

UC Irvine

UC Irvine Previously Published Works

Title

Reproductive factors do not influence survival with ovarian cancer

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/8gs2k3w0>

Journal

Cancer Epidemiology Biomarkers & Prevention, 31(4)

ISSN

1055-9965

Authors

Phung, Minh Tung
Alimujiang, Aliya
Berchuck, Andrew
et al.

Publication Date

2022-04-01

DOI

10.1158/1055-9965.epi-21-1091

Peer reviewed

Reproductive Factors Do Not Influence Survival with Ovarian Cancer



Minh Tung Phung¹, Aliya Alimujiang¹, Andrew Berchuck², Hoda Anton-Culver³, Joellen M. Schildkraut⁴, Elisa V. Bandera⁵, Jenny Chang-Claude^{6,7}, Anne Chase⁸, Jennifer Anne Doherty⁹, Bronwyn Grout⁸, Marc T. Goodman^{10,11}, Gillian E. Hanley¹², Alice W. Lee¹³, Cindy McKinnon Deurloo⁸, Usha Menon¹⁴, Francesmary Modugno^{15,16,17}, Paul D.P. Pharoah^{18,19}, Malcolm C. Pike^{20,21}, Jean Richardson^{8,20}, Harvey A. Risch²², Weiva Sieh^{23,24}, Kathryn L. Terry^{25,26}; for the Multidisciplinary Ovarian Cancer Outcomes Group and the Ovarian Cancer Association Consortium, Penelope M. Webb²⁷; for the Australian Ovarian Cancer Study Group, the Multidisciplinary Ovarian Cancer Outcomes Group and the Ovarian Cancer Association Consortium, Nicolas Wentzensen²⁸, Anna H. Wu²⁰, and Celeste Leigh Pearce¹; for the Multidisciplinary Ovarian Cancer Outcomes Group and the Ovarian Cancer Association Consortium

ABSTRACT

Background: Previous studies on the association between reproductive factors and ovarian cancer survival are equivocal, possibly due to small sample sizes.

Methods: Using data on 11,175 people diagnosed with primary invasive epithelial ovarian, fallopian tube, or primary peritoneal cancer (ovarian cancer) from 16 studies in the Ovarian Cancer Association Consortium (OCAC), we examined the associations between survival and age at menarche, combined oral contraceptive use, parity, breastfeeding, age at last pregnancy, and menopausal status using Cox proportional hazard models. The models were adjusted for age at diagnosis,

race/ethnicity, education level, and OCAC study and stratified on stage and histotype.

Results: During the mean follow-up of 6.34 years (SD = 4.80), 6,418 patients passed away (57.4%). There was no evidence of associations between the reproductive factors and survival among patients with ovarian cancer overall or by histotype.

Conclusions: This study found no association between reproductive factors and survival after an ovarian cancer diagnosis.

Impact: Reproductive factors are well-established risk factors for ovarian cancer, but they are not associated with survival after a diagnosis of ovarian cancer.

Introduction

Invasive epithelial ovarian cancer (ovarian cancer) has a 5-year survival rate of less than 50%. Cigarette smoking (1) and higher body mass index (2) before diagnosis are both associated with poor survival,

whereas menopausal hormone therapy use is a positive prognostic indicator (3). However, the literature surrounding the association between reproductive factors and ovarian cancer survival is equivocal even though many are associated with risk of the disease. Older age at menarche has been associated with both poor (4) and longer

¹Department of Epidemiology, University of Michigan School of Public Health, Ann Arbor, Michigan. ²Division of Gynecologic Oncology, Duke University School of Medicine, Durham, North Carolina. ³Department of Medicine, University of California Irvine, Irvine, California. ⁴Emory University Rollins School of Public Health, Atlanta, Georgia. ⁵Cancer Epidemiology and Health Outcomes, Rutgers Cancer Institute of New Jersey, New Brunswick, New Jersey. ⁶Division of Cancer Epidemiology, German Cancer Research Center, Heidelberg, Germany. ⁷Cancer Epidemiology Group, University Cancer Center Hamburg, University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf, Hamburg, Germany. ⁸Patient Advocate. ⁹Department of Population Health Sciences, Huntsman Cancer Institute, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah. ¹⁰Samuel Oschin Comprehensive Cancer Institute, Cancer Prevention and Genetics Program, Cedars-Sinai Medical Center, Los Angeles, California. ¹¹Department of Biomedical Sciences, Community and Population Health Research Institute, Cedars-Sinai Medical Center, Los Angeles, California. ¹²Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, University of British Columbia Faculty of Medicine, Vancouver, Canada. ¹³Department of Public Health, California State University, Fullerton, Fullerton, California. ¹⁴MRC Clinical Trials Unit, Institute of Clinical Trials and Methodology, UCL, London, United Kingdom. ¹⁵Women's Cancer Research Center, Magee-Women's Research Institute and Hillman Cancer Center, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. ¹⁶Division of Gynecologic Oncology, Department of Obstetrics, Gynecology, and Reproductive Sciences, University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. ¹⁷Department of Epidemiology, University of Pittsburgh Graduate School of Public Health, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. ¹⁸Department of Oncology, Center for Cancer Genetic Epidemiology, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, United Kingdom.

¹⁹Department of Public Health and Primary Care, Center for Cancer Genetic Epidemiology, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, United Kingdom. ²⁰Department of Preventive Medicine, Keck School of Medicine, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California. ²¹Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center, New York, New York. ²²Chronic Disease Epidemiology, Yale School of Public Health, New Haven, Connecticut. ²³Department of Population Health Science and Policy, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, New York, New York. ²⁴Department of Genetics and Genomic Sciences, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, New York, New York. ²⁵Department of Epidemiology, Harvard TH Chan School of Public Health, Boston, Massachusetts. ²⁶Obstetrics and Gynecology Epidemiology Center, Brigham and Women's Hospital and Harvard Medical School, Boston, Massachusetts. ²⁷Department of Population Health, QIMR Berghofer Medical Research Institute, Brisbane, Queensland, Australia. ²⁸Division of Cancer Epidemiology and Genetics, National Cancer Institute, Bethesda, Maryland.

M.T. Phung and A. Alimujiang contributed equally as co-authors of this article.

Corresponding Author: Celeste Leigh Pearce, 4642 SPH Tower, 1415 Washington Heights, Ann Arbor, MI 48109. Phone: 734-764-3835; E-mail: lpearce@umich.edu

Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev 2022;31:909-13

doi: 10.1158/1055-9965.EPI-21-1091

©2022 American Association for Cancer Research

survival (5), but three other studies have found no relationship (6–8). Similarly, some (6, 7), but not all (4, 5, 8) studies have reported that parity is associated with better survival. One study reported a decreased death rate among those who used combined oral contraceptives (COC; ref. 8), but most studies did not observe an association (4–6). A major concern with these studies is power; to our knowledge, the largest published study of reproductive factors and ovarian cancer survival included 1,698 patients (4). Therefore, we have used data from 11,175 patients with ovarian cancer in the Ovarian Cancer Association Consortium (OCAC) to clarify the associations between survival and age at menarche, COC use, parity, breastfeeding, age at last pregnancy, and menopausal status.

Materials and Methods

This analysis used self-reported data from 16 studies in the OCAC, including two studies from Australia, four from Europe, and ten from

the United States (US; <http://ocac.ccge.medschl.cam.ac.uk/>; **Table 1**). All studies obtained institutional ethics committee approval and followed recognized ethical guidelines, including the Declaration of Helsinki, the Belmont Report, and/or the US Common Rule; and participants provided written informed consent. Participants who were diagnosed with primary invasive epithelial ovarian, fallopian tube, or primary peritoneal tumors (hereafter referred to as ovarian cancer) were included in the analysis. To be included, patients had to have been diagnosed with one of the five main histotypes (i.e., high-grade serous, endometrioid, clear cell, mucinous, and low-grade serous) and had follow-up time and vital status information available. Survival time was counted from date of diagnosis to either death or last follow-up. Follow-up is largely done via linkage with national death databases.

The six prediagnosis reproductive factors of interest were age at menarche, COC use, parity, breastfeeding, age at last pregnancy, and menopausal status. The covariates included age at diagnosis, race/

Table 1. Description of the 16 OCAC studies included in the analysis.

Study abbreviation	Study full name	Study location	Recruitment period	Data collection method	Participants	Number of deaths (%)	Mean years of follow-up (standard deviation)
AUS	Australian Ovarian Cancer Study	Australia	2001–2006	Self-completed questionnaire	1,329	947 (71.3%)	5.02 (3.44)
OPL	Ovarian Cancer Prognosis and Lifestyle Study	Australia	2012–2015	Self-completed questionnaire	793	314 (39.6%)	3.52 (1.24)
GER	German Ovarian Cancer Study	Baden-Württemberg and Rhineland-Palatinate, Germany	1993–1998	Self-completed questionnaire	152	100 (65.8%)	7.61 (5.82)
POL	Polish Ovarian Cancer Case–Control Study	Poland	2000–2004	In-person interview	152	82 (53.9%)	3.72 (1.97)
SEA	Study of Epidemiology and Risk Factors in Cancer Heredity	East Anglia and West Midlands, UK	1993–2013	Self-completed questionnaire	1,242	550 (44.3%)	7.31 (5.53)
UKO	United Kingdom Ovarian Cancer Population Study	United Kingdom	2006–2009	Self-completed questionnaire	631	323 (51.2%)	6.73 (4.17)
CON	Connecticut Ovary Study	Connecticut	1999–2003	In-person interview	329	180 (54.7%)	5.86 (2.92)
DOV	Diseases of the Ovary and their Evaluation	Washington	2002–2009	In-person interview	886	519 (58.6%)	7.34 (4.45)
HAW	Hawaii Ovarian Cancer Case–Control Study	Hawai'i	1994–2008	In-person interview	359	203 (56.5%)	7.86 (5.18)
HOP	Hormones and Ovarian Cancer Prediction	Western Pennsylvania, Northeast Ohio, Western New York	2003–2009	In-person interview	615	372 (60.5%)	5.29 (3.19)
NCO	North Carolina Ovarian Cancer Study	North Carolina	1999–2008	In-person interview	814	534 (65.6%)	6.15 (3.97)
NEC	New England Case Control Study	New Hampshire and Eastern Massachusetts	1992–2008	In-person interview	1,373	774 (56.4%)	5.17 (4.59)
NJO	New Jersey Ovarian Cancer Study	New Jersey	2005–2009	Telephone interview	195	118 (60.5%)	6.08 (2.95)
STA	Genetic Epidemiology of Ovarian Cancer	Greater Bay Area, CA	1997–2002	In-person interview	407	236 (58.0%)	6.55 (4.20)
UCI	University California Irvine Ovarian Study	Orange County and San Diego County, CA	1994–2004	Self-completed questionnaire	363	168 (46.3%)	7.47 (3.58)
USC	Study of Lifestyle and Women's Health	Los Angeles, CA	1994–2010	In-person interview	1,535	998 (65.0%)	8.54 (6.84)
Overall					11,175	6,418 (57.4%)	6.34 (4.80)

Table 2. Hazard ratios (HR) and 95% confidence intervals (CI) for the association between each reproductive factor and survival among patients with ovarian cancer overall and by histotype.

Reproductive factors	All women 11,175 cases		High-grade serous 6,582 cases		Endometrioid 1,898 cases		Clear cell 1,013 cases		Mucinous 923 cases		Low-grade serous 759 cases	
	HR ^a (95% CI)	P	HR ^a (95% CI)	P	HR ^a (95% CI)	P	HR ^a (95% CI)	P	HR ^a (95% CI)	P	HR ^a (95% CI)	P
Age at menarche (years)												
<12	1.00 (0.94-1.07)	0.99	1.02 (0.95-1.10)	0.57	0.91 (0.74-1.12)	0.39	0.98 (0.75-1.29)	0.89	0.80 (0.56-1.15)	0.22	1.09 (0.82-1.46)	0.54
12-14	1.00		1.00		1.00		1.00		1.00		1.00	
15+	1.02 (0.94-1.10)	0.65	1.02 (0.93-1.11)	0.72	0.93 (0.72-1.21)	0.60	1.14 (0.80-1.63)	0.47	0.92 (0.62-1.36)	0.68	1.40 (0.99-1.97)	0.05
	<i>P</i> _{trend} = 0.63		<i>P</i> _{trend} = 0.83		<i>P</i> _{trend} = 0.72		<i>P</i> _{trend} = 0.53		<i>P</i> _{trend} = 0.50		<i>P</i> _{trend} = 0.41	
Combined oral contraceptive use duration (years)												
<1	1.00		1.00		1.00		1.00		1.00		1.00	
1-4.99	0.96 (0.90-1.03)	0.25	0.97 (0.90-1.05)	0.45	0.95 (0.76-1.20)	0.69	0.87 (0.64-1.18)	0.38	0.89 (0.61-1.30)	0.54	0.99 (0.75-1.31)	0.95
5-9.99	0.98 (0.90-1.06)	0.61	1.01 (0.92-1.10)	0.88	1.04 (0.80-1.36)	0.74	0.88 (0.62-1.26)	0.49	0.70 (0.44-1.09)	0.12	0.97 (0.67-1.40)	0.86
10+	0.96 (0.88-1.05)	0.39	0.97 (0.88-1.08)	0.61	0.93 (0.69-1.27)	0.67	0.82 (0.54-1.24)	0.35	1.10 (0.72-1.69)	0.66	0.91 (0.63-1.30)	0.60
	<i>P</i> _{trend} = 0.29		<i>P</i> _{trend} = 0.72		<i>P</i> _{trend} = 0.84		<i>P</i> _{trend} = 0.26		<i>P</i> _{trend} = 0.76		<i>P</i> _{trend} = 0.62	
Parity												
0	1.00		1.00		1.00		1.00		1.00		1.00	
1	1.00 (0.91-1.11)	0.96	0.99 (0.87-1.11)	0.81	0.99 (0.72-1.36)	0.97	0.97 (0.62-1.51)	0.88	1.33 (0.79-2.21)	0.28	1.31 (0.86-1.98)	0.21
2	1.00 (0.91-1.10)	1.00	0.98 (0.88-1.10)	0.74	1.02 (0.77-1.37)	0.88	1.01 (0.65-1.57)	0.96	0.72 (0.43-1.19)	0.20	1.30 (0.85-1.99)	0.22
3+	0.98 (0.89-1.09)	0.75	0.99 (0.88-1.12)	0.93	1.02 (0.75-1.40)	0.89	0.67 (0.40-1.12)	0.12	1.09 (0.64-1.87)	0.75	0.92 (0.59-1.45)	0.73
	<i>P</i> _{trend} = 0.83		<i>P</i> _{trend} = 0.99		<i>P</i> _{trend} = 0.84		<i>P</i> _{trend} = 0.14		<i>P</i> _{trend} = 0.90		<i>P</i> _{trend} = 0.33	
Breastfeeding												
Never breastfed	1.00		1.00		1.00		1.00		1.00		1.00	
<12 months	0.95 (0.89-1.02)	0.13	0.94 (0.87-1.02)	0.13	0.94 (0.75-1.18)	0.60	1.07 (0.76-1.50)	0.71	1.04 (0.72-1.49)	0.84	0.92 (0.68-1.24)	0.57
12-23 months	1.00 (0.91-1.09)	0.95	0.96 (0.87-1.07)	0.50	1.00 (0.72-1.39)	0.99	1.09 (0.68-1.73)	0.73	1.22 (0.72-2.05)	0.46	1.23 (0.80-1.88)	0.34
24+ months	1.11 (0.99-1.24)	0.07	1.12 (0.99-1.27)	0.08	0.77 (0.49-1.19)	0.24	1.13 (0.65-1.99)	0.66	1.44 (0.83-2.48)	0.19	1.05 (0.66-1.67)	0.84
	<i>P</i> _{trend} = 0.37		<i>P</i> _{trend} = 0.41		<i>P</i> _{trend} = 0.38		<i>P</i> _{trend} = 0.60		<i>P</i> _{trend} = 0.18		<i>P</i> _{trend} = 0.60	
Age at last pregnancy (years)												
<25	1.00		1.00		1.00		1.00		1.00		1.00	
25-29	0.99 (0.91-1.07)	0.76	0.99 (0.90-1.08)	0.78	1.13 (0.88-1.45)	0.34	1.02 (0.70-1.50)	0.91	0.98 (0.65-1.48)	0.92	0.92 (0.65-1.30)	0.63
30-34	0.92 (0.85-1.00)	0.06	0.93 (0.85-1.03)	0.16	0.88 (0.67-1.16)	0.37	0.95 (0.63-1.44)	0.81	0.95 (0.63-1.42)	0.79	0.93 (0.65-1.32)	0.67
35+	0.94 (0.86-1.03)	0.17	0.97 (0.88-1.08)	0.61	0.82 (0.60-1.10)	0.19	0.88 (0.56-1.40)	0.59	0.65 (0.40-1.05)	0.08	0.92 (0.63-1.35)	0.68
	<i>P</i> _{trend} = 0.055		<i>P</i> _{trend} = 0.36		<i>P</i> _{trend} = 0.07		<i>P</i> _{trend} = 0.54		<i>P</i> _{trend} = 0.10		<i>P</i> _{trend} = 0.72	
Menopausal status												
Pre-menopausal	1.04 (0.96-1.13)	0.32	1.07 (0.97-1.18)	0.19	0.86 (0.67-1.10)	0.23	1.18 (0.85-1.65)	0.33	1.22 (0.80-1.85)	0.35	1.02 (0.70-1.50)	0.91
Post-menopausal	1.00		1.00		1.00		1.00		1.00		1.00	

^aCox proportional hazards model, including all reproductive factors, adjusted for age at diagnosis (continuous in years), race/ethnicity (non-Hispanic White, Hispanic White, Black, Asian, other), education level (less than high school, high school, some college, college graduate or above), OVCAC study (*n* = 16), stratified on stage at diagnosis (local, regional, distant), and histotype (high-grade serous, endometrioid, clear cell, mucinous, and low-grade serous).

^bCox proportional hazards models, including all reproductive factors, adjusted for age at diagnosis (continuous in years), race/ethnicity (non-Hispanic White, Hispanic White, Black, Asian, other), education level (less than high school, high school, some college, college graduate or above), OVCAC study (*n* = 16), stratified on stage at diagnosis (local, regional, distant).

ethnicity, education level, stage, histotype, and OCAC study. The percentage of patients missing data on any variables ranged from none for age to 5.9% for education level. Multiple imputations (*mice* package in R) were conducted to create 20 imputed datasets. All variables in the dataset with $\leq 70\%$ missingness were included for imputation, including the six reproductive factors and those not used in the final models. Data were imputed separately by geographic region (i.e., Australia, Europe, and US), and OCAC study was included as a predictor in all imputation models.

Cox proportional hazards models were fit for all-cause mortality among patients with ovarian cancer overall and by histotype. All models included the six reproductive factors of interest (see above); were adjusted for age at diagnosis, race/ethnicity, education level, and OCAC study; and stratified on stage and histotype (see **Table 2** for the coding schemes). Hazard ratios (HR) and 95% confidence intervals (CI) across the 20 imputed datasets were pooled using Rubin's rule to obtain a single point estimate and pooled standard error for each reproductive factor. The pooled standard error is derived from within and between imputation variances. Adjusting for cigarette smoking, menopausal hormone therapy, body mass index, and aspirin use did not change the results. Including only patients with complete information ($N = 9,422$) yielded similar results. No evidence of heterogeneity between the OCAC studies for each factor-survival association was found using standard meta-analytic techniques.

Data availability

The data generated in this study are not publicly available due to limitations imposed by the original studies in which these data were collected. The corresponding author will facilitate access through existing data request processes for the OCAC.

Results

Of the 11,175 patients with ovarian cancer included in the analysis, there were 6,418 deaths (57.4%) during an average follow-up of 6.34 years ($SD = 4.80$; **Table 1**). There were no statistically significant reproductive factor-survival associations among patients with ovarian cancer overall or by histotype (**Table 2**). There were two borderline significant associations with survival: breastfeeding for 24+ months (HR, 1.11; 95% CI, 0.99–1.24) and age at last pregnancy 30 to 34 years (HR, 0.92; 95% CI, 0.85–1.00, **Table 2**). However, there were no trends across the categories of these exposures suggesting that the associations were likely due to chance. Similarly, there were several borderline significant associations within each histotype, but they were likely due to chance for the same reasons (**Table 2**).

Discussion

Our study was the largest to date to investigate reproductive factors and survival among patients with ovarian cancer, and found no statistically significant associations. Our sample size of more than 11,000 patients afforded us sufficient statistical power to detect potential associations. It further enabled histotype-specific analyses, which had not been evaluated previously. Our cohort's 6-year survival of 43% is close to the Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results Program 5-year survival of 47%, suggesting that our cohort is well-representative of patients with ovarian cancer. However, due to a large proportion of missing data for debulking status, treatment, and time to recurrence, we could not consider these factors in the analysis. Overall, our findings highlight that the prediagnosis reproductive factors included in this analysis have no significant impact on ovarian cancer

survival regardless of their effects on the risk of developing ovarian cancer.

Authors' Disclosures

J.M. Schildkraut reports grants from NIH/NCI during the conduct of the study. E.V. Bandera reports Serving in a Pfizer Advisory Board to Enhance Diversity in Clinical Trials. U. Menon reports grants from Cancer Research UK (CRUK), The Eve Appeal, grants from NIHR HTA, UCL GCRF Internal Small Grant, MRC Proximity to Discovery Industrial Connectivity Award, grants from NIHR BRC UCLH, other support from Abcodia Ltd., British Council, and personal fees from New York Obs. and Gyne. Society, outside the submitted work; in addition, and reports a patent for Patent no: EP10178345.4 issued. F. Modugno reports grants from National Cancer Institute and Department of Defense during the conduct of the study. P.D.P. Pharoah reports grants from Cancer Research UK during the conduct of the study. H.A. Risch reports grants from NIH during the conduct of the study. P.M. Webb reports grants from U.S. Army Medical Research and Materiel Command and National Health and Medical Research Council of Australia during the conduct of the study; grants from AstraZeneca outside the submitted work. C.L. Pearce reports grants from DoD and NIH during the conduct of the study. No disclosures were reported by the other authors.

Authors' Contributions

M.T. Phung: Formal analysis, methodology, writing—original draft. **A. Alimujiang:** Formal analysis, writing—original draft, writing—review and editing. **A. Berchuck:** Writing—review and editing. **H. Anton-Cluver:** Funding acquisition, writing—review and editing. **J.M. Schildkraut:** Funding acquisition, writing—review and editing. **E.V. Bandera:** Data curation, funding acquisition, writing—review and editing. **J. Chang-Claude:** Funding acquisition, writing—review and editing. **A. Chase:** Writing—review and editing. **J.A. Doherty:** Funding acquisition, writing—review and editing. **B. Grout:** Writing—review and editing. **M.T. Goodman:** Funding acquisition, writing—review and editing. **G.E. Hanley:** Funding acquisition, methodology, writing—review and editing. **A.W. Lee:** Conceptualization, data curation, formal analysis, writing—review and editing. **C. McKinnon Deurloo:** Writing—review and editing. **U. Menon:** Funding acquisition, writing—review and editing. **F. Modugno:** Funding acquisition, writing—review and editing. **P.D.P. Pharoah:** Funding acquisition, writing—review and editing. **M.C. Pike:** Conceptualization, funding acquisition, methodology, writing—review and editing. **J. Richardson:** Writing—review and editing. **H.A. Risch:** Funding acquisition, writing—review and editing. **W. Sieh:** Funding acquisition, writing—review and editing. **K.L. Terry:** Funding acquisition, writing—review and editing. **P.M. Webb:** Conceptualization, funding acquisition, methodology, writing—review and editing. **N. Wentzensen:** Writing—review and editing. **A.H. Wu:** Funding acquisition, writing—review and editing. **C.L. Pearce:** Conceptualization, data curation, formal analysis, supervision, funding acquisition, investigation, methodology, writing—original draft.

Acknowledgments

We are grateful to the family and friends of Kathryn Sladek Smith for their generous support of the Ovarian Cancer Association Consortium through their donations to the Ovarian Cancer Research Fund. We thank the study participants, doctors, nurses, clinical and scientific collaborators, health care providers, and health information sources who have contributed to the studies contributing to this article. Acknowledgements for individual studies: **AUS:** The AOCs also acknowledges the cooperation of the participating institutions in Australia, and the contribution of the study nurses, research assistants and all clinical and scientific collaborators. The complete AOCs Study Group can be found at www.aocstudy.org. We would like to thank all of the women who participated in this research program; **CON:** The cooperation of the 32 Connecticut hospitals, including Stamford Hospital, in allowing patient access, is gratefully acknowledged. This study was approved by the State of Connecticut Department of Public Health Human Investigation Committee. Certain data used in this study were obtained from the Connecticut Tumor Registry in the Connecticut Department of Public Health. The authors assume full responsibility for analyses and interpretation of these data; **GER:** The German Ovarian Cancer Study thank Ursula Eilber for competent technical assistance; **OPL:** Members of the OPAL Study Group (<http://opalstudy.qimrberghofer.edu.au/>); **SEA:** SEARCH team, Craig Luccarini, Caroline Baynes, Don Conroy; **UKO:** We particularly thank I. Jacobs, M. Widschwendter, E. Wozniak, A. Ryan, J. Ford and N. Balogun for their contribution to the study. **NJO:** Drs. S. Olson, L. Paddock, and L. Rodriguez, and research staff at the Rutgers Cancer Institute of New Jersey, Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center, and the New Jersey State Cancer Registry. OCAC Funding: The Ovarian

Cancer Association Consortium is supported by a grant from the Ovarian Cancer Research Fund thanks to donations by the family and friends of Kathryn Sladek Smith (PPD/RPCL07 to A. Berchuck). The scientific development and funding for this project were in part supported by the US National Cancer Institute GAME-ON Post-GWAS Initiative (U19-CA148112; to C.L. Pearce and J.M. Schildkraut). Funding for individual studies: AUS: The Australian Ovarian Cancer Study (AOCS) was supported by the U.S. Army Medical Research and Materiel Command (DAMD17-01-1-0729; to P.M. Webb), National Health & Medical Research Council of Australia (199600, 400413 and 400281; to P.M. Webb), Cancer Councils of New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland, South Australia and Tasmania and Cancer Foundation of Western Australia (Multi-State Applications 191, 211, and 182; to P.M. Webb). AOCS gratefully acknowledges additional support from Ovarian Cancer Australia and the Peter MacCallum Foundation; P.M. Webb is supported by NHMRC Investigator Grant APP1173346; OPL: National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC) of Australia (APP1025142, APP1120431 to P.M. Webb) and Brisbane Women's Club (to P.M. Webb); GER: German Federal Ministry of Education and Research, Program of Clinical Biomedical Research (01 GB 9401; to J. Chang-Claude), and the German Cancer Research Center (DKFZ, to J. Chang-Claude); POL: Intramural Research Program of the National Cancer Institute (to N. Wentzensen); SEA: The SEARCH study was supported by Cancer Research UK (C490/A8339, C490/A10119, C490/A10124, and C490/A16561; to P.D.P. Pharoah) and UK National Institute for Health Research Biomedical Research Center at the University of Cambridge (to P.D.P. Pharoah); UKO: The UKOPS study was funded by The Eve Appeal (The Oak Foundation; to U. Menon) with investigators supported by the National Institute for Health Research University College London Hospitals Biomedical Research Center and (MR_UU_12023; to U. Menon); STA: NIH grants U01 CA71966 and U01 CA69417 (to W. Sieh); CON: National Institutes of Health (R01-CA063678,

R01-CA074850; R01-CA080742; to H.A. Risch); DOV: National Institutes of Health R01-CA112523 and R01-CA87538 (to J.A. Doherty); HAW: U.S. National Institutes of Health (R01-CA58598, N01-CN-55424 and N01-PC-67001; to M.T. Goodman); HOP: Department of Defense (DAMD17-02-1-0669; to F. Modugno) and NCI (K07-CA080668, R01-CA95023, P50-CA159981, MO1-RR000056, R01-CA126841; to F. Modugno); NCO: National Institutes of Health (R01-CA76016; to A. Berchuck and J.M. Schildkraut) and the Department of Defense (DAMD17-02-1-0666 to A. Berchuck); NEC: National Institutes of Health R01-CA54419 and P50-CA105009 and Department of Defense W81XWH-10-1-02802 (to K.L. Terry); NJO: National Cancer Institute (NIH-K07 CA095666, R01-CA83918, NIH-K22-CA138563, and P30-CA072720; to E.V. Bandera) and the Rutgers Cancer Institute of New Jersey (to E.V. Bandera); UCI: NIH (R01-CA058860; to H. Anton-Culver) and the Lon V Smith Foundation (grant LVS-39420; to H. Anton-Culver); USC: National Institutes of Health (P01CA17054, N01PC67010, N01CN025403; to A.H. Wu, M.C. Pike, and C.L. Pearce; P30CA14089; to A.H. Wu and M.C. Pike; R01CA61132 to M.C. Pike; R03CA113148 and R03CA115195; to C.L. Pearce); and California Cancer Research Program (00-01389V-20170; to M.C. Pike and C.L. Pearce; 2II0200; to A.H. Wu); Dr. Pike is partially supported by the NIH/NCI support grant P30 CA008748 to Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center.

The costs of publication of this article were defrayed in part by the payment of page charges. This article must therefore be hereby marked *advertisement* in accordance with 18 U.S.C. Section 1734 solely to indicate this fact.

Received September 17, 2021; revised November 23, 2021; accepted January 18, 2022; published first January 21, 2022.

References

1. Praestegaard C, Jensen A, Jensen SM, Nielsen TS, Webb PM, Nagle CM, et al. Cigarette smoking is associated with adverse survival among women with ovarian cancer: results from a pooled analysis of 19 studies. *Int J Cancer* 2017;140:2422–35.
2. Nagle CM, Dixon SC, Jensen A, Kjaer SK, Modugno F, deFazio A, et al. Obesity and survival among women with ovarian cancer: results from the Ovarian Cancer Association Consortium. *Br J Cancer* 2015;113:817–26.
3. Brieger KK, Peterson S, Lee AW, Mukherjee B, Bakulski KM, Alimujiang A, et al. Menopausal hormone therapy prior to the diagnosis of ovarian cancer is associated with improved survival. *Gynecol Oncol* 2020;158:702–9.
4. Shafir AL, Babic A, Tamimi RM, Rosner BA, Tworoger SS, Terry KL. Reproductive and hormonal factors in relation to survival and platinum resistance among ovarian cancer cases. *Br J Cancer* 2016;115:1391–9.
5. Robbins CL, Whiteman MK, Hillis SD, Curtis KM, McDonald JA, Wingo PA, et al. Influence of reproductive factors on mortality after epithelial ovarian cancer diagnosis. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev* 2009;18:2035–41.
6. Kim SJ, Rosen B, Fan I, Ivanova A, McLaughlin JR, Risch H, et al. Epidemiologic factors that predict long-term survival following a diagnosis of epithelial ovarian cancer. *Br J Cancer* 2017;116:964–71.
7. Chi DS, Liao JB, Leon LF, Venkatraman ES, Hensley ML, Bhaskaran D, et al. Identification of prognostic factors in advanced epithelial ovarian carcinoma. *Gynecol Oncol* 2001;82:532–7.
8. Kolomeyevskaya NV, Szender JB, Zirpoli G, Minlikeeva A, Friel G, Cannioto RA, et al. Oral contraceptive use and reproductive characteristics affect survival in patients with epithelial ovarian cancer: a Cohort Study. *Int J Gynecol Cancer* 2015; 25:1587–92.