ARC MONOGRAPHS

PERFLUOROOCTANOIC ACID (PFOA) AND PERFLUOROOCTANESULFONIC ACID (PFOS)

THE A P P I

VOLUME 135

This publication represents the views and expert opinions of an IARC Working Group on the Identification of Carcinogenic Hazards to Humans, which met in Lyon, France, 7–14 November 2023

LYON, FRANCE - 2025

IARC MONOGRAPHS ON THE IDENTIFICATION OF CARCINOGENIC HAZARDS TO HUMANS

International Agency for Research on Cancer



Table S2.5 Epidemiological studies on exposure to PFOA or PFOS and cancers of the digestive tract

Reference, location, enrolment/follow- up period, study design	Population size, description, exposure assessment method	Organ site (incidence or mortality)	Exposure category or level	Exposed cases or deaths	Risk estimate (95% CI)	Covariates controlled	Comments
Lundin et al. (2009)	3993 employees; Cottage Grove (MN) PFOA cohort: Workers employed at a PFOA production plant for at least 365 days before 31 December 1997.	Large intestine,	Employed in APFO-exposed job (SMR, MN			Age, sex,	Exposure assessment critique:
MN, USA Enrolment: 1947–		mortality	referent):			calendar period	See Table 2.1
1997/follow-up: 1947–2002 (mortality)			Never	16	1.30 (0.75– 2.12)	I to the	<i>Other strengths:</i> Occupational cohort with relatively high exposures.
	Exposure assessment method: See		Ever probable/never	10	0.88(0.42 - 1.62)		
Collort	Table 2.1			2	1.02)		Other limitations: Small
			Ever definite	2	1.07 (0.13– 3.86)		number of deaths; potential
		Rectum, mortality	Employed in APFO-exposed job (SMR, MN referent):			Age, sex, calendar	healthy-worker effect due to external comparison of rates from general population limited
			Never	1	0.40 (0.01– 2.22)	period	information on covariates.
			Ever probable/never definite	3	1.28 (0.26– 3.76)		
			Ever definite	0	0 (0.00–9.24)		
		Oesophagus, mortality	Employed in APFO-exposed job (SMR, MN referent):		Age, sex, calendar		
			Never	2	0.59 (0.07– 2.13)	period	
			Ever probable/never definite	1	0.31 (0.01– 1.70)		
			Ever definite	1	1.54 (0.04– 8.57)		
		Stomach/gastric cancer, mortality	Employed in APFO-exposed job (SMR, MN referent):			Age, sex, calendar	
			Never	3	0.74 (0.15– 2.15)	period	

1

2

Table S2.5 Epidemiological studies on exposure to PFOA or PFOS and cancers of the digestive tract

Reference, location, enrolment/follow- up period, study design	Population size, description, exposure assessment method	Organ site (incidence or mortality)	Exposure category or level	Exposed cases or deaths	Risk estimate (95% CI)	Covariates controlled	Comments
			Ever probable/never definite	4	1.06 (0.29– 2.71)		
			Ever definite	0	0 (0.00–5.82)		
Raleigh et al. (2014)	9027 (4668 exposed workers, 4359	Liver, mortality	Exposed to APFO (SI	MR, MN ref	erent):	Age, sex,	Exposure assessment critique:
MN, USAreference workers); Cottage GroveEnrolment: 1947–(MN) PFOA cohort latest update2002/follow-up:(previous Gilliland and Mandel1047-(1002)		Unexposed (Saint	7	0.55 (0.22-	calendar period	See Table 2.1	
		Paul Plant)	0	1.14)	-	Other strengths: Unlikely	
(mortality), 1988–	Workers employed for at least 1 yr		Grove Plant)	8	0.81 (0.35– 1.59)		exposure; reference population
2008 (incidence) Cohort	1947–2002 at an ammonium perfluorooctanoate (APFO) facility (Cottage Grove MN, $n = 4668$). Reference workers employed at a tape and abrasives production facility without any exposure to APFO located in the same suburban geographical area and managed by the same company (Saint Paul, MN, n = 4359). Exposure assessment method: See Table 2.1	Liver, mortality	Estimated cumulative airborne APFO exposure quartile (SMR, MN referent):			Age, sex, calendar shared similar socioecon characteristics as the exp population: long follow-	shared similar socioeconomic characteristics as the exposed
			1st quartile (< $2.6 \times 10^{-5} \ \mu g/m^3$ -yr)	4	1.40 (0.38– 3.58)	period	<i>Other limitations:</i> Lacked data on workers that left MN or Wisconsin; lacked data on cancer incidence before follow-up, starting up to 40 yr after first exposure; lacking information on health behaviours (potential confounding); small numbers of liver and pancreatic cancer.
			2nd quartile (2.6 × 10 ⁻⁵ to < $1.4 \times 10^{-4} \mu g/m^{3}$ - yr)	2	0.86 (0.10– 3.09)		
			3rd quartile (1.4×10^{-4} to < $7.3 \times 10^{-4} \ \mu g/m^{3}$ - yr)	2	0.75 (0.09– 2.72)		
			4th quartile $(\geq 7.3 \times 10^{-4} \ \mu g/m^3 - yr)$	0	0.00 (0.00– 1.79)		
		Liver, mortality	Estimated cumulative quartile (HR):	airborne Al	PFO exposure	Age, [sex], year of birth	
			Unexposed (Saint Paul Plant)	NR	1		

Reference, location, enrolment/follow- up period, study design	Population size, description, exposure assessment method	Organ site (incidence or mortality)	Exposure category or level	Exposed cases or deaths	Risk estimate (95% CI)	Covariates controlled	Comments
			1st and 2nd quartiles $(< 1.5 \times 10^{-4} \ \mu g/m^3-yr)$	NR	2.09 (0.69– 6.31)		
			3rd and 4th quartiles $(\geq 1.5 \times 10^{-4} \ \mu g/m^3 - yr)$	NR	0.67 (0.14– 3.27)		
		Pancreas, mortality	Exposed to APFO (SI	MR, MN ref	erent):	Age, sex,	
			Unexposed (Saint Paul Plant)	30	1.09 (0.74– 1.56)	calendar period	
			Exposed (Cottage Grove Plant)	18	0.85 (0.50– 1.34)		
		Pancreas, mortality	Estimated cumulative quartile (SMR, MN re	airborne Al eferent):	PFO exposure	Age, sex, calendar	
			1st quartile (< 2.6 × 10 ⁻⁵ μg/m ³ - yr)	2	0.32 (0.04– 1.17)	period	
			2nd quartile $(2.6 \times 10^{-5} \text{ to} < 1.4 \times 10^{-4} \mu\text{g/m}^3\text{-} \text{yr})$	5	1.00 (0.32– 2.33)		
			3rd quartile $(1.4 \times 10^{-4} \text{ to} < 7.3 \times 10^{-4} \mu\text{g/m}^3\text{-} \text{yr})$	5	0.87 (0.28– 2.04)		
			4th quartile (\geq 7.3 × 10 ⁻⁴ µg/m ³ - yr)	6	1.41 (0.52– 3.06)		

3

Table S2.5 Epidemiological studies on exposure to PFOA or PFOS and cancers of the digestive tract

4

Reference, location, enrolment/follow-	Population size, description, exposure assessment method	Organ site (incidence or	Exposure category or level	Exposed cases or	Risk estimate (95% CI)	Covariates controlled	Comments
up period, study design		mortality)		deaths	(
		Pancreas, mortality	Estimated cumulative quartile (HR):	airborne Al	PFO exposure	Age, [sex], year of birth	
			Unexposed (Saint Paul Plant)	NR	1		
			1st quartile (< $2.9 \times 10^{-5} \ \mu g/m^3$ -yr)	NR	0.32 (0.08– 1.35)		
			2nd quartile $(2.9 \times 10^{-5} \text{ to} < 1.5 \times 10^{-4} \ \mu\text{g/m}^3\text{-} \text{yr})$	NR	0.89 (0.34– 2.31)		
			3rd quartile $(1.5 \times 10^{-4} \text{ to} < 7.9 \times 10^{-4} \mu\text{g/m}^3\text{-} \text{yr})$	NR	0.82 (0.32– 2.12)		
			4th quartile $(\geq 7.9 \times 10^{-4} \ \mu g/m^3 - yr)$	NR	1.23 (0.50– 3.00)		
		Pancreas, incidence	Estimated cumulative quartile (HR):	airborne Al	PFO exposure	Age, [sex], year of birth	
			Unexposed (Saint Paul Plant)	15	1		
			1st and 2nd quartiles (< $1.5 \times 10^{-4} \ \mu g/m^3$ -yr)	1	0.13 (0.02– 1.03)		
			3rd and 4th quartiles	9	1.36 (0.59– 3.11)		

Table S2.5 Epidemiological studies on exposure to PFOA or PFOS and cancers of the digestive tract

5

Table S2.5 Epidemiological studies on exposure to PFOA or PFOS and cancers of the digestive tract

Reference, location, enrolment/follow- up period, study design	Population size, description, exposure assessment method	Organ site (incidence or mortality)	Exposure category or level	Exposed cases or deaths	Risk estimate (95% CI)	Covariates controlled	Comments
			$(\geq 1.5 \times 10^{-4} \ \mu g/m^3 - yr)$				
Alexander et al. (2003) Decatur, Alabama, USA Enrolment: 1961– 1997/follow-up: 1961–1998 (mortality) Cohort	2083; Decatur (AL) PFOS cohort.	Liver and bile	PFOS exposure group	(SMR, Ala	bama referent):	Sex, age,	Exposure assessment critique:
	Production workers (83% male) who worked at least 365 days in a	ducts, mortality	All jobs	2	1.61 (0.20– 5.82)	calendar period	See Table 2.1.
	plant producing specialty films and fluorochemicals, one of the main		Only non-exposed	0	0		Other strengths: Large exposure contrast.
	ones being perfluorooctanesulfonyl (POSF).		Ever low, never high	1	3.94 (0.10– 21.88)		<i>Other limitations:</i> Few cancer deaths; limited to mortality;
	Most recent follow-up of all cancers except bladder, which is described in a later study by Alexander and Olsen (2007).		Ever high	1	2.00 (0.05– 11.1)		limited to non-exposed, low- exposed, high-exposed categories; lack of data on smoking: mostly
		Large intestine, mortality	PFOS exposure group	(SMR, Ala	bama referent):	Sex, age,	men (83%).
	Exposure assessment method: See Table 2.1		All jobs	1	0.30 (0.01– 1.66)	calendar period	
			Only non-exposed	0	0		
			Ever low, never high	1	1.43 (0.04– 7.94)		
			Ever high	0	0		
		Oesophagus,	PFOS exposure group	(SMR, Ala	bama referent):	Age, sex,	
		mortality	All jobs	2	1.76 (0.21– 6.35)	calendar period	
			Only non-exposed	1	2.25 (0.06– 12.51)		
			Ever low, never high	0	0		
			Ever high	1	2.16 (0.05– 12.02)		

6

Reference, location, enrolment/follow- up period, study design	Population size, description, exposure assessment method	Organ site (incidence or mortality)	Exposure category or level	Exposed cases or deaths	Risk estimate (95% CI)	Covariates controlled	Comments
		Digestive organs	PFOS exposure group	o (SMR, Ala	bama referent):	Age, sex,	
		and peritoneum, mortality	All jobs	5	0.51 (0.17– 1.19)	calendar period	
			Only non-exposed	1	0.27 (0.01– 1.49)		
			Ever low, never high	2	0.99 (0.12– 3.57)		
			Ever high	2	0.51 (0.06– 1.85)		
Leonard et al. (2008)	 6027; Parkersburg (WV, USA), polymer-production PFOA cohort. Workers (81% male) at a US polymer-manufacturing facility for 1 day or more 1948–2002. Exposure assessment method: No quantitative exposure assessment. Workers in a polymer-production facility were identified using the company's administrative records. approximately 30% worked in processes using APFO. All participants had detectable levels of serum PFOA 	Large intestine, mortality	Polymer-production facility cohort (SMR):			Sex, age,	Strengths: Occupational cohort
Parkersburg, WV, USA Enrolment: 1948–			Referent US population	17	[0.668 (0.389– 1.070)]	period	complete cohort ascertainment and follow-up; local reference groups increase comparability with respect to socioeconomic factors and health behaviours. <i>Limitations:</i> No assessment of exposure to specific chemicals (the company uses a wide variety of chemicals including PFOA); small numbers.
2002/follow-up: 1948–2002 (mortality)			Referent WV population	17	[0.681 (0.397– 1.091)]		
(mortality) Cohort			Referent other	17	17 [0.783 (0.456–		
			workers (same company and region)		1.254)]		
		Rectum, mortality	Polymer-production f	acility coho	rt (SMR):	Sex, age,	
			Referent US population	5	[0.917 (0.298– 2.139)]	calendar period	
			Referent WV population	5	[0.836 (0.271– 1.951)]		

Table S2.5 Epidemiological studies on exposure to PFOA or PFOS and cancers of the digestive tract

Reference, location, enrolment/follow- up period, study design	Population size, description, exposure assessment method	Organ site (incidence or mortality)	Exposure category or level	Exposed cases or deaths	Risk estimate (95% CI)	Covariates controlled	Comments
			Referent other workers (same company and region)	5	[1.321 (0.429– 3.082)]		
		Oesophagus,	Polymer-production fa	acility cohor	t (SMR):	Sex, age,	
		mortality	Referent US population	4	[0.410 (0.112– 1.051)]	calendar period	
			Referent WV population	4	[0.469 (0.128– 1.201)]		
			Referent other workers (same company and region)	4	[0.831 (0.226– 2.127)]		
		Stomach/gastric	Polymer-production facility cohort (SMR):			Sex, age,	
		cancer, mortality	Referent US population	3	[0.300 (0.062– 0.876)]	calendar period	
			Referent WV population	3	[0.360 (0.074– 1.053)]		
			Referent other workers (same company and region)	3	[0.521 (0.107– 1.522)]		
Steenland and 5791; Parkersburg (V	5791; Parkersburg (WV, USA),	Liver and	PFOA-exposed worke	ers (SMR):		Age, sex,	Exposure assessment critique:
Woskie (2012) Parkersburg, WV,	polymer-production PFOA cohort. Workers (81% male) at a US polymer-manufacturing facility who had potential exposure to	gallbladder (ICD-9 155–156), mortality	Other workers	10	1.07 (0.51–	calendar period	See Table 2.1.
Parkersburg, WV, USA Enrolment: 1948–			referent (same company and region)	1.96)		_	<i>Other strengths:</i> Evaluated associations with PFOA in a

7

8

Table S2.5 Epidemiological studies on exposure to PFOA or PFOS and cancers of the digestive tract

Reference, location, enrolment/follow- up period, study design	Population size, description, exposure assessment method	Organ site (incidence or mortality)	Exposure category or level	Exposed cases or deaths	Risk estimate (95% CI)	Covariates controlled	Comments
2002/follow-up: 1952–2008 (mortality)	fluoropolymers with sufficiently detailed work histories.		US referent	10	0.77 (0.35– 1.47)		population exposed to levels much higher than in the general population.
Cohort	Earlier follow-up by Leonard et al. (2008). Steenland et al. (2015) presents incidence follow-up for a	Liver and gallbladder (ICD-9	Cumulative serum exp workers referent, same	posure, no la e company a	ag (SMR, other and region):	Age, sex, calendar	<i>Other limitations:</i> small numbers of liver and pancreatic cancer
	subset of this cohort.	155–156), mortality	1st quartile (0 to < 904 ppm-yrs)	4	2.39 (0.65– 6.13)	penod	
	Table 2.1		2nd quartile (904 to < 1520 ppm-yrs)	0	0.00 (0.00– 1.81)		
			3rd quartile (1520 to < 2700 ppm-yrs)	5	2.01 (0.65– 4.68)		
			4th quartile (≥ 2700 ppm-yrs)	1	0.32 (0.01– 1.76)		
		Pancreas, mortality	PFOA-exposed workers (SMR):			Age, sex,	
			Other workers referent (same company and region)	18	1.04 (0.62– 1.64)	calendar period	
			US referent	18	0.85 (0.51– 1.35)		
		Pancreas, mortality	Cumulative serum exp workers referent, same	posure, no la e company a	ag (SMR, other and region):	Age, sex, calendar	
			1st quartile (0 to < 904 ppm-yrs)	4	1.18 (0.32– 3.03)	period	
			2nd quartile (904 to < 1520 ppm-yrs)	4	1.02 (0.28– 2.61)		
			3rd quartile (1520 to < 2700 ppm-yrs)	5	1.09 (0.35– 2.54)		

9

Table S2.5 Epidemiological studies on exposure to PFOA or PFOS and cancers of the digestive tract

Reference, location, enrolment/follow- up period, study design	Population size, description, exposure assessment method	Organ site (incidence or mortality)	Exposure category or level	Exposed cases or deaths	Risk estimate (95% CI)	Covariates controlled	Comments
			4th quartile (≥ 2700 ppm-yrs)	5	0.92 (0.30– 2.16)		
Steenland et al.	3713; Parkersburg (WV, USA),	Colon and rectum,	Cumulative PFOA ex	posure, no l	ag (RR):	Age, sex, race,	Exposure assessment critique:
(2015) Parkersburg, WV, USA	polymer-production PFOA cohort. This is a subset of the workers described in Steenland and Woskie	incidence	1st quartile (< 3.03 μg/mL-yrs)	NR	1	education, BMI, time-	See Table 2.1
Enrolment: 1948– 2002/follow-up:	(2012). Polymer-production workers (80% male) who responded		2nd quartile (3.03 to < 6.16 μg/mL-yrs)	NR	0.58 (0.18– 1.87)	smoking, time-varying	associations with PFOA in a population exposed to levels much
1951–interview date in 2008–2011 (incidence) Cohort	(self or next-of-kin) to a questionnaire about health outcomes and who had measured or		3rd quartile (6.16 to < 11.42 μg/mL-yrs)	NR	1.43 (0.49– 4.19)	alcohol consumption, year of birth	higher than in the general population; adjusted for established cancer risk factors (e.g.
	estimated occupational and residential exposure estimates. 41		4th quartile (≥ 11.42 μg/mL-	NR	1.20 (0.39– 3.62)	,	BMI, smoking, alcohol consumption).
	cases of incident colorectal cancer.		yrs)				Other limitations: Possibility of
	Exposure assessment method: See Table 2.1		Trend-test <i>P</i> -value, 0.).68			investigation included the subset of workers; few colorectal cancer cases.
Eriksen et al. (2009)	Case-cohort within the Diet,	Liver, incidence	Baseline plasma PFOA concentration (IRR):		Age, sex,	Exposure assessment critique:	
Denmark Enrolment:	Cancer and Health cohort (See Table 2.1).		1st quartile	17	1	smoking status, years	See Table 2.1
1 December 1993 to 31 May 1997/follow-	Cases: 67 liver, 128 pancreas incident cases		2nd quartile	17	1.00 (0.44– 2.23)	of school attendance, alcohol intake, occupation associated	Other strengths: Large cohort with numerous incident cancers
up: 1 December 1993 to 1 July 2006 Case–cohort	Comparison cohort: 772 (680 men, 92 women); Subcohort of		3rd quartile	17	0.49 (0.22– 1.09)		(<i>n</i> = 1240) followed 0–12 yr after baseline enrolment; good control of confounders; use of internal
	participants randomly selected		4th quartile	16	0.60 (0.26–	with liver	comparison group.
	without cancer at the end of follow- up.			6 7	1.37)	(waiter or	Other limitations: Low exposure
	Exposure assessment method: See		Continuous (per 1 ng/mL increase)	67	0.95 (0.86– 1.06)	cook)	contrast in a population with background exposure levels.
	1 able 2.1.	Liver, incidence	Baseline plasma PFO	S concentra	tion (IRR):		

10

Reference, location, enrolment/follow- up period, study design	Population size, description, exposure assessment method	Organ site (incidence or mortality)	Exposure category or level	Exposed cases or deaths	Risk estimate (95% CI)	Covariates controlled	Comments
			1st quartile	17	1	Age, sex,	
			2nd quartile	17	0.62 (0.29– 1.33)	smoking status, years of school	
			3rd quartile	17	0.72 (0.33– 1.56)	attendance, alcohol intake,	
			4th quartile	16	0.59 (0.27– 1.27)	occupation associated with liver	
		Continuous (per 10 ng/mL increase)	67	0.97 (0.79– 1.19)	cancer risk (waiter or cook)		
		Pancreas, incidence	Baseline plasma PFO	A concentra	tion (IRR):	Age, sex,	
			1st quartile	32	1	smoking status, smoking intensity, smoking duration, dietary fat	
			2nd quartile	32	0.88 (0.49– 1.57)		
			3rd quartile	32	1.33 (0.74– 2.38)		
			4th quartile	32	1.55 (0.85– 2.80)	intake, fruit and vegetable	
			Continuous (per 1 ng/mL increase)	128	1.03 (0.98– 1.10)	intake	
		Pancreas, incidence	Baseline plasma PFO	S concentrat	tion (IRR):	Age, sex,	
			1st quartile	32	1	smoking status,	
			2nd quartile	32	1.02 (0.57– 1.84)	smoking intensity, smoking duration,	
			3rd quartile	32	1.24 (0.67– 2.31)		

Table S2.5 Epidemiological studies on exposure to PFOA or PFOS and cancers of the digestive tract

11

Table S2.5 Epidemiological studies on exposure to PFOA or PFOS and cancers of the digestive tract

Reference, location, enrolment/follow- up period, study design	Population size, description, exposure assessment method	Organ site (incidence or mortality)	Exposure category or level	Exposed cases or deaths	Risk estimate (95% CI)	Covariates controlled	Comments
			4th quartile	32	0.91 (0.51– 1.65)	dietary fat intake, fruit and vegetable	
			Continuous (per increase of 10 ng/mL)	128	0.99 (0.86– 1.14)	intake	
Barry et al. (2013)	32 254 (28 541 community	Liver, incidence	Estimated cumulative	PFOA seru	m concentration	Age, time-	Exposure assessment critique:
Mid-Ohio Valleym(Ohio and WV)SEnrolment: Augustp2005-AugustP2006/follow-up:at1952 to 2011b(incidence)3CohortwChortU	members and 3713 workers); C8 Science Panel Study. Includes		(ng/mL), no lag (HR):	_		varying smoking, time-varying alcohol consumption,	See Table 2.1
	persons enrolled in the C8 Health Project who lived, worked, or attended school for at least 1 yr between 1950 and 3 December 2004 in a contaminated water district in the vicinity of a chemical plant (Parkersburg (WV, USA), polymer production) using PFOA in manufacturing, as well as a subset of those from the original Parkersburg (WV, USA), polymer- production cohort who worked at the plant between 1948 and 2002. Exposure assessment method: See Table 2.1		Continuous (per unit on natural log scale)	9	0.73 (0.43– 1.23)		<i>Other strengths:</i> Large cohort; fairly high participation rate among eligible residents.
						sex, education, birth year (5- yr calendar intervals)	<i>Other limitations:</i> Potential limitation of a survivor cohort but unlikely to be biased unless those with higher exposure had lower post diagnosis survival rates and
		Liver, incidence	Estimated cumulative PFOA serum concentration (ng/mL), 10-yr lag (HR):			Age, time- varying	those with lower exposure (Barry et al., 2015).
			Continuous (per unit on natural log scale)	9	0.74 (0.43– 1.26)	smoking, time-varying alcohol consumption, sex, education, birth year (5- yr calendar intervals)	
		Pancreas, incidence	Estimated cumulative (ng/mL), no lag (HR):	PFOA seru	m concentration	Age, time- varying	
			Continuous (per unit on natural log scale)	24	1.00 (0.78– 1.29)	smoking, time-varying alcohol	

12

Table S2.5 Epidemiological studies on exposure to PFOA or PFOS and cancers of the digestive tract

Reference, location, enrolment/follow- up period, study design	Population size, description, exposure assessment method	Organ site (incidence or mortality)	Exposure category or level	Exposed cases or deaths	Risk estimate (95% CI)	Covariates controlled	Comments	
						consumption, sex, education, birth year (5- yr calendar intervals)		
	Pancreas, incidence Es (n.	Estimated cumulative (ng/mL), 10-yr lag (H	PFOA seru: R):	m concentration	Age, time- varying			
			Continuous (per unit on natural log scale)	24	0.96 (0.75– 1.22)	5- smoking, time-varying alcohol consumption, sex, education, birth year (5- yr calendar intervals)		
		Colon and rectum, incidence	Estimated cumulative (ng/mL), no lag (HR):	PFOA seru	m concentration	Age, time- varying		
			Continuous (per unit on natural log scale)	264	0.99 (0.92– 1.07)	smoking, time-varying alcohol consumption, sex, education, birth year (5- yr calendar intervals)		
		Colon and rectum, incidence	Estimated cumulative (ng/mL), 10-yr lag (H	PFOA serus R):	m concentration	Age, time- varying		
			Continuous (per unit on natural log scale)	264	0.99 (0.92– 1.07)	smoking, time-varying alcohol		

13

Table S2.5 Epidemiological studies on exposure to PFOA or PFOS and cancers of the digestive tract

Reference, location, enrolment/follow- up period, study design	Population size, description, exposure assessment method	Organ site (incidence or mortality)	Exposure category or level	Exposed cases or deaths	Risk estimate (95% CI)	Covariates controlled	Comments
						consumption, sex, education, birth year (5- yr calendar intervals)	
		Oesophagus, incidence	Estimated cumulative (ng/mL), no lag (HR):	PFOA seru	m concentration	Age, time- varying	
			Continuous (per unit on natural log scale)	15	0.96 (0.70– 1.32)	smoking, time-varying alcohol consumption, sex, education, birth year (5- yr calendar intervals)	
		Oesophagus, incidence	Estimated cumulative (ng/mL), 10-yr lag (H	PFOA serus R):	m concentration	Age, time- varying	
			Continuous (per unit on natural log scale)	15	0.97 (0.72– 1.31)	smoking, time-varying alcohol consumption, sex, education, birth year (5- yr calendar intervals)	
		Stomach/gastric cancer, incidence	Estimated cumulative (ng/mL), no lag (HR):	PFOA seru	m concentration	Age, time- varying	
			Continuous (per unit on natural log scale)	12	0.72 (0.45– 1.14)	smoking, time-varying alcohol	

14

Table S2.5 Epidemiological studies on exposure to PFOA or PFOS and cancers of the digestive tract

Reference, location, enrolment/follow- up period, study design	Population size, description, exposure assessment method	Organ site (incidence or mortality)	Exposure category or level	Exposed cases or deaths	Risk estimate (95% CI)	Covariates controlled	Comments
						consumption, sex, education, birth year (5- yr calendar intervals)	
		Stomach/gastric cancer, incidence	Estimated cumulative (ng/mL), 10-yr lag (H	PFOA seru R):	m concentration	Age, time- varying	
			Continuous (per unit on natural log scale)	12	0.77 (0.49– 1.22)	smoking, time-varying alcohol consumption, sex, education, birth year (5- yr calendar intervals)	
Consonni et al. (2013)	5879 male workers (4205 APFO- exposed); The pooled international TFE (tetrafluoroethylene) cohort includes male workers who for at	Liver and intrahepatic bile	Cumulative APFO exposure (SMR, national referent):			Age, calendar period,	Exposure assessment critique:
USA, United Kingdom, Italy,		ducts (ICD-9 155), mortality	Ever APFO-	7	1.43 (0.57–	country	See Table 2.1 <i>Other strengths:</i> The cohort includes all TFE production sites
Germany,	least $0-12$ mo were employed at		exposed		2.94)		
Enrolment: 1950–	sites in North America and Europe		< 16 unit-yr	1	0.70 (0.02– 3.87)		of production and benefits from
2002/follow-up 1950–2008 Cohort	from 1950–2002. The principal occupational exposures were TFE and APEO (aiding production of		16–138 unit-yr	2	1.25 (0.15– 4.52)		almost complete enrolment and follow-up data.
Cohort	PTFE)		139+ unit-yr	4	2.14 (0.58–		<i>Other limitations:</i> Low statistical power for rarer cancers; high
	Exposure assessment method: See Table 2.1		5.49) Trend-test <i>P</i> -value, 0.24				correlations between exposure to TFE monomer and PFOA precludes evaluation of effects of the individual compounds.
		Pancreas, mortality	Cumulative APFO exposure (SMR, national referent):				

15

Reference, location, enrolment/follow- up period, study design	Population size, description, exposure assessment method	Organ site (incidence or mortality)	Exposure category or level	Exposed cases or deaths	Risk estimate (95% CI)	Covariates controlled	Comments
			Ever APFO- exposed	10	1.05 (0.51– 1.94)	Age, calendar period,	
			< 16 unit-yr	0	0	country	
			16–138 unit-yr	4	1.30 (0.35– 3.33)		
			139+ unit-yr	6	1.84 (0.67– 4.00)		
			Trend-test P-value, 0	34			
		Colon, mortality	SMR (national refere	nt):		Age, calendar	
			Ever APFO- exposed	7	0.48 (0.19– 0.99)	period, country	
		Rectum, mortality	SMR (national referent):			Age, calendar	
			Ever APFO- exposed	6	1.03 (0.38– 2.25)	period, country	
		Oesophagus, mortality	Cumulative APFO ex referent):	posure (SM	R, national	Age, calendar period,	
			Ever APFO- exposed	11	1.44 (0.72– 2.57)	country	
			< 16 unit-yr	4	1.62 (0.44– 4.14)		
			16–138 unit-yr	4	1.54 (0.42– 3.93)		
			139+ unit-yr	3	1.16 (0.24– 3.39)		
			Trend-test P-value, 0	60			
			SMR (national refere	nt):			

Table S2.5 Epidemiological studies on exposure to PFOA or PFOS and cancers of the digestive tract

16

Reference, location, enrolment/follow- up period, study design	Population size, description, exposure assessment method	Organ site (incidence or mortality)	Exposure category or level	Exposed cases or deaths	Risk estimate (95% CI)	Covariates controlled	Comments
		Stomach/gastric cancer, mortality	Ever APFO- exposed	5	0.52 (0.17– 1.21)	Age, calendar period, country	
Girardi and Merler462 (PFAS(2019)workers); WVicenza province,(Veneto, ItalVeneto Region, Italyproduction IEnrolment: 1960–mostly expension2008/follow-up:some PFOS1970–2018compounds(mortality)ComparisonCohortregional genworkers in a	462 (PFAS workers); 1383 (railroad	Liver and	SMR (regional referen	nt):		Age, calendar	Exposure assessment critique:
	workers); Workers in the Trissino (Veneto, Italy) perfluorocarbon	intrahepatic bile ducts (ICD-9 155).	All workers at	7	2.32 (1.11–	period	See Table 2.1
	production facility manufacturing	mortality	Trissino plant		4.87)		<i>Other strengths:</i> High exposure contrast; internal comparisons with non-exposed workers.
	mostly exposed to PFOA, with some PFOS, other perfluorinated		Offices	0	0		
	some FFOS, other perfutorinated compounds and other chemicals. Comparison populations included regional general population and workers in a local railroad industry not exposed to these chemicals. For both occupational cohorts, workers included were men employed ≥ 6 mo. Exposure assessment method: See Table 2.1		Never at PFAS department	4	2.71 (1.02– 7.22)		Other limitations: Small cohort
			Ever at PFAS department	3	4.71 (1.52– 14.6)		with few deaths ($n = 107$); limited to men; no data on confounders; small number of cancer deaths for
		Liver and intrahepatic bile	Cumulative PFOA concentration (SMR, regional referent):			Age, calendar period	liver (7) (the two causes with positive trends with exposure); no
		ducts (ICD-9 155), mortality	1st tertile (≤ 4034 ng/mL-yr)	1	1.02 (0.12– 7.21)		data on some causes of death of interest (e.g. bladder, prostate).
			2nd tertile (4034– 16 956 ng/mL-yr)	2	2.76 (0.69– 11.0)		
			3rd tertile (> 16 956 ng/mL- yr)	4	3.07 (1.15– 8.18)		
		Liver and	RR (relative to other v	workers):		Age, calendar	
		intrahepatic bile ducts (ICD-9 155), mortality	Railroad workers	3	1	period	
			All workers at Trissino plant	7	6.69 (1.71– 26.2)		
			Offices	0	0		

17

Reference, location, enrolment/follow- up period, study design	Population size, description, exposure assessment method	Organ site (incidence or mortality)	Exposure category or level	Exposed cases or deaths	Risk estimate (95% CI)	Covariates controlled	Comments
			Never at PFAS department	4	8.00 (1.79– 35.8)		
			Ever at PFAS department	3	15.3 (3.09– 76.0)		
	L in d n	Liver and intrahepatic bile	Cumulative PFOA co railroad workers):	ncentration	(RR, relative to	Age, calendar period	
		aucts (ICD-9 155), mortality	Railroad workers	3	1		
			1st tertile (≤ 4034 ng/mL-yr)	1	3.07 (0.31– 30.0)		
			2nd tertile (4034– 16 956 ng/mL-yr)	2	8.39 (1.40– 50.3)		
			3rd tertile (> 16 956 ng/mL- yr)	4	9.28 (2.07– 41.5)		
		Colon, mortality	SMR (regional referent):			Age, calendar	
			All workers at Trissino plant	5	1.72 (0.72– 4.14)	period	
		Colon, mortality	RR (relative to railroa	ad workers):		Age, calendar	
			Railroad workers	4	1	period	
			All workers at Trissino plant	5	2.84 (0.74– 10.9)		
		Oesophagus,	SMR (regional refere	nt):		Age, calendar	
		mortality	All workers at Trissino plant	3	2.31 (0.68– 6.50)	period	
		Oesophagus,	RR (relative to railroa	ad workers):		Age, calendar	
		mortality	Railroad workers	2	1	period	

Table S2.5 Epidemiological studies on exposure to PFOA or PFOS and cancers of the digestive tract

18

Organ site **Reference.** location. Population size, description, Exposure category Exposed **Risk estimate** Covariates Comments enrolment/follow-(incidence or cases or (95% CI) controlled exposure assessment method or level up period, study mortality) deaths design 3 All workers at 3.62 (0.59-Trissino plant 22.3) Stomach/gastric SMR (regional referent): Age, calendar cancer, mortality period 3 All workers at 1.30 (0.42-Trissino plant 4.02)Stomach/gastric RR (relative to railroad workers): Age, calendar cancer, mortality period Railroad workers 4 1 3 All workers at 2.43(0.54 -10.9) Trissino plant Residential exposure to highly PFAS-contaminated Li et al. (2022a) 60 507; The Ronneby Register Liver. incidence Age, calendar *Exposure assessment critique*: Cohort includes all individuals who drinking-water (SIR, Blekinge county excluding Ronneby, southern year See Table 2.1 Sweden ever lived in Ronneby municipality Ronneby referent): Enrolment:1985-1985–2013. One third of the Other strengths: A large general 24 Males: Never 1.12(0.72 -2013/follow-up: households received PFASpopulation sample with complete 1.66) 1985-2016 contaminated drinking-water from a ascertainment and follow-up due to (incidence) waterworks situated near a military 9 1.52 (0.70the high-quality Swedish Ever Cohort airfield where PFAS containing 2.89) population registers; a strong firefighting foam was used 1985documented exposure contrast. Liver. incidence Residential exposure to highly PFAS-contaminated Age, calendar 2013 (*n* = 15 811 individuals drinking-water (SIR, Blekinge county excluding year *Other limitations:* The mixed considered "ever high"). Subsets Ronneby referent): exposure profile without with long-term exposure (11 yr or possibility to single out effects due more) in the latest part of the Females: Never 9 0.98(0.45 to specific compounds; small follow-up period (2005–2013) were 1.86) number of cases and lack of considered more highly exposed. 4 information on important Ever 1.52(0.41 -Exposure assessment method: See confounders such as smoking, 3.88) Table 2.1 alcohol drinking, and BMI. Bile Residential exposure to highly PFAS-contaminated Age, calendar duct/gallbladder, drinking-water (SIR, Blekinge county excluding year incidence Ronneby referent):

Table S2.5 Epidemiological studies on exposure to PFOA or PFOS and cancers of the digestive tract

19

Reference, location, enrolment/follow- up period, study design	Population size, description, exposure assessment method	Organ site (incidence or mortality)	Exposure category or level	Exposed cases or deaths	Risk estimate (95% CI)	Covariates controlled	Comments
			Males: Never	11	0.56 (0.28– 1.00)		
			Ever	6	1.10 (0.40– 2.40)		
		Bile duct/gallbladder, incidence	Residential exposure drinking-water (SIR, Ronneby referent):	Residential exposure to highly PFAS-contaminated drinking-water (SIR, Blekinge county excluding Ronneby referent):			
			Females: Never	32	1.21 (0.83– 1.70)		
			Ever	7	0.99 (0.40– 2.05)		
		Bile duct/gallbladder,	Residential exposure to highly PFAS-contaminated drinking-water (HR):			Calendar year, age, sex	
		incidence	Never	43	1		
			Ever	13	1.15 (0.62– 2.15)		
		Bile duct/gallbladder,	Duration of residentia contaminated drinking	ıl exposure t g-water (HR	o highly PFAS- 2):	Calendar year, age, sex	
		incidence	Never	43	1		
			Short (1–10 yr)	7	0.98 (0.44– 2.20)		
			Long (≥ 11 y)	6	1.46 (0.59– 3.61)		
		Pancreas, incidence	Residential exposure drinking-water (SIR, Ronneby referent):	to highly PF Blekinge co	AS-contaminated unty excluding	Age, calendar year	

20

Reference, location, enrolment/follow- up period, study design	Population size, description, exposure assessment method	Organ site (incidence or mortality)	Exposure category or level	Exposed cases or deaths	Risk estimate (95% CI)	Covariates controlled	Comments
			Males: Never	38	0.84 (0.60– 1.16)		
			Ever	6	0.46 (0.17– 1.01)		
		Pancreas, incidence	Residential exposure drinking-water (SIR, Ronneby referent):	to highly PF Blekinge co	AS-contaminated unty excluding	Age, calendar year	
			Females: Never	39	0.93 (0.66– 1.27)		
			Ever	10	0.81 (0.39– 1.50)		
		Pancreas, incidence	Residential exposure drinking-water (HR):	to highly PF	AS-contaminated	Calendar year, age, sex	
			Never	77	1		
			Ever	16	0.71 (0.41– 1.22)		
		Pancreas, incidence	Duration of residentia contaminated drinking	l exposure t g-water (HR	o highly PFAS-):	Calendar year, age, sex	
			Never	77	1		
			Short (1–10 yr)	11	0.89 (0.47– 1.67)		
			Long (≥ 11 y)	5	0.49 (0.19– 1.22)		
		Colon, incidence	Residential exposure drinking-water (SIR, Ronneby referent):	to highly PF Blekinge co	AS-contaminated unty excluding	Age, calendar year	

Table S2.5 Epidemiological studies on exposure to PFOA or PFOS and cancers of the digestive tract

21

Reference, location, enrolment/follow- up period, study design	Population size, description, exposure assessment method	Organ site (incidence or mortality)	Exposure category or level	Exposed cases or deaths	Risk estimate (95% CI)	Covariates controlled	Comments
			Males: Never	172	1.01 (0.87– 1.18)		
			Ever	50	0.99 (0.73– 1.30)		
		Colon, incidence	Residential exposure drinking-water (SIR, Ronneby referent):	to highly PF Blekinge co	AS-contaminated unty excluding	Age, calendar year	
			Females: Never	156	0.88 (0.75– 1.03)		
			Ever	45	0.84 (0.62– 1.13)		
		Colon, incidence	Residential exposure drinking-water (HR):	to highly PF	AS-contaminated	Calendar year, age, sex	
			Never	326	1		
			Ever	93	0.98 (0.78– 1.23)		
		Colon, incidence	Duration of residentia contaminated drinkin	ıl exposure t g-water (HR	o highly PFAS- .):	Calendar year, age, sex	
			Never	326	1		
			Short (1–10 yr)	51	1.02 (0.76– 1.37)		
			Long (≥ 11 yr)	42	0.93 (0.67– 1.30)		
		Rectum, incidence	Residential exposure drinking-water (SIR, Ronneby referent):	to highly PF Blekinge co	AS-contaminated unty excluding	Age, calendar year	

Table S2.5 Epidemiological studies on exposure to PFOA or PFOS and cancers of the digestive tract

22

Reference, location, enrolment/follow- up period, study design	Population size, description, exposure assessment method	Organ site (incidence or mortality)	Exposure category or level	Exposed cases or deaths	Risk estimate (95% CI)	Covariates controlled	Comments
			Males: Never	109	0.96 (0.79– 1.16)		
			Ever	41	1.25 (0.89– 1.69)		
		Rectum, incidence	Residential exposure drinking-water (SIR, Ronneby referent):	to highly PF Blekinge co	AS-contaminated unty excluding	Age, calendar year	
			Females: Never	80	1.00 (0.79– 1.24)		
			Ever	32	1.33 (0.91– 1.88)		
		Rectum, incidence	Residential exposure drinking-water (HR):	to highly PF	AS-contaminated	Calendar year, age, sex	
			Never	190	1		
			Ever	73	1.25 (0.95– 1.64)		
		Rectum, incidence	Duration of residentia contaminated drinking	l exposure t g-water (HR	o highly PFAS- .):	Calendar year, age, sex	
			Never	190	1		
			Short (1–10 yr)	33	1.16 (0.80– 1.69)		
			Long (≥ 11 yr)	40	1.34 (0.94– 1.90)		
		Oesophagus, incidence	Residential exposure drinking-water (SIR, Ronneby referent):	to highly PF Blekinge co	AS-contaminated unty excluding	Age, calendar year	

23

Reference, location, enrolment/follow- up period, study design	Population size, description, exposure assessment method	Organ site (incidence or mortality)	Exposure category or level	Exposed cases or deaths	Risk estimate (95% CI)	Covariates controlled	Comments
			Males: Never	33	1.02 (0.70– 1.44)		
			Ever	7	0.71 (0.29– 1.47)		
		Oesophagus, incidence	Residential exposure drinking-water (SIR, Ronneby referent):	to highly PF Blekinge co	AS-contaminated unty excluding	Age, calendar year	
			Females: Never	11	1.03 (0.51– 1.83)		
			Ever	2	0.64 (0.08– 2.31)		
		Stomach/gastric cancer, incidence	Residential exposure drinking-water (SIR, Ronneby referent):	to highly PF Blekinge co	AS-contaminated unty excluding	Age, calendar year	
			Males: Never	82	1.00 (0.80– 1.24)		
			Ever	24	1.10 (0.70– 1.64)		
		Stomach/gastric cancer, incidence	Residential exposure drinking-water (SIR, Ronneby referent):	to highly PF Blekinge co	AS-contaminated unty excluding	Age, calendar year	
			Females: Never	37	0.85 (0.60– 1.17)		
			Ever	13	1.03 (0.55– 1.76)		
		Stomach/gastric cancer, incidence	Residential exposure drinking-water (HR):	to highly PF	AS-contaminated	Calendar year, age, sex	
			Never	119	1		

Table S2.5 Epidemiological studies on exposure to PFOA or PFOS and cancers of the digestive tract

24

Table S2.5 Epidemiological studies on exposure to PFOA or PFOS and cancers of the digestive tract

Reference, location, enrolment/follow- up period, study design	Population size, description, exposure assessment method	Organ site (incidence or mortality)	Exposure category or level	Exposed cases or deaths	Risk estimate (95% CI)	Covariates controlled	Comments
			Ever	37	1.14 (0.79– 1.66)		
		Stomach/gastric cancer, incidence	Duration of residential exposure to highly PFAS- contaminated drinking-water (HR):			Calendar year, age, sex	
			Never	119	1		
			Short (1–10 yr)	16	0.86 (0.51– 1.46)		
			Long ($\geq 11 \text{ yr}$)	21	1.56 (0.95– 2.55)		
Goodrich et al.	Nested case-control study within	Liver/hepatocellular	Pre-diagnostic plasma	PFOA cond	centration (OR):	Age, sex,	Exposure assessment critique:
(2022) California and	the Multiethnic Cohort (MEC) cohort (see Table 2.1)	carcinoma, incidence	\leq 8.6 ng/mL (85th percentile)	NR	1	race/ethnicity, study area	See Table 2.1
Hawaii Enrolment: 1993– 1996/follow-up: from	Cases: 50; MEC study participants with incident non-viral hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC). Controls: 50; individuals from the		> 8.6 ng/mL	NR	1.20 (0.52– 2.80)		Other strengths: Exposure and outcome are ascertained independently and with high accuracy; comprehensive data on potential confounders Other limitations: No information on exposure-response.
> 20 yr Nested case_control			Continuous (per increase of one SD)	50	0.86 (0.64– 1.20)		
	race/ethnicity, and study area.	Liver/hepatocellular	Pre-diagnostic plasma	PFOA cond	centration (OR):	Age, sex,	
E: Ta	Exposure assessment method: See Table 2.1	carcinoma, incidence	≤ 8.6 ng/mL (85th percentile)	NR	1	race/ethnicity, study area, BMI	
			> 8.6 ng/mL	NR	0.86 (0.34– 2.20)	Dim	
		Liver/hepatocellular	Pre-diagnostic plasma	PFOS conc	entration (OR):	Age, sex,	
		carcinoma, incidence	\leq 54.9 ng/mL (85th percentile)	NR	1	race/ethnicity, study area	
			> 54.9 ng/mL	NR	4.50 (1.20– 16.00)		

25

Reference, location, enrolment/follow- up period, study design	Population size, description, exposure assessment method	Organ site (incidence or mortality)	Exposure category or level	Exposed cases or deaths	Risk estimate (95% CI)	Covariates controlled	Comments
			Continuous (per increase of one SD)	50	1.20 (0.91– 1.60)		
		Liver/hepatocellular carcinoma, incidence	Pre-diagnostic plasma	PFOS conc	centration (OR):	Age, sex,	
			\leq 54.9 ng/mL (85th percentile)	NR	1	race/ethnicity, study area, BMI	
			> 54.9 ng/mL	NR	2.90 (0.78– 10.00)	2	
Zhang et al. (2023)	hang et al. (2023) Two nested case–control studies	Pancreas, ductal	PFOA relative metabo	olite levels (OR):	Age at blood	Exposure assessment critique:
ATBC cohort:nested within (1) the Alpha-Finland, PLCO: USATocopherol, Beta-Carotene CancerATBC: Enrolment:Prevention Study (ATBC) and (2)1985–1988/follow-Prostate, Lung, Colorectal andup through 2011;Ovarian Cancer Screening Trial	adenocarcinoma, incidence	ATBC cohort: 1st	30	1	draw, date of blood draw,	See Table 2.1	
	Prevention Study (ATBC) and (2) Prostate, Lung, Colorectal and Ovarian Cancer Screening Trial (PLCO) (See Table 2.1) Cases: 251 from ATBC, and 360 from the PLCO; Cases from the ATBC study were male smokers who participated in a prevention trial who developed pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma identified in the Finnish Cancer Registry. Cases from the PLCO study were men and women ascertained by annual mail- in surveys, cancer registries and/or the National Death Index		quintile			years smoked,	Other strengths: See Table 2.1
			2nd quintile	55	1.94 (1.05– 3.59)	day, diabetes,	Limitations: See Table 2.1
PLCO: Enrolment: 1993–2001;/follow-			3rd quintile	41	1.45 (0.77– 2.72)	BMI	
up through 2010 Nested case–control			4th quintile	63	2.27 (1.19– 4.33)		
			5th quintile	62	2.37 (1.24– 4.51)		
			Continuous (per SD increase (0.19) on the log base 10 scale)	251	1.27 (1.04– 1.56)		
	Controls: 251 from ATBC, 360		Trend-test P-value, 0.	01			
	from PLCO; In both cohorts,	Pancreas, ductal	PFOS relative metabo	lite levels (OR):	Age at blood	
	controls were individually matched on age and date of blood draws, and	adenocarcinoma, incidence	ATBC cohort: 1st quintile	22	1	draw, date of blood draw,	

26

Table S2.5 Epidemiological studies on exposure to PFOA or PFOS and cancers of the digestive tract

Reference, location, enrolment/follow- up period, study design	Population size, description, exposure assessment method	Organ site (incidence or mortality)	Exposure category or level	Exposed cases or deaths	Risk estimate (95% CI)	Covariates controlled	Comments
	sex. Matching on race in PLCO only.		2nd quintile	31	1.57 (0.69– 3.57)	years smoked, cigarettes per day, diabetes, BMI	
	Exposure assessment method: See Table 2.1.		3rd quintile	18	0.77 (0.32– 1.86)		
			4th quintile	23	0.89 (0.38– 2.11)		
			5th quintile	36	1.82 (0.82– 4.03)		
			Continuous (per SD increase (0.23) on the log base 10 scale)	130	1.13 (0.88– 1.45)		
			Trend-test <i>P</i> -value, 0.	34			
		Pancreas, ductal	PFOA relative metabolite levels (OR):			Age at blood	
		adenocarcinoma, incidence	PLCO cohort: 1st quintile	62	1	draw, date of blood draw, smoking .78– status (never, former quit	
			2nd quintile	78	1.26 (0.78– 2.04)		
3rd quintile 81 1.43 (0.88- 2.31)	1.43 (0.88– 2.31)	\geq 15 yr, former quit < 15 yr,					
			4th quintile	78	1.30 (0.79– 2.13)	current, missing), diabetes, BMI, sex, race	
			5th quintile	61	0.95 (0.57– 1.59)		
			Continuous (per SD increase (0.24) on the log base 10 scale)	360	0.97 (0.82– 1.15)		

27

Population size, description, Organ site **Risk estimate Reference**, location, **Exposure category** Exposed Covariates Comments enrolment/followexposure assessment method (incidence or or level cases or (95% CI) controlled up period, study mortality) deaths design Trend-test P-value, 0.87 Pancreas, ductal PFOA relative metabolite levels (OR): Age at blood adenocarcinoma. draw, date of PLCO cohort (Male 20 1 incidence blood draw, current or ever smoking smokers): 1st status (former quintile quit \geq 15 yr, 0.44 (0.13former quit 2nd quintile 19 1.49) < 15 yr, current, 3rd quintile 16 0.83 (0.23missing), 2.97) diabetes, BMI, race 4th quintile 19 0.78 (0.25-2.47) 5th quintile 9 0.49 (0.14-1.70) Continuous (per SD 83 0.86 (0.58increase (0.24) on 1.29) the log base 10 scale) Trend-test P-value, 0.44 Pancreas, ductal PFOS relative metabolite levels (OR): Age at blood adenocarcinoma, draw, date of PLCO cohort: 1st 80 1 incidence blood draw, quintile smoking status (never, 2nd quintile 65 0.86 (0.51former quit 1.44) \geq 15 yr, 3rd quintile 72 1.03 (0.63former quit 1.70)

Table S2.5 Epidemiological studies on exposure to PFOA or PFOS and cancers of the digestive tract

28

Reference, location, enrolment/follow- up period, study design	Population size, description, exposure assessment method	Organ site (incidence or mortality)	Exposure category or level	Exposed cases or deaths	Risk estimate (95% CI)	Covariates controlled	Comments
			4th quintile	75	1.05 (0.65– 1.70)	< 15 yr, current, missing),	
			5th quintile	68	0.88 (0.53– 1.48)	diabetes, BMI, sex, race	
			Continuous (per SD increase (0.23) on the log base 10 scale)	360	0.97 (0.83– 1.14)		
			Trend-test <i>P</i> -value, 0.	88			
		Pancreas, ductal	PFOS relative metabo	olite levels (OR):	Age at blood	
		incidence	PLCO cohort (Male current or ever smokers): 1st quintile	25	1	blood draw, smoking status (former quit > 15 yr.	
			2nd quintile	14	0.57 (0.18– 1.83)	former quit < 15 yr,	
			3rd quintile	14	0.45 (0.16– 1.28)	current, missing), diabetes, BMI,	
			4th quintile	16	0.52 (0.17– 1.62)	race	
			5th quintile	14	0.73 (0.21– 2.52)		
			Continuous (per SD increase (0.23) on the log base 10 scale)	83	0.90 (0.62– 1.30)		
			Trend-test <i>P</i> -value, 0.	40			
		Pancreas, incidence	Serum PFOA concent	ration (HR)	:		Exposure assessment critique:

Table S2.5 Epidemiological studies on exposure to PFOA or PFOS and cancers of the digestive tract

29

Reference, location, enrolment/follow- up period, study design	Population size, description, exposure assessment method	Organ site (incidence or mortality)	Exposure category or level	Exposed cases or deaths	Risk estimate (95% CI)	Covariates controlled	Comments
Winquist et al. (2023) 20 US states Enrolment 1998– 2001/follow up	Case–cohort within the CPS-II Lifelink Cohort (See Table 2.1)		1st quartile (< 3 850 ng/mL)	43	1	Sex, year of serum sample	See Table 2.1
	Cases: 172 pancreas; Incidence cases from the CPS-II Lifelink		2nd quartile (3.850 to < 5.100 ng/mL)	42	1.03 (0.63– 1.68)	collection, age at serum collection, race, education, smoking status, alcohol consumption	Strengths: See Table 2.1 Limitations: See Table 2.1
through 30 June 2015 Case–cohort	Cohort (surviving CPS-II Nutrition cohort participants) with first cancer diagnosis of paparatic cancer		3rd quartile (5.100 to < 6.300 ng/mL)	41	1.25 (0.75– 2.06)		
	diagnosis of pancreatic cancer detected through self-report or NDI linkage and verified through medical records review or cancer registry. All participants with incident cancers.		4th quartile (≥ 6.300 ng/mL)	45	0.75 (0.46– 1.23)		
			Continuous (per unit on log base 2 scale)	171	0.94 (0.74– 1.21)		
	Comparison cohort: 999; a sex- stratified simple random sample of 499 women and 500 men (approximately 3% of the eligible cohort). Stratification sampling was to ensure an adequate number of subcohort participants in sex- specific analyses (for breast and prostate cancers).	Pancreas, incidence	Serum PFOA concentration (HR):			Year of serum	
			Females: 8 Continuous (per unit on log base 2 scale)	81	1.14 (0.78– 1.67)	sample collection, age at serum collection, race, education, smoking status, alcohol consumption	
	Exposure assessment method: See Table 2.1						
		Pancreas, incidence	Serum PFOA concent	tration (HR):		Year of serum	
			Males: Continuous (per unit on log base 2 scale)	90	0.71 (0.52– 0.96)	collection, age at serum collection, race, education, smoking	

30

Reference, location, enrolment/follow- up period, study design	Population size, description, exposure assessment method	Organ site (incidence or mortality)	Exposure category or level	Exposed cases or deaths	Risk estimate (95% CI)	Covariates controlled	Comments
						status, alcohol consumption	
		Pancreas, incidence	Serum PFOS concentre	ration (HR):		Sex, year of	
			1st quartile (< 12.000 ng/mL)	39	1	serum sample collection, age at serum	
			2nd quartile (12.000 to < 18.000 ng/mL)	44	0.64 (0.39– 1.06)	collection, race,	
			3rd quartile (18.000 to < 25.000 ng/mL)	42	0.75 (0.45– 1.24)	smoking status, alcohol	
			4th quartile (≥ 25.000 ng/mL)	46	0.75 (0.45– 1.25)	consumption	
			Continuous (per unit on log base 2 scale)	171	0.87 (0.70– 1.10)		
		Pancreas, incidence	Serum PFOS concent	ration (HR):		Year of serum	
			Females: Continuous (per unit on log base 2 scale)	81	0.89 (0.63– 1.25)	collection, age at serum collection, race, education, smoking status, alcohol consumption	
		Pancreas, incidence	Serum PFOS concentration (HR):			Year of serum	
			Males: Continuous (per unit on log base 2 scale)	90	0.87 (0.63– 1.21)	sample collection, age at serum collection, race,	

31

Reference, location, enrolment/follow- up period, study design	Population size, description, exposure assessment method	Organ site (incidence or mortality)	Exposure category or level	Exposed cases or deaths	Risk estimate (95% CI)	Covariates controlled	Comments
						education, smoking status, alcohol consumption	
Vieira et al. (2013) Ohio and WV, USA	Cases: Study 1: 179 liver, 495 pancreas, 3543 colon and rectum;	Liver, incidence	Analysis 1. Residence water district (OH and	e in a PFOA- d WV) (OR)	-contaminated	Age, sex, diagnosis year, insurance provider, smoking status	Exposure assessment critique:
1996–2005 (incidence)	Study 2: 61 liver, 162 pancreas, 1149 colon and rectum: Index		Unexposed	156	1		See Table 2.1 <i>Other strengths:</i> Well ascertained cases based on case registries.
Case–control	cancer cases were retrieved from cancer registries covering a community sample with relatively high exposure to PFOA due to contamination of drinking-water from the Parkersburg (WV, USA), Teflon-manufacturing plant in WV, USA.		Any exposed water district	23	1.1 (0.7–1.6)		
	Controls: Study 1: 23 548 (for liver, pancreas), 20 005 (for colon and rectum); Study 2: 7339 (for liver, pancreas), 6190 (for colon and rectum); For each cancer site evaluated, controls were cases of cancer for all other sites, with the exclusion of four cancers of a priori interest (kidney, testicular, pancreas, and liver) which have been associated with PFOA in animal or human studies.						
	Exposure assessment method: See Table 2.1						
		Liver, incidence	Analysis 2. Individual exposure, assuming 1 (OH only) (OR):	l-level annua 0-yr residen	al PFOA serum cy and latency	Age, race, sex, diagnosis year,	

32

Reference, location, enrolment/follow- up period, study design	Population size, description, exposure assessment method	Organ site (incidence or mortality)	Exposure category or level	Exposed cases or deaths	Risk estimate (95% CI)	Covariates controlled	Comments
			Unexposed	50	1	insurance provider,	
			Low (3.7– 12.8 μg/L)	4	1.1 (0.4–3.1)	smoking status	
			Medium (12.9– 30.7 μg/L)	4	0.9 (0.3–2.5)		
			High (30.8– 109 μg/L)	3	1.0 (0.3–3.1)		
			Very high (110– 655 μg/L)	0	-		
		Pancreas, incidence	Analysis 1. Residence water district (OH an	e in a PFOA d WV) (OR)	-contaminated	Age, sex, diagnosis year, insurance	
			Unexposed	437	1		
			Any exposed water district	58	1.0 (0.8–1.3)	provider, smoking status	
		Pancreas, incidence	Analysis 2. Individua exposure, assuming 1 (OH only) (OR):	l-level annua 0-yr residen	al PFOA serum cy and latency	Age, race, sex, diagnosis year,	
			Unexposed	129	1	insurance provider.	
			Low (3.7– 12.8 μg/L)	12	1.3 (0.7–2.3)	2.3) smoking status	
			Medium (12.9– 30.7 μg/L)	10	0.9 (0.5–1.7)		
			High (30.8– 109 μg/L)	9	1.1 (0.6–2.3)		
			Very high (110– 655 μg/L)	2	0.6 (0.1–2.5)		

Table S2.5 Epidemiological studies on exposure to PFOA or PFOS and cancers of the digestive tract

33

Organ site **Reference**, location. Population size, description, Exposure category Exposed **Risk estimate** Covariates Comments enrolment/follow-(incidence or cases or (95% CI) controlled exposure assessment method or level up period, study mortality) deaths design Analysis 1. Residence in a PFOA-contaminated Colon and rectum. Age, sex, incidence water district (OH and WV) (OR): diagnosis year, Unexposed 3160 1 insurance Any exposed water provider, 383 0.9(0.8-1.0)district smoking status Colon and rectum. Analysis 2. Individual-level annual PFOA serum Age, race, sex, incidence exposure, assuming 10-yr residency and latency diagnosis (OH only) (OR): year, insurance Unexposed 937 1 provider, smoking Low (3.7-72 1.0(0.8-1.3)12.8 µg/L) status Medium (12.9– 64 0.9(0.7-1.2)30.7 µg/L) High (30.8-63 1.3(1.0-1.7)109 µg/L) Very high (110-13 0.6(0.3-1.0)655 µg/L) Cao et al. (2022) Cases: 203: incident cases with Serum PFOA concentration (ng/g) (OR) Liver. incidence Age, sex, *Exposure assessment critique*: China liver cancer obtained from a BMI. 1.036 (1.002-Continuous (per 203 Key strengths were that serum Enrolment: 2019hospital in Hangchou, China, from education. 1.070) levels represent the combined unit on log scale) 2021 2019-2021. Cases had no other income exposure through all exposure Case-control diseases. Trend-test P-value, 0.07 pathways; measurement error low. Controls: 203; Healthy controls also Liver, incidence Serum PFOS concentration (ng/g) (OR) Age, sex, Key limitations were that timing of taken from the same Chinese BMI. sample collection relative to time Continuous (per 203 2.609 (1.179hospital 2019-2021. education, point of diagnosis was not unit on log scale) 4.029) income Exposure assessment method: reported; if liver cancer alters Trend-test P-value, 0.001 Quantitative serum measurements; ADME of PFAS there could be

Table S2.5 Epidemiological studies on exposure to PFOA or PFOS and cancers of the digestive tract

34

Table S2.5 Epidemiological studies on exposure to PFOA or PFOS and cancers of the digestive tract

Reference, location, enrolment/follow- up period, study design	Population size, description, exposure assessment method	Organ site (incidence or mortality)	Exposure category or level	Exposed cases or deaths	Risk estimate (95% CI)	Covariates controlled	Comments
	analytical method was state of art. Single blood sample collected. Blood collected before treatment.						possible differential exposure misclassification; single samples at time of case hospitalization may not reflect exposure at crucial windows in cancer development.
							<i>Other limitations:</i> No information on diseases of controls taken from same hospital as cases

ADME, absorption, distribution, metabolism, and excretion; AL, Alabama; APFO, ammonium perfluorooctanoate; ATBC, Alpha-Tocopherol, Beta-Carotene Cancer Prevention Study; BMI, body mass index; CI, confidence interval; CPS-II, Cancer Prevention Study II; HCC, hepatocellular carcinoma; HR, hazard ratio; ICD, International Classification of Diseases; IRR, incidence rate ratio; MEC, Multiethnic Cohort; MN, Minnesota; mo, month(s); NDI, National Death Index; NR, not reported; OH, Ohio; OR, odds ratio; ppm, parts per million; PFAS, perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substance(s); PFOA, perfluorooctanoic acid; PFOS, perfluorooctanesulfonic acid; PLCO, Prostate, Lung, Colorectal and Ovarian Cancer Screening Trial; POSF, perfluorooctanesulfonyl; PTFE, polytetrafluoroethylene; RR, rate ratio; SD, standard deviation; SIR, standardized incidence ratio; SMR, standardized mortality ratio; TFE, tetrafluoroethylene; US, United States; USA, United States of America; WV, West Virginia; yr, year(s).

References

- Alexander BH, Olsen GW (2007). Bladder cancer in perfluorooctanesulfonyl fluoride manufacturing workers. Ann Epidemiol. 17(6):471–8. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annepidem.2007.01.036 PMID:17448680
- Alexander BH, Olsen GW, Burris JM, Mandel JH, Mandel JS (2003). Mortality of employees of a perfluorooctanesulphonyl fluoride manufacturing facility. Occup Environ Med. 60(10):722–9. https://doi.org/10.1136/oem.60.10.722 PMID:14504359
- Barry V, Klein M, Winquist A, Darrow LA, Steenland K (2015). Disease fatality and bias in survival cohorts. Environ Res. 140:275–81. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2015.03.039 PMID:25880887
- Barry V, Winquist A, Steenland K (2013). Perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA) exposures and incident cancers among adults living near a chemical plant. Environ Health Perspect. 121(11–12):1313–8. https://doi.org/10.1289/ehp.1306615 PMID:24007715
- Cao L, Guo Y, Chen Y, Hong J, Wu J, Hangbiao J (2022). Per-/polyfluoroalkyl substance concentrations in human serum and their associations with liver cancer. Chemosphere. 296:134083. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2022.134083 PMID:35216980

- Consonni D, Straif K, Symons JM, Tomenson JA, van Amelsvoort LG, Sleeuwenhoek A, et al. (2013). Cancer risk among tetrafluoroethylene synthesis and polymerization workers. Am J Epidemiol. 178(3):350–8. https://doi.org/10.1093/aje/kws588 PMID:23828249
- Eriksen KT, Sørensen M, McLaughlin JK, Lipworth L, Tjønneland A, Overvad K, et al. (2009). Perfluorooctanoate and perfluorooctanesulfonate plasma levels and risk of cancer in the general Danish population. J Natl Cancer Inst. 101(8):605–9. https://doi.org/10.1093/jnci/djp041 PMID:19351918
- Gilliland FD, Mandel JS (1993). Mortality among employees of a perfluorooctanoic acid production plant. J Occup Med. 35(9):950–4. https://doi.org/10.1097/00043764-199309000-00020 PMID:8229349
- Girardi P, Merler E (2019). A mortality study on male subjects exposed to polyfluoroalkyl acids with high internal dose of perfluorooctanoic acid. Environ Res. 179(Pt A):108743. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2019.108743 PMID:31542491
- Goodrich JA, Walker D, Lin X, Wang H, Lim T, McConnell R, et al. (2022). Exposure to perfluoroalkyl substances and risk of hepatocellular carcinoma in a multiethnic cohort. JHEP Rep. 4(10):100550. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhepr.2022.100550 PMID:36111068
- Leonard RC, Kreckmann KH, Sakr CJ, Symons JM (2008). Retrospective cohort mortality study of workers in a polymer production plant including a reference population of regional workers. Ann Epidemiol. 18(1):15–22. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annepidem.2007.06.011 PMID:17900928
- Li H, Hammarstrand S, Midberg B, Xu Y, Li Y, Olsson DS, et al. (2022a). Cancer incidence in a Swedish cohort with high exposure to perfluoroalkyl substances in drinking water. Environ Res. 204(Pt C):112217. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2021.112217 PMID:34662573
- Lundin JI, Alexander BH, Olsen GW, Church TR (2009). Ammonium perfluorooctanoate production and occupational mortality. Epidemiology. 20(6):921–8. https://doi.org/10.1097/EDE.0b013e3181b5f395 PMID:19797969
- Raleigh KK, Alexander BH, Olsen GW, Ramachandran G, Morey SZ, Church TR, et al. (2014). Mortality and cancer incidence in ammonium perfluorooctanoate production workers. Occup Environ Med. 71(7):500–6. https://doi.org/10.1136/oemed-2014-102109 PMID:24832944
- Steenland K, Woskie S (2012). Cohort mortality study of workers exposed to perfluorooctanoic acid. Am J Epidemiol. 176(10):909–17. https://doi.org/10.1093/aje/kws171 PMID:23079607
- Steenland K, Zhao L, Winquist A (2015). A cohort incidence study of workers exposed to perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA). Occup Environ Med. 72(5):373-80. https://doi.org/10.1136/oemed-2014-102364 PMID:25601914
- Vieira VM, Hoffman K, Shin HM, Weinberg JM, Webster TF, Fletcher T (2013). Perfluorooctanoic acid exposure and cancer outcomes in a contaminated community: a geographic analysis. Environ Health Perspect. 121(3):318–23. https://doi.org/10.1289/ehp.1205829 PMID:23308854
- Winquist A, Hodge JM, Diver WR, Rodriguez JL, Troeschel AN, Daniel J, et al. (2023). Case–cohort study of the association between PFAS and selected cancers among participants in the American Cancer Society's Cancer Prevention Study II LifeLink cohort. Environ Health Perspect. 131(12):127007. https://doi.org/10.1289/ehp13174 PMID:38088576
- Zhang T, Fu S, Yu K, Albanes D, Moore SC, Purdue MP, et al. (2023). Nested case–control studies investigating serum perfluorooctanoate and perfluorooctane sulfonate levels and pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma in two cohorts. Environ Health Perspect. 131(10):107702. https://doi.org/10.1289/EHP13208 PMID:37844029