AIR FORCE HEALTH STUDY

DTIC
ELECTE
DEC 1 4 1995
S D
F

An Epidemiologic Investigation of
Health Effects in Air Force Personnel
Following Exposure to Herbicides

SAIC Team
William D. Grubbs, Ph.D.
Michael B. Lustik, M.S.
Amy S. Brockman, M.S.
Scott C. Henderson, M.S.
Frank R. Burnett, M.S.
Rebecca G. Land, M.S.
Dawn J. Osborne, M.S.
Vanessa K. Rocconi, B.S.
Margaret E. Schrieber, B.A.
David E. Williams, M.D., SCRF

Air Force Team
Col William H. Wolfe, M.D., M.P.H.
Joel E. Michalek, Ph.D.
Col Judson C. Miner, D.V.M., M.P.H.
Col Gary L. Henriksen, M.D., M.P.H.
Lt Col James A. Swaby, Ph.D., B.C.E.

Project Manager: Manager E.B. Owens, Ph.D.
Statistical Task Manager: W.D. Grubbs
SAIC Editor: Jean M. Ault, B.A.

Program Manager: R.W. Ogershok

SCIENCE APPLICATIONS INTERNATIONAL
1710 Goodridge Drive
McLean, Virginia 22102

in conjunction with:

SCRIPPS CLINIC & RESEARCH FOUNDATION,
LA JOLLA , CALIFORNIA

NATIONAL OPINION RESEARCH CENTER,
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

EPIDEMIOLOGIC RESEARCH DIVISION
ARMSTRONG LABORATORY
HUMAN SYSTEMS CENTER (AFMC)
BROOKS AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS 78235

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for public release
Distribution Unlimited

2 May 1995

Volume II

1992 Followup Examination Results

May 1992 to May 1995

Contract Number F41624-91-C-1006
SAIC Project Number 01-0813-02-3005

(Distribution Unlimited)

19951212 085

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 1

DISCLAIMER NOTICE



THIS DOCUMENT IS BEST QUALITY AVAILABLE. THE COPY FURNISHED TO DTIC CONTAINED A SIGNIFICANT NUMBER OF PAGES WHICH DO NOT REPRODUCE LEGIBLY.


AIR FORCE HEALTH STUDY

An Epidemiologic Investigation of Health Effects in Air Force Personnel Following Exposure to Herbicides

May 1995

Volume II

1995 Followup Examination Results



Epidemiologic Research Division
Armstrong Laboratory
Human Systems Center (AFMC)
Brooks Air Force Base, Texas 78235

TABLE OF CONTENTS

VOLUME II

CHAPTER 10 NEOPLASIA ASSESSMENT . . . . . Page

INTRODUCTION 10-1
Background 10-1
Summary of Previous Analyses of the Air Force Health Study 10-3
1982 Baseline Study Summary Results 10-3
1985 Followup Study Summary Results 10-4
1987 Followup Study Summary Results 10-4
Serum Dioxin Analysis of 1987 Followup Study Summary Results 10-5
Parameters for the Neoplasia Assessment 10-5
Dependent Variables 10-5
Verified Medical Records Data 10-6
Laboratory Examination Data 10-7
Covariates 10-7
Statistical Methods 10-10
Longitudinal Analysis 10-16
RESULTS 10-16
Dependent Variable-Covariate Associations 10-16
Exposure Analysis 10-20
Verified Medical Records Variables 10-21
Skin Neoplasms 10-21
Malignant Skin Neoplasms 10-26
Benign Skin Neoplasms 10-31
Skin Neoplasms of Uncertain Behavior or Unspecified Nature 10-36
Basal Cell Carcinomas (All Sites Combined) 10-36
Basal Cell Carcinomas (Ear, Face, Head, and Neck) 10-45
Basal Cell Carcinomas (Trunk) 10-50
Basal Cell Carcinomas (Upper Extremities) 10-50
Basal Cell Carcinomas (Lower Extremities) 10-59
Squamous Cell Carcinomas 10-59
Nonmelanoma 10-68
Melanomas 10-73
Systemic Neoplasms 10-73
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms 10-73
Benign Systemic Neoplasms 10-82
Systemic Neoplasms of Uncertain Behavior or Unspecified Nature . . . 10-91
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Eye, Ear, Face, Head, and Neck) . . . 10-91
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Oral Cavity, Pharynx, and Larynx) . . 10-100
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Esophagus) 10-100
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Brain) 10-100

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

Page

Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Thymus, Heart, and Mediastinum) . . 10-111
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Thyroid Gland) 10-111
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Bronchus and Lung) 10-111
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Colon and Rectum) 10-124
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Kidney and Bladder) 10-124
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Prostate) 10-129
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Testicles) 10-129
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Ill-Defined Sites 10-129
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Connective and Other Soft Tissue) . . 10-142
Carcinomas in Situ of the Penis, Other, and Unspecified Sites 10-142
Hodgkin's Disease 10-142
Leukemia 10-142
Non-Hodgkin's Lymphoma 10-142
Other Malignant Systemic Neoplasms of Lymphoid and Histiocytic Tissue 10-161
Multiple Myeloma 10-161
Skin or Systemic Neoplasms 10-161
Laboratory Examination Variables 10-178
Prostate-Specific Antigen (Continuous) 10-178
Prostate-Specific Antigen (Discrete) 10-187
Longitudinal Analysis 10-192
Verified Medical Records 10-193
Malignant Skin Neoplasms 10-193
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms 10-193
Benign Systemic Neoplasms 10-193
DISCUSSION 10-204
SUMMARY 10-204
Model 1.: Group Analysis 10-204
Model 2: Initial Dioxin Analysis 10-204
Model 3: Categorized Dioxin Analysis 10-223
Models 4, 5, and 6: Current Dioxin Analyses 10-224
CONCLUSION 10-224
REFERENCES 10-226

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
Table 10-1.	Statistical Analyses for the Neoplasia Assessment	10-11
Table 10-2.	Number of Participants with Missing Data for, or excluded from, the Neoplasia Assessment	10-15
Table 10-3.	Analysis of Skin Neoplasms	10-22
Table 10-4.	Analysis of Malignant Skin Neoplasms	10-27
Table 10-5.	Analysis of Benign Skin Neoplasms	10-32
Table 10-6.	Analysis of Skin Neoplasms of Uncertain Behavior or Unspecified Nature	10-37
Table 10-7.	Analysis of Basal Cell Carcinomas (All Sites Combined)	10-41
Table 10-8.	Analysis of Basal Cell Carcinomas (Ear, Face, Head, and Neck)	10-46
Table 10-9.	Analysis of Basal Cell Carcinomas (Trunk)	10-51
Table 10-10.	Analysis of Basal Cell Carcinomas (Upper Extremities)	10-55
Table 10-11.	Analysis of Basal Cell Carcinomas (Lower Extremities)	10-60
Table 10-12.	Analysis of Squamous Cell Carcinomas	10-64
Table 10-13.	Analysis of Nonmelanomas	10-69
Table 10-14.	Analysis of Melanomas	10-74
Table 10-15.	Analysis of Systemic Neoplasms	10-78
Table 10-16.	Analysis of Malignant Systemic Neoplasms	10-83
Table 10-17.	Analysis of Benign Systemic Neoplasms	10-87
Table 10-18.	Analysis of Systemic Neoplasms of Uncertain Behavior or Unspecified Nature	10-92
Table 10-19.	Analysis of Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Eye, Ear, Face, Head, and Neck)	10-96
Table 10-20.	Analysis of Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Oral Cavity, Pharynx, and Larynx)	10-101
Table 10-21.	Analysis of Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Esophagus)	10-105
Table 10-22.	Analysis of Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Brain)	10-107
Table 10-23.	Analysis of Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Thymus, Heart, and Mediastinum)	10-112
Table 10-24.	Analysis of Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Thyroid Gland)	10-116
Table 10-25.	Analysis of Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Bronchus and Lung)	10-120
Table 10-26.	Analysis of Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Colon and Rectum)	10-125
Table 10-27.	Analysis of Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Kidney and Bladder)	10-130
Table 10-28.	Analysis of Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Prostate)	10-134
Table 10-29.	Analysis of Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Testicles)	10-138
Table 10-30.	Analysis of Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Ill-Defined Sites)	10-143
Table 10-31.	Analysis of Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Connective and Other Soft Tissue)	10-147
Table 10-32.	Analysis of Carcinomas in Situ of the Penis, Other, and Unspecified Sites	10-149

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

		Page
Table 10-33.	Analysis of Hodgkin's Disease	10-153
Table 10-34.	Analysis of Leukemia	10-157
Table 10-35.	Analysis of Non-Hodgkin's Lymphoma	10-162
Table 10-36.	Analysis of Other Malignant Systemic Neoplasms of Lymphoid and Histiocytic Tissue	10-166
Table 10-37.	Analysis of Multiple Myeloma	10-170
Table 10-38.	Analysis of Skin or Systemic Neoplasms	10-174
Table 10-39.	Analysis of Prostate-Specific Antigen (Below vs At or Above Sensitivity Limit)	1-179
Table 10-40.	Analysis of Prostate-Specific Antigen (ng/ml) (Continuous)	10-183
Table 10-41.	Analysis of Prostate-Specific Antigen (Discrete)	10-188
Table 10-42.	Longitudinal analysis of Malignant Skin Neoplasms	10-194
Table 10-43.	Longitudinal Analysis of Malignant Systemic Neoplasms	10-197
Table 10-44.	Longitudinal Analysis of Benign Systemic Neoplasms	10-200
Table 10-45.	Summary of Group Analyses (Model 1) for Neoplasia Variables (Ranch Hands vs Comparisons)	10-205
Table 10-46.	Summary of Initial dioxin Analyses (Model 2) for Neoplasia Variables (Ranch Hands Only)	10-209
Table 10-47.	Summary of Categorized Dioxin Analyses (Model 3) for Neoplasia Variables (Ranch Hands vs Comparisons)	10-211
Table 10-48.	Summary of Current Dioxin Analyses (Models 4, 5, and 6) for Neoplasia Variables (Ranch Hands Only)	10-217
Table 10-49.	Summary of Group-by-Covariate and Dioxin-by-Covariate Interactions from Adjusted Analyses of Neoplasia Variables	10-221

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
CHAPTER 11 NEUROLOGICAL ASSESSMENT	11-1
INTRODUCTION	11-1
Background	11-1
Summary of Previous Analyses of the Air Force Health Study	11-3
1982 Baseline Study Summary Results	11-3
1985 Followup Study Summary Results	11-3
1987 Followup Study Summary Results	11-5
Parameters for the Neurological Assessment	11-6
Dependent Variables	11-6
Medical Records Data	11-6
Physical Examination Data	11-6
Covariates	11-8
Statistical Methods	11-9
Longitudinal Analyses	11-10
RESULTS	11-17
Dependent Variable-Covariate Associations	11-17
Age	11-17
Race	11-17
Occupation	11-18
Current Alcohol Use	11-18
Lifetime Alcohol History	11-18
Insecticide Exposure	11-18
Industrial Chemical Exposure	11-19
Degreasing Chemical Exposure	11-19
Diabetic Class	11-19
Serum Insulin	11-20
Composite Exposure to Heavy Metals	11-20
Worked with Vibrating Power Equipment or Tools	11-20
Exposure Analysis	11-20
Medical Records Variables: Historical Neurological Disorders	11-21
Inflammatory Diseases	11-21
Hereditary and Degenerative Diseases	11-22
Peripheral Disorders	11-31
Other Neurological Disorders	11-36
Physical Examination Variables: Cranial Nerve Function	11-41
Smell	11-41
Visual Fields	11-41
Light Reaction	11-50
Ocular Movement	11-55

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

Page

Facial Sensation 11-55
Jaw Clench 11-64
Smile 11-64
Palpebral Fissure 11-71
Balance 11-71
Gag Reflex 11-71
Speech 11-71
Palate and Uvula Movement 11-87
Neck Range of Motion 11-87
Cranial Nerve Index without Range of Motion 11-94
Physical Examination Variables: Peripheral Nerve Status 11-99
Pin Prick 11-99
Light Touch 11-99
Muscle Status 11-108
Patellar Reflex 11-108
Achilles Reflex 11-118
Babinski Reflex 11-123
Vibrotactile Threshold Measurement of Right Great Toe 11-132
Vibrotactile Threshold Measurement of Left Great Toe 11-137
Physical Examination Variables: CNS Coordination Processes 11-142
Tremor 11-142
Coordination 11-147
Romberg Sign 11-147
Gait 11-156
Central Nervous System (CNS) Index 11-156
Longitudinal Analysis 11-165
Physical Examination Variables 11-165
Cranial Nerve Index without Range of Motion 11-165
CNS Index 11-166
DISCUSSION 11-166
SUMMARY 11-173
Medical Records 11-189
Model 1: Group Analysis 11-189
Model 2: Initial Dioxin Analysis 11-189
Model 3: Categorized Dioxin Analysis 11-189
Models 4 through 6: Current Dioxin Analysis 11-189
Physical Examination Variables 11-190
Model 1: Group Analysis 11-190
Model 2: Initial Dioxin Analysis 11-191
Model 3: Categorized Dioxin Analysis 11-191

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

Page

Models 4 through 6: Current Dioxin Analyses 11-191
CONCLUSION 11-191
REFERENCES 11-194

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
Table 11-1.	Statistical Analyses for the Neurological Assessment	11-11
Table 11-2.	Number of Participants with Missing Data for, or Excluded from, the Neurology Assessment	11-15
Table 11-3.	Analysis of Inflammatory Diseases	11-23
Table 11-4.	Analysis of Hereditary and Degenerative Diseases	11-27
Table 11-5.	Analysis of Peripheral Disorders	11-32
Table 11-6.	Analysis of Other Neurological Disorders	11-37
Table 11-7.	Analysis of Smell	11-42
Table 11-8.	Analysis of Visual Fields	11-46
Table 11-9.	Analysis of Light Reaction	11-51
Table 11-10.	Analysis of Ocular Movement	11-56
Table 11-11.	Analysis of Facial Sensation	11-60
Table 11-12.	Analysis of Jaw Clench	11-65
Table 11-13.	Analysis of Smile	11-67
Table 11-14.	Analysis of Palpebral Fissure	11-72
Table 11-15.	Analysis of Balance	11-76
Table 11-16.	Analysis of Gag Reflex	11-80
Table 11-17.	Analysis of Speech	11-83
Table 11-18.	Analysis of Palate and Uvula Movement	11-88
Table 11-19.	Analysis of Neck Range of Motion	11-90
Table 11-20.	Analysis of Cranial Nerve Index without Range of Motion	11-95
Table 11-21.	Analysis of Pin Prick	11-100
Table 11-22.	Analysis of Light Touch	11-104
Table 11-23.	Analysis of Muscle Status	11-109
Table 11-24.	Analysis of Patellar Reflex	11-114
Table 11-25.	Analysis of Achilles Reflex	11-119
Table 11-26.	Analysis of Biceps Reflex	11-124
Table 11-27.	Analysis of Babinski Reflex	11-128
Table 11-28.	Analysis of Vibrotactile Threshold Measurement of Right Great Toe (microns)	11-133
Table 11-29.	Analysis of Vibrotactile Threshold Measurement of Left Great Toe (microns)	11-138
Table 11-30.	Analysis of Tremor	11-143
Table 11-31.	Analysis of Coordination	11-148
Table 11-32.	Analysis of Romberg Sign	11-152
Table 11-33.	Analysis of Gait	11-157
Table 11-34.	Analysis of Central Nervous System (CNS) Index	11-161
Table 11-35.	Longitudinal Analysis of Cranial Nerve Index without Range of Motion	11-167
Table 11-36.	Longitudinal Analysis of Central Nervous System Index	11-170

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

Page

Table 11-37. Summary of Group Analyses (Model 1) for Neurological Variables (Ranch Hands vs Comparisons 11-174
Table 11-38. Summary of Initial Dioxin Analyses (Model 2) for Neurological Variables (Ranch Hands Only) 11-178
Table 11-39. Summary of Categorized Dioxin Analyses (Model 3) for Neurological Variables (Ranch Hands vs Comparisons) 11-180
Table 11-40. Summary of Current Dioxin Analyses (Models 4, 5, and 6) for Neurological Variables (Ranch Hands Only) 11-184
Table 11-41. Summary of Group-by-Covariate and Dioxin-by-Covariate Interactions from adjusted analyses of Neurological Variables 11-188

TABLE OF CONTENTS - REPORT

VOLUME I
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS
CHAPTER 1 - Introduction
CHAPTER 2 - The Dioxin Assay
CHAPTER 3 - Questionnaire Methodology
CHAPTER 4 - Physical examination Methodology
CHAPTER 5 - Study Selection and Participation
CHAPTER 6 - Quality Control
CHAPTER 7 - Statistical Methods
CHAPTER 8 - Covariate Associations with Estimates of Dioxin Exposure
CHAPTER 9 - General Health Assessment

VOLUME II
CHAPTER 10 - Neoplasia Assessment
CHAPTER 11 - Neurological Assessment

VOLUME III
CHAPTER 12 - Psychological Assessment
CHAPTER 13 - Gastrointestinal Assessment

VOLUME IV
CHAPTER 14 - Dermatologic Assessment
CHAPTER 15 - Cardiovascular Assessment
CHAPTER 16 - Hematologic Assessment

VOLUME V
CHAPTER 17 - Renal Assessment
CHAPTER 18 - Endocrine Assessment

VOLUME VI
CHAPTER 19 - Immunologic Assessment
CHAPTER 20 - Pulmonary Assessment
CHAPTER 21 - Conclusions
CHAPTER 22 - Future Directions

VOLUME VI
APPENDIX A - 1 through F-2

VOLUME VII
APPENDIX G - 1 through I-4

VOLUME IX
APPENDIX J - 1 through N-4

VOLUME X
APPENDIX 0 - 1 through R

CHAPTER 10

NEOPLASIA ASSESSMENT

INTRODUCTION

Background

Despite conclusive evidence that chlorophenols are potent carcinogens in laboratory animals, the carcinogenicity of dioxin in humans remains controversial. Traditional difficulties in extrapolating animal data to humans have limited the applicability and relevance of much of the experimental work.

Numerous long-term exposure studies have established the carcinogenicity of 2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin (TCDD, or dioxin) in rats (1,2), mice (3-5), and hamsters (6). The consensus of most research is that TCDD is only weakly mutagenic and does not covalently bind to DNA or cause it to initiate repair synthesis, but that it does behave as a strong tumor promoter at the cellular level (7).

The oncogenic response to TCDD in animals has been shown repeatedly to depend upon the age, sex, and strain of species as well as the dose and route of administration (8-10). In varying doses and routes of administration, TCDD has produced malignant neoplasms at multiple sites in rats (lung, oropharyngeal, thyroid, adrenal, and liver) (2,3), in mice (thyroid, thymus, connective tissue, and liver) (3), and in hamsters (cutaneous) (6). As summarized in detail in a recent review article (11), much of the basic research into the carcinogenicity of TCDD in laboratory animals has focused on the aryl hydrocarbon (Ah) receptor and the induction of the cytochrome P-450 enzyme system (12-16). Though the Ah receptor has been isolated from the tissue of several human organs (e.g., liver, colon, tonsils) (17-22), the relevance of these observations to dioxin toxicity remains to be proven (23).

Most of the longitudinal epidemiologic studies of TCDD toxicity in humans have included malignancy as a principal clinical endpoint and have been based on cohorts of veterans who served in the Vietnam era (24-28) and of civilian populations exposed to dioxin by occupation (29-37) or as a consequence of industrial accidents (38-42). The literature based on research prior to 1987 has been summarized in earlier reports of the Air Force Health Study (AFHS) (25,43) and will not be reviewed in detail. Two more recent large-scale studies, though not designed to correlate clinical endpoints with exposure to Herbicide Orange, have focused on the incidence of specific cancers in Vietnam veterans.

The Department of Veterans Affairs is conducting a proportionate mortality study of Army and Marine Corps veterans of the Vietnam era. The study has now been expanded to include 62,068 veterans who died between 1965 and 1984. The finding in an earlier report (44) of an increased incidence of lung cancer and non-Hodgkin's lymphoma in Marine Vietnam veterans was not confirmed in a more recent study of similar design in U.S. Army veterans who served in the same region at the same time (45). In another report (46), Army

veterans were found to have an increased mortality from cancer of the lung and larynx. The Vietnam Experience Study (VES) and the Selected Cancers Cooperative Study Group conducted by the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) have defined an increased risk for the development of non-Hodgkin's lymphoma associated with military service in Vietnam but no relationship to potential exposure to Herbicide Orange (47,48). These results conflicted with the findings from another Veterans' Administration hospital-based study (49) and other reports from the VES have found no increase in the incidence of Hodgkin's disease (50) or soft-tissue and other sarcomas (51).

The development of assay techniques that permit the accurate determination of the current body burden of dioxin has placed the current investigation on a much more scientific footing. As the only study of military veterans incorporating serum dioxin levels into data analysis, the AFHS is unique among those studies addressing the history of malignancy in those who served in the Vietnam War (24). Stratification of the Ranch Hand cohort by occupation revealed significantly higher mean levels of serum dioxin in the enlisted groundcrew (23.6 parts per trillion [ppt]) and the enlisted flyers (17.2 ppt) than in the officers (range of 6.7 - 9.3 ppt).

There was no significant difference between the cohorts in the overall history of malignancy. Though there is no evidence that TCDD exposure causes skin cancer in humans, the Baseline and subsequent followup examinations found an increased history of basal cell carcinoma in the Ranch Hand cohort versus the Comparison cohort. Stratified analysis based on serum dioxin levels, however, did not reveal a dose-response effect. The greatest number of these skin cancers occurred in those participants (officers) with the lowest mean serum dioxin levels. In a pattern consistent with a dose-response effect, the history of benign systemic neoplasms was greater in Ranch Hands than in Comparisons, most of these neoplasms were lipomas. With reference to those systemic cancers that have been suspect as related to TCDD exposure, there has been one case of soft tissue sarcoma (STS) in each cohort (Ranch Hand and Comparisons) and one case of Hodgkin's disease in a Ranch Hand participant.

Apart from the AFHS, several published reports have incorporated tissue levels of TCDD into the analysis of data derived from populations exposed by occupation (14,29,52) or by industrial accidents (39,40,53). As part of the National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health's (NIOSH) Dioxin Registry, one study examined cause-specific mortality among 5,172 workers exposed to TCDD at 12 chemical production plants (29). Exposure was documented by job description and by correlation with serum TCDD levels in 253 workers in the surviving cohort. The median serum TCDD level in living members of the exposed cohort was 233 parts per trillion and 7 ppt in the unexposed cohort. In exposed workers, there was a slight but statistically significant increase in mortality from all cancers combined but not from those malignancies putatively associated with TCDD exposure (non-Hodgkin's lymphoma, Hodgkin's disease, and STS). In a subcohort of 1,520 workers with a longer period of exposure (more than 1 year; mean serum TCDD of 418 ppt in 119 samples) and greater latency (more than 20 years since first exposure) there was a further increase in mortality from all cancers combined and a significantly increased mortality from soft-tissue sarcoma and for cancers of the respiratory tract.

Though the authors of the NIOSH study recognized such methodologic limitations as low statistical power, misclassification of death certificates, and potential confounders, some of their results were similar to those reported in the most recent study of German chemical workers exposed to TCDD during and after a chlorophenol reactor accident in 1953 (40). Within the total study group of 247, a subcohort of 69 was defined. All of these men developed chloracne and, for those tested, the median serum TCDD level was 24.5 ppt. In this most heavily exposed group, there was a statistically significant increase in mortality from all cancers combined although, as in the NIOSH study, the effect was apparent only in those with latency greater than 20 years. A similar latency effect was noted in another mortality study of 1,583 workers employed at the same plant (after the explosion) from 1954 to 1984 (33). Participants were stratified into high and low exposure groups by job classification and, in 48 individuals, by adipose tissue levels of TCDD (average of 296 ng/kg and 83 ng/kg respectively). In the highly exposed group, standardized mortality ratios (SMRs) for all causes of death were elevated relative to two comparison cohorts and the risk became clearly more pronounced in those with more than 20 years employment (SMRs rising from 1.24 to 1.87 and 1.39 to 1.82 versus the two comparison cohorts). Potential limitations of this study were acknowledged and commented upon separately (54).

Finally, the limited amount of tissue level data that has become available from the 1976 industrial explosion at Seveso, Italy reflects the extreme level of exposure that occurred. In the area closest to the source (Zone A), serum levels of TCDD ranged from 828 ppt to 56,000 ppt, the highest ever recorded in humans (53). Cancer surveillance has been limited by the small number of cases observed. In the most recent report that covers the decade up to 1986 (39), slight increases in the risk of several malignancies have been noted but, with the exception of the occurrence of biliary cancer in women, were not statistically significant.

Summary of Previous Analyses of the Air Force Health Study

1982 Baseline Study Summary Results

Cancer received major emphasis during the AFHS Baseline examination in 1982. The neoplasia assessment used data from both the in-home questionnaire and the review-of-systems questionnaire obtained during the physical examination as well as data from the examination itself. All subjective data were verified by medical record reviews. In addition, tabulation of mortality count data from the Baseline Mortality Report was used in conjunction with cancer morbidity information. The overall results did not show a significant difference in systemic cancer between the two groups but did show significantly more skin cancer ($p=0.03$) in the Ranch Hand group.

Of 50 reported systemic cancers from the Ranch Hand and Comparison groups, 28 (14 in each group) were verified by medical records and pathology reports. A visual inspection of anatomic sites showed a slight excess of genitourinary cancer and oropharyngeal cancer but a relative deficit of digestive system neoplasms in Ranch Hands. A combined morbidity-mortality assessment derived from the initial 1:1 match (Ranch Hand to the Original Comparison member) disclosed similar distributions. One case of STS and one case of Hodgkin's disease were confirmed, both in the Comparison group. Exposure analyses for industrial chemicals and x rays were negative.

Questionnaire data verified by medical record reviews revealed significantly more skin cancer in Ranch Hands (odds ratio 2.35). Basal cell carcinoma accounted for 83.9 percent of the reported skin cancers in both groups and was concentrated anatomically on the face, head, and neck. The few melanoma and squamous cell cancers were distributed evenly between the Ranch Hand and Comparison groups. Adjustments for occupational exposures (e.g., asbestos, degreasing chemicals) did not alter the increased rate of skin cancer in the Ranch Hand group. Skin cancer in both groups was associated with exposure to industrial chemicals ($p=0.03$). Outdoor occupations subsequent to military service as a covariate did not account for the significant skin cancer association.

1985 Followup Study Summary Results

The Baseline and 1985 followup data were combined for the assessment of lifetime history of cancer; occurrences of cancer prior to their service in Southeast Asia (SEA) were excluded.

For the unadjusted analyses (Blacks and non-Blacks included), Ranch Hands had a significantly greater frequency of a verified skin neoplasm (malignant, benign, or uncertain behavior or unspecified nature) than Comparisons. There were no significant unadjusted group differences among non-Black participants for basal cell carcinoma, squamous cell carcinoma, melanoma, or all malignant skin neoplasms. For verified sun exposure-related malignant skin neoplasms, Ranch Hands had a marginally significantly greater frequency than Comparisons. The groups did not differ significantly for verified and suspected sun exposure-related malignant skin neoplasms. The adjusted group contrast in histories of the sun exposure-related skin cancers, the majority of which were basal cell carcinomas, also was significant ($p=0.030$).

The unadjusted group contrasts of the incidence rates of all systemic cancers combined were not significant. There was one new occurrence of an STS (Ranch Hand) and one suspected cancer of the lymphatic system (Ranch Hand), in addition to the one previously reported STS and one Hodgkin's disease in the Comparison group. There were no cases of non-Hodgkin's lymphoma in either group at the time of the 1985 report.

1987 Followup Study Summary Results

The unadjusted analysis of all verified neoplasms indicated that the proportion of Ranch Hands with a neoplasm was significantly greater than that of Comparisons. After including suspected neoplasms with verified neoplasms, the Ranch Hand proportion was marginally greater than the Comparison proportion. The majority of malignant neoplasms observed in Ranch Hands were basal cell carcinomas, a nonlife-threatening form of skin cancer. When the analysis was performed only on skin neoplasms for non-Black participants, significantly more Ranch Hands had a skin neoplasm than did Comparisons.

In the unadjusted analyses of verified basal cell carcinoma, a marginally significant group difference was found. After adjustment for covariates, the group contrast was statistically significant for verified basal cell carcinoma. Also, Ranch Hands had a

significantly higher percentage of participants with multiple verified basal cell carcinomas than did Comparisons.

Sun exposure-related malignant skin neoplasms also exhibited group differences. (Approximately 90 percent of the participants with a sun exposure-related malignant neoplasm had a basal cell carcinoma.) For the unadjusted analysis, the group contrast was significant for verified diagnoses. For the adjusted analysis of these neoplasms, Ranch Hands and Comparisons differed significantly.

No significant group differences were found in the analyses of systemic neoplasms by number, behavior (malignant, benign, or uncertain behavior or unspecified nature), or location and site. Thus, the increase in overall malignancy was due to elevated relative risks for skin cancer (basal cell carcinoma). The number of STS and non-Hodgkin's lymphoma was comparable in the two groups.

Serum Dioxin Analysis of 1987 Followup Study Summary Results

The analyses generally did not establish a significant positive association between dioxin and the presence of a skin neoplasm. Significant relative risks were found for the skin neoplasm analyses; however, the relative risks were almost always less than 1. For the analyses focusing on enlisted flyers with a basal cell carcinoma of other sites (and a sun exposure-related malignant skin neoplasm of other sites), relative risks were found to be significant and greater than 1. However, these results may be the consequence of a multiple-testing artifact, since they were not noted for the enlisted groundcrew who, as a group, had higher levels of serum dioxin than the enlisted flyers.

In general, the analyses of all systemic neoplasms combined produced some significant or marginally significant relative risks greater than 1. The relative risk for participants with a benign systemic neoplasm (such as a lipoma) was significantly greater than 1, in contrast to nonsignificant relative risks, which were often less than 1, for participants with a malignant systemic neoplasm.

The study provides no evidence of increased incidence for the neoplasms most commonly suspected as being associated with exposure to chlorophenols (Hodgkin's disease, non-Hodgkin's lymphoma, and STS). However, the number of participants with these specific neoplasms was small; therefore, the statistical power to detect small or moderately elevated relative risks was low. There is no evidence of a relationship between dioxin and either skin or systemic cancer in these data. There is a suggestion of a dose-related relationship between dioxin and benign systemic neoplasms (lipomas) that was explored in greater depth in the 1992 physical examination.

Parameters for the Neoplasia Assessment

Dependent Variables

The neoplasia assessment was based on the occurrence of neoplasms after service in SEA. Information on the occurrence of neoplasms was captured in the health questionnaires

and the physical examinations at Baseline (1982) and at the 1985 followup and 1987 followup studies and was coded according to conventions in the International Classification of Diseases, 9th Revision, Clinical Modification (ICD-9-CM) manual. This information was combined with data collected at the 1992 followup to form a complete neoplastic history for each participant.

The term "neoplasm" refers to any new growth that may or may not be malignant. Malignant neoplasms are those neoplasms capable of invasion and metastasis. Malignant and benign neoplasms, carcinomas in situ, and neoplasms of uncertain behavior or unspecified nature as well as skin and systemic neoplasms were studied. "Systemic neoplasm" denotes a nonskin neoplasm.

The neoplasia assessment was based on the number of participants with a neoplasm, and not on the number of neoplasms. A participant was considered to have an adverse health condition for the neoplasia assessment if he had one or more neoplasms.

Verified Medical Records Data

During the 1992 health interview, each study participant was asked a series of questions on the occurrence of cancer since the date of his last health interview. The self-reported conditions were verified by medical record review. Only data on verified neoplasms were used in the neoplasia assessment.

Some possible neoplastic conditions were discovered by the physicians at the physical examination. Contingent upon participant authorization, suspicious skin lesions were biopsied, and the pathology determined; however, no other invasive procedures were used to detect systemic neoplasms.

Skin Neoplasms—The analysis of skin neoplasms for the neoplasia assessment was divided into two sets. Analysis Set 1 consisted of analyses of skin neoplasms by behavior type. Four behavior types were examined: (1) all skin neoplasms, (2) malignant skin neoplasms only, (3) benign skin neoplasms only, and (4) skin neoplasms of uncertain behavior or unspecified nature.

Analysis Set 2 consisted of analyses of malignant skin neoplasms by cell type. The following four cell types were analyzed: (1) basal cell carcinomas, (2) squamous cell carcinomas, (3) nonmelanoma (basal cell carcinomas, squamous cell carcinomas, and malignant epithelial neoplasms not otherwise specified), and (4) melanoma. Analyses of basal cell carcinomas were conducted for all sites combined and by location or site. The following four locations or sites were examined for basal cell carcinomas: (1) ear, face, head, and neck; (2) trunk; (3) upper extremities; and (4) lower extremities. There were no basal cell carcinomas on other sites or sites not otherwise specified.

There are relatively few Black participants in this study (approximately 5%), and they have been observed only to exhibit benign skin neoplasms in all phases of the study to date. Consequently, skin neoplasm analyses, except for the analyses of benign skin neoplasms, were limited to non-Blacks. Both Blacks and non-Blacks were included in the analysis of

benign skin neoplasms. Participants with a pre-SEA skin neoplasm were excluded from the analysis of the skin neoplasm variables to avoid any bias caused by predisposition to malignancy.

Systemic Neoplasms—The systemic neoplasms were analyzed by behavior and body site. As with skin neoplasms, each analysis was conducted using verified data. The analysis of the systemic neoplasms was divided into two sets, described below.

Analysis Set 1 consisted of analyses of systemic neoplasms by behavior type. The following four behavior types were examined: (1) all systemic neoplasms, (2) malignant systemic neoplasms, (3) benign systemic neoplasms, and (4) systemic neoplasms of uncertain behavior or unspecified nature.

Analysis Set 2 consisted of analyses of malignant systemic neoplasms by the following sites: (1) eye, ear, head, face, and neck; (2) oral cavity, pharynx, and larynx; (3) esophagus; (4) brain; (5) thymus and mediastinum; (6) thyroid gland; (7) bronchus and lung; (8) colon and rectum; (9) kidney and bladder; (10) prostate; (11) testicles; (12) ill-defined sites; (13) connective and other soft tissues; and (14) carcinomas in situ of the penis and of other and unspecified sites.

In addition to the analyses described above, the number of participants with Hodgkin's disease, leukemia, non-Hodgkin's lymphoma, a malignant systemic neoplasm of lymphoid and histiocytic tissue, and multiple myeloma were analyzed.

Participants with a pre-SEA malignant systemic neoplasm or a pre-SEA systemic neoplasm of uncertain behavior or an unspecified nature were excluded from the analysis of the systemic neoplasm variables.

Skin and Systemic Neoplasms—All neoplasms, skin and systemic combined, were analyzed. Participants with a pre-SEA skin neoplasm and participants with a pre-SEA malignant systemic neoplasm or a pre-SEA systemic neoplasm of uncertain behavior or an unspecified nature were excluded from the analysis of this variable.

Laboratory Examination Data

The prostate-specific antigen (PSA) test is relatively new and was developed to detect prostate enlargement and prostate cancer. Each participant had his PSA measured as a standard portion of the laboratory assay. This measurement is continuous in nature, and the units are ng/ml. Analysis was performed on the continuous measurement, as well as on a discrete form, which is categorized as "normal" or "abnormal," with a cutpoint of 4 ng/ml.

Covariates

The emphasis on choosing risk factors related to cancer was increased during the 1985 followup study and has been emphasized since that time. In particular, the interval health questionnaire was modified to collect information on each geographic location in which a participant lived for more than 12 months. Because ultraviolet light exposure has been

acknowledged as the primary cause of basal cell carcinomas, this information was used to compute a cumulative sun-exposure index based on residential history. An average lifetime residential latitude was estimated by dividing the total degree-years (i.e., the sum of the product of latitude [degrees] and the number of years lived at each residence) from all residences by the total number of residential years reported on the questionnaire.

The denominator of the average lifetime residential latitude covariate is based on the total number of years at each residence. Because this information is reported by the participant, it is subject to under- or over-reporting. For each of the 2,219 participants who provided information on their residential history, the following ratio was constructed:

$$\frac{\text{years reported - age in years}}{\text{age in years}}$$

This ratio was greater than 0.35 for three participants (over-reporting of their residences) and less than -0.35 for six participants (under-reporting of their residences). The average lifetime residential latitude covariate is available for 2,210 participants. This covariate was then dichotomized as less than 37 degrees latitude or greater than or equal to 37 degrees latitude, the approximate median of the covariate.

In the analysis of the 1992 examination results, candidate covariates in adjusted statistical analyses assessing skin neoplasms included age, skin color, hair color, eye color, reaction of skin to sun exposure after at least 2 hours, reaction of skin to sun exposure after repeated exposure, average lifetime residential latitude, and lifetime exposure to asbestos, ionizing radiation, industrial chemicals, herbicides, insecticides, and degreasing chemicals. Information on eye, skin, and hair color was obtained for participants who did not attend either the 1985 or 1987 examinations. The participants' lifetime exposure to the six carcinogens described above was updated. Additionally, race was a used as a candidate covariate for the analysis of benign skin neoplasms. A composite sun-reaction index, which is a composite of the two individual reactions of skin to sun covariates, was used in previous cycles of the AFHS. The two individual reaction of skin to sun exposure variables were used instead of the composite variable because the composite variable was highly correlated with the two individual covariates and the individual covariates were more useful in explaining the skin neoplasia dependent variables. Also, the composite sun-reaction index was highly correlated with the two individual reaction of skin to sun covariates, thereby complicating analyses. The relationship between the skin neoplasm dependent variables and the composite sun-reaction index is shown in Appendix Table F-1-1 to illustrate the similarities of this covariate to the two individual sun-reaction covariates; however, this covariate is not used in the adjusted analysis.

The lifetime alcohol history covariate was based on self-reported information from the 1992 questionnaire and combined with similar information gathered at the 1987 followup. The respondent's average daily alcohol consumption was determined for various drinking stages throughout his lifetime, and an estimate of the corresponding total number of drink-years (1 drink-year is the equivalent of drinking 1.5 ounces of 80-proof alcoholic

beverage per day for 1 year) was derived. For lifetime cigarette smoking history, the respondent's average smoking was estimated over his lifetime based on his responses to the 1992 questionnaire, assuming 365 packs of cigarettes equal 1 pack-year.

Similar to the analysis of all other clinical areas, occupation was included in analyses of Model 1 (see Chapter 7, Statistical Methods, for a description of the basic statistical analysis approaches used). In general, enlisted personnel had higher levels of exposure than officers, with enlisted groundcrew having higher levels than enlisted flyers. Occupation was not considered to be a risk factor in the neoplasia assessment, however, and was not used in adjusted analyses of Models 2 through 6.

Herbicide exposure was included as a candidate covariate in the statistical analysis. Exposure to herbicides naturally has a high association with group (Ranch Hand, Comparison), and it is recognized that adjusting for herbicide exposure has the potential to over-adjust for the effects of dioxin exposure. The intent of the question was to capture information on post-SEA exposure. As seen by the frequencies for this covariate in Chapter 8, Covariate Exposures with Measures of Dioxin Exposure, it appears as if both Ranch Hands and Comparisons misinterpreted this question to apply to SEA experiences as well.

The potential for over-adjusting is most likely for the two models that use Comparisons (Models 1 and 3). As seen in Chapter 8, herbicide exposure is highly associated with group status in the two models using Comparisons (Models 1 and 3). The other models do not show a relationship between dioxin and herbicide exposure in the Ranch Hand cohort (Models 2, 4, 5, and 6). To investigate the effects of adjustment for herbicide exposure, analyses were performed with and without herbicide exposure in the final model when the final adjusted model contained this covariate. Analyses without herbicide exposure in the final model showed no difference from the results described subsequently in the text.

Categories of candidate covariates and definitions are provided below:

- Skin Color: dark, medium, pale, dark peach, and pale peach. (Classified for analysis purposes as (1) dark, medium, pale, or (2) dark peach, pale peach.)

- Hair Color: black, dark brown, light brown, blonde, red, and bald. (Classified for analysis purposes as (1) black, dark brown, or (2) light brown, blonde, red, bald.)

- Eye Color: brown, hazel, green, gray, and blue. (Classified for analysis purposes as (1) brown, (2) hazel, green, or (3) gray, blue.)

- Reaction of Skin to Sun Exposure After at Least 2 Hours, After First Exposure: burns painfully, burns, becomes red, and no reaction.

- Reaction of Skin After Repeated Exposure: freckles with no tan, tans mildly, tans moderately, and tans deep brown.

- Composite Sun-Reaction Index (not used in adjusted exposure analysis): a composite variable based on two reaction of skin to sun exposure variables was defined as

follows: (1) burns painfully or freckles with no tan, (2) burns or tans mildly, and (3) all other reactions.

- Average Lifetime Residential Latitude: average latitude less than 37° and average greater than or equal to 37°.

- Exposure to Carcinogens: asbestos, ionizing radiation, industrial chemicals, herbicides, insecticides, and degreasing chemicals (yes or no for each). These exposures represent lifetime exposure based on self-reported questionnaire data from this examination combined with previous examinations.

The candidate covariates for the systemic neoplasia assessment and the analysis of PSA was the same as those for the skin neoplasia assessment with the following exceptions:

- Race was added as a candidate covariate for all systemic neoplasm analyses.

- The following covariates specific to skin were deleted: skin color, hair color, eye color, reactions of skin to sun exposure, and average lifetime residential latitude.

Statistical Methods

Chapter 7, Statistical Methods, describes the basic statistical analysis methods used in the neoplasia assessment. Table 10-1 summarizes the statistical analyses that were performed for the neoplasia assessment. The first part of this table identifies the dependent variables and the statistical methods. This information is presented in the following three sections: skin neoplasms, systemic neoplasms, and skin and systemic neoplasms. Data source, data form, cutpoints, and candidate covariates are summarized at the end of the table. The second part of the table describes the candidate covariates. Abbreviations used in the body of the table are defined at the end of the table. Table 10-2 provides the number of participants with missing dependent variable data and those excluded due to a history of a pre-SEA neoplasm.

The Neoplasia Assessment contains many covariates for use in adjusted analyses of skin and systemic neoplasms. Additionally, less than one percent of the participants have a history of a neoplasm for over half of the dependent variables. Consequently, the attempts of the modeling strategy for this clinical area were to include as many covariates as main effects and group-by-covariate interactions as feasible (covariate-by-covariate not explored). When the number of participants with a history of a particular neoplasm was too small to support analysis of interactions, models including only the candidate covariates as main effects were investigated. If the number history of participants with a particular neoplasm was still too small to support meaningful analysis, only the continuous covariates of age, lifetime cigarette smoking history, and lifetime alcohol history were included as candidates for the final adjusted model. Other endpoints had so few participants that adjusted analysis was not possible; only unadjusted analyses are specified for these variables and are noted in Table 10-1.

Table 10-1.
Statistical Analyses for the Neoplasia Assessment

Dependent Variables

Category	Location or Site	Statistical Analyses
	Skin Neoplasms	
Behavior		
All	All Sites Combined	U:LR,CS A:LR
Malignant	All Sites Combined	U:LR,CS A:LR L:LR
Benign	All Sites Combined	U:LR,CS A:LR
Uncertain Behavior or Unspecified Nature	All Sites Combined	U:LR,CS A:LR
Cell Type and Location or Site		
Basal Cell Carcinoma	All Sites Combined Ear, Face, Head, and Neck Trunk Upper Extremities Lower Extremities	U:LR,CS A:LR
Squamous Cell Carcinoma	All Sites Combined	U:LR,CS A:LR
Nonmelanoma	All Sites Combined	U:LR,CS A:LR
Melanoma	All Sites Combined	U:LR,CS A:LR
	Systemic Neoplasms	
Behavior		
All	All Sites Combined	U:LR,CS A:LR
Malignant	All Sites Combined	U:LR,CS A:LR L:LR
Benign	All Sites Combined	U:LR,CS A:LR L:LR
Uncertain Behavior or Unspecified Nature	All Sites Combined	U:LR,CS A:LR
Location or Site		
Malignant	Eye, Ear, Face, Head, and Neck	U:LR,CS A:LR
Malignant	Oral Cavity, Pharynx, and Larynx	U:LR,CS A:LR
Malignant	Esophagus	Frequencies
Malignant	Brain	U:LR,CS

Table 10-1. (Continued)
Statistical Analyses for the Neoplasia Assessment

Dependent Variables

Category	Location or Site	Statistical Analyses
Malignant	Thymus, Heart, and Mediastinum	U:LR,CS A:LR
Malignant	Thyroid Gland	U:LR,CS A:LR
Malignant	Bronchus and Lung	U:LR,CS A:LR
Malignant	Colon and Rectum	U:LR,CS A:LR
Malignant	Kidney and Bladder	U:LR,CS A:LR
Malignant	Prostate	U:LR,CS A:LR
Malignant	Testicles	U:LR,CS A:LR
Malignant	Ill-Defined Sites	U:LR,CS A:LR
Malignant	Connective and Other Soft Tissues	Frequencies
Carcinoma In Situ	Penis, Other, and Unspecified Sites	U:LR,CS
Hodgkin's Disease	--	U:LR,CS A:LR
Leukemia	--	U:LR,CS
Non-Hodgkin's Lymphoma	--	U:LR,CS A:LR
Other Malignant Systemic Neoplasms of Lymphoid and Histiocytic Tissue	--	U:LR,CS A:LR
Multiple Myeloma	--	U:LR,CS
	Skin and Systemic Neoplasms	
All	All Sites Combined	U:LR,CS A:LR

Laboratory Variable

Variable (Units)	Data Form	Cutpoints	Candidate Covariates	Statistical Analyses
Prostate-Specific Antigen (ng/ml)	D/C	Abnormal: >4 Normal: ≤4	AGE,RACE,OCC, PACKYR,DRKYR, ASB,IONRAD,IC, HERB,INS,DC	U:LR,CS,GLM,TT A:LR,GLM

Table 10-1. (Continued)
Statistical Analyses for the Neoplasia Assessment

Covariates

Variable (Abbreviation)	Data Source	Data Form	Cutpoints
Age (AGE)	MIL	D/C	Born ≥1942 Born <1942
Race (RACE)	MIL	D	Black Non-Black
Occupation (OCC)	MIL	D	Officer Enlisted Flyer Enlisted Groundcrew
Lifetime Cigarette Smoking History (PACKYR) (pack-years)	Q-SR	D/C	0 >0-10 >10
Lifetime Alcohol History (DRKYR) (drink-years)	Q-SR	D/C	0 >0-40 >40
Skin Color (SKIN)	PE	D	Non-Peach: Dark, Medium, Pale Peach: Dark Peach, Pale Peach
Hair Color (HAIR)	PE	D	Black, Dark Brown Light Brown, Blonde, Red, Bald
Eye Color (EYE)	PE	D	Brown, Hazel, Green Gray, Blue
Reaction of Skin to Sun after at Least 2 Hours, after First Exposure (SUN2HR)	Q-SR	D	Burns Painfully Burns Becomes Red No Reaction
Reaction of Skin to Sun after Repeated Exposure (SUNRPT)	Q-SR	D	Freckles with No Tan Tans Mildly Tans Moderately Tans Deep Brown
Composite Sun-Reaction Index (SUNREAC)	Q-SR	D	Burns Painfully (for SUN2HR) or Freckles with No Tan (for SUNRPT) Burns (for SUN2HR) or Tans Mildly (for SUNRPT) All Other Reactions
Average Lifetime Residential Latitude (LAT)	Q-SR	D	Latitude <37° Latitude ≥37°
Asbestos Exposure (ASB)	Q-SR	D	Yes No

Table 10-1. (Continued)
Statistical Analyses for the Neoplasia Assessment

Covariates

Variable (Abbreviation)	Data Source	Data Form	Cutpoints
Ionizing Radiation Exposure (IONRAD)	Q-SR	D	Yes No
Industrial Chemical Exposure (IC)	Q-SR	D	Yes No
Herbicide Exposure (HERB)	Q-SR	D	Yes No
Insecticide Exposure (INS)	Q-SR	D	Yes No
Degreasing Chemical Exposure (DC)	Q-SR	D	Yes No

Dependent Variables (Except for Prostate-Specific Antigen)

Data Source: Review of medical records and verification based on AFHS questionnaires and physical examinations.

Data Form: Discrete.

Cutpoints: Yes or No.

Candidate Covariates for Skin Neoplasms: All covariates listed above except race, lifetime cigarette smoking history, and lifetime alcohol history.

Candidate Covariates for Systemic Neoplasms: All covariates listed above except skin color, hair color, eye color, reaction of skin to sun exposure variables, composite sun-reaction index, and average lifetime residential latitude.

Abbreviations

Data Source:
- MIL = Air Force military records
- PE = Physical examinations
- Q-SR = Health questionnaires (self-reported)

Data Form:
- D = Discrete analysis only
- D/C = Discrete and continuous analyses for dependent variables; appropriate form for analysis (either discrete or continuous) for covariates

Statistical Analyses:
- U = Unadjusted analyses
- A = Adjusted analyses
- L = Longitudinal analyses

Statistical Methods:
- CS = Chi-square contingency table analysis (continuity-adjusted for 2x2 tables)
- GLM = General linear models analysis
- LR = Logistic regression analysis
- TT = Two-sample t-test

Table 10-2.
Number of Participants with Missing Data for, or Excluded from, the Neoplasia Assessment

Variable	Variable Use	Group		Dioxin (Ranch Hands Only)		Categorized Dioxin	
		Ranch Hand	Comparison	Initial	Current	Ranch Hand	Comparison
Prostate-Specific Antigen	DEP	0	1	0	0	0	0
Lifetime Cigarette Smoking History	COV	1	2	0	1	1	2
Lifetime Alcohol History	COV	22	21	13	20	20	18
Skin Color*	COV	1	4	0	1	1	0
Hair Color*	COV	0	4	0	0	0	0
Eye Color*	COV	0	6	0	0	0	2
Reaction of Skin to Sun After at Least 2 Hours*	COV	1	3	1	1	1	3
Reaction of Skin to Sun After Repeated Exposure*	COV	4	7	3	4	4	6
Composite Sun-Reaction Index*	COV	1	2	1	1	1	2
Average Lifetime Residential Latitude*	COV	3	19	2	3	3	11
Pre-SEA Skin Neoplasms	EXC	10	9	7	10	10	7
Pre-SEA Malignant Systemic Neoplasms	EXC	5	0	4	5	5	0
Pre-SEA Systemic Neoplasms of Uncertain Behavior or Unspecified Nature	EXC	4	1	2	3	3	1
Black Participants	EXC	56	75	36	51	51	55

*Number of participants with missing data for Non-Black participants only.

Abbreviations: DEP = Dependent variable (missing data).
COV = Covariate (missing data).
EXC = Exclusion.

Note: 952 Ranch Hands and 1,281 Comparisons;
520 Ranch Hands for initial dioxin; 894 Ranch Hands for current dioxin;
894 Ranch Hands and 1,063 Comparisons for categorized dioxin.
One Ranch Hand missing total lipids for current dioxin.

Longitudinal Analysis

Longitudinal analyses of malignant skin neoplasms, malignant systemic neoplasms, and benign systemic neoplasms were conducted to evaluate the association between exposure and the changes in neoplasm status between the 1982 Baseline examination and the 1992 followup examination. See Chapter 7, Statistical Methods, for a further discussion of the methods used in the longitudinal analysis.

RESULTS

Dependent Variable-Covariate Associations

Results from the tests of association between the neoplasia dependent variables and candidate covariates in the combined Ranch Hand and Comparison cohorts are presented in Appendix Table F-1-1.

A history of a skin neoplasm was significantly associated with age, indicating older participants were more likely to have had a skin neoplasm than younger participants ($p<0.001$). Occupation also was significant ($p=0.005$). The percentage of participants having a history of a skin neoplasm increased from enlisted groundcrew to enlisted flyer and then to officers. Participants with skin color categorized as peach were significantly more likely to have had a skin neoplasm than those with non-peach skin color ($p=0.011$). Both skin reaction to sun variables, after at least 2 hours and after repeated exposure, were significantly associated with a history of a skin neoplasm ($p<0.001$ and $p=0.017$ respectively). A history of a skin neoplasm increased as burning or freckling tendencies among participants increased.

Covariates displaying a significant association with a history of a malignant skin neoplasm were age ($p<0.001$), occupation ($p<0.001$), skin color ($p=0.050$), reaction of skin to sun after at least 2 hours exposure ($p<0.001$), and skin reaction to sun after repeated exposure ($p<0.001$). Also significant were the composite sun reaction index, which was directly associated ($p<0.001$), and average lifetime residential latitude ($p=0.001$), which indicated participants who were closer to the equator had more histories of a malignant skin neoplasm.

All tests of association involving benign skin neoplasms were nonsignificant ($p>0.15$ for all covariates). Results were similar for skin neoplasms of uncertain behavior or unspecified nature, except for a significant association with reaction of skin to sun after repeated exposure ($p=0.006$). The freckles with no tan category showed the highest percentage of participants with a history of a skin neoplasm of uncertain behavior or unspecified nature.

A history of a basal cell carcinoma was significant and was directly associated with age ($p<0.001$), occupational rank ($p<0.001$; officers were more likely to exhibit a history of a basal cell carcinoma), potential of skin to burn after initial 2-hour sun exposure ($p<0.001$), potential to freckle or not tan after repeated sun exposure ($p<0.001$), and the composite sun reaction index ($p<0.001$). Also as expected, participants living in more southerly latitudes

had a greater history of a basal cell carcinoma than participants living in more northerly latitudes ($p<0.001$).

Covariates that were significantly associated with any basal cell carcinoma were similarly associated with a basal cell carcinoma of the eye, ear, face, head, or neck ($p\leq0.001$ for age, occupation, initial reaction of skin to sun after at least 2 hours, reaction of skin to sun after repeated exposure, composite sun-reaction index, and average lifetime residential latitude). Hair color also displayed a significant association ($p=0.008$). Participants with lighter hair colors had more basal cell carcinomas of the eye, ear, face, head, or neck.

A basal cell carcinoma of the trunk also was associated with age ($p=0.007$), occupation ($p<0.001$), initial reaction of skin to sun after at least 2 hours ($p=0.002$), reaction of skin to sun after repeated exposure ($p=0.004$), composite sun-reaction index ($p=0.018$), and average lifetime residential latitude ($p=0.019$). A significant negative association with asbestos exposure also was found ($p=0.034$), with more basal cell carcinomas of the trunk among participants with no exposure to asbestos.

Tests of association between covariates and a basal cell carcinoma of the upper extremities revealed significantly more disease among older participants ($p=0.006$), officers ($p=0.001$), those who freckle without tanning after repeated sun exposure ($p=0.011$), and participants with the highest composite sun reaction index ($p=0.049$).

The basal cell carcinoma of the lower extremities variable did not exhibit significant associations with any of the covariates tested ($p>0.15$ for all tests). Each covariate association test also was nonsignificant or only marginally significant for the squamous cell carcinoma variable ($p>0.06$ for all tests).

Similar to basal cell carcinoma, nonmelanoma displayed significant associations with several covariates. The age association revealed older participants had a greater history of a nonmelanoma ($p<0.001$). The test for occupation also was significant ($p<0.001$). Officers exhibited the most disease, followed by enlisted flyers, then enlisted groundcrew. Participants with peach skin colors had a significantly higher history of non-melanoma than those with non-peach skin colors ($p=0.031$). Lighter hair color groups displayed significantly more nonmelanoma ($p=0.042$). Both reaction of skin to sun variables, after at least 2 hours and after repeated exposure, were significantly associated with nonmelanoma ($p<0.001$ for each). History of nonmelanoma increased as burning or freckling potential among participants increased. The direct relationship with the composite sun reaction index was significant ($p<0.001$) as well as the relationship with average lifetime residential latitude ($p<0.001$). A history of nonmelanoma was higher for participants in the more southerly latitudes.

Each melanoma-by-covariate test of association was nonsignificant ($p>0.10$ for each test).

A history of a systemic neoplasm and a history of a malignant systemic neoplasm each were tested separately for association with the appropriate covariates and the results were

similar. Both were associated with age ($p<0.001$ for both), where older participants displayed the higher percentages of systemic neoplasms and malignant systemic neoplasms. Both variables also were significantly associated with industrial chemical exposure ($p=0.003$ and $p=0.033$ respectively), although both histories were higher among participants that indicated no exposure. Lifetime cigarette smoking also was significantly associated with each variable ($p=0.031$ and $p=0.003$ respectively). Percentages of histories of both were highest among those participants who had smoked the greatest number of cigarettes. Additionally, a significant association between malignant systemic neoplasms and occupation was identified ($p<0.001$). Enlisted flyers displayed the highest history among the occupational categories.

The benign systemic neoplasms variable was significantly associated with age ($p<0.001$) and industrial chemical exposure ($p=0.012$). The association with age revealed a greater history of a benign skin neoplasm for the older participants, and the industrial chemical association indicated a greater history among those who were not exposed.

Only the association with occupation was significant of all the covariate association tests involving systemic neoplasms of uncertain behavior or unspecified nature ($p=0.043$). Officers exhibited the highest history among the occupational categories.

The ability to detect significant associations between covariates and site-specific history of malignant systemic neoplasms was lessened due to the sparse number of participants with a systemic neoplasm at a given site. Age was the only covariate considered significantly associated with a malignant systemic neoplasm of the eye, ear, face, head, or neck ($p=0.021$). Older participants exhibited a higher history of a malignant systemic neoplasm at these sites.

No tests of association were significant for the malignant systemic neoplasms of the oral cavity, pharynx, or larynx ($p>0.07$ for each test) and for malignant systemic neoplasms of the esophagus ($p>0.07$ for each test).

Lifetime alcohol history was significantly associated with malignant systemic neoplasms of the brain ($p=0.017$) although, history was highest within the 0 drink-years category.

Both malignant systemic neoplasms of the thymus, heart, or mediastinum and malignant systemic neoplasms of the thyroid gland did not demonstrate significant association with any covariate ($p>0.25$ and $p>0.21$ respectively for each test).

Tests of association involving malignant systemic neoplasms of the bronchus or lung revealed a significant and direct relationship with lifetime cigarette smoking history ($p=0.008$). Malignant systemic neoplasms of the bronchus or lung increased as the history of cigarette smoking increased.

No significant covariate associations with a history of malignant systemic neoplasms of the colon or rectum were found ($p>0.11$ for each test).

The malignant systemic neoplasms of the kidney or bladder variable was significantly associated with lifetime cigarette smoking history ($p=0.027$) and lifetime alcohol history ($p=0.014$). Neoplasms increased as both cigarette smoking and alcohol consumption increased. Insecticide exposure also was found to be significantly associated with malignant systemic neoplasms of the kidney or bladder ($p=0.049$), with more kidney or bladder neoplasms among participants who indicated no exposure.

Age and occupation were each significantly related to malignant systemic neoplasms of the prostate ($p<0.001$ and $p=0.001$ respectively). Disease was highest among older participants and officers.

All covariate association tests were nonsignificant for malignant systemic neoplasms of the testicles ($p>0.12$ for each test), ill-defined sites ($p>0.21$ for each test), and connective and other soft tissues ($p>0.25$ for each test). Tests involving carcinoma in situ of the penis and other unspecified sites and Hodgkin's disease also were nonsignificant ($p>0.48$ for each test and $p\geq0.07$ for each test respectively).

Leukemia and lifetime alcohol history were significantly associated and inversely related ($p=0.032$), with less leukemia as alcohol consumption increased.

Non-Hodgkin's lymphoma, other malignant neoplasms of lymphoid and histiocytic tissue, and multiple myeloma did not exhibit any significant covariate association ($p>0.19$, $p>0.05$, and $p>0.32$ for each test respectively).

Age, occupation, skin color, eye color, lifetime alcohol history, industrial chemical exposure, and herbicide exposure each were significantly associated with skin or systemic neoplasms. Increases in skin or systemic neoplasms occurred as age ($p<0.001$), occupation ($p=0.001$; officers exhibited the highest history), and alcohol consumption ($p=0.046$) increased. A history of skin or systemic neoplasms was significantly associated with skin and eye color ($p=0.002$ and $p=0.005$ respectively). Participants with hazel or green eyes exhibited the highest history among all eye color categories. Participants with peach skin color displayed a higher history of neoplasms than participants with non-peach skin colors. The industrial chemical exposure association revealed a significantly higher percentage of participants with skin or systemic neoplasms who indicated no exposure ($p=0.031$), while those who indicated herbicide exposure exhibited the higher history of skin or systemic neoplasms ($p=0.015$). Because these were all associated with skin neoplasms and skin neoplasms accounted for the majority of total neoplasms, this observation is not unexpected.

Tests of covariate association were performed for both the continuous and discrete forms of PSA. The continuous measurement was associated with age ($p<0.001$), occupation ($p<0.001$), and ionizing radiation exposure ($p=0.007$). Prostate-specific antigen levels increased as age increased, and means were highest for officers. Significantly higher PSA means were revealed for participants who reported exposure to ionizing radiation.

The proportion of PSA measurements below the test sensitivity limit was not associated with any of the candidate covariates.

PSA discretized as normal or abnormal also was significantly associated with age ($p<0.001$). The higher percentage of abnormal levels were among older participants. In contrast to the continuous association test, race was significantly associated with PSA ($p=0.009$), with a higher percentage of abnormal levels in Blacks. Enlisted flyers also demonstrated the highest percentage of abnormal PSA levels within the three occupational cohorts ($p=0.003$). Ionizing radiation also was significantly related to the PSA ($p=0.016$). Participants who reported ionizing radiation exposure exhibited the higher prevalence of abnormalities.

In summary, age was significantly associated with many of the skin neoplasm and composite systemic neoplasm dependent variables. Race was significantly associated only with prostate-specific antigen. Occupation also was significantly associated with many of the skin neoplasm and composite systemic neoplasm dependent variables, probably due to the tendency of the officers to be older than the enlisted men in this study.

Skin neoplasms, malignant skin neoplasms, nonmelanomas, and skin or systemic neoplasms variables were significantly related to skin color. Hair color was significantly related only to basal cell carcinoma of the eye, ear, face, head, or neck and nonmelanoma. Eye color was only associated with skin or systemic neoplasms. The reaction of skin to sun variables, after at least 2 hours, after repeated exposure, and the composite index, were significantly associated with many of the skin neoplasm variables, primarily due to the associations with basal cell carcinoma. Similar patterns also were observed with average lifetime residential latitude.

Systemic neoplasms, malignant systemic neoplasms, and malignant systemic neoplasms of the bronchus or lung, and kidney or bladder variables each showed a significant association with lifetime cigarette smoking history. Lifetime alcohol history was associated with malignant systemic neoplasms of the brain and kidney or bladder, leukemia, and skin or systemic neoplasms.

The carcinogen covariates were related to only a few of the neoplasia dependent variables. Asbestos exposure was related only to basal cell carcinomas of the trunk and ionizing radiation exposure was associated with only the continuous and discrete prostate-specific antigen variables. Industrial chemical exposure was significantly associated with four variables: systemic neoplasms, malignant systemic neoplasms, benign systemic neoplasms, and skin or systemic neoplasms. Herbicide exposure was only significantly associated with skin or systemic neoplasms and insecticide exposure exhibited a significant association only with malignant systemic neoplasms of the kidney or bladder. Degreasing chemical exposure was not significantly associated with any of the neoplasia dependent variables.

Exposure Analysis

The following section presents the results of the statistical analyses of the dependent variables shown in Table 10-1. Dependent variables are grouped into two sections: those derived and verified from a review of medical records and the 1992 physical examination and data derived from the laboratory portion of the 1992 followup examination.

Unadjusted and adjusted analyses of six models are presented for each variable. Model 1 examines the relationship between the dependent variable and group (Ranch Hand or Comparison). Model 2 explores the relationship between the dependent variable and an extrapolated initial dioxin measure for Ranch Hands who had a 1987 dioxin measurement greater than 10 ppt. If a participant did not have a 1987 dioxin level, a 1992 level was used. A statistical adjustment for the percent of body fat at the participant's time of duty in SEA and the change in the percent of body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin is included in this model to account for body-fat-related differences in elimination rate (55). Model 3 dichotomizes the Ranch Hands in Model 2 based on their initial dioxin measures; these two categories of Ranch Hands are referred to as the "low Ranch Hand" category and the "high Ranch Hand" category. These participants are added to Ranch Hands and Comparisons with current serum dioxin levels (1987, if available; 1992, if the 1987 level was not available) at or below 10 ppt to create a total of four categories. Ranch Hands with current serum dioxin levels at or below 10 ppt are referred to as the "background Ranch Hand" category. The relationship between the dependent variable in each of the three Ranch Hand categories and the dependent variable in the "Comparison" category is examined. A fourth contrast, exploring the relationship of the dependent variable in the low Ranch Hand category and the high Ranch Hand category combined, also is conducted. This combination is referred to in the text and tables as the "low plus high Ranch Hand" category. As in Model 2, a statistical adjustment is made for the percent of body fat at the participant's time of duty in SEA and the change in the percent of body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

Models 4, 5, and 6 examine the relationship between the dependent variable and 1987 dioxin levels in all Ranch Hands with a dioxin measurement. If a participant did not have a 1987 dioxin measurement, a 1992 measurement was utilized in determining the current dioxin level. The measure of dioxin in Model 4 is lipid-adjusted, whereas whole-weight dioxin is used in Models 5 and 6. Model 6 differs from Model 5 in that a statistical adjustment for total lipids is included in Model 6. Details on dioxin and the modeling strategy are found in Chapters 2 and 7 respectively.

Results of investigation for group-by-covariate and dioxin-by-covariate interactions are referenced in the text, and tabular results are presented in Appendix F-2.

Verified Medical Records Variables

Skin Neoplasms

The Model 1 unadjusted and adjusted analyses revealed marginally significant associations between group and a history of a skin neoplasm (Table 10-3(a,b): $p=0.095$, Est. $RR=1.18$ and $p=0.074$, Adj. $RR=1.19$ respectively). Histories of a skin neoplasm were 31.6 percent for Ranch Hands and 28.1 percent for Comparisons. All unadjusted and adjusted contrasts within each occupational category were nonsignificant (Table 10-3(a,b): $p>0.22$ for all remaining contrasts). Significant covariates include age, skin color, reaction of skin to sun after at least 2 hours, average lifetime residential latitude, and ionizing radiation exposure.

Table 10-3.
Analysis of Skin Neoplasms

a) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — UNADJUSTED					
Occupational Category	**Group**	**n**	**Percent Yes**	**Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**
All	***Ranch Hand***	***886***	***31.6***	***1.18 (0.98,1.43)***	***0.095***
	Comparison	***1,198***	***28.1***		
Officer	Ranch Hand	357	35.6	1.18 (0.89,1.58)	0.287
	Comparison	490	31.8		
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	150	31.3	1.29 (0.80,2.07)	0.360
	Comparison	187	26.2		
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	379	28.0	1.14 (0.85,1.54)	0.419
	Comparison	521	25.3		

b) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — ADJUSTED			
Occupational Category	**Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**	**Covariate Remarks[a]**
All	***1.19 (0.98,1.45)***	***0.074***	AGE ($p<0.001$)
Officer	1.20 (0.90,1.61)	0.221	SKIN ($p=0.072$)
Enlisted Flyer	1.32 (0.81,2.15)	0.259	SUN2HR ($p<0.001$)
Enlisted Groundcrew	1.14 (0.85,1.55)	0.382	LAT ($p=0.104$) IONRAD ($p=0.145$)

[a] Covariates and associated p-values correspond to final model based on all participants with available data.

Table 10-3. (Continued)
Analysis of Skin Neoplasms

c) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED				
Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics			**Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[a]**	
Initial Dioxin	**n**	**Percent Yes**	**Estimated Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]**	**p-Value**
Low	152	35.5	0.77 (0.66,0.90)	<0.001
Medium	161	29.8		
High	164	24.4		

d) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — ADJUSTED			
Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[c]			
n	**Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]**	**p-Value**	**Covariate Remarks**
476	0.76 (0.64,0.89)	<0.001	EYE (p=0.082) SUN2HR (p<0.001) IC (p=0.088)

[a] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in initial dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: Low = 39-98 ppt; Medium = >98-232 ppt; High = >232 ppt.

Table 10-3. (Continued)
Analysis of Skin Neoplasms

e) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — UNADJUSTED

Dioxin Category	n	Percent Yes	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ab]	p-Value
Comparison	1,002	28.3		
Background RH	356	33.4	1.31 (1.01,1.70)	0.043
Low RH	232	36.6	1.44 (1.06,1.94)	0.019
High RH	245	23.3	0.75 (0.54,1.04)	0.083
Low plus High RH	477	29.8	1.05 (0.82,1.34)	0.694

f) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — ADJUSTED

Dioxin Category	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ac]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
Comparison	988			AGE (p=0.031) SKIN (p=0.047) SUN2HR (p=0.007) LAT (p=0.115)
Background RH	354	1.26 (0.96,1.64)	0.090	
Low RH	229	1.44 (1.06,1.96)	0.021	
High RH	245	0.79 (0.57,1.11)	0.170	
Low plus High RH	474	1.08 (0.85,1.38)	0.526	

[a] Relative risk and confidence interval relative to Comparisons.

[b] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: RH = Ranch Hand.
Comparison: Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Background (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Low (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, 10 ppt < Initial Dioxin ≤ 143 ppt.
High (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, Initial Dioxin > 143 ppt.

Table 10-3. (Continued)
Analysis of Skin Neoplasms

g) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED

Model[a]	Current Dioxin Category Percent Yes/(n) Low	Medium	High	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1) Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
4	33.1 (281)	36.8 (272)	24.3 (280)	0.88 (0.79,0.97)	0.011
5	33.0 (285)	33.6 (268)	27.5 (280)	0.92 (0.85,1.01)	0.065
6[c]	33.1 (284)	33.6 (268)	27.5 (280)	0.86 (0.78,0.95)	0.002

h) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — ADJUSTED

Model[a]	n	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1) Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
4	832	0.90 (0.81,1.00)	0.056	AGE (p=0.069) SUN2HR (p=0.009)
5	831	0.94 (0.86,1.03)**	0.175**	CURR*SKIN (p=0.020) CURR*IC (p=0.033) AGE (p=0.043) SUN2HR (p=0.008)
6[d]	830	0.88 (0.79,0.97)**	0.008**	CURR*SKIN (p=0.022) CURR*IC (p=0.040) AGE (p=0.089) SUN2HR (p=0.005)

[a] Model 4: Log_2 (lipid-adjusted current dioxin + 1).
Model 5: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1).
Model 6: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1), adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in current dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[d] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids in addition to covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

** Log_2 (current dioxin + 1)-by-covariate interactions ($0.01 < p \leq 0.05$); adjusted relative risk, confidence interval, and p-value derived from a model fitted after deletion of these interactions; refer to Appendix Table F-2-1 for further analysis of these interactions.

Note: Model 4: Low = ≤8.1 ppt; Medium = >8.1-20.5 ppt; High = >20.5 ppt.
Models 5 and 6: Low = ≤46 ppq; Medium = >46-128 ppq; High = >128 ppq.
CURR: Log_2 (current dioxin + 1).

Highly significant results were revealed from the Model 2 unadjusted and adjusted analyses of a history of a skin neoplasm (Table 10-3(c,d): $p<0.001$, Est. RR=0.77 and $p<0.001$, Adj. RR=0.76 respectively). The relative risks, which were less than one, indicate that the history of a skin neoplasm decreased as initial dioxin levels increased. Eye color, reaction of skin to sun after at least 2 hours, and industrial chemical exposure were significant in the Model 2 final adjusted model.

Unadjusted contrasts between Comparisons and background Ranch Hands and between Comparisons and low Ranch Hands in Model 3 revealed significant differences (Table 10-3(e): $p=0.043$, Est. RR=1.31 and $p=0.019$, Est. RR=1.44 respectively). For Comparisons, 28.3 percent had a history of a skin neoplasm. For Ranch Hands in the background category, 33.4 percent had a history of a skin neoplasm, and 36.6 percent of Ranch Hands in the low category had a history of a skin neoplasm. The percentage of Ranch Hands in the high category with a history of a skin neoplasm (23.3%) was marginally significantly less than Comparisons (Table 10-3(e): $p=0.083$, Est. RR=0.75). After adjustment for covariates, the difference between Comparisons and background Ranch Hands was marginally significant (Table 10-3(f): $p=0.090$, Adj. RR=1.26). The contrast between Comparisons and low Ranch Hands remained significant after covariate adjustment (Table 10-3(f): $p=0.021$, Adj. RR=1.44), and the contrast between Comparisons and Ranch Hands in the high category became nonsignificant ($p=0.170$). Model 3 adjusted for age, skin color, reaction of skin to sun after at least 2 hours, and average lifetime residential latitude. The unadjusted and adjusted low plus high Ranch Hand contrasts were nonsignificant (Table 10-3(e,f); $p>0.52$ for each contrast).

Significant associations were found between current dioxin and the history of a skin neoplasm from the unadjusted analyses of Models 4 and 6 (Table 10-3(g): $p=0.011$, Est. RR=0.88 and $p=0.002$, Est. RR=0.86). The percentage of Ranch Hands with a history of a skin neoplasm decreased as current dioxin increased. The Model 5 unadjusted result was marginally significant and exhibited a similar relationship between a history of a skin neoplasm and current dioxin (Table 10-3(g): $p=0.065$, Est. RR=0.92). Analysis of Model 4 was marginally significant after adjusting for the effects of age and reaction of skin to sun after at least 2 hours (Table 10-3(h): $p=0.056$, Adj. RR=0.90). Models 5 and 6 each adjusted for age, reaction of skin to sun after at least 2 hours, and the interactions of current dioxin-by-skin color and current dioxin-by-industrial chemical exposure. Stratified results for each level of each interaction are presented in Appendix Table F-2-1. After deletion of the interactions from the final adjusted models, the association between a history of a skin neoplasm and current dioxin was nonsignificant in Model 5 (Table 10-3(h): $p=0.175$). For Model 6, the results after adjustment for the covariates revealed a highly significant association. Similarly, the percentage of Ranch Hands with a history of a skin neoplasm decreased as current dioxin increased (Table 10-3(h): $p=0.008$, Adj. RR=0.88).

Malignant Skin Neoplasms

All Model 1 differences between Ranch Hands and Comparisons from the unadjusted and adjusted analyses of a history of a malignant skin neoplasm were statistically nonsignificant (Table 10-4(a,b): $p>0.22$ for all contrasts). Covariates in the final adjusted model were age, reaction of skin to sun after at least 2 hours, reaction of skin to sun after repeated exposure, and average lifetime residential latitude.

Table 10-4.
Analysis of Malignant Skin Neoplasms

a) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — UNADJUSTED					
Occupational Category	**Group**	**n**	**Percent Yes**	**Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**
All	***Ranch Hand***	***886***	***13.5***	***1.16 (0.89,1.50)***	***0.305***
	Comparison	***1,198***	***11.9***		
Officer	Ranch Hand	357	18.5	1.26 (0.87,1.80)	0.257
	Comparison	490	15.3		
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	150	14.7	1.23 (0.65,2.30)	0.636
	Comparison	187	12.3		
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	379	8.4	0.98 (0.61,1.57)	0.999
	Comparison	521	8.6		

b) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — ADJUSTED			
Occupational Category	**Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**	**Covariate Remarks[a]**
All	***1.17 (0.90,1.54)***	***0.244***	AGE ($p<0.001$)
Officer	1.26 (0.87,1.84)	0.228	SUN2HR ($p<0.001$)
Enlisted Flyer	1.29 (0.67,2.46)	0.445	SUNRPT ($p<0.001$)
Enlisted Groundcrew	0.99 (0.61,1.61)	0.972	LAT ($p=0.003$)

[a] Covariates and associated p-values correspond to final model based on all participants with available data.

Table 10-4. (Continued)
Analysis of Malignant Skin Neoplasms

c) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED				
Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics			**Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[a]**	
Initial Dioxin	**n**	**Percent Yes**	**Estimated Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]**	**p-Value**
Low	152	16.5	0.74 (0.59,0.93)	0.006
Medium	161	13.0		
High	164	8.5		

d) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — ADJUSTED			
Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[c]			
n	**Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]**	**p-Value**	**Covariate Remarks**
472	****	****	INIT*INS (p=0.007) AGE (p=0.108) SUN2HR (p=0.099) SUNRPT (p=0.007) LAT (p=0.054)

[a] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in initial dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

**** Log_2 (initial dioxin)-by-covariate interaction ($p \leq 0.01$); adjusted relative risk, confidence interval, and p-value not presented; refer to Appendix Table F-2-2 for further analysis of this interaction.

Note: Low = 39-98 ppt; Medium = >98-232 ppt; High = >232 ppt.
INIT = Log_2 (initial dioxin).

Table 10-4. (Continued)
Analysis of Malignant Skin Neoplasms

e) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — UNADJUSTED

Dioxin Category	n	Percent Yes	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ab]	p-Value
Comparison	1,002	11.7		
Background RH	356	14.3	1.33 (0.93,1.90)	0.119
Low RH	232	17.3	1.53 (1.03,2.26)	0.036
High RH	245	8.2	0.65 (0.39,1.07)	0.089
Low plus High RH	477	12.6	1.05 (0.75,1.47)	0.761

f) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — ADJUSTED

Dioxin Category	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ac]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
Comparison	984			DXCAT*IC (p=0.048) DXCAT*INS (p=0.036) AGE (p<0.001) SUN2HR (p=0.004) SUNRPT (p=0.002) LAT (p=0.003)
Background RH	354	1.19 (0.82,1.73)**	0.355**	
Low RH	228	1.45 (0.96,2.20)**	0.077**	
High RH	244	0.79 (0.47,1.32)**	0.362**	
Low plus High RH	472	1.13 (0.79,1.60)**	0.509**	

[a] Relative risk and confidence interval relative to Comparisons.

[b] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

** Categorized dioxin-by-covariate interactions ($0.01 < p \leq 0.05$); adjusted relative risk, confidence interval, and p-value derived from a model fitted after deletion of these interactions; refer to Appendix Table F-2-2 for further analysis of these interactions.

Note: RH = Ranch Hand.
Comparison: Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Background (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Low (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, 10 ppt < Initial Dioxin ≤ 143 ppt.
High (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, Initial Dioxin > 143 ppt.
DXCAT = Categorized Dioxin.

Table 10-4. (Continued)
Analysis of Malignant Skin Neoplasms

g) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED					
	Current Dioxin Category Percent Yes/(n)			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)	
Model[a]	Low	Medium	High	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
4	14.6 (281)	16.2 (272)	9.3 (280)	0.86 (0.75,1.00)	0.038
5	14.4 (285)	15.3 (268)	10.4 (280)	0.91 (0.81,1.03)	0.132
6[c]	14.4 (284)	15.3 (268)	10.4 (280)	0.86 (0.76,0.98)	0.021

h) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — ADJUSTED				
	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)			
Model[a]	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
4	829	0.94 (0.81,1.09)	0.428	AGE (p<0.001) SUN2HR (p=0.040) SUNRPT (p=0.010)
5	829	0.99 (0.87,1.12)	0.819	AGE (p<0.001) SUN2HR (p=0.039) SUNRPT (p=0.009)
6[d]	825	0.92 (0.80,1.06)	0.234	AGE (p<0.001) SUN2HR (p=0.032) SUNRPT (p=0.016) LAT (p=0.137)

[a] Model 4: Log_2 (lipid-adjusted current dioxin + 1).
Model 5: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1).
Model 6: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1), adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in current dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[d] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids in addition to covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: Model 4: Low = ≤8.1 ppt; Medium = >8.1-20.5 ppt; High = >20.5 ppt.
Models 5 and 6: Low = ≤46 ppq; Medium = >46-128 ppq; High = >128 ppq.

Unadjusted analysis of Model 2 indicated a decrease in a history of a malignant skin neoplasm with increasing levels of initial dioxin (Table 10-4(c): $p=0.006$, Est. RR=0.74). Model 3 unadjusted analysis revealed a significant difference between Comparisons and low Ranch Hands (Table 10-4(e): $p=0.036$, Est. RR=1.53). For Comparisons, 11.7 percent had a history of a malignant skin neoplasm, whereas 17.3 percent of low Ranch Hands had a history of a malignant skin neoplasm. There also was a marginally significant difference between the percentage of Ranch Hands in the high dioxin category with a history of a malignant skin neoplasm (8.2%) and Comparisons (Appendix Table 10-4(e): $p=0.089$, Est. RR=0.65). Other contrasts were nonsignificant (Table 10-4(e): $p>0.11$ for all remaining contrasts).

Models 2 and 3 both adjusted for a dioxin-by-insecticide exposure interaction, age, reaction of skin to sun after at least 2 hours, reaction of skin to sun after repeated exposure, and average lifetime residential latitude. Model 3 also adjusted for the interaction of categorized dioxin-by-industrial chemical exposure. Stratified results are presented in Appendix F-2-2 for each level of each interaction.

From Model 2 results stratified by insecticide exposure (no, yes), a highly significant association between initial dioxin and a history of a malignant skin neoplasm was revealed for Ranch Hands who reported insecticide exposure (Appendix Table F-2-2(a): $p=0.004$, Adj. RR=0.64). The percentage of Ranch Hands with a history of a malignant skin neoplasm decreased as initial dioxin increased. After deletion of the interactions from the final model of Model 3, the low Ranch Hand category versus Comparison category contrast was marginally significant (Table 10-4(f): $p=0.077$, Adj. RR=1.45). All other Model 3 adjusted contrasts were nonsignificant (Table 10-4(f): $p>0.35$ for all remaining contrasts).

Unadjusted analyses for Models 4 and 6 were significant and also indicated that the percentage of Ranch Hands with a history of a malignant skin neoplasm decreased as current dioxin increased (Table 10-4(g): $p=0.038$, Est. RR=0.86 and $p=0.021$, Est. RR=0.86 respectively). The Model 5 unadjusted analysis and the adjusted analyses for Models 4, 5, and 6 were nonsignificant (Table 10-4(g,h): $p>0.13$ for all analyses). Each final model adjusted for age, reaction of skin to sun after at least 2 hours, and reaction of skin to sun after repeated exposure. Model 6 also adjusted for average lifetime residential latitude.

Benign Skin Neoplasms

The Model 1 analysis of benign skin neoplasms showed nonsignificant differences between Ranch Hands and Comparisons for all unadjusted and adjusted contrasts (Table 10-5(a,b): $p>0.10$ for all contrasts). No significant covariates were detected in the adjusted analysis.

The Model 2 analyses revealed a marginally significant decrease in the history of a benign skin neoplasm as initial dioxin increased (Table 10-5(c): $p=0.085$, Est. and Adj. RR=0.86). Conversely, the contrast of Comparisons and background Ranch Hands of Model 3 revealed more background Ranch Hands (21.6%) had a history of a benign skin neoplasm than Comparisons (17.6%), resulting in a marginally significant increase (Table 10-5(e,f): $p=0.082$, Est. and Adj. RR=1.30). All remaining Model 3 contrasts were

Table 10-5.
Analysis of Benign Skin Neoplasms

a) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — UNADJUSTED					
Occupational Category	**Group**	**n**	**Percent Yes**	**Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**
All	***Ranch Hand***	***942***	***20.1***	***1.20 (0.97,1.49)***	***0.109***
	Comparison	***1,272***	***17.3***		
Officer	Ranch Hand	364	20.6	1.19 (0.84,1.67)	0.372
	Comparison	496	17.9		
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	160	19.4	1.56 (0.89,2.74)	0.160
	Comparison	202	13.4		
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	418	19.9	1.12 (0.81,1.54)	0.543
	Comparison	574	18.1		

b) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — ADJUSTED			
Occupational Category	**Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**	**Covariate Remarks**
All	***1.20 (0.97,1.49)***	***0.109***	
Officer	1.19 (0.84,1.67)	0.372	
Enlisted Flyer	1.56 (0.89,2.74)	0.160	
Enlisted Groundcrew	1.12 (0.81,1.54)	0.543	

Table 10-5. (Continued)
Analysis of Benign Skin Neoplasms

c) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED				
Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics			**Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[a]**	
Initial Dioxin	**n**	**Percent Yes**	**Estimated Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]**	**p-Value**
Low	169	20.7	0.86 (0.72,1.02)	0.085
Medium	171	17.0		
High	173	17.3		

d) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — ADJUSTED			
Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[a]			
n	**Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]**	**p-Value**	**Covariate Remarks**
513	0.86 (0.72,1.02)	0.085	

[a] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in initial dioxin.

Note: Low = 39-98 ppt; Medium = >98-232 ppt; High = >232 ppt.

Table 10-5. (Continued)
Analysis of Benign Skin Neoplasms

e) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — UNADJUSTED

Dioxin Category	n	Percent Yes	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ab]	p-Value
Comparison	1,056	17.6		
Background RH	371	21.6	1.30 (0.97,1.75)	0.082
Low RH	255	20.0	1.17 (0.83,1.66)	0.365
High RH	258	16.7	0.92 (0.64,1.33)	0.661
Low plus High RH	513	18.3	1.04 (0.79,1.38)	0.761

f) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — ADJUSTED

Dioxin Category	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ab]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
Comparison	1,056			
Background RH	371	1.30 (0.97,1.75)	0.082	
Low RH	255	1.17 (0.83,1.66)	0.365	
High RH	258	0.92 (0.64,1.33)	0.661	
Low plus High RH	513	1.04 (0.79,1.38)	0.761	

[a] Relative risk and confidence interval relative to Comparisons.

[b] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

Note: RH = Ranch Hand.
Comparison: Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Background (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Low (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, 10 ppt < Initial Dioxin ≤ 143 ppt.
High (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, Initial Dioxin > 143 ppt.

Table 10-5. (Continued)
Analysis of Benign Skin Neoplasms

g) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED

Model[a]	Current Dioxin Category Percent Yes/(n) Low	Medium	High	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1) Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
4	20.8 (293)	22.1 (294)	16.2 (297)	0.90 (0.80,1.01)	0.082
5	20.8 (298)	20.6 (291)	17.6 (295)	0.93 (0.85,1.03)	0.160
6[c]	20.9 (297)	20.6 (291)	17.6 (295)	0.89 (0.80,0.99)	0.029

h) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — ADJUSTED

Model[a]	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1) n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
4	884	0.88 (0.78,0.99)	0.034	DC (p=0.067)
5	883	0.91 (0.82,1.01)**	0.075**	CURR*SKIN (p=0.013) DC (p=0.087)
6[d]	882	0.87 (0.78,0.97)**	0.012**	CURR*SKIN (p=0.015) DC (p=0.078)

[a] Model 4: Log_2 (lipid-adjusted current dioxin + 1).
Model 5: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1).
Model 6: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1), adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in current dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[d] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids in addition to covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

** Log_2 (current dioxin + 1)-by-covariate interaction ($0.01 < p \leq 0.05$); adjusted relative risk, confidence interval, and p-value derived from a model fitted after deletion of this interaction; refer to Appendix Table F-2-3 for further analysis of this interaction.

Note: Model 4: Low = ≤8.1 ppt; Medium = >8.1-20.5 ppt; High = >20.5 ppt.
Models 5 and 6: Low = ≤46 ppq; Medium = >46-128 ppq; High = >128 ppq.

nonsignificant (Table 10-5(e,f): $p>0.36$ for all remaining contrasts). Similar to Model 1, Models 2 and 3 retained no significant covariates in the final model.

A marginally significant association was found from the Model 4 analysis, where the history of a benign skin neoplasm decreased as current dioxin increased (Table 10-5(g): $p=0.082$, Est. RR=0.90). After adjustment for degreasing chemical exposure, the association became significant (Table 10-5(h): $p=0.034$, Adj. RR=0.88). Unadjusted analysis of Model 5 was nonsignificant (Table 10-5(g): $p=0.160$). The Model 6 unadjusted analysis was significant; again, the history of a benign skin neoplasm decreased as current dioxin increased (Table 10-5(g): $p=0.029$, Est. RR=0.89). Analyses of Models 5 and 6 adjusted for degreasing chemical exposure and a current dioxin-by-skin color interaction. Appendix Table F-2-3 contains results stratified by skin color. After deletion of each interaction from each final model, the association between current dioxin and benign skin neoplasms was marginally significant in Model 5 and significant in Model 6 (Table 10-5(g,h): $p=0.075$, Adj. RR=0.91 and $p=0.012$, Adj. RR=0.87 respectively).

Skin Neoplasms of Uncertain Behavior or Unspecified Nature

All Model 1 unadjusted and adjusted contrasts were nonsignificant (Table 10-6(a,b): $p>0.85$ for all contrasts). Analyses were not performed for the enlisted flyers, because no participant had a history of a skin neoplasm of uncertain behavior or unspecified nature. Reaction of skin to sun after repeated exposure was significant in the final adjusted model.

All results from the unadjusted analyses of Models 2 and 3 and the adjusted analyses of Model 3 of skin neoplasms of uncertain behavior or unspecified nature were nonsignificant (Table 10-6(c-f): $p>0.53$ for all analyses). Adjusted analyses for Model 2 were not possible because of the sparseness of participants with a history of a skin neoplasm of uncertain behavior or unspecified nature (n=2). Significant covariates retained in Model 3 were eye color and reaction of skin to sun after repeated exposure.

No significant relationship was found between current dioxin and skin neoplasms of uncertain behavior or unspecified nature for the unadjusted analyses of Models 4, 5, and 6 (Table 10-6(g,h): $p>0.78$ for each analysis). Similar to Model 2, adjusted analyses were not performed because of the sparse number of Ranch Hands with a history of a skin neoplasm of uncertain behavior or unspecified nature (n=4 for Models 4, 5, and 6).

Basal Cell Carcinomas (All Sites Combined)

No significant differences were found between Ranch Hands and Comparisons for the unadjusted and adjusted analyses of basal cell carcinomas (all sites combined) (Table 10-7(a,b): $p>0.39$ for all contrasts). Significant covariates from the adjusted analyses were age, reaction of skin to sun after at least 2 hours, reaction of skin to sun after repeated exposure, average lifetime residential latitude, and insecticide exposure.

Unadjusted and adjusted analyses of Model 2 indicated a significant association between initial dioxin and basal cell carcinomas (all sites combined), where the history of a basal cell carcinoma decreased as initial dioxin increased (Table 10-7(c,d): $p=0.013$, Est. RR=0.75

Table 10-6.
Analysis of Skin Neoplasms of Uncertain Behavior or Unspecified Nature

a) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — UNADJUSTED					
Occupational Category	**Group**	**n**	**Percent Yes**	**Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**
All	***Ranch Hand***	***886***	***0.5***	***0.77 (0.23,2.64)***	***0.914***
	Comparison	***1,198***	***0.6***		
Officer	Ranch Hand	357	0.6	0.92 (0.15,5.50)	0.999
	Comparison	490	0.6		
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	150	0.0	--	--
	Comparison	187	0.0		
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	379	0.5	0.69 (0.13,3.76)	0.982
	Comparison	521	0.8		

b) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — ADJUSTED			
Occupational Category	**Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**	**Covariate Remarks[a]**
All	***0.89 (0.25,3.17)***	***0.854***	SUNRPT (p=0.011)
Officer	0.88 (0.14,5.32)	0.886	
Enlisted Flyer	--	--	
Enlisted Groundcrew	0.96 (0.16,5.77)	0.960	

[a] Covariates and associated p-values correspond to final model based on all participants with available data.

--: Adjusted relative risk, confidence interval, and p-value not presented due to zero abnormalities.

Table 10-6. (Continued)
Analysis of Skin Neoplasms of Uncertain Behavior or Unspecified Nature

c) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED				
Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[a]	
Initial Dioxin	n	Percent Yes	Estimated Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
Low	152	0.7	0.72 (0.24,2.15)	0.530
Medium	161	0.6		
High	164	0.0		

d) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — ADJUSTED			
Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)			
n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
--	--	--	

[a] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in initial dioxin.

--: Adjusted analysis not performed due to the sparse number of abnormalities.

Note: Low = 39-98 ppt; Medium = >98-232 ppt; High = >232 ppt.

Table 10-6. (Continued)
Analysis of Skin Neoplasms of Uncertain Behavior or Unspecified Nature

e) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — UNADJUSTED

Dioxin Category	n	Percent Yes	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ab]	p-Value
Comparison	1,002	0.5		
Background RH	356	0.6	1.30 (0.25,6.85)	0.760
Low RH	232	0.4	0.79 (0.09,6.90)	0.830
High RH	245	0.4	0.69 (0.08,6.09)	0.739
Low plus High RH	477	0.4	0.74 (0.14,3.90)	0.719

f) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — ADJUSTED

Dioxin Category	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ac]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
Comparison	994			EYE (p=0.129) SUNRPT (p=0.032)
Background RH	355	1.42 (0.26,7.65)	0.685	
Low RH	230	0.76 (0.09,6.74)	0.805	
High RH	244	0.69 (0.08,6.07)	0.738	
Low plus High RH	474	0.72 (0.14,3.81)	0.702	

[a] Relative risk and confidence interval relative to Comparisons.

[b] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: RH = Ranch Hand.
Comparison: Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Background (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Low (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, 10 ppt < Initial Dioxin ≤ 143 ppt.
High (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, Initial Dioxin > 143 ppt.

Table 10-6. (Continued)
Analysis of Skin Neoplasms of Uncertain Behavior or Unspecified Nature

g) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED					
	Current Dioxin Category Percent Yes/(n)			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)	
Model[a]	Low	Medium	High	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
4	0.4 (281)	0.7 (272)	0.4 (280)	0.91 (0.46,1.82)	0.789
5	0.7 (285)	0.4 (268)	0.4 (280)	0.93 (0.52,1.64)	0.790
6[c]	0.7 (284)	0.4 (268)	0.4 (280)	0.96 (0.52,1.79)	0.896

h) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — ADJUSTED				
	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)			
Model[a]	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
4	--	--	--	
5	--	--	--	
6	--	--	--	

[a] Model 4: Log_2 (lipid-adjusted current dioxin + 1).
Model 5: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1).
Model 6: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1), adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in current dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

--: Adjusted analysis not performed due to the sparse number of abnormalities.

Note: Model 4: Low = ≤8.1 ppt; Medium = >8.1-20.5 ppt; High = >20.5 ppt.
Models 5 and 6: Low = ≤46 ppq; Medium = >46-128 ppq; High = >128 ppq.

Table 10-7.
Analysis of Basal Cell Carcinomas (All Sites Combined)

a) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — UNADJUSTED

Occupational Category	Group	n	Percent Yes	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value
All	***Ranch Hand***	***886***	***11.3***	***1.12 (0.85,1.49)***	***0.462***
	Comparison	***1,198***	***10.2***		
Officer	Ranch Hand	357	15.1	1.21 (0.82,1.79)	0.399
	Comparison	490	12.9		
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	150	13.3	1.22 (0.63,2.34)	0.675
	Comparison	187	11.2		
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	379	6.9	0.94 (0.56,1.57)	0.906
	Comparison	521	7.3		

b) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — ADJUSTED

Occupational Category	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value	Covariate Remarks[a]
All	***1.11 (0.82,1.48)***	***0.502***	AGE ($p<0.001$)
Officer	1.18 (0.78,1.77)	0.434	SUN2HR ($p<0.001$)
Enlisted Flyer	1.24 (0.63,2.44)	0.541	SUNRPT ($p=0.002$)
Enlisted Groundcrew	0.93 (0.54,1.58)	0.778	LAT ($p<0.001$)
			INS ($p=0.107$)

[a] Covariates and associated p-values correspond to final model based on all participants with available data.

Table 10-7. (Continued)
Analysis of Basal Cell Carcinomas (All Sites Combined)

c) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED				
Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics			**Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[a]**	
Initial Dioxin	**n**	**Percent Yes**	**Estimated Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]**	**p-Value**
Low	152	13.8	0.75 (0.59,0.95)	0.013
Medium	161	11.8		
High	164	6.1		

d) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — ADJUSTED			
	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[c]		
n	**Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]**	**p-Value**	**Covariate Remarks**
474	0.75 (0.57,0.97)	0.023	AGE (p=0.068) HAIR (p=0.101) SUN2HR (p=0.003) LAT (p=0.031)

[a] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in initial dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: Low = 39-98 ppt; Medium = >98-232 ppt; High = >232 ppt.

Table 10-7. (Continued)
Analysis of Basal Cell Carcinomas (All Sites Combined)

e) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — UNADJUSTED

Dioxin Category	n	Percent Yes	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ab]	p-Value
Comparison	1,002	10.1		
Background RH	356	11.8	1.25 (0.85,1.84)	0.254
Low RH	232	14.7	1.48 (0.97,2.25)	0.066
High RH	245	6.5	0.60 (0.35,1.04)	0.071
Low plus High RH	477	10.5	1.01 (0.71,1.45)	0.948

f) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — ADJUSTED

Dioxin Category	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ac]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
Comparison	984			AGE ($p<0.001$) SUN2HR ($p<0.001$) SUNRPT ($p=0.004$) LAT ($p<0.001$) INS ($p=0.041$)
Background RH	354	1.12 (0.75,1.67)	0.593	
Low RH	228	1.41 (0.91,2.20)	0.126	
High RH	244	0.71 (0.40,1.25)	0.238	
Low plus High RH	472	1.07 (0.73,1.56)	0.732	

[a] Relative risk and confidence interval relative to Comparisons.

[b] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: RH = Ranch Hand.
Comparison: Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Background (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Low (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, 10 ppt < Initial Dioxin ≤ 143 ppt.
High (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, Initial Dioxin > 143 ppt.

Table 10-7. (Continued)
Analysis of Basal Cell Carcinomas (All Sites Combined)

g) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED

Model[a]	Current Dioxin Category Percent Yes/(n) Low	Medium	High	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1) Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
4	12.5 (281)	12.9 (272)	7.9 (280)	0.86 (0.74,1.01)	0.057
5	11.9 (285)	12.7 (268)	8.6 (280)	0.91 (0.81,1.04)	0.166
6[c]	12.0 (284)	12.7 (268)	8.6 (280)	0.86 (0.75,0.99)	0.032

h) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — ADJUSTED

Model[a]	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1) n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
4	826	0.93 (0.79,1.09)	0.350	AGE (p=0.002) SUN2HR (p=0.056) SUNRPT (p=0.040) LAT (p=0.028)
5	826	0.97 (0.85,1.11)	0.669	AGE (p=0.001) SUN2HR (p=0.055) SUNRPT (p=0.037) LAT (p=0.030)
6[d]	825	0.91 (0.78,1.05)**	0.194**	CURR*ASB (p=0.027) AGE (p=0.001) SUN2HR (p=0.030) SUNRPT (p=0.024) LAT (p=0.021)

[a] Model 4: Log_2 (lipid-adjusted current dioxin + 1).
Model 5: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1).
Model 6: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1), adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in current dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[d] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids in addition to covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

** Log_2 (current dioxin + 1)-by-covariate interaction ($0.01 < p \leq 0.05$); adjusted relative risk, confidence interval, and p-value derived from a model fitted after deletion of this interaction; refer to Appendix Table F-2-4 for further analysis of this interaction.

Note: Model 4: Low = ≤8.1 ppt; Medium = >8.1-20.5 ppt; High = >20.5 ppt.
Models 5 and 6: Low = ≤46 ppq; Medium = >46-128 ppq; High = >128 ppq.

and p=0.023, Adj. RR=0.75 respectively). Age, hair color, reaction of skin to sun after at least 2 hours, and average lifetime residential latitude were significant covariates. Model 3 unadjusted analyses revealed a marginally significant difference between Ranch Hands in the low dioxin category and Comparisons (Table 10-7(e): p=0.066, Est. RR=1.48). More Ranch Hands in the low dioxin category (11.8%) had a history of a basal cell carcinoma than Comparisons (10.1%). The contrast between Ranch Hands in the high dioxin category and Comparisons also was marginally significant (p=0.071, Est. RR=0.60). Of Ranch Hands in the high dioxin category, 6.5 percent exhibited a history of a basal cell carcinoma. All remaining unadjusted contrasts and all adjusted contrasts for Model 3 were nonsignificant (Table 10-7(e,f): p>0.12 for each contrast). Significant covariates included age, reaction of skin to sun after at least 2 hours, reaction of skin to sun after repeated exposure, average lifetime residential latitude, and insecticide exposure.

Unadjusted analyses relating the history of basal cell carcinoma to current dioxin revealed a marginally significant association for Model 4 and a significant association for Model 6. In both analyses, the history of a basal cell carcinoma decreased as current dioxin increased (Table 10-7(g): p=0.057, Est. RR=0.86 and p=0.032, Est. RR=0.86 respectively). The unadjusted analysis for Model 5 was nonsignificant (Table 10-7(g): p=0.166). All results from the adjusted analyses of Models 4, 5, and 6 also were nonsignificant (Table 10-7(h): p>0.19 for all adjusted analyses). Each model adjusted for age, reaction of skin to sun after at least 2 hours, reaction of skin to sun after repeated exposure, and average lifetime residential latitude. The current dioxin-by-asbestos exposure interaction also was significant in Model 6. The results displayed in Table 10-7(h) are from the final model after this interaction was deleted. Results stratified by each level of asbestos exposure are displayed in Appendix Table F-2-4.

Basal Cell Carcinomas (Ear, Face, Head, and Neck)

All unadjusted and adjusted Model 1 analyses of basal cell carcinomas on the ear, face, head, or neck were nonsignificant (Table 10-8(a,b): p>0.19 for all contrasts). Age, reaction of skin to sun after at least 2 hours after first exposure, reaction of skin to sun after repeated exposure, and average lifetime residential latitude were retained in the final adjusted model.

The Model 2 unadjusted and adjusted analysis of basal cell carcinomas on the ear, face, head, or neck revealed significant associations with initial dioxin (Table 10-8(c,d): p=0.017, Est. RR=0.73 and p=0.006, Adj. RR=0.68). The history of a basal cell carcinoma on these sites decreased as levels of current dioxin increased. Significant covariates were reaction of skin to sun after at least 2 hours and average lifetime residential latitude.

A significant difference was found in the Model 3 unadjusted contrast between Ranch Hands in the low category and Comparisons (Table 10-8(e): p=0.042, Est. RR=1.61). For Ranch Hands in the low category, 12.1 percent exhibited a history of a basal cell carcinoma on the ear, face, head, or neck, as contrasted to 7.6 percent of Comparisons. Marginally significant differences were revealed between Comparisons and each of the background and high Ranch Hands categories (Table 10-8(e): p=0.091, Est. RR=1.44 and p=0.076, Est. RR=0.56 respectively). Adjusted contrasts exhibited a marginally significant difference between low Ranch Hands and Comparisons (Table 10-8(f): p=0.098, Adj. RR=1.51). All

Table 10-8.
Analysis of Basal Cell Carcinomas (Ear, Face, Head, and Neck)

a) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — UNADJUSTED

Occupational Category	Group	n	Percent Yes	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value
All	***Ranch Hand***	***886***	***9.1***	***1.18 (0.87,1.61)***	***0.330***
	Comparison	***1,198***	***7.9***		
Officer	Ranch Hand	357	12.0	1.32 (0.85,2.05)	0.258
	Comparison	490	9.4		
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	150	10.7	1.12 (0.55,2.28)	0.894
	Comparison	187	9.6		
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	379	5.8	1.01 (0.57,1.78)	0.999
	Comparison	521	5.8		

b) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — ADJUSTED

Occupational Category	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value	Covariate Remarks[a]
All	***1.21 (0.88,1.68)***	***0.244***	AGE ($p<0.001$)
Officer	1.35 (0.86,2.14)	0.196	SUN2HR ($p<0.001$)
Enlisted Flyer	1.15 (0.55,2.42)	0.703	SUNRPT ($p=0.003$)
Enlisted Groundcrew	1.04 (0.58,1.86)	0.893	LAT ($p<0.001$)

[a] Covariates and associated p-values correspond to final model based on all participants with available data.

Table 10-8. (Continued)
Analysis of Basal Cell Carcinomas (Ear, Face, Head, and Neck)

c) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED				
Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[a]	
Initial Dioxin	n	Percent Yes	Estimated Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
Low	152	10.5	0.73 (0.55,0.96)	0.017
Medium	161	10.6		
High	164	3.7		

d) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — ADJUSTED			
Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[c]			
n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
474	0.68 (0.51,0.92)	0.006	SUN2HR ($p<0.001$) LAT ($p=0.014$)

[a] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in initial dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: Low = 39-98 ppt; Medium = >98-232 ppt; High = >232 ppt.

Table 10-8. (Continued)
Analysis of Basal Cell Carcinomas (Ear, Face, Head, and Neck)

e) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — UNADJUSTED

Dioxin Category	n	Percent Yes	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ab]	p-Value
Comparison	1,002	7.6		
Background RH	356	10.1	1.44 (0.94,2.19)	0.091
Low RH	232	12.1	1.61 (1.02,2.56)	0.042
High RH	245	4.5	0.56 (0.29,1.06)	0.076
Low plus High RH	477	8.2	1.05 (0.70,1.58)	0.812

f) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — ADJUSTED

Dioxin Category	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ac]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
Comparison	984			AGE ($p<0.001$) SUN2HR ($p<0.001$) SUNRPT ($p=0.008$) LAT ($p<0.001$) INS ($p=0.063$)
Background RH	354	1.29 (0.84,2.00)	0.246	
Low RH	228	1.51 (0.93,2.46)	0.098	
High RH	244	0.68 (0.35,1.32)	0.256	
Low plus High RH	472	1.11 (0.73,1.70)	0.618	

[a] Relative risk and confidence interval relative to Comparisons.

[b] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: RH = Ranch Hand.
Comparison: Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Background (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Low (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, 10 ppt < Initial Dioxin ≤ 143 ppt.
High (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, Initial Dioxin > 143 ppt.

Table 10-8. (Continued)
Analysis of Basal Cell Carcinomas (Ear, Face, Head, and Neck)

g) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED

Model[a]	Current Dioxin Category Percent Yes/(n) Low	Medium	High	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1) Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
4	10.7 (281)	10.3 (272)	6.1 (280)	0.81 (0.68,0.97)	0.016
5	9.8 (285)	10.8 (268)	6.4 (280)	0.87 (0.76,1.00)	0.056
6[c]	9.9 (284)	10.8 (268)	6.4 (280)	0.82 (0.70,0.95)	0.009

h) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — ADJUSTED

Model[a]	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1) n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
4	826	0.88 (0.73,1.05)	0.151	AGE (p=0.002) SUN2HR (p=0.049) SUNRPT (p=0.087) LAT (p=0.040)
5	826	0.93 (0.81,1.08)	0.347	AGE (p=0.001) SUN2HR (p=0.049) SUNRPT (p=0.083) LAT (p=0.042)
6[d]	825	0.87 (0.74,1.02)	0.079	AGE (p=0.001) SUN2HR (p=0.031) SUNRPT (p=0.088) LAT (p=0.036)

[a] Model 4: Log_2 (lipid-adjusted current dioxin + 1).
Model 5: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1).
Model 6: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1), adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in current dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[d] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids in addition to covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: Model 4: Low = ≤ 8.1 ppt; Medium = >8.1-20.5 ppt; High = >20.5 ppt.
Models 5 and 6: Low = ≤ 46 ppq; Medium = >46-128 ppq; High = >128 ppq.

other contrasts were nonsignificant (Table 10-8(e,f): $p>0.24$ for all other contrasts). Age, reaction of skin to sun after at least 2 hours, reaction of skin to sun after repeated exposure, average lifetime residential latitude, and insecticide exposure were significant in the Model 3 adjusted analysis.

Analysis of associations between basal cell carcinomas on the ear, face, head, or neck and current dioxin were examined in Models 4, 5, and 6. Unadjusted results were significant for Models 4 and 6 and marginally significant for Model 5 (Table 10-8(g): Model 4: $p=0.016$, Est. RR=0.81; Model 6: $p=0.009$, Est. RR=0.82; and Model 5: $p=0.056$, Est. RR=0.87). Each analysis indicated a decrease in basal cell carcinomas on the ear, face, head, or neck from the Ranch Hands with increasing current dioxin levels. Results of the Model 6 adjusted analysis were marginally significant (Table 10-8(h): $p=0.079$, Adj. RR=0.87). Adjusted analyses of Models 4 and 5 were nonsignificant (Table 10-8(h): $p>0.15$ for each analysis). Each model retained age, reaction of skin to sun after at least 2 hours, reaction of skin to sun after repeated exposure, and average lifetime residential latitude in the final adjusted model.

Basal Cell Carcinomas (Trunk)

All unadjusted and adjusted contrasts examined from the Model 1 analysis of basal cell carcinomas on the trunk were nonsignificant (Table 10-9(a,b): $p>0.35$ for all contrasts). Adjusted analysis retained age, reaction of skin to sun after at least 2 hours after first exposure, reaction of skin to sun after repeated exposure, average lifetime residential latitude, asbestos exposure, and herbicide exposure in the final model.

Similar to Model 1, all Model 2 and 3 results obtained from the unadjusted and adjusted analysis of basal cell carcinomas on the trunk were nonsignificant (Table 10-9(c-f): $p>0.13$ for all analyses). Both models adjusted for the significant covariate effects of age, average lifetime residential latitude, and asbestos exposure. Model 3 also retained eye color, reaction of skin to sun after at least 2 hours, reaction of skin to sun after repeated exposure, herbicide exposure, and the interaction of categorized dioxin-by-insecticide exposure. Adjusted results are presented for Model 3 after deletion of this interaction from the final model. Results stratified by each level of insecticide exposure are presented in Appendix Table F-2-5.

Unadjusted and adjusted current dioxin analyses of basal cell carcinomas on the trunk were nonsignificant for Models 4, 5, and 6 (Table 10-9(g,h): $p>0.55$ for all analyses). Each model adjusted for the covariate effects of age, asbestos exposure, and the interaction of current dioxin-by-insecticide exposure. Model 4 also retained reaction of skin to sun after repeated exposure. All adjusted results displayed in Table 10-9 are from the final model after deletion of the current dioxin-by-insecticide exposure interaction. Results are presented by each level of insecticide exposure for each model in Appendix Table F-2-5.

Basal Cell Carcinomas (Upper Extremities)

All unadjusted and adjusted results from Model 1 analysis of basal cell carcinomas on the upper extremities were nonsignificant (Table 10-10(a,b): $p>0.48$ for all contrasts).

Table 10-9.
Analysis of Basal Cell Carcinomas (Trunk)

a) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — UNADJUSTED					
Occupational Category	**Group**	**n**	**Percent Yes**	**Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**
All	***Ranch Hand***	***886***	***3.5***	***1.17 (0.72,1.91)***	***0.613***
	Comparison	***1,198***	***3.0***		
Officer	Ranch Hand	357	5.6	1.21 (0.65,2.23)	0.663
	Comparison	490	4.7		
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	150	4.0	1.91 (0.53,6.88)	0.498
	Comparison	187	2.1		
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	379	1.3	0.76 (0.25,2.29)	0.829
	Comparison	521	1.7		

b) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — ADJUSTED			
Occupational Category	**Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**	**Covariate Remarks[a]**
All	***0.90 (0.50,1.61)***	***0.714***	AGE ($p<0.001$)
Officer	0.92 (0.46,1.87)	0.823	SUN2HR ($p=0.014$)
Enlisted Flyer	1.62 (0.43,6.17)	0.478	SUNRPT ($p=0.048$)
Enlisted Groundcrew	0.58 (0.18,1.86)	0.359	LAT ($p=0.030$)
			ASB ($p=0.021$)
			HERB ($p=0.081$)

[a] Covariates and associated p-values correspond to final model based on all participants with available data.

Table 10-9. (Continued)
Analysis of Basal Cell Carcinomas (Trunk)

c) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED				
Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[a]	
Initial Dioxin	n	Percent Yes	Estimated Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
Low	152	5.9	0.76 (0.52,1.11)	0.134
Medium	161	2.5		
High	164	3.1		

d) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — ADJUSTED			
Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[c]			
n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
475	0.86 (0.57,1.28)	0.439	AGE (p=0.047) LAT (p=0.061) ASB (p<0.001)

[a] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in initial dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: Low = 39-98 ppt; Medium = >98-232 ppt; High = >232 ppt.

Table 10-9. (Continued)
Analysis of Basal Cell Carcinomas (Trunk)

e) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — UNADJUSTED				
Dioxin Category	n	Percent Yes	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ab]	p-Value
Comparison	1,002	2.8		
Background RH	356	3.1	1.16 (0.57,2.38)	0.676
Low RH	232	4.7	1.64 (0.80,3.36)	0.176
High RH	245	2.9	0.99 (0.42,2.30)	0.977
Low plus High RH	477	3.8	1.31 (0.71,2.40)	0.389

f) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — ADJUSTED				
Dioxin Category	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ac]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
Comparison	982			DXCAT*INS (p=0.038) AGE (p=0.020) EYE (p=0.122) SUN2HR (p=0.060) SUNRPT (p=0.044) LAT (p=0.013) ASB (p=0.012) HERB (p=0.036)
Background RH	354	0.67 (0.30,1.49)**	0.324**	
Low RH	228	1.08 (0.48,2.45)**	0.851**	
High RH	244	0.74 (0.29,1.91)**	0.530**	
Low plus High RH	472	0.92 (0.45,1.88)**	0.818**	

[a] Relative risk and confidence interval relative to Comparisons.

[b] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

** Categorized dioxin-by-covariate interaction ($0.01 < p \leq 0.05$); adjusted relative risk, confidence interval, and p-value derived from a model fitted after deletion of this interaction; refer to Appendix Table F-2-5 for further analysis of this interaction.

Note: RH = Ranch Hand.
Comparison: Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Background (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Low (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, 10 ppt < Initial Dioxin ≤ 143 ppt.
High (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, Initial Dioxin > 143 ppt.

Table 10-9. (Continued)
Analysis of Basal Cell Carcinomas (Trunk)

g) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED					
	Current Dioxin Category Percent Yes/(n)			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)	
Model[a]	Low	Medium	High	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
4	3.2 (281)	4.4 (272)	2.9 (280)	0.97 (0.77,1.23)	0.801
5	3.5 (285)	4.9 (268)	2.1 (280)	0.97 (0.78,1.20)	0.780
6[c]	3.5 (284)	4.9 (268)	2.1 (280)	0.95 (0.74,1.23)	0.714

h) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — ADJUSTED				
	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)			
Model[a]	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
4	829	1.09 (0.83,1.43)**	0.551**	CURR*INS (p=0.032) AGE (p=0.002) SUNRPT (p=0.141) ASB (p=0.002)
5	833	1.05 (0.82,1.33)**	0.713**	CURR*INS (p=0.024) AGE (p<0.001) ASB (p=0.001)
6[d]	832	1.07 (0.83,1.38)**	0.613**	CURR*INS (p=0.021) AGE (p<0.001) ASB (p=0.001)

[a] Model 4: Log_2 (lipid-adjusted current dioxin + 1).
Model 5: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1).
Model 6: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1), adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in current dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[d] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids in addition to covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

** Log_2 (current dioxin + 1)-by-covariate interaction ($0.01 < p \leq 0.05$); adjusted relative risk, confidence interval, and p-value derived from a model fitted after deletion of this interaction; refer to Appendix Table F-2-5 for further analysis of this interaction.

Note: Model 4: Low = ≤ 8.1 ppt; Medium = >8.1-20.5 ppt; High = >20.5 ppt.
Models 5 and 6: Low = ≤ 46 ppq; Medium = >46-128 ppq; High = >128 ppq.

Table 10-10.
Analysis of Basal Cell Carcinomas (Upper Extremities)

a) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — UNADJUSTED					
Occupational Category	**Group**	**n**	**Percent Yes**	**Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**
All	***Ranch Hand***	***886***	***1.9***	***1.15 (0.60,2.21)***	***0.796***
	Comparison	***1,198***	***1.7***		
Officer	Ranch Hand	357	3.6	1.39 (0.64,3.03)	0.534
	Comparison	490	2.7		
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	150	0.7	1.25 (0.08,20.13)	0.999
	Comparison	187	0.5		
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	379	0.8	0.69 (0.17,2.76)	0.844
	Comparison	521	1.2		

b) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — ADJUSTED			
Occupational Category	**Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**	**Covariate Remarks[a]**
All	***1.16 (0.60,2.24)***	***0.662***	AGE (p=0.023)
Officer	1.32 (0.60,2.91)	0.489	EYE (p=0.134)
Enlisted Flyer	1.36 (0.08,22.19)	0.829	SUNRPT (p=0.022)
Enlisted Groundcrew	0.71 (0.17,2.89)	0.633	LAT (p=0.119)
			ASB (p=0.094)

[a] Covariates and associated p-values correspond to final model based on all participants with available data.

Table 10-10. (Continued)
Analysis of Basal Cell Carcinomas (Upper Extremities)

c) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED				
Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[a]	
Initial Dioxin	n	Percent Yes	Estimated Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
Low	152	1.3	0.59 (0.31,1.13)	0.082
Medium	161	3.1		
High	164	0.0		

d) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — ADJUSTED			
	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[c]		
n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
477	0.57 (0.29,1.14)	0.081	EYE (p=0.030) ASB (p=0.050) IONRAD (p=0.092)

[a] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in initial dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: Low = 39-98 ppt; Medium = >98-232 ppt; High = >232 ppt.

Table 10-10. (Continued)
Analysis of Basal Cell Carcinomas (Upper Extremities)

e) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — UNADJUSTED				
Dioxin Category	n	Percent Yes	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ab]	p-Value
Comparison	1,002	1.8		
Background RH	356	2.3	1.41 (0.60,3.32)	0.428
Low RH	232	1.7	0.89 (0.30,2.66)	0.829
High RH	245	1.2	0.62 (0.18,2.14)	0.449
Low plus High RH	477	1.5	0.75 (0.31,1.82)	0.523

f) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — ADJUSTED				
Dioxin Category	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ac]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
Comparison	983			AGE (p=0.088) EYE (p=0.105) SUNRPT (p=0.055) LAT (p=0.093) ASB (p=0.060)
Background RH	354	1.30 (0.55,3.09)	0.549	
Low RH	228	0.87 (0.29,2.66)	0.810	
High RH	244	0.73 (0.21,2.59)	0.625	
Low plus High RH	472	0.81 (0.33,1.98)	0.638	

[a] Relative risk and confidence interval relative to Comparisons.

[b] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: RH = Ranch Hand.
Comparison: Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Background (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Low (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, 10 ppt < Initial Dioxin ≤ 143 ppt.
High (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, Initial Dioxin > 143 ppt.

Table 10-10. (Continued)
Analysis of Basal Cell Carcinomas (Upper Extremities)

g) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED

Model[a]	Current Dioxin Category Percent Yes/(n) Low	Medium	High	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1) Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
4	2.5 (281)	1.5 (272)	1.4 (280)	0.82 (0.56,1.18)	0.271
5	2.1 (285)	2.6 (268)	0.7 (280)	0.87 (0.65,1.16)	0.340
6[c]	2.1 (284)	2.6 (268)	0.7 (280)	0.86 (0.63,1.18)	0.360

h) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — ADJUSTED

Model[a]	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1) n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
4	833	0.88 (0.59,1.32)	0.538	AGE (p=0.115) EYE (p=0.007)
5	833	0.93 (0.68,1.27)	0.643	AGE (p=0.104) EYE (p=0.007)
6[d]	832	0.92 (0.64,1.30)	0.620	AGE (p=0.107) EYE (p=0.007)

[a] Model 4: Log_2 (lipid-adjusted current dioxin + 1).
Model 5: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1).
Model 6: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1), adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in current dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[d] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids in addition to covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: Model 4: Low = ≤ 8.1 ppt; Medium = >8.1-20.5 ppt; High = >20.5 ppt.
Models 5 and 6: Low = ≤ 46 ppq; Medium = >46-128 ppq; High = >128 ppq.

Covariate adjustment retained age, eye color, reaction of skin to sun after repeated exposure, average lifetime residential latitude, and asbestos exposure in the final adjusted model.

The Model 2 relative risk estimates resulting from the unadjusted and adjusted analyses of basal cell carcinomas of the upper extremities were marginally significant and less than one, indicating an inverse relationship (Table 10-10(c,d): $p=0.082$, Est. RR=0.59 and $p=0.081$, Adj. RR=0.57). Eye color, asbestos exposure, and ionizing radiation exposure were significant in the final adjusted model. All unadjusted and adjusted contrasts examined from Model 3 were nonsignificant (Table 10-10(e,f): $p>0.42$ for all contrasts). Significant covariates in the final model include age, eye color, reaction of skin to sun after repeated exposure, average lifetime residential latitude, and asbestos exposure.

Paralleling Model 3 analysis, the unadjusted and adjusted analyses of basal cell carcinomas on the upper extremities displayed nonsignificant results for Models 4, 5, and 6 (Table 10-10(g,h): $p>0.27$ for all analyses). Each model adjusted for age and eye color in the final model.

Basal Cell Carcinomas (Lower Extremities)

Each contrast examined from the Model 1 analysis of basal cell carcinomas on the lower extremities was nonsignificant (Table 10-11(a,b): $p>0.83$ for all contrasts). Differences between Ranch Hands and Comparisons within the enlisted flyer and groundcrew occupations were not conducted because of the sparse number of participants with a history of a basal cell carcinoma on the lower extremities. Adjusted analyses were not performed for Model 1 or any of the other five models because of the sparse number of participants with a basal cell carcinoma on the lower extremities.

No Ranch Hands were found to have a history of a basal cell carcinoma on the lower extremities in Model 2 analyses. The Model 3 unadjusted analysis contrast between Ranch Hands in the background category and Comparisons was examined and found to be nonsignificant (Table 10-11(e): $p=0.596$).

Unadjusted analysis of basal cell carcinomas on the lower extremities exhibited nonsignificant results for each of Models 4, 5, and 6 (Table 10-11(g): $p>0.18$ for each model).

Squamous Cell Carcinomas

All examinations of differences between Ranch Hands and Comparisons were nonsignificant for the Model 1 analysis of squamous cell carcinomas (Table 10-12(a,b): $p>0.13$ for all contrasts). Adjusted analysis retained age, reaction of skin to sun after repeated exposure, average lifetime residential latitude, and herbicide exposure in the final model.

Each unadjusted and adjusted analysis of squamous cell carcinomas for Models 2 and 3 was nonsignificant (Table 10-12(c-f): $p>0.14$ for all analyses). Model 2 adjusted for

Table 10-11.
Analysis of Basal Cell Carcinomas (Lower Extremities)

a) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — UNADJUSTED

Occupational Category	Group	n	Percent Yes	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value
All	***Ranch Hand***	***886***	***0.1***	***0.45 (0.05,4.33)***	***0.839***
	Comparison	***1,198***	***0.3***		
Officer	Ranch Hand	357	0.3	1.37 (0.09,22.03)	0.999
	Comparison	490	0.2		
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	150	0.0	--	--
	Comparison	187	0.0		
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	379	0.0	--	--
	Comparison	521	0.4		

b) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — ADJUSTED

Occupational Category	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
All	--	--	
Officer	--	--	
Enlisted Flyer	--	--	
Enlisted Groundcrew	--	--	

--: Adjusted analysis not performed due to the sparse number of abnormalities.

Table 10-11. (Continued)
Analysis of Basal Cell Carcinomas (Lower Extremities)

c) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED				
Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)	
Initial Dioxin	n	Percent Yes	Estimated Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value
Low	152	0.0	--	--
Medium	161	0.0		
High	164	0.0		

d) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — ADJUSTED			
Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)			
n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
--	--	--	

--: Unadjusted and adjusted analyses not performed due to zero abnormalities.

Note: Low = 39-98 ppt; Medium = >98-232 ppt; High = >232 ppt.

Table 10-11. (Continued)
Analysis of Basal Cell Carcinomas (Lower Extremities)

e) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — UNADJUSTED

Dioxin Category	n	Percent Yes	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ab]	p-Value
Comparison	1,002	0.2		
Background RH	356	0.3	1.95 (0.17,22.90)	0.596
Low RH	232	0.0	--	--
High RH	245	0.0	--	--
Low plus High RH	477	0.0	--	--

f) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — ADJUSTED

Dioxin Category	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
Comparison	--			
Background RH	--	--	--	
Low RH	--	--	--	
High RH	--	--	--	
Low plus High RH	--	--	--	

[a] Relative risk and confidence interval relative to Comparisons.

[b] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

--: Adjusted analysis not performed due to the sparse number of abnormalities.

Note: RH = Ranch Hand.
Comparison: Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Background (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Low (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, 10 ppt < Initial Dioxin ≤ 143 ppt.
High (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, Initial Dioxin > 143 ppt.

Table 10-11. (Continued)
Analysis of Basal Cell Carcinomas (Lower Extremities)

g) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED					
	Current Dioxin Category Percent Yes/(n)			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)	
Model[a]	Low	Medium	High	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
4	0.4 (281)	0.0 (272)	0.0 (280)	0.60 (0.13,2.74)	0.491
5	0.0 (285)	0.4 (268)	0.0 (280)	1.06 (0.34,3.32)	0.923
6[c]	0.0 (284)	0.4 (268)	0.0 (280)	0.34 (0.07,1.74)	0.188

h) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — ADJUSTED				
	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)			
Model[a]	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
4	--	--	--	
5	--	--	--	
6	--	--	--	

[a] Model 4: Log_2 (lipid-adjusted current dioxin + 1).
Model 5: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1).
Model 6: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1), adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in current dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

--: Adjusted analysis not performed due to the sparse number of abnormalities.

Note: Model 4: Low = ≤ 8.1 ppt; Medium = >8.1-20.5 ppt; High = >20.5 ppt.
Models 5 and 6: Low = ≤ 46 ppq; Medium = >46-128 ppq; High = >128 ppq.

Table 10-12.
Analysis of Squamous Cell Carcinomas

a) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — UNADJUSTED					
Occupational Category	**Group**	**n**	**Percent Yes**	**Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**
All	***Ranch Hand***	***886***	***1.4***	***1.16 (0.53,2.52)***	***0.859***
	Comparison	***1,198***	***1.2***		
Officer	Ranch Hand	357	1.7	0.91 (0.32,2.59)	0.999
	Comparison	490	1.8		
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	150	1.3	1.25 (0.17,8.98)	0.999
	Comparison	187	1.1		
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	379	1.1	1.84 (0.41,8.28)	0.671
	Comparison	521	0.6		

b) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — ADJUSTED			
Occupational Category	**Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**	**Covariate Remarks[a]**
All	***1.92 (0.69,5.35)***	***0.208***	AGE ($p<0.001$)
Officer	1.44 (0.42,4.99)	0.564	SUNRPT ($p=0.146$)
Enlisted Flyer	2.13 (0.26,17.61)	0.483	LAT ($p=0.120$)
Enlisted Groundcrew	3.47 (0.67,18.00)	0.138	HERB ($p=0.122$)

[a] Covariates and associated p-values correspond to final model based on all participants with available data.

Table 10-12. (Continued)
Analysis of Squamous Cell Carcinomas

c) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED				
Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[a]	
Initial Dioxin	n	Percent Yes	Estimated Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
Low	152	1.3	0.85 (0.43,1.70)	0.641
Medium	161	1.2		
High	164	1.2		

d) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — ADJUSTED			
Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[c]			
n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
472	0.78 (0.36,1.68)	0.512	SUNRPT (p=0.014) LAT (p=0.103) ASB (p=0.040)

[a] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in initial dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: Low = 39-98 ppt; Medium = >98-232 ppt; High = >232 ppt.

Table 10-12. (Continued)
Analysis of Squamous Cell Carcinomas

e) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — UNADJUSTED

Dioxin Category	n	Percent Yes	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ab]	p-Value
Comparison	1,002	1.1		
Background RH	356	1.7	1.59 (0.58,4.40)	0.367
Low RH	232	1.7	1.54 (0.49,4.92)	0.461
High RH	245	0.8	0.73 (0.16,3.32)	0.680
Low plus High RH	477	1.3	1.12 (0.41,3.07)	0.820

f) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — ADJUSTED

Dioxin Category	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ac]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
Comparison	1,002			AGE (p=0.001) HERB (p=0.103)
Background RH	356	2.54 (0.72,8.95)	0.146	
Low RH	232	2.57 (0.63,10.52)	0.189	
High RH	245	1.68 (0.31,9.18)	0.551	
Low plus High RH	477	2.17 (0.61,7.73)	0.231	

[a] Relative risk and confidence interval relative to Comparisons.

[b] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: RH = Ranch Hand.
Comparison: Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Background (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Low (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, 10 ppt < Initial Dioxin ≤ 143 ppt.
High (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, Initial Dioxin > 143 ppt.

Table 10-12. (Continued)
Analysis of Squamous Cell Carcinomas

g) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED

Model[a]	Current Dioxin Category Percent Yes/(n)			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)	
	Low	Medium	High	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
4	1.4 (281)	2.2 (272)	0.7 (280)	0.91 (0.61,1.35)	0.628
5	1.4 (285)	2.2 (268)	0.7 (280)	0.97 (0.69,1.35)	0.834
6[c]	1.4 (284)	2.2 (268)	0.7 (280)	0.89 (0.62,1.28)	0.539

h) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — ADJUSTED

Model[a]	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)			
	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
4	833	0.98 (0.64,1.50)	0.921	AGE (p=0.095) IONRAD (p=0.128)
5	833	1.03 (0.72,1.48)	0.864	AGE (p=0.086) IONRAD (p=0.125)
6[d]	828	1.01 (0.69,1.46)	0.970	AGE (p=0.080) SUNRPT (p=0.149) IONRAD (p=0.131)

[a] Model 4: Log_2 (lipid-adjusted current dioxin + 1).
Model 5: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1).
Model 6: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1), adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in current dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[d] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids in addition to covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: Model 4: Low = ≤ 8.1 ppt; Medium = >8.1-20.5 ppt; High = >20.5 ppt.
Models 5 and 6: Low = ≤ 46 ppq; Medium = >46-128 ppq; High = >128 ppq.

reaction of skin to sun after repeated exposure, average lifetime residential latitude, and asbestos exposure. Model 3 retained age and herbicide exposure in the final adjusted model.

Associations between squamous cell carcinomas and current dioxin were nonsignificant for all analyses of Models 4, 5, and 6 (Table 10-12(g,h): $p>0.53$ for all analyses). Age and ionizing radiation were retained in each adjusted model. Model 6 also adjusted for reaction of skin to sun after repeated exposure.

Nonmelanomas

The Model 1 analysis of nonmelanomas showed no significant differences between Ranch Hands and Comparisons for both the unadjusted and adjusted analyses (Table 10-13(a,b): $p>0.28$ for all analyses). Age, reaction of skin to sun after at least 2 hours, reaction of skin to sun after repeated exposure, and average lifetime residential latitude were retained in the final adjusted model.

A significant association between nonmelanomas and initial dioxin resulted from the unadjusted and adjusted analyses of Model 2, where the history of a nonmelanoma decreased as initial dioxin measurements increased (Table 10-13(c): $p=0.007$, Est. RR=0.74 and $p=0.032$, Adj. RR=0.76). The adjusted results were based on the final adjusted model after deletion of a significant current dioxin-by-insecticide exposure interaction. Analyses stratified by each level of insecticide exposure are presented in Appendix Table F-2-6. Other significant covariates were age, reaction of skin to sun after at least 2 hours, reaction of skin to sun after repeated exposure, and average lifetime residential latitude.

The Model 3 unadjusted contrast of Ranch Hands in the high dioxin category versus Comparisons showed marginally significant results (Table 10-13(e): $p=0.064$, Est. RR=0.61). Of Ranch Hands in the high dioxin category, 7.4 percent had a history of a nonmelanoma, whereas 11.1 percent of Comparisons showed a history of a nonmelanoma. Of Ranch Hands in the low dioxin category, 16.4 percent showed a history of a nonmelanoma, and the contrast with Comparisons was significant (Table 10-13(e): $p=0.042$, Est. RR=1.52). Results were marginally significant for the adjusted contrast between Ranch Hands in the low category and Comparisons (Table 10-13(f): $p=0.078$, Adj. RR=1.47). All other contrasts were nonsignificant (Table 10-13(e,f): $p>0.13$ for all remaining contrasts). Age, reaction of skin to sun after at least 2 hours, reaction of skin to sun after repeated exposure, average lifetime residential latitude, and insecticide exposure were significant in the Model 3 adjusted analysis.

Significant associations between current dioxin levels and nonmelanomas were found from the unadjusted analysis of Models 4 and 6 (Table 10-13(g,h): $p=0.034$, Est. RR=0.86 and $p=0.016$, Est. RR=0.85). A history of a nonmelanoma decreased as current dioxin levels increased. The Model 5 analyses were nonsignificant, as were the adjusted analyses of Models 4 and 6 (Table 10-13(g,h): $p>0.13$ for all remaining analyses). Each model adjusted for the covariate effects of age, reaction of skin to sun after at least 2 hours exposure, reaction of skin to sun after repeated exposure, and average lifetime residential latitude. Model 6 also retained ionizing radiation exposure.

Table 10-13.
Analysis of Nonmelanomas

a) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — UNADJUSTED					
Occupational Category	**Group**	**n**	**Percent Yes**	**Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**
All	***Ranch Hand***	***886***	***12.6***	***1.14 (0.87,1.49)***	***0.374***
	Comparison	***1,198***	***11.3***		
Officer	Ranch Hand	357	17.1	1.22 (0.84,1.77)	0.351
	Comparison	490	14.5		
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	150	14.7	1.23 (0.65,2.30)	0.636
	Comparison	187	12.3		
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	379	7.7	0.97 (0.59,1.59)	0.999
	Comparison	521	7.9		

b) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — ADJUSTED			
Occupational Category	**Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**	**Covariate Remarks[a]**
All	***1.17 (0.88,1.54)***	***0.282***	AGE ($p<0.001$) SUN2HR ($p<0.001$) SUNRPT ($p=0.001$) LAT ($p<0.001$)
Officer	1.22 (0.83,1.80)	0.310	
Enlisted Flyer	1.30 (0.68,2.49)	0.430	
Enlisted Groundcrew	1.00 (0.60,1.66)	0.997	

[a] Covariates and associated p-values correspond to final model based on all participants with available data.

Table 10-13. (Continued)
Analysis of Nonmelanomas

c) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED				
Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics			**Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[a]**	
Initial Dioxin	**n**	**Percent Yes**	**Estimated Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]**	**p-Value**
Low	152	15.8	0.74 (0.58,0.93)	0.007
Medium	161	12.4		
High	164	7.3		

d) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — ADJUSTED			
Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[c]			
n	**Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]**	**p-Value**	**Covariate Remarks**
472	0.76 (0.59,0.99)**	0.032**	INIT*INS (p=0.026) AGE (p=0.119) SUN2HR (p=0.050) SUNRPT (p=0.034) LAT (p=0.010)

[a] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in initial dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

** Log_2 (initial dioxin)-by-covariate interaction ($0.01 < p \leq 0.05$); adjusted relative risk, confidence interval, and p-value derived from a model fitted after deletion of this interaction; refer to Appendix Table F-2-6 for further analysis of this interaction.

Note: Low = 39-98 ppt; Medium = >98-232 ppt; High = >232 ppt.

Table 10-13. (Continued)
Analysis of Nonmelanomas

e) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — UNADJUSTED

Dioxin Category	n	Percent Yes	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ab]	p-Value
Comparison	1,002	11.1		
Background RH	356	13.5	1.32 (0.92,1.91)	0.134
Low RH	232	16.4	1.52 (1.02,2.27)	0.042
High RH	245	7.4	0.61 (0.36,1.03)	0.064
Low plus High RH	477	11.7	1.03 (0.73,1.45)	0.869

f) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — ADJUSTED

Dioxin Category	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ac]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
Comparison	984			AGE ($p<0.001$) SUN2HR ($p=0.001$) SUNRPT ($p=0.003$) LAT ($p<0.001$) INS ($p=0.134$)
Background RH	354	1.19 (0.81,1.75)	0.366	
Low RH	228	1.47 (0.96,2.24)	0.078	
High RH	244	0.74 (0.43,1.28)	0.283	
Low plus High RH	472	1.11 (0.77,1.59)	0.570	

[a] Relative risk and confidence interval relative to Comparisons.

[b] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: RH = Ranch Hand.
Comparison: Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Background (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Low (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, 10 ppt < Initial Dioxin ≤ 143 ppt.
High (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, Initial Dioxin > 143 ppt.

Table 10-13. (Continued)
Analysis of Nonmelanomas

g) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED					
	Current Dioxin Category Percent Yes/(n)			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)	
Model[a]	Low	Medium	High	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
4	13.9 (281)	15.1 (272)	8.6 (280)	0.86 (0.74,0.99)	0.034
5	13.3 (285)	14.9 (268)	9.3 (280)	0.91 (0.81,1.03)	0.131
6[c]	13.4 (284)	14.9 (268)	9.3 (280)	0.85 (0.75,0.97)	0.016

h) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — ADJUSTED				
	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)			
Model[a]	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
4	826	0.93 (0.79,1.08)	0.319	AGE (p<0.001) SUN2HR (p=0.046) SUNRPT (p=0.041) LAT (p=0.030)
5	826	0.98 (0.86,1.11)	0.692	AGE (p<0.001) SUN2HR (p=0.045) SUNRPT (p=0.037) LAT (p=0.032)
6[d]	825	0.91 (0.79,1.04)	0.176	AGE (p<0.001) SUN2HR (p=0.025) SUNRPT (p=0.046) LAT (p=0.025) IONRAD (p=0.128)

[a] Model 4: Log_2 (lipid-adjusted current dioxin + 1).
Model 5: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1).
Model 6: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1), adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in current dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[d] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids in addition to covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: Model 4: Low = ≤ 8.1 ppt; Medium = >8.1-20.5 ppt; High = >20.5 ppt.
Models 5 and 6: Low = ≤ 46 ppq; Medium = >46-128 ppq; High = >128 ppq.

Melanomas

The Model 1 analysis of melanomas was nonsignificant for each unadjusted and adjusted contrast analyzed (Table 10-14(a,b): $p > 0.46$ for each contrast). Differences between Ranch Hands and Comparisons within the enlisted flyer occupation were not considered because of the absence of melanoma within this cohort. Average lifetime residential latitude, industrial chemical exposure, and degreasing chemical exposure were significant in the final adjusted model.

The unadjusted test of association between initial dioxin and melanomas for Model 2 yielded nonsignificant results (Table 10-14(c): $p=0.136$, Est. RR=0.61). However, after covariate adjustment, a significant inverse relationship was revealed (Table 10-14(d): $p=0.021$, Adj. RR=0.43). Skin color, hair color, industrial chemical exposure, and degreasing chemical exposure were significant covariates. From the unadjusted analysis of Model 3, a marginally significant difference was found between Ranch Hands in the low dioxin category and Comparisons (Table 10-14(e): $p=0.076$, Est. RR=2.79). All other unadjusted and adjusted contrasts were nonsignificant (Table 10-14(e,f): $p > 0.14$ for all remaining contrasts). Significant covariates in Model 3 were average lifetime residential latitude, industrial chemical exposure, and degreasing chemical exposure.

For Models 4, 5, and 6, all unadjusted and adjusted results from the analysis of melanomas were nonsignificant (Table 10-14(g,h): $p > 0.86$ for all analyses). Each adjusted analysis retained hair color, average lifetime residential latitude, industrial chemical exposure, and degreasing chemical exposure in the final adjusted model.

After the analyses were well underway, an error in the classification of one participant's race was discovered. He was listed in the data base as Black, when he was actually non-Black. The participant was a 50-year-old Comparison, and he was a member of the enlisted flyer cohort, with a current serum dioxin value < 10 ppt. Because the participant is a Comparison, he was only included in the Model 1 and Model 3 analyses (see Chapter 7, Statistical Methods). This participant had a melanoma and was excluded from the analyses of melanomas, because he was erroneously coded as Black. Additional analyses of melanomas were performed with this participant properly coded as non-Black. Results from this analysis did not indicate any change in conclusions based on this misclassification. The additional analyses are shown in Appendix Table F-1-2.

Systemic Neoplasms

Each unadjusted and adjusted systemic neoplasms analysis examined using Models 1 through 6 was nonsignificant (Table 10-15: $p > 0.13$ for all contrasts). Age and industrial chemical exposure were significant in each of the final adjusted models.

Malignant Systemic Neoplasms

The Model 1 analyses of a history of a malignant systemic neoplasm revealed that differences between Ranch Hands and Comparisons were nonsignificant (Table 10-16(a,b):

Table 10-14.
Analysis of Melanomas

a) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — UNADJUSTED					
Occupational Category	**Group**	**n**	**Percent Yes**	**Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**
All	***Ranch Hand***	***886***	***1.2***	***1.49 (0.63,3.53)***	***0.486***
	Comparison	***1,198***	***0.8***		
Officer	Ranch Hand	357	1.7	1.66 (0.50,5.48)	0.596
	Comparison	490	1.0		
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	150	0.0	--	--
	Comparison	187	0.0		
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	379	1.3	1.38 (0.40,4.80)	0.852
	Comparison	521	1.0		

b) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — ADJUSTED			
Occupational Category	**Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**	**Covariate Remarks[a]**
All	***1.37 (0.58,3.26)***	***0.474***	LAT (p=0.062) IC (p=0.013) DC (p=0.040)
Officer	1.57 (0.47,5.21)	0.465	
Enlisted Flyer	--	--	
Enlisted Groundcrew	1.24 (0.35,4.35)	0.740	

[a] Covariates and associated p-values correspond to final model based on all participants with available data.

--: Adjusted relative risk, confidence interval, and p-value not presented due to zero abnormalities.

Table 10-14. (Continued)
Analysis of Melanomas

c) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED				
Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics			**Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[a]**	
Initial Dioxin	**n**	**Percent Yes**	**Estimated Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]**	**p-Value**
Low	152	2.0	0.61 (0.30,1.24)	0.136
Medium	161	1.2		
High	164	1.2		

d) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — ADJUSTED			
Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[c]			
n	**Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]**	**p-Value**	**Covariate Remarks**
477	0.43 (0.19,0.99)	0.021	SKIN (p=0.047) HAIR (p=0.003) IC (p=0.013) DC (p=0.008)

[a] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in initial dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: Low = 39-98 ppt; Medium = >98-232 ppt; High = >232 ppt.

Table 10-14. (Continued)
Analysis of Melanomas

e) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — UNADJUSTED				
Dioxin Category	n	Percent Yes	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ab]	p-Value
Comparison	1,002	0.8		
Background RH	356	0.8	1.05 (0.27,4.01)	0.948
Low RH	232	2.2	2.79 (0.90,8.66)	0.076
High RH	245	0.8	1.01 (0.21,4.84)	0.987
Low plus High RH	477	1.5	1.86 (0.67,5.21)	0.235

f) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — ADJUSTED				
Dioxin Category	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ac]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
Comparison	991			LAT (p=0.033) IC (p=0.048) DC (p=0.053)
Background RH	355	0.97 (0.25,3.76)	0.964	
Low RH	230	2.34 (0.74,7.40)	0.148	
High RH	245	0.93 (0.19,4.53)	0.930	
Low plus High RH	475	1.64 (0.58,4.63)	0.351	

[a] Relative risk and confidence interval relative to Comparisons.

[b] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: RH = Ranch Hand.
Comparison: Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Background (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Low (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, 10 ppt < Initial Dioxin ≤ 143 ppt.
High (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, Initial Dioxin > 143 ppt.

Table 10-14. (Continued)
Analysis of Melanomas

g) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED

Model[a]	Current Dioxin Category Percent Yes/(n) Low	Medium	High	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1) Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
4	0.7 (281)	2.2 (272)	0.7 (280)	0.98 (0.64,1.50)	0.934
5	1.1 (285)	1.1 (268)	1.4 (280)	0.99 (0.69,1.42)	0.944
6[c]	1.1 (284)	1.1 (268)	1.4 (280)	1.02 (0.69,1.51)	0.938

h) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — ADJUSTED

Model[a]	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1) n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
4	830	1.01 (0.64,1.57)	0.982	HAIR (p=0.086) LAT (p=0.019) IC (p=0.130) DC (p=0.044)
5	830	1.01 (0.69,1.48)	0.950	HAIR (p=0.087) LAT (p=0.019) IC (p=0.130) DC (p=0.043)
6[d]	829	1.03 (0.69,1.54)	0.869	HAIR (p=0.088) LAT (p=0.020) IC (p=0.135) DC (p=0.044)

[a] Model 4: Log_2 (lipid-adjusted current dioxin + 1).
Model 5: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1).
Model 6: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1), adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in current dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[d] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids in addition to covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: Model 4: Low = ≤ 8.1 ppt; Medium = >8.1-20.5 ppt; High = >20.5 ppt.
Models 5 and 6: Low = ≤ 46 ppq; Medium = >46-128 ppq; High = >128 ppq.

Table 10-15.
Analysis of Systemic Neoplasms

a) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — UNADJUSTED					
Occupational Category	**Group**	**n**	**Percent Yes**	**Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**
All	***Ranch Hand***	***943***	***21.1***	***1.04 (0.85,1.28)***	***0.755***
	Comparison	***1,280***	***20.5***		
Officer	Ranch Hand	361	21.3	0.91 (0.66,1.27)	0.640
	Comparison	502	22.9		
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	160	24.4	1.13 (0.69,1.85)	0.712
	Comparison	203	22.2		
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	422	19.7	1.14 (0.82,1.57)	0.489
	Comparison	575	17.7		

b) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — ADJUSTED			
Occupational Category	**Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**	**Covariate Remarks[a]**
All	***1.03 (0.84,1.27)***	***0.772***	AGE ($p<0.001$) IC ($p=0.086$)
Officer	0.90 (0.64,1.25)	0.520	
Enlisted Flyer	1.13 (0.69,1.85)	0.640	
Enlisted Groundcrew	1.13 (0.82,1.57)	0.459	

[a] Covariates and associated p-values correspond to final model based on all participants with available data.

Table 10-15. (Continued)
Analysis of Systemic Neoplasms

c) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED				
Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics			**Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[a]**	
Initial Dioxin	**n**	**Percent Yes**	**Estimated Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]**	**p-Value**
Low	170	23.5	0.93 (0.79,1.09)	0.354
Medium	172	23.3		
High	172	18.6		

d) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — ADJUSTED			
Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[c]			
n	**Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]**	**p-Value**	**Covariate Remarks**
514	1.01 (0.86,1.20)	0.876	AGE (p=0.004) IC (p=0.057)

[a] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in initial dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: Low = 39-98 ppt; Medium = >98-232 ppt; High = >232 ppt.

Table 10-15. (Continued)
Analysis of Systemic Neoplasms

e) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — UNADJUSTED

Dioxin Category	n	Percent Yes	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ab]	p-Value
Comparison	1,062	20.7		
Background RH	372	19.6	0.98 (0.72,1.32)	0.873
Low RH	255	23.9	1.17 (0.85,1.62)	0.340
High RH	259	19.7	0.91 (0.65,1.28)	0.594
Low plus High RH	514	21.8	1.04 (0.80,1.34)	0.784

f) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — ADJUSTED

Dioxin Category	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ac]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
Comparison	1,062			AGE ($p<0.001$) IC ($p=0.043$)
Background RH	372	0.89 (0.65,1.20)	0.437	
Low RH	255	1.12 (0.80,1.55)	0.513	
High RH	259	1.08 (0.76,1.53)	0.671	
Low plus High RH	514	1.10 (0.85,1.43)	0.481	

[a] Relative risk and confidence interval relative to Comparisons.

[b] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: RH = Ranch Hand.
Comparison: Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Background (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Low (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, 10 ppt < Initial Dioxin ≤ 143 ppt.
High (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, Initial Dioxin > 143 ppt.

Table 10-15. (Continued)
Analysis of Systemic Neoplasms

g) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED					
	Current Dioxin Category Percent Yes/(n)			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)	
Model[a]	Low	Medium	High	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
4	18.4 (293)	24.0 (296)	20.2 (297)	1.02 (0.91,1.14)	0.746
5	19.1 (298)	22.3 (292)	21.3 (296)	1.02 (0.93,1.12)	0.668
6[c]	19.2 (297)	22.3 (292)	21.3 (296)	1.01 (0.91,1.12)	0.875

h) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — ADJUSTED				
	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)			
Model[a]	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
4	886	1.10 (0.97,1.23)	0.130	AGE ($p<0.001$) IC ($p=0.037$)
5	886	1.08 (0.98,1.20)	0.135	AGE ($p<0.001$) IC ($p=0.037$)
6[d]	885	1.08 (0.97,1.20)	0.185	AGE ($p<0.001$) IC ($p=0.039$)

[a] Model 4: Log_2 (lipid-adjusted current dioxin + 1).
Model 5: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1).
Model 6: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1), adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in current dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[d] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids in addition to covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: Model 4: Low = ≤ 8.1 ppt; Medium = >8.1-20.5 ppt; High = >20.5 ppt.
Models 5 and 6: Low = ≤ 46 ppq; Medium = >46-128 ppq; High = >128 ppq.

$p \geq 0.34$ for all contrasts). Adjusted analysis retained age and lifetime cigarette smoking history in the final adjusted model.

The association between malignant systemic neoplasms and initial dioxin was significant in the Model 2 unadjusted analysis. A history of a malignant systemic neoplasm decreased among Ranch Hands as initial dioxin levels increased (Table 10-16(c): $p=0.004$, Est. $RR=0.63$). Age and the initial dioxin-by-lifetime cigarette smoking history interaction were significant in the final adjusted model. Appendix Table F-2-7 presents results stratified by levels of lifetime cigarette smoking history. A marginally significant association between initial dioxin and malignant systemic neoplasms was found among Ranch Hands with no lifetime cigarette smoking history (Appendix Table F-2-7(a): $p=0.081$, Adj. $RR=0.29$).

The Model 3 unadjusted analysis revealed that Ranch Hands in the low dioxin category exhibited a significantly greater history of a malignant systemic neoplasm than Comparisons (Table 10-16(e): $p=0.024$, Est. $RR=1.87$). The analogous adjusted contrast was marginally significant (Table 10-16(f): $p=0.060$, Adj. $RR=1.72$). All remaining contrasts were nonsignificant (Table 10-16(e,f): $p \geq 0.22$ for all remaining contrasts). Adjusted results accounted for the covariates age and lifetime cigarette smoking history.

Associations between malignant systemic neoplasms and current dioxin were found to be nonsignificant from the unadjusted and adjusted analyses of Models 4, 5, and 6 (Table 10-16(g,h): $p > 0.35$ for all analyses). Model 4 adjusted results are based on the final model after deletion of the significant current dioxin-by-degreasing chemical exposure interaction. Model 5 and 6 adjusted results are based on the final model after deletion of the significant current dioxin-by-lifetime cigarette smoking history and current dioxin-by-degreasing chemical exposure interactions. Results stratified by each level of degreasing chemical exposure for Models 4, 5, and 6, and lifetime cigarette smoking history for Models 5 and 6, are presented in Appendix F-2-7. Age was significant in each model, and Model 4 also adjusted for lifetime cigarette smoking history.

Benign Systemic Neoplasms

All differences in the history of a benign systemic neoplasm between Ranch Hands and Comparisons were nonsignificant (Table 10-17(a,b): $p \geq 0.24$ for all contrasts). Age and industrial chemical exposure were significant in the final model.

Results from the Model 2 and 3 analyses of benign systemic neoplasms were similar to Model 1. All associations between benign systemic neoplasms and initial dioxin and categorized dioxin were nonsignificant (Table 10-17(c-f): $p > 0.46$ for all analyses). Model 2 was adjusted for lifetime alcohol history and industrial chemical exposure and Model 3 was adjusted for age and industrial chemical exposure.

The analysis of the relationship between benign systemic neoplasms and current dioxin was nonsignificant for Models 4, 5, and 6 (Table 10-17(g,h): $p > 0.71$ for all analyses). Lifetime alcohol history and industrial chemical exposure were significant covariates in each adjusted final model.

Table 10-16.
Analysis of Malignant Systemic Neoplasms

a) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — UNADJUSTED					
Occupational Category	**Group**	**n**	**Percent Yes**	**Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**
All	***Ranch Hand***	***943***	***5.0***	***1.17 (0.78,1.74)***	***0.507***
	Comparison	***1,280***	***4.3***		
Officer	Ranch Hand	361	6.1	0.95 (0.54,1.67)	0.980
	Comparison	502	6.4		
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	160	8.1	1.54 (0.67,3.54)	0.414
	Comparison	203	5.4		
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	422	2.8	1.37 (0.61,3.09)	0.575
	Comparison	575	2.1		

b) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — ADJUSTED			
Occupational Category	**Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**	**Covariate Remarks[a]**
All	***1.16 (0.77,1.75)***	***0.479***	AGE ($p<0.001$) PACKYR ($p=0.051$)
Officer	0.94 (0.53,1.66)	0.820	
Enlisted Flyer	1.51 (0.65,3.52)	0.340	
Enlisted Groundcrew	1.37 (0.60,3.14)	0.454	

[a] Covariates and associated p-values correspond to final model based on all participants with available data.

Table 10-16. (Continued)
Analysis of Malignant Systemic Neoplasms

c) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED				
Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics			**Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[a]**	
Initial Dioxin	**n**	**Percent Yes**	**Estimated Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]**	**p-Value**
Low	170	7.1	0.63 (0.44,0.89)	0.004
Medium	172	8.1		
High	172	1.7		

d) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — ADJUSTED			
Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[c]			
n	**Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]**	**p-Value**	**Covariate Remarks**
514	****	****	INIT*PACKYR (p=0.008) AGE (p<0.001)

[a] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in initial dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

**** Log_2 (initial dioxin)-by-covariate interaction ($p \leq 0.01$); adjusted relative risk, confidence interval, and p-value not presented; refer to Appendix Table F-2-7 for further analysis of this interaction.

Note: Low = 39-98 ppt; Medium = >98-232 ppt; High = >232 ppt.

Table 10-16. (Continued)
Analysis of Malignant Systemic Neoplasms

e) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — UNADJUSTED

Dioxin Category	n	Percent Yes	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ab]	p-Value
Comparison	1,062	4.2		
Background RH	372	4.0	1.03 (0.57,1.89)	0.914
Low RH	255	8.2	1.87 (1.09,3.22)	0.024
High RH	259	3.1	0.67 (0.31,1.45)	0.309
Low plus High RH	514	5.6	1.26 (0.77,2.04)	0.356

f) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — ADJUSTED

Dioxin Category	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ac]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
Comparison	1,060			AGE (p<0.001) PACKYR (p=0.066)
Background RH	371	0.94 (0.51,1.73)	0.834	
Low RH	255	1.72 (0.98,3.01)	0.060	
High RH	259	0.90 (0.41,1.99)	0.801	
Low plus High RH	514	1.37 (0.83,2.26)	0.220	

[a] Relative risk and confidence interval relative to Comparisons.

[b] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: RH = Ranch Hand.
Comparison: Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Background (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Low (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, 10 ppt < Initial Dioxin ≤ 143 ppt.
High (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, Initial Dioxin > 143 ppt.

Table 10-16. (Continued)
Analysis of Malignant Systemic Neoplasms

g) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED					
	Current Dioxin Category Percent Yes/(n)			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)	
Model[a]	Low	Medium	High	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
4	3.8 (293)	8.1 (296)	3.0 (297)	0.94 (0.76,1.17)	0.585
5	4.7 (298)	5.5 (292)	4.7 (296)	0.99 (0.82,1.18)	0.872
6[c]	4.7 (297)	5.5 (292)	4.7 (296)	0.95 (0.78,1.15)	0.585

h) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — ADJUSTED				
	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)			
Model[a]	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
4	885	1.06 (0.85,1.37)**	0.537**	CURR*DC (p=0.024) AGE (p<0.001) PACKYR (p=0.069)
5	885	1.10 (0.90,1.35)**	0.359**	CURR*PACKYR (p=0.039) CURR*DC (p=0.036) AGE (p<0.001)
6[d]	884	1.08 (0.87,1.34)**	0.506**	CURR*PACKYR (p=0.038) CURR*DC (p=0.035) AGE (p<0.001)

[a] Model 4: Log_2 (lipid-adjusted current dioxin + 1).
Model 5: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1).
Model 6: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1), adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in current dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[d] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids in addition to covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

** Log_2 (current dioxin + 1)-by-covariate interaction ($0.01 < p \leq 0.05$); adjusted relative risk, confidence interval, and p-value derived from a model fitted after deletion of this interaction; refer to Appendix Table F-2-7 for further analysis of this interaction.

Note: Model 4: Low = ≤ 8.1 ppt; Medium = >8.1-20.5 ppt; High = >20.5 ppt.
Models 5 and 6: Low = ≤ 46 ppq; Medium = >46-128 ppq; High = >128 ppq.

Table 10-17.
Analysis of Benign Systemic Neoplasms

a) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — UNADJUSTED					
Occupational Category	**Group**	**n**	**Percent Yes**	**Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**
All	***Ranch Hand***	***943***	***16.4***	***1.07 (0.85,1.34)***	***0.611***
	Comparison	***1,280***	***15.6***		
Officer	Ranch Hand	361	14.1	0.86 (0.59,1.25)	0.476
	Comparison	502	16.1		
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	160	19.4	1.15 (0.68,1.97)	0.699
	Comparison	203	17.2		
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	422	17.3	1.24 (0.88,1.75)	0.254
	Comparison	575	14.4		

b) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — ADJUSTED			
Occupational Category	**Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**	**Covariate Remarks[a]**
All	***1.06 (0.84,1.34)***	***0.607***	AGE ($p<0.001$) IC ($p=0.075$)
Officer	0.84 (0.58,1.24)	0.384	
Enlisted Flyer	1.15 (0.67,1.98)	0.602	
Enlisted Groundcrew	1.23 (0.87,1.74)	0.240	

[a] Covariates and associated p-values correspond to final model based on all participants with available data.

Table 10-17. (Continued)
Analysis of Benign Systemic Neoplasms

c) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED				
Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[a]	
Initial Dioxin	n	Percent Yes	Estimated Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
Low	170	16.5	1.02 (0.86,1.22)	0.804
Medium	172	16.3		
High	172	16.3		

d) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — ADJUSTED			
Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[c]			
n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
502	1.00 (0.83,1.20)	0.989	DRKYR (p=0.124) IC (p=0.018)

[a] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in initial dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: Low = 39-98 ppt; Medium = >98-232 ppt; High = >232 ppt.

Table 10-17. (Continued)
Analysis of Benign Systemic Neoplasms

e) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — UNADJUSTED				
Dioxin Category	n	Percent Yes	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ab]	p-Value
Comparison	1,062	15.6		
Background RH	372	16.1	1.07 (0.77,1.48)	0.689
Low RH	255	16.5	1.05 (0.73,1.52)	0.795
High RH	259	16.2	1.02 (0.71,1.48)	0.911
Low plus High RH	514	16.3	1.04 (0.78,1.38)	0.812

f) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — ADJUSTED				
Dioxin Category	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ac]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
Comparison	1,062			AGE ($p<0.001$) IC ($p=0.057$)
Background RH	372	0.99 (0.72,1.38)	0.976	
Low RH	255	1.02 (0.70,1.48)	0.931	
High RH	259	1.15 (0.79,1.68)	0.464	
Low plus High RH	514	1.08 (0.81,1.44)	0.605	

[a] Relative risk and confidence interval relative to Comparisons.

[b] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: RH = Ranch Hand.
Comparison: Current Dioxin $\leq$ 10 ppt.
Background (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin $\leq$ 10 ppt.
Low (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin $>$ 10 ppt, 10 ppt $<$ Initial Dioxin $\leq$ 143 ppt.
High (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin $>$ 10 ppt, Initial Dioxin $>$ 143 ppt.

Table 10-17. (Continued)
Analysis of Benign Systemic Neoplasms

g) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED					
	Current Dioxin Category Percent Yes/(n)			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)	
Model[a]	Low	Medium	High	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
4	15.0 (293)	16.6 (296)	17.2 (297)	1.02 (0.91,1.16)	0.712
5	15.4 (298)	16.8 (292)	16.6 (296)	1.01 (0.91,1.12)	0.829
6[c]	15.5 (297)	16.8 (292)	16.6 (296)	1.02 (0.91,1.14)	0.765

h) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — ADJUSTED				
	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)			
Model[a]	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
4	867	1.01 (0.89,1.15)	0.841	DRKYR (p=0.059) IC (p=0.010)
5	867	1.00 (0.90,1.12)	0.940	DRKYR (p=0.058) IC (p=0.011)
6[d]	866	1.01 (0.90,1.14)	0.870	DRKYR (p=0.057) IC (p=0.011)

[a] Model 4: Log_2 (lipid-adjusted current dioxin + 1).
Model 5: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1).
Model 6: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1), adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in current dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[d] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids in addition to covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: Model 4: Low = ≤ 8.1 ppt; Medium = >8.1-20.5 ppt; High = >20.5 ppt.
Models 5 and 6: Low = ≤ 46 ppq; Medium = >46-128 ppq; High = >128 ppq.

Systemic Neoplasms of Uncertain Behavior or Unspecified Nature

All Ranch Hand versus Comparison contrasts examined from the Model 1 analysis of systemic neoplasms of uncertain behavior or unspecified nature were nonsignificant (Table 10-18(a,b): $p > 0.59$ for all contrasts). Contrasts within the enlisted flyer cohort were not performed because no Ranch Hand enlisted flyers exhibited a history of a systemic neoplasm of uncertain behavior or unspecified nature. Age was significant in the adjusted model.

All unadjusted and adjusted results also were nonsignificant from each Model 2 and 3 analysis of systemic neoplasms of uncertain behavior or unspecified nature (Table 10-18(c-f): $p > 0.44$ for all analyses). No covariates were significant in Model 2, although age was significant in Model 3.

The analyses of systemic neoplasms of uncertain behavior or unspecified nature from Models 4, 5, and 6 were comparable to the above analyses. All unadjusted and adjusted results were nonsignificant (Table 10-18(g,h): $p > 0.25$ for all analyses). Each Model 4, 5, and 6 adjusted analysis retained age and the current dioxin-by-asbestos exposure interaction in the final model. All adjusted results presented in Table 10-18(h) are based upon deletion of the interaction from the final model. For each model, Appendix Table F-2-8 displays results stratified for each level of asbestos exposure.

Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Eye, Ear, Face, Head, and Neck)

Differences in the history of a malignant systemic neoplasm of the eye, ear, face, head, or neck were examined between Ranch Hands and Comparisons in the analysis of Model 1. All unadjusted and adjusted contrasts were nonsignificant (Table 10-19(a,b): $p > 0.26$ for all contrasts). The adjusted analysis retained age and lifetime cigarette smoking history in the final model.

The unadjusted analysis of malignant systemic neoplasms of the eye, ear, face, head, or neck from Model 2 was nonsignificant (Table 10-19(c): $p = 0.182$). Adjusted analysis included degreasing chemical exposure and an initial dioxin-by-lifetime cigarette smoking history interaction in the final model. No significant results were found in analyses of malignant systemic neoplasms of the eye, ear, face, head, or neck stratified by lifetime cigarette smoking history (Appendix Table F-2-9(a)).

Each Model 3 contrast was nonsignificant (Table 10-19(e,f): $p > 0.16$ for all unadjusted and adjusted contrasts). Adjusted analyses revealed a significant categorized dioxin-by-lifetime cigarette smoking history interaction and a categorized dioxin-by-degreasing chemical exposure interaction. Model 3 also adjusted for age, ionizing radiation exposure, and industrial chemical exposure. Results stratified by levels of lifetime cigarette smoking and levels of degreasing chemical exposure are presented in Appendix Table F-2-9. Adjusted results were based on the final model after deletion of the significant interactions.

Model 4, 5, and 6 analyses of malignant systemic neoplasms of the eye, ear, face, head, or neck revealed nonsignificant associations with current dioxin (Table 10-19(g,h): $p > 0.48$

Table 10-18.
Analysis of Systemic Neoplasms of Uncertain Behavior or Unspecified Nature

a) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — UNADJUSTED

Occupational Category	Group	n	Percent Yes	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value
All	***Ranch Hand***	***943***	***1.6***	***0.92 (0.48,1.79)***	***0.948***
	Comparison	***1,280***	***1.7***		
Officer	Ranch Hand	361	2.8	1.27 (0.53,3.03)	0.749
	Comparison	502	2.2		
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	160	0.0	--	--
	Comparison	203	1.0		
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	422	1.2	0.75 (0.25,2.27)	0.817
	Comparison	575	1.6		

b) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — ADJUSTED

Occupational Category	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value	Covariate Remarks[a]
All	***0.92 (0.47,1.78)***	***0.803***	AGE (p=0.010)
Officer	1.26 (0.53,3.01)	0.599	
Enlisted Flyer	--	--	
Enlisted Groundcrew	0.75 (0.25,2.27)	0.616	

[a] Covariates and associated p-values correspond to final model based on all participants with available data.

--: Adjusted relative risk, confidence interval, and p-value not presented due to the sparse number of abnormalities.

Table 10-18. (Continued)
Analysis of Systemic Neoplasms of Uncertain Behavior or Unspecified Nature

c) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED				
Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics			**Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[a]**	
Initial Dioxin	**n**	**Percent Yes**	**Estimated Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]**	**p-Value**
Low	170	2.4	0.91 (0.54,1.52)	0.709
Medium	172	1.2		
High	172	1.2		

d) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — ADJUSTED			
Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[a]			
n	**Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]**	**p-Value**	**Covariate Remarks**
514	0.91 (0.54,1.52)	0.709	

[a] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in initial dioxin.

Note: Low = 39-98 ppt; Medium = >98-232 ppt; High = >232 ppt.

Table 10-18. (Continued)
Analysis of Systemic Neoplasms of Uncertain Behavior or Unspecified Nature

e) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — UNADJUSTED

Dioxin Category	n	Percent Yes	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ab]	p-Value
Comparison	1,062	1.8		
Background RH	372	1.6	0.94 (0.37,2.38)	0.890
Low RH	255	2.0	1.08 (0.40,2.94)	0.877
High RH	259	1.2	0.62 (0.18,2.13)	0.448
Low plus High RH	514	1.6	0.85 (0.37,1.96)	0.698

f) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — ADJUSTED

Dioxin Category	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ac]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
Comparison	1,062			AGE (p=0.028)
Background RH	372	0.88 (0.34,2.24)	0.785	
Low RH	255	1.03 (0.38,2.80)	0.957	
High RH	259	0.72 (0.21,2.48)	0.599	
Low plus High RH	514	0.89 (0.38,2.05)	0.776	

[a] Relative risk and confidence interval relative to Comparisons.

[b] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: RH = Ranch Hand.
Comparison: Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Background (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Low (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, 10 ppt < Initial Dioxin ≤ 143 ppt.
High (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, Initial Dioxin > 143 ppt.

Table 10-18. (Continued)
Analysis of Systemic Neoplasms of Uncertain Behavior or Unspecified Nature

g) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED					
	Current Dioxin Category Percent Yes/(n)			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)	
Model[a]	Low	Medium	High	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
4	2.1 (293)	1.4 (296)	1.4 (297)	0.88 (0.60,1.28)	0.487
5	1.7 (298)	2.1 (292)	1.0 (296)	0.88 (0.65,1.19)	0.404
6[c]	1.7 (297)	2.1 (292)	1.0 (296)	0.83 (0.60,1.14)	0.255

h) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — ADJUSTED				
	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)			
Model[a]	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
4	886	0.92 (0.62,1.37)**	0.689**	CURR*ASB (p=0.009) AGE (p=0.101)
5	886	0.91 (0.66,1.25)**	0.552**	CURR*ASB (p=0.015) AGE (p=0.099)
6[d]	885	0.86 (0.61,1.21)**	0.389**	CURR*ASB (p=0.015) AGE (p=0.112)

[a] Model 4: Log_2 (lipid-adjusted current dioxin + 1).
Model 5: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1).
Model 6: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1), adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in current dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[d] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids in addition to covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

** Log_2 (current dioxin + 1)-by-covariate interaction ($p \leq 0.05$); adjusted relative risk, confidence interval, and p-value derived from a model fitted after deletion of this interaction; refer to Appendix Table F-2-8 for further analysis of this interaction.

Note: Model 4: Low = ≤ 8.1 ppt; Medium = >8.1-20.5 ppt; High = >20.5 ppt.
Models 5 and 6: Low = ≤ 46 ppq; Medium = >46-128 ppq; High = >128 ppq.

Table 10-19.
Analysis of Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Eye, Ear, Face, Head, and Neck)

a) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — UNADJUSTED					
Occupational Category	**Group**	**n**	**Percent Yes**	**Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**
All	***Ranch Hand***	***943***	***1.1***	***1.36 (0.56,3.28)***	***0.644***
	Comparison	***1,280***	***0.8***		
Officer	Ranch Hand	361	1.4	2.34 (0.56,9.84)	0.406
	Comparison	502	0.6		
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	160	1.3	0.63 (0.11,3.48)	0.905
	Comparison	203	2.0		
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	422	0.7	1.37 (0.27,6.80)	0.999
	Comparison	575	0.5		

b) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — ADJUSTED			
Occupational Category	**Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**	**Covariate Remarks[a]**
All	***1.34 (0.55,3.24)***	***0.519***	AGE (p=0.035) PACKYR (p=0.104)
Officer	2.28 (0.54,9.62)	0.263	
Enlisted Flyer	0.61 (0.11,3.37)	0.571	
Enlisted Groundcrew	1.37 (0.27,6.79)	0.703	

[a] Covariates and associated p-values correspond to final model based on all participants with available data.

Table 10-19. (Continued)
Analysis of Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Eye, Ear, Face, Head, and Neck)

c) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED				
Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics			**Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[a]**	
Initial Dioxin	**n**	**Percent Yes**	**Estimated Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]**	**p-Value**
Low	170	2.4	0.65 (0.32,1.30)	0.182
Medium	172	0.0		
High	172	1.2		

d) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — ADJUSTED			
Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[c]			
n	**Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]**	**p-Value**	**Covariate Remarks**
514	****	****	INIT*PACKYR (p=0.003) DC (p=0.015)

[a] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in initial dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

**** Log_2 (initial dioxin)-by-covariate interaction ($p \leq 0.01$); adjusted relative risk, confidence interval, and p-value not presented; refer to Appendix Table F-2-9 for further analysis of this interaction.

Note: Low = 39-98 ppt; Medium = >98-232 ppt; High = >232 ppt.

Table 10-19. (Continued)
Analysis of Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Eye, Ear, Face, Head, and Neck)

e) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — UNADJUSTED

Dioxin Category	n	Percent Yes	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ab]	p-Value
Comparison	1,062	0.6		
Background RH	372	0.8	1.57 (0.38,6.39)	0.532
Low RH	255	1.6	2.49 (0.69,8.98)	0.163
High RH	259	0.8	1.21 (0.24,6.17)	0.820
Low plus High RH	514	1.2	1.85 (0.58,5.86)	0.295

f) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — ADJUSTED

Dioxin Category	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ac]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
Comparison	1,060			DXCAT*PACKYR (p=0.030) DXCAT*DC (p=0.028) AGE (p=0.032) IONRAD (p=0.010) IC (p=0.081)
Background RH	371	1.43 (0.34,5.98)**	0.623**	
Low RH	255	2.32 (0.62,8.63)**	0.210**	
High RH	259	1.86 (0.36,9.71)**	0.460**	
Low plus High RH	514	2.14 (0.66,6.90)**	0.202**	

[a] Relative risk and confidence interval relative to Comparisons.

[b] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

** Categorized dioxin-by-covariate interactions ($0.01 < p \leq 0.05$); adjusted relative risk, confidence interval, and p-value derived from a model fitted after deletion of these interactions; refer to Appendix Table F-2-9 for further analysis of these interactions.

Note: RH = Ranch Hand.
Comparison: Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Background (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Low (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, 10 ppt < Initial Dioxin ≤ 143 ppt.
High (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, Initial Dioxin > 143 ppt.

Table 10-19. (Continued)
Analysis of Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Eye, Ear, Face, Head, and Neck)

g) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED					
	Current Dioxin Category Percent Yes/(n)			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)	
Model[a]	Low	Medium	High	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
4	0.7 (293)	1.7 (296)	0.7 (297)	0.99 (0.63,1.56)	0.976
5	1.0 (298)	1.4 (292)	0.7 (296)	0.97 (0.66,1.42)	0.855
6[c]	1.0 (297)	1.4 (292)	0.7 (296)	1.06 (0.70,1.61)	0.793

h) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — ADJUSTED				
	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)			
Model[a]	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
4	886	1.11 (0.70,1.75)	0.672	DC (p=0.062)
5	886	1.05 (0.71,1.58)	0.795	DC (p=0.068)
6[d]	885	1.17 (0.76,1.81)	0.489	DC (p=0.066)

[a] Model 4: Log_2 (lipid-adjusted current dioxin + 1).
Model 5: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1).
Model 6: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1), adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in current dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[d] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids in addition to covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: Model 4: Low = ≤ 8.1 ppt; Medium = >8.1-20.5 ppt; High = >20.5 ppt.
Models 5 and 6: Low = ≤ 46 ppq; Medium = >46-128 ppq; High = >128 ppq.

for all unadjusted and adjusted analyses). Each adjusted model retained degreasing chemical exposure.

Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Oral Cavity, Pharynx, and Larynx)

All unadjusted and adjusted contrasts examined from the Model 1 analysis of malignant systemic neoplasms of the oral cavity, pharynx, or larynx were nonsignificant (Table 10-20(a,b): $p > 0.72$ for all contrasts). Age and ionizing radiation exposure were significant covariates in the final adjusted model.

The Model 2 and 3 analyses of malignant systemic neoplasms of the oral cavity, pharynx, or larynx also were nonsignificant for the unadjusted and adjusted models (Table 10-20(c-f): $p > 0.27$ for all analyses). Significant covariates for Model 2 were lifetime cigarette smoking history, industrial chemical exposure, and herbicide exposure. Model 3 adjusted for age and ionizing radiation exposure.

Unadjusted results from the Model 4, 5, and 6 analyses of malignant systemic neoplasms of the oral cavity, pharynx, or larynx were each nonsignificant (Table 10-20(g): $p > 0.21$ for each unadjusted analysis). Adjusted analysis of Models 4, 5, and 6 each revealed marginally significant associations with current dioxin (Table 10-20(h): $p=0.076$, Adj. RR=1.79; $p=0.070$; Adj. RR=1.72; and $p=0.087$, Adj. RR=1.73 respectively). Each adjusted model retained ionizing radiation exposure, industrial chemical exposure, and herbicide exposure in the final model.

Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Esophagus)

Because of the sparse number of participants with a history of a malignant systemic neoplasm of the esophagus, statistical analysis was not performed. Frequencies and associated percentages for a history of a malignant systemic neoplasm of the esophagus are presented for each model in Table 10-21.

Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Brain)

Because of the sparse number of participants with a history of a malignant systemic neoplasm of the brain, only the unadjusted analysis of all Ranch Hands versus all Comparisons was performed for Model 1. The results of this analysis displayed a nonsignificant difference between groups (Table 10-22(a): $p=0.999$).

Of Models 2 through 6, only unadjusted analyses of malignant systemic neoplasms of the brain were possible for Models 4 and 5 and yielded nonsignificant results (Table 10-22(g): $p > 0.41$ for each model). No other analyses were performed because of the sparse number of participants with a history of a malignant systemic neoplasm of the brain. Table 10-22(c,e,g) displays frequencies and associated percentages of the history of a malignant systemic neoplasm of the brain for each of these models.

Table 10-20.
Analysis of Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Oral Cavity, Pharynx, and Larynx)

a) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — UNADJUSTED

Occupational Category	Group	n	Percent Yes	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value
All	***Ranch Hand***	***943***	***0.4***	***0.91 (0.26,3.21)***	***0.999***
	Comparison	***1,280***	***0.5***		
Officer	Ranch Hand	361	0.3	0.69 (0.06,7.69)	0.999
	Comparison	502	0.4		
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	160	1.3	1.27 (0.18,9.13)	0.999
	Comparison	203	1.0		
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	422	0.2	0.68 (0.06,7.53)	0.999
	Comparison	575	0.4		

b) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — ADJUSTED

Occupational Category	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value	Covariate Remarks[a]
All	***1.00 (0.28,3.58)***	***0.995***	AGE (p=0.008)
Officer	0.77 (0.07,8.57)	0.828	IONRAD (p=0.132)
Enlisted Flyer	1.42 (0.20,10.30)	0.727	
Enlisted Groundcrew	0.72 (0.06,8.06)	0.791	

[a] Covariates and associated p-values correspond to final model based on all participants with available data.

Table 10-20. (Continued)
Analysis of Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Oral Cavity, Pharynx, and Larynx)

c) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED				
Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics			**Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[a]**	
Initial Dioxin	**n**	**Percent Yes**	**Estimated Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]**	**p-Value**
Low	170	0.6	1.17 (0.52,2.62)	0.706
Medium	172	0.0		
High	172	1.2		

d) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — ADJUSTED			
Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[c]			
n	**Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]**	**p-Value**	**Covariate Remarks**
514	1.50 (0.63,3.59)	0.356	PACKYR (p=0.106) IC (p=0.070) HERB (p=0.069)

[a] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in initial dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: Low = 39-98 ppt; Medium = >98-232 ppt; High = >232 ppt.

Table 10-20. (Continued)
Analysis of Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Oral Cavity, Pharynx, and Larynx)

e) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — UNADJUSTED

Dioxin Category	n	Percent Yes	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ab]	p-Value
Comparison	1,062	0.5		
Background RH	372	0.3	0.58 (0.07,5.08)	0.624
Low RH	255	0.4	0.77 (0.09,6.65)	0.810
High RH	259	0.8	1.55 (0.29,8.26)	0.605
Low plus High RH	514	0.6	1.15 (0.27,4.94)	0.847

f) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — ADJUSTED

Dioxin Category	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ac]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
Comparison	1,062			AGE (p=0.003) IONRAD (p=0.081)
Background RH	372	0.62 (0.07,5.55)	0.673	
Low RH	255	0.77 (0.09,6.84)	0.811	
High RH	259	2.57 (0.47,14.00)	0.275	
Low plus High RH	514	1.44 (0.33,6.32)	0.626	

[a] Relative risk and confidence interval relative to Comparisons.

[b] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: RH = Ranch Hand.
Comparison: Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Background (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Low (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, 10 ppt < Initial Dioxin ≤ 143 ppt.
High (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, Initial Dioxin > 143 ppt.

Table 10-20. (Continued)
Analysis of Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Oral Cavity, Pharynx, and Larynx)

g) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED					
	Current Dioxin Category Percent Yes/(n)			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)	
Model[a]	Low	Medium	High	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
4	0.0 (293)	0.7 (296)	0.7 (297)	1.47 (0.80,2.69)	0.229
5	0.0 (298)	0.7 (292)	0.7 (296)	1.43 (0.82,2.50)	0.213
6[c]	0.0 (297)	0.7 (292)	0.7 (296)	1.43 (0.79,2.59)	0.251

h) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — ADJUSTED				
	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)			
Model[a]	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
4	886	1.79 (0.96,3.33)	0.076	IONRAD (p=0.093) IC (p=0.054) HERB (p=0.107)
5	886	1.72 (0.96,3.09)	0.070	IONRAD (p=0.091) IC (p=0.054) HERB (p=0.116)
6[d]	885	1.73 (0.94,3.19)	0.087	IONRAD (p=0.091) IC (p=0.054) HERB (p=0.119)

[a] Model 4: Log_2 (lipid-adjusted current dioxin + 1).
Model 5: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1).
Model 6: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1), adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in current dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[d] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids in addition to covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: Model 4: Low = ≤ 8.1 ppt; Medium = >8.1-20.5 ppt; High = >20.5 ppt.
Models 5 and 6: Low = ≤ 46 ppq; Medium = >46-128 ppq; High = >128 ppq.

Table 10-21.
Analysis of Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Esophagus)

a) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS

Occupational Category	Group	n	Percent Yes
All	***Ranch Hand***	***943***	***0.0***
	Comparison	***1,280***	***0.1***
Officer	Ranch Hand	361	0.0
	Comparison	502	0.0
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	160	0.0
	Comparison	203	0.5
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	422	0.0
	Comparison	575	0.0

b) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN

Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics

Initial Dioxin	n	Percent Yes
Low	170	0.0
Medium	172	0.0
High	172	0.0

Note: Low = 39-98 ppt; Medium = >98-232 ppt; High = >232 ppt.

Table 10-21. (Continued)
Analysis of Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Esophagus)

c) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY		
Dioxin Category	**n**	**Percent Yes**
Comparison	1,062	0.1
Background RH	372	0.0
Low RH	255	0.0
High RH	259	0.0
Low plus High RH	514	0.0

Note: RH = Ranch Hand.
Comparison: Current Dioxin ≤10 ppt.
Background (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin ≤10 ppt.
Low (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin >10 ppt, 10 ppt < Initial Dioxin ≤143 ppt.
High (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin >10 ppt, Initial Dioxin >143 ppt.

d) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN			
	Current Dioxin Category Percent Yes/(n)		
Model[a]	**Low**	**Medium**	**High**
4	0.0 (293)	0.0 (296)	0.0 (297)
5	0.0 (298)	0.0 (292)	0.0 (296)
6	0.0 (297)	0.0 (292)	0.0 (296)

[a] Model 4: Log_2 (lipid-adjusted current dioxin + 1).
Model 5: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1).
Model 6: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1), adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

Note: Model 4: Low = ≤8.1 ppt; Medium = >8.1-20.5 ppt; High = >20.5 ppt.
Models 5 and 6: Low = ≤46 ppq; Medium = >46-128 ppq; High = >128 ppq.

Table 10-22.
Analysis of Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Brain)

a) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — UNADJUSTED

Occupational Category	Group	n	Percent Yes	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value
All	***Ranch Hand***	***943***	***0.1***	***1.35 (0.09,21.74)***	***0.999***
	Comparison	***1,280***	***0.1***		
Officer	Ranch Hand	361	0.3	--	--
	Comparison	502	0.0		
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	160	0.0	--	--
	Comparison	203	0.5		
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	422	0.0	--	--
	Comparison	575	0.0		

b) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — ADJUSTED

Occupational Category	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
All	--	--	
Officer	--	--	
Enlisted Flyer	--	--	
Enlisted Groundcrew	--	--	

--: Estimated relative risk, confidence interval, and p-value not presented due to the sparse number of abnormalities; adjusted analysis not performed due to the sparse number of abnormalities.

Table 10-22. (Continued)
Analysis of Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Brain)

c) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED				
Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics			**Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)**	
Initial Dioxin	**n**	**Percent Yes**	**Estimated Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**
Low	170	0.6	--	--
Medium	172	0.0		
High	172	0.0		

d) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — ADJUSTED			
Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)			
n	**Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**	**Covariate Remarks**
--	--	--	

--: Estimated relative risk, confidence interval, and p-value not presented due to the sparse number of abnormalities; adjusted analysis not performed due to the sparse number of abnormalities.

Note: Low = 39-98 ppt; Medium = >98-232 ppt; High = >232 ppt.

Table 10-22. (Continued)
Analysis of Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Brain)

e) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — UNADJUSTED				
Dioxin Category	n	Percent Yes	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value
Comparison	1,062	0.0		
Background RH	372	0.0	--	--
Low RH	255	0.4	--	--
High RH	259	0.0	--	--
Low plus High RH	514	0.2	--	--

f) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — ADJUSTED				
Dioxin Category	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
Comparison	--			
Background RH	--	--	--	
Low RH	--	--	--	
High RH	--	--	--	
Low plus High RH	--	--	--	

--: Estimated relative risk, confidence interval, and p-value not presented due to the sparse number of abnormalities; adjusted analysis not performed due to the sparse number of abnormalities.

Note: RH = Ranch Hand.
Comparison: Current Dioxin $\leq$10 ppt.
Background (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin $\leq$10 ppt.
Low (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin $>$10 ppt, 10 ppt $<$ Initial Dioxin $\leq$143 ppt.
High (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin $>$10 ppt, Initial Dioxin $>$143 ppt.

Table 10-22. (Continued)
Analysis of Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Brain)

g) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED					
	Current Dioxin Category Percent Yes/(n)			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)	
Model[a]	Low	Medium	High	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
4	0.0 (293)	0.3 (296)	0.0 (297)	0.78 (0.18,3.33)	0.726
5	0.3 (298)	0.0 (292)	0.0 (296)	0.66 (0.26,1.64)	0.416
6	0.3 (297)	0.0 (292)	0.0 (296)	--	--

h) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — ADJUSTED				
	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)			
Model[a]	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
4	--	--	--	
5	--	--	--	
6	--	--	--	

[a] Model 4: Log_2 (lipid-adjusted current dioxin + 1).
Model 5: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1).
Model 6: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1), adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in current dioxin.

--: Estimated relative risk, confidence interval, and p-value not presented due to the sparse number of abnormalities; adjusted analysis not performed due to the sparse number of abnormalities.

Note: Model 4: Low = ≤8.1 ppt; Medium = >8.1-20.5 ppt; High = >20.5 ppt.
Models 5 and 6: Low = ≤46 ppq; Medium = >46-128 ppq; High = >128 ppq.

Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Thymus, Heart, and Mediastinum)

Because of the sparse number of participants with a history of a malignant systemic neoplasm of the thymus, heart, or mediastinum, statistical analysis was not performed for Models 1, 2, and 3. Table 10-23(a,c,e) displays frequencies and associated percentages of a history of a malignant systemic neoplasm of the thymus, heart, or mediastinum for each model.

Analyses performed for Models 4, 5, and 6 revealed nonsignificant associations between malignant systemic neoplasms of the thymus, heart, or mediastinum and current dioxin (Table 10-23(g,h): $p > 0.21$ for all analyses). Each model adjusted for lifetime alcohol history, and Model 6 also adjusted for lifetime cigarette smoking history.

Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Thyroid Gland)

Over all occupations and within the officer occupation, results from the unadjusted analysis of malignant systemic neoplasms of the thyroid gland indicated no significant differences between the two groups (Table 10-24(a): $p > 0.77$ for both contrasts). Because of the sparse number of participants with a history of a malignant systemic neoplasm of the thyroid gland, only the candidate covariates of age, lifetime cigarette smoking history, and lifetime alcohol history were considered. Each covariate was found to be nonsignificant, and consequently adjusted results are identical to the unadjusted results (Table 10-24(b)). Analysis was not conducted within the enlisted flyer and enlisted groundcrew occupational cohorts because of the sparse number of participants with a history of a malignant systemic neoplasm of the thyroid gland within these strata.

A significant inverse association between initial dioxin and malignant systemic neoplasms of the thyroid gland was found from the unadjusted and adjusted analyses of Model 2 (Table 10-24(c,d): $p=0.044$, Est. $RR=0.14$ and $p=0.041$, Adj. $RR=0.13$ respectively). A history of a malignant systemic neoplasm of the thyroid gland decreased as initial dioxin measurements increased. Lifetime cigarette smoking history exhibited a significant effect in the final adjusted model.

The Model 3 analysis was not performed because of the sparse number of participants with a history of a malignant systemic neoplasm of the thyroid gland. Table 10-24(e) displays frequencies and associated percentages of a history of a malignant systemic neoplasm of the thyroid gland.

Each unadjusted and adjusted analysis of malignant systemic neoplasms of the thyroid gland from Models 4, 5, and 6 produced nonsignificant results (Table 10-24(g,h): $p > 0.77$ for all analyses). Lifetime cigarette smoking history was a significant covariate in each adjusted model.

Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Bronchus and Lung)

All unadjusted and adjusted contrasts examined from the Model 1 analysis of malignant systemic neoplasms of the bronchus or lung were nonsignificant (Table 10-25(a,b): $p \geq 0.13$

Table 10-23.
Analysis of Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Thymus, Heart, and Mediastinum)

a) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — UNADJUSTED					
Occupational Category	**Group**	**n**	**Percent Yes**	**Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**
All	***Ranch Hand***	***943***	***0.2***	--	--
	Comparison	***1,280***	***0.0***		
Officer	Ranch Hand	361	0.3	--	--
	Comparison	502	0.0		
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	160	0.0	--	--
	Comparison	203	0.0		
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	422	0.2	--	--
	Comparison	575	0.0		

b) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — ADJUSTED			
Occupational Category	**Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**	**Covariate Remarks**
All	--	--	
Officer	--	--	
Enlisted Flyer	--	--	
Enlisted Groundcrew	--	--	

--: Estimated relative risk, confidence interval, and p-value not presented due to the sparse number of abnormalities; adjusted analysis not performed due to the sparse number of abnormalities.

Table 10-23. (Continued)
Analysis of Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Thymus, Heart, and Mediastinum)

c) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED				
Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics			**Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)**	
Initial Dioxin	**n**	**Percent Yes**	**Estimated Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**
Low	170	0.0	--	--
Medium	172	0.0		
High	172	0.0		

d) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — ADJUSTED			
Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)			
n	**Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**	**Covariate Remarks**
--	--	--	

--: Estimated relative risk, confidence interval, and p-value not presented due to the sparse number of abnormalities; adjusted analysis not performed due to the sparse number of abnormalities.

Note: Low = 39-98 ppt; Medium = >98-232 ppt; High = >232 ppt.

Table 10-23. (Continued)
Analysis of Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Thymus, Heart, and Mediastinum)

e) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — UNADJUSTED

Dioxin Category	n	Percent Yes	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value
Comparison	1,062	0.0		
Background RH	372	0.3	--	--
Low RH	255	0.0	--	--
High RH	259	0.0	--	--
Low plus High RH	514	0.0	--	--

f) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — ADJUSTED

Dioxin Category	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
Comparison	--			
Background RH	--	--	--	
Low RH	--	--	--	
High RH	--	--	--	
Low plus High RH	--	--	--	

--: Estimated relative risk, confidence interval, and p-value not presented due to the sparse number of abnormalities; adjusted analysis not performed due to the sparse number of abnormalities.

Note: RH = Ranch Hand.
Comparison: Current Dioxin $\leq$10 ppt.
Background (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin $\leq$10 ppt.
Low (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin $>$10 ppt, 10 ppt $<$ Initial Dioxin $\leq$143 ppt.
High (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin $>$10 ppt, Initial Dioxin $>$143 ppt.

Table 10-23. (Continued)
Analysis of Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Thymus, Heart, and Mediastinum)

g) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED

Model[a]	Current Dioxin Category Percent Yes/(n) Low	Medium	High	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1) Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
4	0.3 (293)	0.0 (296)	0.0 (297)	0.43 (0.10,1.91)	0.271
5	0.3 (298)	0.0 (292)	0.0 (296)	0.58 (0.26,1.31)	0.259
6[c]	0.3 (297)	0.0 (292)	0.0 (296)	0.63 (0.22,1.81)	0.449

h) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — ADJUSTED

Model[a]	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1) n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
4	867	0.40 (0.08,2.03)	0.232	DRKYR (p=0.111)
5	867	0.53 (0.21,1.33)	0.216	DRKYR (p=0.108)
6[d]	866	0.61 (0.18,2.09)	0.448	PACKYR (p=0.105) DRKYR (p=0.045)

[a] Model 4: Log_2 (lipid-adjusted current dioxin + 1).
Model 5: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1).
Model 6: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1), adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in current dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[d] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids in addition to covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: Model 4: Low = ≤8.1 ppt; Medium = >8.1-20.5 ppt; High = >20.5 ppt.
Models 5 and 6: Low = ≤46 ppq; Medium = >46-128 ppq; High = >128 ppq.

Table 10-24.
Analysis of Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Thyroid Gland)

a) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — UNADJUSTED

Occupational Category	Group	n	Percent Yes	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value
All	***Ranch Hand***	***943***	***0.2***	***1.36 (0.19.9.66)***	***0.999***
	Comparison	***1,280***	***0.2***		
Officer	Ranch Hand	361	0.6	2.80 (0.25,30.90)	0.774
	Comparison	502	0.2		
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	160	0.0	--	--
	Comparison	203	0.0		
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	422	0.0	--	--
	Comparison	575	0.2		

b) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — ADJUSTED

Occupational Category	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
All	***1.36 (0.19,9.66)***	***0.999***	
Officer	2.80 (0.25,30.90)	0.774	
Enlisted Flyer	--	--	
Enlisted Groundcrew	--	--	

--: Estimated relative risk, confidence interval, and p-value not presented due to the sparse number of abnormalities.

Table 10-24. (Continued)
Analysis of Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Thyroid Gland)

c) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED				
Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics			**Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[a]**	
Initial Dioxin	**n**	**Percent Yes**	**Estimated Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]**	**p-Value**
Low	170	1.2	0.14 (0.01,2.34)	0.044
Medium	172	0.0		
High	172	0.0		

d) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — ADJUSTED			
Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[c]			
n	**Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]**	**p-Value**	**Covariate Remarks**
514	0.13 (0.01,2.16)	0.044	PACKYR (p=0.041)

[a] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in initial dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: Low = 39-98 ppt; Medium = >98-232 ppt; High = >232 ppt.

Table 10-24. (Continued)
Analysis of Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Thyroid Gland)

e) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — UNADJUSTED				
Dioxin Category	n	Percent Yes	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value
Comparison	1,062	0.0		
Background RH	372	0.0	--	--
Low RH	255	0.8	--	--
High RH	259	0.0	--	--
Low plus High RH	514	0.4	--	--

f) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — ADJUSTED				
Dioxin Category	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
Comparison	--			
Background RH	--	--	--	
Low RH	--	--	--	
High RH	--	--	--	
Low plus High RH	--	--	--	

--: Estimated relative risk, confidence interval, and p-value not presented due to the sparse number of abnormalities; adjusted analysis not performed due to the sparse number of abnormalities.

Note: RH = Ranch Hand.
Comparison: Current Dioxin $\leq$10 ppt.
Background (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin $\leq$10 ppt.
Low (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin $>$10 ppt, 10 ppt $<$ Initial Dioxin $\leq$143 ppt.
High (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin $>$10 ppt, Initial Dioxin $>$143 ppt.

Table 10-24. (Continued)
Analysis of Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Thyroid Gland)

g) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED					
	Current Dioxin Category Percent Yes/(n)			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)	
Model[a]	Low	Medium	High	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
4	0.0 (293)	0.7 (296)	0.0 (297)	0.88 (0.32,2.37)	0.789
5	0.0 (298)	0.7 (292)	0.0 (296)	0.90 (0.40,2.01)	0.796
6[c]	0.0 (297)	0.7 (292)	0.0 (296)	0.95 (0.39,2.28)	0.902

h) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — ADJUSTED				
	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)			
Model[a]	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
4	885	0.87 (0.32,2.36)	0.774	PACKYR (p=0.043)
5	885	0.90 (0.38,2.11)	0.804	PACKYR (p=0.043)
6[d]	884	0.91 (0.37,2.25)	0.843	PACKYR (p=0.047)

[a] Model 4: Log_2 (lipid-adjusted current dioxin + 1).
Model 5: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1).
Model 6: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1), adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in current dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[d] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids in addition to covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: Model 4: Low = ≤8.1 ppt; Medium = >8.1-20.5 ppt; High = >20.5 ppt.
Models 5 and 6: Low = ≤46 ppq; Medium = >46-128 ppq; High = >128 ppq.

Table 10-25.
Analysis of Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Bronchus and Lung)

a) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — UNADJUSTED					
Occupational Category	**Group**	**n**	**Percent Yes**	**Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**
All	***Ranch Hand***	***943***	***0.6***	***2.04 (0.58,7.26)***	***0.420***
	Comparison	***1,280***	***0.3***		
Officer	Ranch Hand	361	1.1	5.61 (0.63,50.43)	0.200
	Comparison	502	0.2		
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	160	0.6	0.63 (0.06,7.03)	0.999
	Comparison	203	1.0		
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	422	0.2	1.36 (0.09,21.86)	0.999
	Comparison	575	0.2		

b) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — ADJUSTED			
Occupational Category	**Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**	**Covariate Remarks[a]**
All	***1.95 (0.54,7.04)***	***0.301***	AGE (p=0.003) PACKYR (p=0.022)
Officer	5.53 (0.60,50.64)	0.130	
Enlisted Flyer	0.62 (0.05,7.02)	0.700	
Enlisted Groundcrew	1.18 (0.07,20.41)	0.911	

[a] Covariates and associated p-values correspond to final model based on all participants with available data.

Table 10-25. (Continued)
Analysis of Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Bronchus and Lung)

c) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED				
Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics			**Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[a]**	
Initial Dioxin	**n**	**Percent Yes**	**Estimated Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]**	**p-Value**
Low	170	0.6	0.61 (0.23,1.63)	0.275
Medium	172	1.2		
High	172	0.0		

d) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — ADJUSTED			
Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[c]			
n	**Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]**	**p-Value**	**Covariate Remarks**
502	0.44 (0.13,1.46)	0.120	PACKYR (p=0.132) DRKYR (p=0.024)

[a] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in initial dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: Low = 39-98 ppt; Medium = >98-232 ppt; High = >232 ppt.

Table 10-25. (Continued)
Analysis of Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Bronchus and Lung)

e) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — UNADJUSTED

Dioxin Category	n	Percent Yes	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ab]	p-Value
Comparison	1,062	0.4		
Background RH	372	0.8	2.40 (0.51,11.28)	0.268
Low RH	255	1.2	2.48 (0.53,11.59)	0.249
High RH	259	0.0	--	--
Low plus High RH	514	0.6	1.06 (0.21,5.27)	0.944

f) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — ADJUSTED

Dioxin Category	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ac]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
Comparison	1,060			AGE (p=0.064) PACKYR (p=0.142)
Background RH	371	2.37 (0.48,11.64)	0.286	
Low RH	255	2.15 (0.42,10.93)	0.357	
High RH	259	--	--	
Low plus High RH	514	1.20 (0.24,5.98)	0.828	

[a] Relative risk and confidence interval relative to Comparisons.

[b] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

--: Adjusted relative risk, confidence interval, and p-value not presented due to the sparse number of abnormalities.

Note: RH = Ranch Hand.
Comparison: Current Dioxin $\leq$10 ppt.
Background (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin $\leq$10 ppt.
Low (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin >10 ppt, 10 ppt < Initial Dioxin $\leq$143 ppt.
High (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin >10 ppt, Initial Dioxin >143 ppt.

Table 10-25. (Continued)
Analysis of Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Bronchus and Lung)

g) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED					
	Current Dioxin Category Percent Yes/(n)			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)	
Model[a]	Low	Medium	High	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
4	0.7 (293)	1.4 (296)	0.0 (297)	0.80 (0.45,1.45)	0.460
5	1.0 (298)	0.7 (292)	0.3 (296)	0.92 (0.57,1.47)	0.719
6[c]	1.0 (297)	0.7 (292)	0.3 (296)	0.80 (0.48,1.31)	0.378

h) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — ADJUSTED				
	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)			
Model[a]	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
4	867	0.97 (0.54,1.75)	0.906	AGE (p=0.065) PACKYR (p=0.039) DRKYR (p=0.135)
5	867	1.06 (0.66,1.70)	0.817	AGE (p=0.055) PACKYR (p=0.035) DRKYR (p=0.126)
6[d]	884	0.89 (0.53,1.49)	0.668	AGE (p=0.110) PACKYR (p=0.103)

[a] Model 4: Log_2 (lipid-adjusted current dioxin + 1).
Model 5: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1).
Model 6: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1), adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in current dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[d] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids in addition to covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: Model 4: Low = ≤8.1 ppt; Medium = >8.1-20.5 ppt; High = >20.5 ppt.
Models 5 and 6: Low = ≤46 ppq; Medium = >46-128 ppq; High = >128 ppq.

for all contrasts). Significant covariates included in the final model were age and lifetime cigarette smoking history.

Similar to Model 1, unadjusted and adjusted analyses of malignant systemic neoplasms of the bronchus or lung from Models 2 and 3 yielded nonsignificant results (Table 10-25(c-f): $p \geq 0.12$ for both analyses). Model 2 adjusted for lifetime cigarette smoking history and lifetime alcohol history. Age and lifetime cigarette smoking history were significant covariates for Model 3. The Model 3 contrast between Ranch Hands categorized with high current dioxin levels and Comparisons was not examined because no participants with a history of a malignant systemic neoplasm of the bronchus or lung were within the high Ranch Hand category.

All unadjusted and adjusted analyses of malignant systemic neoplasms of the bronchus or lung from Models 4, 5, and 6 were nonsignificant (Table 10-25(g,h): $p > 0.37$ for each analysis). Significant covariates from each adjusted model were age and lifetime cigarette smoking history. Lifetime alcohol history also was significant for Models 4 and 5.

Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Colon and Rectum)

All results from the unadjusted and adjusted analysis of malignant systemic neoplasms of the colon or rectum for Model 1 were nonsignificant (Table 10-26(a,b): $p > 0.43$ for all contrasts performed). Contrasts for the enlisted flyer and enlisted groundcrew strata were not examined because of the sparse number of participants with a history of a malignant systemic neoplasm of the colon or rectum within these strata. Age was retained in the final model.

Both the unadjusted and adjusted analyses of malignant systemic neoplasms of the colon or rectum for Model 2 were nonsignificant (Table 10-26(c,d): $p > 0.24$ for both analyses). Age, lifetime cigarette smoking history, and ionizing radiation exhibited significant covariate effects in the final adjusted model. Model 3 unadjusted analysis revealed a significant difference between Comparisons and Ranch Hands in the low dioxin category (Table 10-26(e): $p = 0.034$, Est. $RR = 5.12$). Because no covariates were significant in the final adjusted model, adjusted results are identical to the unadjusted results. The Model 3 contrast between Ranch Hands in the high dioxin category and Comparisons was not examined because no Ranch Hands with a history of a malignant systemic neoplasm of the colon or rectum were in the high dioxin category.

All associations examined between malignant systemic neoplasms of the colon or rectum and current dioxin from Models 4, 5, and 6 were nonsignificant (Table 10-26(g,h): $p \geq 0.25$ for all analyses). Each model adjusted for age, lifetime cigarette smoking history, and insecticide exposure.

Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Kidney and Bladder)

Differences in a history of a malignant systemic neoplasm of the kidney or bladder among Ranch Hands and Comparisons were examined in Model 1 analyses. Over all occupations and within the officer occupation, differences were nonsignificant for both the

Table 10-26.
Analysis of Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Colon and Rectum)

a) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — UNADJUSTED					
Occupational Category	**Group**	**n**	**Percent Yes**	**Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**
All	***Ranch Hand***	***943***	***0.5***	***1.70 (0.46,6.35)***	***0.645***
	Comparison	***1,280***	***0.3***		
Officer	Ranch Hand	361	0.8	1.39 (0.28,6.95)	0.999
	Comparison	502	0.6		
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	160	1.3	--	--
	Comparison	203	0.0		
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	422	0.0	--	--
	Comparison	575	0.2		

b) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — ADJUSTED			
Occupational Category	**Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**	**Covariate Remarks[a]**
All	***1.69 (0.45,6.33)***	***0.432***	AGE (p=0.144)
Officer	1.38 (0.28,6.91)	0.692	
Enlisted Flyer	--	--	
Enlisted Groundcrew	--	--	

[a] Covariates and associated p-values correspond to final model based on all participants with available data.

--: Relative risk, confidence interval, and p-value not presented due to the sparse number of abnormalities.

Table 10-26. (Continued)
Analysis of Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Colon and Rectum)

c) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED				
Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics			**Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[a]**	
Initial Dioxin	**n**	**Percent Yes**	**Estimated Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]**	**p-Value**
Low	170	0.6	0.61 (0.24,1.55)	0.245
Medium	172	1.7		
High	172	0.0		

d) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — ADJUSTED			
Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[c]			
n	**Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]**	**p-Value**	**Covariate Remarks**
514	0.70 (0.22,2.26)	0.525	AGE (p=0.042) PACKYR (p=0.076) IONRAD (p=0.047)

[a] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in initial dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: Low = 39-98 ppt; Medium = >98-232 ppt; High = >232 ppt.

Table 10-26. (Continued)
Analysis of Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Colon and Rectum)

e) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — UNADJUSTED

Dioxin Category	n	Percent Yes	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ab]	p-Value
Comparison	1,062	0.3		
Background RH	372	0.3	1.14 (0.12,11.07)	0.910
Low RH	255	1.6	5.12 (1.13,23.27)	0.034
High RH	259	0.0	--	--
Low plus High RH	514	0.8	2.48 (0.55,11.23)	0.239

f) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — ADJUSTED

Dioxin Category	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ab]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
Comparison	1,062			
Background RH	372	1.14 (0.12,11.07)	0.910	
Low RH	255	5.12 (1.13,23.27)	0.034	
High RH	259	--	--	
Low plus High RH	514	2.48 (0.55,11.23)	0.239	

[a] Relative risk and confidence interval relative to Comparisons.

[b] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

--: Relative risk, confidence interval, and p-value not presented due to the sparse number of abnormalities.

Note: RH = Ranch Hand.
Comparison: Current Dioxin ≤10 ppt.
Background (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin ≤10 ppt.
Low (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin >10 ppt, 10 ppt < Initial Dioxin ≤143 ppt.
High (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin >10 ppt, Initial Dioxin >143 ppt.

Table 10-26. (Continued)
Analysis of Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Colon and Rectum)

g) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED					
	Current Dioxin Category Percent Yes/(n)			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)	
Model[a]	Low	Medium	High	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
4	0.3 (293)	1.0 (296)	0.3 (297)	1.03 (0.57,1.87)	0.923
5	0.3 (298)	0.0 (292)	1.4 (296)	1.14 (0.68,1.90)	0.628
6[c]	0.3 (297)	0.0 (292)	1.4 (296)	0.97 (0.55,1.72)	0.919

h) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — ADJUSTED				
	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)			
Model[a]	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
4	885	1.34 (0.65,2.73)	0.440	AGE (p=0.003) PACKYR (p=0.107) INS (p=0.065)
5	885	1.44 (0.78,2.65)	0.250	AGE (p=0.002) PACKYR (p=0.099) INS (p=0.067)
6[d]	884	1.21 (0.61,2.43)	0.589	AGE (p=0.002) PACKYR (p=0.108) INS (p=0.099)

[a] Model 4: Log_2 (lipid-adjusted current dioxin + 1).
Model 5: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1).
Model 6: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1), adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in current dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[d] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids in addition to covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: Model 4: Low = ≤8.1 ppt; Medium = >8.1-20.5 ppt; High = >20.5 ppt.
Models 5 and 6: Low = ≤46 ppq; Medium = >46-128 ppq; High = >128 ppq.

unadjusted and adjusted analyses (Table 10-27(a,b): $p > 0.26$ for all contrasts examined). Contrasts within the enlisted flyer and enlisted groundcrew strata were not examined because of the sparse number of participants with a history of a malignant systemic neoplasm of the kidney or bladder within these strata. Adjusted analysis retained age, lifetime cigarette smoking history, and insecticide exposure in the final model.

The unadjusted and adjusted results from the Model 2 and 3 analyses of malignant systemic neoplasms of the kidney or bladder were nonsignificant (Table 10-27(c,d): $p > 0.12$ for all analyses). Significant covariates in Model 2 were race, lifetime cigarette smoking history, industrial chemical exposure, insecticide exposure, and herbicide exposure. Model 3 adjusted for age, lifetime cigarette smoking history, ionizing radiation exposure, and insecticide exposure.

Similar to Models 1, 2, and 3, each Model 4, 5, and 6 analysis of malignant systemic neoplasms of the kidney or bladder was nonsignificant (Table 10-27(g,h): $p > 0.73$ for all analyses). Models 4, 5, and 6 each adjusted for lifetime cigarette smoking history, ionizing radiation exposure, and insecticide exposure. Model 6 also adjusted for race.

Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Prostate)

All results from the analysis of malignant systemic neoplasms of the prostate were nonsignificant (Table 10-28(a-h): $p > 0.14$ for all analyses). Each model adjusted for age, and Model 2 also adjusted for degreasing chemical exposure. Herbicide exposure was significant in Model 3. In addition to age, Models 3, 4, 5, and 6 also adjusted for the dioxin-by-degreasing chemical exposure interaction. Adjusted results seen in Table 10-28(h) for Models 4 through 6 are based on the final model after the deletion of the significant interaction. Appendix Table F-2-10 displays relative risk estimates for each level of the dioxin-by-degreasing chemical interaction for Models 3 through 6.

Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Testicles)

Analysis of malignant systemic neoplasms of the testicles was performed for Models 2, 4, 5, and 6, and the results of each analysis were nonsignificant (Table 10-29(c,d,g,h): $p > 0.35$ for each analysis). Because of the sparse number of participants with a history of a malignant systemic neoplasm of the testicles, only the candidate covariates of age, lifetime cigarette smoking history, and lifetime alcohol history were considered. Lifetime alcohol history and lifetime cigarette smoking history were significant for the final adjusted Models 2, 4, and 5. Model 6 adjusted for lifetime cigarette smoking history only.

The sparse number of participants with a history of a malignant systemic neoplasm of the testicles precluded analyses of Models 1 and 3. However, there were three Ranch Hands and zero Comparisons with a history of a malignant systemic neoplasm of the testicles.

Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Ill-Defined Sites)

The Model 1 overall contrast between Ranch Hands and Comparisons was nonsignificant for both the unadjusted and adjusted analyses of a history of a malignant

Table 10-27.
Analysis of Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Kidney and Bladder)

a) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — UNADJUSTED					
Occupational Category	**Group**	**n**	**Percent Yes**	**Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**
All	***Ranch Hand***	***943***	***0.6***	***1.63 (0.50,5.37)***	***0.610***
	Comparison	***1,280***	***0.4***		
Officer	Ranch Hand	361	0.8	0.83 (0.20,3.51)	0.999
	Comparison	502	1.0		
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	160	0.6	--	--
	Comparison	203	0.0		
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	422	0.5	--	--
	Comparison	575	0.0		

b) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — ADJUSTED			
Occupational Category	**Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**	**Covariate Remarks[a]**
All	***2.00 (0.58,6.89)***	***0.268***	AGE (p=0.009) PACKYR (p=0.006) INS (p=0.016)
Officer	0.89 (0.20,3.92)	0.881	
Enlisted Flyer	--	--	
Enlisted Groundcrew	--	--	

[a] Covariates and associated p-values correspond to final model based on all participants with available data.

--: Adjusted relative risk, confidence interval, and p-value not presented due to the sparse number of abnormalities.

Table 10-27. (Continued)
Analysis of Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Kidney and Bladder)

c) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED				
Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[a]	
Initial Dioxin	n	Percent Yes	Estimated Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
Low	170	0.6	0.68 (0.28,1.65)	0.359
Medium	172	1.7		
High	172	0.0		

d) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — ADJUSTED			
Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[c]			
n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
514	0.66 (0.21,2.10)	0.455	RACE (p=0.100) PACKYR (p=0.019) IC (p=0.107) INS (p=0.095) HERB (p=0.141)

[a] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in initial dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: Low = 39-98 ppt; Medium = >98-232 ppt; High = >232 ppt.

Table 10-27. (Continued)
Analysis of Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Kidney and Bladder)

e) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — UNADJUSTED

Dioxin Category	n	Percent Yes	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ab]	p-Value
Comparison	1,062	0.4		
Background RH	372	0.5	1.47 (0.26,8.19)	0.261
Low RH	255	1.2	3.01 (0.66,13.61)	0.154
High RH	259	0.4	1.00 (0.11,9.10)	0.997
Low plus High RH	514	0.8	2.01 (0.50,8.14)	0.328

f) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — ADJUSTED

Dioxin Category	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ac]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
Comparison	1,060			AGE (p=0.030) PACKYR (p=0.009) IONRAD (p=0.101) INS (p=0.021)
Background RH	371	1.83 (0.31,10.94)	0.507	
Low RH	255	3.59 (0.70,18.42)	0.125	
High RH	259	2.01 (0.21,19.12)	0.545	
Low plus High RH	514	2.95 (0.67,12.98)	0.152	

[a] Relative risk and confidence interval relative to Comparisons.

[b] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: RH = Ranch Hand.
Comparison: Current Dioxin ≤10 ppt.
Background (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin ≤10 ppt.
Low (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin >10 ppt, 10 ppt < Initial Dioxin ≤143 ppt.
High (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin >10 ppt, Initial Dioxin >143 ppt.

Table 10-27. (Continued)
Analysis of Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Kidney and Bladder)

g) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED

Model[a]	Current Dioxin Category Percent Yes/(n) Low	Medium	High	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1) Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
4	0.7 (293)	1.0 (296)	0.3 (297)	0.98 (0.56,1.71)	0.941
5	0.7 (298)	0.7 (292)	0.7 (296)	1.03 (0.64,1.66)	0.895
6[c]	0.7 (297)	0.7 (292)	0.7 (296)	0.97 (0.58,1.62)	0.915

h) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — ADJUSTED

Model[a]	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1) n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
4	885	1.03 (0.58,1.82)	0.914	PACKYR (p=0.006) IONRAD (p=0.083) INS (p<0.001)
5	885	1.09 (0.67,1.77)	0.731	PACKYR (p=0.006) IONRAD (p=0.075) INS (p<0.001)
6[d]	884	0.99 (0.58,1.71)	0.978	RACE (p=0.121) PACKYR (p=0.004) IONRAD (p=0.047) INS (p<0.001)

[a] Model 4: Log_2 (lipid-adjusted current dioxin + 1).
Model 5: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1).
Model 6: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1), adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in current dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[d] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids in addition to covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: Model 4: Low = ≤8.1 ppt; Medium = >8.1-20.5 ppt; High = >20.5 ppt.
Models 5 and 6: Low = ≤46 ppq; Medium = >46-128 ppq; High = >128 ppq.

Table 10-28.
Analysis of Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Prostate)

a) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — UNADJUSTED					
Occupational Category	**Group**	**n**	**Percent Yes**	**Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**
All	***Ranch Hand***	***943***	***1.7***	***0.94 (0.50,1.80)***	***0.989***
	Comparison	***1,280***	***1.8***		
Officer	Ranch Hand	361	2.5	0.78 (0.34,1.78)	0.694
	Comparison	502	3.2		
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	160	2.5	1.28 (0.31,5.18)	0.999
	Comparison	203	2.0		
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	422	0.7	1.37 (0.27,6.80)	0.999
	Comparison	575	0.5		

b) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — ADJUSTED			
Occupational Category	**Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**	**Covariate Remarks[a]**
All	***0.95 (0.49,1.84)***	***0.869***	AGE ($p<0.001$)
Officer	0.80 (0.34,1.87)	0.605	
Enlisted Flyer	1.24 (0.30,5.17)	0.775	
Enlisted Groundcrew	1.29 (0.25,6.67)	0.762	

[a] Covariates and associated p-values correspond to final model based on all participants with available data.

Table 10-28. (Continued)
Analysis of Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Prostate)

c) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED				
Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics			**Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[a]**	
Initial Dioxin	**n**	**Percent Yes**	**Estimated Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]**	**p-Value**
Low	170	2.4	0.68 (0.39,1.19)	0.147
Medium	172	2.9		
High	172	0.6		

d) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — ADJUSTED			
Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[c]			
n	**Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]**	**p-Value**	**Covariate Remarks**
514	0.94 (0.51,1.74)	0.835	AGE ($p<0.001$) DC ($p=0.078$)

[a] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in initial dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: Low = 39-98 ppt; Medium = >98-232 ppt; High = >232 ppt.

Table 10-28. (Continued)
Analysis of Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Prostate)

e) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — UNADJUSTED

Dioxin Category	n	Percent Yes	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ab]	p-Value
Comparison	1,062	2.1		
Background RH	372	1.3	0.72 (0.27,1.92)	0.508
Low RH	255	2.4	1.04 (0.41,2.61)	0.934
High RH	259	1.5	0.68 (0.23,2.01)	0.487
Low plus High RH	514	2.0	0.86 (0.40,1.84)	0.697

f) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — ADJUSTED

Dioxin Category	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ac]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
Comparison	1,062			DXCAT*DC (p=0.004) AGE (p<0.001) HERB (p=0.047)
Background RH	372	****	****	
Low RH	255	****	****	
High RH	259	****	****	
Low plus High RH	514	****	****	

[a] Relative risk and confidence interval relative to Comparisons.

[b] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

**** Categorized dioxin-by-covariate interaction ($p \leq 0.01$); adjusted relative risk, confidence interval, and p-value not presented; refer to Appendix Table F-2-10 for further analysis of this interaction.

Note: RH = Ranch Hand.
Comparison: Current Dioxin ≤10 ppt.
Background (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin ≤10 ppt.
Low (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin >10 ppt, 10 ppt < Initial Dioxin ≤143 ppt.
High (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin >10 ppt, Initial Dioxin >143 ppt.

Table 10-28. (Continued)
Analysis of Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Prostate)

g) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED

Model[a]	Current Dioxin Category Percent Yes/(n) Low	Medium	High	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1) Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
4	1.0 (293)	2.7 (296)	1.4 (297)	0.93 (0.65,1.33)	0.697
5	1.3 (298)	1.7 (292)	2.0 (296)	0.99 (0.73,1.33)	0.928
6[c]	1.4 (297)	1.7 (292)	2.0 (296)	0.92 (0.67,1.28)	0.625

h) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — ADJUSTED

Model[a]	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1) n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
4	886	1.04 (0.68,1.58)**	0.862**	CURR*DC (p=0.015) AGE (p<0.001)
5	886	1.08 (0.76,1.55)**	0.662**	CURR*DC (p=0.019) AGE (p<0.001)
6[d]	885	1.02 (0.70,1.49)**	0.924**	CURR*DC (p=0.020) AGE (p<0.001)

[a] Model 4: Log_2 (lipid-adjusted current dioxin + 1).
Model 5: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1).
Model 6: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1), adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in current dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[d] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids in addition to covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

** Log_2 (current dioxin + 1)-by-covariate interaction ($0.01 < p \leq 0.05$); adjusted relative risk, confidence interval, and p-value derived from a model fitted after deletion of this interaction; refer to Appendix Table F-2-10 for further analysis of this interaction.

Note: Model 4: Low = ≤8.1 ppt; Medium = >8.1-20.5 ppt; High = >20.5 ppt.
Models 5 and 6: Low = ≤46 ppq; Medium = >46-128 ppq; High = >128 ppq.

Table 10-29.
Analysis of Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Testicles)

a) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — UNADJUSTED					
Occupational Category	**Group**	**n**	**Percent Yes**	**Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**
All	***Ranch Hand***	***943***	***0.3***	--	--
	Comparison	***1,280***	***0.0***		
Officer	Ranch Hand	361	0.3	--	--
	Comparison	502	0.0		
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	160	0.6	--	--
	Comparison	203	0.0		
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	422	0.2	--	--
	Comparison	575	0.0		

b) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — ADJUSTED			
Occupational Category	**Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**	**Covariate Remarks**
All	--	--	
Officer	--	--	
Enlisted Flyer	--	--	
Enlisted Groundcrew	--	--	

--: Estimated relative risk, confidence interval, and p-value not presented due to the sparse number of abnormalities; adjusted analysis not performed due to the sparse number of abnormailities.

Table 10-29. (Continued)
Analysis of Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Testicles)

c) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED				
Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics			**Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[a]**	
Initial Dioxin	**n**	**Percent Yes**	**Estimated Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]**	**p-Value**
Low	170	0.6	0.65 (0.22,1.95)	0.408
Medium	172	1.2		
High	172	0.0		

d) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — ADJUSTED			
	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[c]		
n	**Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]**	**p-Value**	**Covariate Remarks**
502	0.61 (0.20,1.87)	0.353	DRKYR (p=0.094) PACKYR (p=0.053)

[a] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in initial dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: Low = 39-98 ppt; Medium = >98-232 ppt; High = >232 ppt.

Table 10-29. (Continued)
Analysis of Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Testicles)

e) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — UNADJUSTED

Dioxin Category	n	Percent Yes	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value
Comparison	1,062	0.0		
Background RH	372	0.0	--	--
Low RH	255	0.8	--	--
High RH	259	0.4	--	--
Low plus High RH	514	0.6	--	--

f) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — ADJUSTED

Dioxin Category	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
Comparison	--			
Background RH	--	--	--	
Low RH	--	--	--	
High RH	--	--	--	
Low plus High RH	--	--	--	

--: Estimated relative risk, confidence interval, and p-value not presented due to the sparse number of abnormalities; adjusted analysis not performed due to the sparse number of abnormailities.

Note: RH = Ranch Hand.
Comparison: Current Dioxin $\leq$10 ppt.
Background (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin $\leq$10 ppt.
Low (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin $>$10 ppt, 10 ppt $<$ Initial Dioxin $\leq$143 ppt.
High (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin $>$10 ppt, Initial Dioxin $>$143 ppt.

Table 10-29. (Continued)
Analysis of Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Testicles)

g) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED

Model[a]	Current Dioxin Category Percent Yes/(n) Low	Medium	High	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1) Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
4	0.0 (293)	0.7 (296)	0.3 (297)	1.20 (0.58,2.50)	0.636
5	0.0 (298)	0.3 (292)	0.7 (296)	1.32 (0.69,2.53)	0.409
6[c]	0.0 (297)	0.3 (292)	0.7 (296)	1.11 (0.54,2.31)	0.774

h) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — ADJUSTED

Model[a]	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1) n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
4	867	1.24 (0.60,2.57)	0.532	PACKYR (p=0.119) DRKYR (p=0.054)
5	867	1.33 (0.69,2.57)	0.384	PACKYR (p=0.121) DRKYR (p=0.054)
6[d]	884	1.16 (0.57,2.36)	0.691	PACKYR (p=0.123)

[a] Model 4: Log_2 (lipid-adjusted current dioxin + 1).
Model 5: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1).
Model 6: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1), adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in current dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[d] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids in addition to covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: Model 4: Low = ≤8.1 ppt; Medium = >8.1-20.5 ppt; High = >20.5 ppt.
Models 5 and 6: Low = ≤46 ppq; Medium = >46-128 ppq; High = >128 ppq.

systemic neoplasm of ill-defined sites (Table 10-30(a,b): $p > 0.46$ for both contrasts). Age and lifetime alcohol history were significant covariates in the final adjusted model. No other analyses were performed due to the sparse number of study participants with a history of a malignant systemic neoplasm of ill-defined sites. Table 10-30 presents sample sizes and frequencies of histories of malignant systemic neoplasms (ill-defined sites) for Models 2-6.

Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Connective and Other Soft Tissue)

Due to the sparse number of participants with a history of a malignant systemic neoplasm of connective and other soft tissue, no analyses were conducted. Table 10-31 presents sample sizes and frequencies of histories of malignant systemic neoplasms of connective and other soft tissue for each model. Of the two malignant systemic neoplasms of connective and other soft tissues, which were both found in Comparisons, only one was a soft tissue sarcoma.

Carcinomas in Situ of the Penis, Other, and Unspecified Sites

Analysis of carcinomas in situ of the penis, other, and unspecified sites was performed for Models 2, 4, 5, and 6 and for selected contrasts from Models 1 and 3. Results were nonsignificant for each model (Table 10-32(a-h): $p > 0.14$ for each analysis). The sparse number of participants with a history of a carcinoma in situ precluded complete unadjusted analysis and, consequently, adjusted analyses.

Hodgkin's Disease

Selected contrasts analyzing history of Hodgkin's disease were examined from Models 1 and 3 and all results were nonsignificant (Table 10-33(a,e): $p > 0.50$ for all analyses conducted). The sparse number of participants with a history of Hodgkin's disease precluded analysis with Model 2. Frequencies of histories of Hodgkin's disease are presented in Table 10-33(a,c,e) for each model.

Results from the unadjusted and adjusted analyses from Models 4, 5, and 6 were nonsignificant (Table 10-33(g,h): $p > 0.55$ for all analyses). Because of the sparse number of participants with a history of Hodgkin's disease, only the candidate covariates of age, lifetime cigarette smoking history, and lifetime alcohol history were considered in these models. Each model retained age and lifetime alcohol history.

Leukemia

Unadjusted analyses of a history of leukemia were performed where possible for Models 1 through 6. All results were nonsignificant for each model (Table 10-34(a-h): $p \geq 0.30$ for each analysis).

Non-Hodgkin's Lymphoma

Unadjusted analysis of a history of non-Hodgkin's lymphoma was performed where possible for Models 1 through 3. No significant results were found (Table 10-35(a-f):

Table 10-30.
Analysis of Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Ill-Defined Sites)

a) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — UNADJUSTED					
Occupational Category	**Group**	**n**	**Percent Yes**	**Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**
All	***Ranch Hand***	***943***	***0.1***	***0.45 (0.05,4.35)***	***0.842***
	Comparison	***1,280***	***0.2***		
Officer	Ranch Hand	361	0.0	--	--
	Comparison	502	0.4		
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	160	0.6	--	--
	Comparison	203	0.0		
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	422	0.0	--	--
	Comparison	575	0.2		

b) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — ADJUSTED			
Occupational Category	**Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**	**Covariate Remarks[a]**
All	***0.45 (0.05,4.37)***	***0.467***	AGE (p=0.116) DRKYR (p=0.146)
Officer	--	--	
Enlisted Flyer	--	--	
Enlisted Groundcrew	--	--	

[a] Covariates and associated p-values correspond to final model based on all participants with available data.

--: Relative risk, confidence interval, and p-value not presented due to the sparse number of abnormalities.

Table 10-30. (Continued)
Analysis of Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Ill-Defined Sites)

c) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED				
Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)	
Initial Dioxin	n	Percent Yes	Estimated Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value
Low	170	0.0	--	--
Medium	172	0.0		
High	172	0.0		

d) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — ADJUSTED			
Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)			
n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
--	--	--	

--: Analysis not performed due to zero abnormalities.

Note: Low = 39-98 ppt; Medium = >98-232 ppt; High = >232 ppt.

Table 10-30. (Continued)
Analysis of Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Ill-Defined Sites)

e) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — UNADJUSTED

Dioxin Category	n	Percent Yes	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value
Comparison	1,062	0.2		
Background RH	372	0.0	--	--
Low RH	255	0.0	--	--
High RH	259	0.0	--	--
Low plus High RH	514	0.0	--	--

f) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — ADJUSTED

Dioxin Category	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
Comparison	--			
Background RH	--	--	--	
Low RH	--	--	--	
High RH	--	--	--	
Low plus High RH	--	--	--	

--: Relative risk, confidence interval, and p-value not presented due to the sparse number of abnormalities.

Note: RH = Ranch Hand.
Comparison: Current Dioxin $\leq$10 ppt.
Background (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin $\leq$10 ppt.
Low (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin $>$10 ppt, 10 ppt $<$ Initial Dioxin $\leq$143 ppt.
High (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin $>$10 ppt, Initial Dioxin $>$143 ppt.

Table 10-30. (Continued)
Analysis of Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Ill-Defined Sites)

g) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED

Model[a]	Current Dioxin Category Percent Yes/(n) Low	Medium	High	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1) Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value
4	0.0 (293)	0.0 (296)	0.0 (297)	--	--
5	0.0 (298)	0.0 (292)	0.0 (296)	--	--
6	0.0 (297)	0.0 (292)	0.0 (296)	--	--

h) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — ADJUSTED

Model[a]	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1) n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
4	--	--	--	
5	--	--	--	
6	--	--	--	

[a] Model 4: Log_2 (lipid-adjusted current dioxin + 1).
Model 5: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1).
Model 6: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1), adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

--: Analysis not performed due to zero abnormalities.

Note: Model 4: Low = ≤8.1 ppt; Medium = >8.1-20.5 ppt; High = >20.5 ppt.
Models 5 and 6: Low = ≤46 ppq; Medium = >46-128 ppq; High = >128 ppq.

Table 10-31.
Analysis of Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Connective and Other Soft Tissue)

a) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS			
Occupational Category	**Group**	**n**	**Percent Yes**
All	***Ranch Hand***	***943***	***0.0***
	Comparison	***1,280***	***0.2***
Officer	Ranch Hand	361	0.0
	Comparison	502	0.2
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	160	0.0
	Comparison	203	0.0
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	422	0.0
	Comparison	575	0.2

b) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN		
Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics		
Initial Dioxin	**n**	**Percent Yes**
Low	170	0.0
Medium	172	0.0
High	172	0.0

Note: Low = 39-98 ppt; Medium = >98-232 ppt; High = >232 ppt.

Table 10-31. (Continued)
Analysis of Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Connective and Other Soft Tissue)

c) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY		
Dioxin Category	n	Percent Yes
Comparison	1,062	0.2
Background RH	372	0.0
Low RH	255	0.0
High RH	259	0.0
Low plus High RH	514	0.0

Note: RH = Ranch Hand.
Comparison: Current Dioxin ≤10 ppt.
Background (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin ≤10 ppt.
Low (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin >10 ppt, 10 ppt < Initial Dioxin ≤143 ppt.
High (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin >10 ppt, Initial Dioxin >143 ppt.

d) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN			
	Current Dioxin Category Percent Yes/(n)		
Model[a]	Low	Medium	High
4	0.0 (293)	0.0 (296)	0.0 (297)
5	0.0 (298)	0.0 (292)	0.0 (296)
6	0.0 (297)	0.0 (292)	0.0 (296)

[a] Model 4: Log_2 lipid-adjusted (current dioxin + 1).
Model 5: Log_2 whole-weight (current dioxin + 1).
Model 6: Log_2 whole-weight (current dioxin + 1), adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

Note: Model 4: Low = ≤8.1 ppt; Medium = >8.1-20.5 ppt; High = >20.5 ppt.
Models 5 and 6: Low = ≤46 ppq; Medium = >46-128 ppq; High = >128 ppq.

Table 10-32.
Analysis of Carcinomas in Situ of the Penis, Other, and Unspecified Sites

a) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — UNADJUSTED					
Occupational Category	**Group**	**n**	**Percent Yes**	**Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**
All	***Ranch Hand***	***943***	***0.1***	***1.36 (0.09,21.74)***	***0.999***
	Comparison	***1,280***	***0.1***		
Officer	Ranch Hand	361	0.3	--	--
	Comparison	502	0.0		
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	160	0.0	--	--
	Comparison	203	0.0		
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	422	0.0	--	--
	Comparison	575	0.2		

b) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — ADJUSTED			
Occupational Category	**Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**	**Covariate Remarks**
All	--	--	
Officer	--	--	
Enlisted Flyer	--	--	
Enlisted Groundcrew	--	--	

--: Estimated relative risk, confidence interval, and p-value not presented due to the sparse number of abnormalities; adjusted analysis not performed due to the sparse number of abnormalities.

Table 10-32. (Continued)
Analysis of Carcinomas in Situ of the Penis, Other, and Unspecified Sites

c) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED				
Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics			**Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[a]**	
Initial Dioxin	**n**	**Percent Yes**	**Estimated Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]**	**p-Value**
Low	170	0.6	0.11 (0.00,9.47)	0.144
Medium	172	0.0		
High	172	0.0		

d) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — ADJUSTED			
Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)			
n	**Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**	**Covariate Remarks**
--	--	--	

[a] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in initial dioxin.

--: Adjusted analysis not performed due to the sparse number of abnormalities.

Note: Low = 39-98 ppt; Medium = >98-232 ppt; High = >232 ppt.

Table 10-32. (Continued)
Analysis of Carcinomas in Situ of the Penis, Other, and Unspecified Sites

e) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — UNADJUSTED				
Dioxin Category	n	Percent Yes	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value
Comparison	1,062	0.1		
Background RH	372	0.0	--	--
Low RH	255	0.4	4.22 (0.26,68.18)	0.311
High RH	259	0.0	--	--
Low plus High RH	514	0.2	2.05 (0.13,33.72)	0.617

f) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — ADJUSTED				
Dioxin Category	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
Comparison	--			
Background RH	--	--	--	
Low RH	--	--	--	
High RH	--	--	--	
Low plus High RH	--	--	--	

--: Estimated relative risk, confidence interval, and p-value not presented due to the sparse number of abnormalities; adjusted analysis not performed due to the sparse number of abnormalities.

Note: RH = Ranch Hand.
Comparison: Current Dioxin ≤10 ppt.
Background (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin ≤10 ppt.
Low (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin >10 ppt, 10 ppt < Initial Dioxin ≤143 ppt.
High (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin >10 ppt, Initial Dioxin >143 ppt.

Table 10-32. (Continued)
Analysis of Carcinomas in Situ of the Penis, Other, and Unspecified Sites

g) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED

Model[a]	Current Dioxin Category Percent Yes/(n) Low	Medium	High	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1) Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
4	0.0 (293)	0.3 (296)	0.0 (297)	0.89 (0.22,3.60)	0.864
5	0.0 (298)	0.3 (292)	0.0 (296)	0.88 (0.28,2.73)	0.826
6[c]	0.0 (297)	0.3 (292)	0.0 (296)	0.99 (0.28,3.47)	0.991

h) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — ADJUSTED

Model[a]	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1) n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
4	--	--	--	
5	--	--	--	
6	--	--	--	

[a] Model 4: Log_2 (lipid-adjusted current dioxin + 1).
Model 5: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1).
Model 6: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1), adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in current dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

--: Adjusted analysis not performed due to the sparse number of abnormalities.

Note: Model 4: Low = ≤8.1 ppt; Medium = >8.1-20.5 ppt; High = >20.5 ppt.
Models 5 and 6: Low = ≤46 ppq; Medium = >46-128 ppq; High = >128 ppq.

Table 10-33.
Analysis of Hodgkin's Disease

a) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — UNADJUSTED					
Occupational Category	**Group**	**n**	**Percent Yes**	**Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**
All	***Ranch Hand***	***943***	***0.1***	***1.36 (0.09,21.52)***	***0.999***
	Comparison	***1,280***	***0.1***		
Officer	Ranch Hand	361	0.3	1.39 (0.09,22.32)	0.999
	Comparison	502	0.2		
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	160	0.0	--	--
	Comparison	203	0.0		
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	422	0.0	--	--
	Comparison	575	0.0		

b) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — ADJUSTED			
Occupational Category	**Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**	**Covariate Remarks**
All	--	--	
Officer	--	--	
Enlisted Flyer	--	--	
Enlisted Groundcrew	--	--	

--: Estimated relative risk, confidence interval, and p-value not presented due to the sparse number of abnormalities; adjusted analysis not performed due to the sparse number of abnormalities.

Table 10-33. (Continued)
Analysis of Hodgkin's Disease

c) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED				
Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics			**Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)**	
Initial Dioxin	**n**	**Percent Yes**	**Estimated Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**
Low	170	0.0	--	--
Medium	172	0.0		
High	172	0.0		

d) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — ADJUSTED			
Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)			
n	**Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**	**Covariate Remarks**
--	--	--	

--: Statistical analyses not performed due to zero abnormalities.

Note: Low = 39-98 ppt; Medium = >98-232 ppt; High = >232 ppt.

Table 10-33. (Continued)
Analysis of Hodgkin's Disease

e) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — UNADJUSTED				
Dioxin Category	n	Percent Yes	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ab]	p-Value
Comparison	1,062	0.1		
Background RH	372	0.3	2.59 (0.15,43.50)	0.509
Low RH	255	0.0	--	--
High RH	259	0.0	--	--
Low plus High RH	514	0.0	--	--

f) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — ADJUSTED				
Dioxin Category	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
Comparison	--			
Background RH	--	--	--	
Low RH	--	--	--	
High RH	--	--	--	
Low plus High RH	--	--	--	

[a] Relative risk and confidence interval relative to Comparisons.

[b] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

--: Estimated relative risk, confidence interval, and p-value not presented due to the sparse number of abnormalities; adjusted analysis not performed due to the sparse number of abnormalities.

Note: RH = Ranch Hand.
Comparison: Current Dioxin $\leq$10 ppt.
Background (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin $\leq$10 ppt.
Low (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin $>$10 ppt, 10 ppt $<$ Initial Dioxin $\leq$143 ppt.
High (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin $>$10 ppt, Initial Dioxin $>$143 ppt.

Table 10-33. (Continued)
Analysis of Hodgkin's Disease

g) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED					
	Current Dioxin Category Percent Yes/(n)			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)	
Model[a]	Low	Medium	High	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
4	0.3 (293)	0.0 (296)	0.0 (297)	0.64 (0.14,2.90)	0.553
5	0.3 (298)	0.0 (292)	0.0 (296)	0.73 (0.27,2.00)	0.563
6[c]	0.3 (297)	0.0 (292)	0.0 (296)	0.78 (0.25,2.44)	0.684

h) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — ADJUSTED				
	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)			
Model[a]	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
4	867	0.74 (0.11,4.90)	0.746	AGE (p=0.019) DRKYR (p=0.131)
5	867	0.70 (0.13,3.61)	0.661	AGE (p=0.018) DRKYR (p=0.127)
6[d]	866	0.73 (0.12,4.43)	0.725	AGE (p=0.015) DRKYR (p=0.127)

[a] Model 4: Log_2 (lipid-adjusted current dioxin + 1).
Model 5: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1).
Model 6: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1), adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in current dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[d] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids in addition to covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: Model 4: Low = ≤8.1 ppt; Medium = >8.1-20.5 ppt; High = >20.5 ppt.
Models 5 and 6: Low = ≤46 ppq; Medium = >46-128 ppq; High = >128 ppq.

Table 10-34.
Analysis of Leukemia

a) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — UNADJUSTED					
Occupational Category	**Group**	**n**	**Percent Yes**	**Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**
All	***Ranch Hand***	***943***	***0.1***	***1.36 (0.09,21.74)***	***0.999***
	Comparison	***1,280***	***0.1***		
Officer	Ranch Hand	361	0.0	--	--
	Comparison	502	0.0		
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	160	0.6	--	--
	Comparison	203	0.0		
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	422	0.0	--	--
	Comparison	575	0.2		

b) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — ADJUSTED			
Occupational Category	**Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**	**Covariate Remarks**
All	--	--	
Officer	--	--	
Enlisted Flyer	--	--	
Enlisted Groundcrew	--	--	

--: Estimated relative risk, confidence interval, and p-value not presented due to the sparse number of abnormalities; adjusted analysis not performed due to the sparse number of abnormalities.

Table 10-34. (Continued)
Analysis of Leukemia

c) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED				
Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics			**Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[a]**	
Initial Dioxin	**n**	**Percent Yes**	**Estimated Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]**	**p-Value**
Low	170	0.0	0.61 (0.09,4.14)	0.569
Medium	172	0.6		
High	172	0.0		

d) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — ADJUSTED			
Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)			
n	**Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]**	**p-Value**	**Covariate Remarks**
--	--	--	

[a] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in initial dioxin.

--: Adjusted analysis not performed due to the sparse number of abnormalities.

Note: Low = 39-98 ppt; Medium = >98-232 ppt; High = >232 ppt.

Table 10-34. (Continued)
Analysis of Leukemia

e) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — UNADJUSTED				
Dioxin Category	n	Percent Yes	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ab]	p-Value
Comparison	1,062	0.1		
Background RH	372	0.0	--	--
Low RH	255	0.4	4.35 (0.26,70.40)	0.300
High RH	259	0.0	--	--
Low plus High RH	514	0.2	2.10 (0.13,34.67)	0.603

f) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — ADJUSTED				
Dioxin Category	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
Comparison	--			
Background RH	--	--	--	
Low RH	--	--	--	
High RH	--	--	--	
Low plus High RH	--	--	--	

[a] Relative risk and confidence interval relative to Comparisons.

[b] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

--: Estimated relative risk, confidence interval, and p-value not presented due to the sparse number of abnormalities; adjusted analysis not performed due to the sparse number of abnormalities.

Note: RH = Ranch Hand.
Comparison: Current Dioxin $\leq$10 ppt.
Background (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin $\leq$10 ppt.
Low (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin $>$10 ppt, 10 ppt $<$ Initial Dioxin $\leq$143 ppt.
High (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin $>$10 ppt, Initial Dioxin $>$143 ppt.

Table 10-34. (Continued)
Analysis of Leukemia

g) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED					
	Current Dioxin Category Percent Yes/(n)			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)	
Model[a]	Low	Medium	High	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
4	0.0 (293)	0.3 (296)	0.0 (297)	1.10 (0.30,4.06)	0.885
5	0.0 (298)	0.3 (292)	0.0 (296)	1.01 (0.32,3.22)	0.984
6[c]	0.0 (297)	0.3 (292)	0.0 (296)	1.25 (0.36,4.34)	0.728

h) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — ADJUSTED				
	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)			
Model[a]	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
4	--	--	--	
5	--	--	--	
6	--	--	--	

[a] Model 4: Log_2 (lipid-adjusted current dioxin + 1).
Model 5: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1).
Model 6: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1), adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in current dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

--: Adjusted analysis not performed due to the sparse number of abnormalities.

Note: Model 4: Low = ≤8.1 ppt; Medium = >8.1-20.5 ppt; High = >20.5 ppt.
Models 5 and 6: Low = ≤46 ppq; Medium = >46-128 ppq; High = >128 ppq.

$p > 0.26$ for all analyses performed). Lifetime alcohol history displayed significant covariate effects in Models 1 and 3. Model 1 also adjusted for age. Low frequencies of the history of non-Hodgkin's lymphoma prevented further statistical analysis.

Results from Models 4, 5, and 6 were nonsignificant for all unadjusted and adjusted analyses (Table 10-35(d,e): $p \geq 0.43$ for each analysis). Because of the sparse number of participants with a history of non-Hodgkin's lymphoma, only the candidate covariates of age, lifetime cigarette smoking history, and lifetime alcohol history were considered. Each final model adjusted for age.

Other Malignant Systemic Neoplasms of Lymphoid and Histiocytic Tissue

Because of the sparse number of participants with a history of other malignant systemic neoplasms of lymphoid and histiocytic tissue, not all unadjusted analyses were possible for Models 1 and 3. All results were nonsignificant (Table 10-36(a-f): $p > 0.47$). Model 2 analyses were not possible. Sample sizes and history percentages are presented in Table 10-36.

Results from Models 4, 5, and 6 were nonsignificant for all analyses (Table 10-36(g,h): $p \geq 0.43$ for each analysis). Because of the sparse number of participants with a history of other malignant systemic neoplasms of lymphoid and histiocytic tissue, only the candidate covariates of age, lifetime cigarette smoking history, and lifetime alcohol history were considered in these models. Each final model adjusted for age.

Multiple Myeloma

Due to the sparse number of participants with a history of multiple myeloma, analyses of Models 1, 2, and 3 were not possible. Sample sizes and frequencies of histories for Models 1, 2, and 3 are presented in Table 10-37(a-f).

Unadjusted analyses of multiple myeloma showed no significant results for Models 4, 5, and 6 (Table 10-37(g,h): $p > 0.78$ for all analyses). Adjusted analyses were not performed due to the sparse number of Ranch Hands with a history of multiple myeloma.

Skin or Systemic Neoplasms

Each Ranch Hand versus Comparison contrast examined with the Model 1 unadjusted analysis of history of a skin or systemic neoplasm was nonsignificant (Table 10-38(a): $p > 0.10$ for each contrast). A marginally significant difference was found in the adjusted overall contrast (Table 10-38(b): $p = 0.096$, Adj. $RR = 1.16$). Adjusted differences were nonsignificant when examined within each occupational category (Table 10-38(b): $p > 0.11$ for remaining contrasts). Age, skin, and eye color displayed significant covariate effects in the final adjusted model.

Each Model 2 analysis revealed a significant negative association between a history of a skin or systemic neoplasm and initial dioxin (Table 10-38(c,d): $p = 0.012$, Est. $RR = 0.84$ for both unadjusted and adjusted). Results indicate that a history of a skin or systemic neoplasm

Table 10-35.
Analysis of Non-Hodgkin's Lymphoma

a) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — UNADJUSTED					
Occupational Category	**Group**	**n**	**Percent Yes**	**Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**
All	***Ranch Hand***	***943***	***0.1***	***0.34 (0.04,3.04)***	***0.574***
	Comparison	***1,280***	***0.3***		
Officer	Ranch Hand	361	0.0	--	--
	Comparison	502	0.6		
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	160	0.0	--	--
	Comparison	203	0.5		
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	422	0.2	--	--
	Comparison	575	0.0		

b) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — ADJUSTED			
Occupational Category	**Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**	**Covariate Remarks[a]**
All	***0.32 (0.03,2.95)***	***0.267***	AGE (p=0.088) DRKYR (p=0.042)
Officer	--	--	
Enlisted Flyer	--	--	
Enlisted Groundcrew	--	--	

[a] Covariates and associated p-values correspond to final model based on all participants with available data.

--: Estimated relative risk, confidence interval, and p-value not presented due to the sparse number of abnormalities; adjusted analysis not performed due to the sparse number of abnormalities.

Table 10-35. (Continued)
Analysis of Non-Hodgkin's Lymphoma

c) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED				
Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)	
Initial Dioxin	n	Percent Yes	Estimated Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value
Low	170	0.0	--	--
Medium	172	0.0		
High	172	0.0		

d) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — ADJUSTED			
Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)			
n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
--	--	--	

--: Statistical analyses not performed due to zero abnormalities.

Note: Low = 39-98 ppt; Medium = >98-232 ppt; High = >232 ppt.

Table 10-35. (Continued)
Analysis of Non-Hodgkin's Lymphoma

e) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — UNADJUSTED

Dioxin Category	n	Percent Yes	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ab]	p-Value
Comparison	1,062	0.2		
Background RH	372	0.3	1.23 (0.11,14.03)	0.865
Low RH	255	0.0	--	--
High RH	259	0.0	--	--
Low plus High RH	514	0.0	--	--

f) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — ADJUSTED

Dioxin Category	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
Comparison	1,044			DRKYR (p=0.013)
Background RH	365	0.84 (0.06,12.57)	0.900	
Low RH	250	--	--	
High RH	252	--	--	
Low plus High RH	512	--	--	

[a] Relative risk and confidence interval relative to Comparisons.

[b] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

--: Estimated relative risk, confidence interval, and p-value not presented due to the sparse number of abnormalities; adjusted analysis not performed due to the sparse number of abnormalities.

Note: RH = Ranch Hand.
Comparison: Current Dioxin $\leq$10 ppt.
Background (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin $\leq$10 ppt.
Low (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin $>$10 ppt, 10 ppt $<$ Initial Dioxin $\leq$143 ppt.
High (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin $>$10 ppt, Initial Dioxin $>$143 ppt.

Table 10-35. (Continued)
Analysis of Non-Hodgkin's Lymphoma

g) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED

Model[a]	Current Dioxin Category Percent Yes/(n) Low	Medium	High	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1) Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
4	0.3 (293)	0.0 (296)	0.0 (297)	0.57 (0.13,2.61)	0.462
5	0.3 (298)	0.0 (292)	0.0 (296)	0.67 (0.26,1.71)	0.450
6[c]	0.3 (297)	0.0 (292)	0.0 (296)	0.74 (0.25,2.26)	0.624

h) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — ADJUSTED

Model[a]	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1) n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
4	886	0.52 (0.09,3.05)	0.480	AGE (p=0.019)
5	886	0.59 (0.18,1.94)	0.430	AGE (p=0.018)
6[d]	885	0.52 (0.11,2.39)	0.440	AGE (p=0.012)

[a] Model 4: Log_2 (lipid-adjusted current dioxin + 1).
Model 5: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1).
Model 6: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1), adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in current dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[d] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids in addition to covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: Model 4: Low = ≤8.1 ppt; Medium = >8.1-20.5 ppt; High = >20.5 ppt.
Models 5 and 6: Low = ≤46 ppq; Medium = >46-128 ppq; High = >128 ppq.

Table 10-36.
Analysis of Other Malignant Systemic Neoplasms of Lymphoid and Histiocytic Tissue

a) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — UNADJUSTED					
Occupational Category	**Group**	**n**	**Percent Yes**	**Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**
All	***Ranch Hand***	***943***	***0.1***	***1.36 (0.09,21.74)***	***0.999***
	Comparison	***1,280***	***0.1***		
Officer	Ranch Hand	361	0.0	--	--
	Comparison	502	0.2		
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	160	0.0	--	--
	Comparison	203	0.0		
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	422	0.2	--	--
	Comparison	575	0.0		

b) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — ADJUSTED			
Occupational Category	**Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**	**Covariate Remarks**
All	--	--	
Officer	--	--	
Enlisted Flyer	--	--	
Enlisted Groundcrew	--	--	

--: Estimated relative risk, confidence interval, and p-value not presented due to the sparse number of abnormalities; adjusted analysis not performed due to the sparse number of abnormalities.

Table 10-36. (Continued)
Analysis of Other Malignant Systemic Neoplasms of Lymphoid and Histiocytic Tissue

c) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED				
Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)	
Initial Dioxin	n	Percent Yes	Estimated Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value
Low	170	0.0	--	--
Medium	172	0.0		
High	172	0.0		

d) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — ADJUSTED			
Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)			
n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
--	--	--	

--: Statistical analyses not performed due to zero abnormalities.

Note: Low = 39-98 ppt; Medium = >98-232 ppt; High = >232 ppt.

Table 10-36. (Continued)
Analysis of Other Malignant Systemic Neoplasms of Lymphoid and Histiocytic Tissue

e) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — UNADJUSTED

Dioxin Category	n	Percent Yes	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ab]	p-Value
Comparison	1,062	0.1		
Background RH	372	0.3	2.84 (0.16,50.71)	0.477
Low RH	255	0.0	--	--
High RH	259	0.0	--	--
Low plus High RH	514	0.0	--	--

f) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — ADJUSTED

Dioxin Category	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
Comparison	--			
Background RH	--	--	--	
Low RH	--	--	--	
High RH	--	--	--	
Low plus High RH	--	--	--	

[a] Relative risk and confidence interval relative to Comparisons.

[b] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

--: Estimated relative risk, confidence interval, and p-value not presented due to the sparse number of abnormalities; adjusted analysis not performed due to the sparse number of abnormalities.

Note: RH = Ranch Hand.
Comparison: Current Dioxin $\leq$10 ppt.
Background (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin $\leq$10 ppt.
Low (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin >10 ppt, 10 ppt < Initial Dioxin $\leq$143 ppt.
High (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin >10 ppt, Initial Dioxin >143 ppt.

Table 10-36. (Continued)
Analysis of Other Malignant Systemic Neoplasms of Lymphoid and Histiocytic Tissue

g) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED

Model[a]	Current Dioxin Category Percent Yes/(n)			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)	
	Low	Medium	High	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
4	0.3 (293)	0.0 (296)	0.0 (297)	0.57 (0.13,2.61)	0.462
5	0.3 (298)	0.0 (292)	0.0 (296)	0.67 (0.26,1.71)	0.450
6[c]	0.3 (297)	0.0 (292)	0.0 (296)	0.74 (0.25,2.26)	0.624

h) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — ADJUSTED

Model[a]	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)			
	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
4	886	0.52 (0.09,3.05)	0.480	AGE (p=0.019)
5	886	0.59 (0.18,1.94)	0.430	AGE (p=0.018)
6[d]	885	0.52 (0.11,2.39)	0.440	AGE (p=0.012)

[a] Model 4: Log_2 (lipid-adjusted current dioxin + 1).
Model 5: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1).
Model 6: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1), adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in current dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[d] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids in addition to covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: Model 4: Low = ≤8.1 ppt; Medium = >8.1-20.5 ppt; High = >20.5 ppt.
Models 5 and 6: Low = ≤46 ppq; Medium = >46-128 ppq; High = >128 ppq.

Table 10-37.
Analysis of Multiple Myeloma

a) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — UNADJUSTED					
Occupational Category	**Group**	**n**	**Percent Yes**	**Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**
All	***Ranch Hand***	***943***	***0.1***	—	—
	Comparison	***1,280***	***0.0***		
Officer	Ranch Hand	361	0.0	--	--
	Comparison	502	0.0		
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	160	0.0	--	--
	Comparison	203	0.0		
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	422	0.2	--	--
	Comparison	575	0.0		

b) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — ADJUSTED			
Occupational Category	**Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**	**Covariate Remarks**
All	—	—	
Officer	--	--	
Enlisted Flyer	--	--	
Enlisted Groundcrew	--	--	

--: Analyses not performed due to the sparse number of abnormalities.

Table 10-37. (Continued)
Analysis of Multiple Myeloma

c) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED				
Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)	
Initial Dioxin	n	Percent Yes	Estimated Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value
Low	170	0.6	--	--
Medium	172	0.0		
High	172	0.0		

d) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — ADJUSTED			
Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)			
n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
--	--	--	

--: Analyses not performed due to the sparse number of abnormalities.

Note: Low = 39-98 ppt; Medium = >98-232 ppt; High = >232 ppt.

Table 10-37. (Continued)
Analysis of Multiple Myeloma

e) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — UNADJUSTED

Dioxin Category	n	Percent Yes	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value
Comparison	1,062	0.0		
Background RH	372	0.0	--	--
Low RH	255	0.4	--	--
High RH	259	0.0	--	--
Low plus High RH	514	0.2	--	--

f) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — ADJUSTED

Dioxin Category	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
Comparison	--			
Background RH	--	--	--	
Low RH	--	--	--	
High RH	--	--	--	
Low plus High RH	--	--	--	

--: Analyses not performed due to the sparse number of abnormalities.

Note: RH = Ranch Hand.
Comparison: Current Dioxin $\leq$10 ppt.
Background (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin $\leq$10 ppt.
Low (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin $>$10 ppt, 10 ppt $<$ Initial Dioxin $\leq$143 ppt.
High (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin $>$10 ppt, Initial Dioxin $>$143 ppt.

Table 10-37. (Continued)
Analysis of Multiple Myeloma

g) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED					
	Current Dioxin Category Percent Yes/(n)			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)	
Model[a]	Low	Medium	High	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
4	0.0 (293)	0.3 (296)	0.0 (297)	0.82 (0.20,3.44)	0.781
5	0.0 (298)	0.3 (292)	0.0 (296)	0.89 (0.29,2,75)	0.835
6[c]	0.0 (297)	0.3 (292)	0.0 (296)	0.87 (0.26,2.92)	0.817

h) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — ADJUSTED				
	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)			
Model[a]	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
4	--	--	--	
5	--	--	--	
6	--	--	--	

[a] Model 4: Log_2 (lipid-adjusted current dioxin + 1).
Model 5: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1).
Model 6: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1), adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in current dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

--: Adjusted analyses not performed due to the sparse number of abnormalities.

Note: Model 4: Low = ≤8.1 ppt; Medium = >8.1-20.5 ppt; High = >20.5 ppt.
Models 5 and 6: Low = ≤46 ppq; Medium = >46-128 ppq; High = >128 ppq.

Table 10-38.
Analysis of Skin or Systemic Neoplasms

a) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — UNADJUSTED					
Occupational Category	**Group**	**n**	**Percent Yes**	**Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**
All	***Ranch Hand***	***933***	***44.9***	***1.16 (0.97,1.37)***	***0.108***
	Comparison	***1,271***	***41.4***		
Officer	Ranch Hand	358	48.0	1.07 (0.82,1.40)	0.679
	Comparison	496	46.4		
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	158	48.1	1.23 (0.81,1.86)	0.398
	Comparison	202	43.1		
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	417	41.0	1.21 (0.94,1.57)	0.167
	Comparison	573	36.5		

b) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — ADJUSTED			
Occupational Category	**Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**	**Covariate Remarks[a]**
All	***1.16 (0.97,1.38)***	***0.096***	AGE ($p<0.001$) SKIN ($p=0.096$) EYE ($p=0.027$)
Officer	1.08 (0.82,1.42)	0.597	
Enlisted Flyer	1.16 (0.76,1.77)	0.497	
Enlisted Groundcrew	1.24 (0.95,1.61)	0.112	

[a] Covariates and associated p-values correspond to final model based on all participants with available data.

Table 10-38. (Continued)
Analysis of Skin or Systemic Neoplasms

c) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED				
Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[a]	
Initial Dioxin	n	Percent Yes	Estimated Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
Low	165	48.5	0.84 (0.73,0.97)	0.012
Medium	170	44.7		
High	172	39.0		

d) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — ADJUSTED			
Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[c]			
n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
502	0.84 (0.73,0.96)	0.012	EYE (p=0.003) SUN2HR (p=0.033) LAT (p=0.044)

[a] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in initial dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: Low = 39-98 ppt; Medium = >98-232 ppt; High = >232 ppt.

Table 10-38. (Continued)
Analysis of Skin or Systemic Neoplasms

e) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — UNADJUSTED				
Dioxin Category	n	Percent Yes	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ab]	p-Value
Comparison	1,055	42.0		
Background RH	369	45.0	1.17 (0.92,1.49)	0.208
Low RH	250	48.8	1.29 (0.98,1.70)	0.073
High RH	257	39.3	0.87 (0.66,1.16)	0.348
Low plus High RH	507	44.0	1.06 (0.86,1.32)	0.584

f) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — ADJUSTED				
Dioxin Category	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ac]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
Comparison	1,055			AGE ($p<0.001$) SKIN ($p=0.017$)
Background RH	368	1.10 (0.87,1.41)	0.426	
Low RH	250	1.25 (0.95,1.66)	0.115	
High RH	257	0.97 (0.73,1.29)	0.837	
Low plus High RH	507	1.10 (0.89,1.37)	0.371	

[a] Relative risk and confidence interval relative to Comparisons.

[b] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: RH = Ranch Hand.
Comparison: Current Dioxin $\leq$10 ppt.
Background (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin $\leq$10 ppt.
Low (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin $>$10 ppt, 10 ppt $<$ Initial Dioxin $\leq$143 ppt.
High (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin $>$10 ppt, Initial Dioxin $>$143 ppt.

Table 10-38. (Continued)
Analysis of Skin or Systemic Neoplasms

g) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED					
	Current Dioxin Category Percent Yes/(n)			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)	
Model[a]	Low	Medium	High	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
4	45.0 (291)	49.0 (290)	39.3 (295)	0.93 (0.85,1.02)	0.141
5	45.6 (296)	44.4 (286)	43.2 (294)	0.96 (0.89,1.04)	0.358
6[c]	45.8 (295)	44.4 (286)	43.2 (294)	0.92 (0.84,1.00)	0.049

h) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — ADJUSTED				
	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)			
Model[a]	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
4	873	0.98 (0.89,1.08)**	0.651**	CURR*EYE (p=0.011) AGE (p<0.001) SUN2HR (p=0.105)
5	873	1.00 (0.92,1.09)**	0.970**	CURR*EYE (p=0.010) AGE (p<0.001) SUN2HR (p=0.092)
6[d]	872	0.96 (0.87,1.04)**	0.313**	CURR*EYE (p=0.019) AGE (p<0.001) SUN2HR (p=0.093)

[a] Model 4: Log_2 (lipid-adjusted current dioxin + 1).
Model 5: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1).
Model 6: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1), adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in current dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[d] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids in addition to covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

** Log_2 (current dioxin + 1)-by-covariate interaction ($0.01 < p \leq 0.05$); adjusted relative risk, confidence interval, and p-value derived from a model fitted after deletion of this interaction; refer to Appendix Table F-2-11 for further analysis of this interaction.

Note: Model 4: Low = ≤8.1 ppt; Medium = >8.1-20.5 ppt; High = >20.5 ppt.
Models 5 and 6: Low = ≤46 ppq; Medium = >46-128 ppq; High = >128 ppq.

decreased as initial dioxin levels increased. The unadjusted Model 3 analysis revealed that Ranch Hands in the low dioxin category exhibited a marginally significant higher history of a skin or systemic neoplasm than Comparisons (Table 10-38(e): $p=0.073$, Est. RR=1.29). All other Model 3 results were nonsignificant (Table 10-38(e,f): $p>0.11$ for all remaining contrasts). Eye color, reaction of skin to sun after at least 2 hours, and average residential latitude were significant in the Model 2 final adjusted model. Age and skin color were significant in Model 3.

Similar to Model 2, the Model 6 unadjusted analysis revealed a significant inverse association between a history of a skin or systemic neoplasm and current dioxin (Table 10-38(g): $p=0.049$, Est. RR=0.92). History of a skin or systemic neoplasm decreased as current dioxin levels increased. Model 6 adjusted analysis and all analyses from Models 4 and 5 were nonsignificant (Table 10-38(g,h): $p>0.14$ for each analysis). Final models each included age, reaction of skin to sun after at least 2 hours, and the current dioxin-by-eye color interaction. Adjusted results for Models 4, 5, and 6 are based on each final model without the significant interaction. Appendix Table F-2-11 presents relative risk estimates by each eye color grouping.

Laboratory Examination Variables

Prostate-Specific Antigen (Continuous)

Because 2.7 percent (60/2,232) of the prostate-specific antigen measurements were below the test sensitivity limit of 0.2 ng/ml and consequently did not have a true measured value, the continuous analysis was conducted in two parts. First, the proportion of prostate-specific antigen measurements below the sensitivity limit was examined for an association with exposure. Second, only measurements at or above the sensitivity limit detected values were explored for an association with exposure. A natural logarithmic transformation was applied to continuous measurements to enhance normality.

For the first analysis, no associations between the proportion of prostate-specific antigen measurements below the sensitivity limit and group, initial dioxin, or current dioxin were observed (Table 10-39(a-h): $p>0.40$ for each model).

Based on the prostate-specific antigen measurements at or above the test sensitivity limit, Model 1 unadjusted results were nonsignificant, indicating no group association (Table 10-40(a): $p>0.49$ for each contrast). Adjusted analysis revealed a significant group-by-insecticide exposure interaction. Further analysis of this interaction is presented in Appendix Table F-2-12. Comparisons with no insecticide exposure had a significantly larger adjusted mean prostate-specific antigen than Ranch Hands with no insecticide exposure (Appendix Table F-2-12(a): $p=0.012$; Ranch Hand adjusted mean: 0.943 ng/ml, Comparison officer adjusted mean: 1.192 ng/ml). Results were similar when mean differences were examined within the officer stratum (Appendix Table F-2-12(a): $p=0.018$; Ranch Hand officer adjusted mean: 0.934 ng/ml, Comparison officer adjusted mean: 1.192 ng/ml). Other significant covariates in the final adjusted model were lifetime alcohol history, ionizing radiation exposure, and industrial chemical exposure.

Table 10-39.
Analysis of Prostate-Specific Antigen
(Below vs. At or Above Sensitivity Limit)

a) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — UNADJUSTED

Occupational Category	Group	n	Percent Below Sensitivity Limit	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value
All	***Ranch Hand***	***943***	***2.4***	***0.84 (0.50,1.42)***	***0.603***
	Comparison	***1,279***	***2.9***		
Officer	Ranch Hand	361	2.8	0.72 (0.33,1.58)	0.532
	Comparison	502	3.8		
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	160	2.5	1.70 (0.38,7.71)	0.755
	Comparison	202	1.5		
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	422	2.1	0.81 (0.35,1.88)	0.783
	Comparison	575	2.6		

b) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — ADJUSTED

Occupational Category	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value	Covariate Remarks[a]
All	***0.83 (0.49,1.42)***	***0.498***	AGE (p=0.004) ASB (p=0.149) IC (p=0.126)
Officer	0.72 (0.33,1.57)	0.405	
Enlisted Flyer	1.67 (0.37,7.57)	0.508	
Enlisted Groundcrew	0.82 (0.35,1.89)	0.639	

[a] Covariates and associated p-values correspond to final model based on all participants with available data.

Table 10-39. (Continued)
Analysis of Prostate-Specific Antigen
(Below vs. At or Above Sensitivity Limit)

c) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED				
Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[a]	
Initial Dioxin	n	Percent Below Sensitivity Limit	Estimated Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
Low	170	1.8	0.89 (0.57,1.40)	0.608
Medium	172	3.5		
High	172	2.3		

d) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — ADJUSTED			
Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[c]			
n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
514	0.94 (0.60,1.48)	0.794	RACE (p=0.149) IONRAD (p=0.010)

[a] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in initial dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Table 10-39. (Continued)
Analysis of Prostate-Specific Antigen
(Below vs. At or Above Sensitivity Limit)

e) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — UNADJUSTED				
Dioxin Category	n	Percent Below Sensitivity Limit	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ab]	p-Value
Comparison	1,062	3.0		
Background RH	372	2.7	0.95 (0.46,1.96)	0.882
Low RH	255	2.4	0.76 (0.31,1.83)	0.534
High RH	259	2.7	0.85 (0.37,1.96)	0.700
Low plus High RH	514	2.5	0.80 (0.42,1.55)	0.512

f) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — ADJUSTED				
Dioxin Category	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ac]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
Comparison	1,062			AGE (p=0.007)
Background RH	372	0.89 (0.43,1.84)	0.749	
Low RH	255	0.71 (0.29,1.73)	0.456	
High RH	259	0.98 (0.42,2.27)	0.957	
Low plus High RH	514	0.83 (0.43,1.61)	0.589	

[a] Relative risk and confidence interval relative to Comparisons.

[b] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: RH = Ranch Hand.
Comparison: Current Dioxin ≤10 ppt.
Background (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin ≤10 ppt.
Low (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin >10 ppt, 10 ppt < Initial Dioxin ≤143 ppt.
High (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin >10 ppt, Initial Dioxin >143 ppt.

Table 10-39. (Continued)
Analysis of Prostate-Specific Antigen
(Below vs. At or Above Sensitivity Limit)

g) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED

Model[a]	Current Dioxin Category Percent Below Sensitivity Limit/(n)			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)	
	Low	Medium	High	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
4	2.4 (293)	2.4 (296)	3.0 (297)	0.97 (0.73,1.29)	0.824
5	2.4 (298)	2.1 (292)	3.4 (296)	1.02 (0.80,1.30)	0.870
6[c]	2.4 (297)	2.1 (292)	3.4 (296)	0.95 (0.73,1.23)	0.677

h) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — ADJUSTED

Model[a]	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)			
	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
4	886	0.99 (0.75,1.32)	0.962	RACE (p=0.094) IONRAD (p=0.017)
5	886	1.04 (0.82,1.33)	0.722	RACE (p=0.094) IONRAD (p=0.016)
6[d]	885	0.97 (0.75,1.26)	0.834	RACE (p=0.111) IONRAD (p=0.014)

[a] Model 4: Log_2 (lipid-adjusted current dioxin + 1).
Model 5: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1).
Model 6: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1), adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in current dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[d] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids in addition to covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: Model 4: Low = ≤8.1 ppt; Medium = >8.1-20.5 ppt; High = >20.5 ppt.
Models 5 and 6: Low = ≤46 ppq; Medium = >46-128 ppq; High = >128 ppq.

Table 10-40.
Analysis of Prostate-Specific Antigen (ng/ml)
(Continuous)

a) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — UNADJUSTED

Occupational Category	Group	n	Mean[a]	Difference of Means (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value[c]
All	***Ranch Hand***	***920***	***1.013***	***-0.012 --***	***0.717***
	Comparison	***1,242***	***1.025***		
Officer	Ranch Hand	351	1.131	0.014 --	0.821
	Comparison	483	1.117		
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	156	1.111	-0.019 --	0.838
	Comparison	199	1.130		
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	413	0.890	-0.028 --	0.492
	Comparison	560	0.918		

b) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — ADJUSTED

Occupational Category	Group	n	Adj. Mean[a]	Difference of Adj. Means (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value[c]	Covariate Remarks[d]
All	***Ranch Hand***	***900***	****	****	****	GROUP*INS (p=0.004) DRKYR (p=0.114) IONRAD (p=0.004) IC (p=0.023)
	Comparison	***1,223***	****			
Officer	Ranch Hand	348	****	****	****	
	Comparison	476	****			
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	151	****	****	****	
	Comparison	198	****			
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	401	****	****	****	
	Comparison	549	****			

[a] Transformed from the natural logarithm scale.

[b] Difference of means after transformation to original scale; confidence interval on difference of means not presented because analysis was performed on natural logarithm scale.

[c] P-values based on difference of means on natural logarithm scale.

[d] Covariates and associated p-values correspond to final model based on all participants with available data.

**** Group-by-covariate interaction ($p \leq 0.01$); adjusted mean, difference of adjusted means, and p-value not presented; refer to Appendix Table F-2-12 for further analysis this interaction.

Note: Analysis based on measurements at or above 0.2 ng/ml (sensitivity limit) only.

Table 10-40. (Continued)
Analysis of Prostate-Specific Antigen (ng/ml)
(Continuous)

c) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED						
Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics				Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[b]		
Initial Dioxin	n	Mean[a]	Adj. Mean[ab]	R^2	Slope (Std. Error)[c]	p-Value
Low	167	1.202	1.185	0.052	-0.086 (0.026)	0.001
Medium	166	0.936	0.933			
High	168	0.872	0.888			

d) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — ADJUSTED						
Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[d]			
Initial Dioxin	n	Adj. Mean[ad]	R^2	Adj. Slope (Std. Error)[c]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
Low	167	1.016**	0.140	-0.036 (0.026)**	0.179**	INIT*AGE (p=0.026) PACKYR (p=0.019) IONRAD (p=0.065) HERB (p=0.122)
Medium	166	0.874**				
High	168	0.898**				

[a] Transformed from natural logarithm scale.

[b] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[c] Slope and standard error based on natural logarithm of prostate specific antigen versus log_2 (initial dioxin).

[d] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

** Log_2 (initial dioxin)-by-covariate interaction ($0.01 < p \leq 0.05$); adjusted mean, adjusted slope, standard error, and p-value derived from a model fitted after deletion of this interaction; refer to Appendix Table F-2-12 for further analysis of this interaction.

Note: Analysis based on measurements at or above 0.2 ng/ml (sensitivity limit) only.
Low = 39-98 ppt; Medium = >98-232 ppt; High = >232 ppt.

Table 10-40. (Continued)
Analysis of Prostate-Specific Antigen (ng/ml)
(Continuous)

e) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — UNADJUSTED

Dioxin Category	n	Mean[a]	Adj. Mean[ab]	Difference of Adj. Mean vs. Comparisons (95% C.I.)[c]	p-Value[d]
Comparison	1,030	1.043	1.044		
Background RH	362	1.042	1.032	-0.012 --	0.800
Low RH	249	1.098	1.098	0.054 --	0.342
High RH	252	0.900	0.910	-0.134 --	0.010
Low plus High RH	501	0.998	1.003	-0.040 --	0.287

f) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — ADJUSTED

Dioxin Category	n	Adj. Mean[ae]	Difference of Adj. Mean vs. Comparisons (95% C.I.)[c]	p-Value[d]	Covariate Remarks
Comparison	1,014	****			DXCAT*INS (p=0.009) AGE (p<0.001) PACKYR (p=0.009) DRKYR (p=0.008)
Background RH	356	****	****	****	
Low RH	244	****	****	****	
High RH	245	****	****	****	
Low plus High RH	489	****	****	****	

[a] Transformed from natural logarithm scale.

[b] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[c] Difference of adjusted means after transformation to original scale; confidence interval on difference of adjusted means not presented because analysis was performed on natural logarithm scale.

[d] P-value is based on difference of means on natural logarithm scale.

[e] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

**** Categorized dioxin-by-covariate interaction ($p \leq 0.01$); adjusted mean, difference of adjusted means, and p-value not presented; refer to Appendix Table F-2-12 for further analysis of this interaction.

Note: Analysis based on measurements at or above 0.2 ng/ml (sensitivity limit) only.
RH = Ranch Hand.
Comparison: Current Dioxin ≤10 ppt.
Background (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin ≤10 ppt.
Low (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin >10 ppt, 10 ppt < Initial Dioxin ≤143 ppt.
High (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin >10 ppt, Initial Dioxin >143 ppt.

Table 10-40. (Continued)
Analysis of Prostate-Specific Antigen (ng/ml)
(Continuous)

g) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED

Model[b]	Current Dioxin Category Mean[a]/(n) Low	Medium	High	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1) R^2	Slope (Std. Error)[c]	p-Value
4	1.045 (286)	1.128 (289)	0.883 (288)	0.009	-0.049 (0.017)	0.005
5	1.058 (291)	1.088 (286)	0.905 (286)	0.009	-0.042 (0.015)	0.005
6[d]	1.053 (290)	1.087 (286)	0.912 (286)	0.010	-0.041 (0.016)	0.010

h) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — ADJUSTED

Model[b]	Current Dioxin Category Adjusted Mean[a]/(n) Low	Medium	High	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1) R^2	Adj. Slope (Std. Error)[c]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
4	0.973 (285)	1.040 (289)	0.911 (288)	0.098	-0.018 (0.017)	0.275	AGE (p<0.001) PACKYR (p=0.001) INS (p=0.007)
5	0.986 (290)	1.005 (286)	0.928 (286)	0.099	-0.019 (0.014)	0.186	AGE (p<0.001) PACKYR (p=0.001) INS (p=0.007)
6[e]	0.975 (289)	1.002 (286)	0.943 (286)	0.101	-0.015 (0.016)	0.353	AGE (p<0.001) PACKYR (p=0.003) INS (p=0.006)

[a] Transformed from natural logarithm scale.

[b] Model 4: Log_2 (lipid-adjusted current dioxin + 1).
Model 5: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1).
Model 6: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1), adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[c] Slope and standard error based on natural logarithm of prostate specific antigen versus log_2 (current dioxin+1).

[d] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[e] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids in addition to covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: Analysis based on measurements at or above 0.2 ng/ml (sensitivity limit) only.
Model 4: Low = ≤8.1 ppt; Medium = >8.1-20.5 ppt; High = >20.5 ppt.
Models 5 and 6: Low = ≤46 ppq; Medium = >46-128 ppq; High = >128 ppq.

The Model 2 unadjusted analysis revealed a significant inverse association between prostate-specific antigen measurements at or above the test sensitivity limit and initial dioxin (Table 10-40(c): p=0.001, slope=-0.086; low initial dioxin category adjusted mean: 1.185 ng/ml, medium initial dioxin category adjusted mean: 0.933 ng/ml, high initial dioxin category adjusted mean: 0.888 ng/ml). The negative slope indicated prostate-specific antigen measurements among Ranch Hands decreased as initial dioxin measurements increased among Ranch Hands. Results were nonsignificant after covariate adjustment and deletion of the significant interaction between initial dioxin and age (Table 10-40(d): p=0.179). Lifetime cigarette smoking history, ionizing radiation exposure, and herbicide exposure also were significant in the final adjusted model. Analyses stratified by each age category are presented in Appendix Table F-2-12.

The Model 3 unadjusted contrast between Ranch Hands in the high category and Comparisons was significant, with mean prostate-specific antigen in the Comparison group higher than means in the high Ranch Hand group (Table 10-40(e): p=0.010; Comparison mean and high Ranch Hand mean, adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin: 1.044 ng/ml and 0.910 ng/ml respectively). Other unadjusted contrasts were nonsignificant (Table 10-40(e): p>0.28 for each remaining contrast). Age, lifetime cigarette smoking history, lifetime alcohol history, and the interaction between categorized dioxin and insecticide exposure displayed significant effects in the final adjusted model. Results stratified by each level of insecticide exposure are presented in Appendix Table F-2-12. Comparisons with no insecticide exposure have a significantly larger adjusted mean prostate-specific antigen than Ranch Hands in the background category with no insecticide exposure (Appendix Table F-2-12(c): p=0.001; Comparison adjusted mean: 1.099 ng/ml, background Ranch Hand category adjusted mean: 0.833 ng/ml). The same pattern between Comparisons and Ranch Hands in the low plus high Ranch Hand category with no insecticide exposure is seen, except that the significance was marginal (p=0.062).

Results of the analysis of prostate-specific antigen measurements at or above the test sensitivity limit from Models 4, 5, and 6 were similar. Each unadjusted association with current dioxin was significant and inverse in direction (Table 10-40(g): p=0.005, Est. Slope=-0.049, p=0.005, Est. Slope=-0.042, p=0.010, Est. Slope=-0.041 for Models 4, 5, and 6). The unadjusted means for the low, medium, and high lipid-adjusted current dioxin categories were 1.045 ng/ml, 1.128 ng/ml, and 0.883 ng/ml respectively. The unadjusted means for the low, medium, and high whole-weight current dioxin categories were 1.058 ng/ml, 1.088 ng/ml, and 0.905 ng/ml respectively. The means, adjusted for total lipids, for the low, medium, and high whole-weight current dioxin categories were 1.053 ng/ml, 1.087 ng/ml, and 0.912 ng/ml respectively. Associations were nonsignificant after covariate adjustment for age, lifetime cigarette smoking history, and insecticide exposure for each model (Table 10-40(h): p>0.18 for each analysis).

Prostate-Specific Antigen (Discrete)

Each contrast from the Model 1 unadjusted analysis of prostate-specific antigen, categorized as normal or abnormal, indicated that differences between Ranch Hands and Comparisons were nonsignificant (Table 10-41(a): p>0.18 for each contrast). The

Table 10-41.
Analysis of Prostate-Specific Antigen
(Discrete)

a) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — UNADJUSTED

Occupational Category	Group	n	Percent Abnormal	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value
All	***Ranch Hand***	***943***	***3.6***	***0.73 (0.48,1.13)***	***0.188***
	Comparison	***1,279***	***4.9***		
Officer	Ranch Hand	361	5.0	0.86 (0.47,1.57)	0.724
	Comparison	502	5.8		
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	160	5.0	0.71 (0.29,1.73)	0.588
	Comparison	202	6.9		
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	422	1.9	0.57 (0.25,1.30)	0.248
	Comparison	575	3.3		

b) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — ADJUSTED

Occupational Category	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value	Covariate Remarks[a]
All	****	****	GROUP*PACKYR (p=0.009)
Officer	****	****	AGE (p<0.001)
Enlisted Flyer	****	****	RACE (p=0.003) DRKYR (p=0.002) IONRAD (p=0.133)
Enlisted Groundcrew	****	****	INS (p=0.025)

[a] Covariates and associated p-values correspond to final model based on all participants with available data.

**** Group-by-covariate interaction ($p \leq 0.01$); adjusted relative risk, confidence interval, and p-value not presented; refer to Appendix Table F-2-13 for further analysis this interaction.

Table 10-41. (Continued)
Analysis of Prostate-Specific Antigen
(Discrete)

c) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED				
Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[a]	
Initial Dioxin	n	Percent Abnormal	Estimated Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
Low	170	6.5	0.61 (0.41,0.90)	0.006
Medium	172	7.0		
High	172	0.6		

d) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — ADJUSTED			
Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[c]			
n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
514	0.69 (0.46,1.05)	0.064	AGE ($p<0.001$) PACKYR ($p=0.003$)

[a] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in initial dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: Low = 39-98 ppt; Medium = >98-232 ppt; High = >232 ppt.

Table 10-41. (Continued)
Analysis of Prostate-Specific Antigen
(Discrete)

e) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — UNADJUSTED

Dioxin Category	n	Percent Abnormal	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ab]	p-Value
Comparison	1,062	5.0		
Background RH	372	2.4	0.49 (0.24,1.00)	0.050
Low RH	255	5.9	1.14 (0.63,2.06)	0.665
High RH	259	3.5	0.67 (0.33,1.39)	0.282
Low plus High RH	514	4.7	0.91 (0.55,1.49)	0.693

f) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — ADJUSTED

Dioxin Category	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ac]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
Comparison	1,044			DXCAT*INS (p=0.030) AGE (p<0.001) RACE (p=0.038) DRKYR (p<0.001) HERB (p=0.027)
Background RH	365	0.31 (0.13,0.69)**	0.005**	
Low RH	250	0.84 (0.42,1.66)**	0.611**	
High RH	252	0.76 (0.34,1.71)**	0.511**	
Low plus High RH	502	0.81 (0.45,1.46)**	0.480**	

[a] Relative risk and confidence interval relative to Comparisons.

[b] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

** Categorized dioxin-by-covariate interaction ($0.01 < p \leq 0.05$); adjusted relative risk, confidence interval, and p-value derived from a model fitted after deletion of this interaction; refer to Appendix Table F-2-13 for further analysis of this interaction.

Note: RH = Ranch Hand.
Comparison: Current Dioxin ≤10 ppt.
Background (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin ≤10 ppt.
Low (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin >10 ppt, 10 ppt < Initial Dioxin ≤143 ppt.
High (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin >10 ppt, Initial Dioxin >143 ppt.

Table 10-41. (Continued)
Analysis of Prostate-Specific Antigen
(Discrete)

g) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED

Model[a]	Current Dioxin Category Percent Abnormal/(n) Low	Medium	High	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1) Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
4	1.7 (293)	6.8 (296)	2.7 (297)	0.99 (0.78,1.25)	0.904
5	2.0 (298)	5.1 (292)	4.1 (296)	1.03 (0.84,1.26)	0.808
6[c]	2.0 (297)	5.1 (292)	4.1 (296)	0.98 (0.79,1.23)	0.886

h) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — ADJUSTED

Model[a]	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1) n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
4	885	1.08 (0.81,1.44)**	0.593**	CURR*DC (p=0.039) AGE (p<0.001) PACKYR (p<0.001)
5	885	1.12 (0.87,1.44)**	0.384**	CURR*DC (p=0.020) AGE (p<0.001) PACKYR (p<0.001)
6[d]	884	1.07 (0.82,1.40)**	0.610**	CURR*DC (p=0.021) AGE (p<0.001) PACKYR (p<0.001)

[a] Model 4: Log_2 (lipid-adjusted current dioxin + 1).
Model 5: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1).
Model 6: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1), adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in current dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[d] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids in addition to covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

** Log_2 (current dioxin + 1)-by-covariate interaction ($0.01 < p \leq 0.05$); adjusted relative risk, confidence interval, and p-value derived from a model fitted after deletion of this interaction; refer to Appendix Table F-2-13 for further analysis of this interaction.

Note: Model 4: Low = ≤8.1 ppt; Medium = >8.1-20.5 ppt; High = >20.5 ppt.
Models 5 and 6: Low = ≤46 ppq; Medium = >46-128 ppq; High = >128 ppq.

interaction between group and lifetime cigarette smoking history was significant in the adjusted model. Other significant covariates were age, race, lifetime alcohol history, ionizing radiation exposure, and insecticide exposure. Analyses stratified by three lifetime cigarette smoking history categories and three occupational cohorts are presented in Appendix Table F-2-13. Enlisted groundcrew Comparisons with more than 10 pack-years of cigarette smoking had a significantly higher percentage of prostate-specific antigen abnormalities than enlisted groundcrew Ranch Hands with more than 10 pack-years of cigarette smoking (Appendix Table F-2-13(a): $p=0.049$, Adj. RR=0.32).

A significant association between prostate-specific antigen and initial dioxin was revealed from the unadjusted analyses of Model 2 (Table 10-41(c): $p=0.006$, Est. RR=0.61). The background Ranch Hands versus Comparisons unadjusted contrast from Model 3 also was significant (Table 10-41(e): $p=0.050$, Est. RR=0.49). Both relative risk estimates indicate the occurrence of prostate-specific antigen abnormalities decreased as dioxin levels increased. Adjusted results were similar, except the Model 2 result was marginally significant (Table 10-41(d,f): $p=0.064$, Adj. RR=0.69 for Model 2 and $p=0.005$, Adj. RR=0.31 for Model 3). All other Model 3 contrasts were nonsignificant (Table 10-41(e,f): $p>0.28$ for all remaining contrasts). Model 2 adjusted for age and lifetime cigarette smoking history. Age, race, lifetime alcohol history, herbicide exposure, and a categorized dioxin-by-insecticide exposure interaction were significant in Model 3. Adjusted results were obtained from the final model after deletion of the interaction. Results stratified by each level of insecticide exposure are presented in Appendix Table F-2-13.

Analyses of prostate-specific antigen from Model 4, 5, and 6 were nonsignificant (Table 10-41(g,h): $p>0.38$ for all analyses). Each adjusted result was based upon the final model after deletion of a significant current dioxin-by-degreasing chemical exposure interaction. Appendix Table F-2-13 presents relative risk estimates for each level of degreasing chemical exposure. Each model also adjusted for age and lifetime cigarette smoking history.

Longitudinal Analysis

Longitudinal analyses were conducted on three variables—malignant skin neoplasms, malignant systemic neoplasms, and benign systemic neoplasms—to examine whether changes across time differed with respect to group membership (Model 1), initial dioxin (Model 2), and categorized dioxin (Model 3). The longitudinal analyses for these variables investigated the difference between the 1982 examination and the 1992 examinations. Models 4, 5, and 6 were not examined in longitudinal analyses because current dioxin, the measure of exposure in these models, changes over time and is not available for all participants for 1982 or 1992.

The longitudinal analyses examined relative risks at the 1992 examination for participants classified as normal at the earlier examination. Participants classified as abnormal in 1982 were excluded because the focus of the analyses was on investigating the temporal effects of dioxin during the period between 1982 and 1992. Participants classified as abnormal in 1982 were already abnormal before this period; consequently, only participants classified as normal at the 1982 examination were considered to be at risk when the effects of dioxin over time are explored. The rate of abnormalities under this restriction approximates an incidence rate between 1982 and 1992. All three models were adjusted for

age; Models 2 and 3 also were adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and the change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

Verified Medical Records

Malignant Skin Neoplasms

Among participants who did not have a history of a malignant skin neoplasm in 1982, differences between Ranch Hands and Comparisons were nonsignificant in the Model 1 longitudinal analysis (Table 10-42(a): $p > 0.62$ for all contrasts). All Model 3 contrasts also were nonsignificant (Table 10-42(c): $p > 0.20$ for all contrasts).

For participants with no history of a malignant skin neoplasm in 1982, tests of association between a history of a malignant skin neoplasm and initial dioxin, adjusted for age, revealed a significant inverse relationship in the Model 2 analysis (Table 10-42(b): $p=0.039$, Adj. RR=0.73). The history of a malignant skin neoplasm in 1982, 1985, 1987, and 1992 is consistently lowest among Ranch Hands with the highest initial dioxin levels.

Malignant Systemic Neoplasms

No significant results were seen for each group contrast examined from the Model 1 longitudinal analysis of a history of a malignant systemic neoplasm (Table 10-43(a): $p > 0.12$ for all contrasts).

For Ranch Hands without a history of a malignant systemic neoplasm in 1982, the history of malignant systemic neoplasms in 1992 was inversely related to initial dioxin in the Model 2 longitudinal analysis (Table 10-43(b): $p=0.028$, Adj. RR=0.62). Of the Ranch Hands with no history of a malignant systemic neoplasm in 1982, 6.2 percent with low levels of initial dioxin had a history in 1992, compared to 1.2 percent with high levels of initial dioxin. Model 3 analysis revealed a marginally significant difference between Ranch Hands in the low dioxin category (7.0%) and Comparisons (3.5%) (Table 10-43(c): $p=0.070$, Adj. RR=1.80). All other Model 3 contrasts were nonsignificant ($p > 0.31$ for all remaining contrasts).

Benign Systemic Neoplasms

Longitudinal analysis was performed for participants with no history of a benign systemic neoplasm in 1982. Results from Models 1, 2, and 3 were all nonsignificant, indicating no association between a benign systemic neoplasm and group, initial dioxin, or categorized dioxin (Table 10-44(a-c): $p > 0.14$ for analyses).

DISCUSSION

In ambulatory medicine, the recommendation that asymptomatic individuals undergo periodic physical examinations is based largely on the assumption that such screening may reveal occult malignancy. Although the guidelines for the frequency and content of such

Table 10-42.
Longitudinal Analysis of Malignant Skin Neoplasms

a) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS

Occupational Category	Group	Percent Yes/(n) Examination 1982	1985	1987	1992
All	***Ranch Hand***	***5.3 (838)***	***8.3 (817)***	***11.0 (809)***	***14.2 (838)***
	Comparison	***3.5 (994)***	***6.9 (972)***	***8.8 (969)***	***12.5 (994)***
Officer	Ranch Hand	6.0 (331)	10.7 (326)	14.5 (325)	19.6 (331)
	Comparison	3.6 (392)	8.1 (384)	9.7 (380)	16.3 (392)
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	6.8 (148)	8.9 (146)	11.9 (143)	14.9 (148)
	Comparison	3.7 (161)	6.3 (158)	10.6 (160)	13.0 (161)
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	3.9 (359)	5.8 (345)	7.3 (341)	8.9 (359)
	Comparison	3.4 (441)	6.1 (430)	7.2 (429)	8.8 (441)

Occupational Category	Group	No History in 1982: n in 1992	Percent Yes in 1992	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[a]	p-Value[a]
All	***Ranch Hand***	***794***	***9.5***	***1.04 (0.75,1.43)***	***0.834***
	Comparison	***959***	***9.3***		
Officer	Ranch Hand	311	14.5	1.11 (0.72,1.72)	0.627
	Comparison	378	13.2		
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	138	8.7	0.91 (0.41,2.01)	0.808
	Comparison	155	9.7		
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	345	5.2	0.93 (0.50,1.76)	0.834
	Comparison	426	5.6		

[a] Relative risk, confidence interval, and p-values are in reference to a contrast of 1982 and 1992 results; results adjusted for age in 1992.

Note: Summary statistics for 1985 are provided for reference purposes for participants who attended the Baseline, 1985, and 1992 examinations. Summary statistics for 1987 are provided for reference purposes for participants who attended the Baseline, 1987, and 1992 examinations. Statistical analyses are based only on participants who had no history of malignanat skin neoplasms in 1982 (see Chapter 7, Statistical Methods).

Table 10-42. (Continued)
Longitudinal Analysis of Malignant Skin Neoplasms

b) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN				
	Percent Yes/(n) Examination			
Initial Dioxin	1982	1985	1987	1992
Low	6.9 (146)	12.6 (143)	14.5 (145)	17.1 (146)
Medium	5.1 (157)	6.6 (152)	9.2 (153)	13.4 (157)
High	3.8 (159)	5.1 (157)	7.1 (154)	8.8 (159)

Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[a]	
	No History in 1982			
Initial Dioxin	n in 1992	Percent Yes in 1992	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
Low	136	11.0	0.73 (0.54,1.00)	0.039
Medium	149	8.7		
High	153	5.2		

[a] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of blood draw for dioxin, and age in 1992.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in initial dioxin.

Note: Low = 39-98 ppt; Medium = >98-232 ppt; High = >232 ppt.
Summary statistics for 1985 are provided for reference purposes for participants who attended the Baseline, 1985, and 1992 examinations. Summary statistics for 1987 are provided for reference purposes for participants who attended the Baseline, 1987, and 1992 examinations. Statistical analyses are based only on participants who had no history of malignant skin neoplasms in 1982 (see Chapter 7, Statistical Methods).

Table 10-42. (Continued)
Longitudinal Analysis of Malignant Skin Neoplasms

c) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY

Dioxin Category	Percent Yes/(n) Examination			
	1982	1985	1987	1992
Comparison	3.5 (864)	7.0 (853)	8.6 (854)	12.4 (864)
Background RH	5.2 (325)	8.1 (322)	11.3 (319)	15.4 (325)
Low RH	7.6 (223)	11.9 (218)	13.1 (221)	17.9 (223)
High RH	2.9 (239)	4.3 (234)	7.4 (231)	8.4 (239)
Low plus High RH	5.2 (462)	8.0 (452)	10.2 (452)	13.0 (462)

Dioxin Category	No History in 1982			
	n in 1992	Percent Yes in 1992	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ab]	p-Value[b]
Comparison	834	9.2		
Background RH	308	10.7	1.14 (0.74,1.77)	0.551
Low RH	206	11.2	1.17 (0.71,1.92)	0.544
High RH	232	5.6	0.67 (0.36,1.24)	0.202
Low plus High RH	438	8.2	0.92 (0.61,1.40)	0.703

[a] Relative risk and confidence interval relative to Comparisons.

[b] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of blood draw for dioxin, and age in 1992.

Note: RH = Ranch Hand.
Comparison: Current Dioxin $\leq$10 ppt.
Background (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin $\leq$10 ppt.
Low (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin $>$10 ppt, 10 ppt $<$ Initial Dioxin $\leq$143 ppt.
High (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin $>$10 ppt, Initial Dioxin $>$143 ppt.
Summary statistics for 1985 are provided for reference purposes for participants who attended the Baseline, 1985, and 1992 examinations. Summary statistics for 1987 are provided for reference purposes for participants who attended the Baseline, 1987, and 1992 examinations. Statistical analyses are based only on participants who had no history of malignant skin neoplasms in 1982 (see Chapter 7, Statistical Methods).

Table 10-43.
Longitudinal Analysis of Malignant Systemic Neoplasms

a) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS

Occupational Category	Group	Percent Yes/(n) Examination			
		1982	1985	1987	1992
All	***Ranch Hand***	***0.9 (892)***	***1.8 (870)***	***2.4 (861)***	***4.9 (892)***
	Comparison	***1.0 (1,062)***	***1.4 (1,039)***	***1.7 (1,036)***	***4.5 (1,062)***
Officer	Ranch Hand	1.2 (334)	2.4 (329)	3.1 (328)	6.3 (334)
	Comparison	1.2 (403)	2.0 (395)	2.3 (391)	6.7 (403)
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	1.3 (157)	2.6 (155)	2.6 (152)	7.6 (157)
	Comparison	0.0 (175)	0.0 (172)	1.2 (174)	5.7 (175)
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	0.5 (401)	1.0 (386)	1.8 (381)	2.7 (401)
	Comparison	1.2 (484)	1.3 (472)	1.5 (471)	2.3 (484)

Occupational Category	Group	No History in 1982		Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[a]	p-Value[a]
		n in 1992	Percent Yes in 1992		
All	***Ranch Hand***	***884***	***4.1***	***1.24 (0.76,2.00)***	***0.389***
	Comparison	***1051***	***3.5***		
Officer	Ranch Hand	330	5.2	0.96 (0.49,1.88)	0.915
	Comparison	398	5.5		
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	155	6.5	1.17 (0.46,2.94)	0.741
	Comparison	175	5.7		
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	399	2.3	2.44 (0.79,7.51)	0.121
	Comparison	478	1.1		

[a] Relative risk, confidence interval, and p-values are in reference to a contrast of 1982 and 1992 results; results adjusted for age in 1992.

Note: Summary statistics for 1985 are provided for reference purposes for participants who attended the Baseline, 1985, and 1992 examinations. Summary statistics for 1987 are provided for reference purposes for participants who attended the Baseline, 1987, and 1992 examinations. Statistical analyses are based only on participants who had no history of malignant systemic neoplasms in 1982 (see Chapter 7, Statistical Methods).

Table 10-43. (Continued)
Longitudinal Analysis of Malignant Systemic Neoplasms

b) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN				
	Percent Yes/(n) Examination			
Initial Dioxin	1982	1985	1987	1992
Low	0.6 (163)	1.9 (160)	3.7 (162)	6.8 (163)
Medium	2.4 (168)	4.3 (162)	4.3 (164)	8.3 (168)
High	0.6 (167)	1.2 (165)	1.2 (161)	1.8 (167)

Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[a]	
	No History in 1982			
Initial Dioxin	n in 1992	Percent Yes in 1992	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
Low	162	6.2	0.62 (0.39,0.99)	0.028
Medium	164	6.1		
High	166	1.2		

[a] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of blood draw for dioxin, and age in 1992.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in initial dioxin.

Note: Low = 39-98 ppt; Medium = >98-232 ppt; High = >232 ppt.
Summary statistics for 1985 are provided for reference purposes for participants who attended the Baseline, 1985, and 1992 examinations. Summary statistics for 1987 are provided for reference purposes for participants who attended the Baseline, 1987, and 1992 examinations. Statistical analyses are based only on participants who had no history of malignant systemic neoplasms in 1982 (see Chapter 7, Statistical Methods).

Table 10-43. (Continued)
Longitudinal Analysis of Malignant Systemic Neoplasms

c) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY				
	Percent Yes/(n) Examination			
Dioxin Category	1982	1985	1987	1992
Comparison	1.1 (916)	1.3 (905)	1.8 (906)	4.6 (916)
Background RH	0.6 (340)	0.9 (337)	1.5 (334)	4.1 (340)
Low RH	1.2 (245)	2.9 (239)	4.1 (243)	8.2 (245)
High RH	1.2 (253)	2.0 (248)	2.1 (244)	3.2 (253)
Low plus High RH	1.2 (498)	2.5 (487)	3.1 (487)	5.6 (498)

	No History in 1982			
Dioxin Category	n in 1992	Percent Yes in 1992	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ab]	p-Value[b]
Comparison	906	3.5		
Background RH	338	3.6	1.01 (0.50,2.03)	0.986
Low RH	242	7.0	1.80 (0.95,3.42)	0.070
High RH	250	2.0	0.73 (0.27,1.96)	0.529
Low plus High RH	492	4.5	1.35 (0.75,2.43)	0.313

[a] Relative risk and confidence interval relative to Comparisons.

[b] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of blood draw for dioxin, and age in 1992.

Note: RH = Ranch Hand.
Comparison: Current Dioxin $\leq$10 ppt.
Background (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin $\leq$10 ppt.
Low (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin >10 ppt, 10 ppt < Initial Dioxin $\leq$143 ppt.
High (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin >10 ppt, Initial Dioxin >143 ppt.
Summary statistics for 1985 are provided for reference purposes for participants who attended the Baseline, 1985, and 1992 examinations. Summary statistics for 1987 are provided for reference purposes for participants who attended the Baseline, 1987, and 1992 examinations. Statistical analyses are based only on participants who had no history of malignant systemic neoplasms in 1982 (see Chapter 7, Statistical Methods).

Table 10-44.
Longitudinal Analysis of Benign Systemic Neoplasms

a) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS

Occupational Category	Group	Percent Yes/(n) Examination 1982	1985	1987	1992
All	***Ranch Hand***	***4.3 (892)***	***7.1 (870)***	***12.4 (861)***	***16.4 (892)***
	Comparison	***5.9 (1,062)***	***8.6 (1,039)***	***12.3 (1,037)***	***15.8 (1,062)***
Officer	Ranch Hand	4.8 (334)	7.0 (329)	12.5 (328)	14.7 (334)
	Comparison	7.7 (403)	10.1 (395)	13.0 (391)	16.4 (403)
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	5.1 (157)	7.7 (155)	13.8 (152)	19.8 (157)
	Comparison	5.1 (175)	7.6 (172)	14.4 (174)	17.7 (175)
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	3.5 (401)	7.0 (386)	11.8 (381)	16.5 (401)
	Comparison	4.8 (484)	7.6 (472)	10.8 (472)	14.7 (484)

Occupational Category	Group	No History in 1982 n in 1992	Percent Yes in 1992	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[a]	p-Value[a]
All	***Ranch Hand***	***854***	***12.7***	***1.24 (0.93,1.65)***	***0.142***
	Comparison	***999***	***10.5***		
Officer	Ranch Hand	318	10.4	1.12 (0.68,1.84)	0.670
	Comparison	372	9.4		
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	149	15.4	1.21 (0.64,2.27)	0.556
	Comparison	166	13.3		
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	387	13.4	1.36 (0.89,2.07)	0.152
	Comparison	461	10.4		

[a] Relative risk, confidence interval, and p-values are in reference to a contrast of 1982 and 1992 results; results adjusted for age in 1992.

Note: Summary statistics for 1985 are provided for reference purposes for participants who attended the Baseline, 1985, and 1992 examinations. Summary statistics for 1987 are provided for reference purposes for participants who attended the Baseline, 1987, and 1992 examinations. Statistical analyses are based only on participants who had no history of benign systemic neoplasms in 1982 (see Chapter 7, Statistical Methods).

Table 10-44. (Continued)
Longitudinal Analysis of Benign Systemic Neoplasms

b) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN				
	Percent Yes/(n) Examination			
Initial Dioxin	1982	1985	1987	1992
Low	4.9 (163)	8.1 (160)	14.8 (162)	16.0 (163)
Medium	4.8 (168)	7.4 (162)	9.2 (164)	16.1 (168)
High	4.2 (167)	9.7 (165)	12.4 (161)	16.2 (167)

Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[a]	
	No History in 1982			
Initial Dioxin	n in 1992	Percent Yes in 1992	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
Low	155	11.6	1.09 (0.88,1.35)	0.446
Medium	160	11.9		
High	160	12.5		

[a] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of blood draw for dioxin, and age in 1992.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in initial dioxin.

Note: Low = 39-98 ppt; Medium = >98-232 ppt; High = >232 ppt.
Summary statistics for 1985 are provided for reference purposes for participants who attended the Baseline, 1985, and 1992 examinations. Summary statistics for 1987 are provided for reference purposes for participants who attended the Baseline, 1987, and 1992 examinations. Statistical analyses are based only on participants who had no history of benign systemic neoplasms in 1982 (see Chapter 7, Statistical Methods).

Table 10-44. (Continued)
Longitudinal Analysis of Benign Systemic Neoplasms

c) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY				
	Percent Yes/(n) Examination			
Dioxin Category	1982	1985	1987	1992
Comparison	6.1 (916)	9.0 (905)	12.5 (907)	15.7 (916)
Background RH	4.1 (340)	5.6 (337)	12.9 (334)	16.8 (340)
Low RH	5.7 (245)	9.2 (239)	14.0 (243)	16.3 (245)
High RH	3.6 (253)	7.7 (248)	10.3 (244)	15.8 (253)
Low plus High RH	4.6 (498)	8.4 (487)	12.1 (487)	16.1 (498)

	No History in 1982			
Dioxin Category	n in 1992	Percent Yes in 1992	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ab]	p-Value[b]
Comparison	860	10.2		
Background RH	326	13.2	1.29 (0.87,1.92)	0.199
Low RH	231	11.3	1.09 (0.68,1.73)	0.729
High RH	244	12.7	1.39 (0.89,2.17)	0.148
Low plus High RH	475	12.0	1.23 (0.86,1.76)	0.254

[a] Relative risk and confidence interval relative to Comparisons.

[b] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of blood draw for dioxin, and age in 1992.

Note: RH = Ranch Hand.
Comparison: Current Dioxin $\leq$10 ppt.
Background (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin $\leq$10 ppt.
Low (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin $>$10 ppt, 10 ppt $<$ Initial Dioxin $\leq$143 ppt.
High (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin $>$10 ppt, Initial Dioxin $>$143 ppt.
Summary statistics for 1985 are provided for reference purposes for participants who attended the Baseline, 1985, and 1992 examinations. Summary statistics for 1987 are provided for reference purposes for participants who attended the Baseline, 1987, and 1992 examinations. Statistical analyses are based only on participants who had no history of benign systemic neoplasms in 1982 (see Chapter 7, Statistical Methods).

examinations are subject to debate, there is no doubt that early detection affords the best and, in most forms of cancer, the only chance for cure. While no one screening test is absolutely reliable, the scope and depth of the protocol employed in this longitudinal study far exceed that considered routine in clinical practice.

As the anatomic point of contact with industrial toxins and as the only organ system with a clearly defined clinical endpoint (i.e., chloracne) for TCDD exposure, the skin deserves the special emphasis it has received in this study. Although there is no evidence that TCDD exposure causes—or that chloracne is associated with—basal cell carcinomas, the Ranch Hand cohort was found to be at increased risk for the occurrence of these skin cancers in each of the three prior examination cycles. As in previous examination cycles, skin lesions considered to be suggestive of skin cancer were biopsied. Though blind to the participants' exposure status, examiners performed a similar number of biopsies in the Ranch Hand (20 out of 952) and Comparison (34 out of 1,281) cohorts.

In the current analyses, Ranch Hands continue to have a slightly higher prevalence of benign and malignant skin neoplasms than Comparisons, including that of basal cell skin cancers at all sites (11.3% of Ranch Hands vs. 10.2% of Comparisons). However, these group differences are no longer significant. Furthermore, consistent with results reported in the Serum Dioxin Analysis Report of the 1987 examinations, in many analyses employing current serum dioxin, a statistically significant inverse dose-response was documented with the prevalence of basal cell skin cancer decreasing as the level of serum dioxin increased. Similar associations were noted as well in the analyses of squamous cell carcinomas and melanoma, though the results were not statistically significant.

In the 1987 examinations, one of the few statistically significant findings was an increased history of a benign systemic neoplasm in the Ranch Hand cohort in a pattern consistent with a dose-response effect. At that time, Ranch Hands with the highest levels of current serum dioxin had a significantly higher incidence of benign systemic neoplasms (such as lipomas) than Comparisons (10.2% vs. 4.1%). In the current analyses, the prevalence was similar in Ranch Hands and Comparisons (16.4% vs. 15.6%) and there was no evidence suggesting a dose-response effect in any of the analyses.

Consistent with all previous examinations, none of the analyses revealed any significant group differences in the prevalence of systemic malignancies in the Ranch Hand and Comparison cohorts. Furthermore, in Ranch Hands, there was no evidence for an increased risk of any systemic malignancy in association with either the current or extrapolated initial levels of serum dioxin.

The mortality associated with certain neoplasms is of particular interest in this longitudinal study. Four Comparisons and no Ranch Hands with soft tissue sarcoma have died, and eight Comparisons and one Ranch Hand with non-Hodgkin's lymphoma are deceased. With the 19,111 Comparisons and 1,261 Ranch Hands under study for mortality, the history of the malignancies do indicate a detriment to Ranch Hands.

The 1992 examinations were the first to incorporate the PSA in the examination. This test has proven highly valuable in the early detection of silent prostate cancer. Though group

differences were not statistically significant, Comparisons had a slightly higher mean PSA than Ranch Hands (1.025 ng/ml vs. 1.013 ng/ml) and were more likely to have an abnormally elevated PSA by discrete analysis (4.9% vs. 3.6%).

The protocol of the current examinations included close surveillance of the 37 Ranch Hands and 70 Comparisons who had PSA levels equal to or greater than 4.0 ng/ml. With more than 90 percent followup to date, biopsy-proven cancer of the prostate has been diagnosed in 9 Ranch Hands and 8 Comparisons.

Dependent variable-covariate associations confirm an increased risk of various cancers in association with well-established risk factors including age, cigarette use, and alcohol consumption. The finding of a higher prevalence of elevated PSA levels in Black participants is of interest and may reflect a race-specific variation not yet recognized.

In summary, at the end of a decade of surveillance, Ranch Hands and Comparisons appear to be at equal risk for the development of all forms of neoplastic disease. Longitudinal analyses have found no significant group differences in the incidence of benign or malignant neoplasms including those that are thought by some to be related to herbicide exposure (i.e., Hodgkin's disease, non-Hodgkin's lymphoma, and STS).

SUMMARY

A number of verified neoplastic conditions, including specific skin and systemic neoplasia endpoints, were examined in the neoplasia assessment, as well as one laboratory test (prostate-specific antigen). Each health endpoint was tested for any statistically significant relationship with group (Model 1), initial dioxin (Model 2), categorized dioxin (Model 3), current lipid-adjusted dioxin (Model 4), current whole-weight dioxin (Model 5), and current whole-weight dioxin adjusted for total lipids (Model 6). Results are summarized and presented in Tables 10-45 through 10-48. A summary of group-by-covariate and dioxin-by-covariate interactions is found in Table 10-49.

Model 1: Group Analysis

The Model 1 analysis of all the neoplasia endpoints detected only a marginally significant difference between Ranch Hands and Comparisons for one endpoint (skin neoplasms). All other Model 1 analyses were nonsignificant or were not performed due to the sparse number of cases. The ability to detect significant differences for most of the site-specific systemic neoplasms was limited by the small number of participants with a history of a neoplasm at any given site. Prostate-specific antigen exhibited highly significant interactions with insecticide exposure and lifetime cigarette smoking history in the continuous and discrete forms respectively. Unadjusted results for both forms of prostate-specific antigen were nonsignificant.

Model 2: Initial Dioxin Analysis

In contrast to Model 1, several significant and marginally significant associations were found from the Model 2 analyses. Each significant association was from an inverse

Table 10-45.
Summary of Group Analyses (Model 1) for Neoplasia Variables
(Ranch Hands vs. Comparisons)

Variable	UNADJUSTED			
	All	Officer	Enlisted Flyer	Enlisted Groundcrew
Verified Medical Records				
Skin Neoplasms (D)	NS*	NS	NS	NS
Malignant Skin Neoplasms (D)	NS	NS	NS	ns
Benign Skin Neoplasms (D)	NS	NS	NS	NS
Skin Neoplasms of Uncertain Behavior or Unspecified Nature (D)	ns	ns	--	ns
Basal Cell Carcinomas (All Sites Combined) (D)	NS	NS	NS	ns
Basal Cell Carcinomas (Ear, Face, Head, and Neck) (D)	NS	NS	NS	NS
Basal Cell Carcinomas (Trunk) (D)	NS	NS	NS	ns
Basal Cell Carcinomas (Upper Extremities) (D)	NS	NS	NS	ns
Basal Cell Carcinomas (Lower Extremities) (D)	ns	NS	--	--
Squamous Cell Carcinomas (D)	NS	ns	NS	NS
Nonmelanomas (D)	NS	NS	NS	ns
Melanomas (D)	NS	NS	--	NS
Systemic Neoplasms (D)	NS	ns	NS	NS
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (D)	NS	ns	NS	NS
Benign Systemic Neoplasms (D)	NS	ns	NS	NS
Systemic Neoplasms of Uncertain Behavior or Unspecified Nature (D)	ns	NS	--	ns
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Eye, Ear, Face, Head, and Neck) (D)	NS	NS	ns	NS
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Oral Cavity, Pharynx, and Larynx) (D)	ns	ns	NS	ns
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Esophagus) (D)	--	--	--	--
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Brain) (D)	NS	--	--	--
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Thymus, Heart, and Mediastinum) (D)	--	--	--	--
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Thyroid Gland) (D)	NS	NS	--	--
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Bronchus and Lung) (D)	NS	NS	ns	NS

Table 10-45. (Continued)
Summary of Group Analyses (Model 1) for Neoplasia Variables
(Ranch Hands vs. Comparisons)

Variable	UNADJUSTED			
	All	Officer	Enlisted Flyer	Enlisted Groundcrew
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Colon and Rectum) (D)	NS	NS	--	--
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Kidney and Bladder) (D)	NS	ns	--	--
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Prostate) (D)	ns	ns	NS	NS
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Testicles) (D)	--	--	--	--
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Ill-Defined Sites) (D)	ns	--	--	--
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Connective and Other Soft Tissue) (D)	--	--	--	--
Carcinomas in Situ of the Penis, Other, and Unspecified Sites (D)	NS	--	--	--
Hodgkin's Disease (D)	NS	NS	--	--
Leukemia (D)	NS	--	--	--
Non-Hodgkin's Lymphoma (D)	ns	--	--	--
Other Malignant Systemic Neoplasms of Lymphoid and Histiocytic Tissue (D)	NS	--	--	--
Multiple Myeloma (D)	--	--	--	--
Skin or Systemic Neoplasms (D)	NS	NS	NS	NS
Laboratory				
Prostate-Specific Antigen (D: Below vs. At or Above Sensitivity Limit)	NS	NS	ns	NS
Prostate-Specific Antigen (C: Measurements At or Above Sensitivity Limit)	ns	NS	ns	ns
Prostate-Specific Antigen (D)	ns	ns	ns	ns

C: Continuous analysis.
D: Discrete analysis.
--: Analysis not performed due to sparse number of abnormalities.
NS or ns: Not significant ($p > 0.10$).
NS*: Marginally significant ($0.05 < p \leq 0.10$).
Note: A capital "NS" denotes a relative risk 1.00 or greater for discrete analysis or difference of means nonnegative for continuous analysis; a lower case "ns" denotes relative risk less than 1.00 for discrete analysis or difference of means negative for continuous analysis.

Table 10-45. (Continued)
Summary of Group Analyses (Model 1) for Neoplasia Variables
(Ranch Hands vs. Comparisons)

Variable	ADJUSTED			
	All	Officer	Enlisted Flyer	Enlisted Groundcrew
Verified Medical Records				
Skin Neoplasms (D)	NS*	NS	NS	NS
Malignant Skin Neoplasms (D)	NS	NS	NS	ns
Benign Skin Neoplasms (D)	NS	NS	NS	NS
Skin Neoplasms of Uncertain Behavior or Unspecified Nature (D)	ns	ns	--	ns
Basal Cell Carcinomas (All Sites Combined) (D)	NS	NS	NS	ns
Basal Cell Carcinomas (Ear, Face, Head, and Neck) (D)	NS	NS	NS	NS
Basal Cell Carcinomas (Trunk) (D)	ns	ns	NS	ns
Basal Cell Carcinomas (Upper Extremities) (D)	NS	NS	NS	ns
Basal Cell Carcinomas (Lower Extremities) (D)	--	--	--	--
Squamous Cell Carcinomas (D)	NS	NS	NS	NS
Nonmelanomas (D)	NS	NS	NS	NS
Melanomas (D)	NS	NS	--	NS
Systemic Neoplasms (D)	NS	ns	NS	NS
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (D)	NS	ns	NS	NS
Benign Systemic Neoplasms (D)	NS	ns	NS	NS
Systemic Neoplasms of Uncertain Behavior or Unspecified Nature (D)	ns	NS	--	ns
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Eye, Ear, Face, Head, and Neck) (D)	NS	NS	ns	NS
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Oral Cavity, Pharynx, and Larynx) (D)	NS	ns	NS	ns
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Esophagus) (D)	--	--	--	--
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Brain) (D)	--	--	--	--
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Thymus, Heart, and Mediastinum) (D)	--	--	--	--
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Thyroid Gland) (D)	NS	NS	--	--
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Bronchus and Lung) (D)	NS	NS	ns	NS

Table 10-45. (Continued)
Summary of Group Analyses (Model 1) for Neoplasia Variables
(Ranch Hands vs. Comparisons)

Variable	ADJUSTED			
	All	Officer	Enlisted Flyer	Enlisted Groundcrew
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Colon and Rectum) (D)	NS	NS	--	--
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Kidney and Bladder) (D)	NS	ns	--	--
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Prostate) (D)	ns	ns	NS	NS
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Testicles) (D)	--	--	--	--
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Ill-Defined Sites) (D)	ns	--	--	--
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Connective and Other Soft Tissue) (D)	--	--	--	--
Carcinomas of the Penis, Other, and Unspecified Sites (D)	--	--	--	--
Hodgkin's Disease (D)	--	--	--	--
Leukemia (D)	--	--	--	--
Non-Hodgkin's Lymphoma (D)	ns	--	--	--
Other Malignant Systemic Neoplasms of Lymphoid and Histiocytic Tissue (D)	--	--	--	--
Multiple Myeloma (D)	--	--	--	--
Skin or Systemic Neoplasms (D)	NS	NS	NS	NS
Laboratory				
Prostate-Specific Antigen (D: Below vs. At or Above Sensitivity Limit)	ns	ns	NS	ns
Prostate-Specific Antigen (C: Measurements At or Above Sensitivity Limit)	****	****	****	****
Prostate-Specific Antigen (D)	****	****	****	****

C: Continuous analysis.
D: Discrete analysis.
--: Analysis not performed due to sparse number of abnormalities.
NS or ns: Not significant ($p > 0.10$).
NS*: Marginally significant ($0.05 < p \leq 0.10$).
**** Group-by-covariate interaction ($p \leq 0.01$); refer to Appendix F-2 for further analysis of this interaction.
Note: A capital "NS" denotes a relative risk 1.00 or greater; a lower case "ns" denotes relative risk less than 1.00.

Table 10-46.
Summary of Initial Dioxin Analyses (Model 2) for Neoplasia Variables (Ranch Hands Only)

Variable	Unadjusted	Adjusted
Verified Medical Records		
Skin Neoplasms (D)	-<0.001	-<0.001
Malignant Skin Neoplasms (D)	-0.006	****
Benign Skin Neoplasms (D)	ns*	ns*
Skin Neoplasms of Uncertain Behavior or Unspecified Nature (D)	ns	--
Basal Cell Carcinomas (All Sites Combined) (D)	-0.013	-0.023
Basal Cell Carcinomas (Ear, Face, Head, and Neck) (D)	-0.017	-0.006
Basal Cell Carcinomas (Trunk) (D)	ns	ns
Basal Cell Carcinomas (Upper Extremities) (D)	ns*	ns*
Basal Cell Carcinomas (Lower Extremities) (D)	--	--
Squamous Cell Carcinomas (D)	ns	ns
Nonmelanomas (D)	-0.007	**(-0.032)
Melanomas (D)	ns	-0.021
Systemic Neoplasms (D)	ns	NS
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (D)	-0.004	****
Benign Systemic Neoplasms (D)	NS	NS
Systemic Neoplasms of Uncertain Behavior or Unspecified Nature (D)	ns	ns
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Eye, Ear, Face, Head, or Neck) (D)	ns	****
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Oral Cavity, Pharynx, and Larynx) (D)	NS	NS
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Esophagus) (D)	--	--
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Brain) (D)	--	--
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Thymus, Heart, and Mediastinum) (D)	--	--
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Thyroid Gland) (D)	-0.044	-0.044
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Bronchus and Lung) (D)	ns	ns
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Colon and Rectum) (D)	ns	ns

Table 10-46. (Continued)
Summary of Initial Dioxin Analyses (Model 2) for Neoplasia Variables (Ranch Hands Only)

Variable	Unadjusted	Adjusted
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Kidney and Bladder) (D)	ns	ns
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Prostate) (D)	ns	ns
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Testicles) (D)	ns	ns
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Ill-Defined Sites) (D)	--	--
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Connective and Other Soft Tissues) (D)	--	--
Carcinomas in Situ of the Penis, Other, and Unspecified Sites (D)	ns	--
Hodgkin's Disease (D)	--	--
Leukemia (D)	ns	--
Non-Hodgkin's Lymphoma (D)	--	--
Other Malignant Neoplasms of Lymphoid and Histiocytic Tissue (D)	--	--
Multiple Myeloma (D)	--	--
Skin or Systemic Neoplasms (D)	-0.012	-0.012
Laboratory		
Prostate-Specific Antigen (D: Below vs. At or Above Sensitivity Limit)	ns	ns
Prostate-Specific Antigen (C: Measurements At or Above Sensitivity Limit)	-0.001	**(ns)
Prostate-Specific Antigen (D)	-0.006	ns*

C: Continuous analysis.
D: Discrete analysis.
-: Relative risk <1.00 for discrete analysis or slope negative for continuous analysis.
--: Analysis not performed due to sparse number of abnormalities.
NS or ns: Not significant ($p>0.10$).
ns*: Marginally significant ($0.05<p\leq0.10$).
**(ns): Log_2 (initial dioxin)-by-covariate interaction ($0.01<p\leq0.05$); not significant when interaction is deleted; refer to Appendix F-2 for further analysis of this interaction.
**(0.032): Log_2 (initial dioxin)-by-covariate interaction ($0.01<p\leq0.05$); significant ($p=0.032$) when interaction is deleted; refer to Appendix F-2 for further analysis of this interaction.
**** Log_2 (initial dioxin)-by-covariate interaction ($p\leq0.01$); refer to Appendix F-2 for further analysis of this interaction.
Note: P-value given if $p\leq0.05$.
A capital "NS" denotes a relative risk 1.00 or greater for discrete analysis; a lower case "ns" denotes relative risk less than 1.00 for discrete analysis or slope negative for continuous analysis.

Table 10-47.
Summary of Categorized Dioxin Analyses (Model 3) for Neoplasia Variables (Ranch Hands vs. Comparisons)

Variable	UNADJUSTED			
	Background Ranch Hands vs. Comparisons	Low Ranch Hands vs. Comparisons	High Ranch Hands vs. Comparisons	Low plus High Ranch Hands vs. Comparisons
Verified Medical Records				
Skin Neoplasms (D)	+0.043	+0.019	ns*	NS
Malignant Skin Neoplasms (D)	NS	+0.036	ns*	NS
Benign Skin Neoplasms (D)	NS*	NS	ns	NS
Skin Neoplasms of Uncertain Behavior or Unspecified Nature (D)	NS	ns	ns	ns
Basal Cell Carcinomas (All Sites Combined) (D)	NS	NS*	ns*	NS
Basal Cell Carcinomas (Ear, Face, Head, and Neck) (D)	NS*	+0.042	ns*	NS
Basal Cell Carcinomas (Trunk) (D)	NS	NS	ns	NS
Basal Cell Carcinomas (Upper Extremities) (D)	NS	ns	ns	ns
Basal Cell Carcinomas (Lower Extremities) (D)	NS	--	--	--
Squamous Cell Carcinomas (D)	NS	NS	ns	NS
Nonmelanomas (D)	NS	+0.042	ns*	NS
Melanomas (D)	NS	NS*	NS	NS
Systemic Neoplasms (D)	ns	NS	ns	NS
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (D)	NS	+0.024	ns	NS
Benign Systemic Neoplasms (D)	NS	NS	NS	NS
Systemic Neoplasms of Uncertain Behavior or Unspecified Nature (D)	ns	NS	ns	ns
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Eye, Ear, Face, Head, and Neck) (D)	NS	NS	NS	NS
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Oral Cavity, Pharynx, and Larynx) (D)	ns	ns	NS	NS
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Esophagus) (D)	--	--	--	--
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Brain) (D)	--	--	--	--

Table 10-47. (Continued)
Summary of Categorized Dioxin Analyses (Model 3) for Neoplasia Variables (Ranch Hands vs. Comparisons)

Variable	UNADJUSTED			
	Background Ranch Hands vs. Comparisons	Low Ranch Hands vs. Comparisons	High Ranch Hands vs. Comparisons	Low plus High Ranch Hands vs. Comparisons
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Thymus, Heart, and Mediastinum) (D)	--	--	--	--
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Thyroid Gland) (D)	--	--	--	--
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Bronchus and Lung) (D)	NS	NS	--	NS
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Colon and Rectum) (D)	NS	+0.034	--	NS
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Kidney and Bladder) (D)	NS	NS	NS	NS
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Prostate) (D)	ns	NS	ns	ns
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Testicles) (D)	--	--	--	--
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Ill-Defined Sites) (D)	--	--	--	--
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Connective and Other Soft Tissues) (D)	--	--	--	--
Carcinomas in Situ of the Penis, Other, and Unspecified Sites (D)	--	NS	--	NS
Hodgkin's Disease (D)	NS	--	--	--
Leukemia (D)	--	NS	--	NS
Non-Hodgkin's Lymphoma (D)	NS	--	--	--
Other Malignant Neoplasms of Lymphoid and Histiocytic Tissue (D)	NS	--	--	--
Multiple Myeloma (D)	--	--	--	--
Skin or Systemic Neoplasms (D)	NS	NS*	ns	NS

Table 10-47. (Continued)
Summary of Categorized Dioxin Analyses (Model 3) for Neoplasia Variables (Ranch Hands vs. Comparisons)

Variable	UNADJUSTED			
	Background Ranch Hands vs. Comparisons	Low Ranch Hands vs. Comparisons	High Ranch Hands vs. Comparisons	Low plus High Ranch Hands vs. Comparisons
Laboratory				
Prostate-Specific Antigen (D: Below vs. At or Above Sensitivity Limit)	ns	ns	ns	ns
Prostate-Specific Antigen (C: Measurements At or Above Sensitivity Limit)	ns	NS	-0.010	ns
Prostate-Specific Antigen (D)	-0.050	NS	ns	ns

C: Continuous analysis.
D: Discrete analysis.
+: Relative risk $\geq$ 1.00.
-: Relative risk $<$ 1.00 for discrete analysis or difference of means negative for continuous analysis.
--: Analysis not performed due to sparse number of abnormalities.
NS or ns: Not significant ($p > 0.10$).
NS* or ns*: Marginally significant ($0.05 < p \leq 0.10$).
Note: P-value given if $p \leq 0.05$.
A capital "NS" denotes a relative risk 1.00 or greater for discrete analysis or difference of means nonnegative for continuous analysis; a lower case "ns" denotes relative risk less than 1.00 for discrete analysis or difference of means negative for continuous analysis.

Table 10-47. (Continued)
Summary of Categorized Dioxin Analyses (Model 3) for Neoplasia Variables (Ranch Hands vs. Comparisons)

Variable	ADJUSTED			
	Background Ranch Hands vs. Comparisons	Low Ranch Hands vs. Comparisons	High Ranch Hands vs. Comparisons	Low plus High Ranch Hands vs. Comparisons
Verified Medical Records				
Skin Neoplasms (D)	NS*	+0.021	ns	NS
Malignant Skin Neoplasms (D)	**(NS)	**(NS*)	**(ns)	**(NS)
Benign Skin Neoplasms (D)	NS*	NS	ns	NS
Skin Neoplasms of Uncertain Behavior or Unspecified Nature (D)	NS	ns	ns	ns
Basal Cell Carcinomas (All Sites Combined) (D)	NS	NS	ns	NS
Basal Cell Carcinomas (Ear, Face, Head, and Neck) (D)	NS	NS*	ns	NS
Basal Cell Carcinomas (Trunk) (D)	**(ns)	**(NS)	**(ns)	**(ns)
Basal Cell Carcinomas (Upper Extremities) (D)	NS	ns	ns	ns
Basal Cell Carcinomas (Lower Extremities) (D)	--	--	--	--
Squamous Cell Carcinomas (D)	NS	NS	NS	NS
Nonmelanomas (D)	NS	NS*	ns	NS
Melanomas (D)	ns	NS	ns	NS
Systemic Neoplasms (D)	ns	NS	NS	NS
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (D)	ns	NS*	ns	NS
Benign Systemic Neoplasms (D)	ns	NS	NS	NS
Systemic Neoplasms of Uncertain Behavior or Unspecified Nature (D)	ns	NS	ns	ns
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Eye, Ear, Face, Head, and Neck) (D)	**(NS)	**(NS)	**(NS)	**(NS)
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Oral Cavity, Pharynx, and Larynx) (D)	ns	ns	NS	NS
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Esophagus) (D)	--	--	--	--

Table 10-47. (Continued)
Summary of Categorized Dioxin Analyses (Model 3) for Neoplasia Variables (Ranch Hands vs. Comparisons)

Variable	ADJUSTED			
	Background Ranch Hands vs. Comparisons	Low Ranch Hands vs. Comparisons	High Ranch Hands vs. Comparisons	Low plus High Ranch Hands vs. Comparisons
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Brain) (D)	--	--	--	--
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Thymus, Heart, and Mediastinum) (D)	--	--	--	--
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Thyroid Gland) (D)	--	--	--	--
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Bronchus and Lung) (D)	NS	NS	--	NS
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Colon and Rectum) (D)	NS	+0.034	--	NS
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Kidney and Bladder)	NS	NS	NS	NS
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Prostate)	****	****	****	****
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Testicles)	--	--	--	--
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Ill-Defined Sites)	--	--	--	--
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Connective and Other Soft Tissues)	--	--	--	--
Carcinomas in Situ of the Penis, Other, and Unspecified Sites	--	--	--	--
Hodgkin's Disease	--	--	--	--
Leukemia	--	--	--	--
Non-Hodgkin's Lymphoma	ns	--	--	--
Other Malignant Neoplasms of Lymphoid and Histiocytic Tissue	--	--	--	--
Multiple Myeloma	--	--	--	--
Skin or Systemic Neoplasms	NS	NS	ns	NS

Table 10-47. (Continued)
Summary of Categorized Dioxin Analyses (Model 3) for Neoplasia Variables (Ranch Hands vs. Comparisons)

Variable	ADJUSTED			
	Background Ranch Hands vs. Comparisons	Low Ranch Hands vs. Comparisons	High Ranch Hands vs. Comparisons	Low plus High Ranch Hands vs. Comparisons
Laboratory				
Prostate-Specific Antigen (D: Below vs. At or Above Sensitivity Limit)	ns	ns	ns	ns
Prostate-Specific Antigen (C: Measurements At or Above Sensitivity Limit)	****	****	****	****
Prostate-Specific Antigen (D)	**(-0.005)	**(ns)	**(ns)	**(ns)

C: Continuous analysis.
D: Discrete analysis.
+: Relative risk $\geq$ 1.00.
-: Relative risk $<$ 1.00.
--: Analysis not performed due to sparse number of abnormalities.
NS or ns: Not significant ($p > 0.10$).
NS*: Marginally significant ($0.05 < p \leq 0.10$).
**(NS) or **(ns): Categorized dioxin-by-covariate interaction ($0.01 < p \leq 0.05$); not significant when interaction is deleted; refer to Appendix F-2 for further analysis of this interaction.
**(-0.005): Categorized dioxin-by-covariate interaction ($0.01 < p \leq 0.05$); significant ($p = 0.005$) when interaction is deleted; refer to Appendix F-2 for further analysis of this interaction.
**** Categorized dioxin-by-covariate interaction ($p \leq 0.01$); refer to Appendix F-2 for further analysis of this interaction.
Note: P-value given if $p \leq 0.05$.
A capital "NS" denotes a relative risk 1.00 or greater; a lower case "ns" denotes relative risk less than 1.00.

Table 10-48.
Summary of Current Dioxin Analyses (Models 4, 5, and 6) for Neoplasia Variables (Ranch Hands Only)

Variable	UNADJUSTED		
	Model 4: Lipid-Adjusted Current Dioxin	Model 5: Whole-Weight Current Dioxin	Model 6: Whole-Weight Current Dioxin Adjusted for Total Lipids
Verified Medical Records			
Skin Neoplasms (D)	-0.011	ns*	-0.002
Malignant Skin Neoplasms (D)	-0.038	ns	-0.021
Benign Skin Neoplasms (D)	ns*	ns	-0.029
Skin Neoplasms of Uncertain Behavior or Unspecified Nature (D)	ns	ns	ns
Basal Cell Carcinomas (All Sites Combined) (D)	ns*	ns	-0.032
Basal Cell Carcinomas (Ear, Face, Head, and Neck) (D)	-0.016	ns*	-0.009
Basal Cell Carcinomas (Trunk) (D)	ns	ns	ns
Basal Cell Carcinomas (Upper Extremities) (D)	ns	ns	ns
Basal Cell Carcinomas (Lower Extremities) (D)	ns	NS	ns
Squamous Cell Carcinomas (D)	ns	ns	ns
Nonmelanomas (D)	-0.034	ns	-0.016
Melanomas (D)	ns	ns	NS
Systemic Neoplasms (D)	NS	NS	NS
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (D)	ns	ns	ns
Benign Systemic Neoplasms (D)	NS	NS	NS
Systemic Neoplasms of Uncertain Behavior or Unspecified Nature (D)	ns	ns	ns
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Eye, Ear, Face, Head, and Neck) (D)	ns	ns	NS
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Oral Cavity, Pharynx, and Larynx) (D)	NS	NS	NS
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Esophagus) (D)	--	--	--
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Brain) (D)	ns	ns	--
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Thymus, Heart, and Mediastinum) (D)	ns	ns	ns
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Thyroid Gland) (D)	ns	ns	ns

Table 10-48. (Continued)
Summary of Current Dioxin Analyses (Models 4, 5, and 6) for Neoplasia Variables (Ranch Hands Only)

Variable	UNADJUSTED		
	Model 4: Lipid-Adjusted Current Dioxin	Model 5: Whole-Weight Current Dioxin	Model 6: Whole-Weight Current Dioxin Adjusted for Total Lipids
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Bronchus and Lung) (D)	ns	ns	ns
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Colon and Rectum) (D)	NS	NS	ns
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Kidney and Bladder) (D)	ns	NS	ns
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Prostate) (D)	ns	ns	ns
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Testicles) (D)	NS	NS	NS
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Ill-Defined Sites) (D)	--	--	--
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Connective and Other Soft Tissue) (D)	--	--	--
Carcinomas in Situ (Penis, Other, and Unspecified Sites) (D)	ns	ns	ns
Hodgkin's Disease (D)	ns	ns	ns
Leukemia (D)	NS	NS	NS
Non-Hodgkin's Lymphoma (D)	ns	ns	ns
Other Malignant Neoplasms of Lymphoid and Histiocytic Tissue (D)	ns	ns	ns
Multiple Myeloma (D)	ns	ns	ns
Skin or Systemic Neoplasms (D)	ns	ns	-0.049
Laboratory			
Prostate-Specific Antigen (D: Below vs. At or Above Sensitivity Limit)	ns	NS	ns
Prostate-Specific Antigen (C: Measurements At or Above Sensitivity Limit)	-0.005	-0.005	-0.010
Prostate-Specific Antigen (D)	ns	NS	ns

C: Continuous analysis.
D: Discrete analysis.
-: Relative risk < 1.00 for discrete analysis or slope negative for continuous analysis.
--: Analysis not performed due to sparse number of abnormalities.
NS or ns: Not significant ($p > 0.10$).
ns*: Marginally significant ($0.05 < p \leq 0.10$).
Note: P-value given if $p \leq 0.05$.
A capital "NS" denotes a relative risk 1.00 or greater; a lower case "ns" denotes relative risk less than 1.00.

Table 10-48. (Continued)
Summary of Current Dioxin Analyses (Models 4, 5, and 6) for Neoplasia Variables (Ranch Hands Only)

Variable	ADJUSTED		
	Model 4: Lipid-Adjusted Current Dioxin	Model 5: Whole-Weight Current Dioxin	Model 6: Whole-Weight Current Dioxin Adjusted for Total Lipids
Verified Medical Records			
Skin Neoplasms (D)	ns*	**(ns)	**(-0.008)
Malignant Skin Neoplasms (D)	ns	ns	ns
Benign Skin Neoplasms (D)	-0.034	**(ns*)	**(-0.012)
Skin Neoplasms of Uncertain Behavior or Unspecified Nature (D)	--	--	--
Basal Cell Carcinomas (All Sites Combined) (D)	ns	ns	**(ns)
Basal Cell Carcinomas (Ear, Face, Head, and Neck) (D)	ns	ns	ns*
Basal Cell Carcinomas (Trunk) (D)	**(NS)	**(NS)	**(NS)
Basal Cell Carcinomas (Upper Extremities) (D)	ns	ns	ns
Basal Cell Carcinomas (Lower Extremities) (D)	--	--	--
Squamous Cell Carcinomas (D)	ns	NS	NS
Nonmelanomas (D)	ns	ns	ns
Melanomas (D)	NS	NS	NS
Systemic Neoplasms (D)	NS	NS	NS
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (D)	**(NS)	**(NS)	**(NS)
Benign Systemic Neoplasms (D)	NS	NS	NS
Systemic Neoplasms of Uncertain Behavior or Unspecified Nature (D)	**(ns)	**(ns)	**(ns)
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Eye, Ear, Face, Head, and Neck) (D)	NS	NS	NS
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Oral Cavity, Pharynx, and Larynx) (D)	NS*	NS*	NS*
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Esophagus) (D)	--	--	--
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Brain) (D)	--	--	--
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Thymus, Heart, and Mediastinum) (D)	ns	ns	ns
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Thyroid Gland) (D)	ns	ns	ns
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Bronchus and Lung) (D)	ns	NS	ns
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Colon and Rectum) (D)	NS	NS	NS
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Kidney and Bladder) (D)	NS	NS	ns
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Prostate) (D)	**(NS)	**(NS)	**(NS)

Table 10-48. (Continued)
Summary of Current Dioxin Analyses (Models 4, 5, and 6) for Neoplasia Variables (Ranch Hands Only)

Variable	ADJUSTED		
	Model 4: Lipid-Adjusted Current Dioxin	Model 5: Whole-Weight Current Dioxin	Model 6: Whole-Weight Current Dioxin Adjusted for Total Lipids
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Testicles) (D)	NS	NS	NS
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Ill-Defined Sites) (D)	--	--	--
Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Connective and Other Soft Tissues) (D)	--	--	--
Carcinomas in Situ of the Penis, Other, and Unspecified Sites (D)	--	--	--
Hodgkin's Disease (D)	ns	ns	ns
Leukemia (D)	--	--	--
Non-Hodgkin's Lymphoma (D)	ns	ns	ns
Other Malignant Neoplasms of Lymphoid and Histiocytic Tissue (D)	ns	ns	ns
Multiple Myeloma (D)	--	--	--
Skin or Systemic Neoplasms (D)	**(ns)	**(NS)	**(ns)
Laboratory			
Prostate-Specific Antigen (D: Below vs. At or Above Sensitivity Limit)	ns	NS	ns
Prostate-Specific Antigen (C: Measurements At or Above Sensitivity Limit)	ns	ns	ns
Prostate-Specific Antigen (D)	**(NS)	**(NS)	**(NS)

C: Continuous analysis.
D: Discrete analysis.
-: Relative risk < 1.00.
--: Analysis not performed due to sparse number of abnormalities.
NS or ns: Not significant ($p > 0.10$).
NS* or ns*: Marginally significant ($0.05 < p \leq 0.10$).
**(NS) or **(ns): Log_2 (current dioxin + 1)-by-covariate interaction ($p \leq 0.05$); not significant when interaction is deleted; refer to Appendix F-2 for further analysis of this interaction.
**(ns*): Log_2 (current dioxin + 1)-by-covariate interaction ($0.01 < p \leq 0.05$); marginally significant when interaction is deleted; refer to Appendix F-2 for further analysis of this interaction.
**(...): Log_2 (current dioxin + 1)-by-covariate interaction ($0.01 < p \leq 0.05$); significant when interaction is deleted and p-value given in parentheses; refer to Appendix F-2 for further analysis of this interaction.
Note: P-value given if $p \leq 0.05$.
A capital "NS" denotes a relative risk of 1.00 or greater; a lower case "ns" denotes relative risk less than 1.00 for discrete analysis or slope negative for continuous analysis.

Table 10-49.
Summary of Group-by-Covariate and Dioxin-by-Covariate Interactions from Adjusted Analyses of Neoplasia Variables

Model	Variable	Covariate
1[a]	Prostate-Specific Antigen (C: Measurements at or Above Sensitivity Limit)	Insecticide Exposure
	Prostate-Specific Antigen (D)	Lifetime Cigarette Smoking History
2[b]	Malignant Skin Neoplasms	Insecticide Exposure
	Nonmelanoma	Insecticide Exposure
	Malignant Systemic Neoplasms	Lifetime Cigarette Smoking History
	Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Eye, Ear, Face, Head, and Neck)	Lifetime Cigarette Smoking History
	Prostate-Specific Antigen (C: Measurements at or Above Sensitivity Limit)	Age
3[c]	Malignant Skin Neoplasms	Industrial Chemical Exposure, Insecticide Exposure
	Basal Cell Carcinomas (Trunk)	Insecticide Exposure
	Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Eye, Ear, Face, Head, and Neck)	Lifetime Cigarette Smoking History, Degreasing Chemical Exposure
	Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Prostate)	Degreasing Chemical Exposure
	Prostate-Specific Antigen (C: Measurements At or Above Sensitivity Limit)	Insecticide Exposure
	Prostate-Specific Antigen (D)	Insecticide Exposure
4[d]	Basal Cell Carcinomas (Trunk)	Insecticide Exposure
	Malignant Systemic Neoplasms	Degreasing Chemical Exposure
	Systemic Neoplasms of Uncertain Behavior or Unspecified Nature	Asbestos Exposure
	Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Prostate)	Degreasing Chemical Exposure
	Skin or Systemic Neoplasms	Eye Color
	Prostate-Specific Antigen (D)	Degreasing Chemical Exposure
5[e]	Skin Neoplasms	Skin Color, Industrial Chemical Exposure
	Benign Skin Neoplasms	Skin Color
	Basal Cell Carcinomas (Trunk)	Insecticide Exposure
	Malignant Systemic Neoplasms	Lifetime Cigarette Smoking History, Degreasing Chemical Exposure
	Systemic Neoplasms of Uncertain Behavior or Unspecified Nature	Asbestos Exposure
	Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Prostate)	Degreasing Chemical Exposure
	Skin or Systemic Neoplasms	Eye Color
	Prostate-Specific Antigen (D)	Degreasing Chemical Exposure

Table 10-49. (Continued)
Summary of Group-by-Covariate and Dioxin-by-Covariate Interactions from Adjusted Analyses of Neoplasia Variables

Model	Variable	Covariate
6[f]	Skin Neoplasms	Skin Color, Industrial Chemical Exposure
	Benign Skin Neoplasms	Skin Color
	Basal Cell Carcinomas (All Sites Combined)	Asbestos Exposure
	Basal Cell Carcinomas (Trunk)	Insecticide Exposure
	Malignant Systemic Neoplasms	Lifetime Cigarette Smoking History, Degreasing Chemical Exposure
	Systemic Neoplasms of Uncertain Behavior or Unspecified Nature	Asbestos Exposure
	Malignant Systemic Neoplasms (Prostate)	Degreasing Chemical Exposure
	Skin or Systemic Neoplasms	Eye Color
	Prostate-Specific Antigen (D)	Degreasing Chemical Exposure

C: Continuous analysis for measurements at or above the prostate specific antigen sensitivity limit.
D: Discrete analysis.
[a] Group Analysis (Ranch Hands vs. Comparison).
[b] Ranch Hands—Log_2 (Initial Dioxin).
[c] Categorized Dioxin.
[d] Ranch Hands—Log_2 (Current Lipid-Adjusted Dioxin + 1).
[e] Ranch Hands—Log_2 (Current Whole-Weight Dioxin + 1).
[f] Ranch Hands—Log_2 (Current Whole-Weight Dioxin + 1), Adjusted for Total Lipids.

relationship between initial dioxin and the neoplasia endpoint. Histories of neoplasia among Ranch Hands decreased as initial dioxin levels increased. Most of the significant resulting analyses, both unadjusted and adjusted, were among the skin neoplasia endpoints: skin neoplasms, malignant skin neoplasms, basal cell carcinomas (all sites combined), basal cell carcinomas (ear, face, head, and neck), nonmelanoma, and melanoma. Analysis of benign skin neoplasms and basal cell carcinomas of the upper extremities showed marginally negative significant results for both unadjusted and adjusted analyses.

Of the history of systemic neoplasia endpoints, malignant systemic neoplasms and malignant systemic neoplasms of the thyroid gland displayed significant negative unadjusted associations with initial dioxin. Adjusted malignant systemic neoplasms of the thyroid gland results were also significant. For all of these endpoints, the history of a neoplasm decreased as initial dioxin increased. The ability to detect significant differences for most of the site-specific systemic neoplasms was limited by the small number of participants with a history of a neoplasm at any given site.

The analyses of skin and systemic neoplasms revealed significant results for both the unadjusted and adjusted analyses. Prostate-specific antigen was significant in the unadjusted analysis for both the continuous and discrete versions. The discrete association was marginally significant in the adjusted analysis. As for the other endpoints, prostate-specific antigen decreased as initial dioxin increased.

Model 3: Categorized Dioxin Analysis

Similar to the Model 2 analyses, most significant results from Model 3 were among the skin neoplasia endpoints. Of all the significant skin neoplasia contrasts, most were the result of the low Ranch Hands versus Comparisons unadjusted contrasts from the analyses of skin neoplasms, malignant skin neoplasms, basal cell carcinoma (ear, face, head, and neck), and nonmelanoma. The unadjusted background Ranch Hands versus Comparisons contrast and the adjusted low Ranch Hands versus Comparisons contrast from the skin neoplasms analysis also were significant. The estimated relative risks were each greater than one, indicating a higher history of a skin neoplasm in Ranch Hands with background or low dioxin levels than in Comparisons; however, the estimated relative risks were marginally significantly less than one for Ranch Hands in the high category, indicating an inverse dose-response relationship. Contrasts of Ranch Hands versus Comparisons for benign skin neoplasms, basal cell carcinomas (all sites combined), and melanoma also displayed marginally significant estimated relative risks greater than one in either the background Ranch Hand category or the low Ranch Hand category versus Comparisons contrast. Again, the results were nonsignificant for the Ranch Hands in the high dioxin category.

Of the history of systemic neoplasia endpoints analyzed, any significant or marginally significant result again was from the low Ranch Hands versus Comparisons contrasts, and relative risks were greater than one. The results of the contrast of high Ranch Hands with Comparisons were not significant. The history of a malignant systemic neoplasm of the colon and rectum endpoint displayed significant differences for both the unadjusted and adjusted low Ranch Hands contrasts. Differences from the unadjusted analysis of any malignant systemic neoplasms also were significant and the adjusted results were marginally

significant. No significant results were seen in the high Ranch Hand category versus Comparisons contrast.

Other Model 3 results include another marginally significant low Ranch Hands versus Comparisons contrast as a result of the unadjusted analysis of a skin or systemic neoplasm. Also, the discrete prostate-specific antigen analysis revealed significant unadjusted and adjusted differences between background Ranch Hands and Comparisons, although more Comparisons than background Ranch Hands had abnormal prostate-specific antigen levels. The high Ranch Hands versus Comparisons contrast from the continuous prostate-specific antigen unadjusted analysis also was significant with higher prostate-specific antigen measurements in the Comparison group. The ability to detect significant differences for most of the site-specific systemic neoplasms was limited by the small number of participants with a history of a neoplasm at any given site.

Models 4, 5, and 6: Current Dioxin Analyses

Analyses of Models 4, 5, and 6 allowed examination of the relationships between neoplasia endpoints and different forms of current dioxin. Patterns found in Models 2 and 3 also were present in Models 4 through 6. Most significant and marginally significant results were found in the skin neoplasia endpoints, specifically: skin neoplasms, malignant skin neoplasms, benign skin neoplasms, basal cell carcinomas (all sites combined), basal cell carcinomas (ear, face, head, and neck), and nonmelanoma. All significant or marginally significant associations from analyses of Models 4 and 5 also were significant in Model 6. The Model 5 analyses revealed only marginally significant results for all the skin neoplasia endpoints listed above. The basal cell carcinomas of the ear, face, head, and neck adjusted analyses revealed marginally significant results in the Model 6 analysis, but nonsignificant in all other adjusted analyses. Each significant association was of an inverse nature, where disease among Ranch Hands decreased as current dioxin levels increased.

A history of malignant systemic neoplasms of the oral cavity, pharynx, and larynx was the only systemic neoplasia endpoint that displayed any statistical association with current dioxin, and the relationship was only marginally significant for Models 4, 5, and 6.

Unadjusted analysis of a history of a skin or systemic neoplasm revealed significant results for Model 6, and each continuous prostate-specific antigen unadjusted analysis was significant for Models 4, 5, and 6. The estimated relative risk for both variables was less than one, indicating a decrease in disease as dioxin levels increase. After covariate adjustment, however, each of the aforementioned analyses were nonsignificant. The ability to detect significant differences for most of the site-specific systemic neoplasms was limited by the small number of participants with a history of a neoplasm at any given site. However, there is excellent power to detect an increase in overall malignant disease.

CONCLUSION

Analyses of all Ranch Hands and Comparisons indicated no significant difference between the two groups. When analyzing associations between initial dioxin and neoplasm endpoints within the Ranch Hand group, Ranch Hands in the background dioxin category and

Ranch Hands in the low dioxin category tended to be higher than Comparisons, whereas Ranch Hands in the high category often were lower than Comparisons. Parallel to analyses using initial dioxin, results observed when current dioxin was used as the measure of exposure often indicated a negative dose-response relationship. In summary, there appears to be no clinical difference between Ranch Hands and Comparisons, and there is no evidence to suggest a positive dose-response relationship between dioxin and neoplastic disease.

CHAPTER 10
REFERENCES

1. Van Miller, J.P., J.J. Lalich, and J.R. Allen. 1977. Increased incidence of neoplasms in rats exposed to low levels of tetrachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin. *Chemosphere* 6:537-544.

2. Kociba, R.J., D.G. Keyes, J.E. Beyer, R.M. Carreon, C.E. Wade, D.A. Dittenber, R.P. Kalnins, L.E. Frauson, C.N. Park, S.D. Barnard, R.A. Hummel, and C.G. Humiston. 1978. Results of a two-year chronic toxicity and oncogenicity study of 2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin in rats. *Toxicol. Appl. Pharmacol.* 46:279-303.

3. National Toxicology Program. 1982. Bioassay of 2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin for possible carcinogenicity (Gavage study). Technical Report Series No. 209. National Toxicology Program, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina.

4. Toth, K., J. Sugar, S. Somfai-Relle, and J. Bence. 1978. Carcinogenic bioassay of the herbicide 2,4,5-trichlorphenoxy ethanol (TCPE) with different 2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin (dioxin) content in Swiss mice. *Prog. Biochem. Pharmacol.* 14:82-93.

5. Della Porta, G., T.A. Dragani, and G. Sozzi. 1987. Carcinogenic effects of infantile and long-term 2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin in the mouse. *Tumori* 73:99-107.

6. Rao, M.S., V. Subbarao, J.D. Prasad, and D.G. Scartelli. 1988. Carcinogenicity of 2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin in the Syrian golden hamster. *Carcinogenesis* 9(9):1677-1679.

7. Poland, A. 1984. Reflections on the mechanism of action of halogenated aromatic hydrocarbons. In *Banbury Report 18: Biological mechanisms of dioxin action,* ed. A. Poland and R.D. Kimbrough. Cold Spring Harbor, New York: Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory.

8. DiGiovanni, J., A. Viaje, D.L. Berry, T.J. Slaga, and M.R. Juchau. 1977. Tumor initiating ability of 2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin (TCDD) and Aroclor 1254 in a two-stage system of mouse skin carcinogenesis. *Bull. Environ. Contam. Toxicol.* 18:522-57.

9. Berry, D.L., T.J. Slaga, J. DiGiovanni, and M.R. Juchau. 1979. Studies with chlorinated dibenzo-p-dioxins, polybrominated biphenyls and polychlorinated biphenyls in a two-stage system of mouse skin tumorigenesis: Potent anticarcinogenic effects. *Ann. N.Y. Acad. Sci.* 320:405-14.

10. National Toxicology Program. 1982. Carcinogenesis bioassay of 2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin (CAS no. 1746-01-6) in Swiss-Webster mice (dermal study). Report 80-32, technical report series no. 201, NIH publication no. 82-1757, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina.

11. Huff, J., A. Salmon, N. Hooper, and L. Zeise. 1991. Long-term carcinogenesis studies on 2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin and hexachlorodibenzo-p-dioxins. *Cell Biol. Toxicol.* 7(1):67-94.

12. Nebert, D.W., F.M. Gouton, and J.E. Gielen. 1972. Aryl hydrocarbon hydroxylase induction by polycyclic hydrocarbons: Simple autosomal dominant trait in the mouse. *Nature New Biol.* 236:107-110.

13. Nebert, D.W., and N.M. Jensen. 1979. The Ah locus: Genetic regulation of the metabolism of carcinogens, drugs, and environmental chemicals by Cytochrome P-450 mediated monooxygenases. *Crit. Rev. Biochem.* 6:401-410.

14. Poland, A., D. Palen, and E. Glover. 1982. Tumor promotion by TCDD in skin of HRS/J hairless mice. *Nature* 300:271-273.

15. Poland, A., E. Glover, and A.S. Kende. 1982. Stereospecific high affinity binding of 2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin by hepatic cytosol. *J. Biol. Chem.* 2251:4936-4946.

16. Poland, A., and J.C. Knutson. 1982. 2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin and related halogenated aromatic hydrocarbons: Examination of the mechanisms of toxicity. *Ann. Rev. Pharmacol.* 22:517-554.

17. Nebert, D.W. 1989. The Ah locus: Genetic differences in toxicity, cancer, mutation, and birth defects. *Crit. Rev. Toxicol.* 20:153-174.

18. Roberts, E.A., K.C. Johnson, P.A. Harper, and A.B. Okey. 1990. Characterization of the Ah receptor mediating aryl hydrocarbon hydroxylase induction in the human liver cell line Hep G2. *Arch. Biochem. Biophys.* 276:442-450.

19. Choi, E., D. Toscano, J. Ryan, N. Riedel, and W.J. Toscano. 1991. Dioxin induces transforming growth factor-alpha in human keratinocytes. *J. Biol. Chem.* 266(15):9591-9597.

20. Waithe, W., M. Michaud, P. Harper, A. Okey, and A. Anderson. 1991. The Ah receptor, cytochrome P450IA1 mRNA induction, and aryl hydrocarbon hydroxylase in a human lymphoblastoid cell line. *Biochem. Pharmacol.* 41(1):85-9244.

21. Lorenzen, A., and A.B. Okey. 1991. Detection and characterization of Ah receptor in tissue and cells from human tonsils. *Toxicol. Appl. Pharmacol.* 107(2):203-214.

22. Harper, P., R. Prokipcak, L. Bush, C. Golas, and A. Okey. 1991. Detection and characterization of the Ah receptor for 2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin in the human colon adenocarcinoma cell line LS180. *Arch. Biochem. Biophys.* 290(1):27-36.

23. Silbergeld, E.K., and T.A. Gasiewicz. 1989. Commentary: Dioxins and the Ah receptor. *Am. J. Ind. Med.* 16:455-474.

24. Wolfe, W.H., J.E. Michalek, J.C. Miner, A. Rahe, J. Silva, W.F. Thomas, W.D. Grubbs, M.B. Lustik, T.G. Karrison, R.H. Roegner, and D.E. Williams. 1990. Health status of Air Force veterans occupationally exposed to herbicides in Vietnam. I. Physical health. *JAMA* 264:1824-1831.

25. Thomas, W.F., W.D. Grubbs, T.G. Karrison, M.B. Lustik, R.H. Roegner, D.E. Williams, W.H. Wolfe, J.E. Michalek, J.C. Miner, and R.W. Ogershok. 1990. An epidemiologic investigation of health effects in Air Force personnel following exposure to herbicides: 1987 followup examination results, May 1987 to January 1990. NTIS: AD A 222 573. USAF School of Aerospace Medicine, Human Systems Division (AFSC), Brooks Air Force Base, Texas.

26. Thomas, T.L., and H.K. Kang. 1990. Mortality and morbidity among Army Chemical Corps Vietnam veterans: A preliminary report. *Am. J. Ind. Med.* 18:665-673.

27. Breslin, P., H.K. Kang, Y. Lee, V. Burt, and B.M. Shepard. 1988. Proportionate mortality study of US Army and US Marine Corps veterans of the Vietnam War. *J. Occup. Med.* 30:412-419.

28. U.S. Centers for Disease Control (USCDC). 1990. The Association of Selected Cancers With Service in the U.S. Military in Vietnam. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, Centers for Disease Control, Center for Environmental Health and Injury Control, Agent Orange Projects, Atlanta, Georgia 30333.

29. Fingerhut, M.A., W.E. Halperin, D.A. Marlow, L.A. Piacitelli, P.A. Honchar, M.H. Sweeney, A.L. Greife, P.A. Dill, K. Steenland, and A.J. Suruda. 1991. Cancer mortality in workers exposed to 2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin. *N. Engl. J. Med.* 324(4):212-218.

30. Saracci, R., M. Kogenvinas, P.-A. Bertazzi, B.H. Bueno de Mesquita, D. Coggon, L.M. Green, T. Kauppinen, et al. 1991. Cancer mortality in workers exposed to chlorophenoxy herbicides and chlorophenols. *Lancet* 38(8774):1027-1032.

31. Hardell, L., M. Eriksson, O. Axelson, and M. Fredriksson. 1991. Increased risk of soft tissue sarcoma in persons exposed to dioxin. *Lakartidningen* 88(47):4005-4006.

32. Eriksson, M., and L. Hardell. 1991. New experiences strengthen the connection between dioxins, phenoyxy acids and malignant tumors. *Lakartidningen* 88(24):2210-2211.

33. Manz, A., J. Berger, J.H. Dwyer, D. Flesch-Janys, S. Nagel, and H. Waltsgott. 1991. Cancer mortality among workers in chemical plant contaminated with dioxin. *Lancet* 338(8773):959-964.

34. Wigle, D.T., R.M. Semenciw, K. Wilkins., D. Riedel, L. Ritter, H.I. Morrison, and Y. Mao. 1990. Mortality study of Canadian male farm operators: Non-Hodgkin's lymphoma mortality and agricultural practices in Saskatchewan. *JNCI* 82:575-582.

35. Eriksson, M., L. Hardell, and H. Adami. 1990. Exposure to dioxins as a risk factor for soft tissue sarcoma: A population-based case-control study. *JNCI* 82:486-490.

36. Wingren, G., M. Fredrikson, H.N. Brage, B. Nordenskjold, and O. Axelson. 1990. Soft tissue sarcoma and occupational exposures. *Cancer* 66:806-811.

37. Brown, L.M., A. Blair, R. Gibson, G.D. Everett, K.P. Cantor, L.M. Schuman, L.F. Burmeister, S.F. VanLier, and F. Dick. 1990. Pesticide exposures and other agricultural risk factors for leukemia among men in Iowa and Minnesota. *Cancer Res.* 50:6585-6591.

38. Assennato, G., D. Cervino, E.A. Emmett, G. Longo, and F. Merlo. 1989. Followup of subjects who developed chloracne following TCDD exposure at Seveso. *Am. J. Ind. Med.* 16:119-125.

39. Bertazzi, P. 1991. Long-term effects of chemical disasters. Lessons and results from Seveso. *Sci. Total. Environ.* 106(1-2):5-20.

40. Zober, A., P. Messerer, and P. Huber. 1990. Thirty-four-year mortality followup of BASF employees exposed to 2,3,7,8-TCDD after the 1953 accident. *Int. Arch. Occup. Environ. Health* 62:139-157.

41. Bertazzi, P. 1989. Industrial disasters and epidemiology. *Scand. J. Work. Environ. Health* 15:85-100.

42. Bond, G.G., E.A. McLaren, F.E. Brenner, and R.R. Cook. 1989. Incidence of chloracne among chemical workers potentially exposed to chlorinated dioxins. *J. Occup. Med.* 31:771-774.

43. Roegner, R.H., W.D. Grubbs, M.B. Lustik, A.S. Brockman, S.C. Henderson, D.E. Williams, W.H. Wolfe, J.E. Michalek, and J.C. Miner. 1991. The Air Force Health Study: An epidemiologic investigation of health effects in Air Force personnel following exposure to herbicides. Serum Dioxin Analysis of 1987 Examination Results. NTIS: AD A 237 516-24. USAF School of Aerospace Medicine. Brooks Air Force Base, Texas.

44. Breslin, P., H.K. Kang, Y. Lee, V. Burt, and B.M. Shepard. 1988. Proportionate mortality study of US Army and US Marine Corps veterans of the Vietnam War. *J. Occup. Med.* 30:412-419.

45. Bullman, T.A., H.K. Kang, and K.K. Watanabe. 1990. Proportionate mortality among US Army Vietnam veterans who served in Military Region I. *Am. J. Epidermiol.* 132:670-674.

46. Watanabe, K.K., H.K. Kang, and T.L. Thomas. 1991. Mortality among Vietnam veterans: with methodological considerations. *J. Occup. Med.* 33(7):780-785.

47. O'Brien, T.R., P. Decoufle, II, and C.A. Boyle. 1991. Non-Hodgkin's lymphoma in a cohort of Vietnam veterans. *Am. J. Public Health* 81(6):758-760.

48. Selected Cancers Cooperative Study Group. 1990. The association of selected cancers with service in the US military in Vietnam. I. Non-Hodgkin's lymphoma. *Arch. Intern. Med.* 150(12):2473-2482.

49. Dalager, N.A., H.K. Kang, V.L. Burt, and L. Weatherbee. 1991. Non-Hodgkin's lymphoma among Vietnam veterans. *J. Occup. Med.* 33(7):774-779.

50. Selected Cancers Cooperative Study Group. 1990. The association of selected cancers with service in the US military in Vietnam. III. Hodgkin's disease, nasal cancer, nasopharyngeal cancer, and primary liver cancer. *Arch. Intern. Med.* 150(12):2495-2505.

51. Selected Cancers Cooperative Study Group. 1990. The association of selected cancers with service in the US military in Vietnam. II. Soft-tissue and other sarcomas. *Arch. Intern. Med.* 150(12):2485-2492.

52. Smith, A.H., D.G. Patterson, Jr., M.L. Warner, R. Mackenzie, and L.L. Needham. 1992. Serum 2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin levels of New Zealand pesticide applicators and their implication for cancer hypotheses. *J. Natl. Cancer Inst.* 84:104-108.

53. Mocarelli, P., L.L. Needham, A. Marocchi, D.G. Patterson, Jr., P. Brambilla, P.M. Gerthoux, L. Meazza, and V. Carreri. 1991. Serum concentrations of 2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin and test results from selected residents of Seveso, Italy. *J. Toxicol. Environ. Health* 32(4):357-366.

54. Triebig, G. 1991. Is dioxin carcinogenic? *Lancet* 338:1592.

55. Michalek, J.E., R.C. Tripathi, S.P. Caudill, and J.L. Pirkle. 1992. Investigation of TCDD half-life heterogeneity in veterans of Operation Ranch Hand. *J. Tox. Environ. Health* 35:29-38.

CHAPTER 11

NEUROLOGICAL ASSESSMENT

INTRODUCTION

Background

The frequent association of subjective neurological symptoms subsequent to herbicide exposure has driven much of the research on the potential neurotoxicity of dioxin. Studies of industrial accidents have demonstrated that the mixed sensorimotor neuropathy associated with extreme chlorophenol toxicity is reversible and that there is little scientific evidence to date for any chronic central or peripheral neurological disease in humans associated with low-level 2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin (TCDD, or dioxin) exposure. Neurobehavioral endpoints in humans, the subject of intensive investigation in this and other studies of Vietnam veterans, are considered separately in Chapter 12, Psychological Assessment.

Most of the basic research in animal models has focused on the neurobehavioral toxicity of 2,4-D and 2,4,5-T rather than TCDD. In rats (1-4), mice (5), and rabbits (6), perinatal exposure to 2,4-D induced neurobehavioral dysfunction associated with alterations in the concentrations of several central nervous system (CNS) neurotransmitters. In another series of experiments, the neurobehavioral effects of exposure to an ester of 2,4-D were found to be rapidly reversible, and a cellular rather than biochemical basis for the tolerance that developed with repeated injections was proposed by the authors (7-9).

A few studies have investigated the neurotoxic effects of TCDD in laboratory animals. In one experiment (10), the intracerebroventricular administration of TCDD proved far more toxic than the subcutaneous route in producing a wasting syndrome in rats though specific neurological indices were not examined. In another study, the neuromuscular effects associated with acute lethal doses of TCDD in rats were primarily on muscle tissue rather than peripheral nerves (11). A recently reported experiment, which included electrophysiologic studies, found that TCDD administered intraperitoneally in low doses to rats caused dose-dependent and statistically significant reductions in sciatic nerve motor and sensory conduction velocities consistent with a toxic polyneuropathy (12).

In humans, there is only circumstantial evidence linking 2,4-D exposure to neurotoxicity and the arguments against a causal relationship have been summarized in a recent review article (13). A host of subjective neurological symptoms has been reported following TCDD exposure and grouped generically under the diagnosis of "neurasthenia." Numerous studies have been published describing neurological sequelae in populations occupationally exposed to TCDD (14-21), environmental contamination (22-26), and industrial accidents (26-33). The 1976 chemical explosion in Seveso, Italy, provided a basis for longitudinal studies on the exposed population. Several of these studies have included neurological indices. One report included objective data derived from comprehensive neurological examination and electrophysiologic testing performed 7 years after the accident (28). In this report, 152 subjects with chloracne, a marker for high level dioxin exposure, were compared with

controls. In only 1 of 13 neurophysiologic indices was an abnormality found, and none of the exposed subjects were found to have a peripheral neuropathy as defined by World Health Organization criteria. These findings were confirmed in a subsequent report by the same author (29).

Similar results were reported in a study conducted 30 years after an uncontrolled chemical reaction in a trichlorophenol plant in Nitro, West Virginia, in 1949 (17). By neurological examination and nerve conduction velocity studies, no differences were found in 204 exposed subjects (55% of whom had chloracne) compared with controls. In contrast, another study of 47 railroad workers examined 6 years after exposure to polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), including TCDD, during a chemical spill found electrophysiologic evidence for a peripheral neuropathy in 43 of those tested by nerve conduction velocity and evoked action potential studies (30).

Point source environmental exposure to TCDD has been the focus of numerous epidemiologic studies, some of which have included neurological indices in their protocols (22-26). In 1971, waste by-products contaminated with TCDD from a chlorophenol manufacturing plant were mixed with oils and widely sprayed for dust control in residential areas of eastern Missouri. Soil concentrations in some areas reached 2,200 parts per billion. Comprehensive medical evaluations of exposed and unexposed cohorts have included detailed neurological examinations and, in one report (25), quantitative studies of tactile, vibratory, and thermal sensory perception. A recent review article summarizes the results of these Missouri dioxin studies (31). To date there has been no clinical evidence for any central or peripheral neurological disease associated with these TCDD exposures. The first study (24) to report tissue levels of dioxin in relation to neurological findings found no correlation between the body burden of dioxin and abnormalities in the peripheral indices of pain and vibratory sensation and deep tendon reflexes.

A recent report from the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) has the important strength of relating serum dioxin levels to neurological indices (21). In this study, 281 chemical plant workers were compared with 260 referents. Peripheral neuropathy was found in 18 percent of the exposed workers with serum TCDD levels ranging from 2 to 3,390 ppt (median of 68 ppt) versus a prevalence of 19 percent in referents whose TCDD levels range from 2 to 20 ppt (median of 6 ppt). There was no evidence for either a dose-response or causal relationship between TCDD and peripheral neuropathy.

Several studies of Vietnam veterans have included objective neurological data. In the Baseline examination of the Air Force Health Study (AFHS) (32), an increased incidence of abnormal Babinski reflexes was noted in Ranch Hand personnel relative to Comparisons, a finding not seen at the 1985 (33) or 1987 (34) followup examinations. Although, in the 1987 followup study, Ranch Hand participants were found to have more coordination abnormalities than Comparisons, subsequent analyses based on serum dioxin data (34) found no evidence for clinically significant neurological disease associated with the current body burden of dioxin. A few statistically significant associations were noted but not in a pattern consistent with a dose-response effect. In another study of 15 veterans who reported subjective symptoms in association with herbicide exposure, one subject was found to have a bilateral

peripheral neuropathy related to alcohol abuse. In all others, nerve conduction velocity studies at five peripheral sites were normal (35).

One large-scale study (36) of American Legion veterans who served in Vietnam found an increased incidence of reported neurobehavioral disorders among veterans thought to have been exposed to herbicides. However, the significance is limited by self-reporting bias, the lack of confirmation by clinical examination or medical record review, and the use of unvalidated exposure assumptions.

In contrast to the American Legion study, the Vietnam Experience Study (VES) conducted by the U.S. Centers for Disease Control (CDC) (37) compared 2,490 Vietnam veterans with 1,972 non-Vietnam veterans. The study protocol included comprehensive neurological examinations, nerve conduction velocity studies, and neurophysiologic indices of vibratory, thermal, and auditory sensation. Aside from an increased incidence of combat-related high-frequency hearing loss in a pattern typical of prior noise exposure, no neurological abnormalities were noted in association with service in Southeast Asia (SEA).

In summary, animal research and studies of humans exposed to high levels of dioxin leave no doubt that the peripheral nervous system is a target organ for acute TCDD toxicity. However, longitudinal studies would indicate that the neurological signs and symptoms attributable to heavy acute exposure resolve over time and are not associated with any long-term sequelae. Exposures equivalent to those likely to have been encountered by Vietnam veterans have not caused persistent neurological abnormalities.

Summary of Previous Analyses of the Air Force Health Study

1982 Baseline Study Summary Results

The 1982 AFHS neurological assessment consisted of questionnaire, physical examination, and electromyographic data obtained by examiners and technicians who were blind to the group identity of each participant. The physical examination required an average of 30 minutes to complete. Analyses were adjusted for reported alcohol usage, exposure to insecticides and industrial chemicals, and glucose intolerance (diabetes).

Results of the questionnaire disclosed no significant group differences in reported neurological diseases. The physical examination did not reveal any statistically significant group differences in the function of the 12 cranial nerves. Peripheral nerve function was assessed by the quality of four reflexes (patellar, Achilles, biceps, and Babinski); muscle strength or bulk; and reaction to the stimuli of pin prick, light touch, and vibration. Other than a statistically significant increase ($p=0.03$) in Ranch Hand Babinski reflexes, significant group differences were not detected. The alcohol covariate demonstrated a marginal effect ($p=0.07$) on pin-prick reaction, while glucose intolerance had a strong influence on the patellar and Achilles reflexes and reactions to light touch and vibration.

Nerve conduction velocities were obtained by highly standardized methods on the ulnar nerve above and below the elbow and the peroneal nerve. The results for each segmental measurement were nearly identical in the Ranch Hand and Comparison groups. Conduction

velocity showed highly significant inverse relationships to both alcohol (measured in drink-years) and glucose intolerance in almost all of the anatomic measurements. No group associations or interactions were detected with the covariates of industrial and degreasing chemicals and insecticides.

No significant group differences were detected in four measures of central neurological function (tremor, finger-nose coordination, modified positive Romberg sign, or abnormal gait). Alcohol usage was significantly associated with the presence of tremor, and glucose intolerance was highly correlated to abnormal balance and the presence of tremor.

1985 Followup Study Summary Results

The 1985 AFHS neurological examination did not include the measurements of nerve conduction velocities but otherwise repeated the Baseline examination protocol. The questionnaire maintained a historical focus on neurasthenia through five questions for the 1982-1985 interval. With this similarity in examination and questionnaire, the dependent variables of the analyses were almost identical to those of the Baseline study.

Interval questionnaire data (1982-1985) on neurological illness, verified by medical records, revealed no significant group differences. These data were added to verified Baseline historical information to assess possible differences in the lifetime experience of neurological disease. Again, there was no significant difference between the Ranch Hand and Comparison groups.

The detailed neurological examination evaluated neurological integrity in three broad areas: cranial nerve function, peripheral nerve status, and CNS coordination. Assessment of the 12 cranial nerves was based on the measurement of 15 variables. Two summary indices were constructed. Neither the unadjusted nor the adjusted analyses disclosed any statistically significant group differences, although two variables (speech and tongue position) were of marginal significance, with Ranch Hands faring worse then Comparisons. One of the two cranial nerve summary indices was marginally significant, again with the Ranch Hands at a slight detriment. In contrast to the Baseline examination, there was no significant group difference in Babinski reflex. The unadjusted and adjusted analyses of peripheral nerve function, as measured by eight variables (four reflexes, three sensory determinations, and muscle mass), did not reveal significant group differences. Coordination was evaluated by four measurements and a constructed summary variable. Hand tremor was found to be of borderline significance, with the Ranch Hands faring slightly worse than the Comparisons. The CNS summary index showed a significant detriment to the Ranch Hands.

In a longitudinal analysis of the Romberg sign and the Babinski reflex, only the Babinski reflex revealed a significant difference between the Baseline and the 1985 followup examination, with the Ranch Hands shifting from significant adverse findings at Baseline to favorable nonsignificant findings at the 1985 followup examination.

Overall, the 1985 followup examination findings are quite similar to the Baseline findings. However, several distinct patterns were evident from the analyses:

- The followup examination detected substantially fewer abnormalities for almost all measurement variables.

- The decrease in abnormalities was similar in both groups.

- The adjusted analyses were uniformly similar to the unadjusted analyses.

- A significant result was found for the constructed CNS summary variable, and a marginally significant result was found for the constructed cranial nerve index excluding range of motion.

- Although statistical significance at the pre-assigned α-level of 0.05 was not achieved for any of the measurement variables, the Ranch Hand group tended to have a greater percentage of abnormalities.

In conclusion, none of the 27 neurological variables demonstrated a significant group difference, although several showed an aggregation of abnormalities in the Ranch Hand group, which merit continued surveillance. Historical reporting of neurological disease was equal in both groups. The longitudinal analyses disclosed a favorable reversal of significant Babinski reflex abnormalities at Baseline to nonsignificant findings at the 1985 followup examination for the Ranch Hands. The similarity in results between unadjusted and adjusted statistical tests was evidence of group equality for the traditionally important neurological covariates of age, alcohol, and diabetes.

1987 Followup Study Summary Results

The neurological health of the Ranch Hand group was not substantially different from the Comparison group. Of the six questionnaire variables relating to neurological disease, the only significant finding was that Ranch Hands had a higher incidence of hereditary and degenerative neurological disease, such as benign essential tremor. The statistical results of the group contrasts for 30 physical examination variables relating to cranial nerve function, peripheral nerve status, and CNS coordination processes were generally not significant. Unadjusted analyses disclosed marginally more balance (Romberg sign) and coordination abnormalities for Ranch Hands than for Comparisons. Conversely, Ranch Hands had significantly fewer biceps reflex abnormalities than Comparisons. The longitudinal analyses for the cranial nerve index and the CNS index were not significant.

Serum Dioxin Analysis of 1987 Followup Study Summary Results

Overall, the neurological assessment did not indicate that dioxin was associated with neurological disease, although some analyses revealed a significant association with the CNS index and coordination. The adjusted analyses for the historical questionnaire variables were not significant and few statistically significant results were noted for the physical examination variables. The group contrast from the 1987 followup examination found that Ranch Hands had a significantly higher incidence of hereditary and degenerative diseases (mostly benign essential tremor) than Comparisons, but the serum dioxin analyses provided no support that dioxin levels were associated significantly with an increased risk. The adjusted categorized

current dioxin analyses for coordination found that the relative risk was significantly greater than 1 for Ranch Hands in the high current dioxin category. This is consistent with the previous report's finding that the Ranch Hand group had significantly more coordination abnormalities than the Comparison group (1.5% versus 0.6%). The serum dioxin analyses showed significant associations with the CNS index, including a marginally significant association with initial dioxin under the maximal assumption in the longitudinal analyses.

Parameters for the Neurological Assessment

Dependent Variables

The neurological assessment was based on extensive physical examination data on cranial nerve function, peripheral nerve status, and CNS coordination processes. This information was supplemented by verified histories of neurological diseases.

Medical Records Data

The 1992 questionnaire captured data on the occurrence of neurological disorders. Positive responses were verified by medical record review and combined with information from the Baseline, 1985, and 1987 examinations. The neurological diseases and disorders were classified into four ICD-9-CM categories: inflammatory diseases (ICD codes 32000-32600), hereditary and degenerative diseases (ICD codes 33000-33700), peripheral disorders (ICD codes 35000-35900), and other neurological disorders (ICD codes 34000-34900). Other neurological disorders was comprised mostly of diagnoses of unspecified encephalopathy (73.2%) but also included conditions such as multiple sclerosis, other demyelinating diseases of the central nervous system, hemiplegia, other paralytic syndromes, epilepsy, migraine, catalepsy or narcolepsy, other conditions of the brain, and other unspecified disorders of the nervous system. Each of the four disorders were coded as "yes" or "no."

Participants with positive serological tests for syphilis, participants who tested positive for the human immunosuppressant virus (HIV), and participants with a verified pre-SEA history of these disorders were excluded from all analyses of these neurological variables.

Physical Examination Data

The physical examination assessed cranial nerve function, peripheral nerve status, and CNS coordination processes. The evaluation of cranial nerve function was based on the following 14 variables: smell, visual fields, light reaction, ocular movement, facial sensation, jaw clench, smile, palpebral fissure, balance, gag reflex, speech, palate and uvula movement, neck range of motion, and the cranial nerve index excluding neck range of motion. All of these variables were scored as "normal" or "abnormal" except for jaw clench and palate and uvula movement, which were scored as "symmetric" or "deviated." For variables with left and right determinations, the two results were combined to produce a single normal or abnormal result, where normal indicated that both responses were normal, and abnormal indicated that at least one of the responses was abnormal. Abnormal speech conditions included aphasia, dysarthria, agnosia, and other abnormalities. Neck range of

motion was coded as abnormal if there was a decreased range of motion forward or backward or to the left or right. The physical examination also assessed corneal reflex and tongue position relative to midline, but these variables were not included in the analyses because there were no abnormalities.

The cranial nerve index excluding the spinal accessory nerve (nerve controlling neck range of motion) was created by combining responses for the other 12 cranial nerve parameters into a single index, which was classified as abnormal if at least one of the determinations was abnormal, and was classified as normal if all of the cranial nerve parameters were normal.

Peripheral nerve status was assessed by light pin prick, light touch (cotton sticks), visual inspection of muscle mass (and palpation, if indicated), three deep tendon reflexes (patellar, Achilles, and biceps), the Babinski reflex, and a vibrotactile measurement of both great toes using the method-of-limits (MOL) protocol (38).

Light pin prick and light touch were considered normal if the reaction was normal on both legs. A variable to appraise muscle status was constructed using data on bulk; tone of upper and lower extremities; and the strength of distal wrist extensors, ankle and toe flexors, proximal deltoids, and hip flexors. Bulk was classified as either "normal" or "abnormal"; tone was classified as "abnormal" if there was either a decreased or increased response on either the left side, right side, or both sides. The strength of distal wrist extensors, ankle and toe flexors, proximal deltoids, and hip flexors was considered abnormal if either or both the left or right side was decreased. The composite muscle status variable was classified as "normal" if all of the components were normal on both the left and right sides, and "abnormal" if any of the components was abnormal on either or both sides. The patellar, Achilles, and biceps reflexes were coded as "normal" if they were sluggish, active, or very active, and were classified as "abnormal" if absent. Participants with transient clonus or sustained clonus results were excluded from these reflex analyses.

The Vibratron II® device was used to measure vibrotactile threshold on both the left and the right great toes. The Vibratron II® provided a noninvasive means of measuring the sensitivity to vibration of a participant's feet. Participants whose great toes were able to be examined but who sensed no vibration were included in the analysis at a maximum level of 23.0 vibrational units (VU) to represent an extreme loss of sensitivity to vibration. This level of 23.0 VU is slightly higher than the highest recorded measurement in this study.

Paraplegics, amputees, and participants with other conditions not allowing testing of the great toes were not included in the analyses of the vibrotacitle threshold.

The VU measurements were transformed to displacement in microns using the following transformation:

$$Displacement\ (microns) = 0.550 \bullet VU^{2.02217}. \qquad (39)$$

The displacement measurements were transformed to the natural logarithm scale to enhance normal distribution assumptions for analysis. The left and right toes were analyzed separately. For each great toe, the average (in log microns) of four of seven trials was determined. The four trials were those remaining after eliminating the results of the first of the seven trials and the high and low reading of the other six results. A further discussion of the methodology used for analysis is given in Appendix G-1.

The evaluation of CNS coordination processes was based on the analysis of the following variables: tremor, coordination, Romberg sign, gait, and CNS index. For these variables, multiple determinations, which may have included left and right as well as upper and lower responses, were combined to form a single result. A result was classified as "normal" if all determinations were normal, and "abnormal" if any determination was abnormal. Tremor was examined for the left and right upper and lower extremities. Abnormal tremors included resting, essential, intention, and other tremors. Coordination was a composite index defined as "normal" if the Romberg sign, finger-nose-finger and heel-knee-shin coordination processes, rapidly alternating movements of pronation and supination of hands, and rapid patting were normal. The Romberg sign variable is equivalent to the balance variable analyzed as part of the cranial nerve function assessment. The gait variable was based on the examining physician's assessment of the participant's gait. An abnormal gait included conditions such as broad-based, small-stepped, ataxic or other irregular gait patterns. The CNS index was a composite variable based on tremor, coordination, and gait; this index was coded as "normal" if all three of the components were normal.

Participants with positive serological tests for syphilis and participants who tested positive for HIV were excluded from all analyses of these neurological variables. Participants with contact lenses in place were excluded from the assessment of the corneal reflex. Participants edema in the lower extremities were excluded from the analyses of pin prick and light touch.

Covariates

Age, race, military occupation, current alcohol use, lifetime alcohol history, reported exposure to insecticides, reported exposure to industrial chemicals, reported exposure to degreasing chemicals, serum insulin, and diabetic class were candidate covariates for the adjusted statistical analyses. However, based on the results of the covariate tests of association, current alcohol use, industrial chemical exposure, and serum insulin levels were not included in the adjusted analyses. Similarly, degreasing chemical exposure was not examined in the adjusted analyses for all variables except for a medical history of peripheral disorders.

The lifetime alcohol history covariate was based on self-reported information from the 1992 questionnaire, combined with information collected at the previous examinations. The respondent's average daily alcohol consumption was determined for various drinking stages throughout his lifetime, and an estimate of the corresponding total number of drink-years (1 drink-year is the equivalent of drinking 1.5 ounces of 80-proof alcoholic beverage per day

for 1 year) was derived. The current alcohol covariate was based on the average drinks per day for the month prior to completing the 1992 questionnaire.

The exposure to insecticides, industrial chemicals, and degreasing chemicals covariates represented lifetime exposure based on self-reported questionnaire data from the 1992 examination combined with data from previous examinations. Diabetic class was defined as diabetic (verified history of diabetes or $\geq$200 mg/dl 2-hour postprandial glucose), impaired (140 mg/dl $\leq$2-hour postprandial glucose$<$200 mg/dl), and normal ($<$140 mg/dl 2-hour postprandial glucose). Serum insulin levels (mIU/ml) were determined from the AFHS 1992 followup laboratory analysis. For the medical records variables, which are based on cumulative histories, lifetime alcohol history was used to investigate the cumulative effects of alcohol, and diabetic class was used to investigate the lifetime effects of diabetes on the neurological system.

Two additional variables based on self-reported information were candidate covariates for the vibrotactile measurement of both great toes: (1) a composite exposure to heavy metals, and (2) exposure to vibrating power tools. The 1992 questionnaire asked each study participant whether he had worked for 30 days or more with lead, mercury, chromium, nickel, copper, cadmium, manganese, arsenic, selenium, or molybdenum. Responses were combined to form the composite exposure to heavy metals variable. The exposure to power tools covariate was based on the 1992 questionnaire response to whether the participant had ever worked for 30 days or more with vibrating power equipment or tools.

Age and lifetime alcohol history were treated as continuous variables for all adjusted analyses, but they were categorized to explore interactions. Reported insecticides exposure, reported degreasing chemicals exposure, reported industrial chemical exposure, heavy metals exposure, and vibrating power tools exposure were categorized as "yes" or "no" for all analyses. Current alcohol use and serum insulin levels were categorized for the covariate tests of association with the discrete dependent variables, and were treated in their continuous form for the covariate tests of association with vibrotactile threshold of the left and right great toes.

Statistical Methods

Chapter 7, Statistical Methods, describes the basic statistical analysis methods used in the neurological assessment. The neurological assessment applied three modifications to the general modeling strategy delineated in Chapter 7. First, the final models for the serum dioxin analyses (Models 2 through 6) of the historical variables always retained age, regardless of statistical significance. Age always was kept in the final model because it was a potential confounder, being associated with dioxin levels and assumed to be associated with the historical conditions. Second, for models with a sparse number of abnormalities ($<$1.0%), the initial adjusted model examined main effects only, excluding interactions. The main effects included in the initial model depended on the total number of abnormalities for the variable. For example, for variables with extremely few abnormalities, age and occupation (potential confounders in the serum dioxin analyses) were the only covariates considered. A main effects model with all covariates was the starting model for variables with more abnormalities. Third, due to the large number of candidate covariates, the

covariate tests of association discussed in the Dependent Variable-Covariable Associations section were used as a preliminary screen to determine a subset of covariates to be used in the adjusted analyses.

Table 11-1 summarizes the statistical analyses performed for the 1992 neurological assessment. The first part of this table lists the dependent variables analyzed, data source, data form, cutpoints, candidate covariates, and statistical analysis methods. The second part of this table provides a description of candidate covariates examined. Abbreviations used in the body of the table are defined at the end of the table. Dependent variable and covariate data were missing for some participants. The number of participants with missing data and the number of participants excluded are provided in Table 11-2.

Analyses of data collected at the 1987 followup study indicated that dioxin was associated with military occupation. In general, enlisted personnel had higher levels of dioxin than officers, with enlisted groundcrew having higher levels than enlisted flyers. Consequently, adjustment for military occupation in statistical models using dioxin as a measure of exposure may improperly mask an actual dioxin effect. However, occupation also can be a surrogate for socioeconomic effects. Failure to adjust for occupation could overlook important risk factors related to lifestyle. If occupation was found to be significantly associated with a dependent variable in the 1992 followup analyses and was retained in the final statistical models using dioxin as a measure of exposure, the dioxin effect was evaluated in the context of two models. Analyses were performed with and without occupation in the final models to investigate whether conclusions regarding the association between the health endpoint and dioxin differed.

Diabetes also exhibited a significant positive association with dioxin in the serum dioxin analysis of the 1987 followup data. The results of similar diabetic analyses for the 1992 followup are discussed in Chapter 18, Endocrine Assessment. Consequently, clinical endpoints in the neurological assessment may be related to dioxin due to the association between dioxin and diabetes. To investigate this possibility, the dioxin effect was evaluated in the context of two models whenever diabetic class was retained in the final model. Analyses again were performed with and without diabetic class in the model to investigate whether conclusions regarding the association between the health endpoint and dioxin differed.

The results of the analyses without occupation and diabetic class in the final adjusted model are presented in Appendix G-3 and are discussed in the text only if the level of significance differs from the original final adjusted model (significant versus nonsignificant).

Longitudinal Analyses

The neurological longitudinal analyses were based on the cranial nerve index excluding neck range of motion and the CNS index. To enhance the comparability of measurements, the longitudinal assessment contrasted differences between the 1985 and 1992 Scripps Clinic and Research Facility (SCRF) neurological examinations.

Table 11-1.
Statistical Analyses for the Neurological Assessment

Dependent Variables

Variable	Data Source	Data Form	Cutpoints	Candidate Covariates	Statistical Analyses
Inflammatory Diseases	MR-V	D	Yes No	AGE,RACE,OCC, DRKYR,INS,IC, DC,DIAB	U:LR,CS A:LR,CS
Hereditary and Degenerative Diseases	MR-V	D	Yes No	AGE,RACE,OCC, DRKYR,INS,IC, DC,DIAB	U:LR,CS A:LR
Peripheral Disorders	MR-V	D	Yes No	AGE,RACE,OCC, DRKYR,INS,IC, DC,DIAB	U:LR,CS A:LR
Other Neurological Disorders	MR-V	D	Yes No	AGE,RACE,OCC, DRKYR,INS,IC, DC,DIAB	U:LR,CS A:LR
Smell	PE	D	Abnormal Normal	AGE,RACE,OCC,ALC, DRKYR,INS,IC,DC, INSLN,DIAB	U:LR,CS A:LR
Visual Fields	PE	D	Abnormal Normal	AGE,RACE,OCC,ALC, DRKYR,INS,IC,DC, INSLN,DIAB	U:CS A:CS
Light Reaction	PE	D	Abnormal Normal	AGE,RACE,OCC,ALC, DRKYR,INS,IC,DC, INSLN,DIAB	U:LR,CS A:LR
Ocular Movement	PE	D	Abnormal Normal	AGE,RACE,OCC,ALC, DRKYR,INS,IC,DC, INSLN,DIAB	U:LR,CS A:LR
Facial Sensation	PE	D	Abnormal Normal	AGE,RACE,OCC,ALC, DRKYR,INS,IC,DC, INSLN,DIAB	U:LR,CS, FT A:LR,CS
Jaw Clench	PE	D	Deviated Symmetric	AGE,RACE,OCC,ALC, DRKYR,INS,IC,DC, INSLN,DIAB	Frequencies
Smile	PE	D	Abnormal Normal	AGE,RACE,OCC,ALC, DRKYR,INS,IC,DC, INSLN,DIAB	U:LR,CS A:LR,CS
Palpebral Fissure	PE	D	Abnormal Normal	AGE,RACE,OCC,ALC, DRKYR,INS,IC,DC, INSLN,DIAB	U:LR,CS A:LR,CS
Balance	PE	D	Abnormal Normal	AGE,RACE,OCC,ALC, DRKYR,INS,IC,DC, INSLN,DIAB	U:LR,CS A:LR

Table 11-1. (Continued)
Statistical Analyses for the Neurological Assessment

Dependent Variables

Variable	Data Source	Data Form	Cutpoints	Candidate Covariates	Statistical Analyses
Gag Reflex	PE	D	Abnormal Normal	AGE,RACE,OCC,ALC, DRKYR,INS,IC,DC, INSLN,DIAB	Frequencies
Speech	PE	D	Abnormal Normal	AGE,RACE,OCC,ALC, DRKYR,INS,IC,DC, INSLN,DIAB	U:LR,CS, FT A:LR
Palate and Uvula Movement	PE	D	Deviated Symmetric	AGE,RACE,OCC,ALC, DRKYR,INS,IC,DC, INSLN,DIAB	Frequencies
Neck Range of Motion	PE	D	Abnormal Normal	AGE,RACE,OCC,ALC, DRKYR,INS,IC,DC, INSLN,DIAB	U:LR,CS A:LR
Cranial Nerve Index Without Range of Motion	PE	D	Abnormal Normal	AGE,RACE,OCC,ALC, DRKYR,INS,IC,DC, INSLN,DIAB	U:LR,CS A:LR L:LR
Pin Prick	PE	D	Abnormal Normal	AGE,RACE,OCC,ALC, DRKYR,INS,IC,DC, INSLN,DIAB	U:LR,CS A:LR
Light Touch	PE	D	Abnormal Normal	AGE,RACE,OCC,ALC, DRKYR,INS,IC,DC, INSLN,DIAB	U:LR,CS A:LR
Muscle Status	PE	D	Abnormal Normal	AGE,RACE,OCC,ALC, DRKYR,INS,IC,DC, INSLN,DIAB	U:LR,CS A:LR
Patellar Reflex	PE	D	Abnormal Normal	AGE,RACE,OCC,ALC, DRKYR,INS,IC,DC, INSLN,DIAB	U:LR,CS A:LR
Achilles Reflex	PE	D	Abnormal Normal	AGE,RACE,OCC,ALC, DRKYR,INS,IC,DC, INSLN,DIAB	U:LR,CS A:LR
Biceps Reflex	PE	D	Abnormal Normal	AGE,RACE,OCC,ALC, DRKYR,INS,IC,DC, INSLN,DIAB	U:LR,CS A:LR
Babinski Reflex	PE	D	Abnormal Normal	AGE,RACE,OCC,ALC, DRKYR,INS,IC,DC, INSLN,DIAB	U:LR,CS A:LR
Vibrotactile Threshold Measurement of Right Great Toe (microns)	PE	C	--	AGE,RACE,OCC,ALC, DRKYR,INS,IC,DC, INSLN,DIAB,HVMET, PWTOOL	U:GLM,TT A:GLM

Table 11-1. (Continued)
Statistical Analyses for the Neurological Assessment

Dependent Variables

Variable	Data Source	Data Form	Cutpoints	Candidate Covariates	Statistical Analyses
Vibrotactile Threshold Measurement of Left Great Toe (microns)	PE	C	--	AGE,RACE,OCC,ALC, DRKYR,INS,IC,DC, INSLN,DIAB,HVMET, PWTOOL	U:GLM,TT A:GLM
Tremor	PE	D	Abnormal Normal	AGE,RACE,OCC,ALC, DRKYR,INS,IC,DC, INSLN,DIAB	U:LR,CS A:LR
Coordination	PE	D	Abnormal Normal	AGE,RACE,OCC,ALC, DRKYR,INS,IC,DC, INSLN,DIAB	U:LR,CS A:LR
Romberg Sign	PE	D	Abnormal Normal	AGE,RACE,OCC,ALC, DRKYR,INS,IC,DC, INSLN,DIAB	U:LR,CS A:LR
Gait	PE	D	Abnormal Normal	AGE,RACE,OCC,ALC, DRKYR,INS,IC,DC, INSLN,DIAB	U:LR,CS A:LR
Central Nervous System Index	PE	D	Abnormal Normal	AGE,RACE,OCC,ALC, DRKYR,INS,IC,DC, INSLN,DIAB	U:LR,CS A:LR L:LR

Covariates

Variable (Abbreviation)	Data Source	Data Form	Cutpoints
Age (AGE)	MIL	D/C	Born $\geq$1942 Born $<$1942
Race (RACE)	MIL	D	Black Non-Black
Occupation (OCC)	MIL	D	Officer Enlisted Flyer Enlisted Groundcrew
Current Alcohol Use (ALC) (drinks/day)	Q-SR	D/C	0-1 $>$1-4 $>$4
Lifetime Alcohol History (DRKYR) (drink-years)	Q-SR	D/C	0 $>$0-40 $>$40
Insecticide Exposure (INS)	Q-SR	D	Yes No
Industrial Chemical Exposure (IC)	Q-SR	D	Yes No

Table 11-1. (Continued)
Statistical Analyses for the Neurological Assessment

Covariates

Variable (Abbreviation)	Data Source	Data Form	Cutpoints
Degreasing Chemical Exposure (DC)	Q-SR	D	Yes No
Serum Insulin (mIU/ml) (INSLN)	LAB	D/C	0-56 >56
Diabetic Class (DIAB)	LAB/MR-V	D	Diabetic: past history or ≥200 mg/dl 2-hr. postprandial glucose Impaired: ≥140-<200 mg/dl 2-hr. postprandial glucose Normal: <140 mg/dl 2-hr. postprandial glucose
Composite Exposure to Heavy Metals (HVMET)	Q-SR	D	Yes No
Worked With Vibrating Power Equipment or Tools (PWTOOL)	Q-SR	D	Yes No

Abbreviations

Data Source:
- LAB = 1992 laboratory results
- MIL = Air Force military records
- MR-V = Medical records (verified)
- PE = 1992 physical examination
- Q-SR = Health questionnaire (self-reported)

Data Form:
- C = Continuous analysis only
- D = Discrete analysis only
- D/C = Appropriate form for analysis (either discrete or continuous)

Statistical Analyses:
- U = Unadjusted analyses
- A = Adjusted analyses
- L = Longitudinal analyses

Statistical Methods:
- CS = Chi-square contingency table analysis (continuity-adjusted for 2x2 tables)
- FT = Fisher's exact test
- GLM = General linear models analysis
- LR = Logistic regression analysis
- TT = Two-sample t-test

Table 11-2.
Number of Participants with Missing Data for, or Excluded from, the Neurological Assessment

Variable	Variable Use	Group		Dioxin (Ranch Hands Only)		Categorized Dioxin	
		Ranch Hand	Comparison	Initial	Current	Ranch Hand	Comparison
Inflammatory Diseases	DEP	1	9	1	1	1	8
Hereditary and Degenerative Diseases	DEP	0	1	0	0	0	1
Peripheral Diseases	DEP	3	3	0	3	3	3
Other Neurological Disorders	DEP	4	6	1	4	4	6
Visual Fields	DEP	2	4	1	2	2	4
Light Reaction	DEP	1	2	0	1	1	2
Ocular Movement	DEP	1	2	0	1	1	2
Facial Sensation	DEP						
Corneal Reflex	DEP	8	12	3	7	7	10
Balance	DEP	1	1	1	1	1	1
Neck Range of Motion	DEP	1	0	1	1	1	0
Cranial Nerve Index Without Range of Motion	DEP	3	4	2	3	3	4
Pin Prick	DEP	0	1	0	0	0	0
Light Touch	DEP	0	1	0	0	0	0
Muscle Status	DEP	0	2	0	0	0	0
Patellar Reflex	DEP	2	4	0	2	2	3
Achilles Reflex	DEP	4	10	1	3	3	3
Babinski Reflex	DEP	0	2	0	0	0	1
Vibrotactile Threshold Measurement of Right Great Toe (microns)	DEP	2	3	2	2	2	3

Table 11-2. (Continued)
Number of Participants with Missing Data for, or Excluded from, the Neurological Assessment

Variable	Variable Use	Group		Dioxin (Ranch Hands Only)		Categorized Dioxin	
		Ranch Hand	Comparison	Initial	Current	Ranch Hand	Comparison
Vibrotactile Threshold Measurement of Left Great Toe (microns)	DEP	2	3	2	2	2	2
Coordination	DEP	1	2	1	1	1	0
Romberg Sign	DEP	1	1	1	1	1	1
Gait	DEP	0	1	0	0	0	1
Central Nervous System Index	DEP	1	1	1	1	1	0
Current Alcohol Use	COV	10	18	7	9	9	16
Lifetime Alcohol History	COV	22	21	13	20	20	18
Serum Insulin	COV	0	2	0	0	0	1
Diabetic Class	COV	1	2	0	1	1	1
Composite Exposure to Heavy Metals	COV	0	2	0	0	0	2
Worked with Vibrating Power Equipment or Tools	COV	0	2	0	0	0	2
Syphilis Positive	EXC	1	0	1	1	1	0
HIV Positive	EXC	3	1	2	3	3	1
Pre-SEA Other Neurological Disorders	EXC	4	6	1	4	4	6
Contact Lenses Not Removed	EXC	6	7	3	5	5	6
Pitting Edema on Lower Extremities	EXC	40	62	26	38	38	49

Abbreviations: DEP = Dependent variable (missing data).
COV = Covariate (missing data).
EXC = Exclusion.

Note: 952 Ranch Hands and 1,281 Comparisons;
520 Ranch Hands for initial dioxin; 894 Ranch Hands for current dioxin;
894 Ranch Hands and 1,063 Comparisons for categorized dioxin.
One Ranch Hand missing total lipids for current dioxin.

RESULTS

Dependent Variable-Covariate Associations

Covariate tests of association were performed to examine the unadjusted relationships between the covariates used in the adjusted analyses and the dependent variables. Appendix Table G-1-1 provides summary results of these analyses, presenting percents abnormal and p-values to test the statistical significance of the relationship. Statistically significant associations are discussed below.

Age

Of the four historical neurological disorder variables, age exhibited a highly significant positive association with peripheral disorders and with the category of other neurological disorders. The prevalence of peripheral disorders was higher for older participants than for younger participants ($p<0.001$, 19.4% for men born before 1942 vs. 12.2% for men born in or after 1942) as was the prevalence of other neurological disorders ($p<0.001$, 24.1% for men born before 1942 vs. 14.6% for men born in or after 1942). The covariate tests of association did not find age to be significantly associated with a history of inflammatory disease or hereditary and degenerative diseases.

Of the cranial nerve function variables analyzed at the physical examination, age showed a significant positive association with balance ($p=0.010$), neck range of motion ($p<0.001$), and the cranial nerve index (without range of motion) ($p=0.002$). The results were not significant for the other cranial nerve variables, although older participants were more likely to have abnormalities than younger participants for each variable with at least one abnormality. The nonsignificance may be partly attributable to the sparse number of abnormalities for these variables.

As expected, age was positively associated with the peripheral nerve variables of pin prick ($p=0.009$), light touch ($p=0.008$), muscle status ($p=0.009$), patellar reflex ($p<0.001$), Achilles reflex ($p<0.001$), biceps reflex ($p=0.048$), and vibrotactile threshold ($p<0.001$ for both the left and right great toes). Age also was positively associated with the central nervous system variables of coordination ($p=0.001$), Romberg sign ($p=0.010$), gait ($p=0.037$), and the CNS index ($p=0.020$).

Race

Black participants were more likely than non-Black participants to have a medical history of the category of other neurological disorders ($p<0.001$, 33.3% vs. 19.2%). Non-Blacks were more than twice as likely as Blacks to have a decreased neck range of motion ($p=0.011$, 14.6% vs. 6.2%). The only other significant association with race was that the mean vibrotactile threshold for the left great toe was significantly higher for non-Blacks than for Blacks ($p=0.019$, 16.96 microns vs. 13.23 microns).

Occupation

The covariate tests of association found a highly significant association between occupation and the category of other neurological disorders ($p<0.001$), with enlisted personnel exhibiting a higher history of disorders (26.4% of enlisted groundcrew and 30.5% of enlisted flyers) than officers (8.3%). The other neurological disorders category was comprised mostly of diagnoses of unspecified encephalopathy (416 of 568, 73.2%). There were no significant occupational differences for the other historical variables.

Neck range of motion and both left and right great toe vibrotactile threshold measurements were the only physical examination variables associated significantly with occupation ($p<0.001$ for each variable). Officers (16.8%) and enlisted flyers (17.8%) were more likely to have a decreased neck range of motion than enlisted groundcrew (10.4%). Enlisted flyers had the highest mean vibrotactile thresholds followed by officers and enlisted groundcrew.

Current Alcohol Use

Vibrotactile threshold for the left great toe was the only dependent variable significantly associated with current alcohol consumption ($p=0.017$, $r=0.051$). Because of the general nonsignificance of these results and because of the large number of candidate covariates, current alcohol consumption was not used in the adjusted analyses.

Lifetime Alcohol History

Lifetime alcohol history was associated significantly with neck range of motion ($p=0.047$), cranial nerve index (without range of motion) ($p=0.010$), vibrotactile threshold for both left and right great toes ($p<0.001$ for both great toes), tremor ($p=0.015$), and the CNS index ($p=0.030$). The percentage of neck range of motion abnormalities increased with the number of drink-years (12.7%, 12.9%, and 17.0% for men with 0 drink-years, for those with more than 0 but less than or equal to 40 drink-years, and for those with more than 40 drink-years respectively). By contrast, the highest prevalence of cranial nerve index abnormalities was seen for participants who had never drank alcohol. The prevalence rates were 9.0 percent for participants with 0 drink-years, 3.6 percent for those with between 0 and 40 drink-years and 3.7 percent for participants with more than 40 drink-years. Vibrotactile threshold levels and the percentage of tremor and central nervous system abnormalities increased with lifetime alcohol consumption.

Insecticide Exposure

The covariate tests of association found that participants who reported having been exposed to insecticides had a significantly higher prevalence of peripheral disorders than participants who had never been exposed to insecticides ($p=0.001$, 18.1% vs. 12.5%). Participants exposed to insecticides also had a significantly higher prevalence of cranial nerve index (without range of motion) abnormalities than participants who had not been exposed ($p=0.029$, 4.6% vs. 2.6%).

Industrial Chemical Exposure

A significantly higher percentage of individuals who reported being exposed to industrial chemicals had a history of other neurological disorders than individuals who had never been exposed ($p=0.001$, 22.4% vs. 16.7%). However, this association was due to the confounding effect of occupation, as enlisted personnel were more likely to have been exposed to industrial chemicals and also to have a history of other neurological diseases. An additional analysis, conducted as part of a covariate screening process to reduce the overall number of covariates, found that the association between industrial chemical exposure and other neurological disorders became nonsignificant after adjusting for occupation ($p=0.864$).

Neck range of motion and vibrotactile threshold of the right great toe also were associated significantly with industrial chemical exposure. The prevalence of decreased neck range of motion was lower for participants who had been exposed to industrial chemicals than for participants who had not been exposed ($p=0.049$, 12.8% vs. 15.9%). Participants exposed to industrial chemicals had a lower mean vibrotactile threshold in the right great toe than participants who had never been exposed ($p=0.046$, 15.96 microns vs. 17.63 microns). Both of these results also were attributable to the confounding effect of occupation and became nonsignificant after adjustment for occupation. Because of the general nonsignificance of these results and because of the large number of candidate covariates, industrial chemical exposure was not used in the adjusted analyses.

Degreasing Chemical Exposure

The covariate tests of association found that participants exposed to degreasing chemicals had a significantly higher history of peripheral disorders ($p=0.044$) and a significantly higher history of the category of other neurological disorders ($p=0.004$) than participants who had never been exposed to degreasing chemicals. Comparable to the industrial chemical exposure analyses, the association with other neurological disorders was due to the confounding effect of occupation, and became nonsignificant after adjustment for occupation ($p=0.158$). However the peripheral disorders finding remained significant even when occupation was included in the model ($p=0.014$).

Degreasing chemical exposure was not associated significantly with any of the physical examination variables. Based on these results degreasing chemical exposure was only used in the adjusted analyses of peripheral disorders.

Diabetic Class

Diabetic class was associated significantly with a history of peripheral disorders ($p<0.001$) and with a history of other neurological disorders ($p=0.001$). The percentages of individuals with peripheral disorders were 14.3 percent, 17.9 percent, and 25.6 percent for nondiabetics, glucose-impaired participants, and diabetics. The percentages of individuals with other neurological disorders were 18.1, 24.1, and 26.4 percent for nondiabetics, glucose-impaired participants, and diabetics.

Diabetic class was associated significantly with several of the cranial nerve variables including jaw clench ($p=0.020$), balance ($p<0.001$), gag reflex ($p=0.020$), palate and uvula movement ($p=0.020$), and the cranial nerve index (without range of motion) ($p=0.002$). The results for jaw clench, gag reflex, and palate and uvula movement are partly attributable to sparse data. The same individual had the only abnormality for these three variables, and he was glucose-impaired. Only frequencies are presented for these variables; no unadjusted or adjusted analyses were performed. Diabetics had the highest prevalence of balance abnormalities (2.2%) relative to impaired individuals (0.4%) and nondiabetics (0.2%). Diabetics had a higher prevalence of cranial nerve index (without range of motion) abnormalities (7.5%) than did impaired participants (2.8%) and nondiabetics (3.5%).

Diabetic class was highly associated with most of the peripheral nerve functions assessed at the neurological examination. In particular, pin prick ($p<0.001$), light touch ($p=0.001$), patellar reflex ($p<0.001$), Achilles reflex ($p<0.001$), biceps reflex ($p=0.009$), and vibrotactile threshold ($p<0.001$ for both left and right great toes) were significantly associated with diabetic class. Diabetics had relatively more peripheral reflex abnormalities and a higher mean vibrotactile threshold than impaired and normal participants. Romberg sign (identical to balance described above) was the only central nervous system variable that was associated significantly with diabetic class ($p<0.001$).

Serum Insulin

The covariate tests of association did not find a significant association between serum insulin levels and any of the neurological variables. Based on these results serum insulin was not included in the adjusted analyses.

Composite Exposure to Heavy Metals

The mean vibrotactile threshold did not differ significantly between participants exposed to heavy metals and those who had not been exposed.

Worked with Vibrating Power Equipment or Tools

Participants who had worked with vibrating power equipment or tools did not have a significantly different mean vibrotactile threshold than participants who had not worked with vibrating equipment.

Exposure Analysis

The following section presents the results of the statistical analyses of the dependent variables shown in Table 11-1. Dependent variables are grouped into two sections: those derived and verified from a review of medical records and data obtained during the 1992 physical examination.

Unadjusted and adjusted analyses of six models are presented for each variable. Model 1 examines the relationship between the dependent variable and group (Ranch Hand or Comparison). Model 2 explores the relationship between the dependent variable and an

extrapolated initial dioxin measure for Ranch Hands who had a 1987 dioxin level greater than 10 ppt. If a participant did not have a 1987 dioxin level, a 1992 level was used. A statistical adjustment for the percent of body fat at the participant's time of duty in SEA and the change in the percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin is included in this model to account for body-fat-related differences in elimination rate (40). Model 3 dichotomizes the Ranch Hands in Model 2 based on their initial dioxin measures; these two categories of Ranch Hands are referred to as the "low Ranch Hand" category and the "high Ranch Hand" category. These participants are added to Ranch Hands and Comparisons with current serum dioxin levels (1987, if available; 1992, if the 1987 level was not available) at or below 10 ppt to create a total of four categories. Ranch Hands with current serum dioxin levels at or below 10 ppt are referred to as the "background Ranch Hand" category. The relationship between the dependent variable in each of the three Ranch Hand categories and the dependent variable in the "Comparison" category is examined. A fourth contrast, exploring the relationship of the dependent variable in the low Ranch Hand category and the high Ranch Hand category combined, also is conducted. This combination is referred to in the text and tables as the "low plus high Ranch Hand" category. As in Model 2, a statistical adjustment is made for percent body fat at the participant's time of duty in SEA and the change in the percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

Models 4, 5, and 6 examine the relationship between the dependent variable and 1987 dioxin levels in all Ranch Hands with a dioxin measurement. If a participant did not have a 1987 dioxin measurement, a 1992 measurement was utilized in determining the current dioxin level. The measure of dioxin in Model 4 is lipid-adjusted, whereas whole-weight dioxin is used in Models 5 and 6. Model 6 differs from Model 5 in that a statistical adjustment for total lipids is included in Model 6. Further details on dioxin and the modeling strategy are found in Chapters 2 and 7 respectively.

Results of investigations for group-by-covariate and dioxin-by-covariate interactions are referenced in the text, and tabular results are presented in Appendix G-2. As described previously, additional analyses were performed when occupation or body fat was retained in the final model for Models 2 through 6. Results excluding occupation and body fat from these models are tabled in Appendix G-3, and dioxin-by-covariate interactions with occupation and body fat excluded from these models are presented in Appendix G-4. Results from analyses excluding occupation and body fat are discussed in the text only if a meaningful change in the results occurred (that is, changes between significant results, marginally significant results, and nonsignificant results).

Medical Records Variables: Historical Neurological Disorders

Inflammatory Diseases

The unadjusted Model 1 analyses showed that the percentage of participants with a history of inflammatory disease did not differ significantly between the Ranch Hand and Comparison groups, although the estimated relative risk was more than four (Table 11-3(a): $p=0.136$, Est. RR: 4.05, 95% C.I.=[0.82, 20.09]). There were eight participants with a history of inflammatory disease, six Ranch Hands and two Comparisons. Within each of the

occupational cohorts, Ranch Hands had a higher prevalence of inflammatory diseases than Comparisons, although these differences were not significant ($p > 0.38$ within each stratum). The adjusted Model 1 analyses were identical to the unadjusted analysis because no covariates were retained in the final model.

For Model 2, the unadjusted and adjusted analyses did not show a significant association between initial dioxin and inflammatory disease (Table 11-3(c,d): $p > 0.70$ for both analyses). The adjusted model contained the covariate age.

The unadjusted and adjusted Model 3 analyses did not reveal a significant contrast involving the Comparison group (Table 11-3(e,f): $p > 0.10$ for all contrasts) although a dose-response pattern was seen and the adjusted relative risk was nearly five for the high dioxin category (Table 11-3(f): $p=0.133$, Adj. RR=4.72, 95% C.I.=[0.62, 35.64]). The adjusted analysis included the covariate age. The percentages of participants with a history of inflammatory disease were 0.2 for the Comparison group and 0.3, 0.4, and 0.8 for Ranch Hands in the background, low, and high dioxin categories respectively.

Presented in Table 11-3(g,h), the unadjusted and adjusted results for Models 4 through 6 did not reveal a significant association between current dioxin and inflammatory disease ($p > 0.52$ for all analyses). Each of the adjusted analyses contained the covariate age.

Hereditary and Degenerative Diseases

The unadjusted and adjusted Model 1 analyses did not reveal a significant group difference in the percentage of participants with hereditary and degenerative diseases (Table 11-4(a,b): $p > 0.35$ for all contrasts). Age was retained in the final adjusted model.

The unadjusted Model 2 analysis did not reveal a significant association between initial dioxin and hereditary and degenerative diseases (Table 11-4(c): $p=0.712$). The initial dioxin-by-occupation interaction was significant in the adjusted analysis of Model 2 (Table 11-4(d): $p=0.028$). Appendix Table G-2-1 displays adjusted results stratified by occupation. In addition to the initial dioxin-by-occupation interaction, the adjusted analysis contained age and the lifetime alcohol history-by-insecticide interaction. The adjusted analysis did not detect a significant association between initial dioxin and hereditary diseases when the initial dioxin-by-occupation interaction was removed from the final model (Table 11-4(d): $p=0.379$).

For Model 3, the unadjusted and adjusted analyses did not show any of the Ranch Hand categories to be significantly different from the Comparison group in the percentages of participants with hereditary and degenerative diseases (Table 11-4(e,f): $p \geq 0.42$ for all contrasts). The final adjusted model included age, occupation, and lifetime alcohol history.

The unadjusted analyses for Models 4 and 5 did not find a significant association between current dioxin and hereditary and degenerative diseases (Table 11-4(g): $p > 0.14$ for both analyses). However, the unadjusted Model 6 analysis revealed a marginally significant inverse association between current dioxin and hereditary and degenerative diseases (Table 11-4(g): $p=0.096$, Est. RR=0.86, 95% C.I.=[0.72,1.03]).

Table 11-3.
Analysis of Inflammatory Diseases

a) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — UNADJUSTED

Occupational Category	Group	n	Percent Yes	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value
All	***Ranch Hand***	***947***	***0.6***	***4.05 (0.82,20.09)***	***0.136***
	Comparison	***1,271***	***0.2***		
Officer	Ranch Hand	367	0.5	2.72 (0.25,30.09)	0.792
	Comparison	497	0.2		
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	162	1.2	--	0.388
	Comparison	200	0.0		
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	418	0.5	2.76 (0.25,30.48)	0.782
	Comparison	574	0.2		

b) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — ADJUSTED

Occupational Category	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
All	***4.05 (0.82,20.09)***	***0.136***	
Officer	2.72 (0.25,30.09)	0.792	
Enlisted Flyer	--	0.388	
Enlisted Groundcrew	2.76 (0.25,30.48)	0.782	

--: Relative risk and confidence interval not presented due to the sparse number of abnormalities.

Table 11-3. (Continued)
Analysis of Inflammatory Diseases

c) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED				
Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics			**Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[a]**	
Initial Dioxin	**n**	**Percent Yes**	**Estimated Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]**	**p-Value**
Low	174	0.0	1.09 (0.51,2.35)	0.826
Medium	173	0.6		
High	169	1.2		

d) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — ADJUSTED			
Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[c]			
n	**Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]**	**p-Value**	**Covariate Remarks**
516	0.85 (0.35,2.03)	0.705	AGE (p=0.165)

[a] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in initial dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: Low = 39-98 ppt; Medium = >98-232 ppt; High = >232 ppt.

Table 11-3. (Continued)
Analysis of Inflammatory Diseases

e) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — UNADJUSTED				
Dioxin Category	n	Percent Yes	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ab]	p-Value
Comparison	1,054	0.2		
Background RH	373	0.3	1.14 (0.10,12.72)	0.916
Low RH	260	0.4	2.19 (0.20,24.61)	0.525
High RH	256	0.8	5.14 (0.70,37.90)	0.108
Low plus High RH	516	0.6	3.53 (0.57,21.74)	0.174

f) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — ADJUSTED				
Dioxin Category	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ac]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
Comparison	1,054			AGE (p=0.539)
Background RH	373	1.19 (0.11,13.33)	0.889	
Low RH	260	2.23 (0.20,24.93)	0.516	
High RH	256	4.72 (0.62,35.64)	0.133	
Low plus High RH	516	3.39 (0.55,20.96)	0.188	

[a] Relative risk and confidence interval relative to Comparisons.

[b] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: RH = Ranch Hand.
Comparison: Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Background (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Low (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, 10 ppt < Initial Dioxin ≤ 143 ppt.
High (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, Initial Dioxin > 143 ppt.

Table 11-3. (Continued)
Analysis of Inflammatory Diseases

g) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED					
	Current Dioxin Category Percent Yes/(n)			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)	
Model[a]	Low	Medium	High	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
4	0.3 (294)	0.3 (300)	0.7 (295)	1.20 (0.63,2.27)	0.586
5	0.3 (299)	0.3 (297)	0.7 (293)	1.14 (0.64,2.03)	0.654
6[c]	0.3 (298)	0.3 (297)	0.7 (293)	1.23 (0.66,2.27)	0.521

h) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — ADJUSTED				
	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)			
Model[a]	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
4	889	1.10 (0.57,2.10)	0.781	AGE (p=0.321)
5	889	1.06 (0.60,1.88)	0.833	AGE (p=0.306)
6[d]	888	1.13 (0.61,2.09)	0.706	AGE (p=0.347)

[a] Model 4: Log_2 (lipid-adjusted current dioxin + 1).
Model 5: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1).
Model 6: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1), adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in current dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[d] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids in addition to covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: Model 4: Low = ≤ 8.1 ppt; Medium = >8.1-20.5 ppt; High = >20.5 ppt.
Models 5 and 6: Low = ≤ 46 ppq; Medium = >46-128 ppq; High = >128 ppq.

Table 11-4.
Analysis of Hereditary and Degenerative Diseases

a) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — UNADJUSTED

Occupational Category	Group	n	Percent Yes	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value
All	***Ranch Hand***	***948***	***5.6***	***1.09 (0.75,1.58)***	***0.725***
	Comparison	***1,279***	***5.2***		
Officer	Ranch Hand	367	4.9	1.07 (0.57,2.01)	0.963
	Comparison	500	4.6		
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	162	5.6	0.74 (0.31,1.73)	0.624
	Comparison	203	7.4		
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	419	6.2	1.30 (0.75,2.24)	0.434
	Comparison	576	4.9		

b) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — ADJUSTED

Occupational Category	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value	Covariate Remarks[a]
All	***1.08 (0.75,1.57)***	***0.683***	AGE (p=0.009)
Officer	1.06 (0.56,1.99)	0.861	
Enlisted Flyer	0.73 (0.31,1.71)	0.465	
Enlisted Groundcrew	1.30 (0.75,2.25)	0.356	

[a] Covariates and associated p-values correspond to final model based on all participants with available data.

Table 11-4. (Continued)
Analysis of Hereditary and Degenerative Diseases

c) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED				
Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics			**Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[a]**	
Initial Dioxin	**n**	**Percent Yes**	**Estimated Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]**	**p-Value**
Low	174	6.9	0.95 (0.70,1.28)	0.712
Medium	173	4.0		
High	170	5.3		

d) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — ADJUSTED			
Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[c]			
n	**Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]**	**p-Value**	**Covariate Remarks**
504	0.85 (0.59,1.22)**	0.379**	INIT*OCC (p=0.028) AGE (p=0.168) DRKYR*INS (p=0.021)

[a] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in initial dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

** Log_2 (initial dioxin)-by-covariate interaction ($0.01 < p \leq 0.05$); adjusted relative risk, confidence interval, and p-value derived from a model fitted after deletion of this interaction; refer to Appendix Table G-2-1 for further analysis of this interaction.

Note: Low = 39-98 ppt; Medium = >98-232 ppt; High = >232 ppt.
INIT = Log_2 (initial dioxin).

Table 11-4. (Continued)
Analysis of Hereditary and Degenerative Diseases

e) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — UNADJUSTED				
Dioxin Category	n	Percent Yes	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ab]	p-Value
Comparison	1,061	5.6		
Background RH	373	6.4	1.10 (0.67,1.80)	0.714
Low RH	260	5.8	1.09 (0.61,1.95)	0.778
High RH	257	5.1	0.94 (0.51,1.75)	0.846
Low plus High RH	517	5.4	1.01 (0.64,1.62)	0.952

f) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — ADJUSTED				
Dioxin Category	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ac]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
Comparison	1,043			AGE (p=0.003) OCC (p=0.120) DRKYR (p=0.137)
Background RH	366	1.19 (0.72,1.99)	0.498	
Low RH	254	1.00 (0.55,1.83)	0.997	
High RH	250	0.76 (0.38,1.49)	0.420	
Low plus High RH	504	0.88 (0.54,1.44)	0.606	

[a] Relative risk and confidence interval relative to Comparisons.

[b] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: RH = Ranch Hand.
Comparison: Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Background (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Low (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, 10 ppt < Initial Dioxin ≤ 143 ppt.
High (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, Initial Dioxin > 143 ppt.

Table 11-4. (Continued)
Analysis of Hereditary and Degenerative Diseases

g) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED

Model[a]	Current Dioxin Category Percent Yes/(n) Low	Medium	High	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1) Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
4	7.5 (294)	5.0 (300)	5.1 (296)	0.86 (0.70,1.06)	0.145
5	7.0 (299)	5.1 (297)	5.4 (294)	0.89 (0.75,1.04)	0.148
6[c]	7.0 (298)	5.1 (297)	5.4 (294)	0.86 (0.72,1.03)	0.096

h) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — ADJUSTED

Model[a]	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1) n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
4	889	0.79 (0.63,0.98)	0.030	AGE (p=0.923) OCC*DIAB (p=0.027)
5	889	0.83 (0.70,0.98)	0.033	AGE (p=0.898) OCC*DIAB (p=0.026)
6[d]	868	0.76 (0.62,0.93)	0.009	AGE (p=0.390) OCC*DRKYR (p=0.003) DIAB*DRKYR (p=0.003) OCC*DIAB (p=0.005)

[a] Model 4: Log_2 (lipid-adjusted current dioxin + 1).
Model 5: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1).
Model 6: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1), adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in current dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[d] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids in addition to covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: Model 4: Low = ≤ 8.1 ppt; Medium = >8.1-20.5 ppt; High = >20.5 ppt.
Models 5 and 6: Low = ≤ 46 ppq; Medium = >46-128 ppq; High = >128 ppq.

The adjusted results for Models 4 through 6 differed from the unadjusted results in that each of the adjusted analyses revealed a significant inverse association between current dioxin and hereditary and degenerative diseases (Table 11-4(h): $p=0.030$, Adj. RR=0.79, 95% C.I.=[0.63,0.98] for Model 4; $p=0.033$, Adj. RR=0.83, 95% C.I.=[0.70,0.98] for Model 5; and $p=0.009$, Adj. RR=0.76, 95% C.I.=[0.62,0.93] for Model 6). The adjusted analyses for Models 4 and 5 contained the covariate age and the occupation-by-diabetic class interaction. The Model 6 adjusted analysis included the covariate age and three covariate-by-covariate interactions: occupation-by-lifetime alcohol history, diabetic class-by-lifetime alcohol history, and occupation-by-diabetic class.

Without occupation and diabetic class, the adjusted results resembled the unadjusted results. The analyses for Models 4 and 5 did not find a significant association between current dioxin and hereditary and degenerative diseases (Appendix Table G-3-1(c): $p>0.16$ for both analyses); however, the Model 6 analysis revealed a marginally significant inverse association between current dioxin and hereditary and degenerative diseases (Appendix Table G-3-1(c): $p=0.069$, Adj. RR=0.84, 95% C.I.=[0.70,1.01]).

Peripheral Disorders

The unadjusted and adjusted Model 1 analyses did not reveal a significant group difference in the percentage of peripheral disorders (Table 11-5(a,b): $p>0.34$ for all contrasts). The adjusted analysis contained the covariates diabetic class, insecticide exposure, and degreasing chemical exposure, and an age-by-occupation interaction.

In Model 2, the unadjusted and adjusted analyses did not reveal a significant association between initial dioxin and peripheral disorders (Table 11-5(c,d): $p>0.53$ for both analyses). The final adjusted model contained the covariates age, race, and diabetic class.

The unadjusted and adjusted analyses for Model 3 did not reveal a significant difference between any of the Ranch Hand categories and the Comparison group (Table 11-5(e,f): $p>0.47$ for all contrasts). The adjusted analysis included diabetic class, degreasing chemical exposure, and two covariate-by-covariate interactions: age-by-occupation and age-by-insecticide exposure.

The unadjusted results for Models 4 through 6 did not reveal a significant association between current dioxin and peripheral disorders (Table 11-5(g): $p>0.25$ for all analyses). Each of the adjusted analyses for Models 4 through 6 contained a significant interaction between current dioxin and lifetime alcohol history (Table 11-5(h): $p=0.017$, $p=0.025$, and $p=0.040$ for Models 4, 5, and 6 respectively). Appendix Table G-2-2 presents adjusted results stratified by lifetime alcohol history for Models 4 through 6. In addition to the current dioxin-by-lifetime alcohol history interaction, each of the adjusted analyses included race, diabetic class, insecticide exposure, and an age-by-occupation interaction. Without the current dioxin-by-lifetime alcohol history interaction, none of the adjusted analyses for Models 4 through 6 detected a significant association between current dioxin and peripheral disorders (Table 11-5(h): $p>0.20$ for all analyses).

Table 11-5.
Analysis of Peripheral Disorders

a) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — UNADJUSTED

Occupational Category	Group	n	Percent Yes	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value
All	***Ranch Hand***	***945***	***16.9***	***1.08 (0.86,1.35)***	***0.552***
	Comparison	***1,277***	***15.9***		
Officer	Ranch Hand	366	18.3	1.21 (0.85,1.73)	0.343
	Comparison	499	15.6		
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	161	18.0	1.05 (0.61,1.80)	0.975
	Comparison	202	17.3		
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	418	15.3	0.98 (0.69,1.38)	0.963
	Comparison	576	15.6		

b) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — ADJUSTED

Occupational Category	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value	Covariate Remarks[a]
All	***1.01 (0.80,1.28)***	***0.923***	DIAB (p=0.002) INS (p=0.006) DC (p=0.033) AGE*OCC (p=0.015)
Officer	1.15 (0.79,1.67)	0.455	
Enlisted Flyer	0.95 (0.55,1.64)	0.850	
Enlisted Groundcrew	0.92 (0.65,1.32)	0.663	

[a] Covariates and associated p-values correspond to final model based on all participants with available data.

Table 11-5. (Continued)
Analysis of Peripheral Disorders

c) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED				
Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics			**Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[a]**	
Initial Dioxin	**n**	**Percent Yes**	**Estimated Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]**	**p-Value**
Low	174	17.8	1.04 (0.88,1.23)	0.673
Medium	173	17.9		
High	170	18.8		

d) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — ADJUSTED			
Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[c]			
n	**Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]**	**p-Value**	**Covariate Remarks**
517	1.06 (0.88,1.27)	0.531	AGE (p=0.288) RACE (p=0.072) DIAB (p=0.009)

[a] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in initial dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: Low = 39-98 ppt; Medium = >98-232 ppt; High = >232 ppt.

Table 11-5. (Continued)
Analysis of Peripheral Disorders

e) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — UNADJUSTED

Dioxin Category	n	Percent Yes	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ab]	p-Value
Comparison	1,059	16.7		
Background RH	370	16.2	0.99 (0.72,1.37)	0.947
Low RH	260	18.8	1.14 (0.80,1.62)	0.472
High RH	257	17.5	1.04 (0.72,1.49)	0.837
Low plus High RH	517	18.2	1.09 (0.82,1.44)	0.550

f) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — ADJUSTED

Dioxin Category	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ac]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
Comparison	1,058			DIAB ($p<0.001$) DC ($p=0.086$) AGE*OCC ($p=0.001$) AGE*INS ($p=0.035$)
Background RH	369	0.93 (0.66,1.30)	0.662	
Low RH	260	0.97 (0.68,1.40)	0.881	
High RH	257	1.04 (0.71,1.53)	0.824	
Low plus High RH	517	1.01 (0.75,1.34)	0.971	

[a] Relative risk and confidence interval relative to Comparisons.

[b] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: RH = Ranch Hand.
Comparison: Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Background (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Low (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, 10 ppt < Initial Dioxin ≤ 143 ppt.
High (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, Initial Dioxin > 143 ppt.

Table 11-5. (Continued)
Analysis of Peripheral Disorders

g) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED

Model[a]	Current Dioxin Category Percent Yes/(n) Low	Medium	High	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1) Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
4	13.0 (292)	21.1 (299)	17.9 (296)	1.07 (0.95,1.21)	0.253
5	13.5 (296)	19.9 (297)	18.7 (294)	1.06 (0.95,1.17)	0.294
6[c]	13.5 (296)	19.9 (297)	18.7 (294)	1.06 (0.95,1.19)	0.286

h) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — ADJUSTED

Model[a]	n	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1) Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
4	866	1.10 (0.95,1.28)**	0.204**	CURR*DRKYR (p=0.017) RACE (p=0.120) DIAB (p=0.045) INS (p=0.041) AGE*OCC (p=0.001)
5	866	1.07 (0.94,1.21)**	0.311**	CURR*DRKYR (p=0.025) RACE (p=0.120) DIAB (p=0.049) INS (p=0.040) AGE*OCC (p<0.001)
6[d]	866	1.09 (0.95,1.25)**	0.202**	CURR*DRKYR (p=0.040) RACE (p=0.110) DIAB (p=0.040) INS (p=0.040) AGE*OCC (p<0.001)

[a] Model 4: Log_2 (lipid-adjusted current dioxin + 1).
Model 5: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1).
Model 6: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1), adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in current dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[d] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids in addition to covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

** Log_2 (current dioxin + 1)-by-covariate interaction ($0.01 < p \leq 0.05$); adjusted relative risk, confidence interval, and p-value derived from a model fitted after deletion of this interaction; refer to Appendix Table G-2-2 for further analysis of this interaction.

Note: Model 4: Low = ≤ 8.1 ppt; Medium = >8.1-20.5 ppt; High = >20.5 ppt.
Models 5 and 6: Low = ≤ 46 ppq; Medium = >46-128 ppq; High = >128 ppq.
CURR = Log_2 (current dioxin + 1).

The adjusted results for Models 4 through 6 changed substantially when occupation and diabetic class were removed from each of the final models. Without these covariates and without the current dioxin-by-lifetime alcohol history interaction, each of the adjusted models detected a significant positive association between current dioxin and peripheral disorders (Appendix Table G-3-2(c): p=0.024, Adj. RR=1.16, 95% C.I.=[1.02,1.31]; p=0.043, Adj. RR=1.12, 95% C.I.=[1.00,1.25]; and p=0.027, Adj. RR=1.14, 95% C.I.=[1.01,1.29] for Models 4, 5, and 6 respectively).

Other Neurological Disorders

The unadjusted and adjusted Model 1 analyses did not find a significant group difference in the percentage of participants with other neurological disorders (Table 11-6(a,b): $p>0.22$ for all contrasts). The final adjusted model contained the covariates age, race, and occupation.

For Model 2, the unadjusted and adjusted analyses did not reveal a significant association between initial dioxin and other neurological disorders (Table 11-6(c,d): $p>0.32$ for both analyses). Age and occupation were retained in the adjusted analysis. When occupation was removed from the final model, a significant positive association was found between other neurological disorders and initial dioxin (Appendix Table G-3-3(a): p=0.022, Adj. RR=1.21, 95% C.I.=[1.03,1.42]).

The unadjusted Model 3 analysis of other neurological disorders found a significant difference between the high Ranch Hands and Comparisons: (Table 11-6(e): p=0.040, Est. RR=1.40, 95% C.I.=[1.01,1.92]). The percentage of other neurological disorders was higher for the high Ranch Hands than for the Comparisons (26.1% versus 20.4%). The low plus high Ranch Hand versus Comparison contrast was marginally significant (p=0.055), Adj. RR=1.28, 95% C.I.=[0.99,1.65]). After adjusting for age, race, and occupation, the adjusted analysis did not show any of the Ranch Hands categories to be significantly different from the Comparison group (Table 11-6(f): $p>0.50$ for all contrasts).

The adjusted results changed when occupation was removed from the final model. Without occupation, the adjusted analysis detected a marginally significant difference for the background Ranch Hands, and a significant difference for the high Ranch Hands and the low plus high Ranch Hands. The adjusted relative risk was less than 1.00 for the background Ranch Hands and greater than 1.00 for the high Ranch Hands and the low plus high Ranch Hands (Appendix Table G-3-3(b): p=0.061, Adj. RR=0.74, 95% C.I.=[0.53,1.01]; p=0.002, Adj. RR=1.69, 95% C.I.=[1.21,2.36]; and p=0.034, Adj. RR=1.32, 95% C.I.=[1.02,1.71] for the background Ranch Hands, high Ranch Hands, and low plus high Ranch Hands respectively).

The unadjusted analyses for Models 4 and 6 detected a significant positive association between current dioxin and other neurological disorders (Table 11-6(g): p=0.022, Est. RR=1.14, 95% C.I.=[1.02,1.27] and p=0.011, Est. RR=1.14, 95% C.I.=[1.03,1.27] for Models 4 and 6 respectively). For Model 5, the unadjusted analysis revealed a marginally significant association between current dioxin and other neurological disorders (Table 11-6(g): p=0.070, Est. RR=1.09, 95% C.I.=[0.99,1.20]).

Table 11-6.
Analysis of Other Neurological Disorders

a) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — UNADJUSTED					
Occupational Category	**Group**	**n**	**Percent Yes**	**Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**
All	***Ranch Hand***	***944***	***21.2***	***1.14 (0.92,1.40)***	***0.258***
	Comparison	***1,274***	***19.2***		
Officer	Ranch Hand	365	8.5	1.04 (0.64,1.69)	0.976
	Comparison	500	8.2		
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	162	31.5	1.09 (0.70,1.70)	0.801
	Comparison	202	29.7		
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	417	28.3	1.18 (0.89,1.57)	0.276
	Comparison	572	25.0		

b) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — ADJUSTED			
Occupational Category	**Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**	**Covariate Remarks[a]**
All	***1.14 (0.91,1.43)***	***0.269***	AGE ($p<0.001$) RACE ($p=0.011$) OCC ($p<0.001$)
Officer	1.04 (0.63,1.70)	0.891	
Enlisted Flyer	1.07 (0.67,1.70)	0.779	
Enlisted Groundcrew	1.21 (0.89,1.63)	0.223	

[a] Covariates and associated p-values correspond to final model based on all participants with available data.

Table 11-6. (Continued)
Analysis of Other Neurological Disorders

c) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED				
Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics			**Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[a]**	
Initial Dioxin	**n**	**Percent Yes**	**Estimated Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]**	**p-Value**
Low	174	21.3	1.08 (0.93,1.25)	0.323
Medium	172	27.3		
High	170	25.9		

d) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — ADJUSTED			
Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[c]			
n	**Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]**	**p-Value**	**Covariate Remarks**
516	0.96 (0.80,1.15)	0.649	AGE ($p<0.001$) OCC ($p<0.001$)

[a] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in initial dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: Low = 39-98 ppt; Medium = >98-232 ppt; High = >232 ppt.

Table 11-6. (Continued)
Analysis of Other Neurological Disorders

e) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — UNADJUSTED				
Dioxin Category	n	Percent Yes	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ab]	p-Value
Comparison	1,056	20.4		
Background RH	370	16.8	0.79 (0.57,1.08)	0.132
Low RH	259	23.6	1.17 (0.85,1.62)	0.339
High RH	257	26.1	1.40 (1.01,1.92)	0.040
Low plus High RH	516	24.8	1.28 (0.99,1.65)	0.055

f) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — ADJUSTED				
Dioxin Category	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ac]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
Comparison	1,056			AGE ($p<0.001$) RACE ($p=0.002$) OCC ($p<0.001$)
Background RH	370	1.13 (0.79,1.60)	0.506	
Low RH	259	1.09 (0.76,1.55)	0.649	
High RH	257	1.02 (0.72,1.45)	0.902	
Low plus High RH	516	1.05 (0.80,1.38)	0.714	

[a] Relative risk and confidence interval relative to Comparisons.

[b] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: RH = Ranch Hand.
Comparison: Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Background (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Low (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, 10 ppt < Initial Dioxin ≤ 143 ppt.
High (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, Initial Dioxin > 143 ppt.

Table 11-6. (Continued)
Analysis of Other Neurological Disorders

g) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED					
	Current Dioxin Category Percent Yes/(n)			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)	
Model[a]	Low	Medium	High	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
4	16.1 (292)	20.7 (299)	27.5 (295)	1.14 (1.02,1.27)	0.022
5	16.5 (297)	23.3 (296)	24.6 (293)	1.09 (0.99,1.20)	0.070
6[c]	16.2 (296)	23.3 (296)	24.6 (293)	1.14 (1.03,1.27)	0.011

h) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — ADJUSTED				
	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)			
Model[a]	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
4	886	0.96 (0.84,1.09)	0.547	AGE ($p<0.001$) RACE ($p=0.009$) OCC ($p<0.001$)
5	886	0.94 (0.84,1.05)	0.268	AGE ($p<0.001$) RACE ($p=0.010$) OCC ($p<0.001$)
6[d]	885	0.99 (0.88,1.11)	0.834	AGE ($p<0.001$) RACE ($p=0.015$) OCC ($p<0.001$)

[a] Model 4: Log_2 (lipid-adjusted current dioxin + 1).
Model 5: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1).
Model 6: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1), adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in current dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[d] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids in addition to covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: Model 4: Low = ≤ 8.1 ppt; Medium = >8.1-20.5 ppt; High = >20.5 ppt.
Models 5 and 6: Low = ≤ 46 ppq; Medium = >46-128 ppq; High = >128 ppq.

By contrast, the adjusted analyses for Models 4 through 6 did not show a significant association between current dioxin and other neurological disorders (Table 11-6(h): $p>0.26$ for all analyses). Each of the adjusted analyses for Models 4 through 6 contained the covariates age, race, and occupation.

The adjusted results changed after occupation was removed from each of the final models. Without occupation in the models, each of the adjusted analyses for Models 4 through 6 revealed a significant association between current dioxin and other neurological disorders (Appendix Table G-3-3(c): $p<0.001$, Adj. RR=1.24, 95% C.I.=[1.10,1.39]; $p=0.003$, Adj. RR=1.17, 95% C.I.=[1.05,1.29]; and $p=0.001$, Adj. RR=1.24, 95% C.I.=[1.11,1.39] for Models 4, 5, and 6 respectively).

Physical Examination Variables: Cranial Nerve Function

Smell

The unadjusted and adjusted Model 1 analyses of smell did not find a significant group difference in the percentage of smell abnormalities (Table 11-7(a,b): $p>0.26$ for all contrasts). The covariate age was included in the final adjusted model.

The unadjusted results for Model 2 did not reveal a significant association between initial dioxin and smell (Table 11-7(c): $p=0.341$). Because no covariates were retained in the final model, the unadjusted and adjusted results were the same.

For Model 3, the unadjusted analysis of smell did not show any of the Ranch Hand categories to be significantly different from the Comparison group (Table 11-7(e): $p>0.22$ for all contrasts). The adjusted Model 3 analysis contained a significant interaction between categorized dioxin and insecticide exposure (Table 11-7(f): $p=0.006$). Appendix Table G-2-3 displays adjusted results stratified by insecticide exposure. The adjusted analysis also included the covariate age. Without the categorized dioxin-by-insecticide exposure, the adjusted analysis did not reveal any significant contrasts involving the Comparison group (Table 11-7(f): $p>0.25$ for all contrasts).

The unadjusted analyses for Models 4 through 6 revealed a significant inverse association between current dioxin and smell (Table 11-7(g): $p=0.018$, Est. RR=0.61, 95% C.I.=[0.39,0.93]; $p=0.015$, Est. RR=0.69, 95% C.I.=[0.52,0.91]; and $p=0.019$, Est. RR=0.68, 95% C.I.=[0.50,0.92] for Models 4, 5, and 6 respectively). None of the adjusted analyses for Models 4, 5, and 6 retained any covariates; therefore, the adjusted results were identical to the unadjusted results for each of these models.

Visual Fields

The unadjusted Model 1 analysis did not detect a significant group difference in the percentage of visual field abnormalities (Table 11-8(a): $p>0.61$ for all contrasts). No covariates were retained in the final model; therefore, the adjusted and unadjusted results were identical.

Table 11-7.
Analysis of Smell

a) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — UNADJUSTED					
Occupational Category	**Group**	**n**	**Percent Abnormal**	**Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**
All	***Ranch Hand***	***948***	***1.5***	***1.11 (0.55,2.27)***	***0.910***
	Comparison	***1,280***	***1.3***		
Officer	Ranch Hand	367	1.1	0.60 (0.18,1.97)	0.573
	Comparison	501	1.8		
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	162	1.9	1.26 (0.25,6.32)	0.999
	Comparison	203	1.5		
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	419	1.7	1.94 (0.61,6.16)	0.395
	Comparison	576	0.9		

b) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — ADJUSTED			
Occupational Category	**Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**	**Covariate Remarks[a]**
All	***1.10 (0.54,2.25)***	***0.790***	AGE (p=0.017)
Officer	0.59 (0.18,1.95)	0.391	
Enlisted Flyer	1.24 (0.25,6.22)	0.797	
Enlisted Groundcrew	1.94 (0.61,6.16)	0.262	

[a] Covariates and associated p-values correspond to final model based on all participants with available data.

Table 11-7. (Continued)
Analysis of Smell

c) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED				
Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics			**Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[a]**	
Initial Dioxin	**n**	**Percent Abnormal**	**Estimated Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]**	**p-Value**
Low	174	1.7	0.69 (0.31,1.55)	0.341
Medium	173	0.6		
High	170	0.6		

d) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — ADJUSTED			
Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[a]			
n	**Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]**	**p-Value**	**Covariate Remarks**
517	0.69 (0.31,1.55)	0.341	

[a] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in initial dioxin.

Note: Low = 39-98 ppt; Medium = >98-232 ppt; High = >232 ppt.

Table 11-7. (Continued)
Analysis of Smell

e) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — UNADJUSTED				
Dioxin Category	n	Percent Abnormal	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ab]	p-Value
Comparison	1,062	1.3		
Background RH	373	2.1	1.70 (0.70,4.12)	0.243
Low RH	260	1.5	1.15 (0.37,3.53)	0.807
High RH	257	0.4	0.28 (0.04,2.18)	0.227
Low plus High RH	517	1.0	0.72 (0.26,2.01)	0.526

f) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — ADJUSTED				
Dioxin Category	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ac]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
Comparison	1,062			DXCAT*INS (p=0.006) AGE (p=0.082)
Background RH	373	1.49 (0.61,3.65)**	0.379**	
Low RH	260	1.00 (0.32,3.09)**	0.996**	
High RH	257	0.31 (0.04,2.37)**	0.257**	
Low plus High RH	517	0.69 (0.24,1.95)**	0.482**	

[a] Relative risk and confidence interval relative to Comparisons.

[b] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

** Categorized dioxin-by-covariate interaction ($p \leq 0.05$); adjusted relative risk, confidence interval, and p-value derived from a model fitted after deletion of this interaction; refer to Appendix Table G-2-3 for further analysis of this interaction.

Note: RH = Ranch Hand.
Comparison: Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Background (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Low (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, 10 ppt < Initial Dioxin ≤ 143 ppt.
High (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, Initial Dioxin > 143 ppt.
DXCAT = Categorized Dioxin.

Table 11-7. (Continued)
Analysis of Smell

g) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED					
	Current Dioxin Category Percent Abnormal/(n)			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)	
Model[a]	Low	Medium	High	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
4	2.4 (294)	1.7 (300)	0.3 (296)	0.61 (0.39,0.93)	0.018
5	2.3 (299)	1.7 (297)	0.3 (294)	0.69 (0.52,0.91)	0.015
6[c]	2.3 (298)	1.7 (297)	0.3 (294)	0.68 (0.50,0.92)	0.019

h) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — ADJUSTED				
	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)			
Model[a]	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
4	890	0.61 (0.39,0.93)	0.018	
5	890	0.69 (0.52,0.91)	0.015	
6[c]	889	0.68 (0.50,0.92)	0.019	

[a] Model 4: Log_2 (lipid-adjusted current dioxin + 1).
Model 5: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1).
Model 6: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1), adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in current dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

Note: Model 4: Low = ≤ 8.1 ppt; Medium = >8.1-20.5 ppt; High = >20.5 ppt.
Models 5 and 6: Low = ≤ 46 ppq; Medium = >46-128 ppq; High = >128 ppq.

Table 11-8.
Analysis of Visual Fields

a) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — UNADJUSTED

Occupational Category	Group	n	Percent Abnormal	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value
All	***Ranch Hand***	***946***	***0.1***	***0.45 (0.05,4.32)***	***0.837***
	Comparison	***1,276***	***0.2***		
Officer	Ranch Hand	367	0.0	--	0.619
	Comparison	500	0.4		
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	162	0.0	--	--
	Comparison	203	0.0		
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	417	0.2	1.38 (0.09,22.05)	0.999
	Comparison	573	0.2		

b) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — ADJUSTED

Occupational Category	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
All	***0.45 (0.05,4.32)***	***0.837***	
Officer	--	0.619	
Enlisted Flyer	--	--	
Enlisted Groundcrew	1.38 (0.09,22.05)	0.999	

--: Relative risk, confidence interval, and p-value not presented due to the sparse number of abnormalities.

Table 11-8. (Continued)
Analysis of Visual Fields

c) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED				
Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)	
Initial Dioxin	n	Percent Abnormal	Estimated Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value
Low	174	0.0	--	--
Medium	173	0.0		
High	169	0.0		

d) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — ADJUSTED			
Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)			
n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
--	--	--	

--: Analysis not conducted due to the sparse number of abnormalities.

Note: Low = 39-98 ppt; Medium = >98-232 ppt; High = >232 ppt.

Table 11-8. (Continued)
Analysis of Visual Fields

e) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — UNADJUSTED				
Dioxin Category	n	Percent Abnormal	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value
Comparison	1,058	0.1		
Background RH	372	0.3	--	--
Low RH	260	0.0	--	--
High RH	256	0.0	--	--
Low plus High RH	516	0.0	--	--

f) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — ADJUSTED				
Dioxin Category	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
Comparison	--			
Background RH	--	--	--	
Low RH	--	--	--	
High RH	--	--	--	
Low plus High RH	--	--	--	

--: Analysis not conducted due to the sparse number of abnormalities.

Note: RH = Ranch Hand.
Comparison: Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Background (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Low (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, 10 ppt < Initial Dioxin ≤ 143 ppt.
High (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, Initial Dioxin > 143 ppt.

Table 11-8. (Continued)
Analysis of Visual Fields

g) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED					
	Current Dioxin Category Percent Abnormal/(n)			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)	
Model[a]	Low	Medium	High	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value
4	0.3 (293)	0.0 (300)	0.0 (295)	--	--
5	0.3 (298)	0.0 (297)	0.0 (293)	--	--
6	0.3 (297)	0.0 (297)	0.0 (293)	--	--

h) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — ADJUSTED				
	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)			
Model[a]	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
4	--	--	--	
5	--	--	--	
6	--	--	--	

[a] Model 4: Log_2 (lipid-adjusted current dioxin + 1).
Model 5: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1).
Model 6: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1), adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

--: Analysis not conducted due to the sparse number of abnormalities.

Note: Model 4: Low = ≤ 8.1 ppt; Medium = >8.1-20.5 ppt; High = >20.5 ppt.
Models 5 and 6: Low = ≤ 46 ppq; Medium = >46-128 ppq; High = >128 ppq.

Statistical analyses were not conducted for Models 2 through 6 due to the sparse number of abnormalities. There were no abnormalities in the Model 2 analysis. For Model 3, the background Ranch Hand category and Comparison group each contained one abnormality. There were no abnormalities in the low Ranch Hand and high Ranch Hand categories. Each of the analyses for Models 4 through 6 included only one abnormal participant. The participant in each analysis was in the low current dioxin category. Table 11-8(c,e,g) presents frequencies and percentages of abnormalities for these models.

Light Reaction

The unadjusted Model 1 analysis did not reveal a significant overall group difference in the percentage of light reaction abnormalities (Table 11-9(a): $p=0.433$). However, stratifying the unadjusted analysis by occupation revealed a marginally significant group difference within the enlisted groundcrew stratum (Table 11-9(a): $p=0.066$). Of the enlisted groundcrew, four Ranch Hands had light reaction abnormalities whereas none of the enlisted groundcrew Comparisons displayed light reaction abnormalities.

The adjusted Model 1 analysis did not show the percentage of light reaction abnormalities to be significantly different between the Ranch Hands and Comparisons (Table 11-9(b): $p>0.255$ for all contrasts). For the enlisted groundcrew, a relative risk and p-value were not calculated because no Comparisons experienced an abnormal light reaction. The final adjusted model contained diabetic class.

The unadjusted Model 2 results did not reveal a significant association between initial dioxin and light reaction even though the estimated relative risk was 1.43 for a twofold increase in initial dioxin (Table 11-9(c): $p=0.384$). Only four individuals in the Model 2 analysis displayed light reaction abnormalities. Two of those four participants had a high initial dioxin level. The adjusted results for Model 2 were identical to the unadjusted findings because no covariates were retained in the final model.

The unadjusted Model 3 analysis of light reaction abnormalities revealed a marginally significant difference between the low plus high Ranch Hand category and the Comparisons group (Table 11-9(e): $p=0.061$, Est. RR=5.18, 95% C.I.=[0.93,28.94]. The percentages of abnormalities for the low plus high Ranch Hand category and the Comparison group were 0.8 percent and 0.2 percent respectively. The estimated relative risks for the low Ranch Hands and the high Ranch Hands exceeded five but were not significant (Table 11-9(e): $p>0.10$ for both contrasts). The adjusted and unadjusted results were identical because no covariates were retained in the final model.

The unadjusted analyses for Models 4 through 6 did not reveal a significant association between current dioxin and light reaction even though each of the estimated relative risks for a twofold increase in current dioxin was greater than or equal to 1.30 (Table 11-9(g): $p>0.22$ for all analyses). Only five participants displayed abnormal light reactions in the analyses of Models 4 through 6. Three of the five abnormal participants had a high current dioxin level in each of the models. For Models 4 through 6, the adjusted analysis did not differ from the unadjusted analysis because no covariates were retained in the final model.

Table 11-9.
Analysis of Light Reaction

a) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — UNADJUSTED					
Occupational Category	**Group**	**n**	**Percent Abnormal**	**Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**
All	***Ranch Hand***	***947***	***0.5***	***2.26 (0.54,9,47)***	***0.433***
	Comparison	***1,278***	***0.2***		
Officer	Ranch Hand	367	0.3	0.68 (0.06,7.54)	0.999
	Comparison	501	0.4		
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	162	0.0	--	0.999
	Comparison	203	0.5		
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	418	1.0	--	0.066
	Comparison	574	0.0		

b) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — ADJUSTED			
Occupational Category	**Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**	**Covariate Remarks[a]**
All	***2.27 (0.54,9.50)***	***0.255***	DIAB (p=0.140)
Officer	0.64 (0.06,7.14)	0.720	
Enlisted Flyer	--	--	
Enlisted Groundcrew	--	--	

[a] Covariates and associated p-values correspond to final model based on all participants with available data.

--: Relative risk, confidence interval, and p-value not presented due to the sparse number of abnormalities.

Table 11-9. (Continued)
Analysis of Light Reaction

c) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED				
Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[a]	
Initial Dioxin	n	Percent Abnormal	Estimated Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
Low	174	0.6	1.43 (0.64,3.20)	0.384
Medium	173	0.6		
High	170	1.2		

d) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — ADJUSTED			
Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[a]			
n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
517	1.43 (0.64,3.20)	0.384	

[a] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in initial dioxin.

Note: Low = 39-98 ppt; Medium = >98-232 ppt; High = >232 ppt.

Table 11-9. (Continued)
Analysis of Light Reaction

e) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — UNADJUSTED				
Dioxin Category	n	Percent Abnormal	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ab]	p-Value
Comparison	1,060	0.2		
Background RH	372	0.3	1.07 (0.10,11.97)	0.956
Low RH	260	0.8	5.05 (0.70,36.61)	0.109
High RH	257	0.8	5.31 (0.72,39.12)	0.101
Low plus High RH	517	0.8	5.18 (0.93,28.94)	0.061

f) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — ADJUSTED				
Dioxin Category	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ab]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
Comparison	1,060			
Background RH	372	1.07 (0.10,11.97)	0.956	
Low RH	260	5.05 (0.70,36.61)	0.109	
High RH	257	5.31 (0.72,39.12)	0.101	
Low plus High RH	517	5.18 (0.93,28.94)	0.061	

[a] Relative risk and confidence interval relative to Comparisons.

[b] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

Note: RH = Ranch Hand.
Comparison: Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Background (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Low (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, 10 ppt < Initial Dioxin ≤ 143 ppt.
High (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, Initial Dioxin > 143 ppt.

Table 11-9. (Continued)
Analysis of Light Reaction

g) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED

Model[a]	Current Dioxin Category Percent Abnormal/(n) Low	Medium	High	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1) Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
4	0.3 (293)	0.3 (300)	1.0 (296)	1.38 (0.80,2.39)	0.260
5	0.3 (298)	0.3 (297)	1.0 (294)	1.37 (0.83,2.26)	0.221
6[c]	0.3 (297)	0.3 (297)	1.0 (294)	1.30 (0.76,2.23)	0.346

h) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — ADJUSTED

Model[a]	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1) n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
4	889	1.38 (0.80,2.39)	0.260	
5	889	1.37 (0.83,2.26)	0.221	
6[c]	888	1.30 (0.76,2.23)	0.346	

[a] Model 4: Log_2 (lipid-adjusted current dioxin + 1).
Model 5: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1).
Model 6: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1), adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in current dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

Note: Model 4: Low = ≤ 8.1 ppt; Medium = >8.1-20.5 ppt; High = >20.5 ppt.
Models 5 and 6: Low = ≤ 46 ppq; Medium = >46-128 ppq; High = >128 ppq.

Ocular Movement

The unadjusted and adjusted Model 1 analyses did not reveal a significant group difference in the percentage of ocular movement abnormalities (Table 11-10(a,b): $p > 0.42$ for all contrasts). The final adjusted model contained the covariate age.

The unadjusted and adjusted Model 2 results did not detect a significant association between initial dioxin and ocular movement (Table 11-10(c,d), $p > 0.54$ for both analyses). The adjusted analysis contained the covariate insecticide exposure.

For Model 3, the unadjusted analysis of ocular movement did not show any of the Ranch Hand categories to differ significantly from the Comparison group (Table 11-10(e): $p > 0.23$ for all contrasts). The adjusted and unadjusted analyses were identical because no covariates were retained in the final model.

The unadjusted and adjusted analyses for Models 4 through 6 did not reveal a significant association between current dioxin and ocular movement (Table 11-10(g,h): $p > 0.73$ for all analyses). Each of the adjusted models contained the covariate insecticide exposure.

Facial Sensation

The unadjusted and adjusted Model 1 analyses did not show a significant group difference in the percentage of facial sensation abnormalities (Table 11-11(a,b): $p > 0.14$ for all contrasts). No covariates were retained in the adjusted analysis.

For Model 2, the unadjusted analysis did not reveal a significant association between initial dioxin and facial sensation even though the estimated relative risk for a twofold increase in initial dioxin was 1.53 (Table 11-11(c): $p = 0.382$). Only two participants displayed facial sensation abnormalities and both had a high initial dioxin level. The adjusted analysis was not performed due to the sparse number of abnormalities.

The unadjusted Model 3 analysis of facial sensation detected a marginally significant difference between the high Ranch Hands and the Comparisons (Table 11-11(e): $p = 0.076$ from Fisher's exact test). Two of the high Ranch Hands had facial sensation abnormalities whereas none of the Comparisons displayed facial sensation abnormalities. Due to the sparse number of abnormalities, the adjusted Model 3 analysis was not conducted.

For Models 4 through 6, the unadjusted analyses did not find a significant association between current dioxin and facial sensation (Table 11-11(g): $p > 0.24$ for all analyses), although the estimated relative risk for a twofold increase in current dioxin was greater than or equal to 1.47 for each model. Three individuals displayed facial sensation abnormalities in Models 4, 5, and 6. Of the three, two were in the high current dioxin category and the other was in the medium current dioxin category. No covariates were retained in the adjusted analysis.

Table 11-10.
Analysis of Ocular Movement

a) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — UNADJUSTED					
Occupational Category	**Group**	**n**	**Percent Abnormal**	**Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**
All	***Ranch Hand***	***947***	***0.7***	***1.58 (0.53,4.71)***	***0.586***
	Comparison	***1,278***	***0.5***		
Officer	Ranch Hand	367	0.8	1.02 (0.23,4.60)	0.999
	Comparison	501	0.8		
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	162	0.6	--	0.910
	Comparison	203	0.0		
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	418	0.7	2.07 (0.34,12.43)	0.721
	Comparison	574	0.3		

b) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — ADJUSTED			
Occupational Category	**Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**	**Covariate Remarks[a]**
All	***1.56 (0.52,4.67)***	***0.423***	AGE (p=0.094)
Officer	1.01 (0.23,4.55)	0.987	
Enlisted Flyer	--	--	
Enlisted Groundcrew	2.07 (0.35,12.44)	0.425	

[a] Covariates and associated p-values correspond to final model based on all participants with available data.

--: Relative risk, confidence interval, and p-value not presented due to the sparse number of abnormalities.

Table 11-10. (Continued)
Analysis of Ocular Movement

c) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED				
Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[a]	
Initial Dioxin	n	Percent Abnormal	Estimated Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
Low	174	1.1	0.80 (0.39,1.67)	0.542
Medium	173	0.6		
High	170	1.2		

d) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — ADJUSTED			
Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[c]			
n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
517	0.83 (0.40,1.72)	0.609	INS (p=0.121)

[a] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in initial dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: Low = 39-98 ppt; Medium = >98-232 ppt; High = >232 ppt.

Table 11-10. (Continued)
Analysis of Ocular Movement

e) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — UNADJUSTED				
Dioxin Category	n	Percent Abnormal	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ab]	p-Value
Comparison	1,060	0.5		
Background RH	372	0.5	1.16 (0.22,6.06)	0.863
Low RH	260	1.2	2.41 (0.57,10.21)	0.232
High RH	257	0.8	1.64 (0.31,8.59)	0.556
Low plus High RH	517	1.0	2.03 (0.58,7.11)	0.266

f) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — ADJUSTED				
Dioxin Category	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ab]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
Comparison	1,060			
Background RH	372	1.16 (0.22,6.06)	0.863	
Low RH	260	2.41 (0.57,10.21)	0.232	
High RH	257	1.64 (0.31,8.59)	0.556	
Low plus High RH	517	2.03 (0.58,7.11)	0.266	

[a] Relative risk and confidence interval relative to Comparisons.

[b] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

Note: RH = Ranch Hand.
Comparison: Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Background (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Low (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, 10 ppt < Initial Dioxin ≤ 143 ppt.
High (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, Initial Dioxin > 143 ppt.

Table 11-10. (Continued)
Analysis of Ocular Movement

g) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED					
	Current Dioxin Category Percent Abnormal/(n)			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)	
Model[a]	Low	Medium	High	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
4	0.7 (293)	1.0 (300)	0.7 (296)	1.07 (0.65,1.76)	0.805
5	0.7 (298)	1.0 (297)	0.7 (294)	1.07 (0.69,1.66)	0.753
6[c]	0.7 (297)	1.0 (297)	0.7 (294)	1.06 (0.66,1.70)	0.810

h) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — ADJUSTED				
	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)			
Model[a]	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
4	889	1.07 (0.64,1.79)	0.786	INS (p=0.053)
5	889	1.08 (0.69,1.69)	0.735	INS (p=0.052)
6[d]	888	1.07 (0.66,1.72)	0.786	INS (p=0.053)

[a] Model 4: Log_2 (lipid-adjusted current dioxin + 1).
Model 5: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1).
Model 6: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1), adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in current dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[d] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids in addition to covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: Model 4: Low = ≤ 8.1 ppt; Medium = >8.1-20.5 ppt; High = >20.5 ppt.
Models 5 and 6: Low = ≤ 46 ppq; Medium = >46-128 ppq; High = >128 ppq.

Table 11-11.
Analysis of Facial Sensation

a) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — UNADJUSTED

Occupational Category	Group	n	Percent Abnormal	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value
All	***Ranch Hand***	***948***	***0.3***	***4.06 (0.42,39.10)***	***0.419***
	Comparison	***1,280***	***0.1***		
Officer	Ranch Hand	367	0.0	--	--
	Comparison	501	0.0		
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	162	0.0	--	0.999
	Comparison	203	0.5		
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	419	0.7	--	0.148
	Comparison	576	0.0		

b) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — ADJUSTED

Occupational Category	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
All	***4.06 (0.42,39.10)***	***0.419***	
Officer	--	--	
Enlisted Flyer	--	0.999	
Enlisted Groundcrew	--	0.148	

--: Relative risk, confidence interval, and p-value not presented due to the sparse number of abnormalities.

Table 11-11. (Continued)
Analysis of Facial Sensation

c) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED				
Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics			**Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[a]**	
Initial Dioxin	**n**	**Percent Abnormal**	**Estimated Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]**	**p-Value**
Low	174	0.0	1.53 (0.60,3.92)	0.382
Medium	173	0.0		
High	170	1.2		

d) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — ADJUSTED			
Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[a]			
n	**Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]**	**p-Value**	**Covariate Remarks**
--	--	--	

[a] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in initial dioxin.

--: Analysis not performed due to the sparse number of abnormalities.

Note: Low = 39-98 ppt; Medium = >98-232 ppt; High = >232 ppt.

Table 11-11. (Continued)
Analysis of Facial Sensation

e) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — UNADJUSTED				
Dioxin Category	n	Percent Abnormal	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ab]	p-Value[c]
Comparison	1,062	0.0		
Background RH	373	0.3	--	0.520
Low RH	260	0.0	--	--
High RH	257	0.8	--	0.076
Low plus High RH	517	0.4	--	0.214

f) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — ADJUSTED				
Dioxin Category	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ab]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
Comparison	--			
Background RH	--	--	--	
Low RH	--	--	--	
High RH	--	--	--	
Low plus High RH	--	--	--	

[a] Relative risk and confidence interval relative to Comparisons.

[b] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[c] P-value equals two times the p-value obtained from Fisher's exact test. This p-value is not adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA or change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

--: Analysis not performed due to the sparse number of abnormalities.

Note: RH = Ranch Hand.
Comparison: Current Dioxin $\leq$ 10 ppt.
Background (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin $\leq$ 10 ppt.
Low (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, 10 ppt < Initial Dioxin $\leq$ 143 ppt.
High (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, Initial Dioxin > 143 ppt.

Table 11-11. (Continued)
Analysis of Facial Sensation

g) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED					
	Current Dioxin Category Percent Abnormal/(n)			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)	
Model[a]	Low	Medium	High	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
4	0.0 (294)	0.3 (300)	0.7 (296)	1.52 (0.76,3.04)	0.251
5	0.0 (299)	0.3 (297)	0.7 (294)	1.47 (0.77,2.78)	0.248
6[c]	0.0 (298)	0.3 (297)	0.7 (294)	1.50 (0.76,2.98)	0.253

h) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — ADJUSTED				
	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)			
Model[a]	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
4	890	1.52 (0.76,3.04)	0.251	
5	890	1.47 (0.77,2.78)	0.248	
6[c]	889	1.50 (0.76,2.98)	0.253	

[a] Model 4: Log_2 (lipid-adjusted current dioxin + 1).
Model 5: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1).
Model 6: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1), adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in current dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

Note: Model 4: Low = ≤ 8.1 ppt; Medium = >8.1-20.5 ppt; High = >20.5 ppt.
Models 5 and 6: Low = ≤ 46 ppq; Medium = >46-128 ppq; High = >128 ppq.

Jaw Clench

Statistical analyses were not performed for jaw clench because there was only one participant with a deviated jaw clench. This individual was an enlisted groundcrew Ranch Hand who was in the high initial dioxin category for Model 2, the high categorized dioxin category for Model 3, and the high current dioxin category for Models 4 through 6. He also was the only participant with an abnormal gag reflex and a deviated palate and uvula movement. Table 11-12(a-d) displays percentages of jaw clench deviations by group and dioxin category.

Smile

The overall prevalence of smile abnormalities did not differ significantly between the Ranch Hand and Comparison groups in the unadjusted Model 1 analyses (Table 11-13(a): $p > 0.10$ for each analysis). Although not significant, the estimated relative risk in the enlisted groundcrew stratum (the occupational cohort with the highest current levels of dioxin) was nearly 7.00 (Table 11-13(a): $p=0.102$, Est. RR=6.94, 95% C.I. = [0.81,59.66]). The nonsignificance of the results must be interpreted with caution due to the sparse number of abnormalities (<1.0% of participants), which leads to decreased statistical power in detecting a significant difference.

To increase statistical power for the enlisted strata, additional unadjusted and adjusted Model 1 analyses were conducted with the enlisted flyers and enlisted groundcrew combined into one stratum. This unadjusted analysis revealed a marginally significant group difference for the enlisted participants (Appendix Table G-5-1(a): $p=0.055$, Est. RR=8.12, 95% C.I.=[0.98, 67.62]). Within the enlisted stratum, the percentages of smile abnormalities for Ranch Hands and Comparisons were 1.0 percent and 0.1 percent respectively. After adjusting for occupation, the adjusted analysis combining enlisted flyers and enlisted groundcrew did not reveal a significant overall group difference (Appendix Table G-5-1(b): $p=0.383$). The relative risk for the enlisted stratum remained marginally significant (Appendix Table G-5-1(b): $p=0.055$, Adj. RR=8.12, 95% C.I.=[0.98, 67.62]).

The unadjusted Model 2 analysis of smile abnormalities did not find a significant association with initial dioxin (Table 11-13(c): $p=0.363$), and the unadjusted Model 3 analysis did not reveal a significant contrast between the Ranch Hand categories and the Comparison group (Table 11-13(e): $p > 0.10$ for all contrasts).

The unadjusted Model 4 analysis found a marginally significant association between lipid-adjusted current dioxin and smile (Table 11-13(g): $p=0.079$, Est. RR=1.49, 95% C.I.=[0.97,2.28]. The association with whole-weight current dioxin was not significant in the unadjusted Model 5 analysis ($p=0.115$) but became marginally significant in the unadjusted Model 6 analysis, which forced total lipids in the model ($p=0.062$, Est. RR=1.51, 95% C.I.=[0.99,2.31]).

All of the adjusted analyses for smile were identical to the unadjusted analyses because no covariates were retained in any of the final adjusted models.

Table 11-12.
Analysis of Jaw Clench

a) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS			
Occupational Category	**Group**	**n**	**Percent Deviated**
All	***Ranch Hand***	***948***	***0.1***
	Comparison	***1,280***	***0.0***
Officer	Ranch Hand	367	0.0
	Comparison	501	0.0
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	162	0.0
	Comparison	203	0.0
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	419	0.2
	Comparison	576	0.0

b) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN		
Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics		
Initial Dioxin	**n**	**Percent Deviated**
Low	174	0.0
Medium	173	0.0
High	170	0.6

Note: Low = 39-98 ppt; Medium = >98-232 ppt; High = >232 ppt.

Table 11-12. (Continued)
Analysis of Jaw Clench

c) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY		
Dioxin Category	n	Percent Deviated
Comparison	1,062	0.0
Background RH	373	0.0
Low RH	260	0.0
High RH	257	0.4
Low plus High RH	517	0.2

d) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN			
	Current Dioxin Category Percent Deviated/(n)		
Model[a]	Low	Medium	High
4	0.0 (294)	0.0 (300)	0.3 (296)
5	0.0 (299)	0.0 (297)	0.3 (294)
6	0.0 (298)	0.0 (297)	0.3 (294)

[a] Model 4: Log_2 (lipid-adjusted current dioxin + 1).
Model 5: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1).
Model 6: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1), adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

Note: Model 3: RH = Ranch Hand.
Comparison: Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Background (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Low (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, 10 ppt < Initial Dioxin ≤ 143 ppt.
High (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, Initial Dioxin > 143 ppt.
Model 4: Low = ≤ 8.1 ppt; Medium = >8.1-20.5 ppt; High = >20.5 ppt.
Models 5 and 6: Low = ≤ 46 ppq; Medium = >46-128 ppq; High = >128 ppq.

Table 11-13.
Analysis of Smile

a) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — UNADJUSTED					
Occupational Category	**Group**	**n**	**Percent Abnormal**	**Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**
All	***Ranch Hand***	***948***	***0.9***	***1.52 (0.59,3.97)***	***0.533***
	Comparison	***1,280***	***0.6***		
Officer	Ranch Hand	367	0.8	0.58 (0.15,2.26)	0.639
	Comparison	501	1.4		
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	162	0.6	--	0.910
	Comparison	203	0.0		
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	419	1.2	6.94 (0.81,59.66)	0.102
	Comparison	576	0.2		

b) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — ADJUSTED			
Occupational Category	**Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**	**Covariate Remarks[a]**
All	***1.52 (0.59,3.97)***	***0.533***	
Officer	0.58 (0.15,2.26)	0.639	
Enlisted Flyer	--	0.910	
Enlisted Groundcrew	6.94 (0.81,59.66)	0.102	

[a] Covariates and associated p-values correspond to final model based on all participants with available data.

--: Relative risk and confidence interval not presented due to the sparse number of abnormalities.

Table 11-13. (Continued)
Analysis of Smile

c) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED				
Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[a]	
Initial Dioxin	n	Percent Abnormal	Estimated Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
Low	174	1.1	1.29 (0.75,2.22)	0.363
Medium	173	0.6		
High	170	1.8		

d) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — ADJUSTED			
Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[a]			
n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
517	1.29 (0.75,2.22)	0.363	

[a] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in initial dioxin.

Note: Low = 39-98 ppt; Medium = >98-232 ppt; High = >232 ppt.

Table 11-13. (Continued)
Analysis of Smile

e) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — UNADJUSTED				
Dioxin Category	n	Percent Abnormal	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ab]	p-Value
Comparison	1,062	0.4		
Background RH	373	0.5	1.58 (0.28,8.75)	0.603
Low RH	260	1.2	2.98 (0.66,13.48)	0.155
High RH	257	1.2	2.84 (0.62,12.94)	0.176
Low plus High RH	517	1.2	2.91 (0.81,10.45)	0.101

f) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — ADJUSTED				
Dioxin Category	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ab]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
Comparison	1,062			
Background RH	373	1.58 (0.28,8.75)	0.603	
Low RH	260	2.98 (0.66,13.48)	0.155	
High RH	257	2.84 (0.62,12.94)	0.176	
Low plus High RH	517	2.91 (0.81,10.45)	0.101	

[a] Relative risk and confidence interval relative to Comparisons.

[b] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

Note: RH = Ranch Hand.
Comparison: Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Background (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Low (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, 10 ppt < Initial Dioxin ≤ 143 ppt.
High (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, Initial Dioxin > 143 ppt.

Table 11-13. (Continued)
Analysis of Smile

g) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED					
	Current Dioxin Category Percent Abnormal/(n)			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)	
Model[a]	Low	Medium	High	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
4	0.3 (294)	1.3 (300)	1.0 (296)	1.49 (0.97,2.28)	0.079
5	0.3 (299)	1.3 (297)	1.0 (294)	1.38 (0.93,2.05)	0.115
6[c]	0.3 (298)	1.3 (297)	1.0 (294)	1.51 (0.99,2.31)	0.062

h) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — ADJUSTED				
	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)			
Model[a]	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
4	890	1.49 (0.97,2.28)	0.079	
5	890	1.38 (0.93,2.05)	0.115	
6[c]	889	1.51 (0.99,2.31)	0.062	

[a] Model 4: Log_2 (lipid-adjusted current dioxin + 1).
Model 5: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1).
Model 6: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1), adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in current dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

Note: Model 4: Low = ≤ 8.1 ppt; Medium = >8.1-20.5 ppt; High = >20.5 ppt.
Models 5 and 6: Low = ≤ 46 ppq; Medium = >46-128 ppq; High = >128 ppq.

Palpebral Fissure

The unadjusted Model 1 analysis did not find a significant group difference in the percentage of palpebral fissure abnormalities (Table 11-14(a): $p > 0.83$ for all contrasts). The unadjusted and adjusted analyses were identical because no covariates were retained in the final model.

The unadjusted and adjusted Model 2 analyses did not reveal a significant association between initial dioxin and palpebral fissure (Table 11-14(c,d): $p > 0.87$ for both analyses). The adjusted model contained the covariate diabetic class.

The unadjusted Model 3 analysis of palpebral fissure abnormalities did not show any of the Ranch Hand categories to differ significantly from the Comparison group (Table 11-14(e): $p > 0.62$ for all contrasts). The unadjusted analyses for Models 4 through 6 did not reveal any significant associations between current dioxin and palpebral fissure (Table 11-14(g): $p > 0.62$ for all analyses). The adjusted and unadjusted results were identical in Models 3 through 6 because no covariates were retained in the final models.

Balance

The unadjusted and adjusted Model 1 analyses did not reveal a significant group difference in the percentage of balance abnormalities (Table 11-15(a,b): $p > 0.24$ for all contrasts). The nonsignificance of these results must be interpreted with caution due to the sparse number of balance abnormalities (0.5% of participants). Although not significant, the adjusted relative risk for the enlisted groundcrew (the most highly exposed occupational cohort) was nearly 4.00 (Table 11-15(b): $p=0.244$, Adj. RR=3.89, 95% C.I.=[0.40,38.26]). The adjusted analysis contained age and diabetic class.

Initial dioxin was not associated significantly with balance in both the unadjusted and adjusted Model 2 analyses (Table 11-15(c,d): $p > 0.41$ for both analyses). The unadjusted and adjusted Model 3 analyses did not find a significant difference between any of the Ranch Hand categories and the Comparison group (Table 11-15(e,f): $p > 0.53$ for all contrasts). The unadjusted and adjusted analyses for Models 4 through 6 also were not significant (Table 11-15(g,h): $p > 0.45$ for all analyses). Each of the adjusted analyses for Models 2 through 6 contained the covariate age.

Gag Reflex

Statistical analyses for gag reflex were not performed because there was only one participant with an abnormality. This individual also was the only participant with a deviated jaw clench and a deviated palate and uvula movement. Table 11-16(a-d) presents percentages of gag reflex abnormalities by group and dioxin category.

Speech

The unadjusted Model 1 analysis did not reveal a significant group difference in the percentage of speech abnormalities (Table 11-17(a): $p > 0.13$ for all comparisons). Although

Table 11-14.
Analysis of Palpebral Fissure

a) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — UNADJUSTED					
Occupational Category	**Group**	**n**	**Percent Abnormal**	**Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**
All	***Ranch Hand***	***948***	***1.0***	***1.01 (0.43,2.41)***	***0.999***
	Comparison	***1,280***	***0.9***		
Officer	Ranch Hand	367	0.8	0.68 (0.17,2.74)	0.836
	Comparison	501	1.2		
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	162	1.2	2.53 (0.23,28.10)	0.844
	Comparison	203	0.5		
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	419	1.0	1.01 (0.29,4.12)	0.999
	Comparison	576	0.9		

b) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — ADJUSTED			
Occupational Category	**Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**	**Covariate Remarks**
All	***1.01 (0.43,2.41)***	***0.999***	
Officer	0.68 (0.17,2.74)	0.836	
Enlisted Flyer	2.53 (0.23,28.10)	0.844	
Enlisted Groundcrew	1.01 (0.29,4.12)	0.999	

Table 11-14. (Continued)
Analysis of Palpebral Fissure

c) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED				
Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[a]	
Initial Dioxin	n	Percent Abnormal	Estimated Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
Low	174	0.6	1.05 (0.56,1.98)	0.876
Medium	173	1.2		
High	170	1.2		

d) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — ADJUSTED			
Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[c]			
n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
517	1.04 (0.55,1.94)	0.909	DIAB (p=0.080)

[a] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in initial dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: Low = 39-98 ppt; Medium = >98-232 ppt; High = >232 ppt.

Table 11-14. (Continued)
Analysis of Palpebral Fissure

e) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — UNADJUSTED				
Dioxin Category	n	Percent Abnormal	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ab]	p-Value
Comparison	1,062	0.8		
Background RH	373	1.1	1.35 (0.41,4.46)	0.624
Low RH	260	1.2	1.35 (0.36,5.04)	0.657
High RH	257	0.8	0.86 (0.18,4.04)	0.848
Low plus High RH	517	1.0	1.10 (0.36,3.32)	0.866

f) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — ADJUSTED				
Dioxin Category	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ab]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
Comparison	1,062			
Background RH	373	1.35 (0.41,4.46)	0.624	
Low RH	260	1.35 (0.36,5.04)	0.657	
High RH	257	0.86 (0.18,4.04)	0.848	
Low plus High RH	517	1.10 (0.36,3.32)	0.866	

[a] Relative risk and confidence interval relative to Comparisons.

[b] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

Note: RH = Ranch Hand.
Comparison: Current Dioxin $\leq$10 ppt.
Background (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin $\leq$10 ppt.
Low (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin $>$10 ppt, 10 ppt $<$ Initial Dioxin $\leq$143 ppt.
High (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin $>$10 ppt, Initial Dioxin $>$143 ppt.

Table 11-14. (Continued)
Analysis of Palpebral Fissure

g) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED					
	Current Dioxin Category Percent Abnormal/(n)			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)	
Model[a]	Low	Medium	High	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
4	0.7 (294)	1.7 (300)	0.7 (296)	1.09 (0.70,1.68)	0.717
5	1.0 (299)	1.3 (297)	0.7 (294)	1.06 (0.72,1.56)	0.761
6[c]	1.0 (298)	1.3 (297)	0.7 (294)	1.11 (0.73,1.68)	0.629

h) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — ADJUSTED				
	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)			
Model[a]	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
4	890	1.09 (0.70,1.68)	0.717	
5	890	1.06 (0.72,1.56)	0.761	
6[c]	889	1.11 (0.73,1.68)	0.629	

[a] Model 4: Log_2 (lipid-adjusted current dioxin + 1).
Model 5: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1).
Model 6: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1), adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in current dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

Note: Model 4: Low = ≤8.1 ppt; Medium = >8.1-20.5 ppt; High = >20.5 ppt.
Models 5 and 6: Low = ≤46 ppq; Medium = >46-128 ppq; High = >128 ppq.

Table 11-15.
Analysis of Balance

a) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — UNADJUSTED					
Occupational Category	**Group**	**n**	**Percent Abnormal**	**Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**
All	***Ranch Hand***	***947***	***0.5***	***1.13 (0.34,3.70)***	***0.999***
	Comparison	***1,279***	***0.5***		
Officer	Ranch Hand	366	0.5	1.37 (0.19,9.76)	0.999
	Comparison	500	0.4		
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	162	0.0	--	0.332
	Comparison	203	1.5		
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	419	0.7	4.15 (0.43,40.01)	0.408
	Comparison	576	0.2		

b) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — ADJUSTED			
Occupational Category	**Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**	**Covariate Remarks[a]**
All	***1.03 (0.31,3.43)***	***0.960***	AGE (p=0.022) DIAB (p=0.006)
Officer	1.18 (0.16,8.55)	0.872	
Enlisted Flyer	--	--	
Enlisted Groundcrew	3.89 (0.40,38.26)	0.244	

[a] Covariates and associated p-values correspond to final model based on all participants with available data.

--: Relative risk, confidence interval, and p-value not presented due to the sparse number of abnormalities.

Table 11-15. (Continued)
Analysis of Balance

c) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED				
Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[a]	
Initial Dioxin	n	Percent Abnormal	Estimated Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
Low	174	0.6	1.14 (0.51,2.51)	0.757
Medium	172	0.0		
High	170	1.2		

d) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — ADJUSTED			
Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[c]			
n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
516	1.42 (0.63,3.19)	0.414	AGE (p=0.059)

[a] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in initial dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: Low = 39-98 ppt; Medium = >98-232 ppt; High = >232 ppt.

Table 11-15. (Continued)
Analysis of Balance

e) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — UNADJUSTED				
Dioxin Category	n	Percent Abnormal	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ab]	p-Value
Comparison	1,061	0.5		
Background RH	373	0.5	1.19 (0.23,6.29)	0.836
Low RH	259	0.4	0.71 (0.08,6.15)	0.755
High RH	257	0.8	1.31 (0.23,7.41)	0.760
Low plus High RH	516	0.6	1.01 (0.23,4.43)	0.994

f) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — ADJUSTED				
Dioxin Category	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ac]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
Comparison	1,061			AGE (p=0.023)
Background RH	373	1.10 (0.21,5.83)	0.912	
Low RH	259	0.61 (0.07,5.45)	0.662	
High RH	257	1.72 (0.31,9.61)	0.539	
Low plus High RH	516	1.06 (0.24,4.70)	0.935	

[a] Relative risk and confidence interval relative to Comparisons.

[b] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: RH = Ranch Hand.
Comparison: Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Background (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Low (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, 10 ppt < Initial Dioxin ≤ 143 ppt.
High (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, Initial Dioxin > 143 ppt.

Table 11-15. (Continued)
Analysis of Balance

g) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED					
	Current Dioxin Category Percent Abnormal/(n)			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)	
Model[a]	Low	Medium	High	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
4	0.3 (294)	0.7 (300)	0.7 (295)	1.08 (0.60,1.95)	0.788
5	0.3 (299)	0.3 (296)	1.0 (294)	1.10 (0.66,1.84)	0.717
6[c]	0.3 (298)	0.3 (296)	1.0 (294)	1.05 (0.60,1.83)	0.877

h) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — ADJUSTED				
	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)			
Model[a]	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
4	889	1.26 (0.66,2.42)	0.490	AGE (p=0.014)
5	889	1.25 (0.70,2.22)	0.455	AGE (p=0.013)
6[d]	888	1.20 (0.65,2.24)	0.565	AGE (p=0.014)

[a] Model 4: Log_2 (lipid-adjusted current dioxin + 1).
Model 5: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1).
Model 6: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1), adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in current dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[d] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids in addition to covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: Model 4: Low = ≤ 8.1 ppt; Medium = >8.1-20.5 ppt; High = >20.5 ppt.
Models 5 and 6: Low = ≤ 46 ppq; Medium = >46-128 ppq; High = >128 ppq.

Table 11-16.
Analysis of Gag Reflex

a) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS			
Occupational Category	**Group**	**n**	**Percent Abnormal**
All	***Ranch Hand***	***948***	***0.1***
	Comparison	***1,280***	***0.0***
Officer	Ranch Hand	367	0.0
	Comparison	501	0.0
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	162	0.0
	Comparison	203	0.0
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	419	0.2
	Comparison	576	0.0

b) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN		
Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics		
Initial Dioxin	**n**	**Percent Abnormal**
Low	174	0.0
Medium	173	0.0
High	170	0.6

Note: Low = 39-98 ppt; Medium = >98-232 ppt; High = >232 ppt.

Table 11-16. (Continued)
Analysis of Gag Reflex

c) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY		
Dioxin Category	**n**	**Percent Abnormal**
Comparison	1,062	0.0
Background RH	373	0.0
Low RH	260	0.0
High RH	257	0.4
Low plus High RH	517	0.2

d) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN			
	Current Dioxin Category Percent Abnormal/(n)		
Model[a]	**Low**	**Medium**	**High**
4	0.0 (294)	0.0 (300)	0.3 (296)
5	0.0 (299)	0.0 (297)	0.3 (294)
6	0.0 (298)	0.0 (297)	0.3 (294)

[a] Model 4: Log_2 (lipid-adjusted current dioxin + 1).
Model 5: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1).
Model 6: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1), adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

Note: Model 3: RH = Ranch Hand.
Comparison: Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Background (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Low (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, 10 ppt < Initial Dioxin ≤ 143 ppt.
High (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, Initial Dioxin > 143 ppt.
Model 4: Low = ≤ 8.1 ppt; Medium = >8.1-20.5 ppt; High = >20.5 ppt.
Models 5 and 6: Low = ≤ 46 ppq; Medium = >46-128 ppq; High = >128 ppq.

none of the contrasts were significant, the estimated relative risk for the overall group contrast exceeded 4.00, and the estimated relative risk within the enlisted groundcrew stratum was greater than 5.00 (Table 11-17(a): p=0.133, Est. RR=4.07, 95% C.I.=[0.82,20.21]; p=0.205, Est. RR=5.54, 95% C.I.=[0.62,49.77] respectively). These results should be interpreted with caution due to the sparse number of abnormalities.

To increase statistical power for the enlisted strata, additional unadjusted and adjusted Model 1 analyses were conducted with the enlisted flyers and enlisted groundcrew combined into one stratum. This unadjusted analysis did not reveal a significant difference between the Ranch Hands and Comparisons (Appendix Table G-5-2(a): $p>0.10$ for all contrasts) even though the estimated relative risk for the enlisted stratum was greater than 6 (Appendix Table G-5-2(a): p=0.109, Est. RR=6.75, 95% C.I.=[0.79, 57.96]). The adjusted analysis combining enlisted flyers and enlisted groundcrew revealed a marginally significant overall group difference in the percentage of speech abnormalities (Table G-5-2(b): p=0.068, Adj. RR=3.98, 95% C.I.=[0.80, 19.91]). Stratifying by occupation also revealed a marginally significant group difference for the enlisted participants (Table G-5-2(b): p=0.090, Adj. RR=6.55, 95% C.I.=[0.74, 57.62]). The final model for this adjusted analysis contained the covariates age and occupation.

After adjusting for age, the overall group contrast in the Model 1 analysis of speech abnormalities became marginally significant (Table 11-17(b): p=0.063, Adj. RR=4.06, 95% C.I.=[0.81,20.20]). The relative risk for the enlisted groundcrew remained greater than 5.00 and nonsignificant in the adjusted analysis (Table 11-17(b): p=0.132, Adj. RR=5.45, 95% C.I.=[0.60,49.56]).

The unadjusted and adjusted Model 2 analyses did not reveal a significant association between initial dioxin and speech (Table 11-17(c,d): $p\geq0.47$ for both analyses). Age was the only covariate retained in the adjusted analysis.

The unadjusted Model 3 analysis revealed significantly or marginally significantly more speech abnormalities in the low, high, and low plus high Ranch Hand categories than in the Comparison group (Table 11-17(e): p=0.077, p=0.076, and p=0.023 respectively). There were no speech abnormalities in the Comparison group and two speech abnormalities (0.8%) in each of the low and high categories. Relative risk estimates were not calculated because there were no abnormalities in the Comparison group. The statistical significance of these results should be interpreted with caution because the analysis was not adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin. An adjusted analysis was not conducted because the Comparison group had no abnormalities.

The unadjusted and adjusted analyses for Models 4 through 6 did not show a significant association between current dioxin and speech (Table 11-17(g,h): $p>0.44$ for all analyses). Each of the adjusted analyses contained age and occupation.

Table 11-17.
Analysis of Speech

a) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — UNADJUSTED					
Occupational Category	**Group**	**n**	**Percent Abnormal**	**Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**
All	***Ranch Hand***	***948***	***0.6***	***4.07 (0.82,20.21)***	***0.133***
	Comparison	***1,280***	***0.2***		
Officer	Ranch Hand	367	0.3	1.37 (0.09,21.91)	0.999
	Comparison	501	0.2		
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	162	0.6	--	0.910
	Comparison	203	0.0		
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	419	1.0	5.54 (0.62,49.77)	0.205
	Comparison	576	0.2		

b) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — ADJUSTED			
Occupational Category	**Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**	**Covariate Remarks[a]**
All	***4.06 (0.81,20.20)***	***0.063***	AGE (p=0.004)
Officer	1.40 (0.09,22.59)	0.814	
Enlisted Flyer	--	--	
Enlisted Groundcrew	5.45 (0.60,49.56)	0.132	

[a] Covariates and associated p-values correspond to final model based on all participants with available data.

--: Relative risk, confidence interval, and p-value not presented due to the sparse number of abnormalities.

Table 11-17. (Continued)
Analysis of Speech

c) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED				
Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics			**Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[a]**	
Initial Dioxin	**n**	**Percent Abnormal**	**Estimated Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]**	**p-Value**
Low	174	0.6	1.11 (0.54,2.26)	0.777
Medium	173	0.6		
High	170	1.2		

d) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — ADJUSTED			
Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[c]			
n	**Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]**	**p-Value**	**Covariate Remarks**
517	1.33 (0.63,2.79)	0.470	AGE (p=0.089)

[a] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in initial dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: Low = 39-98 ppt; Medium = >98-232 ppt; High = >232 ppt.

Table 11-17. (Continued)
Analysis of Speech

e) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — UNADJUSTED				
Dioxin Category	n	Percent Abnormal	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[a]	p-Value[b]
Comparison	1,062	0.0		
Background RH	373	0.3	--	0.520
Low RH	260	0.8	--	0.077
High RH	257	0.8	--	0.076
Low plus High RH	517	0.8	--	0.023

f) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — ADJUSTED				
Dioxin Category	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[a]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
Comparison	--			
Background RH	--	--	--	
Low RH	--	--	--	
High RH	--	--	--	
Low plus High RH	--	--	--	

[a] Relative risk and confidence interval relative to Comparisons.

[b] P-value equals two times the p-value obtained from a one-sided Fisher's exact test. This p-value is not adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA or change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

--: Adjusted relative risk and confidence interval not presented due to the sparse number of abnormalities; adjusted analyses not performed due to the sparse number of abnormalities.

Note: RH = Ranch Hand.
Comparison: Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Background (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Low (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, 10 ppt < Initial Dioxin ≤ 143 ppt.
High (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, Initial Dioxin > 143 ppt.

Table 11-17. (Continued)
Analysis of Speech

g) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED					
	Current Dioxin Category Percent Abnormal/(n)			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)	
Model[a]	Low	Medium	High	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
4	0.3 (294)	0.7 (300)	0.7 (296)	1.24 (0.71,2.18)	0.461
5	0.3 (299)	0.7 (297)	0.7 (294)	1.22 (0.73,2.03)	0.446
6[c]	0.3 (298)	0.7 (297)	0.7 (294)	1.21 (0.70,2.10)	0.490

h) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — ADJUSTED				
	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)			
Model[a]	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
4	890	1.05 (0.57,1.92)	0.882	AGE (p=0.014) OCC (p=0.034)
5	890	1.05 (0.62,1.78)	0.858	AGE (p=0.014) OCC (p=0.034)
6[d]	889	1.04 (0.58,1.85)	0.903	AGE (p=0.014) OCC (p=0.034)

[a] Model 4: Log_2 (lipid-adjusted current dioxin + 1).
Model 5: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1).
Model 6: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1), adjusted for log_2 total lipids

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in current dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[d] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids in addition to covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: Model 4: Low = ≤ 8.1 ppt; Medium = >8.1-20.5 ppt; High = >20.5 ppt.
Models 5 and 6: Low = ≤ 46 ppq; Medium = >46-128 ppq; High = >128 ppq.

Palate and Uvula Movement

Statistical analyses were not conducted because there was only one participant with a deviated palate and uvula movement. This individual also was the only participant with a deviated jaw clench and an abnormal gag reflex. Table 11-18(a-d) displays percentages of deviated palate and uvula movement by group and dioxin category.

Neck Range of Motion

The unadjusted Model 1 analysis of neck range of motion did not show the Ranch Hands and Comparisons to differ significantly (Table 11-19(a): $p > 0.14$ for all contrasts). The relative risk for the overall group contrast remained nonsignificant after adjusting for age, race, and occupation (Table 11-19(b): $p = 0.919$). However, stratifying the adjusted analysis by occupation revealed a marginally significant group difference within the enlisted flyer stratum (Table 11-19(b): $p = 0.067$, Adj. RR=0.58, 95% C.I.=[0.33,1.04]). For the enlisted flyers, Ranch Hands had fewer abnormalities than Comparisons (Table 11-19(a): 14.2% versus 20.7%).

The unadjusted and adjusted Model 2 analyses did not reveal a significant association between initial dioxin and neck range of motion (Table 11-19(c,d): $p \geq 0.34$ for both analyses). The adjusted final model contained diabetic class and an age-by-occupation interaction.

The unadjusted Model 3 analysis of neck range of motion did not show a significant contrast between any of the Ranch Hand categories and the Comparison group (Table 11-19(e): $p > 0.44$ for all contrasts). The categorized dioxin-by-occupation interaction was retained in the adjusted Model 3 analysis (Table 11-19(f): $p = 0.021$). Appendix Table G-2-4 presents adjusted results stratified by occupation. In addition to this interaction, the final adjusted model included age. When the categorized dioxin-by-occupation interaction was removed from the final model, the adjusted analysis did not reveal any significant contrasts (Table 11-19(f): $p > 0.22$ for all contrasts).

For Models 4 through 6, the unadjusted and adjusted analyses did not detect a significant association between current dioxin and neck range of motion (Table 11-19(g,h): $p > 0.11$ for all analyses). Each of the adjusted analyses contained insecticide exposure and two covariate-by-covariate interactions: age-by-occupation and occupation-by-lifetime alcohol history. The adjusted relative risk for lipid-adjusted current dioxin and for whole-weight current dioxin became significantly greater than 1.00 in Models 4 and 5 when occupation was removed from both of the final models (Appendix Table G-3-5(c): $p = 0.049$, Adj. RR=1.16, 95% C.I.=[1.00,1.35] for Model 4; $p = 0.045$, Adj. RR=1.14, 95% C.I.=[1.00,1.29] for Model 5). The adjusted relative risk for whole-weight dioxin became marginally greater than 1.00 when total lipids was forced into the adjusted Model 6 analysis excluding occupation ($p = 0.075$, Adj. RR=1.13, 95% C.I.=[0.99,1.30]).

Table 11-18.
Analysis of Palate and Uvula Movement

a) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS			
Occupational Category	**Group**	**n**	**Percent Deviated**
All	***Ranch Hand***	***948***	***0.1***
	Comparison	***1,280***	***0.0***
Officer	Ranch Hand	367	0.0
	Comparison	501	0.0
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	162	0.0
	Comparison	203	0.0
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	419	0.2
	Comparison	576	0.0

b) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN		
Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics		
Initial Dioxin	**n**	**Percent Deviated**
Low	174	0.0
Medium	173	0.0
High	170	0.6

Note: Low = 39-98 ppt; Medium = >98-232 ppt; High = >232 ppt.

Table 11-18. (Continued)
Analysis of Palate and Uvula Movement

c) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY		
Dioxin Category	**n**	**Percent Deviated**
Comparison	1,062	0.0
Background RH	373	0.0
Low RH	260	0.0
High RH	257	0.4
Low plus High RH	517	0.2

d) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN			
	Current Dioxin Category Percent Deviated/(n)		
Model[a]	**Low**	**Medium**	**High**
4	0.0 (294)	0.0 (300)	0.3 (296)
5	0.0 (299)	0.0 (297)	0.3 (294)
6	0.0 (298)	0.0 (297)	0.3 (294)

[a] Model 4: Log_2 (lipid-adjusted current dioxin + 1).
Model 5: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1).
Model 6: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1), adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

Note: Model 3: RH = Ranch Hand.
Comparison: Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Background (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Low (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, 10 ppt < Initial Dioxin ≤ 143 ppt.
High (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, Initial Dioxin > 143 ppt.
Model 4: Low = ≤ 8.1 ppt; Medium = >8.1-20.5 ppt; High = >20.5 ppt.
Models 5 and 6: Low = ≤ 46 ppq; Medium = >46-128 ppq; High = >128 ppq.

Table 11-19.
Analysis of Neck Range of Motion

a) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — UNADJUSTED					
Occupational Category	**Group**	**n**	**Percent Abnormal**	**Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**
All	***Ranch Hand***	***947***	***14.4***	***1.04 (0.82,1.32)***	***0.808***
	Comparison	***1,280***	***13.9***		
Officer	Ranch Hand	367	18.3	1.19 (0.83,1.71)	0.381
	Comparison	501	15.8		
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	162	14.2	0.63 (0.36,1.11)	0.141
	Comparison	203	20.7		
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	418	11.0	1.13 (0.75,1.70)	0.645
	Comparison	576	9.9		

b) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — ADJUSTED			
Occupational Category	**Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**	**Covariate Remarks[a]**
All	***1.01 (0.79,1.31)***	***0.919***	AGE ($p<0.001$) RACE ($p=0.039$) OCC ($p=0.144$)
Officer	1.19 (0.82,1.74)	0.362	
Enlisted Flyer	0.58 (0.33,1.04)	0.067	
Enlisted Groundcrew	1.14 (0.73,1.76)	0.571	

[a] Covariates and associated p-values correspond to final model based on all participants with available data.

Table 11-19. (Continued)
Analysis of Neck Range of Motion

c) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED				
Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics			**Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[a]**	
Initial Dioxin	**n**	**Percent Abnormal**	**Estimated Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]**	**p-Value**
Low	174	17.2	0.91 (0.76,1.10)	0.340
Medium	173	12.7		
High	169	14.2		

d) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — ADJUSTED			
Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[c]			
n	**Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]**	**p-Value**	**Covariate Remarks**
516	1.02 (0.81,1.29)	0.867	DIAB (p=0.117) AGE*OCC (p=0.022)

[a] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in initial dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: Low = 39-98 ppt; Medium = >98-232 ppt; High = >232 ppt.

Table 11-19. (Continued)
Analysis of Neck Range of Motion

e) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — UNADJUSTED

Dioxin Category	n	Percent Abnormal	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ab]	p-Value
Comparison	1,062	13.2		
Background RH	373	13.4	1.07 (0.75,1.52)	0.702
Low RH	260	15.8	1.16 (0.79,1.70)	0.446
High RH	256	13.7	1.01 (0.67,1.51)	0.976
Low plus High RH	516	14.7	1.08 (0.80,1.47)	0.605

f) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — ADJUSTED

Dioxin Category	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ac]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
Comparison	1,062			DXCAT*OCC (p=0.021) AGE (p=0.023)
Background RH	373	0.98 (0.68,1.42)**	0.919**	
Low RH	260	1.04 (0.70,1.56)**	0.836**	
High RH	256	1.32 (0.84,2.05)**	0.225**	
Low plus High RH	516	1.15 (0.83,1.59)**	0.399**	

[a] Relative risk and confidence interval relative to Comparisons.

[b] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

** Categorized dioxin-by-covariate interaction ($0.01 < p \leq 0.05$); adjusted relative risk, confidence interval, and p-value derived from a model fitted after deletion of this interaction; refer to Appendix Table G-2-4 for further analysis of this interaction.

Note: RH = Ranch Hand.
Comparison: Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Background (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Low (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, 10 ppt < Initial Dioxin ≤ 143 ppt.
High (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, Initial Dioxin > 143 ppt.

Table 11-19. (Continued)
Analysis of Neck Range of Motion

g) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED					
	Current Dioxin Category Percent Abnormal/(n)			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)	
Model[a]	Low	Medium	High	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
4	12.6 (294)	17.0 (300)	12.9 (295)	1.01 (0.89,1.15)	0.832
5	12.7 (299)	15.8 (297)	14.0 (293)	1.03 (0.92,1.15)	0.650
6[c]	12.8 (298)	15.8 (297)	14.0 (293)	1.00 (0.89,1.13)	0.968

h) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — ADJUSTED				
	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)			
Model[a]	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
4	869	1.14 (0.96,1.35)	0.127	INS (p=0.124) AGE*OCC (p<0.001) OCC*DRKYR (p=0.008)
5	869	1.12 (0.97,1.30)	0.112	INS (p=0.123) AGE*OCC (p<0.001) OCC*DRKYR (p=0.008)
6[d]	868	1.12 (0.95,1.31)	0.166	INS (p=0.123) AGE*OCC (p<0.001) OCC*DRKYR (p=0.008)

[a] Model 4: Log_2 (lipid-adjusted current dioxin + 1).
Model 5: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1).
Model 6: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1), adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in current dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[d] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids in addition to covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: Model 4: Low = ≤ 8.1 ppt; Medium = >8.1-20.5 ppt; High = >20.5 ppt.
Models 5 and 6: Low = ≤ 46 ppq; Medium = >46-128 ppq; High = >128 ppq.

Cranial Nerve Index without Range of Motion

The unadjusted Model 1 analysis of the cranial nerve index without range of motion did not show a significant overall group difference (Table 11-20(a): $p=0.266$). However, stratifying the unadjusted analysis by occupation revealed a significant group difference within the enlisted groundcrew stratum (Table 11-20(a): $p=0.012$, Est. RR=2.44, 95% C.I.=[1.25,4.78]). Ranch Hand enlisted groundcrew were more than twice as likely as Comparison enlisted groundcrew to have abnormalities (5.8% versus 2.4%).

The adjusted Model 1 analysis contained a significant interaction between group and occupation (Table 11-20(b): $p=0.034$). In addition to this interaction, the final model included four covariates: age, lifetime alcohol history, insecticide exposure, and diabetic class. The adjusted relative risk for the overall group contrast was not significant when the group-by-occupation interaction was removed from the final model (Table 11-20(b): $p=0.395$). The relative risk for the enlisted groundcrew remained significant when the adjusted analysis was stratified by occupation (Table 11-20(b): $p=0.014$, Adj. RR=2.36, 95% C.I.=[1.19,4.71].

For Model 2, the unadjusted analysis did not reveal a significant association between initial dioxin and the cranial nerve index without range of motion (Table 11-20(c): $p=0.619$). The adjusted Model 2 analysis retained initial dioxin-by-age and initial dioxin-by-diabetic class interactions (Table 11-20(d): $p=0.033$ and $p=0.003$ respectively). Appendix Table G-2-5 presents adjusted results stratified separately by age and diabetic class. After removing the initial dioxin-by-age and initial dioxin-by-diabetic class interactions from the final model, the adjusted Model 2 analysis did not reveal a significant association between initial dioxin and cranial nerve index without range of motion (Table 11-20(d): $p=0.335$).

The unadjusted Model 3 analysis of the cranial nerve index without range of motion did not find a significant difference between any of the Ranch Hand categories and the Comparison group (Table 11-20(e): $p>0.11$ for all contrasts). The interaction between categorized dioxin and occupation was included in the adjusted Model 3 analysis (Table 11-20(d): $p=0.017$). Appendix Table G-2-5 presents adjusted results stratified by occupation. In addition to the categorized dioxin-by-occupation interaction, the adjusted analysis contained age, diabetic class, and insecticide exposure. Without the categorized dioxin-by-occupation interaction in the final model, the adjusted Model 3 analysis did not show any of the Ranch Hand categories to be significantly different from the Comparison group (Table 11-20(f): $p>0.25$ for all contrasts).

The unadjusted and adjusted analyses for Models 4 through 6 did not reveal a significant association between current dioxin and the cranial nerve index without range of motion (Table 11-20(g,h): $p>0.68$ for all analyses). Each of the adjusted analyses contained age, occupation, and a diabetic class-by-insecticide exposure interaction.

Table 11-20.
Analysis of Cranial Nerve Index without Range of Motion

a) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — UNADJUSTED

Occupational Category	Group	n	Percent Abnormal	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value
All	***Ranch Hand***	***945***	***4.6***	***1.30 (0.85,2.00)***	***0.266***
	Comparison	***1,276***	***3.5***		
Officer	Ranch Hand	366	3.8	0.86 (0.44,1.71)	0.801
	Comparison	499	4.4		
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	162	3.1	0.69 (0.23,2.09)	0.695
	Comparison	203	4.4		
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	417	5.8	2.44 (1.25,4.78)	0.012
	Comparison	574	2.4		

b) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — ADJUSTED

Occupational Category	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value	Covariate Remarks[a]
All	***1.21 (0.78,1.87)****	***0.395****	GROUP*OCC (p=0.034) AGE (p<0.001) DRKYR (p=0.138) INS (p=0.019) DIAB (p=0.014)
Officer	0.79 (0.39,1.57)	0.495	
Enlisted Flyer	0.62 (0.20,1.91)	0.404	
Enlisted Groundcrew	2.36 (1.19,4.71)	0.014	

[a] Covariates and associated p-values correspond to final model based on all participants with available data.

** Group-by-covariate interaction ($0.01 < p \leq 0.05$); adjusted relative risk, confidence interval, and p-value derived from a model fitted after deletion of this interaction.

Table 11-20. (Continued)
Analysis of Cranial Nerve Index without Range of Motion

c) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED				
Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[a]	
Initial Dioxin	n	Percent Abnormal	Estimated Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
Low	174	5.7	1.08 (0.80,1.46)	0.619
Medium	172	2.3		
High	169	6.5		

d) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — ADJUSTED			
Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[c]			
n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
515	1.19 (0.84,1.70)**	0.335**	INIT*AGE (p=0.033) INIT*DIAB (p=0.003)

[a] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in initial dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

** Log_2 (initial dioxin)-by-covariate interactions ($p \leq 0.05$); adjusted relative risk, confidence interval, and p-value derived from a model fitted after deletion of these interactions; refer to Appendix Table G-2-5 for further analysis of these interactions.

Note: Low = 39-98 ppt; Medium = >98-232 ppt; High = >232 ppt.

Table 11-20. (Continued)
Analysis of Cranial Nerve Index without Range of Motion

e) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — UNADJUSTED				
Dioxin Category	n	Percent Abnormal	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ab]	p-Value
Comparison	1,058	3.3		
Background RH	372	4.3	1.32 (0.72,2.43)	0.368
Low RH	259	5.4	1.66 (0.88,3.14)	0.119
High RH	256	4.3	1.31 (0.65,2.62)	0.450
Low plus High RH	515	4.9	1.48 (0.88,2.51)	0.142

f) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — ADJUSTED				
Dioxin Category	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ac]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
Comparison	1,057			DXCAT*OCC (p=0.017) AGE (p=0.002) DIAB (p=0.131) INS (p=0.037)
Background RH	371	1.26 (0.67,2.36)**	0.476**	
Low RH	259	1.46 (0.76,2.79)**	0.255**	
High RH	256	1.27 (0.61,2.62)**	0.520**	
Low plus High RH	515	1.37 (0.80,2.35)**	0.253**	

[a] Relative risk and confidence interval relative to Comparisons.

[b] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

** Categorized dioxin-by-covariate interaction ($0.01 < p \leq 0.05$); adjusted relative risk, confidence interval, and p-value derived from a model fitted after deletion of this interaction; refer to Appendix Table G-2-5 for further analysis of this interaction.

Note: RH = Ranch Hand.
Comparison: Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Background (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Low (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, 10 ppt < Initial Dioxin ≤ 143 ppt.
High (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, Initial Dioxin > 143 ppt.

Table 11-20. (Continued)
Analysis of Cranial Nerve Index without Range of Motion

g) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED					
	Current Dioxin Category Percent Abnormal/(n)			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)	
Model[a]	Low	Medium	High	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
4	4.1 (293)	5.7 (300)	4.1 (294)	1.05 (0.84,1.29)	0.683
5	4.4 (298)	5.1 (296)	4.4 (293)	1.03 (0.85,1.24)	0.782
6[c]	4.4 (297)	5.1 (296)	4.4 (293)	1.02 (0.83,1.24)	0.884

h) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — ADJUSTED				
	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)			
Model[a]	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
4	886	0.97 (0.77,1.24)	0.815	AGE (p=0.049) OCC (p=0.020) DIAB*INS (p=0.013)
5	886	0.96 (0.79,1.18)	0.713	AGE (p=0.050) OCC (p=0.017) DIAB*INS (p=0.013)
6[d]	885	0.96 (0.77,1.19)	0.693	AGE (p=0.050) OCC (p=0.018) DIAB*INS (p=0.013)

[a] Model 4: Log_2 (lipid-adjusted current dioxin + 1).
Model 5: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1).
Model 6: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1), adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in current dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[d] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids in addition to covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: Model 4: Low = ≤ 8.1 ppt; Medium = >8.1-20.5 ppt; High = >20.5 ppt.
Models 5 and 6: Low = ≤ 46 ppq; Medium = >46-128 ppq; High = >128 ppq.

Physical Examination Variables: Peripheral Nerve Status

Pin Prick

The unadjusted and adjusted Model 1 analyses of pin prick did not reveal a significant difference between the Ranch Hands and Comparisons (Table 11-21(a,b): $p>0.19$ for all contrasts). The adjusted model retained age and diabetic class.

The unadjusted and adjusted analyses for Model 2 did not reveal a significant association between initial dioxin and pin prick (Table 11-21(c,d): $p>0.60$ for both analyses). The adjusted analysis included diabetic class and an age-by-occupation interaction.

The unadjusted and adjusted Model 3 results of pin prick analyses did not show any of the Ranch Hand categories to be significantly different from the Comparison group (Table 11-21(e,f): $p>0.36$ for all contrasts). Age and diabetic class were significant covariates in the adjusted analysis.

The unadjusted analyses for Models 4 through 6 revealed a marginally significant positive association between current dioxin and pin prick (Table 11-21(g): $p=0.079$, Est. RR=1.19, 95% C.I.=[0.98,1.44]; $p=0.064$, Est. RR=1.18, 95% C.I.=[0.99,1.40]; and $p=0.079$, Est. RR=1.18, 95% C.I.=[0.98,1.42] for Models 4, 5, and 6 respectively).

Each of the adjusted analyses for Models 4 through 6 contained a significant current dioxin-by-diabetic class interaction (Table 11-21(h): $p=0.006$, $p=0.014$, and $p=0.011$ for Models 4, 5, and 6 respectively). Appendix Table G-2-6 presents adjusted results stratified by diabetic class for each of the three models. In addition to the current dioxin-by-diabetic class interaction, each of the adjusted analyses for Models 4 through 6 included two covariate-by-covariate interactions: age-by-occupation and occupation-by-diabetic class. In contrast to the unadjusted results, the adjusted analyses of Models 4 through 6 did not reveal a significant association between current dioxin and pin prick when the current dioxin-by-diabetic class interaction was removed from each of the adjusted models ($p>0.18$).

The adjusted results for Models 4 through 6 changed when occupation and diabetic class were removed from the final models. Without occupation and diabetic class, each of the adjusted analyses revealed a significant positive association between current dioxin and pin prick (Appendix Table G-3-7(c): $p=0.014$, Adj. RR=1.30, 95% C.I.=[1.06,1.59]; $p=0.013$, Adj. RR=1.26, 95% C.I.=[1.05,1.52]; and $p=0.014$, Adj. RR=1.28, 95% C.I.=[1.05, 1.57] for Models 4, 5, and 6 respectively).

Light Touch

For Model 1, the unadjusted and adjusted analyses of light touch did not show a significant difference between Ranch Hands and Comparisons (Table 11-22(a,b): $p>0.13$ for all contrasts). The adjusted model included age, diabetic class, and lifetime alcohol history.

Table 11-21.
Analysis of Pin Prick

a) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — UNADJUSTED

Occupational Category	Group	n	Percent Abnormal	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value
All	***Ranch Hand***	***908***	***5.5***	***1.02 (0.70,1.48)***	***0.999***
	Comparison	***1,217***	***5.4***		
Officer	Ranch Hand	348	5.5	0.99 (0.54,1.82)	0.999
	Comparison	473	5.5		
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	156	5.1	0.57 (0.24,1.35)	0.275
	Comparison	195	8.7		
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	404	5.7	1.38 (0.76,2.50)	0.359
	Comparison	549	4.2		

b) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — ADJUSTED

Occupational Category	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value	Covariate Remarks[a]
All	***0.98 (0.67,1.43)***	***0.911***	AGE ($p<0.001$) DIAB ($p=0.003$)
Officer	0.93 (0.50,1.72)	0.819	
Enlisted Flyer	0.56 (0.23,1.34)	0.194	
Enlisted Groundcrew	1.36 (0.74,2.48)	0.317	

[a] Covariates and associated p-values correspond to final model based on all participants with available data.

Table 11-21. (Continued)
Analysis of Pin Prick

c) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED				
Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[a]	
Initial Dioxin	n	Percent Abnormal	Estimated Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
Low	163	6.7	0.97 (0.74,1.27)	0.832
Medium	165	6.1		
High	163	6.1		

d) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — ADJUSTED			
Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[c]			
n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
491	0.92 (0.66,1.28)	0.604	DIAB (p=0.034) AGE*OCC (p=0.022)

[a] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in initial dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: Low = 39-98 ppt; Medium = >98-232 ppt; High = >232 ppt.

Table 11-21. (Continued)
Analysis of Pin Prick

e) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — UNADJUSTED				
Dioxin Category	n	Percent Abnormal	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ab]	p-Value
Comparison	1,013	5.4		
Background RH	361	4.4	0.93 (0.52,1.65)	0.795
Low RH	245	7.3	1.29 (0.74,2.26)	0.363
High RH	246	5.3	0.86 (0.46,1.62)	0.642
Low plus High RH	491	6.3	1.07 (0.68,1.70)	0.768

f) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — ADJUSTED				
Dioxin Category	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ac]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
Comparison	1,013			AGE (p=0.003) DIAB (p=0.039)
Background RH	360	0.88 (0.49,1.58)	0.672	
Low RH	245	1.19 (0.68,2.08)	0.552	
High RH	246	0.92 (0.49,1.75)	0.803	
Low plus High RH	491	1.06 (0.67,1.69)	0.804	

[a] Relative risk and confidence interval relative to Comparisons.

[b] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: RH = Ranch Hand.
Comparison: Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Background (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Low (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, 10 ppt < Initial Dioxin ≤ 143 ppt.
High (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, Initial Dioxin > 143 ppt.

Table 11-21. (Continued)
Analysis of Pin Prick

g) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED

Model[a]	Current Dioxin Category Percent Abnormal/(n) Low	Medium	High	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1) Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
4	2.8 (285)	8.5 (284)	5.3 (283)	1.19 (0.98,1.44)	0.079
5	3.8 (292)	6.8 (279)	6.0 (281)	1.18 (0.99,1.40)	0.064
6[c]	3.8 (291)	6.8 (279)	6.0 (281)	1.18 (0.98,1.42)	0.079

h) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — ADJUSTED

Model[a]	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1) n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
4	851	1.17 (0.91,1.50)**	0.220**	CURR*DIAB (p=0.006) AGE*OCC (p=0.025) OCC*DIAB (p=0.002)
5	851	1.15 (0.93,1.43)**	0.195**	CURR*DIAB (p=0.014) AGE*OCC (p=0.021) OCC*DIAB (p=0.003)
6[d]	850	1.17 (0.92,1.48)**	0.186**	CURR*DIAB (p=0.011) AGE*OCC (p=0.032) OCC*DIAB (p=0.003)

[a] Model 4: Log_2 (lipid-adjusted current dioxin + 1).
Model 5: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1).
Model 6: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1), adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in current dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[d] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids in addition to covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

** Log_2 (current dioxin + 1)-by-covariate interaction ($p \leq 0.05$); adjusted relative risk, confidence interval, and p-value derived from a model fitted after deletion of this interaction; refer to Appendix Table G-2-6 for further analysis of this interaction.

Note: Model 4: Low = ≤ 8.1 ppt; Medium = >8.1-20.5 ppt; High = >20.5 ppt.
Models 5 and 6: Low = ≤ 46 ppq; Medium = >46-128 ppq; High = >128 ppq.

Table 11-22.
Analysis of Light Touch

a) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — UNADJUSTED					
Occupational Category	**Group**	**n**	**Percent Abnormal**	**Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**
All	***Ranch Hand***	***908***	***5.1***	***1.33 (0.88,2.01)***	***0.217***
	Comparison	***1,217***	***3.9***		
Officer	Ranch Hand	348	4.6	1.09 (0.56,2.14)	0.934
	Comparison	473	4.2		
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	156	4.5	1.10 (0.39,3.10)	0.999
	Comparison	195	4.1		
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	404	5.7	1.68 (0.90,3.14)	0.134
	Comparison	549	3.5		

b) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — ADJUSTED			
Occupational Category	**Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**	**Covariate Remarks[a]**
All	***1.23 (0.80,1.88)***	***0.347***	AGE ($p<0.001$) DIAB ($p=0.060$) DRKYR ($p=0.149$)
Officer	0.80 (0.44,1.46)	0.465	
Enlisted Flyer	1.07 (0.46,2.47)	0.874	
Enlisted Groundcrew	1.26 (0.73,2.16)	0.413	

[a] Covariates and associated p-values correspond to final model based on all participants with available data.

Table 11-22. (Continued)
Analysis of Light Touch

c) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED				
Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[a]	
Initial Dioxin	n	Percent Abnormal	Estimated Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
Low	163	4.9	0.97 (0.72,1.29)	0.821
Medium	165	6.7		
High	163	4.9		

d) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — ADJUSTED			
Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[a]			
n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
491	0.97 (0.72,1.29)	0.821	

[a] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in initial dioxin.

Note: Low = 39-98 ppt; Medium = >98-232 ppt; High = >232 ppt.

Table 11-22. (Continued)
Analysis of Light Touch

e) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — UNADJUSTED				
Dioxin Category	n	Percent Abnormal	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ab]	p-Value
Comparison	1,013	4.1		
Background RH	361	4.4	1.23 (0.68,2.23)	0.500
Low RH	245	5.7	1.30 (0.69,2.43)	0.412
High RH	246	5.3	1.15 (0.60,2.19)	0.678
Low plus High RH	491	5.5	1.22 (0.74,2.02)	0.433

f) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — ADJUSTED				
Dioxin Category	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ac]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
Comparison	1,013			AGE ($p<0.001$)
Background RH	361	1.15 (0.63,2.09)	0.646	
Low RH	245	1.22 (0.65,2.28)	0.544	
High RH	246	1.33 (0.69,2.56)	0.394	
Low plus High RH	491	1.27 (0.76,2.10)	0.358	

[a] Relative risk and confidence interval relative to Comparisons.

[b] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: RH = Ranch Hand.
Comparison: Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Background (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Low (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, 10 ppt < Initial Dioxin ≤ 143 ppt.
High (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, Initial Dioxin > 143 ppt.

Table 11-22. (Continued)
Analysis of Light Touch

g) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED

Model[a]	Current Dioxin Category Percent Abnormal/(n) Low	Medium	High	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1) Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
4	3.5 (285)	6.3 (284)	5.3 (283)	1.12 (0.92,1.38)	0.264
5	4.1 (292)	4.7 (279)	6.4 (281)	1.14 (0.95,1.36)	0.165
6[c]	4.1 (291)	4.7 (279)	6.4 (281)	1.10 (0.91,1.34)	0.335

h) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — ADJUSTED

Model[a]	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1) n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
4	851	1.15 (0.89,1.48)	0.272	AGE (p=0.013) OCC*DIAB (p=0.016)
5	851	1.15 (0.93,1.44)	0.192	AGE (p=0.013) OCC*DIAB (p=0.016)
6[d]	850	1.14 (0.90,1.44)	0.284	AGE (p=0.013) OCC*DIAB (p=0.016)

[a] Model 4: Log_2 (lipid-adjusted current dioxin + 1).
Model 5: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1).
Model 6: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1), adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in current dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[d] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids in addition to covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: Model 4: Low = ≤ 8.1 ppt; Medium = >8.1-20.5 ppt; High = >20.5 ppt.
Models 5 and 6: Low = ≤ 46 ppq; Medium = >46-128 ppq; High = >128 ppq.

The unadjusted Model 2 analysis did not show a significant association between light touch and initial dioxin (Table 11-22(c): $p=0.821$). The adjusted results were identical to the unadjusted results because no covariates were retained in the final model.

Both the unadjusted and adjusted analyses of light touch for Model 3 detected no significant contrasts involving the Comparisons (Table 11-22(e,f): $p>0.35$ for all contrasts). Age was significant in the adjusted analysis.

The unadjusted and adjusted results for Models 4 through 6 revealed no significant association between current dioxin and light touch (Table 11-22(g,h): $p>0.16$ for all analyses). Each of the adjusted models contained age and an occupation-by-diabetic class interaction.

The adjusted results for Models 4 and 5 changed when occupation and diabetic class were removed from the final models. Without these two covariates, the adjusted analyses revealed a marginally significant and a significant positive association between current dioxin and light touch for Models 4 and 5 respectively (Appendix Table G-3-8(a): $p=0.079$, Adj. RR=1.22, 95% C.I.=[0.98,1.51] and $p=0.049$, Adj. RR=1.21, 95% C.I.=[1.00,1.47] for Models 4 and 5).

Muscle Status

For Model 1, the unadjusted and adjusted analyses did not reveal a significant group difference in the percentage of abnormalities for muscle status (Table 11-23(a,b): $p>0.15$ for all contrasts). Age and race were significant covariates in the final adjusted model.

The unadjusted and adjusted Model 2 analyses did not detect a significant association between initial dioxin and muscle status (Table 11-23(c,d): $p>0.63$ for both analyses). The final model contained the covariate age.

The unadjusted Model 3 analysis of muscle status did not show any of the Ranch Hand categories to be significantly different from the Comparison group (Table 11-23(e): $p>0.42$ for all contrasts). The adjusted analysis for Model 3 included a significant interaction between categorized dioxin and insecticide exposure (Table 11-23(f): $p=0.024$). Appendix Table G-2-7 displays adjusted results stratified by insecticide exposure. When the categorized dioxin-by-insecticide exposure interaction was removed from the final model, which retained age and race, the adjusted analysis did not show a significant difference between Ranch Hands and Comparisons (Table 11-23(f): $p>0.31$ for all contrasts).

The unadjusted and adjusted results for Models 4 through 6 did not reveal a significant association between current dioxin and muscle status (Table 11-23(g,h): $p>0.60$ for all analyses). Each of the adjusted analyses contained age and race.

Patellar Reflex

The unadjusted Model 1 analysis revealed a significant overall group difference in the percentage of patellar reflex abnormalities (Table 11-24(a): $p=0.043$, Est. RR=0.48, 95%

Table 11-23.
Analysis of Muscle Status

a) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — UNADJUSTED					
Occupational Category	**Group**	**n**	**Percent Abnormal**	**Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**
All	***Ranch Hand***	***948***	***3.4***	***1.32 (0.80,2.16)***	***0.331***
	Comparison	***1,278***	***2.6***		
Officer	Ranch Hand	367	3.3	1.51 (0.66,3.45)	0.448
	Comparison	501	2.2		
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	162	3.1	0.61 (0.20,1.82)	0.526
	Comparison	201	5.0		
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	419	3.6	1.75 (0.81,3.77)	0.216
	Comparison	576	2.1		

b) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — ADJUSTED			
Occupational Category	**Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**	**Covariate Remarks[a]**
All	***1.31 (0.80,2.14)***	***0.291***	AGE (p=0.010) RACE (p=0.008)
Officer	1.50 (0.65,3.44)	0.340	
Enlisted Flyer	0.59 (0.20,1.76)	0.340	
Enlisted Groundcrew	1.75 (0.81,3.78)	0.158	

[a] Covariates and associated p-values correspond to final model based on all participants with available data.

Table 11-23. (Continued)
Analysis of Muscle Status

c) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED				
Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[a]	
Initial Dioxin	n	Percent Abnormal	Estimated Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
Low	174	2.9	0.98 (0.67,1.42)	0.905
Medium	173	3.5		
High	170	2.9		

d) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — ADJUSTED			
Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[c]			
n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
517	1.10 (0.74,1.62)	0.637	AGE (p=0.035)

[a] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in initial dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: Low = 39-98 ppt; Medium = >98-232 ppt; High = >232 ppt.

Table 11-23. (Continued)
Analysis of Muscle Status

e) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — UNADJUSTED				
Dioxin Category	n	Percent Abnormal	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ab]	p-Value
Comparison	1,062	2.5		
Background RH	373	3.2	1.16 (0.58,2.33)	0.674
Low RH	260	3.1	1.25 (0.56,2.79)	0.590
High RH	257	3.1	1.34 (0.60,3.00)	0.477
Low plus High RH	517	3.1	1.29 (0.69,2.43)	0.427

f) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — ADJUSTED				
Dioxin Category	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ac]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
Comparison	1,062			DXCAT*INS (p=0.024) AGE (p=0.013) RACE (p=0.015)
Background RH	373	1.08 (0.54,2.19)**	0.821**	
Low RH	260	1.26 (0.56,2.85)**	0.578**	
High RH	257	1.52 (0.67,3.44)**	0.317**	
Low plus High RH	517	1.38 (0.73,2.61)**	0.327**	

[a] Relative risk and confidence interval relative to Comparisons.

[b] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

** Categorized dioxin-by-covariate interaction ($0.01 < p \leq 0.05$); adjusted relative risk, confidence interval, and p-value derived from a model fitted after deletion of this interaction; refer to Appendix Table G-2-7 for further analysis of this interaction.

Note: RH = Ranch Hand.
Comparison: Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Background (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Low (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, 10 ppt < Initial Dioxin ≤ 143 ppt.
High (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, Initial Dioxin > 143 ppt.

Table 11-23. (Continued)
Analysis of Muscle Status

g) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED					
	Current Dioxin Category Percent Abnormal/(n)			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)	
Model[a]	Low	Medium	High	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
4	3.4 (294)	2.7 (300)	3.4 (296)	0.99 (0.76,1.28)	0.923
5	3.3 (299)	2.7 (297)	3.4 (294)	0.99 (0.80,1.24)	0.954
6[c]	3.4 (298)	2.7 (297)	3.4 (294)	1.00 (0.78,1.27)	0.971

h) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — ADJUSTED				
	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)			
Model[a]	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
4	890	1.06 (0.81,1.40)	0.661	AGE (p=0.006) RACE (p=0.100)
5	890	1.05 (0.83,1.33)	0.692	AGE (p=0.006) RACE (p=0.101)
6[d]	889	1.07 (0.83,1.38)	0.604	AGE (p=0.006) RACE (p=0.095)

[a] Model 4: Log_2 (lipid-adjusted current dioxin + 1).
Model 5: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1).
Model 6: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1), adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in current dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[d] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids in addition to covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: Model 4: Low = ≤ 8.1 ppt; Medium = >8.1-20.5 ppt; High = >20.5 ppt.
Models 5 and 6: Low = ≤ 46 ppq; Medium = >46-128 ppq; High = >128 ppq.

C.I.=[0.25,0.94]). Ranch Hands were half as likely as Comparisons to have abnormal patellar reflexes (1.3% vs. 2.6%). Stratifying the unadjusted analysis by occupation revealed a significant group difference within the officer stratum (p=0.033, Est. RR=0.25, 95% C.I.=[0.07,0.86]), in which the percentage of patellar reflex abnormalities was lower for the Ranch Hands than for the Comparisons (0.8% vs. 3.2%). In the enlisted flyer stratum, the relative risk was less than 1.00 but not significant (p=0.137, Est. RR=0.17); in the enlisted groundcrew stratum, the relative risk was greater than 1.00 but not significant (p=0.999, Est. RR=1.10).

The adjusted Model 1 analysis contained a significant interaction between group and lifetime alcohol history (Table 11-24(b): $p<0.001$). Appendix Table G-2-8 presents adjusted results stratified by lifetime alcohol history. In addition to this interaction, the final model included age and three covariate-by-covariate interactions: occupation-by-lifetime alcohol history, lifetime alcohol history-by-diabetic class, and insecticide exposure-by-diabetic class. After the group-by-lifetime alcohol history interaction was removed, the adjusted analysis detected a significant overall group difference (Table 11-24(b): p=0.009, Adj. RR=0.40, 95% C.I.=[0.19,0.83]). Stratifying the adjusted analysis by occupation revealed significantly fewer abnormalities for Ranch Hands relative to Comparisons within the officer and enlisted flyer strata (p=0.021, Adj. RR=0.21, 95% C.I.=[0.06,0.79] and p=0.048, Adj. RR=0.05, 95% C.I.=[0.00,0.98] for officers and enlisted flyers respectively).

The unadjusted and adjusted Model 2 results did not reveal a significant association between initial dioxin and patellar reflex (Table 11-24(c,d): $p>0.51$ for both analyses). The final adjusted model contained age, lifetime alcohol history, and diabetic class.

For Model 3, the unadjusted analysis of patellar reflex showed a significant contrast between background Ranch Hands and Comparisons (Table 11-24(e): p=0.033, Est. RR=0.11, 95% C.I.=[0.02,0.84]). Background Ranch Hands were considerably less likely than Comparisons to have abnormal patellar reflexes (0.3% vs. 2.7%). There were fewer abnormalities in the low, high, and low plus high Ranch Hand categories (1.9% in each) than in the Comparison group, but the estimated relative risks were not significant ($p>0.30$).

Categorized dioxin-by-lifetime alcohol history was a significant interaction in the adjusted Model 3 analysis of patellar reflex. Appendix Table G-2-8 presents adjusted results stratified by lifetime alcohol history categories. The adjusted analysis also included age, diabetic class, and an occupation-by-lifetime alcohol history interaction. Without the categorized dioxin-by-lifetime alcohol history interaction, the adjusted analysis detected a relative risk significantly less than 1.00 for the background Ranch Hands (Table 11-24(f): p=0.025, Adj. RR=0.09, 95% C.I.=[0.01,0.75]) and a relative risk marginally less than 1.00 for the low Ranch Hands (p=0.098, Adj. RR=0.38, 95% C.I.=[0.12,1.19]). When occupation and diabetic class were removed from the final model, the relative risk for the low Ranch Hands became nonsignificant (Appendix Table G-3-9(b): p=0.187.

The unadjusted analyses for Models 4 through 6 did not reveal a significant association between current dioxin and patellar reflex (Table 11-24(g): $p>0.13$ for each analysis). By contrast, the adjusted analyses for Models 4 and 5 detected a marginally significant positive

Table 11-24.
Analysis of Patellar Reflex

a) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — UNADJUSTED					
Occupational Category	**Group**	**n**	**Percent Abnormal**	**Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**
All	***Ranch Hand***	***946***	***1.3***	***0.48 (0.25,0.94)***	***0.043***
	Comparison	***1,276***	***2.6***		
Officer	Ranch Hand	366	0.8	0.25 (0.07,0.86)	0.033
	Comparison	499	3.2		
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	162	0.6	0.17 (0.02,1.41)	0.137
	Comparison	201	3.5		
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	418	1.9	1.10 (0.43,2.82)	0.999
	Comparison	576	1.7		

b) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — ADJUSTED			
Occupational Category	**Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**	**Covariate Remarks[a]**
All	***0.40 (0.19,0.83)*****	***0.009*****	GROUP*DRKYR (p<0.001) AGE (p<0.001) OCC*DRKYR (p=0.001) DRKYR*DIAB (p=0.026) INS*DIAB (p=0.016)
Officer	0.21 (0.06,0.79)**	0.021**	
Enlisted Flyer	0.05 (0.00,0.98)**	0.048**	
Enlisted Groundcrew	1.10 (0.40,2.99)**	0.854**	

[a] Covariates and associated p-values correspond to final model based on all participants with available data.

** Group-by-covariate interaction ($p \leq 0.05$); adjusted relative risk, confidence interval, and p-value derived from a model fitted after deletion of this interaction; refer to Appendix Table G-2-8 for further analysis of this interaction.

Table 11-24. (Continued)
Analysis of Patellar Reflex

c) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED				
Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[a]	
Initial Dioxin	n	Percent Abnormal	Estimated Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
Low	174	1.7	0.93 (0.58,1.48)	0.756
Medium	173	2.3		
High	170	1.8		

d) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — ADJUSTED			
Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[c]			
n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
504	1.19 (0.71,2.02)	0.516	AGE (p=0.028) DRKYR (p=0.056) DIAB (p=0.132)

[a] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in initial dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: Low = 39-98 ppt; Medium = >98-232 ppt; High = >232 ppt.

Table 11-24. (Continued)
Analysis of Patellar Reflex

e) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — UNADJUSTED

Dioxin Category	n	Percent Abnormal	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ab]	p-Value
Comparison	1,059	2.7		
Background RH	371	0.3	0.11 (0.02,0.84)	0.033
Low RH	260	1.9	0.62 (0.24,1.63)	0.334
High RH	257	1.9	0.60 (0.23,1.58)	0.301
Low plus High RH	517	1.9	0.61 (0.29,1.27)	0.188

f) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — ADJUSTED

Dioxin Category	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ac]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
Comparison	1,040			DXCAT*DRKYR (p=0.002) AGE (p=0.002) DIAB (p<0.001) OCC*DRKYR (p<0.001)
Background RH	363	0.09 (0.01,0.75)**	0.025**	
Low RH	254	0.38 (0.12,1.19)**	0.098**	
High RH	250	0.81 (0.29,2.28)**	0.688**	
Low plus High RH	504	0.55 (0.25,1.22)**	0.143**	

[a] Relative risk and confidence interval relative to Comparisons.

[b] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

** Categorized dioxin-by-covariate interaction ($p \leq 0.05$); adjusted relative risk, confidence interval, and p-value derived from a model fitted after deletion of this interaction; refer to Appendix Table G-2-8 for further analysis of this interaction.

Note: RH = Ranch Hand.
Comparison: Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Background (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Low (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, 10 ppt < Initial Dioxin ≤ 143 ppt.
High (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, Initial Dioxin > 143 ppt.

Table 11-24. (Continued)
Analysis of Patellar Reflex

g) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED					
	Current Dioxin Category Percent Abnormal/(n)			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)	
Model[a]	Low	Medium	High	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
4	0.3 (293)	1.0 (299)	2.4 (296)	1.29 (0.88,1.88)	0.204
5	0.3 (298)	2.0 (296)	1.4 (294)	1.21 (0.86,1.71)	0.275
6[c]	0.3 (297)	2.0 (296)	1.4 (294)	1.33 (0.92,1.92)	0.138

h) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — ADJUSTED				
	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)			
Model[a]	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
4	867	1.55 (0.99,2.41)	0.058	DRKYR (p=0.029) DIAB (p=0.082) AGE (p=0.019)
5	867	1.41 (0.94,2.12)	0.098	AGE (p=0.023) DRKYR (p=0.030) DIAB (p=0.084)
6[d]	866	1.58 (1.03,2.45)	0.039	AGE (p=0.021) DRKYR (p=0.034) DIAB (p=0.077)

[a] Model 4: Log_2 (lipid-adjusted current dioxin + 1).
Model 5: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1).
Model 6: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1), adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in current dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[d] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids in addition to covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: Model 4: Low = ≤ 8.1 ppt; Medium = >8.1-20.5 ppt; High = >20.5 ppt.
Models 5 and 6: Low = ≤ 46 ppq; Medium = >46-128 ppq; High = >128 ppq.

association between current dioxin and patellar reflex (Table 11-24(h): p=0.058, Adj. RR=1.55, 95% C.I.=[0.99,2.41] and p=0.098, Adj. RR=1.41, 95% C.I.=[0.94,2.12] for Models 4 and 5 respectively). The adjusted Model 6 analysis revealed a significant positive association between current dioxin and patellar reflex (Table 11-24(h): p=0.039, Adj. RR=1.58, 95% C.I.=[1.03,2.45]). Each of the adjusted analyses for Models 4 through 6 contained age, lifetime alcohol history, and diabetic class. For Model 4, the adjusted results changed slightly when diabetic class was removed from the final model. Without diabetic class, the relative risk became significant (Appendix Table G-3-9(c): p=0.050, Adj. RR=1.56, 95% C.I.=[1.01,2.41]).

Achilles Reflex

The unadjusted and adjusted Model 1 analyses did not reveal significant differences between the Ranch Hands and Comparisons in the percentage of Achilles reflex abnormalities (Table 11-25(a,b): p>0.25 for all contrasts). The adjusted analysis included age, diabetic class, and an occupation-by-lifetime alcohol history interaction.

The Model 2 unadjusted results did not show a significant association between initial dioxin and Achilles reflex (Table 11-25(c): p=0.634). Initial dioxin-by-lifetime alcohol history was a significant interaction (p=0.030) in the adjusted Model 2 analysis. Appendix Table G-2-9 presents adjusted results stratified by lifetime alcohol history categories. The adjusted model also included age, insecticide exposure, and diabetic class. When the initial dioxin-by-lifetime alcohol history interaction was removed from the final model, the adjusted analysis did not reveal a significant association between initial dioxin and Achilles reflex (Table 11-25(d): p=0.612).

The unadjusted Model 3 analysis of Achilles reflex did not show any of the Ranch Hand categories to differ significantly with the Comparison group (Table 11-25(e): p>0.35 for all contrasts). The adjusted Model 3 analysis contained a significant interaction between categorized dioxin and lifetime alcohol history (Table 11-25(f): p=0.006). Appendix Table G-2-9 displays adjusted results stratified by lifetime alcohol history categories. In addition to the categorized dioxin-by-lifetime alcohol history interaction, the adjusted analysis included diabetic class and an age-by-lifetime alcohol history interaction. The adjusted analysis did not reveal a significant contrast involving Comparisons when the categorized dioxin-by-lifetime alcohol history interaction was removed from the final model (Table 11-25(f): p>0.60 for all contrasts).

For Models 4 through 6, the unadjusted and adjusted analyses did not reveal a significant association between current dioxin and Achilles reflex (Table 11-25(g,h): p>0.41 for all analyses). Each of the adjusted analyses contained age, diabetic class, and an occupation-by-lifetime alcohol history interaction.

Table 11-25.
Analysis of Achilles Reflex

a) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — UNADJUSTED

Occupational Category	Group	n	Percent Abnormal	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value
All	***Ranch Hand***	***944***	***10.0***	***1.11 (0.83,1.48)***	***0.519***
	Comparison	***1,270***	***9.1***		
Officer	Ranch Hand	365	12.1	1.32 (0.85,2.04)	0.257
	Comparison	499	9.4		
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	162	9.9	0.93 (0.47,1.85)	0.971
	Comparison	199	10.6		
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	417	8.2	0.99 (0.63,1.57)	0.999
	Comparison	572	8.2		

b) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — ADJUSTED

Occupational Category	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value	Covariate Remarks[a]
All	***1.05 (0.78,1.41)***	***0.767***	AGE ($p<0.001$) DIAB ($p<0.001$) OCC*DRKYR ($p=0.040$)
Officer	1.18 (0.75,1.86)	0.486	
Enlisted Flyer	0.95 (0.47,1.93)	0.893	
Enlisted Groundcrew	0.96 (0.59,1.56)	0.868	

[a] Covariates and associated p-values correspond to final model based on all participants with available data.

Table 11-25. (Continued)
Analysis of Achilles Reflex

c) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED				
Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics			**Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[a]**	
Initial Dioxin	**n**	**Percent Abnormal**	**Estimated Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]**	**p-Value**
Low	173	11.6	0.95 (0.77,1.18)	0.634
Medium	173	11.0		
High	170	8.8		

d) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — ADJUSTED			
Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[c]			
n	**Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]**	**p-Value**	**Covariate Remarks**
503	1.06 (0.84,1.34)**	0.612**	INIT*DRKYR (p=0.030) AGE (p=0.063) INS (p=0.075) DIAB (p=0.039)

[a] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in initial dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

** Log_2 (initial dioxin)-by-covariate interaction ($0.01 < p \leq 0.05$); adjusted relative risk, confidence interval, and p-value derived from a model fitted after deletion of this interaction; refer to Appendix Table G-2-9 for further analysis of this interaction.

Note: Low = 39-98 ppt; Medium = >98-232 ppt; High = >232 ppt.

Table 11-25. (Continued)
Analysis of Achilles Reflex

e) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — UNADJUSTED				
Dioxin Category	n	Percent Abnormal	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ab]	p-Value
Comparison	1,059	9.1		
Background RH	371	9.2	1.10 (0.73,1.67)	0.638
Low RH	259	11.6	1.23 (0.79,1.91)	0.352
High RH	257	9.3	0.96 (0.60,1.55)	0.879
Low plus High RH	516	10.5	1.10 (0.77,1.56)	0.610

f) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — ADJUSTED				
Dioxin Category	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ac]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
Comparison	1,040			DXCAT*DRKYR (p=0.006) DIAB (p<0.001) AGE*DRKYR (p=0.009)
Background RH	363	1.05 (0.68,1.62)**	0.825**	
Low RH	253	1.01 (0.63,1.61)**	0.972**	
High RH	250	1.11 (0.68,1.81)**	0.684**	
Low plus High RH	503	1.10 (0.76,1.59)**	0.603**	

[a] Relative risk and confidence interval relative to Comparisons.

[b] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

** Categorized dioxin-by-covariate interaction ($p \leq 0.05$); adjusted relative risk, confidence interval, and p-value derived from a model fitted after deletion of this interaction; refer to Appendix Table G-2-9 for further analysis of this interaction.

Note: RH = Ranch Hand.
Comparison: Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Background (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Low (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, 10 ppt < Initial Dioxin ≤ 143 ppt.
High (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, Initial Dioxin > 143 ppt.

Table 11-25. (Continued)
Analysis of Achilles Reflex

g) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED					
	Current Dioxin Category Percent Abnormal/(n)			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)	
Model[a]	Low	Medium	High	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
4	8.9 (293)	10.7 (298)	10.1 (296)	1.02 (0.88,1.18)	0.804
5	8.1 (298)	11.2 (295)	10.5 (294)	1.02 (0.90,1.16)	0.744
6[c]	8.1 (297)	11.2 (295)	10.5 (294)	1.00 (0.87,1.15)	0.974

h) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — ADJUSTED				
	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)			
Model[a]	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
4	866	1.08 (0.89,1.32)	0.411	AGE ($p<0.001$) DIAB ($p=0.041$) OCC*DRKYR ($p=0.031$)
5	866	1.06 (0.90,1.25)	0.487	AGE ($p<0.001$) DIAB ($p=0.041$) OCC*DRKYR ($p=0.031$)
6[d]	865	1.06 (0.89,1.27)	0.515	AGE ($p<0.001$) DIAB ($p=0.041$) OCC*DRKYR ($p=0.031$)

[a] Model 4: Log_2 (lipid-adjusted current dioxin + 1).
Model 5: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1).
Model 6: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1), adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in current dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[d] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids in addition to covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: Model 4: Low = ≤ 8.1 ppt; Medium = >8.1-20.5 ppt; High = >20.5 ppt.
Models 5 and 6: Low = ≤ 46 ppq; Medium = >46-128 ppq; High = >128 ppq.

Biceps Reflex

The unadjusted and adjusted Model 1 analyses of biceps reflex did not show the Ranch Hands and Comparisons to differ significantly (Table 11-26(a,b): $p>0.31$ for all contrasts). The estimated and adjusted relative risks for the enlisted flyers were not calculated because no enlisted flyer Ranch Hands had abnormalities. The final adjusted model contained age and diabetic class.

For Model 2, the unadjusted analysis detected a significant inverse association between initial dioxin and biceps reflex (Table 11-26(c): $p=0.030$, Est. RR=0.47, 95% C.I.=[0.21,1.06]). After adjusting for occupation, the association between initial dioxin and biceps reflex became nonsignificant (Table 11-26(d): $p=0.389$).

In the unadjusted and adjusted Model 3 analyses, the prevalence of biceps reflex abnormalities did not differ significantly between any of the Ranch Hand categories and the Comparison group (Table 11-26(e,f): $p>0.17$ for all contrasts). Relative risks were not calculated for the background Ranch Hand versus Comparison contrast because there were no background Ranch Hands with abnormalities. The adjusted analysis contained the covariate age.

The unadjusted analyses for Models 4 through 6 did not reveal a significant association between current dioxin and biceps reflex (Table 11-26(g): $p>0.45$ for all analyses). The adjusted analyses for Models 4 and 5 were not significant although the adjusted relative risks for a twofold increase in current dioxin exceeded 1.4 in both final models (Table 11-26(h): $p=0.115$, Adj. RR=1.76, 95% C.I.=[0.87,3.55] and $p=0.245$, Adj. RR=1.43, 95% C.I.=[0.78,2.65]). The adjusted Model 6 analysis, which forced total lipids into the model, found a marginally significant positive association between whole-weight current dioxin and biceps reflex (Table 11-26(h): $p=0.059$, Adj. RR=1.98, 95% C.I.=[0.95,4.14]). Age and occupation were significant covariates in each of the adjusted models. Removing occupation from the adjusted Model 6 analysis caused the association between current dioxin and biceps reflex to become nonsignificant (Appendix Table G-3-11(a): $p=0.243$).

Babinski Reflex

The unadjusted and adjusted Model 1 analyses did not find a significant group difference in the percentage of Babinski reflex abnormalities (Table 11-27(a,b): $p>0.36$ for all contrasts). Relative risks for the officer and enlisted flyer categories were not calculated because there were no Ranch Hands with abnormalities in either of these strata. The final adjusted model contained age and insecticide exposure.

Statistical analyses for Model 2 were not conducted because there was only one Ranch Hand in the Model 2 analysis with an abnormal Babinski reflex. This participant was in the low initial dioxin category. Table 11-27(c) displays percentages of abnormalities by initial dioxin category.

The unadjusted and adjusted Model 3 analyses of Babinski reflex did not find a significant difference between any of the Ranch Hand categories and the Comparison group

Table 11-26.
Analysis of Biceps Reflex

a) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — UNADJUSTED					
Occupational Category	**Group**	**n**	**Percent Abnormal**	**Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**
All	***Ranch Hand***	***948***	***0.7***	***0.67 (0.27,1.67)***	***0.524***
	Comparison	***1,280***	***1.1***		
Officer	Ranch Hand	367	1.4	1.14 (0.35,3.76)	0.999
	Comparison	501	1.2		
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	162	0.0	--	0.580
	Comparison	203	1.0		
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	419	0.5	0.46 (0.09,2.27)	0.532
	Comparison	576	1.0		

b) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — ADJUSTED			
Occupational Category	**Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**	**Covariate Remarks[a]**
All	***0.64 (0.26,1.60)***	***0.332***	AGE (p=0.007) DIAB (p=0.109)
Officer	1.05 (0.32,3.51)	0.932	
Enlisted Flyer	--	--	
Enlisted Groundcrew	0.44 (0.09,2.21)	0.319	

[a] Covariates and associated p-values correspond to final model based on all participants with available data.

--: Relative risk, confidence interval, and p-value not presented due to the sparse number of abnormalities.

Table 11-26. (Continued)
Analysis of Biceps Reflex

c) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED				
Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[a]	
Initial Dioxin	n	Percent Abnormal	Estimated Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
Low	174	2.3	0.47 (0.21,1.06)	0.030
Medium	173	1.7		
High	170	0.0		

d) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — ADJUSTED			
Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[c]			
n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
517	0.69 (0.29,1.66)	0.389	OCC (p=0.081)

[a] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in initial dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: Low = 39-98 ppt; Medium = >98-232 ppt; High = >232 ppt.

Table 11-26. (Continued)
Analysis of Biceps Reflex

e) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — UNADJUSTED

Dioxin Category	n	Percent Abnormal	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ab]	p-Value
Comparison	1,062	1.2		
Background RH	373	0.0	--	0.584
Low RH	260	2.3	1.60 (0.59,4.33)	0.351
High RH	257	0.4	0.24 (0.03,1.89)	0.174
Low plus High RH	517	1.4	0.91 (0.35,2.34)	0.837

f) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — ADJUSTED

Dioxin Category	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ac]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
Comparison	1,062			AGE (p=0.016)
Background RH	373	--	--	
Low RH	260	1.42 (0.52,3.90)	0.492	
High RH	257	0.30 (0.04,2.36)	0.251	
Low plus High RH	517	0.93 (0.36,2.43)	0.885	

[a] Relative risk and confidence interval relative to Comparisons.

[b] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

--: Relative risk, confidence interval, and p-value not presented due to the sparse number of abnormalities.

Note: RH = Ranch Hand.
Comparison: Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Background (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Low (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, 10 ppt < Initial Dioxin ≤ 143 ppt.
High (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, Initial Dioxin > 143 ppt.

Table 11-26. (Continued)
Analysis of Biceps Reflex

g) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED

Model[a]	Current Dioxin Category Percent Abnormal/(n) Low	Medium	High	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1) Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
4	0.0 (294)	1.3 (300)	1.0 (296)	1.10 (0.67,1.81)	0.704
5	0.0 (299)	2.0 (297)	0.3 (294)	1.04 (0.67,1.61)	0.871
6[c]	0.0 (298)	2.0 (297)	0.3 (294)	1.20 (0.75,1.92)	0.459

h) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — ADJUSTED

Model[a]	n	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1) Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
4	890	1.76 (0.87,3.55)	0.115	AGE (p=0.043) OCC (p=0.092)
5	890	1.43 (0.78,2.65)	0.245	AGE (p=0.044) OCC (p=0.133)
6[d]	889	1.98 (0.95,4.14)	0.059	AGE (p=0.035) OCC (p=0.088)

[a] Model 4: Log_2 (lipid-adjusted current dioxin + 1).
Model 5: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1).
Model 6: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1), adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in current dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[d] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids in addition to covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: Model 4: Low = ≤ 8.1 ppt; Medium = >8.1-20.5 ppt; High = >20.5 ppt.
Models 5 and 6: Low = ≤ 46 ppq; Medium = >46-128 ppq; High = >128 ppq.

Table 11-27.
Analysis of Babinski Reflex

a) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — UNADJUSTED					
Occupational Category	**Group**	**n**	**Percent Abnormal**	**Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**
All	***Ranch Hand***	***948***	***0.3***	***0.50 (0.13,1.91)***	***0.469***
	Comparison	***1,278***	***0.6***		
Officer	Ranch Hand	367	0.0	--	0.367
	Comparison	500	0.6		
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	162	0.0	--	0.578
	Comparison	202	1.0		
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	419	0.7	1.38 (0.28,6.86)	0.999
	Comparison	576	0.5		

b) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — ADJUSTED			
Occupational Category	**Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**	**Covariate Remarks[a]**
All	***0.57 (0.15,2.17)***	***0.388***	AGE (p=0.035) INS (p=0.121)
Officer	--	--	
Enlisted Flyer	--	--	
Enlisted Groundcrew	1.52 (0.30,7.67)	0.614	

[a] Covariates and associated p-values correspond to final model based on all participants with available data.

--: Relative risk, confidence interval, and p-value not presented due to the sparse number of abnormalities.

Table 11-27. (Continued)
Analysis of Babinski Reflex

c) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED				
Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)	
Initial Dioxin	n	Percent Abnormal	Estimated Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value
Low	174	0.6	--	--
Medium	173	0.0		
High	170	0.0		

d) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — ADJUSTED			
Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)			
n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
--	--	--	--

--: Analysis not conducted due to the sparse number of abnormalities.

Note: Low = 39-98 ppt; Medium = >98-232 ppt; High = >232 ppt.

Table 11-27. (Continued)
Analysis of Babinski Reflex

e) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — UNADJUSTED				
Dioxin Category	n	Percent Abnormal	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ab]	p-Value
Comparison	1,061	0.7		
Background RH	373	0.5	0.72 (0.15,3.53)	0.684
Low RH	260	0.4	0.55 (0.07,4.54)	0.578
High RH	257	0.0	--	0.408
Low plus High RH	517	0.2	0.28 (0.03,2.37)	0.244

f) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — ADJUSTED				
Dioxin Category	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ac]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
Comparison	1,061			AGE (p=0.016) OCC (p=0.097)
Background RH	373	0.83 (0.16,4.33)	0.826	
Low RH	260	0.52 (0.06,4.43)	0.552	
High RH	257	--	--	
Low plus High RH	517	0.25 (0.03,2.13)	0.206	

[a] Relative risk and confidence interval relative to Comparisons.

[b] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

--: Relative risk, confidence interval, and p-value not presented due to the sparse number of abnormalities.

Note: RH = Ranch Hand.
Comparison: Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Background (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Low (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, 10 ppt < Initial Dioxin ≤ 143 ppt.
High (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, Initial Dioxin > 143 ppt.

Table 11-27. (Continued)
Analysis of Babinski Reflex

g) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED					
	Current Dioxin Category Percent Abnormal/(n)			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)	
Model[a]	Low	Medium	High	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
4	0.7 (294)	0.3 (300)	0.0 (296)	0.47 (0.20,1.13)	0.087
5	0.7 (299)	0.3 (297)	0.0 (294)	0.64 (0.38,1.08)	0.131
6[c]	0.7 (298)	0.3 (297)	0.0 (294)	0.63 (0.36,1.11)	0.154

h) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — ADJUSTED				
	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)			
Model[a]	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
4	890	0.43 (0.19,0.98)	0.039	AGE (p=0.086) OCC (p=0.014)
5	890	0.59 (0.35,0.98)	0.062	AGE (p=0.073) OCC (p=0.015)
6[d]	889	0.60 (0.34,1.05)	0.092	AGE (p=0.072) OCC (p=0.016)

[a] Model 4: Log_2 (lipid-adjusted current dioxin + 1).
Model 5: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1).
Model 6: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1), adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in current dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[d] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids in addition to covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: Model 4: Low = ≤ 8.1 ppt; Medium = >8.1-20.5 ppt; High = >20.5 ppt.
Models 5 and 6: Low = ≤ 46 ppq; Medium = >46-128 ppq; High = >128 ppq.

(Table 11-27(e,f): $p > 0.20$ for all contrasts). Relative risks for the high Ranch Hand contrast were not computed because there were no abnormalities in the high Ranch Hand category. The adjusted analysis contained age and occupation.

For Model 4, the unadjusted analysis revealed a marginally significant inverse association between lipid-adjusted current dioxin and Babinski reflex (Table 11-27(g): $p=0.087$, Est. RR=0.47, 95% C.I.=[0.20,1.13]). The unadjusted analyses for Models 5 and 6 did not find a significant association (Table 11-27(g): $p > 0.13$ for both contrasts).

In the adjusted analyses, the association between current dioxin and Babinski reflex became significant for Model 4 and marginally significant for Models 5 and 6 (Table 11-27(h): $p=0.039$, Adj. RR=0.43, 95% C.I.=[0.19,0.98]; $p=0.062$, Adj. RR=0.59, 95% C.I.=[0.35,0.98]; and $p=0.092$, Adj. RR=0.60, 95% C.I.=[0.34,1.05] respectively). Age and occupation were significant in each adjusted model. The associations became nonsignificant in Models 4 through 6 when occupation was removed from each of the adjusted analyses (Appendix Table G-3-12(b): $p > 0.10$ in each model).

Vibrotactile Threshold Measurement of Right Great Toe

The unadjusted and adjusted Model 1 analyses for vibrotactile threshold measurement of the right great toe did not find a significant difference between Ranch Hands and Comparisons (Table 11-28(a,b): $p > 0.13$ for all contrasts). The final adjusted model contained age, occupation, and an insecticide exposure-by-diabetic class interaction.

For Model 2, the unadjusted analysis did not reveal a significant association between initial dioxin and vibrotactile threshold measurement of the right great toe (Table 11-28(c): $p=0.218$). The adjusted analysis contained an initial dioxin-by-composite exposure to heavy metals interaction (Table 11-28(d): $p=0.002$). Appendix Table G-2-10 presents adjusted results stratified by composite exposure to heavy metals. In addition to this interaction, the adjusted analysis included age, lifetime alcohol history, and an occupation-by-worked with vibrating power equipment or tools interaction. The adjusted analysis did not reveal a significant association between initial dioxin and vibrotactile threshold measurement of the right great toe when the initial dioxin-by-composite exposure to heavy metals interaction was removed from the final model ($p=0.438$).

The unadjusted Model 3 analysis of vibrotacitle threshold measurement of the right great toe did not reveal a significant contrast between any of the Ranch Hand categories and the Comparison group (Table 11-28(e): $p > 0.38$ for all contrasts). The adjusted Model 3 analysis retained a categorized dioxin-by-lifetime alcohol history interaction (Table 11-28(f): $p < 0.001$). Appendix Table G-2-10 displays adjusted results stratified by lifetime alcohol history categories. The adjusted analysis also included the covariate age and three covariate-by-covariate interactions: lifetime alcohol history-by-occupation, insecticide exposure-by-diabetic class, and diabetic class-by-composite exposure to heavy metals. After removing the categorized dioxin-by-lifetime alcohol history interaction, the adjusted analysis did not show any of the Ranch Hand categories to be significantly different from the Comparison group (Table 11-28(f): $p > 0.26$ for all contrasts).

Table 11-28.
Analysis of Vibrotactile Threshold Measurement of Right Great Toe (microns)

a) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — UNADJUSTED

Occupational Category	Group	n	Mean[a]	Difference of Means (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value[c]
All	***Ranch Hand***	***946***	***16.66***	***0.04--***	***0.957***
	Comparison	***1,277***	***16.61***		
Officer	Ranch Hand	366	16.97	-1.48--	0.303
	Comparison	499	18.45		
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	162	20.18	0.88--	0.711
	Comparison	203	19.29		
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	418	15.21	0.83--	0.442
	Comparison	575	14.38		

b) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — ADJUSTED

Occupational Category	Group	n	Adj. Mean[a]	Difference of Adj. Means (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value[c]	Covariate Remarks[d]
All	***Ranch Hand***	***945***	***16.28***	***-0.19--***	0.798	AGE ($p<0.001$)
	Comparison	***1,275***	***16.48***			OCC ($p<0.001$)
Officer	Ranch Hand	366	13.32	-1.54--	0.136	INS*DIAB ($p=0.012$)
	Comparison	499	14.86			
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	162	17.46	0.23--	0.904	
	Comparison	202	17.22			
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	417	18.62	1.16--	0.349	
	Comparison	574	17.46			

[a] Transformed from the natural logarithm scale.

[b] Difference of means after transformation to original scale; confidence interval on difference of means not presented because analysis was performed on natural logarithm scale.

[c] P-values based on difference of means on natural logarithm scale.

[d] Covariates and associated p-values correspond to final model based on all participants with available data.

Table 11-28. (Continued)
Analysis of Vibrotactile Threshold Measurement of Right Great Toe (microns)

c) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED						
Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics				Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[b]		
Initial Dioxin	n	Mean[a]	Adj. Mean[ab]	R^2	Slope (Std. Error)[c]	p-Value
Low	173	17.18	17.06	0.002	-0.0473 (0.0384)	0.218
Medium	172	21.11	21.21			
High	170	14.73	14.77			

d) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — ADJUSTED						
Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[d]			
Initial Dioxin	n	Adj. Mean[ad]	R^2	Adj. Slope (Std. Error)[c]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
Low	171	17.43**	0.165	0.0325 (0.0419)**	0.438**	INIT*HVMET (p=0.002)
Medium	167	23.20**				AGE (p<0.001) DRKYR (p=0.057) OCC*PWTOOL (p=0.016)
High	165	19.06**				

[a] Transformed from natural logarithm scale.

[b] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[c] Slope and standard error based on natural logarithm of vibrotactile threshold measurement of right great toe versus log_2 (initial dioxin).

[d] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

** Log_2 (initial dioxin)-by-covariate interaction ($p \leq 0.05$); adjusted mean, adjusted slope, standard error, and p-value derived from a model fitted after deletion of this interaction; refer to Appendix Table G-2-10 for further analysis of this interaction.

Note: Low = 39-98 ppt; Medium = >98-232 ppt; High = >232 ppt.

Table 11-28. (Continued)
Analysis of Vibrotactile Threshold Measurement of Right Great Toe (microns)

e) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — UNADJUSTED

Dioxin Category	n	Mean[a]	Adj. Mean[ab]	Difference of Adj. Mean vs. Comparisons (95% C.I.)[c]	p-Value[d]
Comparison	1,059	17.05	17.05		
Background RH	373	15.98	16.47	-0.58--	0.620
Low RH	258	18.73	18.27	1.22--	0.384
High RH	257	16.33	16.03	-1.02--	0.438
Low plus High RH	515	17.49	17.11	0.06--	0.953

f) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — ADJUSTED

Dioxin Category	n	Adj. Mean[ae]	Difference of Adj. Mean vs. Comparisons (95% C.I.)[c]	p-Value[d]	Covariate Remarks
Comparison	1,040	17.35**			DXCAT*DRKYR (p<0.001) AGE (p<0.001) DRKYR*OCC (p=0.040) INS*DIAB (p=0.024) DIAB*HVMET (p=0.018)
Background RH	365	16.11**	-1.24--**	0.266**	
Low RH	253	17.13**	-0.22--**	0.864**	
High RH	250	18.40**	1.05--**	0.448**	
Low plus High RH	503	17.76**	0.40--**	0.696**	

[a] Transformed from natural logarithm scale.

[b] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[c] Difference of adjusted means after transformation to original scale; confidence interval on difference of adjusted means not presented because analysis was performed on natural logarithm scale.

[d] P-value is based on difference of means on natural logarithm scale.

[e] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

** Categorized dioxin-by-covariate interaction ($p \leq 0.05$); adjusted mean, difference of adjusted means, and p-value derived from a model fitted after deletion of this interaction; refer to Appendix Table G-2-10 for further analysis of this interaction.

Note: RH = Ranch Hand.
Comparison: Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Background (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Low (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, 10 ppt < Initial Dioxin ≤ 143 ppt.
High (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, Initial Dioxin > 143 ppt.

Table 11-28. (Continued)
Analysis of Vibrotactile Threshold Measurement of Right Great Toe (microns)

g) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED

Model[b]	Current Dioxin Category Mean[a]/(n) Low	Medium	High	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1) R^2	Slope (Std. Error)[c]	p-Value
4	14.96 (294)	19.34 (299)	16.47 (295)	<0.001	0.0017 (0.0271)	0.950
5	14.93 (299)	19.32 (295)	16.59 (294)	<0.001	0.0067 (0.0232)	0.772
6[d]	15.25 (298)	19.35 (295)	16.27 (294)	0.002	-0.0082 (0.0251)	0.744

h) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — ADJUSTED

Model[b]	Current Dioxin Category Adjusted Mean[a]/(n) Low	Medium	High	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1) R^2	Adj. Slope (Std. Error)[c]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
4	15.42** (290)	18.41** (292)	18.36** (286)	0.171	0.0290 (0.0295)**	0.326**	CURR*DRKYR (p=0.001) CURR*HVMET (p=0.003) AGE (p<0.001) OCC (p=0.025) DIAB*PWTOOL (p=0.041)
5	15.25** (294)	18.66** (289)	18.08** (285)	0.169	0.0243 (0.0249)**	0.328**	CURR*DRKYR (p=0.002) CURR*HVMET (p=0.012) AGE (p<0.001) OCC (p=0.028) DIAB*PWTOOL (p=0.045)
6[e]	15.40** (293)	18.73** (289)	18.17** (285)	0.168	0.0178 (0.0269)**	0.508**	CURR*DRKYR (p=0.002) CURR*HVMET (p=0.027) AGE (p<0.001) OCC (p=0.027) DIAB*PWTOOL (p=0.046)

[a] Transformed from natural logarithm scale.

[b] Model 4: Log_2 (lipid-adjusted current dioxin + 1).
Model 5: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1).
Model 6: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1), adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[c] Slope and standard error based on natural logarithm of vibrotactile threshold measurement of right great toe versus log_2 (current dioxin + 1).

[d] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[e] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids in addition to covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

** Log_2 (current dioxin + 1)-by-covariate interactions ($p \leq 0.05$); adjusted mean, adjusted slope, standard error, and p-value derived from a model fitted after deletion of these interactions; refer to Appendix Table G-2-10 for further analysis of these interactions.

Note: Model 4: Low = ≤ 8.1 ppt; Medium = >8.1-20.5 ppt; High = >20.5 ppt.
Models 5 and 6: Low = ≤ 46 ppq; Medium = >46-128 ppq; High = >128 ppq.

The unadjusted analyses for Models 4 through 6 did not reveal a significant association between current dioxin and vibrotactile threshold measurement of the right great toe (Table 11-28(g): $p > 0.74$ for all analyses). Each of the adjusted analyses for Models 4 through 6 contained a current dioxin-by-lifetime alcohol history and a current dioxin-by-composite exposure to heavy metals interaction (Table 11-28(h): $p=0.001$ and $p=0.003$, $p=0.002$ and $p=0.012$, and $p=0.002$ and $p=0.027$ for Models 4, 5, and 6 respectively). Appendix Table G-2-10 displays adjusted results stratified separately by lifetime alcohol history and composite exposure to heavy metals for Models 4 through 6. In addition to these interactions, each of the adjusted analyses included age, occupation, and a diabetic class-by-worked with vibrating power equipment or tools interaction.

None of the adjusted analyses for Models 4 through 6 detected a significant association between current dioxin and vibrotactile threshold measurement of the right great toe when the current dioxin-by-lifetime alcohol history and current dioxin-by-composite exposure to heavy metals interactions were removed from each of the final models (Table 11-28(h): $p > 0.32$ for each analysis). However, the association between current dioxin and vibrotactile threshold measurement of the right great toe became significant in Models 4 and 5 and marginally significant in Model 6 when occupation, diabetic class, and the current dioxin-by-covariate interactions were removed from the final models (Appendix Table G-3-13(c): $p=0.020$, Adj. Slope=0.0609; $p=0.025$, Adj. Slope=0.0498; and $p=0.056$, Adj. Slope=0.0463 for Models 4, 5, and 6).

Vibrotactile Threshold Measurement of Left Great Toe

The unadjusted and adjusted Model 1 analyses of vibrotactile threshold measurement of the left great toe did not find a significant difference between Ranch Hands and Comparisons (Table 11-29(a,b): $p > 0.20$ for all contrasts). The final adjusted model contained age, race, occupation, and two covariate-by-covariate interactions: lifetime alcohol history-by-insecticide exposure and insecticide exposure-by-diabetic class.

For Model 2, the unadjusted analysis detected a marginally significant inverse association between initial dioxin and vibrotactile threshold measurement of the left great toe (Table 11-29(c): $p=0.061$, Est. Slope=-0.0720). An initial dioxin-by-diabetic class and an initial dioxin-by-composite exposure to heavy metals interaction were retained in the adjusted Model 2 analysis (Table 11-29(d): $p=0.033$ and $p=0.021$ respectively). Appendix Table G-2-11 presents adjusted results stratified separately by diabetic class and composite exposure to heavy metals. The adjusted analysis also included the covariates age, race, and worked with vibrating power equipment or tools. Without the initial dioxin-by-diabetic class and initial dioxin-by-composite exposure to heavy metals interactions, the adjusted analysis did not find a significant association between current dioxin and vibrotactile threshold measurement of the left great toe (Table 11-29(d): $p=0.833$).

The unadjusted and adjusted Model 3 analyses of vibrotactile threshold measurement of the left great toe did not reveal a significant contrast between any of the Ranch Hand categories and the Comparison group (Table 11-29(e,f): $p > 0.18$ for all contrasts). The adjusted analysis contained age, race, occupation, and a lifetime alcohol history-by-insecticide exposure interaction.

Table 11-29.
Analysis of Vibrotactile Threshold Measurement of Left Great Toe (microns)

a) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — UNADJUSTED

Occupational Category	Group	n	Mean[a]	Difference of Means (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value[c]
All	***Ranch Hand***	***946***	***17.12***	***0.70--***	***0.408***
	Comparison	***1,277***	***16.43***		
Officer	Ranch Hand	366	18.16	0.22--	0.880
	Comparison	500	17.94		
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	162	19.98	-0.39--	0.873
	Comparison	202	20.37		
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	418	15.32	1.21--	0.267
	Comparison	575	14.11		

b) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — ADJUSTED

Occupational Category	Group	n	Adj. Mean[a]	Difference of Adj. Means (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value[c]	Covariate Remarks[d]
All	***Ranch Hand***	***924***	***15.77***	***0.31--***	0.664	AGE ($p<0.001$) RACE ($p=0.110$) OCC ($p<0.001$) DRKYR*INS ($p=0.016$) INS*DIAB ($p=0.038$)
	Comparison	***1,254***	***15.46***			
Officer	Ranch Hand	362	13.15	-0.25--	0.797	
	Comparison	492	13.40			
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	156	15.90	-1.14--	0.540	
	Comparison	200	17.04			
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	406	18.09	1.52--	0.205	
	Comparison	562	16.58			

[a] Transformed from the natural logarithm scale.

[b] Difference of means after transformation to original scale; confidence interval on difference of means not presented because analysis was performed on natural logarithm scale.

[c] P-values based on difference of means on natural logarithm scale.

[d] Covariates and associated p-values correspond to final model based on all participants with available data.

Table 11-29. (Continued)
Analysis of Vibrotactile Threshold Measurement of Left Great Toe (microns)

c) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED						
Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics				Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[b]		
Initial Dioxin	n	Mean[a]	Adj. Mean[ab]	R^2	Slope (Std. Error)[c]	p-Value
Low	173	19.64	19.62	0.030	-0.0720 (0.0383)	0.061
Medium	172	18.74	18.94			
High	170	15.15	15.00			

d) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — ADJUSTED						
Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[d]			
Initial Dioxin	n	Adj. Mean[ad]	R^2	Adj. Slope (Std. Error)[c]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
Low	173	18.18**	0.194	0.0079 (0.0375)**	0.833**	INIT*DIAB (p=0.033) INIT*HVMET (p=0.021) AGE (p<0.001) RACE (p=0.112) PWTOOL (p=0.009)
Medium	172	19.18**				
High	170	18.08**				

[a] Transformed from natural logarithm scale.

[b] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[c] Slope and standard error based on natural logarithm of vibrotactile threshold measurement of left great toe versus log_2 (initial dioxin).

[d] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

** Log_2 (initial dioxin)-by-covariate interactions ($0.01 < p \leq 0.05$); adjusted mean, adjusted slope, standard error, and p-value derived from a model fitted after deletion of these interactions; refer to Appendix Table G-2-11 for further analysis of these interactions.

Note: Low = 39-98 ppt; Medium = >98-232 ppt; High = >232 ppt.

Table 11-29. (Continued)
Analysis of Vibrotactile Threshold Measurement of Left Great Toe (microns)

e) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — UNADJUSTED

Dioxin Category	n	Mean[a]	Adj. Mean[ab]	Difference of Adj. Mean vs. Comparisons (95% C.I.)[c]	p-Value[d]
Comparison	1,060	16.93	16.93		
Background RH	373	16.66	17.24	0.31--	0.797
Low RH	258	19.39	18.80	1.87--	0.189
High RH	257	16.24	15.94	-0.99--	0.453
Low plus High RH	515	17.75	17.31	0.38--	0.719

f) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — ADJUSTED

Dioxin Category	n	Adj. Mean[ae]	Difference of Adj. Mean vs. Comparisons (95% C.I.)[c]	p-Value[d]	Covariate Remarks
Comparison	1,042	15.71			AGE ($p<0.001$) RACE ($p=0.136$) OCC ($p<0.001$) DRKYR*INS ($p=0.012$)
Background RH	366	15.45	-0.26--	0.801	
Low RH	253	16.32	0.62--	0.603	
High RH	250	16.45	0.75--	0.545	
Low plus High RH	503	16.39	0.68--	0.466	

[a] Transformed from natural logarithm scale.

[b] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[c] Difference of adjusted means after transformation to original scale; confidence interval on difference of adjusted means not presented because analysis was performed on natural logarithm scale.

[d] P-value is based on difference of means on natural logarithm scale.

[e] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: RH = Ranch Hand.
Comparison: Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Background (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Low (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, 10 ppt < Initial Dioxin ≤ 143 ppt.
High (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, Initial Dioxin > 143 ppt.

Table 11-29. (Continued)
Analysis of Vibrotactile Threshold Measurement of Left Great Toe (microns)

g) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED						
	Current Dioxin Category Mean[a]/(n)			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)		
Model[b]	Low	Medium	High	R^2	Slope (Std. Error)[c]	p-Value
4	15.85 (294)	20.05 (299)	16.20 (295)	<0.001	-0.0106 (0.0274)	0.698
5	15.82 (299)	19.62 (295)	16.64 (294)	<0.001	-0.0056 (0.0235)	0.813
6[d]	16.04 (298)	19.65 (295)	16.38 (294)	0.001	-0.0150 (0.0254)	0.557

h) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — ADJUSTED							
	Current Dioxin Category Adjusted Mean[a]/(n)			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)			
Model[b]	Low	Medium	High	R^2	Adj. Slope (Std. Error)[c]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
4	17.08** (290)	19.92** (292)	19.08** (286)	0.207	0.0226 (0.0291)**	0.439**	CURR*DRKYR (p=0.004) CURR*DIAB (p=0.019) CURR*PWTOOL (p=0.005) AGE (p<0.001) OCC (p=0.046) HVMET (p=0.146)
5	16.63** (295)	19.32** (289)	18.88** (285)	0.200	0.0167 (0.0240)**	0.487**	CURR*DRKYR (p=0.002) CURR*PWTOOL (p=0.018) AGE (p<0.001) OCC (p=0.026) HVMET (p=0.133)
6[e]	16.52** (294)	19.29** (289)	19.04** (285)	0.200	0.0183 (0.0262)**	0.485**	CURR*DRKYR (p=0.002) CURR*PWTOOL (p=0.016) AGE (p<0.001) OCC (p=0.029) HVMET (p=0.145)

[a] Transformed from natural logarithm scale.

[b] Model 4: Log_2 (lipid-adjusted current dioxin + 1).
Model 5: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1).
Model 6: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1), adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[c] Slope and standard error based on natural logarithm of vibrotactile threshold measurement of left great toe versus log_2 (current dioxin + 1).

[d] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[e] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids in addition to covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

** Log_2 (current dioxin + 1)-by-covariate interaction ($p \leq 0.05$); adjusted mean, adjusted slope, standard error, and p-value derived from a model fitted after deletion of these interactions; refer to Appendix Table G-2-11 for further analysis of these interactions.

Note: Model 4: Low = ≤ 8.1 ppt; Medium = >8.1-20.5 ppt; High = >20.5 ppt.
Models 5 and 6: Low = ≤ 46 ppq; Medium = >46-128 ppq; High = >128 ppq.

The unadjusted analyses for Models 4 through 6 did not reveal a significant association between current dioxin and vibrotactile threshold measurement of the left great toe (Table 11-29(g): $p>0.55$ for each analysis). Each of the adjusted analyses for Models 4 through 6 contained a current dioxin-by-lifetime alcohol history and a current dioxin-by-worked with vibrating power equipment or tools interaction (Table 11-29(h): $p=0.004$ and $p=0.005$, $p=0.002$ and $p=0.018$, and $p=0.002$ and $p=0.016$ for Models 4, 5, and 6 respectively). Model 4 also contained a current dioxin-by-diabetic class interaction ($p=0.019$). Appendix Table G-2-11 presents adjusted results stratified separately by lifetime alcohol history and worked with vibrating power equipment or tools for Models 4 through 6. Appendix Table G-2-11 also displays adjusted results stratified by diabetic class for Model 4. In addition to these interactions, Models 4, 5, and 6 included age, occupation, and composite exposure to heavy metals.

None of the adjusted analyses for Models 4 through 6 found a significant association between current dioxin and vibrotactile threshold measurement of the left great toe when the current dioxin-by-covariate interactions were removed from each of the final models (Table 11-29(h): $p>0.43$ for each analysis). However, the association between current dioxin and vibrotactile threshold measurement of the left great toe became significant in Model 4 and marginally significant in Models 5 and 6 after occupation, diabetic class, and the current dioxin-by-covariate interactions were removed from the adjusted analyses (Appendix Table G-3-14(c): $p=0.034$, Adj. Slope=0.0547; $p=0.054$, Adj. Slope=0.0422; and $p=0.057$, Adj. Slope=0.0454 for Models 4, 5, and 6 respectively).

Physical Examination Variables: CNS Coordination Processes

Tremor

The unadjusted and adjusted Model 1 analyses of tremor did not find a significant difference between Ranch Hands and Comparisons (Table 11-30(a,b): $p>0.10$ for all contrasts). The adjusted analysis contained an age-by-lifetime alcohol history interaction.

Additional unadjusted and adjusted Model 1 analyses for tremor were conducted with the enlisted flyers and enlisted groundcrew combined into one stratum. This unadjusted analysis found a marginally significant group difference within the enlisted stratum (Appendix Table G-5-3(a): $p=0.081$, Est. RR=1.95, 95% C.I.=[0.98, 3.89]). Among enlisted participants, the percentage of abnormalities was higher for the Ranch Hands than for the Comparisons (Table G-5-3(a): 3.4% versus 1.8%). The adjusted analyses combining enlisted flyers and enlisted groundcrew did not detect a significant overall group difference (Appendix Table G-5-3(b): $p=0.755$). For the enlisted participants, the relative risk remained marginally significant (Appendix Table G-5-3(b): $p=0.094$, Adj. RR=1.83, 95% C.I.=[0.90, 3.69]). The group-by-age and age-by-lifetime alcohol history interactions were retained in this adjusted analysis.

The unadjusted and adjusted results for Model 2 did not show a significant association between initial dioxin and tremor (Table 11-30(c,d): $p>0.12$ for both analyses). The final model included an age-by-occupation interaction.

Table 11-30.
Analysis of Tremor

a) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — UNADJUSTED					
Occupational Category	**Group**	**n**	**Percent Abnormal**	**Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**
All	***Ranch Hand***	***948***	***3.0***	***1.12 (0.67,1.85)***	***0.771***
	Comparison	***1,280***	***2.7***		
Officer	Ranch Hand	367	2.2	0.54 (0.23,1.23)	0.194
	Comparison	501	4.0		
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	162	3.7	3.87 (0.77,19.41)	0.161
	Comparison	203	1.0		
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	419	3.3	1.63 (0.74,3.55)	0.304
	Comparison	576	2.1		

b) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — ADJUSTED			
Occupational Category	**Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**	**Covariate Remarks[a]**
All	***1.09 (0.65,1.83)***	***0.754***	AGE*DRKYR (p=0.036)
Officer	0.55 (0.24,1.28)	0.166	
Enlisted Flyer	3.84 (0.76,19.35)	0.104	
Enlisted Groundcrew	1.49 (0.67,3.33)	0.332	

[a] Covariates and associated p-values correspond to final model based on all participants with available data.

Table 11-30. (Continued)
Analysis of Tremor

c) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED				
Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[a]	
Initial Dioxin	n	Percent Abnormal	Estimated Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
Low	174	1.1	1.28 (0.85,1.94)	0.244
Medium	173	2.9		
High	170	3.5		

d) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — ADJUSTED			
Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[c]			
n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
517	1.47 (0.90,2.40)	0.129	AGE*OCC (p=0.011)

[a] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in initial dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: Low = 39-98 ppt; Medium = >98-232 ppt; High = >232 ppt.

Table 11-30. (Continued)
Analysis of Tremor

e) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — UNADJUSTED				
Dioxin Category	n	Percent Abnormal	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ab]	p-Value
Comparison	1,062	2.7		
Background RH	373	3.2	1.19 (0.60,2.37)	0.623
Low RH	260	1.5	0.57 (0.20,1.62)	0.289
High RH	257	3.5	1.27 (0.59,2.73)	0.539
Low plus High RH	517	2.5	0.92 (0.47,1.78)	0.797

f) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — ADJUSTED				
Dioxin Category	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ac]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
Comparison	1,044			AGE (p=0.043) DRKYR (p=0.145)
Background RH	366	1.16 (0.58,2.33)	0.674	
Low RH	254	0.57 (0.20,1.65)	0.303	
High RH	250	1.30 (0.58,2.93)	0.530	
Low plus High RH	504	0.91 (0.46,1.81)	0.785	

[a] Relative risk and confidence interval relative to Comparisons.

[b] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: RH = Ranch Hand.
Comparison: Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Background (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Low (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, 10 ppt < Initial Dioxin ≤ 143 ppt.
High (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, Initial Dioxin > 143 ppt.

Table 11-30. (Continued)
Analysis of Tremor

g) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED

Model[a]	Current Dioxin Category Percent Abnormal/(n) Low	Medium	High	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1) Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
4	3.7 (294)	1.0 (300)	3.7 (296)	0.97 (0.73,1.28)	0.819
5	3.0 (299)	2.0 (297)	3.4 (294)	0.98 (0.78,1.24)	0.898
6[c]	3.0 (298)	2.0 (297)	3.4 (294)	0.96 (0.75,1.24)	0.750

h) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — ADJUSTED

Model[a]	n	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1) Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
4	869	0.95 (0.70,1.29)**	0.735**	CURR*AGE (p=0.009) DIAB*DRKYR (p=0.037)
5	890	0.98 (0.78,1.24)	0.898	
6[d]	889	0.96 (0.75,1.24)	0.750	

[a] Model 4: Log_2 (lipid-adjusted current dioxin + 1).
Model 5: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1).
Model 6: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1), adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in current dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[d] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids in addition to covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

** Log_2 (current dioxin + 1)-by-covariate interaction ($p \leq 0.05$); adjusted relative risk, confidence interval, and p-value derived from a model fitted after deletion of this interaction; refer to Appendix Table G-2-12 for further analysis of this interaction.

Note: Model 4: Low = ≤ 8.1 ppt; Medium = >8.1-20.5 ppt; High = >20.5 ppt.
Models 5 and 6: Low = ≤ 46 ppq; Medium = >46-128 ppq; High = >128 ppq.

For Model 3, the unadjusted and adjusted analyses of tremor did not reveal any of the Ranch Hand categories to be significantly different from the Comparison group (Table 11-30(e,f): $p > 0.28$ for all contrasts). Age and lifetime alcohol history were retained in the final model.

The unadjusted analyses of Models 4 through 6 did not reveal a significant association between current dioxin and tremor (Table 11-30(g): $p \geq 0.75$ for all analyses). Current dioxin-by-age was a significant interaction in the adjusted analysis of Model 4 (Table 11-30(h): $p = 0.009$). Appendix Table G-2-12 presents adjusted results stratified by age. In addition to the current dioxin-by-age interaction, the adjusted model included a diabetic class-by-lifetime alcohol history interaction. The adjusted Model 4 analysis did not find a significant association between current dioxin and tremor after the current dioxin-by-age interaction was removed from the final model (Table 11-30(h): $p = 0.735$). For Models 5 and 6, the unadjusted and adjusted results were identical because no covariates were retained in the final model.

Coordination

The unadjusted and adjusted Model 1 analyses did not reveal a significant group difference in the percentage of coordination abnormalities (Table 11-31(a,b): $p > 0.25$ for all contrasts). Age was retained in the final adjusted model.

For Model 2, the unadjusted and adjusted analyses did not reveal a significant association between initial dioxin and coordination (Table 11-31(c,d): $p > 0.62$ for both analyses). The final model contained the covariate age.

The unadjusted and adjusted results for Model 3 did not show a significant difference in the percentage of coordination abnormalities between any of the Ranch Hand categories and the Comparison group (Table 11-31(e,f): $p > 0.47$ for all contrasts). Age was significant in the adjusted analysis.

The unadjusted and adjusted analyses for Models 4 through 6 did not reveal a significant association between current dioxin and coordination (Table 11-31(g,h): $p > 0.72$ for all analyses). Each of the adjusted analyses for Models 4 through 6 contained age.

Romberg Sign

For Model 1, the unadjusted and adjusted analyses did not show a significant group difference in the percentage of Romberg sign abnormalities (Table 11-32(a,b): $p > 0.24$ for all contrasts). Relative risks were not estimated for the enlisted flyer stratum because no enlisted flyer Ranch Hand had an abnormal Romerg sign. The final adjusted model contained the covariates age and diabetic class.

The unadjusted and adjusted Model 2 analyses did not reveal a significant association between initial dioxin and Romberg sign (Table 11-32(c,d): $p > 0.41$ for both analyses). Age was retained in the adjusted analysis.

Table 11-31.
Analysis of Coordination

a) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — UNADJUSTED					
Occupational Category	**Group**	**n**	**Percent Abnormal**	**Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**
All	***Ranch Hand***	***947***	***2.2***	***1.14 (0.63,2.04)***	***0.781***
	Comparison	***1,278***	***2.0***		
Officer	Ranch Hand	366	2.2	1.00 (0.40,2.50)	0.999
	Comparison	501	2.2		
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	162	1.2	0.49 (0.09,2.56)	0.632
	Comparison	201	2.5		
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	419	2.6	1.70 (0.70,4.14)	0.342
	Comparison	576	1.6		

b) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — ADJUSTED			
Occupational Category	**Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**	**Covariate Remarks[a]**
All	***1.13 (0.62,2.03)***	***0.695***	AGE ($p < 0.001$)
Officer	1.00 (0.40,2.53)	0.999	
Enlisted Flyer	0.47 (0.09,2.48)	0.374	
Enlisted Groundcrew	1.70 (0.69,4.19)	0.251	

[a] Covariates and associated p-values correspond to final model based on all participants with available data.

Table 11-31. (Continued)
Analysis of Coordination

c) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED				
Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[a]	
Initial Dioxin	n	Percent Abnormal	Estimated Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
Low	174	2.3	0.90 (0.58,1.39)	0.622
Medium	172	2.9		
High	170	2.4		

d) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — ADJUSTED			
Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[c]			
n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
516	1.02 (0.65,1.61)	0.918	AGE (p=0.023)

[a] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in initial dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: Low = 39-98 ppt; Medium = >98-232 ppt; High = >232 ppt.

Table 11-31. (Continued)
Analysis of Coordination

e) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — UNADJUSTED				
Dioxin Category	n	Percent Abnormal	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ab]	p-Value
Comparison	1,062	2.2		
Background RH	373	1.9	0.83 (0.35,1.96)	0.664
Low RH	259	2.7	1.20 (0.51,2.84)	0.681
High RH	257	2.3	1.09 (0.43,2.74)	0.858
Low plus High RH	516	2.5	1.15 (0.57,2.30)	0.703

f) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — ADJUSTED				
Dioxin Category	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ac]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
Comparison	1,062			AGE ($p<0.001$)
Background RH	373	0.75 (0.31,1.79)	0.516	
Low RH	259	1.12 (0.47,2.69)	0.797	
High RH	257	1.41 (0.55,3.58)	0.475	
Low plus High RH	516	1.24 (0.61,2.50)	0.556	

[a] Relative risk and confidence interval relative to Comparisons.

[b] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: RH = Ranch Hand.
Comparison: Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Background (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Low (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, 10 ppt < Initial Dioxin ≤ 143 ppt.
High (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, Initial Dioxin > 143 ppt.

Table 11-31. (Continued)
Analysis of Coordination

g) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED					
	Current Dioxin Category Percent Abnormal/(n)			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)	
Model[a]	Low	Medium	High	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
4	2.0 (294)	2.0 (300)	2.7 (295)	0.97 (0.71,1.32)	0.829
5	1.7 (299)	2.4 (296)	2.7 (294)	0.99 (0.76,1.29)	0.949
6[c]	1.7 (298)	2.4 (296)	2.7 (294)	0.95 (0.72,1.26)	0.726

h) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — ADJUSTED				
	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1)			
Model[a]	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
4	889	1.04 (0.75,1.45)	0.809	AGE (p=0.013)
5	889	1.05 (0.79,1.39)	0.734	AGE (p=0.012)
6[d]	888	1.02 (0.75,1.38)	0.919	AGE (p=0.014)

[a] Model 4: Log_2 (lipid-adjusted current dioxin + 1).
Model 5: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1).
Model 6: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1), adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in current dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[d] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids in addition to covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: Model 4: Low = ≤ 8.1 ppt; Medium = >8.1-20.5 ppt; High = >20.5 ppt.
Models 5 and 6: Low = ≤ 46 ppq; Medium = >46-128 ppq; High = >128 ppq.

Table 11-32.
Analysis of Romberg Sign

a) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — UNADJUSTED					
Occupational Category	**Group**	**n**	**Percent Abnormal**	**Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**
All	***Ranch Hand***	***947***	***0.5***	***1.13 (0.34,3.70)***	***0.999***
	Comparison	***1,279***	***0.5***		
Officer	Ranch Hand	366	0.5	1.37 (0.19,9.76)	0.999
	Comparison	500	0.4		
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	162	0.0	--	0.332
	Comparison	203	1.5		
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	419	0.7	4.15 (0.43,40.01)	0.408
	Comparison	576	0.2		

b) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — ADJUSTED			
Occupational Category	**Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**	**Covariate Remarks[a]**
All	***1.03 (0.31,3.43)***	***0.960***	AGE (p=0.022) DIAB (p=0.006)
Officer	1.18 (0.16,8.55)	0.872	
Enlisted Flyer	--	--	
Enlisted Groundcrew	3.89 (0.40,38.26)	0.244	

[a] Covariates and associated p-values correspond to final model based on all participants with available data.

--: Relative risk, confidence interval, and p-value not presented due to the sparse number of abnormalities.

Table 11-32. (Continued)
Analysis of Romberg Sign

c) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED				
Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[a]	
Initial Dioxin	n	Percent Abnormal	Estimated Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
Low	174	0.6	1.14 (0.51,2.51)	0.757
Medium	172	0.0		
High	170	1.2		

d) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — ADJUSTED			
Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[c]			
n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
516	1.42 (0.63,3.19)	0.414	AGE (p=0.059)

[a] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in initial dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: Low = 39-98 ppt; Medium = >98-232 ppt; High = >232 ppt.

Table 11-32. (Continued)
Analysis of Romberg Sign

e) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — UNADJUSTED

Dioxin Category	n	Percent Abnormal	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ab]	p-Value
Comparison	1,061	0.5		
Background RH	373	0.5	1.19 (0.23,6.29)	0.836
Low RH	259	0.4	0.71 (0.08,6.15)	0.755
High RH	257	0.8	1.31 (0.23,7.41)	0.760
Low plus High RH	516	0.6	1.01 (0.23,4.43)	0.994

f) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — ADJUSTED

Dioxin Category	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ac]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
Comparison	1,061			AGE (p=0.023)
Background RH	373	1.10 (0.21,5.83)	0.912	
Low RH	259	0.61 (0.07,5.45)	0.662	
High RH	257	1.72 (0.31,9.61)	0.539	
Low plus High RH	516	1.06 (0.24,4.70)	0.935	

[a] Relative risk and confidence interval relative to Comparisons.

[b] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: RH = Ranch Hand.
Comparison: Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Background (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Low (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, 10 ppt < Initial Dioxin ≤ 143 ppt.
High (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, Initial Dioxin > 143 ppt.

Table 11-32. (Continued)
Analysis of Romberg Sign

g) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED

Model[a]	Current Dioxin Category Percent Abnormal/(n) Low	Medium	High	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1) Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
4	0.3 (294)	0.7 (300)	0.7 (295)	1.08 (0.60,1.95)	0.788
5	0.3 (299)	0.3 (296)	1.0 (294)	1.10 (0.66,1.84)	0.717
6[c]	0.3 (298)	0.3 (296)	1.0 (294)	1.05 (0.60,1.83)	0.877

h) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — ADJUSTED

Model[a]	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1) n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
4	889	1.26 (0.66,2.42)	0.490	AGE (p=0.014)
5	889	1.25 (0.70,2.22)	0.455	AGE (p=0.013)
6[d]	888	1.20 (0.65,2.24)	0.565	AGE (p=0.014)

[a] Model 4: Log_2 (lipid-adjusted current dioxin + 1).
Model 5: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1).
Model 6: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1), adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in current dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[d] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids in addition to covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: Model 4: Low = ≤ 8.1 ppt; Medium = >8.1-20.5 ppt; High = >20.5 ppt.
Models 5 and 6: Low = ≤ 46 ppq; Medium = >46-128 ppq; High = >128 ppq.

Displayed in Table 11-32(e,f), the unadjusted and adjusted Model 3 results did not reveal any of the Ranch Hand categories to be significantly different from the Comparison group in the percentage of Romberg sign abnormalities ($p > 0.53$ for all contrasts). The adjusted analysis contained the covariate age.

The unadjusted and adjusted results for Models 4 through 6 did not reveal a significant association between current dioxin and Romberg sign (Table 11-32(g,h): $p > 0.45$ for all analyses). Each of the adjusted analyses contained age.

Gait

The unadjusted and adjusted Model 1 analyses of gait did not show a significant group difference in percentage of gait abnormalities between Ranch Hands and Comparisons (Table 11-33(a,b): $p > 0.20$ for all contrasts). Age and lifetime alcohol history were significant covariates in the adjusted analysis.

For Model 2, the unadjusted analysis did not reveal a significant association between initial dioxin and gait (Table 11-33(c): $p = 0.598$). The interaction between initial dioxin and age was significant in the adjusted Model 2 analysis (Table 11-33(d): $p = 0.031$). Appendix Table G-2-13 displays adjusted results stratified by age. The final model also included an age-by-lifetime alcohol history interaction. Without the initial dioxin-by-age interaction, the adjusted analysis did not detect a significant association between initial dioxin and gait (Table 11-33(d): $p = 0.260$).

The unadjusted and adjusted analyses of gait for Model 3 did not reveal any of the Ranch Hand categories to be significantly different than the Comparison group (Table 11-33(e,f): $p > 0.18$ for all contrasts). The final model contained the covariates age and lifetime alcohol history.

The unadjusted and adjusted results for Models 4 through 6 did not reveal a significant association between current dioxin and gait (Table 11-33(g,h): $p > 0.66$ for all analyses). Each of the adjusted analyses contained age, occupation, and a diabetic class-by-insecticide exposure interaction.

Central Nervous System (CNS) Index

The unadjusted and adjusted Model 1 analyses of the CNS index did not reveal a significant difference between the Ranch Hands and Comparisons (Table 11-34(a,b): $p > 0.41$ for all contrasts). The adjusted model contained the covariates age, race, and lifetime alcohol history.

For Model 2, the unadjusted and adjusted analyses did not reveal a significant association between initial dioxin and the CNS index (Table 11-34(c,d): $p > 0.18$ for both analyses). Age was significant in the final model.

Table 11-33.
Analysis of Gait

a) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — UNADJUSTED					
Occupational Category	**Group**	**n**	**Percent Abnormal**	**Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**
All	***Ranch Hand***	***948***	***3.5***	***1.12 (0.70,1.79)***	***0.732***
	Comparison	***1,279***	***3.1***		
Officer	Ranch Hand	367	2.7	0.91 (0.40,2.04)	0.973
	Comparison	500	3.0		
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	162	3.7	0.83 (0.29,2.38)	0.933
	Comparison	203	4.4		
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	419	4.1	1.48 (0.74,2.97)	0.351
	Comparison	576	2.8		

b) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — ADJUSTED			
Occupational Category	**Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)**	**p-Value**	**Covariate Remarks[a]**
All	***1.14 (0.71,1.83)***	***0.597***	AGE (p=0.001) DRKYR (p=0.072)
Officer	0.89 (0.39,2.01)	0.776	
Enlisted Flyer	0.84 (0.29,2.43)	0.753	
Enlisted Groundcrew	1.59 (0.78,3.23)	0.205	

[a] Covariates and associated p-values correspond to final model based on all participants with available data.

Table 11-33. (Continued)
Analysis of Gait

c) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED				
Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics			**Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[a]**	
Initial Dioxin	**n**	**Percent Abnormal**	**Estimated Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]**	**p-Value**
Low	174	2.9	1.10 (0.78,1.56)	0.598
Medium	173	2.3		
High	170	4.7		

d) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — ADJUSTED			
Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[c]			
n	**Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]**	**p-Value**	**Covariate Remarks**
504	1.24 (0.86,1.80)**	0.260**	INIT*AGE (p=0.031) AGE*DRKYR (p=0.016)

[a] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in initial dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

** Log_2 (initial dioxin)-by-covariate interaction ($0.01 < p \leq 0.05$); adjusted relative risk, confidence interval, and p-value derived from a model fitted after deletion of this interaction; refer to Appendix Table G-2-13 for further analysis of this interaction.

Note: Low = 39-98 ppt; Medium = >98-232 ppt; High = >232 ppt.

Table 11-33. (Continued)
Analysis of Gait

e) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — UNADJUSTED				
Dioxin Category	n	Percent Abnormal	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ab]	p-Value
Comparison	1,061	3.5		
Background RH	373	3.8	1.16 (0.61,2.18)	0.655
Low RH	260	1.9	0.53 (0.20,1.36)	0.184
High RH	257	4.7	1.28 (0.66,2.51)	0.467
Low plus High RH	517	3.3	0.90 (0.50,1.62)	0.726

f) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — ADJUSTED				
Dioxin Category	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ac]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
Comparison	1,043			AGE (p=0.007) DRKYR (p=0.077)
Background RH	366	1.13 (0.60,2.14)	0.706	
Low RH	254	0.52 (0.20,1.35)	0.182	
High RH	250	1.48 (0.75,2.94)	0.259	
Low plus High RH	504	0.96 (0.53,1.73)	0.889	

[a] Relative risk and confidence interval relative to Comparisons.

[b] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: RH = Ranch Hand.
Comparison: Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Background (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Low (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, 10 ppt < Initial Dioxin ≤ 143 ppt.
High (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, Initial Dioxin > 143 ppt.

Table 11-33. (Continued)
Analysis of Gait

g) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED

Model[a]	Current Dioxin Category Percent Abnormal/(n) Low	Medium	High	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1) Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
4	3.4 (294)	3.3 (300)	3.7 (296)	1.01 (0.79,1.29)	0.945
5	3.0 (299)	3.7 (297)	3.7 (294)	1.02 (0.83,1.26)	0.854
6[c]	3.0 (298)	3.7 (297)	3.7 (294)	1.00 (0.80,1.26)	0.970

h) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — ADJUSTED

Model[a]	n	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1) Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
4	889	0.94 (0.71,1.24)	0.662	AGE (p=0.061) OCC (p=0.099) DIAB*INS (p=0.033)
5	889	0.96 (0.76,1.22)	0.753	AGE (p=0.060) OCC (p=0.107) DIAB*INS (p=0.033)
6[d]	888	0.95 (0.73,1.22)	0.673	AGE (p=0.061) OCC (p=0.101) DIAB*INS (p=0.033)

[a] Model 4: Log_2 (lipid-adjusted current dioxin + 1).
Model 5: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1).
Model 6: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1), adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in current dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[d] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids in addition to covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: Model 4: Low = ≤ 8.1 ppt; Medium = >8.1-20.5 ppt; High = >20.5 ppt.
Models 5 and 6: Low = ≤ 46 ppq; Medium = >46-128 ppq; High = >128 ppq.

Table 11-34.
Analysis of Central Nervous System (CNS) Index

a) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — UNADJUSTED

Occupational Category	Group	n	Percent Abnormal	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value
All	***Ranch Hand***	***947***	***6.0***	***1.03 (0.72,1.47)***	***0.950***
	Comparison	***1,279***	***5.9***		
Officer	Ranch Hand	366	4.9	0.78 (0.43,1.43)	0.515
	Comparison	501	6.2		
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	162	6.8	1.06 (0.46,2.43)	0.999
	Comparison	202	6.4		
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	419	6.7	1.26 (0.74,2.13)	0.470
	Comparison	576	5.4		

b) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS — ADJUSTED

Occupational Category	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)	p-Value	Covariate Remarks[a]
All	***1.03 (0.72,1.48)***	***0.875***	AGE ($p<0.001$) RACE ($p=0.096$) DRKYR ($p=0.009$)
Officer	0.80 (0.44,1.46)	0.465	
Enlisted Flyer	1.07 (0.46,2.47)	0.874	
Enlisted Groundcrew	1.26 (0.73,2.16)	0.413	

[a] Covariates and associated p-values correspond to final model based on all participants with available data.

Table 11-34. (Continued)
Analysis of Central Nervous System (CNS) Index

c) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED				
Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics			**Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[a]**	
Initial Dioxin	**n**	**Percent Abnormal**	**Estimated Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]**	**p-Value**
Low	174	4.0	1.10 (0.84,1.45)	0.501
Medium	172	6.4		
High	170	7.1		

d) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN — ADJUSTED			
Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[c]			
n	**Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]**	**p-Value**	**Covariate Remarks**
516	1.22 (0.92,1.62)	0.181	AGE (p=0.013)

[a] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in initial dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: Low = 39-98 ppt; Medium = >98-232 ppt; High = >232 ppt.

Table 11-34. (Continued)
Analysis of Central Nervous System (CNS) Index

e) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — UNADJUSTED				
Dioxin Category	n	Percent Abnormal	Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ab]	p-Value
Comparison	1,062	6.3		
Background RH	373	6.2	1.01 (0.62,1.65)	0.969
Low RH	259	4.2	0.64 (0.33,1.24)	0.185
High RH	257	7.4	1.16 (0.68,1.97)	0.589
Low plus High RH	516	5.8	0.89 (0.57,1.40)	0.622

f) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY — ADJUSTED				
Dioxin Category	n	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ac]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
Comparison	1,044			AGE ($p<0.001$) DRKYR ($p=0.055$)
Background RH	366	0.98 (0.59,1.62)	0.940	
Low RH	253	0.64 (0.33,1.23)	0.181	
High RH	250	1.30 (0.75,2.26)	0.356	
Low plus High RH	503	0.88 (0.56,1.40)	0.593	

[a] Relative risk and confidence interval relative to Comparisons.

[b] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin, and covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: RH = Ranch Hand.
Comparison: Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Background (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin ≤ 10 ppt.
Low (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, 10 ppt < Initial Dioxin ≤ 143 ppt.
High (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin > 10 ppt, Initial Dioxin > 143 ppt.

Table 11-34. (Continued)
Analysis of Central Nervous System (CNS) Index

g) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — UNADJUSTED

Model[a]	Current Dioxin Category Percent Abnormal/(n) Low	Medium	High	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1) Est. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
4	6.5 (294)	4.3 (300)	7.1 (295)	1.00 (0.83,1.22)	0.959
5	5.4 (299)	5.4 (296)	7.1 (294)	1.03 (0.87,1.21)	0.721
6[c]	5.4 (298)	5.4 (296)	7.1 (294)	0.99 (0.83,1.18)	0.869

h) MODELS 4, 5, AND 6: RANCH HANDS — CURRENT DIOXIN — ADJUSTED

Model[a]	n	Analysis Results for Log_2 (Current Dioxin + 1) Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value	Covariate Remarks
4	889	0.93 (0.75,1.16)	0.519	AGE (p=0.022) OCC*INS (p=0.035)
5	889	0.97 (0.81,1.17)	0.766	AGE (p=0.020) OCC*INS (p=0.036)
6[d]	888	0.92 (0.76,1.12)	0.407	AGE (p=0.028) OCC*INS (p=0.030)

[a] Model 4: Log_2 (lipid-adjusted current dioxin + 1).
Model 5: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1).
Model 6: Log_2 (whole-weight current dioxin + 1), adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in current dioxin.

[c] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids.

[d] Adjusted for log_2 total lipids in addition to covariates specified under "Covariate Remarks" column.

Note: Model 4: Low = ≤ 8.1 ppt; Medium = >8.1-20.5 ppt; High = >20.5 ppt.
Models 5 and 6: Low = ≤ 46 ppq; Medium = >46-128 ppq; High = >128 ppq.

None of the Ranch Hand categories differed significantly from the Comparison group in the unadjusted and adjusted Model 3 analyses of the CNS index (Table 11-34(e,f): $p>0.18$ for all contrasts). The adjusted analysis contained the covariates age and lifetime alcohol history.

The unadjusted and adjusted results for Models 4 through 6 did not reveal a significant association between current dioxin and the CNS index (Table 11-34(g,h): $p>0.40$ for all analyses). Each of the adjusted analyses included age and an occupation-by-insecticide exposure interaction.

Longitudinal Analysis

Physical Examination Variables

Longitudinal analyses were conducted on two composite variables, the cranial nerve index without range of motion and the CNS index, to examine whether changes over time differed with respect to group membership (Model 1), initial dioxin (Model 2), and categorized dioxin (Model 3). Models 4, 5, and 6 were not examined in the longitudinal analyses because current dioxin is the measure of exposure in these models. Current dioxin changes over time and is not available for all participants for 1985 and 1992. For both variables, the longitudinal analyses investigated the differences between the 1985 examination and the 1992 examination to enhance comparability, because SCRF conducted both of these neurological examinations.

The longitudinal analyses examined relative risks at the 1992 examination for participants who were classified as "normal" at the 1985 examination. Participants classified as "abnormal" at the 1985 examination were excluded because the focus of the analyses was on investigating the temporal effects of dioxin during the period between 1985 and 1992. Participants classified as "abnormal" in 1985 were already abnormal before this period; consequently, only participants classified as "normal" at the 1985 examination were considered to be at risk when the effects of dioxin over time were explored. The rate of abnormalities under this restriction approximates an incidence rate between 1985 and 1992. All three models were adjusted for age; Models 2 and 3 also were adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin.

Cranial Nerve Index without Range of Motion

Based on participants with a normal response in 1985, the Model 1 analysis of the cranial nerve index without range of motion did not reveal a significant overall group difference (Table 11-35(a): $p=0.343$). However, stratifying the analysis by occupation revealed a significant group difference within the enlisted groundcrew stratum ($p=0.049$, Adj. RR=2.33, 95% C.I.=[1.00,5.41]) and a marginally significant group difference within the enlisted flyer stratum ($p=0.068$, Adj. RR=0.14, 95% C.I.=[0.02,1.16]. For the enlisted groundcrew, Ranch Hands were more than twice as likely as Comparisons to develop a cranial nerve index abnormality in 1992 conditioned on normality in 1985 (4.0% vs. 1.8%). By contrast, the enlisted flyer Ranch Hands were less than one fourth as likely as

the enlisted flyer Comparisons to have an abnormal cranial nerve index without range of motion response in 1992 conditioned on normality in 1985 (0.7% vs. 4.4%).

The Model 2 longitudinal analysis did not detect a significant association between initial dioxin and the cranial nerve index without range of motion (Table 11-35(b): $p=0.747$). Similarly, the longitudinal analysis of Model 3 did not find a significant difference between any of the Ranch Hands categories and the Comparison group (Table 11-35(c): $p>0.13$ for all contrasts).

CNS Index

The Model 1 analysis for participants with a normal CNS index in 1985 did not reveal a significant group difference based on the 1992 results (Table 11-36(a): $p>0.21$ for all contrasts).

For Model 2, the longitudinal analysis revealed a marginally significant positive association between initial dioxin and the CNS index (Table 11-36(b): $p=0.052$, Adj. RR=1.41, 95% C.I.=[1.01,1.98]). Based on the Ranch Hands in the Model 2 analysis who had a normal CNS index in 1985, the percentages of abnormalities in 1992 for the low, medium, and high initial dioxin categories were 2.5, 3.1, and 6.2 percent respectively.

The Model 3 longitudinal analysis found that Ranch Hands in the low dioxin category had significantly fewer CNS index abnormalities in 1992 than the Comparison group conditioned on normality in 1985 (Table 11-36(c): $p=0.042$, Adj. RR=0.43, 95% C.I.=[0.19, 0.97]). Based on participants with a normal CNS index in 1985, the percentages of participants that had a CNS index abnormality in 1992 were 2.9 percent of the low Ranch Hand category versus 5.6 percent of the Comparison group.

DISCUSSION

Although definitive diagnosis usually requires laboratory testing beyond the scope of the current study, the data analyzed in the neurological assessment can be relied upon to detect the presence, if not the cause, of neurological disease including disorders of the peripheral nervous system. CNS, cranial, and peripheral nerve variables examined can provide specific clues to the anatomical site of neurological lesions and clarify the need for additional diagnostic studies. Pertinent to the current study, the neurological examination is highly sensitive in detecting the presence of peripheral neuropathy, a suspect clinical condition related to TCDD exposure.

In clinical practice, it is convenient to divide the neurological assessment into examinations of the peripheral and cranial nerves. The 5 motor, and 4 sensory peripheral nerve variables and the 13 cranial nerve variables examined provide highly specific clues in the anatomic site of neurological lesions and clarify which additional diagnostic studies would be most helpful in establishing a diagnosis.

Table 11-35.
Longitudinal Analysis of Cranial Nerve Index without Range of Motion

a) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS				
		Percent Abnormal/(n) Examination		
Occupational Category	Group	1985	1987	1992
All	***Ranch Hand***	***3.7 (894)***	***4.4 (862)***	***4.8 (894)***
	Comparison	***2.3 (1,133)***	***4.0 (1,096)***	***3.3 (1,133)***
Officer	Ranch Hand	2.9 (345)	3.6 (337)	4.1 (345)
	Comparison	2.1 (435)	2.6 (420)	3.9 (435)
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	3.2 (158)	4.6 (154)	3.2 (158)
	Comparison	1.6 (187)	5.5 (181)	4.3 (187)
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	4.6 (391)	5.1 (371)	6.1 (391)
	Comparison	2.7 (511)	4.7 (495)	2.4 (511)

		Normal in 1985			
Occupational Category	Group	n in 1992	Percent Abnormal in 1992	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[a]	p-Value[a]
All	***Ranch Hand***	***861***	***3.4***	***1.29 (0.76,2.18)***	***0.343***
	Comparison	***1,107***	***2.6***		
Officer	Ranch Hand	335	3.9	1.37 (0.62,3.05)	0.439
	Comparison	426	2.8		
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	153	0.7	0.14 (0.02,1.16)	0.068
	Comparison	184	4.4		
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	373	4.0	2.33 (1.00,5.41)	0.049
	Comparison	497	1.8		

[a] Relative risk, confidence interval, and p-values are in reference to a contrast of 1985 and 1992 results; results adjusted for age in 1992.

Note: Summary statistics for 1987 are provided for reference purposes for participants who attended the 1985 and 1992 examinations. Statistical analyses are based only on participants who had a normal cranial nerve index without range of motion in 1985 (see Chapter 7, Statistical Methods).

Table 11-35. (Continued)
Longitudinal Analysis of Cranial Nerve Index without Range of Motion

b) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN			
	Percent Abnormal/(n) Examination		
Initial Dioxin	1985	1987	1992
Low	2.4 (165)	3.7 (162)	6.1 (165)
Medium	3.0 (166)	6.8 (162)	2.4 (166)
High	3.7 (164)	4.5 (156)	6.7 (164)

Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[a]	
	Normal in 1985			
Initial Dioxin	n in 1992	Percent Abnormal in 1992	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
Low	161	5.6	0.94 (0.63,1.39)	0.747
Medium	161	1.2		
High	158	4.4		

[a] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of blood draw for dioxin, and age in 1992.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in initial dioxin.

Note: Low = 39-98 ppt; Medium = >98-232 ppt; High = >232 ppt.
Summary statistics for 1987 are provided for reference purposes for participants who attended the 1985 and 1992 examinations. Statistical analyses are based only on participants who had a normal cranial nerve index without range of motion in 1985 (see Chapter 7, Statistical Methods).

Table 11-35. (Continued)
Longitudinal Analysis of Cranial Nerve Index without Range of Motion

c) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY			
	Percent Abnormal/(n) Examination		
Dioxin Category	1985	1987	1992
Comparison	2.1 (980)	4.3 (960)	3.2 (980)
Background RH	4.6 (351)	3.5 (342)	4.6 (351)
Low RH	3.2 (247)	5.4 (242)	5.7 (247)
High RH	2.8 (248)	4.6 (238)	4.4 (248)
Low plus High RH	3.0 (495)	5.0 (480)	5.1 (495)

	Normal in 1985			
Dioxin Category	n in 1992	Percent Abnormal in 1992	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ab]	p-Value[b]
Comparison	959	2.5		
Background RH	335	3.0	1.16 (0.54,2.47)	0.702
Low RH	239	4.6	1.75 (0.84,3.66)	0.134
High RH	241	2.9	1.27 (0.54,3.03)	0.584
Low plus High RH	480	3.8	1.53 (0.82,2.87)	0.183

[a] Relative risk and confidence interval relative to Comparisons.

[b] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of blood draw for dioxin, and age in 1992.

Note: RH = Ranch Hand.
Comparison: Current Dioxin $\leq$10 ppt.
Background (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin $\leq$10 ppt.
Low (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin >10 ppt, 10 ppt < Initial Dioxin $\leq$143 ppt.
High (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin >10 ppt, Initial Dioxin > 143 ppt.
Summary statistics for 1987 are provided for reference purposes for participants who attended the 1985 and 1992 examinations. Statistical analyses are based only on participants who had a normal cranial nerve index without range of motion in 1985 (see Chapter 7, Statistical Methods).

Table 11-36.
Longitudinal Analysis of Central Nervous System Index

a) MODEL 1: RANCH HANDS VS. COMPARISONS

Occupational Category	Group	Percent Abnormal/(n) Examination 1985	1987	1992
All	***Ranch Hand***	***4.0 (908)***	***5.9 (882)***	***6.1 (908)***
	Comparison	***2.7 (1,149)***	***4.7 (1,121)***	***5.7 (1,149)***
Officer	Ranch Hand	2.9 (351)	3.5 (343)	5.1 (351)
	Comparison	1.4 (443)	4.2 (431)	6.1 (443)
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	6.3 (158)	5.2 (154)	7.0 (158)
	Comparison	4.3 (188)	4.9 (184)	5.3 (188)
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	4.0 (399)	8.3 (385)	6.5 (399)
	Comparison	3.3 (518)	5.1 (506)	5.6 (518)

Occupational Category	Group	Normal in 1985: n in 1992	Normal in 1985: Percent Abnormal in 1992	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[a]	p-Value[a]
All	***Ranch Hand***	***872***	***4.1***	***0.78 (0.51,1.20)***	***0.252***
	Comparison	***1,118***	***5.2***		
Officer	Ranch Hand	341	3.8	0.64 (0.32,1.28)	0.212
	Comparison	437	5.7		
Enlisted Flyer	Ranch Hand	148	4.7	0.93 (0.34,2.58)	0.892
	Comparison	180	5.0		
Enlisted Groundcrew	Ranch Hand	383	4.2	0.87 (0.45,1.67)	0.679
	Comparison	501	4.8		

[a] Relative risk, confidence interval, and p-values are in reference to a contrast of 1985 and 1992 results; results adjusted for age in 1992.

Note: Summary statistics for 1987 are provided for reference purposes for participants who attended the 1985 and 1992 examinations. Statistical analyses are based only on participants who had a normal cranial nerve index without range of motion in 1985 (see Chapter 7, Statistical Methods).

Table 11-36. (Continued)
Longitudinal Analysis of Central Nervous System Index

b) MODEL 2: RANCH HANDS — INITIAL DIOXIN			
	Percent Abnormal/(n) Examination		
Initial Dioxin	1985	1987	1992
Low	3.6 (167)	2.4 (167)	4.2 (167)
Medium	3.0 (166)	4.9 (163)	5.4 (166)
High	3.0 (167)	8.0 (162)	7.2 (167)

Initial Dioxin Category Summary Statistics			Analysis Results for Log_2 (Initial Dioxin)[a]	
	Normal in 1985			
Initial Dioxin	n in 1992	Percent Abnormal in 1992	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[b]	p-Value
Low	161	2.5	1.41 (1.01,1.98)	0.052
Medium	161	3.1		
High	162	6.2		

[a] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of blood draw for dioxin, and age in 1992.

[b] Relative risk for a twofold increase in initial dioxin.

Note: Low = 39-98 ppt; Medium = >98-232 ppt; High = >232 ppt.
Summary statistics for 1987 are provided for reference purposes for participants who attended the 1985 and 1992 examinations. Statistical analyses are based only on participants who had a normal cranial nerve index without range of motion in 1985 (see Chapter 7, Statistical Methods).

Table 11-36. (Continued)
Longitudinal Analysis of Central Nervous System Index

c) MODEL 3: RANCH HANDS AND COMPARISONS BY DIOXIN CATEGORY			
	Percent Abnormal/(n) Examination		
Dioxin Category	1985	1987	1992
Comparison	2.6 (995)	4.9 (981)	6.1 (995)
Background RH	4.2 (360)	6.0 (350)	6.4 (360)
Low RH	2.8 (249)	2.0 (247)	4.4 (249)
High RH	3.6 (251)	8.2 (245)	6.8 (251)
Low plus High RH	3.2 (500)	5.1 (492)	5.6 (500)

	Normal in 1985			
Dioxin Category	n in 1992	Percent Abnormal in 1992	Adj. Relative Risk (95% C.I.)[ab]	p-Value[b]
Comparison	969	5.6		
Background RH	345	4.4	0.76 (0.42,1.37)	0.358
Low RH	242	2.9	0.43 (0.19,0.97)	0.042
High RH	242	5.0	1.02 (0.53,1.98)	0.943
Low plus High RH	484	3.9	0.68 (0.40,1.17)	0.166

[a] Relative risk and confidence interval relative to Comparisons.

[b] Adjusted for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA, change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of blood draw for dioxin, and age in 1992.

Note: RH = Ranch Hand.
Comparison: Current Dioxin $\leq$10 ppt.
Background (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin $\leq$10 ppt.
Low (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin >10 ppt, 10 ppt < Initial Dioxin $\leq$143 ppt.
High (Ranch Hand): Current Dioxin >10 ppt, Initial Dioxin > 143 ppt.
Summary statistics for 1987 are provided for reference purposes for participants who attended the 1985 and 1992 examinations. Statistical analyses are based only on participants who had a normal cranial nerve index without range of motion in 1985 (see Chapter 7, Statistical Methods).

As indices of CNS function, tremor and coordination are less specific and more subject to individual variation in the absence of underlying neurological disease. Tremor, for example, may occur as a benign familial trait, may be reflective of alcohol withdrawal, or may be a marker of extra pyramidal motor system disease as in Parkinson's Syndrome. The Romberg sign may signal a lesion in the cerebellum but is more often indicative of impaired position sense in the lower extremities or of inner ear disease. Finally, the mental status examination is of obvious importance in the CNS assessment and, as in previous examination cycles, extensive psychometric studies were conducted and are reported in Chapter 12, Psychology Assessment.

In the adjusted analyses of the medical records variables, the prevalence of neurological disorders by history was similar in the Ranch Hand and Comparison cohorts. In a pattern consistent with a positive dose-response and with results reported in the serum dioxin analysis of the 1987 followup, the diagnosis of other neurological disorders occurred more commonly in Ranch Hands with high versus medium and low levels of serum dioxin. After adjustment for covariates, however, the associations were no longer statistically significant. In contrast, but of doubtful clinical significance, an inverse dose-response was noted in all adjusted analyses relating the current serum dioxin to the history of hereditary and degenerative disorders. Disorders included in this ICD-9-CM category, more common in Ranch Hands than in Comparisons in the 1987 examinations, were equally prevalent in the current study.

In relation to the extrapolated initial level of serum dioxin, no significant associations were noted in the adjusted analyses of any of the directly measured physical examination variables. The analyses employing current serum dioxin yielded inconsistent results. A positive association was noted in relation to the cranial nerve motor variable smile and the peripheral nerve variables pin prick and patellar reflex, while inverse dose-response patterns were defined for smell and the Babinski reflex.

The dependent variable-covariate analyses confirmed associations well-established in clinical practice. Diabetes mellitus was associated with multiple motor and sensory manifestations of neurological disease including deficits in pin prick sensation and balance, the Romberg sign, and all of the deep tendon reflexes tested. Consistent with the peripheral neuropathy common to age, alcoholism, and diabetes, highly significant associations were noted between these risk factors and abnormalities in the vibrotactile threshold (of both left and right great toes).

In summary, data analyzed in the current section reflect a comparable prevalence of neurological disease in the Ranch Hand and Comparison cohorts and no consistent evidence for a dose-response effect in relation to the current body burden of dioxin.

SUMMARY

The neurological assessment focused on extensive physical examination data for cranial nerve function, peripheral nerve status, and CNS coordination processes. Verified histories of neurological diseases also were examined. Tables 11-37 through 11-40 summarize the results of the group contrast analyses (Table 11-37), the initial dioxin analyses (Table 11-38),

Table 11-37.
Summary of Group Analyses (Model 1) for Neurological Variables
(Ranch Hands vs. Comparisons)

Variable	UNADJUSTED			
	All	Officer	Enlisted Flyer	Enlisted Groundcrew
Medical Records				
Inflammatory Diseases (D)	NS	NS	NS	NS
Hereditary and Degenerative Diseases (D)	NS	NS	ns	NS
Peripheral Disorders (D)	NS	NS	NS	ns
Other Neurological Disorders (D)	NS	NS	NS	NS
Physical Examination: Cranial Nerve Function				
Smell (D)	NS	ns	NS	NS
Visual Fields (D)	ns	ns	--	NS
Light Reaction (D)	NS	ns	ns	NS*
Ocular Movement (D)	NS	NS	NS	NS
Facial Sensation (D)	NS	--	ns	NS
Jaw Clench (D)	--	--	--	--
Smile (D)	NS	ns	NS	NS
Palpebral Fissure (D)	ns	ns	NS	ns
Balance (D)	NS	NS	ns	NS
Gag Reflex (D)	--	--	--	--
Speech (D)	NS	NS	NS	NS
Palate and Uvula Movement (D)	--	--	--	--
Neck Range of Motion (D)	NS	NS	ns	NS
Cranial Nerve Index without Range of Motion (D)	NS	ns	ns	+0.012
Physical Examination: Peripheral Nerve Status				
Pin Prick (D)	NS	ns	ns	NS
Light Touch (D)	NS	NS	NS	NS
Muscle Status (D)	NS	NS	ns	NS
Patellar Reflex (D)	-0.043	-0.033	ns	NS
Achilles Reflex (D)	NS	NS	ns	ns
Biceps Reflex (D)	ns	NS	ns	ns
Babinski Reflex (D)	ns	ns	ns	NS
Vibrotactile Threshold Measurement of Right Great Toe (C)	NS	ns	NS	NS

Table 11-37. (Continued)
Summary of Group Analyses (Model 1) for Neurological Variables
(Ranch Hands vs. Comparisons)

Variable	UNADJUSTED			
	All	Officer	Enlisted Flyer	Enlisted Groundcrew
Vibrotactile Threshold Measurement of Left Great Toe (C)	NS	NS	ns	NS
Physical Examination: CNS Coordination Processes				
Tremor (D)	NS	ns	NS	NS
Coordination (D)	NS	NS	ns	NS
Romberg Sign (D)	NS	NS	ns	NS
Gait (D)	NS	ns	ns	NS
Central Nervous System Index (D)	NS	ns	NS	NS

C: Continuous analysis.
D: Discrete analysis.
+: Relative risk ≥ 1.00.
-: Relative risk < 1.00.
--: Analysis not performed due to sparse number of abnormalities.
NS or ns: Not significant ($p > 0.10$).
Note: P-value given if $p \leq 0.05$.
A capital "NS" denotes a relative risk 1.00 or greater for discrete analysis or difference of means nonnegative for continuous analysis; a lower case "ns" denotes relative risk less than 1.00 for discrete analysis or difference of means negative for continuous analysis.

Table 11-37. (Continued)
Summary of Group Analyses (Model 1) for Neurological Variables
(Ranch Hands vs. Comparisons)

Variable	ADJUSTED			
	All	Officer	Enlisted Flyer	Enlisted Groundcrew
Medical Records				
Inflammatory Diseases (D)	NS	NS	NS	NS
Hereditary and Degenerative Diseases (D)	NS	NS	ns	NS
Peripheral Disorders (D)	NS	NS	ns	ns
Other Neurological Disorders (D)	NS	NS	NS	NS
Physical Examination: Cranial Nerve Function				
Smell (D)	NS	ns	NS	NS
Visual Fields (D)	ns	ns	--	NS
Light Reaction (D)	NS	ns	--	--
Ocular Movement (D)	NS	NS	--	NS
Facial Sensation (D)	NS	--	ns	NS
Jaw Clench (D)	--	--	--	--
Smile (D)	NS	ns	NS	NS
Palpebral Fissure (D)	ns	ns	NS	ns
Balance (D)	NS	NS	--	NS
Gag Reflex (D)	--	--	--	--
Speech (D)	NS*	NS	--	NS
Palate and Uvula Movement (D)	--	--	--	--
Neck Range of Motion (D)	NS	NS	ns*	NS
Cranial Nerve Index without Range of Motion (D)	**(NS)	ns	ns	+0.014
Physical Examination: Peripheral Nerve Status				
Pin Prick (D)	ns	ns	ns	NS
Light Touch (D)	NS	ns	NS	NS
Muscle Status (D)	NS	NS	ns	NS
Patellar Reflex (D)	**(-0.009)	**(-0.021)	**(-0.048)	**(NS)
Achilles Reflex (D)	NS	NS	ns	ns
Biceps Reflex (D)	ns	NS	--	ns
Babinski Reflex (D)	ns	--	--	NS
Vibrotactile Threshold Measurement of Right Great Toe (C)	ns	ns	NS	NS
Vibrotactile Threshold Measurement of Left Great Toe (C)	NS	ns	ns	NS

Table 11-37. (Continued)
Summary of Group Analyses (Model 1) for Neurological Variables
(Ranch Hands vs. Comparisons)

	ADJUSTED			
Variable	**All**	**Officer**	**Enlisted Flyer**	**Enlisted Groundcrew**
Physical Examination: CNS Coordination Processes				
Tremor (D)	NS	ns	NS	NS
Coordination (D)	NS	NS	ns	NS
Romberg Sign (D)	NS	NS	--	NS
Gait (D)	NS	ns	ns	NS
Central Nervous System Index (D)	NS	ns	NS	NS

C: Continuous analysis.
D: Discrete analysis.
+: Relative risk ≥ 1.00.
-: Relative risk < 1.00.
--: Analysis not performed due to sparse number of abnormalities.
NS or ns: Not significant ($p > 0.10$).
NS* or ns*: Marginally significant ($0.05 < p \leq 0.10$).
**(NS) or **(ns): Group-by-covariate interaction ($p \leq 0.05$); not significant when interaction is deleted; refer to Appendix G-2 for further analysis of this interaction.
**(...): Group-by-covariate interaction ($p \leq 0.05$); significant when interaction is deleted and p-value is given in parentheses; refer to Appendix G-2 for further analysis of this interaction.
Note: A capital "NS" denotes a relative risk 1.00 or greater for discrete analysis or difference of means nonnegative for continuous analysis; a lower case "ns" denotes relative risk less than 1.00 for discrete analysis or difference of means negative for continuous analysis.

Table 11-38.
Summary of Initial Dioxin Analyses (Model 2) for Neurological Variables (Ranch Hands Only)

Variable	Unadjusted	Adjusted
Medical Records		
Inflammatory Diseases (D)	NS	ns
Hereditary and Degenerative Diseases (D)	ns	**(ns)
Peripheral Disorders (D)	NS	NS
Other Neurological Disorders (D)	NS	ns
Physical Examination: Cranial Nerve Function		
Smell (D)	ns	ns
Visual Fields (D)	--	--
Light Reaction (D)	NS	NS
Ocular Movement (D)	ns	ns
Facial Sensation (D)	NS	--
Jaw Clench (D)	--	--
Smile (D)	NS	NS
Palpebral Fissure (D)	NS	NS
Balance (D)	NS	NS
Gag Reflex (D)	--	--
Speech (D)	NS	NS
Palate and Uvula Movement (D)	--	--
Neck Range of Motion (D)	ns	NS
Cranial Nerve Index without Range of Motion (D)	NS	**(NS)
Physical Examination: Peripheral Nerve Status		
Pin Prick (D)	ns	ns
Light Touch (D)	ns	ns
Muscle Status (D)	ns	NS
Patellar Reflex (D)	ns	NS
Achilles Reflex (D)	ns	**(NS)
Biceps Reflex (D)	-0.030	ns
Babinski Reflex (D)	--	--
Vibrotactile Threshold Measurement of Right Great Toe (C)	ns	**(NS)
Vibrotactile Threshold Measurement of Left Great Toe (C)	ns*	**(NS)

Table 11-38. (Continued)
Summary of Initial Dioxin Analyses (Model 2) for Neurological Variables (Ranch Hands Only)

Variable	Unadjusted	Adjusted
Physical Examination: CNS Coordination Processes		
Tremor (D)	NS	NS
Coordination (D)	ns	NS
Romberg Sign (D)	NS	NS
Gait (D)	NS	**(NS)
Central Nervous System Index (D)	NS	NS

C: Continuous analysis.
D: Discrete analysis.
-: Relative risk <1.00.
--: Analysis not performed due to sparse number of abnormalities.
NS or ns: Not significant ($p>0.10$).
ns*: Marginally significant ($0.05<p\leq0.10$).
**(NS) or **(ns): Log_2 (initial dioxin)-by-covariate interaction ($p\leq0.05$); not significant when interaction is deleted; refer to Appendix G-2 for further analysis of this interaction.
Note: P-value given if $p\leq0.05$.
A capital "NS" denotes a relative risk 1.00 or greater for discrete analysis or slope nonnegative for continuous analysis; a lower case "ns" denotes relative risk less than 1.00 for discrete analysis or slope negative for continuous analysis.

Table 11-39.
Summary of Categorized Dioxin Analyses (Model 3) for Neurological Variables (Ranch Hands vs. Comparisons)

Variable	UNADJUSTED			
	Background Ranch Hands vs. Comparisons	Low Ranch Hands vs. Comparisons	High Ranch Hands vs. Comparisons	Low plus High Ranch Hands vs. Comparisons
Medical Records				
Inflammatory Diseases (D)	NS	NS	NS	NS
Hereditary and Degenerative Diseases (D)	NS	NS	ns	NS
Peripheral Disorders (D)	ns	NS	NS	NS
Other Neurological Disorders (D)	ns	NS	+0.040	NS*
Physical Examination: Cranial Nerve Function				
Smell (D)	NS	NS	ns	ns
Visual Fields (D)	--	--	--	--
Light Reaction (D)	NS	NS	NS	NS*
Ocular Movement (D)	NS	NS	NS	NS
Facial Sensation (D)	NS	--	NS*	NS
Corneal Reflex (D)	--	--	--	--
Jaw Clench (D)	--	--	--	--
Smile (D)	NS	NS	NS	NS
Palpebral Fissure (D)	NS	NS	ns	NS
Balance (D)	NS	ns	NS	NS
Gag Reflex (D)	--	--	--	--
Speech (D)	NS	NS*	NS*	+0.023
Tongue Position Relative to Midline (D)	--	--	--	--
Palate and Uvula Movement (D)	--	--	--	--
Neck Range of Motion (D)	NS	NS	NS	NS
Cranial Nerve Index without Range of Motion (D)	NS	NS	NS	NS
Physical Examination: Peripheral Nerve Status				
Pin Prick (D)	ns	NS	ns	NS
Light Touch (D)	NS	NS	NS	NS
Muscle Status (D)	NS	NS	NS	NS
Patellar Reflex (D)	-0.033	ns	ns	ns
Achilles Reflex (D)	NS	NS	ns	NS
Biceps Reflex (D)	ns	NS	ns	ns
Babinski Reflex (D)	ns	ns	ns	ns

Table 11-39. (Continued)
Summary of Categorized Dioxin Analyses (Model 3) for Neurological Variables (Ranch Hands vs. Comparisons)

Variable	UNADJUSTED			
	Background Ranch Hands vs. Comparisons	Low Ranch Hands vs. Comparisons	High Ranch Hands vs. Comparisons	Low plus High Ranch Hands vs. Comparisons
Vibrotactile Threshold Measurement of Right Great Toe (C)	ns	NS	ns	NS
Vibrotactile Threshold Measurement of Left Great Toe (C)	NS	NS	ns	NS
Physical Examination: CNS Coordination Processes				
Tremor (D)	NS	ns	NS	ns
Coordination (D)	ns	NS	NS	NS
Romberg Sign (D)	NS	ns	NS	NS
Gait (D)	NS	ns	NS	ns
Central Nervous System Index (D)	NS	ns	NS	ns

C: Continuous analysis.
D: Discrete analysis.
+: Relative risk $\geq$ 1.00 for discrete analysis or difference of means nonnegative for continuous analysis.
-: Relative risk $<$ 1.00 for discrete analysis or difference of means negative for continuous analysis.
--: Not applicable for unadjusted analysis.
NS or ns: Not significant ($p > 0.10$).
NS*: Marginally significant ($0.05 < p \leq 0.10$).
Note: P-value given if $p \leq 0.05$.
A capital "NS" denotes a relative risk 1.00 or greater for discrete analysis or difference of means nonnegative for continuous analysis; a lower case "ns" denotes relative risk less than 1.00 for discrete analysis or difference of means negative for continuous analysis.

Table 11-39. (Continued)
Summary of Categorized Dioxin Analyses (Model 3) for Neurological Variables (Ranch Hands vs. Comparisons)

Variable	ADJUSTED			
	Background Ranch Hands vs. Comparisons	Low Ranch Hands vs. Comparisons	High Ranch Hands vs. Comparisons	Low plus High Ranch Hands vs. Comparisons
Medical Records				
Inflammatory Diseases (D)	NS	NS	NS	NS
Hereditary and Degenerative Diseases (D)	NS	NS	ns	ns
Peripheral Disorders (D)	ns	ns	NS	NS
Other Neurological Disorders (D)	NS	NS	NS	NS
Physical Examination: Cranial Nerve Function				
Smell (D)	**(NS)	**(NS)	**(ns)	**(ns)
Visual Fields (D)	--	--	--	--
Light Reaction (D)	NS	NS	NS	NS*
Ocular Movement (D)	NS	NS	NS	NS
Facial Sensation (D)	--	--	--	--
Corneal Reflex (D)	--	--	--	--
Jaw Clench (D)	--	--	--	--
Smile (D)	NS	NS	NS	NS
Palpebral Fissure (D)	NS	NS	ns	NS
Balance (D)	NS	ns	NS	NS
Gag Reflex (D)	--	--	--	--
Speech (D)	--	--	--	--
Tongue Position Relative to Midline (D)	--	--	--	--
Palate and Uvula Movement (D)	--	--	--	--
Neck Range of Motion (D)	**(ns)	**(NS)	**(NS)	**(NS)
Cranial Nerve Index without Range of Motion (D)	**(NS)	**(NS)	**(NS)	**(NS)
Physical Examination: Peripheral Nerve Status				
Pin Prick (D)	ns	NS	ns	NS
Light Touch (D)	NS	NS	NS	NS
Muscle Status (D)	**(NS)	**(NS)	**(NS)	**(NS)
Patellar Reflex (D)	**(-0.025)	**(ns*)	**(ns)	**(ns)
Achilles Reflex (D)	**(NS)	**(NS)	**(NS)	**(NS)

Table 11-39. (Continued)
Summary of Categorized Dioxin Analyses (Model 3) for Neurological Variables (Ranch Hands vs. Comparisons)

Variable	ADJUSTED			
	Background Ranch Hands vs. Comparisons	Low Ranch Hands vs. Comparisons	High Ranch Hands vs. Comparisons	Low plus High Ranch Hands vs. Comparisons
Biceps Reflex (D)	--	NS	ns	ns
Babinski Reflex (D)	ns	ns	--	ns
Vibrotactile Threshold Measurement of Right Great Toe (C)	**(ns)	**(ns)	**(NS)	**(NS)
Vibrotactile Threshold Measurement of Left Great Toe (C)	ns	NS	NS	NS
Physical Examination: CNS Coordination Processes				
Tremor (D)	NS	ns	NS	ns
Coordination (D)	ns	NS	NS	NS
Romberg Sign (D)	NS	ns	NS	NS
Gait (D)	NS	ns	NS	ns
Central Nervous System Index (D)	ns	ns	NS	ns

C: Continuous analysis.
D: Discrete analysis.
-: Relative risk <1.00 for discrete analysis or difference of means negative for continuous analysis.
--: Not applicable for unadjusted analysis.
NS or ns: Not significant ($p>0.10$).
NS* or ns*: Marginally significant ($0.05<p\leq0.10$).
**(NS) or **(ns): Categorized dioxin-by-covariate interaction ($0.01<p\leq0.05$); not significant when interaction is deleted; refer to Appendix G-2 for further analysis of this interaction.
**(ns*): Categorized dioxin-by-covariate interaction ($0.01<p\leq0.05$); marginally significant when interaction is deleted; refer to Appendix G-2 for further analysis of this interaction.
**(...): Categorized dioxin-by-covariate interaction ($0.01<p\leq0.05$); significant ($p=-0.025$) when interaction is deleted; refer to Appendix G-2 for further analysis of this interaction.
Note: P-value given if $p\leq0.05$.
A capital "NS" denotes a relative risk 1.00 or greater for discrete analysis or difference of means nonnegative for continuous analysis; a lower case "ns" denotes relative risk less than 1.00 for discrete analysis or difference of means negative for continuous analysis.

Table 11-40.
Summary of Current Dioxin Analyses (Models 4, 5, and 6) for Neurological Variables (Ranch Hands Only)

Variable	UNADJUSTED		
	Model 4: Lipid-Adjusted Current Dioxin	Model 5: Whole-Weight Current Dioxin	Model 6: Whole-Weight Current Dioxin Adjusted for Total Lipids
Medical Records			
Inflammatory Diseases (D)	NS	NS	NS
Hereditary and Degenerative Diseases (D)	ns	ns	ns*
Peripheral Disorders (D)	NS	NS	NS
Other Neurological Disorders (D)	+0.022	NS*	+0.011
Physical Examination: Cranial Nerve Function			
Smell (D)	-0.018	-0.015	-0.019
Visual Fields (D)	--	--	--
Light Reaction (D)	NS	NS	NS
Ocular Movement (D)	NS	NS	NS
Facial Sensation (D)	NS	NS	NS
Jaw Clench (D)	--	--	--
Smile (D)	NS*	NS	NS*
Palpebral Fissure (D)	NS	NS	NS
Balance (D)	NS	NS	NS
Gag Reflex (D)	--	--	--
Speech (D)	NS	NS	NS
Palate and Uvula Movement (D)	--	--	--
Neck Range of Motion (D)	NS	NS	NS
Cranial Nerve Index without Range of Motion (D)	NS	NS	NS
Physical Examination: Peripheral Nerve Status			
Pin Prick (D)	NS*	NS*	NS*
Light Touch (D)	NS	NS	NS
Muscle Status (D)	ns	ns	NS
Patellar Reflex (D)	NS	NS	NS
Achilles Reflex (D)	NS	NS	NS
Biceps Reflex (D)	NS	NS	NS
Babinski Reflex (D)	ns*	ns	ns
Vibrotactile Threshold Measurement of Right Great Toe (C)	NS	NS	ns
Vibrotactile Threshold Measurement of Left Great Toe (C)	ns	ns	ns

Table 11-40. (Continued)
Summary of Current Dioxin Analyses (Models 4, 5, and 6) for Neurological Variables (Ranch Hands Only)

Variable	UNADJUSTED		
	Model 4: Lipid-Adjusted Current Dioxin	Model 5: Whole-Weight Current Dioxin	Model 6: Whole-Weight Current Dioxin Adjusted for Total Lipids
Physical Examination: CNS Coordination Processes			
Tremor (D)	ns	ns	ns
Coordination (D)	ns	ns	ns
Romberg Sign (D)	NS	NS	NS
Gait (D)	NS	NS	NS
Central Nervous System Index (D)	NS	NS	ns

C: Continuous analysis.
D: Discrete analysis.
+: Relative risk ≥ 1.00.
-: Relative risk < 1.00.
--: Analysis not performed due to sparse number of abnormalities.
NS or ns: Not significant ($p > 0.10$).
NS* or ns*: Marginally significant ($0.05 < p \leq 0.10$).
Note: P-value given if $p \leq 0.05$.
A capital "NS" denotes a relative risk 1.00 or greater for discrete analysis or slope nonnegative for continuous analysis; a lower case "ns" denotes relative risk less than 1.00 for discrete analysis or slope negative for continuous analysis.

Table 11-40. (Continued)
Summary of Current Dioxin Analyses (Models 4, 5, and 6) for Neurological Variables (Ranch Hands Only)

Variable	ADJUSTED		
	Model 4: Lipid-Adjusted Current Dioxin	Model 5: Whole-Weight Current Dioxin	Model 6: Whole-Weight Current Dioxin Adjusted for Total Lipids
Medical Records			
Inflammatory Diseases (D)	NS	NS	NS
Hereditary and Degenerative Diseases (D)	-0.030	-0.033	-0.009
Peripheral Disorders (D)	**(NS)	**(NS)	**(NS)
Other Neurological Disorders (D)	ns	ns	ns
Physical Examination: Cranial Nerve Function			
Smell (D)	-0.018	-0.015	-0.019
Visual Fields (D)	--	--	--
Light Reaction (D)	NS	NS	NS
Ocular Movement (D)	NS	NS	NS
Facial Sensation (D)	NS	NS	NS
Jaw Clench (D)	--	--	--
Smile (D)	NS*	NS	NS*
Palpebral Fissure (D)	NS	NS	NS
Balance (D)	NS	NS	NS
Gag Reflex (D)	--	--	--
Speech (D)	NS	NS	NS
Palate and Uvula Movement (D)	--	--	--
Neck Range of Motion (D)	NS	NS	NS
Cranial Nerve Index without Range of Motion (D)	ns	ns	ns
Physical Examination: Peripheral Nerve Status			
Pin Prick (D)	**(NS)	**(NS)	**(NS)
Light Touch (D)	NS	NS	NS
Muscle Status (D)	NS	NS	NS
Patellar Reflex (D)	NS*	NS*	+0.039
Achilles Reflex (D)	NS	NS	NS
Biceps Reflex (D)	NS	NS	NS*
Babinski Reflex (D)	-0.039	ns*	ns*
Vibrotactile Threshold Measurement of Right Great Toe (C)	**(NS)	**(NS)	**(NS)
Vibrotactile Threshold Measurement of Left Great Toe (C)	**(NS)	**(NS)	**(NS)

Table 11-40. (Continued)
Summary of Current Dioxin Analyses (Models 4, 5, and 6) for Neurological Variables (Ranch Hands Only)

Variable	ADJUSTED		
	Model 4: Lipid-Adjusted Current Dioxin	Model 5: Whole-Weight Current Dioxin	Model 6: Whole-Weight Current Dioxin Adjusted for Total Lipids
Physical Examination: CNS Coordination Processes			
Tremor (D)	**(ns)	**(ns)	**(ns)
Coordination (D)	NS	NS	NS
Romberg Sign (D)	NS	NS	NS
Gait (D)	ns	ns	ns
Central Nervous System Index (D)	ns	ns	ns

C: Continuous analysis.
D: Discrete analysis.
+: Relative risk ≥ 1.00.
-: Relative risk < 1.00.
--: Analyses not performed due to sparse number of abnormalities.
NS or ns: Not significant ($p > 0.10$).
NS* or ns*: Marginally significant ($0.05 < p \leq 0.10$).
**(NS) or **(ns): Log_2 (current dioxin + 1)-by-covariate interaction ($p \leq 0.05$); not significant when interaction is deleted; refer to Appendix G-2 for further analysis of this interaction.
Note: P-value given if $p \leq 0.05$.
A capital "NS" denotes a relative risk 1.00 or greater for discrete analysis or a nonnegative slope for continuous analysis; a lower case "ns" denotes relative risk less than 1.00.

Table 11-41.
Summary of Group-by-Covariate and Dioxin-by-Covariate Interactions from Adjusted Analyses of Neurological Variables

Model	Variable	Covariate
1[a]	Cranial Nerve Index without Range of Motion	Occupation
	Patellar Reflex (D)	Lifetime Alcohol History
2[b]	Hereditary and Degenerative Diseases (D)	Occupation
	Cranial Nerve Index without Range of Motion (D)	Age, Diabetic Class
	Achilles Reflex (D)	Lifetime Alcohol History
	Vibrotactile Threshold Measurement of Right Great Toe (C)	Composite Exposure to Heavy Metals
	Vibrotactile Threshold Measurement of Left Great Toe (C)	Diabetic Class, Composite Exposure to Heavy Metals
	Gait (D)	Age
3[c]	Smell (D)	Insecticide Exposure
	Neck Range of Motion (D)	Occupation
	Cranial Nerve Index without Range of Motion (D)	Occupation
	Muscle Status (D)	Insecticide Exposure
	Patellar Reflex (D)	Lifetime Alcohol History
	Achilles Reflex (D)	Lifetime Alcohol History
	Vibrotactile Threshold Measurement of Right Great Toe (C)	Lifetime Alcohol History
4[d]	Peripheral Disorders (D)	Lifetime Alcohol History
	Pin Prick (D)	Diabetic Class
	Vibrotactile Threshold Measurement of Right Great Toe (C)	Lifetime Alcohol History, Composite Exposure to Heavy Metals
	Vibrotactile Threshold Measurement of Left Great Toe (C)	Lifetime Alcohol History, Diabetic Class, Worked With Vibrating Power Equipment or Tools
	Tremor (D)	Age
5[e]	Peripheral Disorders (D)	Lifetime Alcohol History
	Pin Prick (D)	Diabetic Class
	Vibrotactile Threshold Measurement of Right Great Toe (C)	Lifetime Alcohol History, Composite Exposure to Heavy Metals
	Vibrotactile Threshold Measurement of Left Great Toe (C)	Lifetime Alcohol History, Worked With Vibrating Power Equipment or Tools
6[f]	Peripheral Disorders (D)	Lifetime Alcohol History
	Pin Prick (D)	Diabetic Class
	Vibrotactile Threshold Measurement of Right Great Toe (C)	Lifetime Alcohol History, Composite Exposure to Heavy Metals
	Vibrotactile Threshold Measurement of Left Great Toe (C)	Lifetime Alcohol History, Worked With Vibrating Power Equipment or Tools

C: Continuous analysis.
D: Discrete analysis.
[a] Group Analysis (Ranch Hands vs. Comparison).
[b] Ranch Hands—Log_2 (Initial Dioxin).
[c] Categorized Dioxin.
[d] Ranch Hands—Log_2 (Current Lipid-Adjusted Dioxin + 1).
[e] Ranch Hands—Log_2 (Current Whole-Weight Dioxin + 1).
[f] Ranch Hands—Log_2 (Current Whole-Weight Dioxin + 1), Adjusted for Total Lipids.

the categorized dioxin analyses (Table 11-39), and the current dioxin analyses (Table 11-40). Table 11-41 lists the group-by-covariate and dioxin-by-covariate interactions that were encountered in the adjusted analyses of the variables.

Medical Records

Historical data collected at the 1982, 1985, and 1987 examinations were updated with information collected at the 1992 health interview and grouped by ICD code into four categories of neurological disorders for analysis: inflammatory disorders (ICD-9 codes 3200-3269), hereditary and degenerative disorders (ICD-9 codes 3300-3379), peripheral disorders (ICD-9 codes 3501-3599), and other neurological disorders (ICD-9 codes 3400-3499). The category of other neurological disorders included mostly diagnoses of unspecified encephalopathy (73.2%).

Model 1: Group Analysis

The unadjusted and adjusted analyses found that the prevalence of neurological disorders did not differ significantly between the Ranch Hand and Comparison groups for any of the medical records variables. Although not significant, the estimated relative risk of inflammatory disease was more than 4.00. These results were affected by sparse data, as there were only six Ranch Hands and two Comparisons with a history of inflammatory disease.

Model 2: Initial Dioxin Analysis

Estimated initial dioxin exposure was not significantly associated with any of the historical neurological disorders in both the unadjusted and adjusted Model 2 analyses.

Model 3: Categorized Dioxin Analysis

The Ranch Hand dioxin category versus Comparison group contrasts were not significant for inflammatory diseases, hereditary and degenerative diseases, or peripheral disorders. The relative risk of the category of other neurological disorders was significantly greater than 1.00 in the unadjusted analysis for Ranch Hands in the high dioxin category, but this finding became nonsignificant after adjusting for age, race, and occupation. Occupation was highly associated with other neurological disorders and also is associated with dioxin exposure. Removing occupation from the adjusted model caused the relative risk to become significant.

Models 4 though 6: Current Dioxin Analysis

The unadjusted analyses of the category of other neurological disorders found a significant positive association with lipid-adjusted current dioxin in Model 4 and a marginally significant positive association with whole-weight dioxin in Model 5. The association with whole-weight dioxin became significant after forcing total lipids into the Model 6 analysis. Similar to the Model 3 results, all of these associations became nonsignificant after adjusting

for age, race, and occupation. The positive associations became highly significant when occupation was removed from the final adjusted models.

The unadjusted current dioxin analyses of hereditary and degenerative diseases were all nonsignificant, but the relative risks became significantly less than 1.00 in Models 4 through 6 after adjusting for covariates, including occupation and diabetic class. When occupation and diabetic class were removed from the final models, the adjusted results supported the unadjusted findings, revealing no significant associations.

The unadjusted and adjusted peripheral disorders results were not significant, but the adjusted relative risks became significantly greater than 1.0 after removing the occupation and diabetic class covariates from the final models. When current dioxin was adjusted for age only, the relative risks were significant, but the results became nonsignificant when adjusting for the age-by-occupation interaction in the final model. The diabetic class covariate (whether in or out) had minimal effect on the current dioxin significance level.

Physical Examination Variables

The neurological assessment analyzed 14 cranial nerve function variables (smell, visual fields, light reaction, ocular movement, facial sensation, jaw clench, smile, palpebral fissure, balance, gag reflex, speech, palate and uvula movement, neck range of motion, and a cranial nerve index), 9 peripheral nerve variables (pin prick, light touch, muscle status, vibrotactile threshold (of left and right great toes), patellar reflex, Achilles reflex, biceps reflex, and the Babinski reflex) and 5 CNS coordination process variables (tremor, coordination, Romberg sign (balance), gait, and a CNS summary index) with respect to group differences and associations with dioxin. There were few abnormalities for many of these variables, limiting the power to detect a significant difference.

Model 1: Group Analysis

There were no significant overall group differences for the cranial nerve function variables. However, the group contrasts stratified by occupation found that the adjusted relative risk of a cranial nerve index abnormality was significantly greater than 1.00 for enlisted groundcrew Ranch Hands ($p=0.014$, Adj. $RR=2.36$, 95% C.I.$=[1.19,4.71]$). Although not significant, the estimated relative risk was greater than 4.00 for facial sensation (3 Ranch Hands vs. 1 Comparison).

The unadjusted and adjusted analyses of the peripheral nerves found significantly fewer patellar reflex abnormalities in the Ranch Hand group than in the Comparison group ($p=0.009$, Adj. $RR=0.40$, 95% C.I.$=[0.19,0.83]$). Stratified by occupation, the adjusted relative risk of an abnormal patellar reflex was significantly less than 1.00 in the officer and enlisted flyer categories, and greater than 1.00, but not significant in the enlisted groundcrew category.

The overall group contrasts and the group contrasts stratified by occupation were not significant for the CNS coordination process variables.

Model 2: Initial Dioxin Analysis

The unadjusted Model 2 analyses found a significant negative association between biceps reflex and estimated initial dioxin exposure, but this finding became nonsignificant after adjustment for occupation. None of the other physical examination variables was associated significantly with initial dioxin exposure.

Model 3: Categorized Dioxin Analysis

There were significantly more Ranch Hands in the high dioxin category with facial sensation abnormalities and speech abnormalities than in the Comparison group ($p=0.008$, 0.8% vs. 0.0%). The percentage of speech abnormalities also was significantly greater in the low and low plus high Ranch Hand categories than in the Comparison group. The results from facial sensation and speech abnormalities must be interpreted with caution because, due to the sparse number of abnormalities, there was no adjustment for percent body fat at the time of duty in SEA and change in percent body fat from the time of duty in SEA to the date of the blood draw for dioxin (incorporated to adjust for possible differential dioxin half-life elimination) or for any covariates. There also was a marginally significant increase in light reaction abnormalities for Ranch Hands in the low plus high dioxin category relative to the Comparison group. The only other significant finding in the unadjusted or adjusted Model 3 analyses was that the relative risk of patellar reflex abnormalities was significantly less than 1.00 for Ranch Hands in the background category.

Models 4 through 6: Current Dioxin Analyses

The unadjusted current dioxin analyses of the cranial nerve function variables found a significant inverse association with smell in Models 4, 5, and 6. The adjusted results were identical to the unadjusted findings because no covariates were retained in the final model. There were no significant associations between current dioxin and any of the other cranial nerve variables, although smile showed a marginally significant positive association with current dioxin in the unadjusted and adjusted Model 4 and 6 analyses.

The unadjusted analyses of the peripheral nerve status variables revealed marginally significant positive associations between current dioxin and pin prick in Models 4, 5, and 6, and a marginally significant inverse association between lipid-adjusted current dioxin and the Babinski reflex in Model 4.

The adjusted pin prick analyses yielded equivocal results. The associations with current dioxin (both lipid-adjusted and whole-weight) were not significant after adjustment for covariates, including occupation and diabetic class. However, the relative risks became significantly greater than 1.0 when occupation and diabetic class were removed from the model, and the current dioxin effect was adjusted only for age. In addition, the adjusted analyses showed a significant interaction between current dioxin and diabetic class in each of the adjusted analyses. Stratification of these interactions showed that the relative risk of a pin prick abnormality was significantly greater than 1.0 for diabetics, while the relative risks were not significant in both the normal and impaired strata.

After adjusting for age and occupation, the Babinski reflex analyses found a significant inverse relationship with lipid-adjusted current dioxin. The inverse association with whole-weight dioxin was marginally significant in Models 5 and 6.

The unadjusted current dioxin results for patellar reflex were not significant, but after adjusting for age, lifetime alcohol history, and diabetic class, the associations with lipid-adjusted dioxin in Model 4 and with whole-weight dioxin in Model 5 became marginally positive. The association with whole-weight dioxin became significantly positive in the adjusted Model 6 analysis, which forced total lipids into the model. When diabetic class was excluded from the final models, the association with lipid-adjusted current dioxin became significant, while the association with whole-weight dioxin remained marginally significant in Model 5 and significant in Model 6.

There were no significant associations between current dioxin and any of the CNS coordination process variables.

CONCLUSION

Overall, the neurological assessment found the prevalence of neurological disease to be comparable between the Ranch Hand and Comparison groups, and showed no consistent evidence of a dose-response effect with either estimated initial dioxin exposure or current TCDD levels. In the group contrasts stratified by occupation, Ranch Hand enlisted groundcrew, the occupation category with the highest current levels of dioxin, had significantly more cranial nerve index abnormalities than Comparison enlisted groundcrew, but the serum dioxin analyses did not find a significant dose-response.

For several variables—other neurological disorders, peripheral disorders, hereditary and degenerative diseases, neck range of motion, pin prick, light touch, vibrotactile threshold, biceps reflex and Babinski reflex—the results of the current dioxin models adjusted for the covariates occupation and diabetic class differed from results for followup models that removed these covariates. Possible explanations for differences include confounding, collinearity, differential half-life elimination associated with body fat measures related to diabetic class, and an indirect relationship between current dioxin and the dependent variable due to adjustment for diabetic class. Chapter 1, Introduction, and Chapter 7, Statistical Methods, contain Interpretive Considerations sections that discuss these issues in more detail.

The results for the category of other neurological disorders were primarily attributable to the confounding effects of occupation; enlisted personnel were three times as likely to have an other neurological disorder (mostly unspecified encephalopathy) than were officers. Thus more importance should be placed on the nonsignificant relative risks adjusted for occupation than on the significant relative risks that were not adjusted for occupation.

Interpretation of the results for some of the other variables becomes ambiguous because the diabetic class covariate is both a risk factor for the dependent variable and also is associated with body fat measures related to differential half-life elimination. The pin prick results are particularly difficult to interpret because in addition to the discrepant results between occupation and diabetic class (in and out of the model), each of the current dioxin

analyses found a significant interaction with diabetic class. The interactions displayed significant positive associations between current dioxin levels (lipid-adjusted and whole-weight) and pin prick for diabetics, but no significant association for participants classified as normal and impaired.

While the current dioxin analysis results for these variables may be unclear and inconclusive, they must be interpreted in conjunction with the other model results, which found no significant group differences and no significant associations with estimated initial dioxin (which was adjusted for differential half-life elimination).

CHAPTER 11
REFERENCES

1. Mohammad, F.K., and V.E.V. St. Omer. 1985. Developing rat brain monoamine levels following in utero exposure to a mixture of 2,4,-dichlorophenoxyacetic and 2,4,5-trichlorophenoxyacetic acids. *Toxicol. Lett.* 29:215-23.

2. Mohammad, F.K., and V.E.V. St. Omer. 1986. Behavioral and developmental effects in rats following in utero exposure to 2,4-D/2,4,5-T mixture. *Neurobehav. Toxicol. Teratol.* 8:551-560.

3. Mohammad, F.K., and V.E.V. St. Omer. 1988. Effects of prenatal exposure to 2,4-D/2,4,5-T mixture on postnatal changes in rat brain glutamate, GABA, protein, and nucleic acid levels. *Bull. Environ. Contam. Toxicol.* 40:294-300.

4. Mohammad, F.K., and V.E.V. St. Omer. 1988. Behavioral and neurochemical alterations in rats prenatally exposed to 2,4-diochlorophenoxyacetate (2,4-D) and 2,4,5-trichlorophenoxyacetate (2,4,5-D) mixture. *Teratology* 37:515.

5. St. Omer, V.E.V., and F.K. Mohammad. 1987. Ontogeny of swimming behavior and brain catecholamine turnover in rats prenatally exposed to a mixture of 2, 4-D and 2, 4, 5-T. *Neuropharmacology* 26:1351-58.

6. Kim, C.S., R.F. Keizer, and J.B. Pritchard. 1988. 2,4-dichlorophenoxyacetic acid intoxication increases its accumulation within the brain. *Brain Res.* 440:216-26.

7. Schulze, G.E. 1988. 2,4-D-n-butyl ester (2,4-D ester) induced ataxia in rats: Role for n-butanol formation. *Neurotoxicol. Teratol.* 10:81-84.

8. Schulze, G.E., and J.A. Dougherty. 1988. Neurobehavioral toxicity of 2,4-D-n-butyl ester (2,4-D ester): Tolerance and lack of cross-tolerance. *Neurotoxicol. Teratol.* 10:75-79.

9. Schulze, G.E., and J.A. Dougherty. 1988. Neurobehavioral toxicity and tolerance to the herbicide 2,4-dichlorophenoxyacetic and acid-n-butyl ester (2,4-D ester). *Fund. Appl. Toxicol.* 10:413-24.

10. Pohjanvirta, R., L. Tuomisto, and J. Tuomisto. 1989. The central nervous system may be involved in TCDD toxicity. *Toxicology* 58:167-74.

11. Silbergeld, E.K. and S.R. Max. 1986. Neuromuscular targets for the action of 2,3,7,8-TCDD. Abstract of a paper presented at the 6th International Symposium on Chlorinated Dioxins and Related Compounds, 16-19 September, at Fukuoka, Japan.

12. Grahmann, F., D. Claus, H. Grehl, and B. Neundorfer. 1993. Electrophysiologic evidence for a toxic polyneuropathy in rats after exposure to 2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin (TCDD). *J. Neurol. Sci.* 115(1):71-5.

13. Mattsson, J.L., and D.L. Eisenbrandt. 1990. The improbable association between the herbicide 2,4-D and polyneuropathy. *Biomed. Environ. Sci.* 3:43-51.

14. Klawans, H.L. 1987. Dystonia and tremor following exposure to 2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin. *Mov. Disord.* 2:255-61.

15. Oliver, R.M. 1975. Toxic effects of 2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzo-1,4-dioxin in laboratory workers. *Br. J. Ind. Med.* 32:49-53.

16. Singer, R., M. Moses, J. Valciukas, R. Lilis, and I.J. Selikoff. 1982. Nerve conduction velocity studies of workers employed in the manufacture of phenoxy herbicides. *Environ. Res.* 29:297-311.

17. Moses, M., R. Lilis, K.D. Crow, J. Thornton, A. Fischbein, H.A. Anderson, and I.J.Selikoff. 1984. Health status of workers with past exposure to 2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin in the manufacture of 2,4,5-trichlorophenoxyacetic acid: Comparison of findings with and without chloracne. *Am. J. Ind. Med.* 5:161-82.

18. Filippini, G., B. Bordo, P. Crenna, N. Massetto, M. Musicco, and R. Boeri. 1981. Relationship between clinical and electrophysiological findings and indicators of heavy exposure to 2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzo-dioxin. *Scand. J. Work Environ. Health* 7:257-262.

19. Pazderova-Vejlupkova, J., M. Nemcova, J. Pickova, L. Jirasek, and E. Lukas. 1981. The development and prognosis of chronic intoxication by tetrachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin in men. *Arch. Environ. Health* 36:5-11.

20. Bertozzi, P. 1991. Long-term effects of chemical disasters. Lessons and results from Seveso. *Sci. Total. Environ.* 196(1-2):5-20.

21. Sweeney, M.H., M.A. Fingerhut, L.B. Connally, and R. Hornung. 1992. Evaluation of the peripheral nervous system among workers employed in the production of chemicals contaminated with 2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin. *Government Reports Announcements & Index (GRA & I)* Issue 22.

22. Webb, K.B., S.M. Ayres, J. Mikes, and R.G. Evans. 1986. The diagnosis of dioxin-associated illness. *Am. J. Prev. Med.* 2:103-108.

23. Webb, K.B., R.G. Evans, P.A. Stehr, and S.M. Ayres. 1987. Pilot study on health effects of environmental 2,3,7,8-TCDD in Missouri. *Am. J. of Ind. Med.* 11:685-91.

24. Webb, K.B., R.G. Evans, A.P. Knutsen, S.T. Roodman, D.W. Roberts, W.F. Schramm, B.B. Gibson, J.S. Andrews, Jr., L.L. Needham, and D.G. Patterson. 1989. Medical evaluation of subjects with known body levels of 2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin. *J. of Toxicol. and Environ. Health* 28:183-93.

25. Hoffman, R.E., P.A. Stehr-Green, K.B. Webb, R.G. Evans, A.P. Knutsen, W.F. Schramm, B.B. Gibson, and K.K. Steinberg. 1986. Health effects of long-term exposure to 2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin. *JAMA* 225:2031-38.

26. Stehr, P.A., G. Stein, H. Falk, E. Sampson, S.J. Smith, K. Steinberg, K. Webb, S. Ayres, W.F. Schramm, H.D. Donnell, W.B. Gedney. 1986. A pilot epidemiologic study of possible health effects associated with 2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin contaminations in Missouri. *Arch. of Environ. Health* 41:16-22.

27. Boeri, R., B. Bordo, P. Crenna, G. Filippini, M. Massetto, and A. Zecchini. 1978. Preliminary results of a neurological investigation of the population exposed to TCDD in the Seveso region. *Riv. Pat. Nerv. Ment.* 99:111-28.

28. Barbieri, S., C. Pirovano, and G. Scarlato. 1986. 2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzo-para-dioxin and peripheral nervous-system involvement--A clinical and neurophysiological controlled-study on subjects with chloracne from the Seveso area. *Muscle and Nerve* 9:134.

29. Barbieri, S., C. Pirovano, G. Scarlato, P. Tarchini, A. Zappa, and M. Maranzana. 1988. Long-term effects of 2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin on the peripheral nervous system. Clinical and neurophysiological controlled study on subjects with chloracne from the Seveso area. *Neuroepidemiology* 7:29-37.

30. Klawans, H.L., R.S. Wilson, and D.C. Garron. 1987. Neurological problems following exposure to 2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin (TCDD, Dioxin). In *Neurotoxins and Their Pharmacological Implications*, ed. P. Jeffer. Raven Press, 1987, New York. pp. 279-285.

31. Stehr-Green, P.A., J.S. Andrews, Jr., R.E. Hoffman, K.B. Webb, and W.F. Schramm. 1988. An overview of the Missouri dioxin studies. *Arch. Environ. Health* 43:174-77.

32. Lathrop, G.D., W.H. Wolfe, R.A. Albanese, and P.M. Moynahan. 1984. The Air Force Health Study: An epidemiologic investigation of health effects in Air Force personnel following exposure to herbicides: Baseline Morbidity Study Results. NTIS: AD A 138 340. USAF School of Medicine, Brooks Air Force Base, Texas.

33. Lathrop, G.D., S.G. Machado, T.G. Karrison, W.D. Grubbs, W.F. Thomas, W.H. Wolfe, J.E. Michalek, J.C. Miner, and M.R. Peterson. 1987. Epidemiologic investigation of health effects in Air Force personnel following exposure to herbicides: First followup examination results. NTIS: AD A 188 262. USAF School of Aerospace Medicine, Brooks Air Force Base, Texas.

34. Roegner, R.H., W.D. Grubbs, M.B. Lustik, A.S. Brockman, S.C. Henderson, D.E. Williams, W.H. Wolfe, J.E. Michalek, and J.C. Miner. 1991. The Air Force Health Study: An epidemiologic investigation of health effects in Air Force personnel following exposure to herbicides. Serum Dioxin Analysis of 1987 Examination Results. NTIS: AD A 237 516-24. USAF School of Aerospace Medicine, Brooks Air Force Base, Texas.

35. Dyro, F.M. 1985. Conduction velocities and Agent Orange exposure. *Electroencephalogr. Clin. Neurophysiol.* 60:112.

36. Stellman, S.D., J.M. Stellman, and J.F. Sommer, Jr. 1988. Health and reproductive outcomes among American Legionnaires in relation to combat and herbicide exposure in Vietnam. *Environ. Res.* 47:150-74.

37. U.S. Centers for Disease Control. 1988. Health Status of Vietnam veterans. In Part 2, Physical health. The Centers for Disease Control Vietnam Experience Study. *JAMA* 259:2708-14.

38. Gerr, F., D. Hershman, and R. Letz. 1990. Vibrotactile threshold measurement for detecting neurotoxicity's reliability and determination of age- and height-standardized normative values. *Archives of Environmental Health* 45:148-154.

39. Personal written communication. Dr. Richard Letz with Dr. William Grubbs. 25 August 1993.

40. Michalek, J.E., R.C. Tripathi, S.P. Caudill, and J.L. Pirkle. 1992. Investigation of TCDD half-life heterogeneity in veterans of Operation Ranch Hand. *J. Tox. Environ. Health* 35:29-38.