High pre-diagnosis inflammation-related risk score associated with decreased ovarian cancer survival

Katharine K. Brieger[1*], Minh Tung Phung[1*], Bhramar Mukherjee[2], Kelly M. Bakulski[1], Hoda Anton-Culver[3], Elisa V. Bandera[4], David D. L. Bowtell[5,6], Daniel W. Cramer[7,8], Anna deFazio[9,10], Jennifer A. Doherty[11], Sian Fereday[5,6], Renée T. Fortner[12], Aleksandra Gentry-Maharaj[13], Ellen L. Goode[14], Marc T. Goodman[15,16], Holly R. Harris[17,18], Keitaro Matsuo[19,20], Usha Menon[13], Francesmary Modugno[21,22,23], Kirsten B. Moysich[24], Bo Qin[4], Susan J. Ramus[25,26], Harvey A. Risch[27], Mary Anne Rossing[17,18], Joellen M. Schildkraut[28,], Britton Trabert[29], Robert A. Vierkant[30], Stacey J. Winham[31], Nicolas Wentzensen[29], Anna H. Wu[32], Argyrios Ziogas[3], Lilah Khoja[1], Kathleen R. Cho[33], Karen McLean[34], Jean Richardson[32], Bronwyn Grout[35], Anne Chase[35], Cindy McKinnon Deurloo[35], Kunle Odunsi[36], Brad H. Nelson[37], James D. Brenton[38], Kathryn L. Terry[7,8] Paul D. P. Pharoah[39,40], Andrew Berchuck[41] Gillian E. Hanley[42], Penelope M. Webb[43], Malcolm C. Pike[32,44], Celeste Leigh Pearce[1]; for the Ovarian Cancer Association Consortium

[1] Department of Epidemiology, University of Michigan School of Public Health, Ann Arbor, MI, USA.
[2] Department of Biostatistics, University of Michigan School of Public Health, Ann Arbor, MI, USA.
[3] Department of Medicine, University of California Irvine, Irvine, CA, USA.
[4] Cancer Epidemiology and Health Outcomes, Rutgers Cancer Institute of New Jersey, New Brunswick, NJ, USA.
[5] Peter MacCallum Cancer Centre, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia.
[6] Sir Peter MacCallum Department of Oncology, The University of Melbourne, Victoria, Australia.
[7]Department of Epidemiology, Harvard TH Chan School of Public Health, Boston, MA, USA.
[8] Obstetrics and Gynecology Epidemiology Center, Brigham and Women's Hospital and Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, USA.
[9] Centre for Cancer Research, The Westmead Institute for Medical Research, and The University of Sydney, New South Wales, Australia.
[10] Department of Gynaecological Oncology, Westmead Hospital, Westmead, New South Wales, Australia
[11]Huntsman Cancer Institute, Department of Population Health Sciences. University of Utah. Salt Lake City, UT, USA.
[12]Division of Cancer Epidemiology, German Cancer Research Center (DKFZ), Heidelberg, Germany.
[13] MRC Clinical Trials Unit, Institute of Clinical Trials & Methodology, UCL, London, UK.
[14] Department of Quantitative Health Sciences, Division of Epidemiology, Mayo Clinic, Rochester, MN, USA.
[15] Samuel Oschin Comprehensive Cancer Institute, Cancer Prevention and Genetics Program, Cedars-Sinai Medical Center, Los Angeles, CA, USA.
[16]Community and Population Health Research Institute, Department of Biomedical Sciences, Cedars-Sinai Medical Center, Los Angeles, CA, USA
[17] Program in Epidemiology, Division of Public Health Sciences, Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center, Seattle, WA, USA.

[18]Department of Epidemiology, University of Washington School of Public Health, Seattle, WA, USA.
[19] Division of Cancer Epidemiology and Prevention, Aichi Cancer Center Research Institute, Nagoya, Japan.
[20]Department of Cancer Epidemiology, Nagoya University Graduate School of Medicine, Nagoya, Japan.
[21] Women's Cancer Research Center. Magee-Women's Research Institute and Hillman Cancer Center, Pittsburgh, PA, USA.
[22] Division of Gynecologic Oncology, Department of Obstetrics, Gynecology and Reproductive Sciences, University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine, Pittsburgh, PA, USA.
[23] Department of Epidemiology, University of Pittsburgh Graduate School of Public Health, Pittsburg, PA, USA.
[24] Division of Cancer Prevention and Control, Roswell Park Comprehensive Cancer Center. Buffalo, NY, USA.
[25] School of Women's and Children's Health, Faculty of Medicine, University of NSW Sydney, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia.
[26] The Kinghorn Cancer Centre, Garvan Institute of Medical Research, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia.
[27] Chronic Disease Epidemiology, Yale School of Public Health, New Haven, CT, USA.
[28] Emory University Rollins School of Public Health. Atlanta, GA: USA; 30322
[29] Division of Cancer Epidemiology and Genetics, National Cancer Institute, Bethesda, MD, USA.
[30] Department of Quantitative Health Sciences, Division of Clinical Trials and Biostatistics, Mayo Clinic, Rochester, MN, USA.

[31] Department of Quantitative Health Sciences, Division of Computational Biology, Mayo Clinic, Rochester, MN, USA.
[32] Department of Preventive Medicine, Keck School of Medicine, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, USA.
[33] Department of Pathology, Michigan Medicine, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, USA.
[34] Division of Gynecologic Oncology, Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, University of Michigan Medical School, Ann Arbor, Michigan, USA.
[35] Patient Advocate.
[36] Department of Gynecological Oncology, Roswell Park Cancer Institute, Buffalo, New York, USA.
[37] Deeley Research Centre, British Columbia Cancer Agency, Victoria, British Columbia, Canada.
[38] Cancer Research UK Cambridge Institute, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK.
[39] Centre for Cancer Genetic Epidemiology, Department of Oncology. University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK.
[40] Centre for Cancer Genetic Epidemiology, Department of Public Health and Primary Care, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK.
[41] Division of Gynecologic Oncology, Duke University School of Medicine, Durham, NC, USA.
[42] University of British Columbia Faculty of Medicine, Department of Obstetrics & Gynecology, Vancouver, Canada.

[43] Department of Population Health, QIMR Berghofer Medical Research Institute, Brisbane, Queensland, Australia.
[44] Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center, New York, NY, USA.

*These authors contributed equally to this work.

Running Title: Inflammation-related exposures and ovarian cancer survival

Keywords: ovarian, survival, inflammation, pre-diagnosis, risk

Additional Information:

Corresponding author:
Dr. Celeste Leigh Pearce, email: lpearce@umich.edu
4642 SPH Tower
1415 Washington Heights
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109-2029
Phone: 734-764-3835

Conflict of Interest Disclosure: The authors declare no potential conflicts of interest.

Word Count: 3,524

Number of figures and tables: 3 tables in the main body of the text; 5 supplemental

ABSTRACT

Background

There is suggestive evidence that inflammation is related to ovarian cancer survival. However, more research is needed to identify inflammation-related factors that are associated with ovarian cancer survival and to determine their combined effects.

Methods

This analysis used pooled data on 8,147 women with invasive epithelial ovarian cancer from the Ovarian Cancer Association Consortium. Pre-diagnosis inflammatory-related exposures of interest included alcohol use, aspirin use, other nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drug use, body mass index, environmental tobacco smoke exposure, history of pelvic inflammatory disease, polycystic ovarian syndrome, and endometriosis, menopausal hormone therapy use, physical inactivity, smoking status, and talc use. Using Cox proportional hazards (PH) models, the relationship between each exposure and survival was assessed in 50% of the data. A weighted inflammation-related risk score (IRRS) was developed and its association with survival was assessed using Cox PH models in the remaining 50% of the data.

Results

There was a statistically significant trend of increasing risk of death per quartile of the IRRS (HR=1.09, 95% CI 1.03-1.14). Women in the upper quartile of the IRRS had 31% higher death rate compared to the lowest quartile (95% CI 1.11-1.54).

Conclusions

A higher pre-diagnosis IRRS was associated with increased mortality risk after an ovarian cancer diagnosis. Further investigation is warranted to evaluate whether post-diagnosis exposures are also associated with survival.

Impact

Given that pre- and post-diagnosis exposures are often correlated and many are modifiable, our study results can ultimately motivate the development of behavioral recommendations to enhance survival among ovarian cancer patients.

INTRODUCTION

Systemic and local inflammatory processes are related to the etiologies of many diseases, including autoimmune disease, cardiovascular disease, and cancer. Chronic inflammation can directly cause DNA damage[1,2], which is particularly relevant for cancer initiation and progression. Not surprisingly, invasive epithelial ovarian cancer, hereafter referred to as ovarian cancer, risk is associated with pro-inflammatory exposures, including smoking history[3], pelvic inflammatory disease[4-6], endometriosis[7,8], and possibly genital talc powder application[7,9]. However, there remain important gaps in knowledge with respect to inflammation-related exposures and their impact on survival with ovarian cancer.

There is some suggestion that ovarian cancer survival is decreased by pro-inflammatory exposures. For example, decreased ovarian cancer survival has been associated with pre-diagnosis high body mass index (hazard ratio HR=1.03%, 95% confidence interval CI 1.00-1.06 per 5 kg/m^2)[10], physical inactivity (HR=1.34, 95% CI 1.18-1.52)[11], and smoking (HR=1.17, 95% CI 1.08-1.28 for current smokers and HR=1.10, 95% CI 1.02-1.18 for former smokers compared to never smokers)[12]. In contrast, better survival has been associated with anti-inflammatory exposures including post-diagnosis use of aspirin (HR=0.68, 95% CI 0.52-0.89)[13], other non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (HR=0.67, 95% CI 0.51-0.87)[13], and statins (HR=0.81, 95% CI 0.72-0.90)[14]. In addition, pre-diagnosis[15-18] and post-diagnosis[19,20] menopausal hormone therapy (MHT) use, also thought to have anti-inflammatory properties, has been associated with 10%-30% and 30%-40% increased survival, respectively[21-25].

Overall, a summary measure of the relative contribution of pro- and anti-inflammatory factors is needed to better understand the potential impact of inflammation on survival among women with ovarian cancer. Using data from a large, multi-national consortium of epidemiologic

studies, we evaluated the association between 12 self-reported pre-diagnosis exposures related to inflammation and ovarian cancer survival in half of our dataset. We then used those estimates to create an inflammation-related risk score (IRRS) and examine its association with survival in the remaining half of our participants.

METHODS

All studies included in this analysis obtained written informed consent from participants. This analysis used pooled data from the Ovarian Cancer Association Consortium (OCAC), an international ovarian cancer collaboration (http://ocac.ccge.medschl.cam.ac.uk/). Data were sent to the OCAC data-coordinating center (Duke University) for central harmonization[26]. Ovarian cancer patients with low-grade serous, high-grade serous, endometrioid, mucinous, or clear cell cancer and for whom stage data were available were eligible for inclusion.

Twelve pre-diagnosis exposures of interest were included in this analysis: lifetime alcohol use, aspirin use, other nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drug (NSAID) use, body mass index (BMI), environmental smoke exposure (ever having been exposed to smoking in the home or at work as defined by each study), history of pelvic inflammatory disease (PID), polycystic ovarian syndrome (PCOS), endometriosis, MHT use, physical inactivity, smoking status, and talc use. Details on the definitions of the exposures have been described elsewhere[27-33] and are presented in Supplemental Table 1. Within each OCAC study, the pattern of missingness among these exposures was investigated. To be included in the analysis, OCAC studies had to have collected data on at least seven of the 12 exposures of interest (Supplemental Figure 1). Eleven OCAC sites, one from Australia[34] and 10 from the United States[35-45], met this criterion and were

included in this analysis. A total of 8,147 people with ovarian cancer were included in this analysis.

Phone or in-person interviews or self-completed questionnaires were used to collect self-reported information from participants about their *pre-diagnosis* exposures as well as sociodemographic characteristics. All exposure data were collected after diagnosis. Each study site also collected data on histotype, grade, stage at diagnosis, vital status, and survival time. Overall survival was defined as length of time (in days) from diagnosis to either death, from any cause, or date of last follow-up (for censored women).

Overall analytic approach

The goal of this analysis was to develop a combined measure of inflammation-related risk factors using exposure information before diagnosis and to assess its association with survial among ovarian cancer patients. First, we selected 12 inflammation-related exposures (see above) and measured the strength of the individual exposure-survival associations in a training set of cases comprising a 50% random sample of the study population (n=4,073). Using these estimates, we then constructed a weighted inflammation-related risk score (IRRS) and evaluated the association between this score and survival in a test set comprising the other half of the study population (n=4,074).

Imputation

The missingness across the 11 studies for these exposures is shown in Supplemental Figure 1. Multiple imputation (*mice* package in *R*) was used to address data missingness across sites. We imputed missing values iteratively and generated 50 imputed datasets (Supplemental Figure 2). All variables in the dataset were initially considered for imputation, including those that were not used in final models, as this information potentially improved imputation[46]. Before

imputing, we excluded variables with a missingness of greater than 70% across the entire dataset. The U.S.-based studies were imputed separately from the Australian study. OCAC study site was included as a predictor in the imputation.

Training Set Analysis

The training set was used to fit a Cox proportional hazards model with all 12 inflammation-related risk factors (Supplemental Table 1) simultaneously. In this model, the hazard ratios (HRs) across the 50 imputed training datasets were pooled using Rubin's rule[47] to obtain a single point estimate for each of the 12 risk factors (Supplemental Figure 2).

The 12 risk factors were fit as follows: lifetime alcohol use status (never, current, former drinker), regular aspirin use (yes/no), regular NSAID use (yes/no), BMI (continuous), environmental smoke exposure (yes/no), history of pelvic inflammatory disease (yes/no), history of polycystic ovary syndrome (yes/no), history of endometriosis (yes/no), MHT duration of use (none, <5 years, 5+ years), physical inactivity (yes/no), smoking status (never, current, former), and talc use (never use, use on genital areas, use on non-genital areas). *A priori* covariates included in the model were age at diagnosis (continuous), education level (less than high school, high school, some college, college graduate or above), and stage at diagnosis (local, regional, distant). We stratified by histotype (low-grade serous, high-grade serous, endometrioid, mucinous, or clear cell), menopausal status (pre/post), OCAC study site, and race/ethnicity (Asian, Black, Hispanic White, Non-Hispanic White, Other) within the model, thus allowing the baseline hazard to vary. Adjusting for year of diagnosis or year of interview did not change the results.

Prior to combining these data into a single model, we evaluated heterogeneity across the study sites using standard meta-analysis techniques. The I^2 for the 12 exposures was low, with

eight having a value of zero. Given the lack of heterogeneity we proceeded with fitting a single model as described above (Table 2).

Test Set Analysis

The beta coefficients obtained in the training set for the 12 exposures of interest were used to create a weighted IRRS within each imputed test dataset. The beta coefficients for continuous variables were multiplied by the exposure level and those estimates along with the beta coefficients from binary or categorical variables were summed to create the IRRS for each woman. The score was divided into quartiles.

Cox proportional hazards models were used to evaluate the association between IRRS quartile (categorical and ordinal) and survival. We also fit an additive Cox proportional hazard model with the IRRS in a natural form to assess whether a trend in the association between IRRS and survival was present. As in the training set analysis, *a priori* covariates included in the model were stage at diagnosis, age at diagnosis, and education level. Likewise, as in the training set, we stratified by histotype, menopausal status, OCAC study site, and race/ethnicity within the model. Adjusted survival curves were generated to evaluate the association between the IRRS and survival over time (Supplemental Figure 3). In addition, we fitted separate histotype-specific models.

Goodness-of-fit tests were conducted to assess model fit in both the training and test sets. Goodness-of-fit tests showed insignificant results ($p>0.05$) in 32 out of 50 imputed datasets in the training set. The results were insignificant in 34 out of 50 imputed datasets in the test set. Thus, the models in the training and test sets fit the data well.

Sensitivity Analyses

In the training set, we conducted a sensitivity analysis for BMI using the World Health Organization (WHO) categories (<18.5, 18-5-2.99, 25-29.99, 30+ kg/m^2) and continuous lifetime alcohol consumption (grams/day) to determine if our categorization of these exposures in the primary analysis were appropriate. We also conducted sensitivity analyses to evaluate whether specific variables were contributing more information to the models. We used a backward stepwise selection approach to select variables in the training set. The backward stepwise selection approach for multiple imputation was described by van Buuren[48]. Briefly, in each of the 50 imputed datasets, a backward stepwise selection was conducted to select variables so that the model had the lowest Akaike information criterion (AIC). The variables that were selected by the models in all 50 individual datasets were included in the final model. For the variables that were selected by more than half of the models in the 50 individual datasets, Wald tests were used to determine if they should be included in the final model.We also carried out elastic net analysis; all 12 exposures were selected, thus these results are not presented as they are nearly identical our main analysis.

As BMI and MHT were the only exposures statistically significantly associated with survival (see Results below), we conducted a sensitivity analysis in the test set that created the IRRS without BMI and MHT and fit the same model described above to determine whether there was still an association between the IRRS and survival. We also conducted a sensitivity analysis with the IRRS created from the variables selected by a backward stepwise approach (BMI and MHT) in the training set.

Statistical significance was defined as $p \leq 0.05$ using two-sided tests. Data were analyzed using R studio 1.1.463.

RESULTS

A total of 8,147 women diagnosed with ovarian cancer from 11 OCAC study sites were included in the study (Table 1). A majority of the women had high-grade serous carcinoma (61.4%) and most had advanced stage disease at the time of diagnosis (63.3%; Table 1). The mean age at diagnosis was 57.5 years (SD = 11.3 years) and most women were post-menopausal at the time of diagnosis (71.1%). Physical inactivity was reported by 15.0% of the women. Regular use (at least once per week) of aspirin and NSAIDs were reported by 11.2% and 15.4% of women, respectively, and MHT use for less than five years and at least five years were reported by 12.3% and 15.7% of women, respectively (Table 1). The distributions of the factors were similar between the training and test sets (Table 1). All of these descriptive statistics were based on unimputed data.

Hazard ratios (HRs) for each individual inflammation-related factor were generated in the training set to create the IRRS (Table 2). Only BMI was significantly associated with a higher death rate (HR=1.01 for one additional kg/m^2, 95% CI 1.00-1.02, p=0.012). MHT use for 5+ years was significantly associated with a lower death rate (HR=0.83, 95% CI 0.74-0.93, p=0.001). However, all 12 factors were included in the IRRS (Table 2).

Women in the highest quartile of the IRRS had a 31% increased risk of death (95% CI 1.11-1.54), compared to those in the lowest quartile during follow-up. There was an increased death rate per quartile increase in the IRRS (HR=1.09, 95% CI 1.03-1.14, p= 0.001) based on fitting the IRRS as an ordinal variable. The adjusted survival curves show that patients in the highest quartile of the IRRS had worse survival compared to those in the lowest quartile at all time points after diagnosis (Supplemental Figure 3). When fitting the IRRS in a natural spline

form, there was also a clear trend that a higher IRRS was associated with poorer survival (Supplemental Figure 4).

Results were consistent in direction across histotype, with the exception of mucinous cancers which showed no association (Table 3). These results were consistent when follow-up was restricted to the first five years after diagnosis, when most deaths are due to ovarian cancer itself. Also, there was still an association between the IRRS and survival after removing BMI and MHT from the score; patients in the second, third, and highest quartiles of the IRRS had 3%, 11% and 18% higher death rate, respectively, compared to the lowest quartile (per quartile (HR=1.06, 95% CI 1.00-1.12, p=0.043 per quartile).

Sensitivity analyses using a categorical BMI variable rather than a continuous variable did not change the results. In the training set, being obese was statistically significantly associated with 12% increased death rate (95% CI 1.00-1.25, p=0.042). We created an IRRS using BMI categories in the test set and found an increased death rate per quartile of the IRRS (HR=1.08, 95% CI 1.03-1.14, p=0.001) which was nearly identical to the result with continuous BMI (HR=1.09). Similarly, replacing recency of lifetime alcohol consumption by grams/day did not change the results. In the training set, the consumption of an additional 100 grams of alcohol per day was associated with 9% increased death rate (95% CI 0.88-1.35, p=0.41). There was also an increased death rate per quartile increase in the IRRS created using grams/day alcohol consumption (HR=1.07, 95% CI 1.02-1.13, p=0.004) which was similar to the result with categories of alcohol consumption.

In the sensitivity analysis using a backward stepwise selection approach, only BMI (HR=1.01, 95% CI 1.00-1.02, p=0.02 for one additional kg/m^2) and MHT use for 5+ years (HR=0.84, 95% CI 0.75-0.92, p=0.001) compared to never use) were selected to be in the final

model in the training set. In the test set, the IRRS created from only BMI and MHT use for 5+ years was statistically significantly assocociated with death rate (per quartile HR=1.05, 95% CI 1.01-1.09). Patients in the second, third, and highest quartiles of the IRRS had 9%, 8% and 17% higher death rate, respectively, compared to the lowest quartile.

DISCUSSION

The present analyses evaluated the combined effects of multiple inflammation-related exposures using a risk score for ovarian cancer survival in thousands of women across Australia and the U.S. in the OCAC. Our results suggest that inflammation-related exposures play a role in survival with ovarian cancer. Women in the highest quartile of the IRRS compared to those in the lowest had a 31% higher death rate. There was a clear trend of increasing risk of death per quartile increase of the IRRS (p=0.001).

Previous work suggests possible mechanisms by which inflammatory factors impact cancer survival. The complex interplay between inflammation and the immune system is key to these processes. For example, tumors infiltrated by intraepithelial effector T cells predict better patient survival[49,50], while tumors infiltrated by immunosuppressive regulatory T cells confer poor prognosis[51]. A systemic immune-inflammation index, which integrates neutrophils, lymphocytes, and platelet counts, also predicts overall survival and progression-free survival among women with ovarian carcinoma[52]. Another study found that low absolute lymphocyte count (ALC) at the time of diagnosis was prognostic of poor survival of HGSC, an effect that was independent of intraepithelial CD8+ T cell density[53]. Notably, however, pre-diagnostic (2+ years prior to diagnosis) ALC values showed no prognostic effect, suggesting that tumor-induced decline of ALC is a more significant prognostic factor. The pre-diagnosis exposures we studied likely impact the development of the tumor and its microenvironment, including the immune

response. Our results suggest that lifestyle exposures associated with inflammation may contribute to these prognostic effects and provide new opportunities for intervention.

Several biologic mechanisms may explain the observed relationship between increased BMI and decreased survival, including chronic inflammation and lower immune function. Ovarian cancer cells localize to the omentum and take up lipids which provide energy[55]. This insight also provides the potential therapeutic targets of lipid metabolism and transport. Additionally, the enzyme nicotinamide N-methyltransferase (NNMT) regulates methyl metabolism and has been linked to body composition regulation and obesity[56]. NNMT is highly expressed in the stroma surrounding ovarian cancer metastases. NNMT has important roles in regulating the epigenetic landscape, and NNMT expression contribute to the conversion of normal fibroblasts to cancer-associated fibroblasts[57]. These findings support the further exploration of possible inhibitors of NNMT to halt or slow ovarian cancer progression.

Our findings of the beneficial effect of MHT use and the detrimental effect of smoking were also consistent with previous findings and proposed biologic mechanisms. Our previous findings with OCAC data showed a positive prognostic impact of MHT use of at least five years prior to diagnosis; this association may be partly explained with evidence that estrogen has anti-inflammatory properties[58-60]. In addition to evidence that hormone status alters the course of many common inflammatory disease processes, there is molecular evidence that activation of the estrogen receptor accelerates resolution phase of the inflammation in macrophages[61]. On the other hand, cigarette smoke and environmental cigarette smoke exposure are pro-inflammatory. Tobacco smoke exposure directly causes cellular changes that increase production of pro-inflammatory cytokines[62,63] and enhance recruitment of immune cells[64] not only in lung but at the systemic level as well. The association of former (but not current) alcohol use with decreased

survival was somewhat surprising and could simplybe due to chance or reflect the lack of important detail in this variable. Quantity of current consumption is likely important as alcohol has anti-inflammatory effects at low levels[65] and pro-inflammatory effects at high levels (once there is liver damage). A future, more comprehensive analysis of this exposure will be informative.

BMI and MHT use for 5+ years appeared to contribute the most to survival. These two factors were the only ones significantly associated with survival in the training set (Table 2). In the sensitivity analysis using a backward stepwise approach, only these two factors were selected in the final model. However, the magnitude of the association between survival and the IRRS created using only BMI and MHT use for 5+ years was smaller than that between survival and the IRRS including all 12 factors, which indicates that other factors also mattered. This is consistent with our sensitivity analysis result that there was still an association between the IRRS and survival after removing BMI and MHT from the score. We therefore kept all factors in the score.

The strengths of this study include the novel analytic approach, the large sample from harmonized data across 11 studies, the ability to take a training and test set approach, and the clear link between the epidemiology and a well-established biologic mechanism around inflammation and survival. There are also a few limitations to our study. First, exposure missingness necessitated imputation of exposures. Because certain variables were completely missing at some OCAC sites (Supplemental Figure 1), we cannot rule out the possibility that imputation relied on the relationship between variables that ideally should have only been applied within site. We did imputation by region separately (Australia vs U.S.), allowing for regional differences in the distributions of the predictors. We also recognize that the inferences

drawn from the analysis would be even more convincing with confirmation that the exposure-survival relationships was correlated with the strength of the exposure-inflammation relationship. Because we do not have the relevant biomarkers of inflammation for these data, this could not be confirmed. Also, although we have accounted for education level, it is possible that we have residual confounding related to socio-economic status which could be related to access to better health care.

This analysis was based on *pre*-diagnosis exposures, but because pre-diagnosis exposures and behaviors are often correlated with post-diagnosis exposures and behaviors[66,67], the effect of a measured pre-diagnosis exposure may be due at least in part to the post-diagnosis exposure; for instance, certain diet and lifestyle factor may remain consistent. Hansen and colleagues in a related analysis have shown that both pre- and post-diagnosis exposures are relevant[68]. In their study of ovarian cancer survivors, they generated a healthy lifestyle index including smoking status, BMI, physical activity, diet, and alcohol consumption based on both pre- and post-diagnosis exposures. Women in the highest tertile of the health lifestyle index were 21% less likely to die based on pre-diagnosis exposures and 39% less likely to die based on post-diagnosis exposures compared to those in the lowest tertile (95% CIs 0.59-1.04 and 0.40-0.93, respectively)[68].

Our findings highlight potential ovarian cancer biology and offer insight into the combined effect of inflammation-related factors on ovarian cancer survival. Using data from multiple regions in the U.S. and Australia extends the representativeness of these findings. Survival cohorts should aim to collect information about medications and behavior post-diagnosis to examine whether these relationships that we have found remain consistent with use after diagnosis. Because many contributors to inflammation are modifiable, their associations

with survival can ultimately be used to motivate and develop behavioral recommendations to enhance survival among people with ovarian cancer. These factors also have the potential to be included in risk stratification tools to identify women with a high risk of mortality who may need further tertiary prevention strategies. Future work should continue to explore the role of inflammation-related factors in ovarian cancer survival, using advanced methods to allow for summary of inflammation information. Further, both pre- and post-diagnosis exposures should be examined, including the incorporation of laboratory measures and tumor characteristics. Also, conducting integrated analyses incorporating detailed tumor characteristics such as immune infiltration status, sequencing data, and copy number variation with epidemiologic exposures before and after diagnosis will be informative with respect to prognosis among ovarian cancer patients.

Acknowledgements

The Ovarian Cancer Association Consortium is supported by a grant from the Ovarian Cancer Research Fund thanks to donations by the family and friends of Kathryn Sladek Smith (PPD/RPCI.07 to A. Berchuck). The scientific development and funding for this project were in part supported by the US National Cancer Institute GAME-ON Post-GWAS Initiative (U19-CA148112 to C.L. Pearce and J.M. Schildkraut).

Funding for individual studies: **AUS:** The Australian Ovarian Cancer Study (AOCS) was supported by the U.S. Army Medical Research and Materiel Command (DAMD17-01-1-0729 to D.D.L. Bowtell and P.M. Webb); National Health & Medical Research Council of Australia (199600, 400413 and 400281 to D.D.L. Bowtell and P.M. Webb); Cancer Councils of New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland, South Australia and Tasmania and Cancer Foundation of Western Australia (Multi-State Applications 191, 211 and 182 to D.D.L. Bowtell and P.M. Webb). AOCS gratefully acknowledges additional support from Ovarian Cancer Australia and the Peter MacCallum Foundation; Dr D.D.L. Bowtell is supported by the National Health and Medical Research Council of Australia (NHMRC; APP1117044, APP1161198, APP1092856); Dr. P.M. Webb is supported by NHMRC Investigator Grant APP1173346; **CON:** National Institutes of Health (R01-CA063678, R01-CA074850, and R01-CA080742 to H.A. Risch); **DOV:** National Institutes of Health (R01-CA112523 and R01-CA87538 to J.A. Doherty); **HAW:** U.S. National Institutes of Health (R01-CA58598, N01-CN-55424 and N01-PC-67001 to M.T. Goodman); **HOP:** University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine Dean's Faculty Advancement Award (to F. Modugno), Department of Defense (DAMD17-02-1-0669 to F. Modugno) and NCI (K07-CA080668 to F. Modugno; P50-CA159981 and R01-CA126841 to K.B. Moysich; R01-CA95023 and MO1-RR000056 to F. Modugno and K.B. Moysich); **MAY:** National Institutes of Health (R01-CA122443, P30-CA15083, and P50-CA136393 to E.L. Goode); Mayo Foundation; Minnesota Ovarian Cancer Alliance; Fred C. and Katherine B. Andersen Foundation (to E.L. Goode); **NCO:** National Institutes of Health (R01-CA76016 to A. Berchuck and J.M. Schildkraut) and the Department of Defense (DAMD17-02-1-0666 to A. Berchuck); **NEC:** National Institutes of Health (R01-CA54419 and P50-CA105009 to D.W. Cramer) and Department of Defense (W81XWH-10-1-02802 to K.L. Terry); **NJO:** National Cancer Institute (NIH-K07 CA095666, R01-CA83918, NIH-K22-CA138563 and P30-CA072720 to E.V. Bandera) and the Cancer Institute of New Jersey (to E.V. Bandera); **UCI:** NIH (R01-CA058860 to H. Anton-Culver) and the Lon V Smith Foundation (grant LVS-39420 to H. Anton-Culver); **USC:** National Institutes of Health (P01CA17054, N01PC67010, N01CN025403 to A.H. Wu, M.C. Pike and C.L. Pearce; P30CA14089 to A.H. Wu and M.C. Pike; R01CA61132 to M.C. Pike; R03CA113148 and R03CA115195 to C.L. Pearce); and California Cancer Research Program (00-01389V-20170 to M.C. Pike and C.L. Pearce; 2II0200 to A.H. Wu); Dr M.C. Pike is partially supported by the NIH/NCI Support Grant P30 CA008748 to Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center.

We are grateful to the family and friends of Kathryn Sladek Smith for their generous support of the Ovarian Cancer Association Consortium through their donations to the Ovarian Cancer Research Fund. We thank the study participants, doctors, nurses, clinical and scientific collaborators, health care providers and health information sources who have contributed to the many studies contributing to this manuscript.

Acknowledgements for individual studies: **AUS:** The AOCS also acknowledges the cooperation of the participating institutions in Australia, and the contribution of the study nurses, research

assistants and all clinical and scientific collaborators. The complete AOCS Study Group can be found at www.aocstudy.org. We would like to thank all of the women who participated in this research program; **CON:** The cooperation of the 32 Connecticut hospitals, including Stamford Hospital, in allowing patient access, is gratefully acknowledged. This study was approved by the State of Connecticut Department of Public Health Human Investigation Committee. Certain data used in this study were obtained from the Connecticut Tumor Registry in the Connecticut Department of Public Health. The authors assume full responsibility for analyses and interpretation of these data; **NJO**: Drs. Sara Olson, Lisa Paddock, and Lorna Rodriguez, and research staff at the Rutgers Cancer Institute of New Jersey, Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center, and the New Jersey State Cancer Registry**.**

REFERENCES

1. Ferguson LR. Chronic inflammation and mutagenesis. *Mutat Res*. Aug 7 2010;690(1-2):3-11. doi:10.1016/j.mrfmmm.2010.03.007
2. Kawanishi S, Ohnishi S, Ma N, Hiraku Y, Murata M. Crosstalk between DNA Damage and Inflammation in the Multiple Steps of Carcinogenesis. *Int J Mol Sci*. Aug 19 2017;18(8)doi:10.3390/ijms18081808
3. Faber MT, Kjaer SK, Dehlendorff C, et al. Cigarette smoking and risk of ovarian cancer: a pooled analysis of 21 case-control studies. *Cancer Causes Control*. May 2013;24(5):989-1004. doi:10.1007/s10552-013-0174-4
4. Zhou Z, Zeng F, Yuan J, et al. Pelvic inflammatory disease and the risk of ovarian cancer: a meta-analysis. *Cancer Causes Control*. May 2017;28(5):415-428. doi:10.1007/s10552-017-0873-3
5. Trabert B, Ness RB, Lo-Ciganic WH, et al. Aspirin, nonaspirin nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drug, and acetaminophen use and risk of invasive epithelial ovarian cancer: a pooled analysis in the Ovarian Cancer Association Consortium. *J Natl Cancer Inst*. Feb 2014;106(2):djt431. doi:10.1093/jnci/djt431
6. Risch HA, Howe GR. Pelvic inflammatory disease and the risk of epithelial ovarian cancer. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev*. Jul-Aug 1995;4(5):447-51.
7. Ness RB, Grisso JA, Cottreau C, et al. Factors related to inflammation of the ovarian epithelium and risk of ovarian cancer. *Epidemiology*. Mar 2000;11(2):111-7. doi:10.1097/00001648-200003000-00006
8. Brilhante AV, Augusto KL, Portela MC, et al. Endometriosis and Ovarian Cancer: an Integrative Review (Endometriosis and Ovarian Cancer). *Asian Pac J Cancer Prev*. Jan 1 2017;18(1):11-16. doi:10.22034/APJCP.2017.18.1.11
9. Cramer DW, Vitonis AF, Terry KL, Welch WR, Titus LJ. The Association Between Talc Use and Ovarian Cancer: A Retrospective Case-Control Study in Two US States. *Epidemiology*. May 2016;27(3):334-46. doi:10.1097/EDE.0000000000000434
10. Nagle CM, Dixon SC, Jensen A, et al. Obesity and survival among women with ovarian cancer: results from the Ovarian Cancer Association Consortium. *Br J Cancer*. Sep 1 2015;113(5):817-26. doi:10.1038/bjc.2015.245
11. Cannioto RA, LaMonte MJ, Kelemen LE, et al. Recreational physical inactivity and mortality in women with invasive epithelial ovarian cancer: evidence from the Ovarian Cancer Association Consortium. *Br J Cancer*. Jun 28 2016;115(1):95-101. doi:10.1038/bjc.2016.153
12. Praestegaard C, Jensen A, Jensen SM, et al. Cigarette smoking is associated with adverse survival among women with ovarian cancer: Results from a pooled analysis of 19 studies. *Int J Cancer*. Jun 1 2017;140(11):2422-2435. doi:10.1002/ijc.30600
13. Merritt MA, Rice MS, Barnard ME, et al. Pre-diagnosis and post-diagnosis use of common analgesics and ovarian cancer prognosis (NHS/NHSII): a cohort study. *Lancet Oncol*. Aug 2018;19(8):1107-1116. doi:10.1016/S1470-2045(18)30373-5
14. Couttenier A, Lacroix O, Vaes E, Cardwell CR, De Schutter H, Robert A. Statin use is associated with improved survival in ovarian cancer: A retrospective population-based study. *PLoS One*. 2017;12(12):e0189233. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0189233
15. Mascarenhas C, Lambe M, Bellocco R, et al. Use of hormone replacement therapy before and after ovarian cancer diagnosis and ovarian cancer survival. *Int J Cancer*. Dec 15 2006;119(12):2907-15. doi:10.1002/ijc.22218

16. Nagle CM, Bain CJ, Green AC, Webb PM. The influence of reproductive and hormonal factors on ovarian cancer survival. *Int J Gynecol Cancer*. May-Jun 2008;18(3):407-13. doi:10.1111/j.1525-1438.2007.01031.x
17. Shafrir AL, Babic A, Tamimi RM, Rosner BA, Tworoger SS, Terry KL. Reproductive and hormonal factors in relation to survival and platinum resistance among ovarian cancer cases. *Br J Cancer*. Nov 22 2016;115(11):1391-1399. doi:10.1038/bjc.2016.316
18. Kim SJ, Rosen B, Fan I, et al. Epidemiologic factors that predict long-term survival following a diagnosis of epithelial ovarian cancer. *Br J Cancer*. Mar 28 2017;116(7):964-971. doi:10.1038/bjc.2017.35
19. Eeles RA, Morden JP, Gore M, et al. Adjuvant Hormone Therapy May Improve Survival in Epithelial Ovarian Cancer: Results of the AHT Randomized Trial. *J Clin Oncol*. Dec 10 2015;33(35):4138-44. doi:10.1200/JCO.2015.60.9719
20. Eeles RA, Tan S, Wiltshaw E, et al. Hormone replacement therapy and survival after surgery for ovarian cancer. *BMJ*. Feb 2 1991;302(6771):259-62. doi:10.1136/bmj.302.6771.259
21. Georgiadou P, Sbarouni E. Effect of hormone replacement therapy on inflammatory biomarkers. *Adv Clin Chem*. 2009;47:59-93.
22. Pradhan AD, Manson JE, Rossouw JE, et al. Inflammatory biomarkers, hormone replacement therapy, and incident coronary heart disease: prospective analysis from the Women's Health Initiative observational study. *JAMA*. Aug 28 2002;288(8):980-7. doi:10.1001/jama.288.8.980
23. Lamon-Fava S, Posfai B, Schaefer EJ. Effect of hormonal replacement therapy on C-reactive protein and cell-adhesion molecules in postmenopausal women. *Am J Cardiol*. Jan 15 2003;91(2):252-4. doi:10.1016/s0002-9149(02)03121-1
24. Anderson GL, Limacher M, Assaf AR, et al. Effects of conjugated equine estrogen in postmenopausal women with hysterectomy: the Women's Health Initiative randomized controlled trial. *JAMA*. Apr 14 2004;291(14):1701-12. doi:10.1001/jama.291.14.1701
25. Walsh BW, Cox DA, Sashegyi A, Dean RA, Tracy RP, Anderson PW. Role of tumor necrosis factor-alpha and interleukin-6 in the effects of hormone replacement therapy and raloxifene on C-reactive protein in postmenopausal women. *Am J Cardiol*. Oct 1 2001;88(7):825-8. doi:10.1016/s0002-9149(01)01865-3
26. Cannioto RA, Trabert B, Poole EM, Schildkraut JM. Ovarian cancer epidemiology in the era of collaborative team science. *Cancer Causes Control*. May 2017;28(5):487-495. doi:10.1007/s10552-017-0862-6
27. Minlikeeva AN, Cannioto R, Jensen A, et al. Joint exposure to smoking, excessive weight, and physical inactivity and survival of ovarian cancer patients, evidence from the Ovarian Cancer Association Consortium. *Cancer Causes Control*. May 2019;30(5):537-547. doi:10.1007/s10552-019-01157-3
28. Pearce CL, Templeman C, Rossing MA, et al. Association between endometriosis and risk of histological subtypes of ovarian cancer: a pooled analysis of case-control studies. *Lancet Oncol*. Apr 2012;13(4):385-94. doi:10.1016/S1470-2045(11)70404-1
29. Rasmussen CB, Kjaer SK, Albieri V, et al. Pelvic Inflammatory Disease and the Risk of Ovarian Cancer and Borderline Ovarian Tumors: A Pooled Analysis of 13 Case-Control Studies. *Am J Epidemiol*. 01 01 2017;185(1):8-20. doi:10.1093/aje/kww161
30. Harris HR, Babic A, Webb PM, et al. Polycystic Ovary Syndrome, Oligomenorrhea, and Risk of Ovarian Cancer Histotypes: Evidence from the Ovarian Cancer Association Consortium.

Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev. 02 2018;27(2):174-182. doi:10.1158/1055-9965.EPI-17-0655
31. Brieger KK, Peterson S, Lee AW, et al. Menopausal hormone therapy prior to the diagnosis of ovarian cancer is associated with improved survival. *Gynecol Oncol*. Jul 2020;doi:10.1016/j.ygyno.2020.06.481
32. Trabert B, Ness RB, Lo-Ciganic WH, et al. Aspirin, nonaspirin nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drug, and acetaminophen use and risk of invasive epithelial ovarian cancer: a pooled analysis in the Ovarian Cancer Association Consortium. *J Natl Cancer Inst*. Feb 2014;106(2):djt431. doi:10.1093/jnci/djt431
33. Terry KL, Karageorgi S, Shvetsov YB, et al. Genital powder use and risk of ovarian cancer: a pooled analysis of 8,525 cases and 9,859 controls. *Cancer Prev Res (Phila)*. Aug 2013;6(8):811-21. doi:10.1158/1940-6207.CAPR-13-0037
34. Merritt MA, Green AC, Nagle CM, Webb PM, Australian Cancer Study (Ovarian Cancer), Australian Ovarian Cancer Study Group. Talcum powder, chronic pelvic inflammation and NSAIDs in relation to risk of epithelial ovarian cancer. *Int J Cancer*. Jan 2008;122(1):170-6. doi:10.1002/ijc.23017
35. Risch HA, Bale AE, Beck PA, Zheng W. PGR +331 A/G and increased risk of epithelial ovarian cancer. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev*. Sep 2006;15(9):1738-41. doi:10.1158/1055-9965.EPI-06-0272
36. Bodelon C, Cushing-Haugen KL, Wicklund KG, Doherty JA, Rossing MA. Sun exposure and risk of epithelial ovarian cancer. *Cancer Causes Control*. Dec 2012;23(12):1985-94. doi:10.1007/s10552-012-0076-x
37. Lurie G, Terry KL, Wilkens LR, et al. Pooled analysis of the association of PTGS2 rs5275 polymorphism and NSAID use with invasive ovarian carcinoma risk. *Cancer Causes Control*. Oct 2010;21(10):1731-41. doi:10.1007/s10552-010-9602-x
38. Ness RB, Dodge RC, Edwards RP, Baker JA, Moysich KB. Contraception methods, beyond oral contraceptives and tubal ligation, and risk of ovarian cancer. *Ann Epidemiol*. Mar 2011;21(3):188-96. doi:10.1016/j.annepidem.2010.10.002
39. Kelemen LE, Sellers TA, Schildkraut JM, et al. Genetic variation in the one-carbon transfer pathway and ovarian cancer risk. *Cancer Res*. Apr 2008;68(7):2498-506. doi:10.1158/0008-5472.CAN-07-5165
40. Schildkraut JM, Iversen ES, Wilson MA, et al. Association between DNA damage response and repair genes and risk of invasive serous ovarian cancer. *PLoS One*. Apr 2010;5(4):e10061. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0010061
41. Terry KL, De Vivo I, Titus-Ernstoff L, Shih MC, Cramer DW. Androgen receptor cytosine, adenine, guanine repeats, and haplotypes in relation to ovarian cancer risk. *Cancer Res*. Jul 2005;65(13):5974-81. doi:10.1158/0008-5472.CAN-04-3885
42. Bandera EV, King M, Chandran U, Paddock LE, Rodriguez-Rodriguez L, Olson SH. Phytoestrogen consumption from foods and supplements and epithelial ovarian cancer risk: a population-based case control study. *BMC Womens Health*. Sep 2011;11:40. doi:10.1186/1472-6874-11-40
43. Ziogas A, Gildea M, Cohen P, et al. Cancer risk estimates for family members of a population-based family registry for breast and ovarian cancer. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev*. Jan 2000;9(1):103-11.

44. Pike MC, Pearce CL, Peters R, Cozen W, Wan P, Wu AH. Hormonal factors and the risk of invasive ovarian cancer: a population-based case-control study. *Fertil Steril*. Jul 2004;82(1):186-95. doi:10.1016/j.fertnstert.2004.03.013
45. Wu AH, Pearce CL, Tseng CC, Templeman C, Pike MC. Markers of inflammation and risk of ovarian cancer in Los Angeles County. *Int J Cancer*. Mar 2009;124(6):1409-15. doi:10.1002/ijc.24091
46. Collins LM, Schafer JL, Kam CM. A comparison of inclusive and restrictive strategies in modern missing data procedures. *Psychol Methods*. Dec 2001;6(4):330-51.
47. Rubin DB. *Multiple imputation for nonresponse in surveys*. Wiley series in probability and mathematical statistics Applied probability and statistics,. Wiley; 1987:xxix, 258 p.
48. Van Buuren S. *Flexible imputation of missing data*. CRC press; 2018.
49. Zhang L, Conejo-Garcia JR, Katsaros D, et al. Intratumoral T cells, recurrence, and survival in epithelial ovarian cancer. *N Engl J Med*. Jan 16 2003;348(3):203-13. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa020177
50. Hwang WT, Adams SF, Tahirovic E, Hagemann IS, Coukos G. Prognostic significance of tumor-infiltrating T cells in ovarian cancer: a meta-analysis. *Gynecol Oncol*. Feb 2012;124(2):192-8. doi:10.1016/j.ygyno.2011.09.039
51. Sato E, Olson SH, Ahn J, et al. Intraepithelial CD8+ tumor-infiltrating lymphocytes and a high CD8+/regulatory T cell ratio are associated with favorable prognosis in ovarian cancer. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. Dec 20 2005;102(51):18538-43. doi:10.1073/pnas.0509182102
52. Nie D, Gong H, Mao X, Li Z. Systemic immune-inflammation index predicts prognosis in patients with epithelial ovarian cancer: A retrospective study. *Gynecol Oncol*. Feb 2019;152(2):259-264. doi:10.1016/j.ygyno.2018.11.034
53. Milne K, Alexander C, Webb JR, et al. Absolute lymphocyte count is associated with survival in ovarian cancer independent of tumor-infiltrating lymphocytes. *J Transl Med*. Feb 2012;10:33. doi:10.1186/1479-5876-10-33
54. Savant SS, Sriramkumar S, O'Hagan HM. The Role of Inflammation and Inflammatory Mediators in the Development, Progression, Metastasis, and Chemoresistance of Epithelial Ovarian Cancer. *Cancers (Basel)*. Jul 30 2018;10(8)doi:10.3390/cancers10080251
55. Nieman KM, Kenny HA, Penicka CV, et al. Adipocytes promote ovarian cancer metastasis and provide energy for rapid tumor growth. *Nat Med*. Oct 30 2011;17(11):1498-503. doi:10.1038/nm.2492
56. Zhou Q, Zhu XJ, Li JH. Association between Nicotinamide N-Methyltransferase Gene Polymorphisms and Obesity in Chinese Han Male College Students. *Biomed Res Int*. 2017;2017:2984826. doi:10.1155/2017/2984826
57. Eckert MA, Coscia F, Chryplewicz A, et al. Proteomics reveals NNMT as a master metabolic regulator of cancer-associated fibroblasts. *Nature*. May 2019;569(7758):723-728. doi:10.1038/s41586-019-1173-8
58. Martin-Millan M, Castaneda S. Estrogens, osteoarthritis and inflammation. *Joint Bone Spine*. Jul 2013;80(4):368-73. doi:10.1016/j.jbspin.2012.11.008
59. Ostensen M. Sex hormones and pregnancy in rheumatoid arthritis and systemic lupus erythematosus. *Ann N Y Acad Sci*. Jun 22 1999;876:131-43; discussion 144. doi:10.1111/j.1749-6632.1999.tb07630.x
60. Straub RH. The complex role of estrogens in inflammation. *Endocr Rev*. Aug 2007;28(5):521-74. doi:10.1210/er.2007-0001

61. Villa A, Rizzi N, Vegeto E, Ciana P, Maggi A. Estrogen accelerates the resolution of inflammation in macrophagic cells. *Sci Rep*. Oct 19 2015;5:15224. doi:10.1038/srep15224
62. Hellermann GR, Nagy SB, Kong X, Lockey RF, Mohapatra SS. Mechanism of cigarette smoke condensate-induced acute inflammatory response in human bronchial epithelial cells. *Respir Res*. 2002;3:22. doi:10.1186/rr172
63. Chung KF. Inflammatory mediators in chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. *Curr Drug Targets Inflamm Allergy*. Dec 2005;4(6):619-25. doi:10.2174/156801005774912806
64. Lee J, Taneja V, Vassallo R. Cigarette smoking and inflammation: cellular and molecular mechanisms. *J Dent Res*. Feb 2012;91(2):142-9. doi:10.1177/0022034511421200
65. Albert MA, Glynn RJ, Ridker PM. Alcohol consumption and plasma concentration of C-reactive protein. *Circulation*. Jan 28 2003;107(3):443-7. doi:10.1161/01.cir.0000045669.16499.ec
66. Anderson C, Sandler DP, Weinberg CR, et al. Age- and treatment-related associations with health behavior change among breast cancer survivors. *Breast*. Jun 2017;33:1-7. doi:10.1016/j.breast.2017.02.013
67. van Zutphen M, Boshuizen HC, Kok DE, et al. Colorectal cancer survivors only marginally change their overall lifestyle in the first 2 years following diagnosis. *J Cancer Surviv*. Dec 2019;13(6):956-967. doi:10.1007/s11764-019-00812-7
68. Hansen JM, Nagle CM, Ibiebele TI, et al. A healthy lifestyle and survival among women with ovarian cancer. *Int J Cancer*. 12 2020;147(12):3361-3369. doi:10.1002/ijc.33155

Table 1: Demographic and clinical information among women with ovarian carcinoma in the Ovarian Cancer Association Consortium (OCAC) included in analyses.

			All women (%)	Training set (%)	Test set (%)
			(N=8147)	(N=4073)	(N=4074)
Study site,Location, Years of recruitment					
AUS[34]	Australia	2001-2006	1054 (12.9%)	504 (12.4%)	550 (13.5%)
CON[35]	Connecticut, USA	1999-2003	308 (3.8%)	153 (3.8%)	155 (3.8%)
DOV[36]	western Washington, USA	2002-2009	849 (10.4%)	412 (10.1%)	437 (10.7%)
HAW[37]	Hawaii, USA	1994-2008	358 (4.4%)	194 (4.8%)	164 (4.0%)
HOP[38]	western Pennsylvania, northeast Ohio, western New York, USA	2003-2009	519 (6.4%)	273 (6.7%)	246 (6.0%)
MAY[39]	Iowa, Illinois, Minesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Wisconsin, USA	1999-2018	1017 (12.5%)	512 (12.6%)	505 (12.4%)
NCO[40]	North Carolina, USA	1999-2008	731 (9.0%)	362 (8.9%)	369 (9.1%)
NEC[41]	New Hampshire, eastern Massachusetts, USA	1992-2008	1306 (16.0%)	652 (16.0%)	654 (16.1%)
NJO[42]	New Jersey, USA	2005-2009	193 (2.4%)	96 (2.4%)	97 (2.4%)
UCI[43]	Southern California, USA	1994-2004	345 (4.2%)	172 (4.2%)	173 (4.2%)
USC[44,45]	Los Angeles County, California, USA	1994-2010	1467 (18.0%)	743 (18.2%)	724 (17.8%)
Histology					
Low-grade serous			326 (4.0%)	170 (4.2%)	156 (3.8%)
High-grade serous			5002 (61.4%)	2476 (60.8%)	2526 (62.0%)
Endometrioid			1508 (18.5%)	787 (19.3%)	721 (17.7%)
Mucinous			561 (6.9%)	263 (6.5%)	298 (7.3%)
Clear cell			750 (9.2%)	377 (9.3%)	373 (9.2%)
Stage					
Local			1539 (18.9%)	770 (18.9%)	769 (18.9%)
Regional			1448 (17.8%)	714 (17.5%)	734 (18.0%)
Distant			5160 (63.3%)	2589 (63.6%)	2571 (63.1%)
Age at diagnosis					
Mean (SD)			57.5 (11.3)	57.3 (11.3)	57.7 (11.2)
Median [Min, Max]			58.0 [20.0, 91.0]	57.0 [20.0, 91.0]	58.0 [20.0, 91.0]
Menopausal status					
Post-menopausal status			5790 (71.1%)	2877 (70.6%)	2913 (71.5%)
Pre-menopausal status			2357 (28.9%)	1196 (29.4%)	1161 (28.5%)
Education (%)					
Less than high school			877 (10.8%)	481 (11.8%)	396 (9.7%)
High school			2093 (25.7%)	1052 (25.8%)	1041 (25.6%)
Some college			2339 (28.7%)	1129 (27.7%)	1210 (29.7%)
College graduate or above			2611 (32.0%)	1300 (31.9%)	1311 (32.2%)
Missing			227 (2.8%)	111 (2.7%)	116 (2.8%)
Race/ethnicity					
Asian			406 (5.0%)	219 (5.4%)	187 (4.6%)

Black	232 (2.8%)	112 (2.7%)	120 (2.9%)
Hispanic White	289 (3.5%)	149 (3.7%)	140 (3.4%)
Non-Hispanic White	6954 (85.4%)	3456 (84.9%)	3498 (85.9%)
Other	229 (2.8%)	121 (3.0%)	108 (2.7%)
Missing	37 (0.5%)	16 (0.4%)	21 (0.5%)
BMI 1 year prior to diagnosis (kg/m^2)			
Mean (SD)	26.9 (6.30)	26.9 (6.41)	26.9 (6.19)
Median [Min, Max]	25.5 [13.7, 68.3]	25.6 [13.7, 62.5]	25.5 [15.6, 68.3]
Missing	827 (10.2%)	422 (10.4%)	405 (9.9%)
Physical inactivity			
No	4443 (54.5%)	2219 (54.5%)	2224 (54.6%)
Yes	1224 (15.0%)	633 (15.5%)	591 (14.5%)
Missing	2480 (30.4%)	1221 (30.0%)	1259 (30.9%)
Aspirin regular use			
No	3951 (48.5%)	1976 (48.5%)	1975 (48.5%)
Yes	916 (11.2%)	466 (11.4%)	450 (11.0%)
Missing	3280 (40.3%)	1631 (40.0%)	1649 (40.5%)
NSAID regular use			
No	3709 (45.5%)	1862 (45.7%)	1847 (45.3%)
Yes	1255 (15.4%)	618 (15.2%)	637 (15.6%)
Missing	3183 (39.1%)	1593 (39.1%)	1590 (39.0%)
Hormone therapy duration of use			
Never use	4744 (58.2%)	2392 (58.7%)	2352 (57.7%)
<5 years	1003 (12.3%)	486 (11.9%)	517 (12.7%)
5+ years	1280 (15.7%)	649 (15.9%)	631 (15.5%)
Missing	1120 (13.7%)	546 (13.4%)	574 (14.1%)
Environmental cigarette smoke			
No	1034 (12.7%)	530 (13.0%)	504 (12.4%)
Yes	3804 (46.7%)	1925 (47.3%)	1879 (46.1%)
Missing	3309 (40.6%)	1618 (39.7%)	1691 (41.5%)
Smoking status			
Never	4278 (52.5%)	2094 (51.4%)	2184 (53.6%)
Current	978 (12.0%)	520 (12.8%)	458 (11.2%)
Former	2505 (30.7%)	1270 (31.2%)	1235 (30.3%)
Missing	386 (4.7%)	189 (4.6%)	197 (4.8%)
Lifetime alcohol use			
Never	1671 (20.5%)	864 (21.2%)	807 (19.8%)
Current	1651 (20.3%)	815 (20.0%)	836 (20.5%)
Former	592 (7.3%)	294 (7.2%)	298 (7.3%)
Missing	4233 (52.0%)	2100 (51.6%)	2133 (52.4%)
History of polycystic ovary syndrome (PCOS)			
No	6519 (80.0%)	3257 (80.0%)	3262 (80.1%)

Yes	71 (0.9%)	39 (1.0%)	32 (0.8%)
Missing	1557 (19.1%)	777 (19.1%)	780 (19.1%)
History of pelvic inflammatory disease (PID)			
No	5933 (72.8%)	2963 (72.7%)	2970 (72.9%)
Yes	224 (2.7%)	111 (2.7%)	113 (2.8%)
Missing	1990 (24.4%)	999 (24.5%)	991 (24.3%)
History of endometriosis			
No	7065 (86.7%)	3515 (86.3%)	3550 (87.1%)
Yes	869 (10.7%)	447 (11.0%)	422 (10.4%)
Missing	213 (2.6%)	111 (2.7%)	102 (2.5%)
Talc use			
Never use	2242 (27.5%)	1168 (28.7%)	1074 (26.4%)
Use on genital area	1387 (17.0%)	691 (17.0%)	696 (17.1%)
Use on body/non-genital area	793 (9.7%)	398 (9.8%)	395 (9.7%)
Missing	3725 (45.7%)	1816 (44.6%)	1909 (46.9%)
Vital status			
Alive	3300 (40.5%)	1638 (40.2%)	1662 (40.8%)
Death	4847 (59.5%)	2435 (59.8%)	2412 (59.2%)
Follow-up years			
Mean (SD)	6.4 (4.87)	6.4 (4.86)	6.4 (4.88)
Median [Min, Max]	5.1 [0.1-26.2]	5.1 [0.1-26.2]	5.08 [0.1-25.6]

Table 2: Association (hazard ratio, 95% confidence interval, and p-value) of each inflammation-related variable to survival in the training set (n=4,073).

Variables		HR*	95% CI			p-value	I^2 (%)**
Lifetime alcohol use							
	Never	1.00					
	Current	1.00	0.90	-	1.11	0.944	0.0
	Former	1.11	0.96	-	1.27	0.149	0.0
Aspirin, regular use							
	No	1.00					
	Yes	0.93	0.82	-	1.04	0.191	0.0
NSAID, regular use							
	No	1.00					
	Yes	0.96	0.87	-	1.07	0.497	0.0
BMI one year prior to diagnosis	+1 kg/m^2	1.01	1.00	-	1.02	0.012	9.1
Environmental smoking							
	No	1.00					
	Yes	1.07	0.96	-	1.19	0.230	0.0
History of pelvic inflammatory disease (PID)							
	No	1.00					
	Yes	0.95	0.75	-	1.21	0.687	20.0
History of polycystic ovary syndrome (PCOS)							
	No	1.00					
	Yes	1.22	0.86	-	1.73	0.274	21.0
History of endometriosis							
	No	1.00					
	Yes	0.94	0.80	-	1.09	0.407	0.0
MHT duration use							
	Never use	1.00					
	Use <5 years	0.96	0.84	-	1.10	0.555	28.4
	Use 5+ years	0.83	0.74	-	0.93	0.001	26.7
Physical inactivity							
	No	1.00					
	Yes	1.08	0.97	-	1.20	0.151	0.0
Smoking							
	Never	1.00					
	Current	1.09	0.95	-	1.24	0.213	0.0
	Former	1.01	0.92	-	1.11	0.898	0.0

Talc use						
Never use						
Use on genital area	0.94	0.84	-	1.04	0.222	0.0
Use on non-genital area	0.95	0.84	-	1.08	0.463	0.0

*Hazard ratios (and 95% confidence intervals) were estimated from a Cox proportional hazards model, adjusted for stage at diagnosis, age at diagnosis, and education, stratified on menopausal status, race/ethnicity,histotype, and OCAC study site. The results were the pooled estimates from 50 imputed datasets.
**I^2 from meta-analyses of 11 studies for each variable.

Table 3. Hazard ratios (HR) and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) for the risk of death by quartile of the inflammation-related risk score (IRRS) for all women with ovarian cancer and by histotype.

	All (n=4,074)			High Grade Serous (n=2,526)			Endometrioid (n=721)			Clear Cell (n=373)			Mucinous (n=298)			Low Grade Serous (n=156)		
	HR*	95% CI		HR**	95% CI		HR**	95% CI		HR**	95% CI		HR**	95% CI		HR**	95% CI	
Quartile 1	1.0			1.0			1.0			1.0			1.0			1.0		
Quartile 2	1.13	0.97 -	1.31	1.10	0.92 -	1.31	1.17	0.73 -	1.87	1.33	0.68 -	2.62	0.70	0.25 -	1.95	1.36	0.46 -	4.00
Quartile 3	1.17	1.01 -	1.36	1.13	0.94 -	1.36	1.37	0.83 -	2.25	1.29	0.63 -	2.65	0.93	0.39 -	2.20	1.72	0.53 -	5.58
Quartile 4	1.31	1.11 -	1.54	1.22	1.02 -	1.46	1.65	1.02 -	2.67	1.39	0.72 -	2.68	1.03	0.40 -	2.67	2.09	0.73 -	6.03
Per Quartile	1.09	1.03 -	1.14	1.07	1.01 -	1.13	1.18	1.01 -	1.38	1.10	0.89 -	1.35	1.03	0.78 -	1.37	1.28	0.91 -	1.79

*stratified on histotype, race/ethnicity, menopausal status, and OCAC study site and adjusted for stage at diagnosis, age at diagnosis, and education level
**stratified on race/ethnicity, menopausal status, and OCAC study site and adjusted for stage at diagnosis, age at diagnosis, and education level

Cancer Epidemiology, Biomarkers & Prevention

AACR American Association for Cancer Research

High pre-diagnosis inflammation-related risk score associated with decreased ovarian cancer survival

Katharine K Brieger, Minh Tung Phung, Bhramar Mukherjee, et al.

Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev Published OnlineFirst November 17, 2021.