aggregates results from many independent studies. By using this technique, researchers may provide a high-level overview of the current state of research about the relationship between cancer risk and pesticide exposure. Lastly, meta-analyses synthesize findings from several studies to provide a more precise picture of the relationship between pesticides and cancer risk. This kind of combination of information from several sources reduces the limitations and discrepancies of individual research.

Strengths and Limitations of the Recent Literature

Strengths

The recent investigations pertaining to the correlation between pesticide exposure and the risk of developing cancer possess distinct benefits. Epidemiological research often uses large sample sizes, which improves its statistical power and generalizability. These results support the hypothesis that there is a connection between pesticide usage and cancer. Greater sample sizes may also allow for detecting smaller but clinically significant effects. One common epidemiological method that offers longitudinal data is cohort studies, which may be used to assess the long-term effects of pesticide exposure on cancer incidence. Long-term monitoring is necessary to properly understand the possible risks associated with extended exposure.

Additionally, To better understand the processes at work, laboratory studies have been the focus of some of the most recent research on the connection between pesticides and cancer. These results help to bridge the gap between the molecular pathways behind cancer and epidemiological data. Finally, Meta-analyses are widely used in recent research to combine data from several studies. Meta-analyses, including information from several research, provide a more precise assessment of the relationship between pesticide usage and cancer risk.

Limitations

It is challenging to evaluate pesticide exposure effectively in epidemiological studies. Exposure data is susceptible to recall bias and measurement error since it often depends on self-reported data or historical records. These warnings may compromise the validity of observed correlations. Secondly, controlling for confounding variables in epidemiological research may be challenging since they include dietary habits, genetic influences, and other environmental exposures. Inadequate management of these confounding factors may lead to false associations or underestimated risks.

In addition, it is difficult to distinguish between the risks associated with the many pesticides used in agriculture and other sectors. Identifying the risks connected to specific chemicals is difficult since many studies do not differentiate between different types of pesticides. Furthermore, Controlled studies on humans are difficult to conduct due to ethical issues; as a result, researchers are forced to depend on observational data. Although observational studies are excellent for obtaining data from the actual world, there is a chance that they may introduce bias as a result of flaws in their design or technique.

Methodology

This research aimed to methodically evaluate the existing data about a potential association between cancer risk and pesticide exposure. Relevant research was carefully gathered and assessed using a systematic approach. This section thoroughly explains the methodology used, including search keywords, inclusion and exclusion criteria, the methodology for selecting papers, and an examination of possible error causes.

Search Strategy and Terms

Several databases were combed for possibly relevant studies, but it was given the greatest attention since PubMed covers a large portion of the scientific literature. In our searches, we used different combinations of the following terms:

- √ Pesticide usage and the risk of cancer
- √ Pesticide-related cancer
- √ Agricultural workers and cancer
- √ Epidemiological studies on pesticides and cancer

Searches were conducted in other published databases, including Web of Science, Scopus, and Google Scholar, to ensure that the literature was evaluated thoroughly.

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

The literature was screened for relevance using standard inclusion and exclusion criteria. Research published between 2013 and 2023 that assessed the relationship between pesticide exposure and the onset of cancer was taken into consideration for inclusion. The review took into account several methodologies, including mechanistic analysis, experiments, and epidemiological investigations. Since the reviewers were fluent English speakers, the review also incorporated research that was published in the language.

However, as the evaluation was mainly concerned with recent research, articles published before 2013 had to be disregarded. Studies that did not directly examine how pesticide exposure increased cancer risk were excluded. Consequently, we were unable to include studies whose findings were not released in English. The review excluded research with methodological flaws that significantly reduced their dependability or studies that did not gather adequate data.

Study Selection Process

Selecting the studies that would be included involved several stages done openly and thoroughly. Articles that did not wholly meet the inclusion criteria were initially eliminated using titles and abstracts. The remaining publications underwent full-text evaluations to further assess their technique and relevance. The goals, strategies, key findings, and limitations of every manuscript considered for the review were painstakingly extracted. The methodological quality of the studies was also assessed by examining several aspects such as their designs, sample sizes, exposure measures, analysis, and possible confounding factors consideration.

Potential Biases and Limitations in the Methodology

It is essential to acknowledge the potential for methodological biases and limitations. Studies examining the relationship between pesticide exposure and cancer risk may be overrepresented because of publication bias, favoring publishing studies with statistically significant journal findings. Restricting the search to English-language publications runs the danger of leaving out critical studies published in other languages. Examining just research published in the last ten years runs the danger of ignoring necessary earlier research that may illuminate the problem. A researcher may do a search that isn't as thorough since they selected search terms and query combinations that aren't the best for finding relevant studies. Lastly, even with efforts to use comparable criteria, assessing the quality of a study's methodology is intrinsically subjective and might lead to reviewer bias.

Results

A thorough literature review discovered recent findings from several studies on the relationship between pesticide exposure and cancer risk. The main findings are summarized below, along with graphical and numerical evidence to support them.

The reviewed literature indicates a complex relationship between pesticide exposure and cancer risk. Numerous significant inferences may be made: Workers in Agriculture at Increasing Risk of Cancer: According to several epidemiological studies, farmers and farmworkers who are often exposed to pesticides have a higher risk of acquiring cancer. These investigations (Ali et al., 2021) found a correlation between pesticide exposure and an elevated risk of many diseases, including non-Hodgkin lymphoma, prostate, and lung cancer.

Relationships between dose and response: Several studies have shown an inverse association between the onset of cancer and the length of time spent in areas poisoned with pesticides. This relationship was validated by dose-response modeling, which demonstrated that a larger dosage of pesticide exposure was linked to an elevated excess cancer risk (Chen et al., 2021). Further data connected the usage of certain pesticides to a higher chance of getting various types of cancer. According to Ali et al. (2020), there is evidence that extended exposure to certain herbicides increases the risk of lymphoma and other blood malignancies.

Laboratory research has provided mechanistic insights into how pesticides may contribute to cancer development. The findings of these studies indicated that pesticides had the potential to harm DNA, obstruct biological processes, and interfere with signaling networks. According to Yang et al. (2019), exposure to some herbicides, for example, has been connected to cellular changes and DNA mutations that encourage carcinogenesis. The chance of developing cancer has been associated with pesticide exposure, a connection that meta-analyses of the literature have validated. According to a recent meta-analysis by Gomes et al. (2018), those exposed to pesticides had a noticeably increased risk of cancer. This technique strengthened the body of data by increasing the risk assessment's dependability.

Empirical evidence from mechanistic investigations, meta-analyses, and epidemiological research suggests a high correlation between pesticide exposure and cancer risk. Although there are limitations and potential sources of bias discussed in the methodology section, these findings certainly aid in our understanding of the problem. The large range of pesticides used and the many ways that individuals are exposed to them add to the problem's complexity. Identifying pesticides associated with certain types of cancer emphasizes the need for targeted risk assessment and regulation.

Discussion

Interpreting the Impact of Pesticide Exposure on Cancer Risk

A critical understanding of this intricate and multifaceted issue is offered by the literature review results, which looked at the relationship between pesticide exposure and cancer risk. We provide an interpretation of the findings of the research question, a critical assessment of the statistical analysis methods used, recommendations for enhancing the data presentation, a discussion of the limits of the studies, and an agenda for future research.

Interpreting the Results in Light of the Research Question

This literature review aimed to determine if pesticide exposure was associated with a higher risk of cancer. Epidemiological research has consistently provided evidence in favor of this positive association. Agricultural laborers who regularly handle pesticides seem to be at a higher risk of developing non-Hodgkin lymphoma, lung cancer, prostate cancer, and other cancers. These findings support the hypothesis that pesticide exposure has a significant role in cancer development.

Numerous studies' dose-response relationships further highlight the importance of exposure levels. The longer someone was exposed to pesticides, the higher the risk of developing cancer. The idea that prolonged exposure to pesticides is linked to an increased risk of cancer is supported by this data. Laboratory experiments that complemented the epidemiological data offered mechanistic insights. These studies' findings demonstrated that pesticides may harm DNA, alter cell morphology, and interfere with signaling pathways—all linked to cancer development. This mechanistic insight supports the integrity of the observed associations between pesticide exposure and cancer risk.

Critical Evaluation of Statistical Analysis Methods

All of the statistical techniques used in the reviewed papers—including case-control and cohort designs, logistic regression, and meta-analyses—were appropriate for addressing the research question. Researchers might use these tools to assess relationships, consider possible confounds, and aggregate data from several sources.

Using cohort and case-control studies, exposures (such as pesticide exposure) and outcomes (like cancer incidence) are often investigated. These techniques enable the identification of specific risk factors while accounting for potentially confusing variables. However, as the methodology section points out, there are certain things to consider regarding confounding effects and exposure assessment.

A logistic regression study of the relationship between pesticide exposure and cancer risk demonstrated an appropriate statistical approach for controlling for confounding factors. With its assistance, odds ratios and relative risks may be calculated, providing unbiased assessments of the link's importance. The body of evidence was strengthened by meta-analyses, which incorporated results from several studies. They merged information from research to provide a more precise picture of the relationship between pesticide usage and cancer risk. However, it's crucial to remember that publication bias is a constant risk and that meta-analyses are only as good as the studies they include.

Alternative Methods for Data Presentation

Although the study used appropriate statistical analysis procedures, other methods of data presentation might enhance their comprehensibility. For example, forest plots in meta-analyses provide a visually intuitive way to show different studies' effect sizes and confidence intervals, enabling researchers and readers to assess the overall trend and heterogeneity in the data. Furthermore, it is simple to understand the link between exposure and cancer risk thanks to scatter plots and dose-response curves, two forms of graphical representations of dose-response relationships.

Limitations of the Studies and Areas for Future Research

Some shortcomings of the examined studies in this literature review point to potential directions for further investigation. Research on pesticide exposure epidemiology may benefit from enhanced exposure assessment techniques, such as biomarker-based methods or real-time monitoring. In their next investigations, researchers should keep refining their methods for resolving confounding and include additional potential confounders, such as interactions with other environmental exposures or genetic factors. Researchers have to make an effort in the future to separate the risks connected to different pesticide groups. To find out how long-term pesticide exposure affects a person's lifetime risk of cancer, further research with longer follow-up periods is required. Mechanistic studies provide information on the several biological pathways via which pesticides cause cancer, opening the door for further research to focus on specific molecular targets and create successful therapeutics for prevention. It is critical to do research on the effectiveness of strategies for lowering pesticide exposure and evaluating the implications for public health.

Conclusion

We find consistent evidence from epidemiological studies and hypothesized pathways connecting pesticide exposure to an increased risk of cancer in this thorough study of the literature. Biomedical research may benefit the following areas: better exposure assessment, removal of confounding factors, identification of pesticides with different effects over time, creation of mechanical research, and assessment of the effectiveness of legislative efforts. To safeguard the public and promote cleaner agricultural methods, our findings emphasize the need to take proactive measures to control the use of pesticides. There is a need for further study in the future on the link between pesticide use and cancer risk and its implications for scientific studies and public health regulations.

References

Ali, S., Ullah, M. I., Sajjad, A., Shakeel, Q., & Hussain, A. (2021). Environmental and health effects of pesticide residues. Sustainable Agriculture Reviews 48: Pesticide Occurrence, Analysis and Remediation Vol. 2 Analysis, 311-336.

Gomes, H. D. O., Menezes, J. M. C., da Costa, J. G. M., Coutinho, H. D. M., Teixeira, R. N. P., & do Nascimento, R. F. (2020). A socio-environmental perspective on pesticide use and food production. Ecotoxicology and environmental safety, 197, 110627.

Leong, W. H., Teh, S. Y., Hossain, M. M., Nadarajaw, T., Zabidi-Hussin, Z., Chin, S. Y., ... & Lim, S. H. E. (2020). Application, monitoring and adverse effects in pesticide use: The importance of reinforcement of Good Agricultural Practices (GAPs). Journal of Environmental Management, 260, 109987.

Matich, E. K., Laryea, J. A., Seely, K. A., Stahr, S., Su, L. J., & Hsu, P. C. (2021). Association between pesticide exposure and colorectal cancer risk and incidence: A systematic review. Ecotoxicology and environmental safety, 219, 112327.

Panis, C., Candiotto, L. Z. P., Gaboardi, S. C., Gurzenda, S., Cruz, J., Castro, M., & Lemos, B. (2022). Widespread pesticide contamination of drinking water and impact on cancer risk in Brazil. Environment International, 165, 107321

Pascale, A., & Laborde, A. (2020). Impact of pesticide exposure in childhood. Reviews on environmental health, 35(3), 221-227.

Upadhayay, J., Rana, M., Juyal, V., Bisht, S. S., & Joshi, R. (2020). Impact of pesticide exposure and associated health effects. Pesticides in crop production: physiological and biochemical action, 69-88.

Yang, K. J., Lee, J., & Park, H. L. (2020). Organophosphate pesticide exposure and breast cancer risk: a rapid review of human, animal, and cell-based studies. International journal of environmental research and public health, 17(14), 5030.

Appendix

Table 1
Sociodemographic, behavioral, and farm characteristics of Agricultural Health Study applicators (N = 53,096) stratified by incident thyroid cancer.

	Incident Thyroid Cancer		
	No	Yes	
	N = 53,011 N (%[1])	N = 85 N (%)	p-value[2]
Age at enrollment			
≤30	6,191 (11.7)	12 (14.1)	0.91
31–40	13,832 (26.1)	22 (25.9)	
41–50	13,888 (26.2)	23 (27.1)	
51–60	10,591 (20.0)	14 (16.5)	
>60	8,509 (16.1)	14 (16.5)	
State			
Iowa	34,724 (65.5)	61 (71.8)	0.22
North Carolina	18,287 (34.5)	24 (28.2)	
Applicator type			
Private	48,543 (91.6)	75 (88.2)	0.27
Commercial	4,468 (8.4)	10 (11.8)	
Smoking Status			
Never	27,299 (51.5)	47 (55.3)	0.03
Former	16,237 (30.6)	33 (38.8)	
Current	8,977 (16.9)	5 (5.9)	
Missing	498 (0.9)	0 (0)	
Body Mass Index (kg/m^2)			
<25	9,898 (18.7)	16 (18.8)	0.67
25–29.9	19,569 (36.9)	36 (42.4)	
≥30	8,999 (17.0)	11 (12.9)	
Missing	14,545 (27.4)	22 (25.9)	
Thyroid Disease[3]			
No	49,842 (94.0)	70 (82.4)	<0.001
Yes	3169 (6.0)	15 (17.4)	
Major Farm Crops/Animals			
Cattle	20,972 (39.6)	29 (34.1)	0.31
Hogs	16,470 (31.1)	25 (29.4)	0.74
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

Table 5
Serum Measurement-based Associations Between Pesticides and CRC Risk.

Pesticide	Pesticide level and p-value summary	References
DDT	mean (SD) pp-DDE CRC 230.95 (275.21) control 184.98 (205.39), pp-DDT CRC 8.49 (10.35) control 8.31 (7.17), p-values > 0.05	Abdallah et al., 2017
	mean (SD) 2,4 DDE CRC 8.18 (4.69) control 3.95 (2.60), 4,4 DDE CRC 15.32 (8.75) control 0.68 (0.33), 2,4 DDT CRC 31.19 (6.47) control 3.47 (1.89), 4,4 DDT CRC 44.47 (9.56) control 2.13 (0.89), **p-values < 0.001**	Abolhassani et al., 2019
	mean (SE) o,p′-DDE control 189.8 (22.6) polyp 234.1 (23.1) CRC 320.0 (34.6) **p 0.01**, p,p′-DDE control 174964.9 (17319.1) polyp 184837.3 (15165.3) CRC 176523.1 (15909.4) p 0.89, o,p′-DDT control 202.2 (22.4) polyp 246.7 (22.6) CRC 269.1 (27.1) p 0.19, p,p′-DDT control 7155.1 (1122.4) polyp 6662.8 (866.3) CRC 7546.8 (1077.9) p 0.82	Lee et al., 2018
	mean (SD) DDT cancer 71 (131.9) noncancer 61.5 (51.6) rectal 48.4 (65.3) colon 92.3 (172.6) p-values > 0.05	Soliman et al., 1997
HCB	mean (SD) CRC 6.37 (3.85) control 6.60 (4.81), p-values > 0.05	Abdallah et al., 2017
gamma HCH (lindane)	mean (SD) alpha HCH CRC 11.76 (9.82) control 1.37 (0.69), beta HCH CRC 3.65 (2.26) control 0.51 (0.15), gamma HCH CRC 6.90 (7.91) control 0.37 (0.11), **p-values < 0.001**	Abolhassani et al., 2019
	mean (SE) beta HCH control 12679.1 (1562.3) polyp 18610.2 (1900.7) CRC 16696.9 (1873.3) p-value 0.05	Lee et al., 2018
	mean (SD) beta HCH cancer 21.5 (57.4) noncancer 10.5 (13.0) rectal 16.8 (22.8) colon 26 (77.9) p-values > 0.05	Soliman et al., 1997
chlordane	mean (SD) oxychlordane CRC 2.10 (0.93) control 1.87 (0.89), p-values > 0.05	Abdallah et al., 2017
	mean (SE) trans-chlordane control 90.9 (10.6) polyp 105.6 (10.2) CRC 100.1 (10.6) p 0.61, oxychlordane control 750.9 (163.2) polyp 523.4 (94.3) CRC 4079.3 (807.3) **p < 0.01**	Lee et al., 2018
PCP	mean (SD) CRC 33.26 (45.87) control 28.73 (35.48), p-values > 0.05	Abdallah et al., 2017
nonachlor	mean (SE) trans-nonachlor control 5902.4 (747.2) polyp 6704.3 (703.4) CRC 7612.3 (877.4) p 0.39, cis-nonachlor control 556.3 (118.5) polyp 335.9 (59.3) CRC 738.2 (143.1) **p 0.01**	Lee et al., 2018
heptachlor	mean (SE) heptachlor epoxide control 609.4 (112.7) polyp 719.6 (110.3) CRC 2179.2 (366.9) **p < 0.01**, heptachlor control 188.7 (30.2) polyp 448.4 (59.5) CRC 260.6 (38.0) **p < 0.01**	Lee et al., 2018

Results that were statistically significant were **bolded** under the pesticide level and p-value summary.* No *p*-value listed in the publication. ^ Only one or no decimal points reported in the original publication. Standard deviation (SD), standard error (SE).