

Table 1: Distribution of asbestos-related cancers among 47 studies reported in major risk assessment reports, grouped by asbestos fibre types defined by Nicholson^{24*}

| Type of asbestos fibre | No. of studies | PYs† | ELC | ELC/ PY | EPIM | EPIM/ PY | EPerM | EPerM/ PY |
|-----------------------------|----------------|------|-----|------------|------|-------------|-------|--------------|
| Chrysotile (C)‡ | 8 | 19% | 11% | 0.6 | 4% | 0.2 | 1% | 0.04 |
| Mainly chrysotile | 8 | 17% | 7% | 0.4 | 11% | 0.6 | 7% | 0.4 |
| Mixed asbestos types | 20 | 56% | 66% | 1.2 | 64% | 1.1 | 82% | 1.5 |
| Mainly/only amphiboles (MA) | 11 | 8% | 16% | 2.0 | 21% | 2.7 | 10% | 1.3 |
| Amphibole/chrysotile (MA/C) | | | | 3.4 | | 12.2 | | 30.2 |

Note: PY = person-year, ELC = excess lung cancers, EPIM = excess pleural mesotheliomas, EPerM = excess peritoneal mesotheliomas.

*This table summarizes that compiled by the HEI-AR in 1991;⁹ it is not updated. Percentages are proportions of person-years or cancers relative to all 47 studies. Fibre types are imperfect characterizations of industrial processes.

†The distribution of person-years is estimated from “expected lung cancers” and is, thus, partly age-adjusted.

‡Ten of the 14 mesotheliomas reported in the chrysotile group before 1991 were from Quebec chrysotile mills and mines and were essentially attributed to amphibole exposure.

[\[Return to text\]](#)