HFE C282Y Homozygotes Are at Increased Risk of Breast and Colorectal Cancer

Nicholas J. Osborne,[1,2,3] Lyle C. Gurrin,[1,2] Katrina J. Allen,[1,3,4] Clare C. Constantine,[2] Martin B. Delatycki,[3,5] Christine E. McLaren,[6] Dorota M. Gertig,[2,7] Gregory J. Anderson,[8] Melissa C. Southey,[9] John K. Olynyk,[10,11,12] Lawrie W. Powell,[8,13] John L. Hopper,[2] Graham G. Giles,[2,14] and Dallas R. English[2,14]

The evidence that mutations in the *HFE* gene for hemochromatosis are associated with increased cancer risk is inconsistent. The Melbourne Collaborative Cohort Study is a prospective cohort study that commenced recruitment in 1990. Participants born in Australia, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, or Ireland (n = 28,509) were genotyped for the *HFE* C282Y (substitution of tyrosine for cysteine at amino acid 282) variant. Incident cancers were ascertained from Australian cancer registries during an average of 14 years follow-up. Hazard ratios (HRs), confidence intervals (CIs), and *P* values were obtained from separate Cox regression analyses for colorectal, breast, and prostate cancers, all other solid cancers, and all cancers. Compared to those with no C282Y variant, C282Y homozygotes were at increased risk of colorectal cancer (HR = 2.28; 95% CI = 1.22, 4.25; *P* = 0.01) and female C282Y homozygotes were at increased risk of developing breast cancer (HR = 2.39; 95% CI = 1.24, 4.61; *P* = 0.01), but male C282Y homozygotes were not at increased risk for prostate cancer (HR = 0·96; 95% CI = 0·43, 2·15; *P* = 0.92). C282Y/H63D compound heterozygotes were not at increased risk for colorectal cancer (HR = 1.27; 95% CI = 0.80, 2.01), breast cancer (HR = 1.16; 95% CI = 0.74, 1.84), or prostate cancer (HR = 1.08; 95% CI = 0.68, 1.70). *Conclusion*: *HFE* C282Y homozygotes have twice the risk of colorectal and breast cancer compared with those individuals without the C282Y variant. (HEPATOLOGY 2010;51:1311-1318.)

The essential trace element iron can be carcinogenic through a variety of mechanisms including catalyzing the formation of mutagenic hydroxyl radicals,[1] suppression of the host immune response,[2] and by acting as an essential nutrient for proliferating tumor cells.[3] Hereditary hemochromatosis is an inherited disorder of iron overload characterized by inappropriately elevated intestinal iron absorption. In HFE-associated hereditary hemochromatosis, mutations in the *HFE* gene can impair synthesis of the master iron-regulatory protein hepcidin. Reduced hepcidin levels leads to increased release of iron from intestinal cells and macrophages, ele-

vating plasma transferrin saturation and causing deposition of iron in the liver and other tissues.[4] Individuals homozygous for the mutation that leads to the C282Y substitution of tyrosine for cysteine at amino acid 282 in the HFE protein are at increased risk of iron overload[5] and account for 82%-90% of clinical diagnoses of hereditary hemochromatosis for those individuals of northern European descent.[6] We have recently shown that the majority of C282Y homozygotes (82% of men and 65% of women) have elevated serum ferritin and, based on objective criteria, 28% of male and 1% of female C282Y homozygotes develop iron overload-related disease by, on average, 65 years of age. People having a single copy of both the C282Y and H63D (substitution of aspartic acid for histidine at amino acid 63) mutations in *HFE* (described as compound heterozygotes) have, on average, higher serum ferritin and transferrin saturation levels than people with neither *HFE* mutation, although they are not at increased risk of iron overload–related disease.[7] Previous studies of the association between *HFE* genotype and risk of colorectal cancer and breast cancer have provided inconsistent results,[8-17] possibly related to the small numbers of C282Y homozygous participants (see Supporting Materials).

We assessed the relationships between the risk of cancer including breast, colorectal, and prostate cancers and the C282Y variant of the *HFE* gene using a prospective cohort study.

Patients and Methods

Participants. From 1990-1994, the Melbourne Collaborative Cohort Study enrolled 41,514 people (24,469 women) aged between 27 and 75 years (99.3% were 40-69 years) in Melbourne, Australia. Participants were recruited using Electoral Rolls (voting is compulsory for Australian citizens) and by advertisements and community announcements.

Approximately one-quarter of the participants were born in Greece, Italy, or Malta, but because the prevalence of the C282Y variants in the *HFE* gene was low in this group,[18] genotyping was restricted to the 31,181 participants born in Australia, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, or Ireland.

Because cancer diagnosis was ascertained prospectively, 1245 participants who had been diagnosed with any cancer before enrollment in the study were excluded from the analysis. A further 41 were excluded because their baseline blood samples were missing or they had insufficient DNA for genotyping, leaving 29,895 eligible participants. The study protocol was approved by the Cancer Council Victoria's Human Research Ethics Com-

mittee (Project No. HREC0105). Participants gave written consent for participation and for the investigators to obtain their medical records.

Assessment of Risk Factors at Baseline. At baseline, a structured interview schedule was used to obtain information about potential risk factors including country of birth, education, smoking history, alcohol consumption, and for women, reproductive history and use of hormone replacement therapy. Current usual diet was assessed by a 121-item food frequency questionnaire.[19] A blood sample was collected and weight, height, waist, and hip circumferences were measured.[20]

Ascertainment of Cancer Cases. Addresses and vital status of the subjects were determined by record linkage to electoral rolls, the National Death Index, Victorian death records, and from electronic phone books and responses to mailed questionnaires and newsletters. Cancer cases were identified by linkage to population-based cancer registries in all Australian states.

Assessment of HFE Genotype. Blood samples were stored either in liquid nitrogen or dried on Guthrie cards. DNA was extracted from Guthrie cards by the Chelex method and from buffy coats using a guanidinium isothiocyanate–based method (Corbett Buffy Coat CorProtocol 14102). All samples were genotyped for the single-nucleotide polymorphism in the *HFE* gene that is responsible for the C282Y substitution in the HFE protein (rs1800562) using real-time polymerase chain reaction. Those samples with one copy of the variant leading to C282Y were also genotyped for the variant leading to the H63D substitution (rs1799945).[21] Therefore, there were four *HFE* genotype groups: (1) C282Y homozygotes, (2) simple heterozygotes with one copy of the C282Y variant and no copies of the H63D variant, (3) compound heterozygotes with one copy each of the C282Y and H63D variants, and (4) other *HFE* genotype with no copies of the C282Y variant and unknown number of copies of the H63D variant. The H63D and C282Y variants have only very rarely been reported to occur together on a single chromosome.[22]

For participants classified as C282Y homozygotes by this genotyping, additional genotyping was performed for confirmation. All participants homozygous for the C282Y variant (as part of an HFE-genotype stratified random sample) were invited to participate in a study of iron and health (the "HealthIron" study) from 2004-2007, where we collected a cheek swab, with subsequent genotyping for C282Y and H63D in an independent laboratory. For those who did not participate in HealthIron, additional genotyping was done on a baseline plasma sample. Only those participants classified as C282Y homozygotes by the initial and confirmatory genotyping

were considered to be homozygotes for this analysis, otherwise they were classified according to the results of the confirmatory genotyping.

Statistical Analysis. Hazard ratios were estimated using Cox regression with age as the time axis. Follow-up began at baseline and ended at death, date of diagnosis, date left Australia, or end of follow-up, whichever came first. Follow-up ended on December 31, 2007, for colorectal cancer and December 31, 2006, for all other cancers. For participants who moved to other states, end of follow-up ended on December 31, 2003, because linkage to other cancer registries was complete to 2003 only. Separate analyses were performed for three of the four most common cancers in this cohort (female breast, prostate, and colorectal). Melanoma was the only other cancer common enough to be considered separately, but we did not analyze it because we had no data on sun exposure, its major cause. Separate analyses were also performed for all other solid cancers combined and all cancers. Analyses of prostate cancer and breast cancer were restricted to men and women, respectively. The primary exposure variables were combinations of single-nucleotide polymorphism genotypes of the *HFE* gene (C282Y and H63D variants). The proportional hazards assumption was examined visually from plots of the Nelson-Aalen estimate of the cumulative hazard, and formally by tests based on Schoenfeld residuals. Statistical analyses were performed with Stata 10.1 (Stata Corp., College Station, TX).

Several variables were assessed as potential confounders of the association between *HFE* genotype and cancer risk. These included those listed in Table 1: age, height, weight, waist circumference, body mass index, smoking, alcohol consumption, physical activity, education, dietary intake of fresh red meat, processed meat, folate, calcium, and multivitamin use. For women, all analyses considered adjustment for current hormone replacement therapy use, age at menarche, history of pregnancy (yes/no), and menstruation at baseline. A change of any estimated hazard ratio (HR) of 10% or more after inclusion of a potential confounding variable in the statistical model was considered to be indicative of confounding. None of the variables met this criterion, and hence, the final HRs were unadjusted. For the analyses of colorectal cancer, all cancer, and all nonhematological cancer, statistical models based on females only were analyzed first to examine possible confounding by reproductive and hormonal factors. None were found and the definitive models for these cancers were stratified by sex to account for differences by sex in the underlying hazard rates.

Because data on use of nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs) and aspirin at baseline were coded only for a random sample of 5268 participants, these variables were assessed only for their association with genotype. Table 1 shows that there were only small differences in use of NSAIDs and aspirin when assessed by genotype group and, therefore, confounding by use of aspirin or NSAIDs is unlikely.

To obtain a quantitative summary of the literature on *HFE* genotypes and risk of breast, prostate, and colorectal cancer, where possible we performed fixed effects meta-analyses that included the present study (see Supporting Material).

Results

Samples from 28,509 (95%) of the 29,895 eligible participants were successfully genotyped for the major mutation in *HFE* (leading to the C282Y substitution). Of these, 24,339 (85.4%) were wild-type, 3977 (13.3%) were C282Y heterozygotes, and 193 (0.64%) were C282Y homozygotes. The expected numbers under Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium are 24,313 wild-type, 4029 heterozygous, and 167 homozygous ($P = 0.03$); thus, there was an excess of homozygotes and a deficit of heterozygotes.

Genotyping for H63D was successful for 3882 (98%) of the 3977 C282Y heterozygotes, of which 690 (17.8%) were heterozygous and thus were heterozygous for both the C282Y and H63D variants. We excluded from further analysis the 95 participants for whom the H63D genotyping failed, because it was not known whether they were simple C282Y heterozygotes or compound heterozygotes. It was not possible to check for Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium because of the restriction of H63D genotyping to C282Y heterozygotes.

A summary of baseline characteristics for participants successfully genotyped is presented in Table 1. C282Y homozygotes had the lowest mean body mass index, which would mean that any confounding of the association would be toward the null. A higher proportion of male participants than female participants were C282Y homozygotes. Only minor differences were seen for other risk factors.

Between initial attendance and December 31, 2007, 84 participants had left Australia and 3365 were confirmed dead. There were 620 participants diagnosed with colorectal cancer (mean age at diagnosis, 68.3; range, 42.0-83.3 years), 664 women diagnosed with breast cancer (mean age at diagnosis, 62.8; range, 41.3-82.0 years), 758 men diagnosed with prostate cancer (mean age at diagnosis, 67.6; range, 47.6-83.6 years), 3755 with nonhematological cancers (mean age at diagnosis, 66.1; range, 41.3-84.4 years), and 4025 with any cancer (mean age at diagnosis, 66.1; range, 41.3-84.4 years).

Table 1. Summary of Cohort Characteristics at Baseline

Risk Factor	Definition or Units	C282Y Homozygote	Compound Heterozygote	C282Y Heterozygote	No C282Y Mutation
Number		193	690	3,192	24,339
Male		94 (49.0%)	272 (39.4%)	1257 (39.4%)	9728 (40.0%)
Female		99 (51.0%)	418 (60.6%)	1935 (60.6%)	14611 (60.0%)
Age	Years (at baseline)	55.5 (8.8)	55.1 (8.9)	54.9 (9.0)	55.1 (8.9)
Male height	Centimeters	174.8 (6.9)	175.7 (7.1)	174.6 (6.3)	174.4 (6.7)
Female height	Centimeters	162.2 (5.8)	161.7 (6.1)	161.7 (6.1)	161.3 (6.2)
Male weight	Kilograms	78.4 (10.2)	83.1 (13.7)	81.2 (11.6)	81.2 (12.2)
Female weight	Kilograms	67.2 (11.1)	68.2 (12.7)	67.4 (12.1)	67.5 (12.4)
Male waist circumference	Centimeters	90.9 (9.0)	94.0 (10.5)	92.5 (9.9)	92.5 (10.1)
Female waist circumference	Centimeters	77.7 (11.1)	78.9 (11.4)	78.2 (11.3)	78.3 (11.3)
Male body mass index		25.6 (2.8)	26.9 (3.9)	26.7 (3.5)	26.7 (3.6)
Female body mass index		25.6 (4.3)	26.1 (5.0)	25.8 (4.6)	26.0 (4.6)
Smoking	Never smoked	102 (52.6%)	408 (59.1%)	1853 (58.1%)	13881 (57.0%)
	Former smoker	71 (36.8%)	219 (31.7%)	1001 (31.4%)	7900 (32.5%)
	Current smoker	20 (10.4%)	63 (9.1%)	338 (10.6%)	2556 (10.5%)
Alcohol	0 g/day	68 (35.3%)	267 (38.9%)	1266 (39.9%)	9842 (40.7%)
	1-39 g/day (men) 1-19 g/day (women)	115 (59.6%)	339 (49.4%)	1549 (48.8%)	11698 (48.4%)
	40-59 g/day (men) 20-39 g/day (women)	7 (3.6%)	50 (7.3%)	263 (8.3%)	1893 (7.8%)
	60+ g/day (men) 40+ g/day (women)	3 (1.6%)	30 (4.4%)	95 (3.0%)	734 (3.0%)
Country of birth	Australia	179 (92.2%)	623 (89.3%)	2908 (90.3%)	22004 (84.7%)
	British Isles	14 (7.3%)	58 (8.4%)	260 (8.2%)	2493 (10.2%)
	New Zealand	0 (0%)	4 (0.6%)	25 (0.8%)	226 (0.9%)
Education	Primary School	8 (4.1%)	35 (5.1%)	143 (4.5%)	2026 (8.3%)
	Some High School	99 (51.3%)	352 (51.0%)	1764 (55.3%)	13209 (54.3%)
	Completed High School	32 (16.6%)	90 (13.0%)	499 (15.6%)	3817 (15.7%)
	Degree/diploma	55 (28.5%)	221 (32.0%)	911 (28.5%)	6917 (28.4%)
Calcium	Calcium from diet (mg/d)	883.8 (321.2)	920.9 (467.2)	899.6 (412.0)	885.6 (408.3)
Folate	Folate from diet (mcg/d)	333.1 (112.0)	341.3 (139.1)	337.1 (137.3)	334.5 (138.6)
Multivitamin	Multivitamin used at least once a week	26 (13.4%)	139 (19.9%)	637 (19.2%)	4841 (18.6%)
Fresh meat	Fresh meat intake (times/week)	5.0 (3.0)	4.9 (4.3)	4.8 (3.0)	4.8 (3.4)
Processed meat	Processed meat intake (times/week)	3.2 (2.4)	3.0 (2.5)	2.9 (2.5)	2.9 (2.8)
Activity*	Physical activity score	4.5 (3.9)	4.6 (3.8)	4.5 (3.8)	4.5 (3.7)
Aspirin use†		14%	10%	14%	14%
NSAIDs use†		10%	12%	9%	9%
Women Only					
Age at menarche	Years	13.1 (1.6)	13.1 (1.6)	13.1 (1.5)	13.0 (1.6)
Menstrual periods at baseline‡	No	68 (68.7%)	273 (65.0%)	1205 (61.9%)	9697 (63.3%)
	Yes	31 (31.3%)	147 (35.0%)	741 (38.1%)	5633 (36.7%)
Parity	Parous	81 (81.8%)	353 (84.5%)	1673 (86.5%)	12664 (86.7%)
	Nulliparous	18 (18.2%)	65 (15.6%)	262 (15.5%)	1947 (13.3%)
Hormone replacement therapy	Never	67 (69.1%)	304 (72.6%)	1414 (72.9%)	10906 (71.4%)
	Former	6 (6.2%)	42 (10.0%)	174 (9.1%)	1391 (9.1%)
	Current	24 (24.7%)	73 (17.4%)	432 (17.9%)	2974 (19.5%)

*Physical activity score is a calculated field; see Haydon et al.[42]

†In a random sample of 5268 participants.

‡Menstrual periods at baseline is a calculated field defined from the two questions "Have you had a menstrual period in the last 12 months?" and "Have you had a hysterectomy?"

Table 2 presents the results of the Cox regression analysis of the association between the C282Y and H63D variants of the *HFE* gene and the risk of cancer. C282Y homozygotes had an increased risk of colorectal cancer compared with those with no C282Y variant (HR, 2.28; 95% confidence interval [CI], 1.22, 4.25).

Similarly, female C282Y homozygotes had increased risk of breast cancer compared with those with no C282Y variant (HR, 2.39; 95% CI, 1.24, 4.61). There was no evidence of increased risk of prostate cancer for male C282Y homozygotes (HR, 0.96; 95% CI, 0.43, 2.15), although the wide confidence interval does not

Table 2. Hazard Ratios for the Associations Between *HFE* Genotype Group and the Risk of Cancer

Cancer	Allele	C282Y Copies	Cases	Person Years	HR*	95% CI	P Value†
Colorectal	Codominant	0	530	326,019	ref		0.02
(stratified by sex)		1	80	53,275	0.88	0.67,1.14	
		2	10	2,566	2.28	1.22,4.25	
	Recessive	0 or 1	610	379,294	ref		0.01
		2	10	2,566	2.31	1.24,4.32	
	with H63D	0	530	326,019	ref		0.04
		1 (no H63D)	61	44,017	0.92	0.73,1.17	
		1 (and 1 H63D)	19	9,233	1.27	0.80,2.01	
		2	10	2,566	2.28	1.22,4.25	
Breast	Codominant	0	565	188,991	ref		0.03
(female only)		1	90	31,238	0.93	0.73,1.20	
		2	9	1,245	2.39	1.24,4.61	
	Recessive	0 or 1	655	220,229	ref		0.01
		2	9	1,245	2.40	1.24,4.63	
	with H63D	0	565	188,991	ref		0.09
		1 (no H63D)	71	25,805	0.96	0.77,1.20	
		1 (and 1 H63D)	19	5,433	1.16	0.74,1.84	
		2	9	1,245	2.39	1.24,4.61	
Prostate	Codominant	0	646	121,404	ref		0.84
		1	106	19,585	1.04	0.83,1.30	
		2	6	1,159	0.96	0.43,2.15	
	Recessive	0 or 1	752	140,989	ref		0.91
		2	6	1,159	0.96	0.43,2.14	
	with H63D	0	646	121,404	ref		0.96
		1 (no H63D)	87	16,220	1.02	0.83,1.26	
		1 (and 1 H63D)	19	3,364	1.08	0.68,1.70	
		2	6	1,159	0.96	0.43,2.15	
Any other	Codominant	0	1510	289,434	ref		0.58
nonhematological		1	234	47,498	0.92	0.79,1.07	
cancer‡		2	12	2,163	1.01	0.57,1.78	
(stratified by sex)	Recessive	0 or 1	1744	336,932	ref		0.96
		2	12	2163	1.02	0.58,1.79	
	with H63D	0	1510	289,434	ref		0.39
		1 (no H63D)	188	39,419	0.94	0.82,1.08	
		1 (and 1 H63D)	46	8,080	1.11	0.82,1.48	
		2	12	2,163	1.01	0.57,1.78	
Any cancer	Codominant	0	3441	320,421	ref		0.11
(stratified by sex)		1	548	52,519	0.96	0.86,1.06	
		2	36	2,451	1.30	0.93,1.80	
	Recessive	0 or 1	3989	372,940	ref		0.12
		2	36	2,451	1.30	0.94,1.81	
	with H63D	0	3441	320,421	ref		0.09
		1 (no H63D)	439	43,486	0.97	0.89,1.06	
		1 (and 1 H63D)	109	9,033	1.13	0.93,1.36	
		2	36	2,451	1.30	0.93,1.80	

*Analysis used Cox regression with age as the primary time scale but included no other potential confounders.

†P values were generated from the likelihood ratio test, which was used to compare a model assuming a separate risk parameter for each HFE genotype to the null model assuming no HFE genotype effect on the risk of cancer. The "codominant" model classifies HFE genotype based on the C282Y mutation alone (likelihood ratio test with 2 degrees of freedom), whereas the "with H63D" model further classifies those with one copy of the C282Y mutation into those who do and do not have a copy of the H63D mutation (likelihood ratio test with 3 degrees of freedom).

‡The category comprises all cancers except for colorectal, breast (female), prostate, and hematological cancers.

preclude the possibility of an association of similar magnitude to those seen for breast and colorectal cancer. The HR for all other nonhematological cancers was 1·15 (95% CI, 0.73, 1.81). HRs for simple and compound heterozygotes were close to unity for each of the cancers in Table 2; the strongest association was for compound heterozygotes and risk of colorectal cancer (HR, 1.27; 95% CI, 0.8, 2.1). Exclusion of the first 2

years of follow-up made no material difference to any of the results (data not shown).

Meta-Analyses. No meta-analysis of studies of the association between C282Y homozygosity and the risk of colorectal cancer was performed because two studies had no C282Y homozygous cases;[11,12] the other two studies had only two C282Y homozygous cases each.[8,15] Two studies of colorectal adenomas had one and five C282Y

homozygous cases, respectively.[13,14] The pooled estimate of the HR from three studies of breast cancer was 2.1 (95% CI, 1.13, 3.90), although the other two studies each had only one homozygous case.[9,16] The pooled estimate of the HR for prostate cancer, from two studies only, was 1.12 (95% CI, 0.56, 2.21).

Meta-analyses of compound heterozygotes gave pooled estimates of the HR of 1.36 (95% CI, 0.92, 2.01) for colorectal cancer, 1.41 (95% CI, 0.97, 2.06) for colorectal cancer and adenomas together, and 0.95 (95% CI, 0.79, 1.16) for breast cancer. No other studies published data for prostate cancer. For simple C282Y heterozygotes, the pooled estimates of the HR were 1.00 (95% CI, 0.84, 1.19) for colorectal cancers, 0.99 (95% CI, 0.86, 1.15) for colorectal cancers and adenomas together, 0.95 (95% CI, 0.79, 1.16) for breast cancer, and 0.94 (95% CI, 0.78, 1.13) for prostate cancer.

Discussion

HFE C282Y homozygotes had a two-fold increased risk of breast and colorectal cancer compared with those who had no C282Y variant. They had no increased risk of prostate cancer or of all other cancers combined, but moderate associations cannot be ruled out with confidence.

Our study has several strengths. Recruitment was not based on the presence or absence of hemochromatosis and occurred prior to the discovery of the *HFE* gene, thus reducing the potential for selective recruitment bias or reverse causation. We had almost complete ascertainment of cancers because all Australian states have high-quality population-based cancer registries and few participants left the country. We had extensive information on diet and other risk factors that might confound the associations, none of which showed great variation between *HFE* genotypes (Table 1). There are also several limitations. We were unable to determine whether the associations with genotype were mediated through body iron stores because data on baseline serum ferritin and transferrin saturation were not available for most cases of cancer. Surveillance of participants known to have hemochromatosis may have contributed to the apparent increased risk of breast and colorectal cancer. Because we had incomplete information on diagnoses of hemochromatosis for the C282Y homozygotes, we were unable to undertake sensitivity analyses to address this issue. If iron is involved in the causal pathway, we might have underestimated some associations if some C282Y homozygotes had therapeutic venesection, thus depleting their iron stores. Finally, there was deviation from Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium for C282Y genotype. Genotyping errors are unlikely to be the cause of this deviation because of the

additional genotyping of C282Y homozygotes using a second, independent DNA sample. We note also that genotyping errors, such that people with no or only one C282Y variant were classified as C282Y homozygotes, would have attenuated the associations.

This study had more cases homozygous for the C282Y substitution than other studies of breast and colorectal cancer, and provides most of the evidence regarding whether C282Y homozygotes have increased risks for these cancers. The pooled estimates for breast and prostate cancer were both close to the estimate derived from our study. No pooled estimate was calculated for colorectal cancer because two studies had no homozygous cases. For compound heterozygotes, the pooled estimate was consistent with a small increase in risk for colorectal cancer, albeit not significant. For breast cancer, the pooled estimate was close to one, but a modest association cannot be excluded. For C282Y heterozygotes, the pooled estimates for breast, colorectal, and prostate cancers were all one or close to one and had narrow confidence intervals, suggesting that C282Y heterozygotes have no increase in risk for breast, colorectal, or prostate cancer.

Elevated body iron stores is one potential explanation for an association between *HFE* genotype and risk for cancer. The strongest evidence for a direct role of body iron stores comes from a secondary analysis of a randomized controlled trial of phlebotomy for patients with peripheral arterial disease.[23] The risk for cancer was lower for the phlebotomy group (ferritin 79.7 ng/mL versus 122.5 ng/mL) with an HR of 0.65 (95% CI, 0.43, 0.97). Results from several cohort studies have also been reported. Positive associations were found between serum ferritin and risk for liver cancer and for combined all other cancers combined in a Taiwanese cohort study.[24] In an analysis of participants in a French antioxidant trial, women with serum ferritin levels above 160 μg/L had 1.88 (95% CI, 1.05, 3.35) times the cancer risk of those with levels below 30 μg/L, but no association was seen for men.[25] Other studies found little evidence of positive associations with colorectal adenomas,[13,26] or some evidence of inverse associations with colorectal cancer.[27,28]

Other cohort studies have considered risk of cancer in relation to transferrin saturation and total iron binding capacity, which examined an iron transport compartment and hence not iron stores. Three analyses from follow-up of the first National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES) have been reported.[29-31] Stevens et al. reported a relative risk for all cancer of 1.81 (95% CI, 1.21-2.71) comparing people with a baseline transferrin saturation of 60% or higher with people with a transferrin saturation of 30% or less.[29] The risk was only slightly elevated for those with transferrin saturation between

50% and 60% (relative risk, 1.38 [95% CI, 1.00-1.90]) and not elevated at lower levels. The latest analysis with more cases found weakly elevated risks for colorectal cancer.[31] Positive associations between risk for cancer and transferrin saturation were also found during follow-up of the second NHANES cohort.[32] Selby et al. reported an inverse association between total iron-binding capacity and subsequent risk for lung cancer, but little evidence of an association for other cancers.[33] A Finnish study found increased risks for colorectal and lung cancer associated with high transferrin saturation.[34]

For several of the prospective studies that did not find positive associations, the highest categories of transferrin saturation or serum ferritin were low, and it is possible that associations restricted to high body iron stores might have been missed.

Other mechanisms might also explain the association between *HFE* genotype and risk of cancer. HFE is a non-classical major histocompatibility complex (MHC) protein and has been purported to have an immunological function whereby individuals with *HFE* variants have abnormal expression of MHC class I molecules and an impaired class I antigen presentation pathway,[35] as well as also having an altered CD4/CD8 ratio.[36] This may be responsible for the finding that *HFE* variants have increased risk of sustained viral response in chronic hepatitis C.[37] Studies reviewed by Santos et al. found genes that occur in the commonly amplified (DNA copy number aberration) regions of chromosome 6p (the most commonly amplified genomic interval is 6p21-p23.) have helped to identify molecular pathways that become deregulated during tumor progression in diverse tumor types.[38] It has been proposed that chromosome 6p harbors one or more oncogenes that are in the same chromosomal region as the *HFE* gene,[39] and are directly involved in tumor progression, with a bias toward solid tumors (the *HFE* gene has been mapped to the locus 6p21.3).[40] Similarly, Motokura et al. have mapped the human cyclin D3 gene (CCND3) to chromosome 6p→q13, and members of this family of genes have been implicated as possible proto-oncogenes for parathyroid, lymphoid, and mammary tumors.[41] Alternatively, there may be an as-yet undiscovered interaction of *HFE* with other genes accounting for the increased cancer risk.

In conclusion, people homozygous for the C282Y variant of the *HFE* gene are at a two-fold increased risk for colorectal cancer and female breast cancer, but not for prostate cancer. Clinicians caring for patients with hereditary hemochromatosis should take this into account when deciding on screening recommendations for colorectal and breast cancer or evaluation of relevant or suggestive clinical signs and symptoms.

References

1. Ames B. Dietary carcinogens and anticarcinogens. Oxygen radicals and degenerative diseases. Science 1983;221:1256-1264.
2. Porto G, De Sousa M. Iron overload and immunity. World J Gastroenterol 2007;13:4707-4715.
3. Stevens R, Kalkwarf D. Iron, radiation, and cancer. Environ Health Perspect 1990;87:291-300.
4. Olynyk JK, Trinder D, Ramm GA, Britton RS, Bacon BR. Hereditary hemochromatosis in the post-*HFE* era. HEPATOLOGY 2008;48:991-1001.
5. Gurrin LC, Osborne NJ, Constantine CC, McLaren CE, English DR, Gertig DM, et al. The natural history of serum iron indices for HFE C282Y homozygosity associated with hereditary hemochromatosis. Gastroenterology 2008;135:1945-1952.
6. Adams PC, Barton JC. Haemochromatosis. Lancet 2007;370:1855-1860.
7. Gurrin LC, Bertalli NA, Dalton GW, Osborne NJ, Constantine CC, McLaren CE, et al. *HFE* C282Y/H63D compound heterozygotes are at low risk of hemochromatosis-related morbidity. HEPATOLOGY 2009;50: 94-101.
8. Altes A, Gimferrer E, Capella G, Barcelo MJ, Baiget M. Colorectal cancer and HFE gene mutations. Haematologica 1999;84:479-480.
9. Beckman LE, Van Landeghem GF, Sikstrom C, Wahlin A, Markevarn B, Hallmans G, et al. Interaction between haemochromatosis and transferrin receptor genes in different neoplastic disorders. Carcinogenesis 1999;20: 1231-1233.
10. MacDonald GA, Tarish J, Whitehall VJ, McCann SJ, Mellick GD, Buttenshaw RL, et al. No evidence of increased risk of colorectal cancer in individuals heterozygous for the Cys282Tyr haemochromatosis mutation. J Gastroenterol Hepatol 1999;14:1188-1191.
11. Shaheen NJ, Silverman LM, Keku T, Lawrence LB, Rohlfs EM, Martin CF, et al. Association between hemochromatosis (HFE) gene mutation carrier status and the risk of colon cancer. J Natl Cancer Inst 2003;95:154-159.
12. van der A DL, van der Hel O, Roest M, van der Schouw YT, van Gils CH, Marx JJM, et al. Heterozygosity for the Cys282Tyr mutation in the HFE gene and the risk of colorectal cancer (Netherlands). Cancer Causes Control 2003;14:541-545.
13. Chan AT, Ma J, Tranah GJ, Giovannucci EL, Rifai N, Hunter DJ, et al. Hemochromatosis gene mutations, body iron stores, dietary iron, and risk of colorectal adenoma in women. J Natl Cancer Inst 2005;97:917-926.
14. McGlynn KA, Sakoda LC, Hu Y, Schoen RE, Bresalier RS, Yeager M, et al. Hemochromatosis gene mutations and distal adenomatous colorectal polyps. Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev 2005;14:158-163.
15. Robinson JP, Johnson VL, Rogers PA, Houlston RS, Maher ER, Bishop DT, et al. Evidence for an association between compound heterozygosity for germ line mutations in the hemochromatosis (HFE) gene and increased risk of colorectal cancer. Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev 2005;14: 1460-1463.
16. Abraham BK, Justenhoven C, Pesch B, Harth V, Weirich G, Baisch C, et al. Investigation of genetic variants of genes of the hemochromatosis pathway and their role in breast cancer. Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev 2005;14:1102-1107.
17. Kondrashova T, Neriishi K, Ban S, Ivanova T, Krikunova L, Shentereva N, et al. Frequency of hemochromatosis gene (HFE) mutations in Russian healthy women and patients with estrogen-dependent cancers. Biochim Biophys Acta 2006;1762:59-65.
18. Lucotte G, Dieterlen F. A European allele map of the C282Y mutation of hemochromatosis: Celtic versus Viking origin of the mutation? Blood Cells Mol Dis 2003;31:262-267.

19. Hodge A, English D, McCredie M, Severi G, Boyle P, Hopper J, et al. Foods, nutrients and prostate cancer. Cancer Causes Control 2004;15:11-20.

20. MacInnis RJ, English DR, Hopper JL, Haydon AM, Gertig DM, Giles GG. Body size and composition and colon cancer risk in men. Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev 2004;13:553-559.

21. Allen KJ, Gurrin LC, Constantine CC, Osborne NJ, Delatycki MB, Nicoll AJ, et al. Iron-overload-related disease in HFE hereditary hemochromatosis. N Engl J Med 2008;358:221-230.

22. Pointon J, Wallace D, Merryweather-Clarke A, Robson K. Uncommon mutations and polymorphisms in the hemochromatosis gene. Genet Test 2000;4:151-161.

23. Zacharski LR, Chow BK, Howes PS, Shamayeva G, Baron JA, Dalman RL, et al. Decreased cancer risk after iron reduction in patients with peripheral arterial disease: results from a randomized trial. J Natl Cancer Inst 2008;100:996-1002.

24. Stevens R, Beasley R, Blumberg B. Iron-binding proteins and risk of cancer in Taiwan. J Natl Cancer Inst 1986;76:605-610.

25. Hercberg S, Estaquio C, Czernichow S, Mennen L, Noisette N, Bertrais S, et al. Iron status and risk of cancers in the SU.VI.MAX cohort. J Nutr 2005;135:2664-2668.

26. Tseng M, Greenberg ER, Sandler RS, Baron JA, Haile RW, Blumberg BS, et al. Serum ferritin concentration and recurrence of colorectal adenoma. Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev 2000;9:625-630.

27. Kato I, Dnistrian A, Schwartz M, Toniolo P, Koenig K, Shore R, et al. Iron intake, body iron stores and colorectal cancer risk in women: a nested case-control study. Int J Cancer 1999;80:693-698.

28. Cross AJ, Gunter MJ, Wood RJ, Pietinen P, Taylor PR, Virtamo J, et al. Iron and colorectal cancer risk in the alpha-tocopherol, beta-carotene cancer prevention study. Int J Cancer 2006;118:3147-3152.

29. Stevens RG, Jones DY, Micozzi MS, Taylor PR. Body iron stores and the risk of cancer. N Engl J Med 1988;75:81-84.

30. Stevens RG, Graubard BI, Micozzi MS, Neriishi K, Blumberg BS. Moderate elevation of body iron level and increased risk of cancer occurrence and death. Int J Cancer 1994;56:364-369.

31. Wurzelmann JI, Silver A, Schreinemachers DM, Sandler RS, Everson RB. Iron intake and the risk of colorectal cancer. Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev 1996;5:503-507.

32. Wu T, Sempos C, Freudenheim J, Muti P, Smit E. Serum iron, copper and zinc concentrations and risk of cancer mortality in US adults. Ann Epidemiol 2004;14:195-201.

33. Selby JV, Friedman GD. Epidemiologic evidence of an association between body iron stores and risk of cancer. Int J Cancer 1988;41:677-682.

34. Knekt P, Reunanen A, Takkunen H, Aromaa A, Heliövaara M, Hakuunen T. Body iron stores and risk of cancer. Int J Cancer 1994;56:379-382.

35. de Almeida SF, Carvalho IF, Cardoso CS, Cordeiro JV, Azevedo JE, Neefjes J, et al. HFE cross-talks with the MHC class I antigen presentation pathway. Blood 2005;106:971-977.

36. Porto G, Reimão R, Gonçalves C, Vicente C, Justiça B, de Sousa M. Haemochromatosis as a window into the study of the immunological system: a novel correlation between CD8+ lymphocytes and iron overload. Eur J Haematol 1994;52:283-290.

37. Bonkovsky HL, Naishadham D, Lambrecht RW, Chung RT, Hoefs JC, Nash SR, et al. Roles of iron and HFE mutations on severity and response to therapy during retreatment of advanced chronic hepatitis C. Gastroenterology 2006;131:1440-1451.

38. Santos GC, Zielenska M, Prasad M, Squire JA. Chromosome 6p amplification and cancer progression. J Clin Pathol 2007;60:1-7.

39. Diep CB, Parada LA, Teixeira MR, Eknæs M, Nesland JM, Johansson B, et al. Genetic profiling of colorectal cancer liver metastases by combined comparative genomic hybridization and G-banding analysis. Genes Chromosomes Cancer 2003;36:189-197.

40. Rhodes D, Trowsdale J. Alternate splice variants of the hemochromatosis gene HFE. Immunogenetics 1999;49:357-359.

41. Motokura T, Yi H, Kronenberg H, McBride O, Arnold A. Assignment of the human cyclin D3 gene (CCND3) to chromosome 6p→q13. Cytogenet Cell Genet 1992;61:5-7.

42. Haydon AMM, MacInnis RJ, English DR, Morris H, Giles GG. Physical activity, insulin-like growth factor 1, insulin-like growth factor binding protein 3, and survival from colorectal cancer. Gut 2006;55:689-694.