Relationship Between Oral Contraceptives and The Risk of Gliomas and Meningiomas : A Dose-response Meta-analysis and Systematic Review

Xin Yang, M.D, Feng liu, M.D, Jiawei Zheng, M.D, Wenke Cheng, M.D, Chao Zhao, M.D, Ji Di, M.D

PII: S1878-8750(20)32567-5

DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wneu.2020.11.175

Reference: WNEU 16453

To appear in: *World Neurosurgery* 

Received Date: 20 October 2020

Accepted Date: 30 November 2020

Please cite this article as: Yang X, Feng liu Zheng J, Cheng W, Zhao C, Di J, Relationship Between Oral Contraceptives and The Risk of Gliomas and Meningiomas :A Dose-response Meta-analysis and Systematic Review, *World Neurosurgery* (2021), doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wneu.2020.11.175.

This is a PDF file of an article that has undergone enhancements after acceptance, such as the addition of a cover page and metadata, and formatting for readability, but it is not yet the definitive version of record. This version will undergo additional copyediting, typesetting and review before it is published in its final form, but we are providing this version to give early visibility of the article. Please note that, during the production process, errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

© 2020 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.



# Relationship Between Oral Contraceptives and The Risk of Gliomas and Meningiomas : A Dose-response Meta-analysis and Systematic Review

Xin Yang<sup>1</sup>, Feng liu<sup>2</sup>, Jiawei Zheng<sup>3</sup>, Wenke Cheng<sup>4</sup>, Chao Zhao<sup>5</sup>, Ji Di<sup>1\*</sup>

1.Department of Oncology, Affiliated Hospital of Qinghai University.

2.Department of Obstetrics, Maternity and Child Health care of Zaozhuang.

3. Department of Cardiology, Shenzhen Nanshan Hospital.

4. Department of Cardiology, Zaozhuang Municipal Hospital.

5. Department of Neurosurgery, Zaozhuang Municipal Hospital.

\* Corresponding Author: Di Ji(<u>dj18@mails.tsinghua.edu.cn</u>),No.29 Tongren Road, Xining 810000,China;

Highest academic degrees for all authors: Xin Yang, Feng liu, Jiawei Zheng, Wenke Cheng,

Chao Zhao, M.D; Ji Di, PHD

Running Title: Oral Contraceptive and The Risk of Glioma and Meningioma

Abbreviations list: OCs, Oral contraceptives. MeSH, medical subject headings. ORs, odds

ratios.NOS, Newcastle-Ottawa scale.ICD, International Classification of Diseases.

# Relationship Between Oral Contraceptives and The Risk of Glioma and Meningioma : A Dose-response Meta-analysis and Systematic Review

#### Abstract

**Objective:** Glioma and meningioma are the most common primary brain tumors in adults. Epidemiological studies on the relationship between female hormone exposure and exogenous hormone use and the risk of meningioma and glioma in females have yielded inconsistent results.

**Methods:** Two investigators comprehensively retrieved three electronic databases, including Pubmed, Embase database, and Cochrane library. Finally, a total of 11 case-control studies were enrolled for meta-analysis. Meanwhile ,a dose-response meta-analyses were conducted.

**Results:** Compared with the non-OCs female users, the female OCs users might have reduced risk of glioma (RR 0.87,95%CI0.77-0.97;  $I^242.6\%$ ). However, there was no obvious evidence of an association between OCs use and the risk of meningioma in females (RR 0.99,95%CI0.87-1.13; $I^242.7\%$ ). Using OCs over 10years in females may significantly decrease the risk of glioma to 30% (RR 0.7,95%CI0.6 -0.81;  $I^20\%$ ). The dose-response meta-analyses indicated that the risk of glioma in females significantly decreased when the duration of oral OCs use was over7.5 year.

**Conclusions** In conclusion, OCs use may not increase the risks of glioma and meningioma in females. Instead, the long-term use of OCs may significantly decrease the risk of glioma, and the benefits are even more pronounced when the "time window" is beyond7.5 years. Nonetheless, the pooled results in this study suggest that OCs use may not elevate the risk of meningioma. Therefore, our conclusion should be validated and supplemented in future larger studies.

Keywords: oral contraceptives; Glioma; Meningioma; Meta-analysis

# Introduction

Glioma and meningioma are the most common primary brain tumors in adults<sup>[1]</sup>, but their precise pathogenesis has not been well established yet. High dose ionizing radiation<sup>[2-3]</sup>, genetic susceptibility<sup>[4-5]</sup> and some rare genetic diseases<sup>[6]</sup> have been identified as the risk factors, but only in a small proportion of cases. Other factors, such as mobile phone use <sup>[7-8]</sup>, head trauma <sup>[9]</sup>, family history<sup>[10-11]</sup> and oral contraceptive (OC)use<sup>[12-13]</sup>, have also been proposed as the risk factors, but they have not been validated yet. As reported in several studies, the incidence of meningioma and glioma is different depending on the sex. For example, meningioma is more frequently seen in women, with a female-to-male ratio of up to 3.5:1 in some age groups<sup>[14]</sup>, while glioma hasa higherincidence in males (7.10 per 100,000 person-years) than in females (5.01 per 100,000 person-years)<sup>[1]</sup>. Therefore, many scholars suggest that hormones may be one of the important factors affecting the development of these tumors. It is shown by some experimental evidence that, estrogen exposure may protect againstglioma by inhibiting glioma cell proliferation and promoting cell apoptosis <sup>[15-17]</sup>. In contrast, estrogen may also increase the risk of meningioma, and it is reported that meningioma cell lines exposed to estradiol or progesterones how higher proliferation rates<sup>[18]</sup>. Generally speaking, exogenous hormones, such as OC and hormone replacement therapy (HRT), have been extensively applied among the non-menopausal and postmenopausal females. HRT application displays a declining trend across postmenopausal women, whereas OC use shows an increasing trend<sup>[19]</sup>.OCs, the most common drug contraception method that can achieve a high contraception success rate, are mostly made up of synthetic estrogen and progesterone. However, there are inconsistent results from epidemiological studies on the relationship of female hormone exposure and exogenous hormone use with the risks of meningioma and glioma in females, and there is no evidence of a trend toward longer duration of hormone use<sup>[20-23]</sup>. To address these gaps, a systematic meta-analysis was conducted in the present work to investigate the association between OCs use and the risks of meningioma and glioma. In addition, a dose-response meta-analysis was also carried out to evaluate the effect of the duration of OCs use on the risks of meningioma and glioma.

### Methods

## Search Strategy

The present meta-analysis was performed following the protocols and guidelines in the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA)<sup>[24]</sup>. The databases, including Pubmed, Embase database and Cochrane library, were systemically searched to identify relevant articles published in English from inception to October 6<sup>th</sup>, 2020. In addition, the library was manually retrieved to avoid omitting any eligible article. To ensure a

comprehensive search, three sets of medical subject headings (MeSH) were adopted, including "Contraceptive Agents, Hormonal", "Meningioma" and "Glioma". Moreover, relevant previous meta-analyses and systematic reviews were also retrieved and included in the study<sup>[25-28]</sup>. The search strategy is displayed in *Appendix 1*.

## **Study Selection**

The study inclusion criteria were as follows: 1) Females had a history of hormonal contraceptive agent use, no history of glioma or meningioma or precancerous lesions. 2) The exposure was the use of hormonal contraceptive agents.3) Subjects who never used hormonal contraceptive agents were adopted as a control.4)The outcome was the risk of incidence of glioma or meningioma.5) The study type was limited to observational study or randomized controlled trial (RCT). 6).There were available data on the maximum adjustment risk ratios (RRs), odds ratios (ORs), hazard ratios (HRs), together with corresponding 95% confidence interval (CI) in the study. Meanwhile, the study exclusion criteria were shown below: 1). Females with nohistory of using hormonal contraceptive agents or with a history of glioma or meningioma or precancerous lesions were excluded. 2). The exposure was not the use of hormonal contraceptive agents.3) The outcome was the risk of incidence of non-glioma or non-meningioma.4).Conference abstracts, letters, and case reports were excluded.

# Data extraction and quality assessment

The following data, including first author, publication year, study type, country, date of recruitment, age, patient number, gliomaconfirmation, intervention, control number and outcomes, were extracted using the unified data list. In the meantime, the numbers of all participants and cases in the intervention and control groups were also recorded. Any disagreement or dispute in the process of data extraction was resolved through mutual negotiation. Besides, the Newcastle-Ottawa scale (NOS)<sup>[29]</sup> was utilized to assess the study quality, and the total score was 9. Specifically, studies with a NOS score over 6 stars were considered as high quality studies, while those with a NOS score less than 6 stars as low quality studies.

#### Statistical Analysis

The primary outcome in this study was qualitative analysis on the relationship of OCs use with the risks of glioma and meningioma. Generally, HR equaled to RR and was thus roughly considered as RR<sup>[30]</sup>.Meanwhile, ORs were transformed into RRs by the following

formula: RR=OR/[ $(1-P_0)+(P_0\times OR)$ ], where P<sub>0</sub>stands for the incidence of outcome in unexposed group<sup>[31]</sup>.Besides, the corresponding 95CI was transformed by the formula:  $SElog(RR)=SElog(OR)\times log(RR)/log(OR)$ <sup>[32]</sup>. The data were presented as RRs. Statistical heterogeneity was evaluated by the  $I^2$  statistic <sup>[33]</sup>, where the  $I^2$  values of 25%, 50% and 75% represented low, moderate and high inconsistency, respectively. Moreover, subgroup analysis and meta-regression were also performed to explore the potential sources of heterogeneity and to compare different groups. Sensitivity analysis was implemented by eliminating one study each time to test its impact on the pooled results. To more conservatively estimate the pooled RRs, the random effect model was adopted, since it was more capable of explaining the heterogeneity between studies. Further, the funnel plot was drawn to assess the publication bias by Begg's test and Egger's test<sup>[34-35]</sup>.

The secondary outcome in this study was the systematic assessment of the impact of OCs use duration on the risk of glioma or meningioma. To this end, a quantitative dose-response meta-analysis was conducted. For the maximum excavation of available studies, the robust error meta-regression method described by Xu and Doi<sup>[36]</sup> was adopted to establish the potential dose-response relationship of oral hormonal contraceptives use with the risk of glioma or meningioma. In this "one-stage" framework method, each included study was treated as a cluster across the whole population, which required that the studies include at least two categories. In this study, the restricted cubic spline was employed to fit the potential non-linear trend with three knots, and the nonlinear P-value was calculated by testing the second spline coefficient of zero. The nonlinear model was adopted when P for nonlinear  $\leq 0.05$ ; otherwise, the linear model was adopted. Generally speaking, the included studies should take the category of lowest dose as a reference. The original author was contacted when the number of cases in a category was missing. In addition, when the open intervals were studied, their amplitudes were assumed to be the same as those of adjacent categories <sup>[36]</sup>. All data were analyzed by Stata 12.0.

# Results

A total of 440 studies were retrieved from three electronic databases including PubMed, Embase, and the Cochrane library, as shown in *Figure 1*. No additional study was found by manual search. Among these440 studies, 50 were excluded due to duplication, while354were removed due to irrelevance after title and abstract reading. For the remaining 36 studies, the full-texts were carefully read and 16 were excluded due to the following reasons: a) reviews(n=7); b) the outcome was brain tumor (n=2); c) the subjects had no history of hormonal contraceptive (n=3); d) both male and female were exposed(n=1);e) letters and abstracts (n=3).Finally,

20observational studies <sup>[21-22, 37-54]</sup> were enrolled in the present meta-analysis, including 13 population-based case-controlled studies and 7 cohort studies. The baseline characteristics of all the enrolled studies are shown in *Table 1*. Among the 20 observational studies enrolled, 12 reported the relationship between OCs use and the risk of glioma, whereas13 reported the association between OCs use and the risk of meningioma. Quality assessment of the included studies is presented in *Supplementary Table 1*. Of these 20 studies, nine studies scored 8 stars; ten studies scored 7 stars; one study scored 6 stars. All studies scored higher than 6 stars and were considered as the high-quality studies.

#### Meta-analysis

#### OCs Users Vs. Non-OCs Users

As shown in *Figure 2*, 12 studies involving 1,844,503 participants reported the association between OCs use and the risk of glioma. Compared with the non-OCs female users, the female OCs users might have reduced risk of glioma (RR 0.87,95%CI0.77-0.97;  $I^2$ 42.6%). In addition, 13 studies recruiting 1,948,360 participants mentioned the association between OCs use and the risk of meningioma, as shown in *Figure 2*. Compared with the non-OCs female users, there was no obvious evidence of an association between OCs use and the risk of meningioma in females (RR 0.99,95%CI0.87-1.13; $I^2$ 42.7%).

The funnel plot showing the relationship between OCs use and the risks of glioma and meningioma in females is displayed in *Supplementary Figure 1*. Obviously, the funnel plot was asymmetrical, but there was no obvious evidence of publication bias upon Begg's (p=0.837)or Egger's test (p=0.843). Moreover, to explore the potential heterogeneity among diverse studies, this study carried out subgroup analysis and meta-regression, as exhibited in *Table 2*. Additionally, subgroup-analysis stratified by publication year, sample size, country, tumor confirmation and study design was carried out. As a result, the publication year after 2010, the sample size less than 500, the included studies from Europe and tumor confirmation by the International Classification of Diseases(ICD) were the potential sources of heterogeneity in glioma. Simultaneously, the publication year ascertainment by the medical records were the possible sources of heterogeneity in meningioma. Nonetheless, the above-mentioned factors made no contribution to inter-study heterogeneity, as suggested by meta-regression analysis. Sensitivity analysis on the relationship between OCs use and the risks of glioma and meningioma in females is shown in *Supplementary Figure 2*. The pooled results only changed mildly when one study was removed a time.

## Duration of OCs use

As observed from *Figure 3*, compared with non-OCs users, there was no significant increase in the risk of glioma among females who used OCs for less than 1 year (RR 0.86, 95%CI 0.7-1.06;I<sup>2</sup>41.8%).

However, OCs use for1-10years in females might significantly decrease the risk of glioma to17% (RR 0.83,95%CI0.0.74-0.93; $I^20$ %).Similarly, it was indicated that OCs use for over 10 years might decrease the risk of glioma in females compared with that in non-OCs users (RR 0.7,95%CI0.6 -0.81;  $I^20$ %).

It was illustrated from *Figure 4* that, compared with non-OCs users, there was no significant increase in the risk of meningioma among females who used OCs for less than 1 year (RR 0.99,95% CI0.8-1.22;  $I^20\%$ ). In addition, similar results were found in the groups with OCs use for 1-10 years and over 10 years, with (RR1.16,95%CI0.95-1.42; $I^20\%$ ) and (RR0.99,95% CI0.78-1.25; $I^20\%$ ), respectively.

## Dose-response Meta-analyses

According to *Figure 5*, 11 studies involving1,844,146 participants satisfied the dose-response for the relationship between OCs use and the risk of glioma. The results showed that there was a positive non-linear correlation between the duration of OCs use and the risk of glioma ( $P_{nonlinear}$ =0.004). With the increase in the years of oral OCs use, the risk of glioma in females decreased gradually. Specifically, the risk of glioma in females significantly decreased when the duration of oral OCs use was over7.5 years, while there was no significant association between OCs use and the risk of glioma when the duration was less than 7.5 years.

It was found in *Figure 6* that, 9 studies involving1,527,165participants met the dose-response for the relationship between OCs use and the risk of meningioma. Clearly, there was a non-linear correlation between the duration of OCs use and the risk of meningioma ( $P_{nonlinear}=0.033$ ). However, with the increase in the years of oral OCs use, there was no distinct evidence on the relationship between OCs use and the risk of meningioma.

# Discussion

Findings in the present meta-analysis involving 2,138,608 participants suggested that, the use of OCs might not increase the risk of glioma or meningioma. Conversely, as time went by, long-term use of OCs might significantly decrease the risk of glioma, and the "critical point" seemed to be 7.5 years. However, results of qualitative analysis indicated that OCs use might not increase the risk of meningioma, and similar results were reported in dose-response analysis.

OCs are the most common drug contraception method that can achieve a high contraceptive success rate, and they are mostly made up of synthetic estrogen and progesterone. OCs, one of the sources of exogenous hormone intake, are still controversial about their relationship with the risks of meningioma and glioma. A study by Andersen L et al. <sup>[45]</sup>suggested that, long-term hormonal contraceptive use might increase the risk of glioma, which was possibly related to the fact that progesterone promoted the proliferation of high-grade astrocytoma cells <sup>[55]</sup> and the levels of growth factors <sup>[56]</sup>, and the progesterone receptor (PR) mRNA or protein expression increases as the glioma grade elevates<sup>[57]</sup>. However, a study by Krishnamachari B et al. <sup>[39]</sup> showed that, OCs use decreased the risk of glioma, which was because that the hormone promoted the expression of Th2 cytokines that had certain protective effects on glioblastoma<sup>[58]</sup>. Further, some epidemiological and observational studies also reveal that, hormonal regulation plays a certain role in meningioma genesis and development. The PR expression level is found to be negatively correlated with histological grade and the high meningioma relapse rate; besides, oral contraception may down-regulate PR expression, thereby leading to an increased risk of meningioma<sup>[41,59-60]</sup>. Nonetheless, Guevara P et al. discovered that the PR level was not related to the relapse of meningioma<sup>[61]</sup>. Furthermore, the biological data-based studies in vitro indicate that, estradiol or progesterone application promotes meningioma cell proliferation<sup>[62]</sup>, whereas estrogen suppresses glioma cell growth<sup>[63-64]</sup>.In recent years, Peyre M et al. first illustrated the specific mutational landscape in progesterone-related meningioma occurrence from the molecular biology perspective, where the hormone-induced PIK3CA gene mutations were found to be involved. But our pooled results revealed that OCs use was not related to the risk of meningioma. The diverse types of hormones are well recognized to exert different functions in meningioma and glioma, but no further precise analysis can be conducted due to the limited existing data. Future research must focus on hormone type differentiation. Moreover, the mechanisms by which OCs use affects the risks of glioma and meningioma should be further clarified in more future studies.

Note worthily, our meta-analysis has the following strengths. Firstly, to the best of our knowledge, this is the first systemic and qualitative meta-analysis. Meanwhile, the results of

qualitative meta-analysis were further validated by the dose-response meta-analysis. Secondly, OCs use is one of the complementary sources of exogenous sex hormones, which has not been well explained to be related to meningioma or glioma. This study partially explained the problem. More importantly, this study found that long-term use of oral OCs might reduce the risk of glioma, which provided a direction for future study. Thirdly, the quality of our enrolled studies was high, which guaranteed the reliability of the results.

Inevitably, several limitations should be noted in this study. Firstly, due to the limited number of existing studies, subgroup analysis stratified by race, age and parity was not performed. Secondly, although the results of most studies were adjusted according to the maximum covariates, the influence of residual confounding variables was not excluded. Thirdly, most studies did not report the specific sex hormone components in OCs, therefore, difference in the sex hormone contraceptive might lead to a certain difference in the pooled results. Fourthly, it was suggested that OCs use did not elevate the risk of meningioma according to the limited existing data, but the risk of other possible diseases was not eliminated.

In conclusion, OCs use may not increase the risks of glioma and meningioma in females. Instead, the long-term use of OCs may significantly decrease the risk of glioma, and the benefits are even more pronounced when the "time window" is beyond7.5 years. Nonetheless, the pooled results in this study suggest that OCs use may not elevate the risk of meningioma. Therefore, our conclusion should be validated and supplemented in future larger studies.

Acknowledgements: Thanks to reviewers and editors for correcting the shortcomings of this article during the review of this paper.

Disclosures: The authors have no conflicts of interest to disclose.

Sources of Funding: None.

### Figure legends

Figure 1. Flowchart of the study retrieval process.

**Figure 2.** Forest plots of OCs use and the risks of glioma and meningioma regardless of the use duration.

**Figure 3.** Forest plots of OCs use and the risk of glioma according to the different use duration.

**Figure 4.** Forest plots of OCs use and the risk of meningioma according to the differentuse duration.

Figure 5. The dose-response of glioma.

Figure 6. The dose-response of meningioma.

Supplementary Figure 1. Funnel plot of the risks of glioma and meningioma.

Supplementary Figure 2. Sensitivity analysis on the risk of glioma and meningioma.

## Reference

- Ostrom Q T, Gittleman H, Farah P, et al. CBTRUS statistical report: Primary brain and central nervous system tumors diagnosed in the United States in 2006-2010[J]. Neuro-oncology, 2013, 15(suppl\_2): ii1-ii56.
- Preston DL, Ron E, Yonehara S, Kobuke T, Fujii H, Kishikawa M, Tokunaga M, Tokuoka S, Mabuchi K (2002) Tumors of the nervous system and pituitary gland associated with atomic bomb radiation exposure. J Natl Cancer Inst 94(20):1555–1563
- Ron E, Modan B, Boice JD Jr, Alfandary E, Stovall M, Chetrit A, Katz L (1988) Tumors of the brain and nervous system after radiotherapy in childhood. N Engl J Med 319(16):1033–1039
- Shete S, Hosking F J, Robertson L B, et al. Genome-wide association study identifies five susceptibility loci for glioma. Nature genetics, 2009, 41(8): 899-904.
- 5. Wrensch M, Jenkins R B, Chang J S, et al. Variants in the CDKN2B and RTEL1 regions are associated with high-grade glioma susceptibility[J]. Nature genetics, 2009, 41(8): 905-908.
- Gu J, Liu Y, Kyritsis A P, et al. Molecular epidemiology of primary brain tumors. Neurotherapeutics, 2009, 6(3): 427-435.
- Hardell L, Carlberg M. Mobile phones, cordless phones and the risk for brain tumours. Int J Oncol 2009;35(1):5–17.
- Hardell L, Carlberg M, Hansson Mild K. Pooled analysis of case-control studies on malignant brain tumours and the use of mobile and cordless phones including living and deceased subjects. Int J Oncol 2011;38(5):1465–74.

- Phillips LE, Koepsell TD, van Belle G, Kukull WA, Gehrels JA, Longstreth Jr WT. History of head trauma and risk of intracranial meningioma: population-based case-control study. Neurology 2002;58(12):1849–52.
- Hemminki K, Tretli S, Sundquist J, Johannesen TB, Granstrom C. Familial risks in nervous-system tumours: a histology-specific analysis from Sweden and Norway. Lancet Oncol 2009;10(5):481–8.
- Smith MJ, Higgs JE, Bowers NL, Halliday D, Paterson J, Gillespie J, et al. Cranial meningiomas in 411 neurofibromatosis type 2 (NF2) patients with proven gene mutations: clear positional effect of mutations, but absence of female severity effect on age at onset. J Med Genet 2011;48(4):261–5.
- Cowppli-Bony A, Bouvier G, Rué M, Loiseau H, Vital A, Lebailly P, Fabbro-Peray P, Baldi I. Brain tumors and hormonal factors: review of the epidemiological literature. Cancer Causes Control 2011; 22: 697–714.
- 13. Qi ZY, Shao C, Zhang X, Hui GZ, Wang Z. Exogenous and endogenous hormones in relation to glioma in women: ameta-analysis of 11 case-control studies. PLoS ONE 2013; 8:e68695.
- Klaeboe L, Lonn S, Scheie D, Auvinen A, Christensen HC, Feychting M, et al. Incidence of intracranial meningiomas in Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden, 1968–1997. Int J Cancer 2005;117(6):996–1001.
- De Nicola A F, Brocca M E, Pietranera L, et al. Neuroprotection and sex steroid hormones: evidence of estradiol-mediated protection in hypertensive encephalopathy. Mini reviews in medicinal chemistry, 2012, 12(11): 1081-1089.
- Kang S H, Cho H T, Devi S, et al. Antitumor effect of 2-methoxyestradiol in a rat orthotopic brain tumor model. Cancer research, 2006, 66(24): 11991-11997.
- Chamaon K, Stojek J, Kanakis D, et al. Micromolar concentrations of 2-methoxyestradiol kill glioma cells by an apoptotic mechanism, without destroying their microtubule cytoskeleton. Journal of neuro-oncology, 2005, 72(1): 11-16.
- 18. Jay J R, MacLaughlin D T, Riley K R, et al. Modulation of meningioma cell growth by sex steroid hormones in vitro[J]. Journal of neurosurgery, 1985, 62(5): 757-762.
- 19. Claus EB, Black PM, Bondy ML, Calvocoressi L, Schildkraut JM, Wiemels JL, et al:

Exogenous hormone use and meningioma risk: what do we tell our patients? Cancer 110:471-476, 2007

- 20. Silvera S A N, Miller A B, Rohan T E. Hormonal and reproductive factors and risk of glioma: a prospective cohort study. International journal of cancer, 2006, 118(5): 1321-1324.
- Huang K, Whelan E A, Ruder A M, et al. Reproductive factors and risk of glioma in women. Cancer Epidemiology and Prevention Biomarkers, 2004, 13(10): 1583-1588.
- 22. Hatch E E, Linet M S, Zhang J, et al. Reproductive and hormonal factors and risk of brain tumors in adult females. International journal of cancer, 2005, 114(5): 797-805.
- Wigertz A, Lönn S, Hall P, et al. Reproductive factors and risk of meningioma and glioma. Cancer Epidemiology and Prevention Biomarkers, 2008, 17(10): 2663-2670.
- 24. Liberati A, Altman DG, Tetzlaff J, et al. The PRISMA statement for reporting systematic reviews and meta-analyses of studies that evaluate health care interventions: explanation and elaboration. J Clin Epidemiol.2009;62:e1–34
- Lan Y L, Wang X, Lou J C, et al. Update on the effect of exogenous hormone use on glioma risk in women: a meta-analysis of case-control and cohort studies. Journal of neuro-oncology, 2018, 137(2): 357-365.
- 26. Qi Z Y, Shao C, Huang Y L, et al. Reproductive and exogenous hormone factors in relation to risk of meningioma in women: a meta-analysis. PloS one, 2013, 8(12): e83261.
- 27. Qi Z Y, Shao C, Zhang X, et al. Exogenous and endogenous hormones in relation to glioma in women: a meta-analysis of 11 case-control studies PLoS One, 2013, 8(7): e68695.
- Zong H, Xu H, Geng Z, et al. Reproductive factors in relation to risk of brain tumors in women: an updated meta-analysis of 27 independent studies. Tumor biology, 2014, 35(11): 11579-11586.
- 29. Wells G A, Shea B, O'Connell D, et al. The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) for assessing the quality of nonrandomised studies in meta-analyses. 2000.
- Spruance SL, Reid JE, Grace M, et al. Hazard ratio in clinical trials. Antimicrob Agents Chemother. 2004;48:2787–2792.
- Zhang J, Yu KF (1998) What's the relative risk? A method of correcting the odds ratio in cohort studies of common outcomes. Jama 280(19):1690-1691

- Ronksley PE, Brien SE, Turner BJ et al (2011) Association of alcohol consumption with selected cardiovascular disease outcomes: a systematic review and meta-analysis. BMJ 342:d671.
- Higgins JP, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ, Altman DG .Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses.
  BMJ .2003;327: 557–560.
- Begg CB, Mazumdar M. Operating characteristics of a rank correlation test for publication bias. Biometrics.1994; 50:1088–1101.
- Egger M, Davey Smith G, Schneider M, Minder C Bias in meta-analysis detected by a simple, graphical test. BMJ .1997;315: 629–634.
- 36. Cheng W, Zhang Z, Cheng W, et al. Associations of leisure-time physical activity with cardiovascular mortality: a systematic review and meta-analysis of 44 prospective cohort studies. European journal of preventive cardiology, 2018, 25(17): 1864-1872.
- Anic G M, Madden M H, Nabors L B, et al. Reproductive factors and risk of primary brain tumors in women. Journal of Neuro-oncology, 2014, 118(2): 297-304.
- Felini M J, Olshan A F, Schroeder J C, et al. Reproductive factors and hormone use and risk of adult gliomas[J]. Cancer Causes & Control, 2009, 20(1): 87-96.
- Krishnamachari B, Ilyasova D, Scheurer M E, et al. A pooled multisite analysis of the effects of female reproductive hormones on glioma risk. Cancer Causes & Control, 2014, 25(8): 1007-1013.
- Wigertz A, Lonn S, Mathiesen T, et al. Risk of Brain Tumors Associated with Exposure to Exogenous Female Sex Hormones. American Journal of Epidemiology, 2006, 164(7): 629-636.
- Custer B, Longstreth W T, Phillips L E, et al. Hormonal exposures and the risk of intracranial meningioma in women: a population-based case-control study. BMC Cancer, 2006, 6(1): 152-152.
- 42. Lee E, Grutsch J, Persky V, et al. Association of meningioma with reproductive factors.. International Journal of Cancer, 2006, 119(5): 1152-1157.
- 43. Ceasoriano L, Blenk T, Wallander M, et al. Hormonal therapies and meningioma: Is there a link?. Cancer Epidemiology, 2012, 36(2): 198-205.

- 44. Korhonen K, Raitanen J, Isola J, et al. Exogenous sex hormone use and risk of meningioma: a population-based case-control study in Finland.. Cancer Causes & Control, 2010, 21(12): 2149-2156.
- 45. Andersen L, Friis S, Hallas J, et al. Hormonal contraceptive use and risk of glioma among younger women a nationwide case-control study. British Journal of Clinical Pharmacology, 2015, 79(4): 677-684.
- Benson V S, Pirie K, Green J, et al. Lifestyle factors and primary glioma and meningioma tumours in the Million Women Study cohort[J]. British journal of cancer, 2008, 99(1): 185-190.
- Claus EB, Calvocoressi L, Bondy ML, Wrensch M, Wiemels JL, Schildkraut JM. Exogenous hormone use, reproductive factors, and risk of intracranial meningioma in females. J Neurosurg. 2013;118(3):649-656.
- Jhawar BS, Fuchs CS, Colditz GA, Stampfer MJ. Sex steroid hormone exposures and risk for meningioma. J Neurosurg. 2003 Nov;99(5):848-53.
- 49. Michaud D S, Gallo V, Schlehofer B, et al. Reproductive factors and exogenous hormone use in relation to risk of glioma and meningioma in a large European cohort study. Cancer Epidemiology and Prevention Biomarkers, 2010, 19(10): 2562-2569.
- 50. Silvera SA, Miller AB, Rohan TE. Hormonal and reproductive factors and risk of glioma: a prospective cohort study. Int J Cancer. 2006 Mar 1;118(5):1321-4.
- 51. Wang SS, Hartge P, Yeager M, Carreón T, Ruder AM, Linet M, Inskip PD, Black A, Hsing AW, Alavanja M, Beane-Freeman L, Safaiean M, Chanock SJ, Rajaraman P. Joint associations between genetic variants and reproductive factors in glioma risk among women. Am J Epidemiol. 2011 Oct 15;174(8):901-8.
- 52. Kabat GC, Park Y, Hollenbeck AR, Schatzkin A, Rohan TE. Reproductive factors and exogenous hormone use and risk of adult glioma in women in the NIH-AARP Diet and Health Study. Int J Cancer. 2011 Feb 15;128(4):944-50.
- Preston-Martin S, Monroe K, Lee P J, et al. Spinal meningiomas in women in Los Angeles County: investigation of an etiological hypothesis. Cancer Epidemiology and Prevention Biomarkers, 1995, 4(4): 333-339.

- 54. Johnson DR, Olson JE, Vierkant RA, Hammack JE, Wang AH, Folsom AR, Virnig BA, Cerhan JR. Risk factors for meningioma in postmenopausal women: results from the Iowa Women's Health Study. Neuro-oncology. 2011 Sep 1;13(9):1011-9.
- 55. Cabrera-Muñoz E, Hernández-Hernández OT,Camacho-Arroyo I. Role of progesterone in human astrocytomas growth. Curr Top Med Chem 2011; 11: 1663–7.
- 56. Hernández-Hernández OT, González-García TK, Camacho-Arroyo I. Progesterone receptor and SRC-1 participate in the regulation of VEGF, EGFR and Cyclin D1expression in human astrocytoma cell lines. J Steroid Biochem Mol Biol 2012; 132: 127–34.
- 57. González-Agüero G, Ondarza R, Gamboa-Domínguez A.Progesterone receptor isoforms expression pattern in human astrocytomas. Brain Res Bull 2001; 56: 43–8.
- Brandacher G, Winkler C, Schroecksnadel K, Margreiter R, Fuchs D. Antitumoral activity of interferon-gamma involved in impaired immune function in cancer patients. CurrDrug Metab 2006;7:599–612
- Fewings PE, Battersby RD, Timperley WR. Long-term follow up of progesterone receptor status in benign meningioma: a prognostic indicatorof recurrence? J Neurosurg. (2000) 92:401–5
- 60. Roser F, Nakamura M, Bellinzona M, Rosahl S, Ostertag H, Samii M. The prognostic value of progesterone receptor status in meningiomas. J Clin Pathol. (2004) 57:1033–7.
- Guevara P, Escobar-Arriaga E, Saavedra-Perez D, Martinez-Rumayor A, Flores-Estrada D, Rembao D, et al. Angiogenesis and expression of estrogen and progesterone receptors as predictive factors for recurrence of meningioma. J Neuro Oncol. (2010) 98:379–84.
- 62. Jay JR, MacLaughlin DT, Riley KR, Martuza RL. Modulation of meningioma cell growth by sex steroid hormones in vitro. J Neurosurg985;62:757–62.
- 63. KangSH,ChoHT,DeviS,etal.Antitumoreffectof2-methoxyestradiol n a rat orthotopic brain tumor model. Cancer Res 2006;66:11991–7.
- Lis A, Ciesielski MJ, Barone TA, Scott BE, Fenstermaker RA, Plunkett J.
  2-Methoxyestradiol inhibits proliferation of normal and neoplastic glial cells, and induces cell death, in vitro. Cancer Lett 004;213:57–65.

## Pubmed

1. Search: "Contraceptive Agents" [Mesh] 42381

2. Search: (((((Agents, Contraceptive) OR (Contraceptives)) OR (Contraceptive Effect)) OR

(Effect, Contraceptive)) OR (Contraceptive Effects)) OR (Effects, Contraceptive) 147,472

3.1 or 2 147,472

4. Search: "Glioma" [Mesh] 84,046

6.4 or 5 **105,523** 

7. Search: "Meningioma" [Mesh] 19,335

ngiomas) OR (Xanthomatous Meningioma)) OR (Meningioma, Xanthomatous)) OR (Meningiomas, Xanthomatous)) OR (Xanthomatous Meningiomas)) OR (Angioblastic Meningioma)) OR (Angioblastic Meningiomas)) OR (Meningioma, Angioblastic)) OR (Meningiomas, Angioblastic)) OR (Angiomatous Meningioma)) OR (Angiomatous Meningiomas)) OR (Meningioma, Angiomatous)) OR (Meningiomas, Angiomatous)) OR (Clear Cell Meningioma)) OR (Clear Cell Meningiomas)) OR (Meningioma, Clear Cell)) OR (Meningiomas, Clear Cell)) OR (Fibrous Meningioma)) OR (Fibrous Meningiomas)) OR (Meningioma, Fibrous)) OR (Meningiomas, Fibrous)) OR (Hemangioblastic Meningioma)) OR (Hemangioblastic Meningiomas)) OR (Meningioma, Hemangioblastic)) OR (Meningiomas, Hemangioblastic)) OR (Hemangiopericytic Meningioma)) OR (Hemangiopericytic Meningiomas)) OR (Meningioma, Hemangiopericytic)) OR (Meningiomas, Hemangiopericytic)) OR (Intracranial Meningioma)) OR (Intracranial Meningiomas)) OR (Meningioma, Intracranial)) OR (Meningiomas, Intracranial)) OR (Intraorbital Meningioma)) OR (Intraorbital Meningiomas)) OR (Meningioma, Intraorbital)) OR (Meningiomas, Intraorbital)) OR (Intraventricular Meningioma)) OR (Intraventricular Meningiomas)) OR (Meningioma, Intraventricular)) OR (Meningiomas, Intraventricular)) OR (Malignant Meningioma)) OR (Malignant Meningiomas)) OR (Meningioma, Malignant)) OR (Meningiomas, Malignant)) OR (Meningiomas, Multiple)) OR (Meningioma, Multiple)) OR (Multiple Meningioma)) OR (Multiple Meningiomas)) OR (Meningiomatosis)) OR (Meningiomatoses)) OR (Meningotheliomatous Meningioma)) OR (Meningioma, Meningotheliomatous)) OR (Meningiomas, Meningotheliomatous)) OR (Meningotheliomatous Meningiomas)) OR (Microcystic Meningioma)) OR (Meningioma, Microcystic)) OR (Meningiomas, Microcystic)) OR (Microcystic Meningiomas)) OR (Olfactory Groove Meningioma)) OR (Groove Meningiomas, Olfactory)) OR (Meningioma, Olfactory Groove)) OR (Meningiomas, Olfactory Groove)) OR (Olfactory Groove Meningiomas)) OR (Papillary Meningioma)) OR (Meningioma, Papillary)) OR (Meningiomas, Papillary)) OR (Papillary) Meningiomas)) OR (Parasagittal Meningioma)) OR (Meningioma, Parasagittal)) OR (Meningiomas, Parasagittal)) OR (Parasagittal Meningiomas)) OR (Posterior Fossa Meningioma)) OR (Meningioma, Posterior Fossa)) OR (Meningiomas, Posterior Fossa)) OR (Posterior Fossa Meningiomas)) OR (Psammomatous Meningioma)) OR (Meningioma, Psammomatous)) OR (Meningiomas, Psammomatous)) OR (Psammomatous Meningiomas)) OR (Secretory

Meningioma)) OR (Meningioma, Secretory)) OR (Meningiomas, Secretory)) OR (Secretory Meningiomas)) OR (Sphenoid Wing Meningioma)) OR (Meningiomas, Sphenoid Wing)) OR (Meningioma, Sphenoid)) OR (Meningiomas, Sphenoid)) OR (Sphenoid Wing)) OR (Spinal Meningiomas)) OR (Meningioma, Sphenoid)) OR (Meningiomas, Sphenoid)) OR (Meningiomas, Sphenoid)) OR (Spinal Meningioma)) OR (Meningioma, Spinal)) OR (Meningioma, Spinal)) OR (Meningioma, Spinal)) OR (Meningiomas, Transitional)) OR (Transitional Meningioma)) OR (Meningioma, Transitional)) OR (Meningiomas, Transitional)) OR (Meningioma, Benign)) OR (Meningiomas, Benign)) OR (Cerebral Convexity Meningioma)) OR (Cerebral Convexity Meningioma)) OR (Meningiomas, Cerebral)) OR (

9.7 or 8 **26,074** 10.6 or 9 **126,441** 11.3 and 10 **269** 

# Embase

- 1. 'hormonal contraceptive agent'/exp 76,584
- contraceptive AND agents, AND hormonal OR (hormonal AND contraceptive) OR (hormonal AND contraceptive AND agents) OR (hormonal AND contraceptives) 14,925
- 3. #1 OR #2 85,731
- 4. 'meningioma'/exp 32,898
- meningeal AND neoplasms OR meningeoma OR (meningeal AND tumor) OR (meningeal AND tumour) OR (meninges AND tumor) OR (meninges AND tumour) OR meningothelioma OR (multiple AND meningioma) OR (petroclival AND meningioma) OR (retrochiasmatic AND meningioma) OR (suprasellar AND meningioma) 10,495
- 6. #4 OR #5 37,881
- 7. 'glioma'/exp 140,685
- brain AND glioma OR (cerebral AND glioma) OR ganglioglioma OR (glia AND tumor) OR (glia AND tumour) OR (glial AND tumour) OR (glial AND tumour) OR (high AND grade AND glioma) OR (low AND grade AND glioma) OR (recurrent AND glioma) 77,746
- 9. #7 OR #8 160,085
- 10. #6 OR #9 189,743
- **11.** #3 AND #10 **171**

# Cochrane

- 1. MeSH descriptor: [Contraceptive Agents, Hormonal] explode all trees 384
- 2. (Contraceptive Agents, Female Hormonal) OR (Hormonal Contraceptive Agents) OR

(Contraceptive Agents, Male Hormonal) 997

- **3.** #1 or #2 **701**
- 4. MeSH descriptor: [Glioma] explode all trees 1173
- (Gliomas, Malignant) OR (Malignant Glioma) OR (Malignant Gliomas) OR (Gliomas) 1726
- (Glioma, Mixed) OR (Mixed Gliomas) OR (Mixed Glioma) OR (Gliomas, Mixed) OR (Glioma, Malignant)715
- 7. #5 or #6 1121
- 8. #4 or #7 1896
- 9. MeSH descriptor: [Meningioma] explode all trees 64
- (Meningioma, Angiomatous) OR (Angiomatous Meningioma) OR (Meningiomas, Angiomatous) OR (Angiomatous Meningiomas) OR (Fibrous Meningioma) 5
- (Meningiomas, Fibrous) OR (Meningioma, Fibrous) OR (Fibrous Meningiomas) OR (Transitional Meningioma) OR (Transitional Meningiomas) 8
- **12.** (Posterior Fossa Meningiomas) OR (Malignant Meningioma) OR (Meningiomas, Malignant) OR (Malignant Meningiomas) OR (Meningioma, Malignant)**66**
- 13. (Meningiomas, Olfactory Groove) OR (Meningioma, Olfactory Groove) OR (Olfactory Groove Meningiomas) OR (Groove Meningiomas, Olfactory) OR (Olfactory Groove Meningioma) 2
- (Meningioma, Microcystic) OR (Microcystic Meningioma) OR (Meningiomas, Microcystic) OR (Microcystic Meningiomas) OR (Meningioma, Clear Cell) 32
- (Clear Cell Meningiomas) OR (Clear Cell Meningioma) OR (Meningiomas, Clear Cell) OR (Meningiomas, Secretory) OR (Meningioma, Secretory) 33
- (Secretory Meningiomas) OR (Secretory Meningioma) OR (Meningiomas) OR (Xanthomatous Meningiomas) OR (Xanthomatous Meningioma) 276
- 17. (Meningioma, Xanthomatous) OR (Meningiomas, Xanthomatous) OR (Meningiomas, Parasagittal) OR (Meningioma, Parasagittal) OR (Parasagittal Meningiomas) 1
- 18. (Parasagittal Meningioma) OR (Meningiomas, Benign) OR (Benign Meningiomas) OR (Benign Meningioma) OR (Meningioma, Benign)38
- (Meningiomas, Spinal) OR (Spinal Meningioma) OR (Meningioma, Spinal) OR (Spinal Meningiomas) OR (Meningioma, Hemangiopericytic)12
- 20. (Hemangiopericytic Meningiomas) OR (Meningiomas, Hemangiopericytic) OR (Hemangiopericytic Meningioma) OR (Meningioma, Intracranial) OR (Intracranial Meningiomas)75
- (Intracranial Meningioma) OR (Meningiomas, Intracranial) OR (Psammomatous Meningioma) OR (Meningiomas, Psammomatous) OR (Psammomatous Meningiomas)75
- 22. (Meningioma, Psammomatous) OR (Sphenoid Wing Meningiomas) OR (Wing Meningiomas, Sphenoid) OR (Wing Meningioma, Sphenoid) OR (Meningioma, Sphenoid Wing) 1
- 23. (Sphenoid Wing Meningioma) OR (Meningiomas, Sphenoid Wing) OR (Meningiomas, Cerebral Convexity) OR (Convexity Meningioma, Cerebral) OR (Convexity Meningiomas, Cerebral) 1
- 24. (Cerebral Convexity Meningiomas) OR (Cerebral Convexity Meningioma) OR (Meningioma, Cerebral Convexity) OR (Meningotheliomatous Meningiomas) OR

(Meningiomas, Meningotheliomatous) 0

- 25. (Meningotheliomatous Meningioma) OR (Meningioma, Meningotheliomatous) OR (Multiple Meningiomas) OR (Meningioma, Multiple) OR (Multiple Meningioma) 53
- 26. (Meningiomas, Multiple) OR (Meningiomas, Hemangioblastic) OR (Hemangioblastic Meningiomas) OR (Meningioma, Hemangioblastic) OR (Hemangioblastic Meningioma) 53
- 27. (Meningioma, Papillary) OR (Papillary Meningioma) OR (Meningiomas, Papillary) OR (Papillary Meningiomas) OR (Intraventricular Meningioma)2
- 28. (Meningioma, Intraventricular) OR (Meningiomas, Intraventricular) OR (Intraventricular Meningiomas)1
- **29.** #10 or #11 or #12 or #13 or #14 or #15 or #16 or #17 or #18 or #19 or #20 or #21 or #22 or #23 or #24 or #25 or #26 or #27 or #28 **183**
- **30.** #9 or #29 **206**
- **31.** #8 or #30 2046
- **32.** #3 and #31 **0**

		<b>T</b> ble1	.The Detaile	ed Chard	acters of The Inc	luded 20 Obs	ervational S	tudies	
First Author, year	Study Type	Country	The Date of Recruitment	Age, year	Patients Number (G/M)	Ascertainment	Intervention	Control or Total Number	Outcome
Anic.GM <sup>[37]</sup> ,2014	PCC	USA	NA	52.6y	507/247	Medical Records	OCs	659	Gliomas/ Meningiomas
Felini MJ <sup>[38]</sup> ,2009	PCC	USA	1991-1994 1997-1999 2001-2004	56.3y	619/	International Classification of Diseases	OCs	650	Gliomas
Hatch EE <sup>[22]</sup> ,2005	PCC	USA	1994-1998	51.8y	212/151	International Classification of Diseases	OCs	436	Gliomas/ Meningiomas
Krishnamachari B <sup>[39]</sup> ,2014	PCC	USA	2003-2008	51.4y	968	International Classification of Diseases	OCs	1322	Gliomas
Wigertz A <sup>[40]</sup> ,2006	PCC	Sweden	2000-2002	20-69y	115/178	International Classification of Diseases	OCs	323	Gliomas/ Meningiomas
Custer B [41],2006	PCC	USA	1995-1998	NA	/143	Medical Records	OCs	286	Meningiomas
Huang K <sup>[21]</sup> ,2004	PCC	USA	1995-1997	52y	341	International Classification of Diseases	OCs	527	Gliomas
Lee E <sup>[42]</sup> ,2006	PCC	USA	1987-1992	NA	/219	Medical Records	OCs	260	Meningiomas

Cea-Soriano L <sup>[43]</sup>	Cohort	Spain	1996-2008	12-89y	549	Medical Records	OCs	7347	Meningiomas
,2011									
Korhonen K <sup>[44]</sup> ,2010	PCC	Finland	2000-2002	54y	/264	International Classification of Diseases	OCs	505	Meningiomas
Andersen L <sup>[45]</sup> ,2014	PCC	Denmark	2000-2009	15-49y	317/	International Classification of Diseases	OCs	2126	Gliomas
Benson VS <sup>[46]</sup> ,2008	Cohort	UK	1996-2001	55.9y	646/390	International Classification of Diseases	OCs	1,249,670	Gliomas/ Meningiomas
Claus EB <sup>[47]</sup> ,2013	PCC	USA	2006-2011	57.2y	/1127	Medical Records	OCs	1092	Meningiomas
Jhawar BS <sup>[48]</sup> ,2003	Cohort	USA	1976-1996	54.2y	/125	Medical Records	OCs	121,700	Meningiomas
Michaud DS <sup>[49]</sup> ,2010	Cohort	UK	1990s	50.4y	193/194	International Classification of Diseases	OCs	276,212	Gliomas/ Meningiomas
Navarro Silvera.SA <sup>[50]</sup> ,2005	Cohort	USA	1980-2000	48.5y	125/	International Classification of Diseases	OCs	89,830	Gliomas
Wang SS <sup>[51]</sup> ,2011	PCC	USA	1993-2001	NA	357/	Medical Records	OCs	822	Gliomas
Kabat GC <sup>[52]</sup> ,2011	Cohort	USA	1995-2003	50-71y	174/	Medical Records	OCs	225,355	Gliomas

				Journal Pre-proof					
<b>D</b> [53]	PCC	USA	1978-1985	20-74y	/81	Medical	OCs	155	Meningiomas
Preston-Martin S ,						Records			
1995									
Johnson DR <sup>[54]</sup> 2011	Cohort	USA	1986–2004	69.3y	/125	International	OCs	291,021	Meningiomas
Johnson DR ,2011						Classification			
						of Diseases			
PCC, Pop	ulation-bas	ed Case-Co	ontrol. OCs, oral	contraceptives	.NA: No Applica	ble.			

Table.2 Subgroup analyses and Meta-regression of the OCs usage of the risk of Gliomas and Meningiomas										
		Gliomas					Meningiomas			
Туре	Ν	RR(95%CI)	$I^2$	$P^{a}$	$P^b$	Ν	RR(95%CI)	$I^2$	$P^{a}$	$P^b$
Published Year	12				0.859	13				0.967
Before 2010	6	0.86(0.78-0.96)	0%	0.908		7	0.86(0.68-1.09)	58.2%	0.026	
After 2010*	6	0.87(0.69-1.1)	71.6%	0.003		6	1.13(1.0-1.28)	0%	0.535	
Sample Size					0.541					0.426
<500	5	0.93(0.70-1.23)	66.4%	0.018		6	0.88(0.65-1.20)	60.6%	0.026	
≥500	7	0.83(0.76-0.91)	0%	0.777		7	1.07(0.95-1.20)	16%	0.038	
Country					0.531					0.712
America	9	0.80(0.72-0.88)	0%	0.964		8	0.93(0.75-1.16)	62.5%	0.009	
Europe	3	1.04(0.72-1.48)	81%	0.005		5	1.07(0.94-1.21)	0%	0.471	
Ascertainment					0.478					0.561
ICD	8	0.9(0.78-1.05)	59%	0.017		5	1.13(1.00-1.28)	0	0.457	
Medical Records	4	0.76(0.62-0.93)	0%	0.998		8	0.90(0.74-1.10)	52.4%	0.04	
Study Design					0.596					0.505
PCC	8	0.87(0.72-1.05)	0%	0.013		8	0.94(0.76-1.14)	49.1%	0.056	
Cohort	4	0.87(0.77-0.97)	0%	0.686		5	1.07(0.90-1.26)	40.8%	0.149	

\* indicated including 2010. ICD, International Classification of Diseases.  $P^a$  for heterogeneity within each subgroup.  $P^b$  for heterogeneity between subgroups with meta-regression analysis.



Study ID	RR (95% CI)	% Weight
Gliomas		
Anic.GM	0.79 (0.41, 1.53)	2.63
Felini MJ	0.78 (0.59, 1.03)	9.48
Hatch EE	0.76 (0.50, 1.15)	5.58
Krishnamachari B	0.75 (0.62, 0.92)	13.22
Wigertz A	0.85 (0.51, 1.41)	4.08
Huang K	0.88 (0.61, 1.26)	6.80
Andersen L	- 1.42 (1.10, 1.84)	10.35
Michaud DS	0.84 (0.66, 1.08)	10.83
Navarro Silvera.SA	1.01 (0.68, 1.52)	5.87
Kabat GC	0.74 (0.53, 1.05)	7.37
Wang SS	0.77 (0.55, 1.09)	7.36
Benson VS	0.88 (0.77, 1.02)	16.43
Subtotal (I-squared = $42.6\%$ , p = $0.058$ )	0.87 (0.77, 0.97)	100.00
Meningiomas		2
Anic.GM	0.99 (0.74, 1.33)	9.65
Hatch EE	1.01 (0.62, 1.65)	5.27
Wigertz A	1.00 (0.61, 1.63)	5.24
Custer B	1.26 (0.68, 2.31)	3.77
Lee E	0.68 (0.48, 0.96)	8.15
Cea-Soriano L	1.16 (0.86, 1.58)	9.32
Korhonen K	1.20 (0.85, 1.70)	8.15
Claus EB	1.07 (0.80, 1.44)	9.63
Jhawar BS	0.76 (0.51, 1.14)	6.85
Michaud DS	1.30 (1.03, 1.64)	11.66
Preston-Martin S	0.40 (0.21, 0.77)	3.43
Johnson DR	0.82 (0.50, 1.33)	5.28
Benson VS	1.08 (0.90, 1.29)	13.59
Subtotal (I-squared = $47.2\%$ , p = 0.030)	0.99 (0.87, 1.13)	100.00
NOTE: Weights are from random effects analysis		
.21 1	4.76	

Study ID	RR (95% CI)	% Weight
0-1y		
Anic.GM	1.01 (0.84, 1.18)	30.72
Felini MJ	0.52 (0.33, 0.82)	13.43
Hatch EE	0.77 (0.41, 1.45)	8.37
Krishnamachari B 🕂	0.88 (0.66, 1.18)	21.93
Wigertz A	0.76 (0.30, 1.92)	4.38
Andersen L	1.33 (0.79, 2.26)	11.03
Michaud DS	0.73 (0.42, 1.28)	10.13
Subtotal (I-squared = 41.8%, p = 0.112)	0.86 (0.70, 1.06)	100.00
1–10y		
Anic.GM	0.97 (0.74, 1.28)	17.85
Felini MJ	0.86 (0.60, 1.23)	10.40
Hatch EE	0.73 (0.56, 0.96)	18.45
Krishnamachari B	0.81 (0.67, 0.98)	37.06
Wigertz A	0.79 (0.50, 1.26)	6.27
Michaud DS	0.88 (0.61, 1.27)	9.97
Subtotal (I-squared = $0.0\%$ , p = $0.798$ )	0.83 (0.74, 0.93)	100.00
>10y		
Anic.GM	0.60 (0.41, 0.85)	16.76
Felini MJ	0.62 (0.41, 0.91)	14.02
Hatch EE	0.89 (0.48, 1.68)	5.68
Krishnamachari B 🔶	0.64 (0.48, 0.86)	26.20
Wigertz A	0.84 (0.44, 1.63)	5.20
Michaud DS	0.86 (0.57, 1.30)	13.11
Wang SS	0.77 (0.55, 1.09)	19.04
Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.741)	0.70 (0.60, 0.81)	100.00
NOTE: Weights are from random effects analysis		
	1	

Study		%
ID	RR (95% Cl)	Weight
0-1y		
Anic.GM	1.00 (0.75, 1.34)	51.77
Hatch EE	0.65 (0.28, 1.52)	6.09
Wigertz A	- 0.78 (0.34, 1.81)	6.24
Korhonen K	- 1.08 (0.67, 1.74)	19.14
Michaud DS	1.10 (0.66, 1.83)	16.76
Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.816)	0.99 (0.80, 1.22)	100.00
1–10y		
Anic.GM	1.09 (0.73, 1.61)	26.41
Hatch EE	0.95 (0.55, 1.65)	13.69
Wigertz A	1.03 (0.68, 1.56)	23.97
Michaud DS	1.42 (1.01, 1.99)	35.93
Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.516)	1.16 (0.95, 1.42)	100.00
>10y		
Anic.GM	0.89 (0.58, 1.37)	29.79
Hatch EE	0.86 (0.41, 1.82)	9.91
Wigertz A	1.06 (0.60, 1.89)	16.72
Lee E	0.73 (0.38, 1.41)	12.80
Michaud DS	1.26 (0.82, 1.91)	30.78
Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.643)	0.99 (0.78, 1.25)	100.00
NOTE WILLIAM COMPANY	ar 1011 M	
NOTE: weights are from random effects analysis		





*Abbreviations list*: OC, Oral contraceptive. MeSH, medical subject headings. ORs, odds ratios.NOS, Newcastle-Ottawa scale.ICD, International Classification of Diseases.

## **Declaration of interests**

■ The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

The authors declare the following financial interests/personal relationships which may be considered as potential competing interests:

<b>Disclosures:</b> The authors have no conflicts o	f interest to disclose.
Sources of Funding: None.	