AD NUMBER

ADB222547

NEW LIMITATION CHANGE

TO
Approved for public release, distribution unlimited

FROM
Distribution authorized to U.S. Gov’t. agencies only; Proprietary Info.; Nov 96. Other requests shall be referred to Commander, Army Medical Research and Materiel Command, Attn: MCMR-RMI-S, Fort Detrick, Frederick, MD 21702-5012.

AUTHORITY

P. M. Rinehart, Deputy Chief of Staff for Info. Mgmt., USAMRMC, MCMR-RMI-S [70-1y], Ft. Detrick, MD.
AD

GRANT NUMBER DAMD17-94-J-4206

TITLE: A Follow-up of a National Cohort of Breast Disease Factors Affecting the Development of Breast Cancer

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Baruch Modan, M.D.

CONTRACTING ORGANIZATION: Chaim Sheba Medical Center
Tel Hashomer 52621 Israel

REPORT DATE: September 1996

TYPE OF REPORT: Final

PREPARED FOR: Commander
U.S. Army Medical Research and Materiel Command
Fort Detrick, Frederick, Maryland 21702-5012

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT: Distribution authorized to U.S. Government agencies only (proprietary information, Nov 96). Other requests for this document shall be referred to Commander, U.S. Army Medical Research and Materiel Command, ATTN: MCMR-RMI-S, Fort Detrick, Frederick, MD 21702-5012.

The views, opinions and/or findings contained in this report are those of the author(s) and should not be construed as an official Department of the Army position, policy or decision unless so designated by other documentation.
In 1979-80 we collected and re-examined all breast biopsies performed in Israel by a single pathologist in New York (Dr. M. Black), using his prognostic grading system, nuclear differentiation and LRE response for breast diseases. The complete cohort consisted of about 3720 women. By September 1996, 1760 benign breast disease (BBD) cases were interviewed. Preliminary data show that about 30% of the BBD women went through an additional biopsy and 11% went through two, that were re-evaluated by Dr. Black. First follow-up for morbidity and mortality was done by linkage of our cohort file with that of the Cancer Registry: 2.2% with normotypic (grade 1), 3.3% of hyperplastic (grade 2), and 9% of atypic, (grade 3) and 4.2% of the in-situ Ca (grade 5) women developed BC. Median time to BC was 9.9, 9.2, 5.1, 3.1, 3-10 years respectively. Data collected from the BBD cohort women included information on hormonal and parity history, history of BBD and BC, physical activity and alcohol drinking habits. Computer programming has been concluded and frequencies of selected parameters are presented. Mortality of the invasive cancer patient's cohort was 67.2%. For 45% of the breast cancer (BC) cohort women, oncological information from medical records was abstracted.
Opinions, interpretations, conclusions and recommendations are those of the author and are not necessarily endorsed by the US Army.

Where copyrighted material is quoted, permission has been obtained to use such material.

Where material from documents designated for limited distribution is quoted, permission has been obtained to use the material.

Citations of commercial organizations and trade names in this report do not constitute an official Department of Army endorsement or approval of the products or services of these organizations.

In conducting research using animals, the investigator(s) adhered to the "Guide for the Care and Use of Laboratory Animals," prepared by the Committee on Care and Use of Laboratory Animals of the Institute of Laboratory Resources, National Research Council (NIH Publication No. 86-23, Revised 1985).

For the protection of human subjects, the investigator(s) adhered to policies of applicable Federal Law 45 CFR 46.

In conducting research utilizing recombinant DNA technology, the investigator(s) adhered to current guidelines promulgated by the National Institutes of Health.

In the conduct of research utilizing recombinant DNA, the investigator(s) adhered to the NIH Guidelines for Research Involving Recombinant DNA Molecules.

In the conduct of research involving hazardous organisms, the investigator(s) adhered to the CDC-NIH Guide for Biosafety in Microbiological and Biomedical Laboratories.

Not Applicable

Signature Date
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Report Documentation Page</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreword</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstract</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction and Study Purpose</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Objectives</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Progress and Preliminary Results</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future plans</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References</td>
<td>11-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tables</td>
<td>14-20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTRODUCTION AND STUDY PURPOSE

Dissatisfaction with the prognostic value of a traditional pathologic categorization of BBD has led to the development of a classification of defined segments of the mammary duct system based on proliferation and the degree of atypical changes (1,2).

The essential feature of Black-Chabon grading system is based on a score of 1 to 5 describing a degree of ductal atypia. Normotypic lesions included those classified as normoplastic (Grade 1) and hyperplastic (Grade 2). The normoplastic lesions included those conventionally categorized as cystic changes, stromal fibrosis, duct ectasia, and normal-appearing breast parenchyma. The hyperplastic lesions included those conventionally classified as intraductal papillomas, papillomatosis, adenosis, and duct hyperplasia without atypia. The term benign proliferative mastopathy was ascribed to the preceding group of conditions with duct Grades 1 to ≥1 to ≥2. Minimal, moderate and marked degrees of ductal and/or lobular atypia were graded as 3 and 4, respectively. A grading of 5 essentially coincides with the traditional category of Ca in situ.

The evolution of BC from normal tissue to malignancy has a long natural history which may be a multistage process that proceeds through duct cell hyperproliferation to atypia, in situ growth, and malignant transformation. This tumorogenesis model may be associated with several genetic, hormonal and reproductive factors that may act to depress, or enhance, the final outcome in this dynamic continuum (3).

It is recognized that a number of factors may play a role, in a stepwise manner, in the process of carcinogenesis. In this continuum, there are factors such
as oral contraceptives (OC) intake, reproductive events and breast irradiation, that can influence the risk of BC onset (4-8). Therefore, this study offers an unusual opportunity to evaluate the role of various factors in relation to baseline (start of follow-up) and final outcome in the process (end of follow-up). Such influence may be evaluated in a comparative perspective, for women with high and low baseline risks of BC (i.e. those born in Europe or America versus born in Asia or Africa), who share an apparent common risk factor (BBD).

Our nested case-control study will allow comparing, within each pathological subgroup, the effects of several recognized factors associated with BC risk, acting before and after first BBD appearance between women who developed BC and those who did not.

The passive follow-up of the subcohort of BC will allow a better understanding of the role of demographic, pathological, and medical characteristics (including surgical and oncological treatment of BC) for further mortality (9).

The study is based on a twelve-year follow-up of the cohort of 3500 women histologically diagnosed nationwide for benign and malignant breast lesions, between July 1979 and June 1980 (10). A particular feature of the study population is that it stems from a single community but comprises subgroups with varying BC incidence; high risk women born in Europe, America and Israel, and low risk women originating from the Middle East and North Africa. The age-adjusted BC incidence rates of these groups in the late 1980's were 87.0 and 57.2 per 100,000 respectively, a gradient similar to the one observed between US whites and Africans (11).

**Significance**

This study offers a unique opportunity to evaluate the progression of benign and malignant breast disease on a whole community base population.
Results will contribute to shedding light in respect to the role of BBD in general, and its specific histologic types in BC causation, taking into account interactions with main hormonal and demographic risk factors.

TECHNICAL OBJECTIVES

The specific aims are:

1. To assess morbidity patterns in a nationwide cohort of women with breast lesions by histopathological type and by ethnic origin.

2. To compare the prognostic value of Black-Chabon atypia-based grading system of BBD to the "traditional" histopathologic diagnosis, as predictors for progression from benign to malignant breast lesions.

3. To evaluate the role of selected hormonal and other factors, on the course of progression from benign to malignant breast lesions.

4. To evaluate the prognostic significance of selected specific characteristics of breast malignant neoplasms by clinical stage (TNM): histopathology; laterality of sequential neoplastic events; angiogenesis; degree of nuclear differentiation of the tumor cells (expressed as nuclear grade (NG)); and cell mediated immunity to autologous cancer cells (as manifested by microscopically demonstrable lymphoreticuloendothelial (LRE) response).

5. To assess the role of demographic and medical characteristics on the development of a second BC.

6. To establish a national datafile for subsequent long-term follow-up of this population.
WORK PROGRESS AND PRELIMINARY RESULTS

Table 1 presents the study cohort by main diagnosis, representing all women going through breast biopsy in Israel during one year period (6.1.79 - 7.1.80) and identified 12 years later. The source of the demographic information collected at time of first identification of cases consisted of the pathological records, which in many cases were found to be incomplete. Completion of demographic information was done by tracing and identifying medical records in all hospitals in Israel. Our file was then linked to the Population Registry to further update addresses and vital status (complete name and address, year of birth, father's name and place of birth) to validate identification. As can be observed, 161 cases (6.2%) were not identified. Unidentified women were found not to belong to one specific subpopulation (type of benign breast disease) but are rather distributed similarly among the various diagnostic categories, 9.7 in precancerous breast diseases and 6.3% in the normotypic benign breast disease.

Table 2 shows the interview status of the nested case control study. By 1.6.96 we completed 1769 interviews and about 300 cases are still in progress. Response was about 80%. Non response by type of diagnosis shows a similar distribution among all types of diseases.

Table 3 shows results of 12 years BC morbidity follow-up. The prognostic value of Black-Chabon grading system of benign breast diseases was confirmed in our cohort. An increased risk for breast cancer with increased grading was observed: from 2.3% in the normotypic normoplastic type of BBD (grade 1) to 8.7% in atypic precancerous mastopathy (grade 3). In the same line median time till BC diagnosis decreases with increased grading from 9.9, 9.2, 5.1 10 years. For two in situ cases median time till BC was 3.1 and 10.3 for the second.
Table 4 shows the standardized incidence rate and confidence interval of breast cancer among the cohort of BBD patients by Black's prognostic system pathology. There is a significant increase in the risk of breast cancer in the BBD population as compared to the expected in the general population. A significant increase in risk with increased grading (from I to III) is observed. Atypic grade ≥3 BBD cases have a four and a half fold greater risk of breast cancer than the expected in the general population. Analysing the effect of age and origin on SIR (Table 5) we found that the increased incidence risk persists when age (<50 and >50) and origin are taken into consideration. Tables 6-7 show the frequency of selected epidemiological hormonal factors from the analysis of data obtained from personal interviews of BBD cohort.

The frequency of subsequent BBD biopsies is presented in Table 6. Thirty percent of the study cases went through at least one additional biopsy, 11% had two or more. Fifty-nine percent of consecutive biopsies were validated by local pathologists and 33% of them by Black in N.Y..

Table 7 shows preliminary data on the associations of parity and hormonal parameters with BBD by diagnosis. Parity was higher in the more advanced grade categories. This will be explored further.

The main finding thus far is the correlation between grading and subsequent BC. Using the conventional diagnostic nomenclature (e.g. fibrocystic BBD), this pattern would have been lost and would not allow identification of women with higher risk of BC that should be followed accordingly. Findings strongly support the increased risk for BC associated with previous BBD (12-23). Further analysis of our data may provide knowledge about factors associated with the progression from BBD to BC.
Future plans

Nested case control study - Last Interviews are being completed. Double check of case identification is being done by going back to unidentified cases by a second interviewer. Genetical analysis of mutations (BRCA1-2) of familial BC and familial BBD is being considered for the next year.

Direct and inferential evidence indicates that the precursor to invasive progression is impeded by cell-mediated immunity to a particular immunogen that is characteristically expressed in the preinvasive phase of mammary carcinogenesis. Further data analysis will include evaluation of this component - Lymphocyte Reticular Endotelial (LRE) response associated with further morbidity and mortality to the tumor was made in our cohort and will also be analyzed as marker for further BC morbidity. Within grade 2 and 3 there are many cases (67%) that were designed traditionally as fibrocystic disease.

Breast cancer cohort - During the next year completion of BC follow up will be done, and a special effort is being made to identify all records on the basis of a nationwide search, in addition to hospital.
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### Table 1

Breast cohort by diagnostic category and current status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diagnostic Category</th>
<th>Total Cohort</th>
<th>Total Cohort Identified*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1979-80) n</td>
<td>(1979-80) n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total BBD</td>
<td>2615*</td>
<td>2454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normotypic/ hyperplastic</td>
<td>2431</td>
<td>2277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Grade 1-2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atypical, precancerous</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Grade 3-4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In situ</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Grade 5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invasive</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>840</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* For about 10% of cases no review was done by Dr. Black, the complete cohort includes these women as well, with their histopathology by local pathologist
Table 2
Distribution of the study population by interview status and cause of non-response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Interviewed</th>
<th>In process*</th>
<th>Refused</th>
<th>Not identified</th>
<th>Other reasons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total cohort</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2454</td>
<td>1769</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>124</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* until 8.1.96
Table 3

Development of BC in the BBD Cohort
by Black’s Prognostic Grading System (1991)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Total BBD</th>
<th>Breast Cancer</th>
<th>Median time to BC (years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Normotypic-Normoplastic (Grade 1)</td>
<td>933</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normotypic-Hyperplastic (Grade 2)</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atypic-Hyperplastic (Grade ≥3)</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Situ Ca</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3.1-10.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2454</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4

Standardized Incidence Rate (SIR)* and Confidence Interval (CI) of Breast Cancer Among Cohort of Patients With BBD by Black's Diagnostic Grading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BBD Diagnosis</th>
<th>Total BBD</th>
<th>Observed n</th>
<th>Expected n</th>
<th>SIR*</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total BBD&lt;sup&gt;↑&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2342</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>1.67-2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normotypic-</td>
<td>893</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>0.90-2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normoplastic (Grade I)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyperplastic</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>1.63-3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Grade II)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atypic-</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>2.14-8.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyperplastic (Grade III)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Situ Ca</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>0.22-7.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* SIR derived from cases with available demographic (age and origin); for 112 cases this information was missing

<sup>↑</sup> see remarks to Table 1
Table 5

Standardized Incidence Rate (SIR) and Confidence Interval of Breast Cancer by Origin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Total BBD</th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Expected</th>
<th>SIR</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>2342</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>1.67-2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia-Africa</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>1.82-4.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe-America</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>1.20-2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>817</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>1.41-3.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Age

| <50               | 181       | 50       | 22.3     | 2.24 | 1.67-2.96 |
| 50+               | 526       | 28       | 14.4     | 1.95 | 1.50-2.82 |

*see remarks to Table 1*
Table 6

Frequency distribution of repeated breast biopsies among interviewed population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Breast Biopsies</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1*</td>
<td>1095 (70.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>299 (19.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>95 (6.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥4</td>
<td>74 (4.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1563↑ 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* no additional biopsy
↑ 203 interviewed cases, one in progress
Table 7
Parity characteristics of the BBD cohort by type of Black's grading system

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Normotypic</th>
<th>Normoplastic</th>
<th>Hyperplastic</th>
<th>Atypic</th>
<th>In-situ</th>
<th>Unknown Black-Chabon grading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n=583)</td>
<td>(n=595)</td>
<td>(n=76)</td>
<td>(n=21)</td>
<td>(n=288)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean no. of pregnancies*</td>
<td>4.46±2.59</td>
<td>4.60±2.32</td>
<td>5.19±3.37</td>
<td>5.60±3.37</td>
<td>4.87±3.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean no. of births</td>
<td>2.82±1.69</td>
<td>30±1.67</td>
<td>2.76±1.25</td>
<td>2.91±1.8</td>
<td>2.93±1.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parity:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nulliparous</td>
<td>24 (4.1)</td>
<td>19 (3.2)</td>
<td>3 (3.9)</td>
<td>3 (14)</td>
<td>21 (7.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parous</td>
<td>359 (95.9)</td>
<td>576 (96.8)</td>
<td>73 (96.1)</td>
<td>17 (81)</td>
<td>267 (92.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infertility problems:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>473 (81.1)</td>
<td>492 (82.7)</td>
<td>65 (85.5)</td>
<td>19 (90.5)</td>
<td>221 (76.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>110 (18.9)</td>
<td>103 (17.3)</td>
<td>11 (14.9)</td>
<td>2 (9.5)</td>
<td>65 (22.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infertility treatment:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>52 (8.9)</td>
<td>60 (10.1)</td>
<td>5 (6.6)</td>
<td>1 (4.8)</td>
<td>5 (6.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>531 (91.9)</td>
<td>535 (89.9)</td>
<td>71 (93.9)</td>
<td>20 (95.2)</td>
<td>71 (93.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hormonal treatment for infertility:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>160 (27.4)</td>
<td>156 (26.2)</td>
<td>14 (18.4)</td>
<td>4 (19)</td>
<td>70 (24.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>423 (72.6)</td>
<td>439 (73.8)</td>
<td>62 (81.6)</td>
<td>17 (81)</td>
<td>218 (75.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean age of menstruation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13.1±1.6</td>
<td>13.2±1.6</td>
<td>13.0±1.8</td>
<td>13.0±1.3</td>
<td>13.2±1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>46 (7.9)</td>
<td>56 (9.4)</td>
<td>14 (18.4)</td>
<td>5 (6.6)</td>
<td>22 (7.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular menses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>537 (92.1)</td>
<td>538 (90.4)</td>
<td>62 (81.6)</td>
<td>71 (93.4)</td>
<td>266 (92.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p=0.04 for difference between the diagnostic categories