Cancer Incidence in Connecticut Counties, 1995-98



State of Connecticut
Department of Public Health
Connecticut Tumor Registry
410 Capitol Avenue, MS# 13TMR
P.O. Box 340308
Hartford, CT 06134-0308

May, 2002

CANCER INCIDENCE IN CONNECTICUT COUNTIES, 1995-98

CONNECTICUT TUMOR REGISTRY

CONNECTICUT DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH

P.O. BOX 340308

410 CAPITOL AVENUE

HARTFORD CT 06134

MAY 2002

This work was supported in part by Contract N01-CN-67005 between the National Cancer Institute and the Connecticut Department of Public Health.

Requests for further information, and questions about this report, should be directed to P. D. Sullivan at the Connecticut Tumor Registry (telephone 860-509-7167)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Execu	utive Summary	1
Introd	duction	3
Meth	odology	4
Discu	assion of Results	6
Table	es	
A	all Races	
(1)	All Sites	7
(2)	Oral Cavity, Pharynx	8
(3)	Stomach Esophagus	9
(4)	Pancreas	10
(5)	Colon, Rectum	11
(6)	Colon	12
(7)	Rectum	13
(8)	Liver Gallbladder	14
(9)	Lung, Bronchus, Trachea Larynx	15
(10)	Melanoma of Skin	16
(11)	Female Breast Prostate Testis	17
(12)	Cervix Corpus, Uterus Nos	18
(13)	Ovary Other Female Genital	19

TABLE OF CONTENTS – Page 2

Table	es (Cont.)	
	All Races	
(14)	Kidney, Renal Pelvis, Ureter	20
(15)	Bladder	21
(16)	Brain, Cranial Nerves, Cerebral Meninges Brain	22
(17)	Lymphoma	23
(18)	Leukemia Multiple Myeloma	24
Appe	ndix Tables	
A-1	Connecticut Population by County	25
A-2	Connecticut Counties by Town	26-27

Executive Summary

This report presents data on the incidence of malignant tumors diagnosed for Connecticut residents in the years 1995-98 and reported to the Connecticut Tumor Registry. Crude and ageadjusted rates per 100,000, with 95% confidence intervals for the latter, are shown by primary site, county and sex. There are sections for an introduction, methodology, and a discussion of results together with tables of incidence rates, populations and of towns within counties.

New London County had the highest age-adjusted incidence rates for all sites combined in 1995-98: 511 per 100,000 among males and 415 for females. By site, females in this county also led in the rates for tumors of the colon and rectum (combined and separately), melanomas of the skin and bladder tumors, and were second highest in rates of lung and breast cancer. Males in New London were second highest among the counties for the rates of lung, bladder and melanoma tumors.

The second highest rate for all sites combined among females was 402 in New Haven County. This sex was diagnosed at the highest rates for lung, stomach, kidney and cervical cancer, being second highest for non-Hodgkin's lymphomas. Males in the county led in the rates for stomach, colon, non-Hodgkin's lymphomas, and were second highest in the rate of kidney tumors.

Female residents of Hartford County had the lowest rates of corpus and bladder tumors, the second lowest rate in the state for melanomas, and were below average in the rate for breast. Males in the county had the second highest rates for all sites, stomach and leukemias and a rate of lung cancer slightly higher than that for the state.

Males in Fairfield County had the highest rate of prostate tumors and the second lowest for lung cancer, colon and rectal tumors combined and of non-Hodgkin's lymphomas. They also had the lowest rate for bladder cancers. Female residents had rates of lung and breast tumors that were next to lowest by county.

Tolland County females had the lowest rate of all sites combined and rates of colon cancer, alone and combined with rectal sites, 32% and 27% below the state averages. Males in the county had both the lowest colon rate and the highest for melanoma, with the latter 38% above the state average.

Middlesex County was lowest in the rate of rectal tumors for each sex. Females were diagnosed for melanomas and tumors of the uterine corpus at rates 36% and 30%, respectively, above the averages for Connecticut. Males in Middlesex had rates for colon and rectal cancers combined, and of non-Hodgkin's lymphomas, which were lows for counties.

Males of Windham County ranked highest in rates of lung tumors and leukemias. The county also had the lowest rates for female breast and prostate, the latter, 27% less than the state average.

Litchfield County males had the lowest rate for all sites and were highest for bladder tumors. This county showed the lowest rate of lung cancer for each sex, and of melanomas among females in 1995-98.

Introduction

Incidence data for this report, shown in 18 tables, are for malignant tumors diagnosed in the years 1995-98 and reported to the Connecticut Tumor Registry. Included are all reportable invasive tumors plus in situ stage malignancies of the bladder. Non-epithelial type skin tumors and all types of epidermal tumors diagnosed in genital organs are included. All other skin tumors are excluded. The tables give the ICD-O-2 site codes for invasive cancers with the leading "C" deleted. Malignant tumors on file in August 2000 comprise the database.

Incidence rates are subject to all known and unknown cancer risks and also to influences of a random nature due to chance occurrences, often of an unknown source. One measure of this component, the standard error of the age-adjusted rates, while available for this report, is not shown in the tables. The 95% confidence limits for the age-adjusted rates, which are calculated separately from the standard errors, are included. Both of these measures are useful in evaluating and comparing rates (further discussed in the Methodology section). Age-adjusted rates with standard errors of 20% or higher (usually based on 25 or fewer cancers) are not shown. This standard was met in several tables by combining data for more than one county.

Among all causes of mortality in 1995-98 for state residents, 25% of male deaths and 23% of females deaths were assigned to malignant neoplasms. Males aged 60-69 and females, 50-54 in this period had the highest proportions of deaths from tumors, 36% and 51%, respectively. Malignant tumors of the lung, bronchus and trachea caused 29% of malignant tumor deaths among males in 1995-98 and 23% for females. Death from malignant tumors, diagnosed in 1995-98 and earlier years, as a proportion of malignant tumors of the same site diagnosed in 1995-98, were highest among major sites for pancreas, 0.95 and lung tumors, 0.75; all sites were 0.40.

Methodology

The crude incidence rate per person is defined as the number of tumors diagnosed for a cancer site and sex in one or more calendar years divided by the total estimated population at risk.

A rate per 100,000 can be computed by moving the decimal point of the population left 5 places before division.

While useful as a measure of an area's average incidence rate, the crude rate is usually not an appropriate measure of the cancer rate in one area relative to other areas. This results from (1) the usually observed pattern of rising tumor rates with increasing age and (2) variation between areas in the distribution of population by age. In 1995-98 the average incidence rates, all sites combined, to age 64 were 226 per 100,000 for males and 251 among females; at ages 65 and over the average rates increased to 2981 and 1850 per 100,000, respectively.

An area's crude incidence rates are averages of the corresponding age-specific rates, weighted by the proportion of the population in each age group. Age distributions by county in Connecticut are not uniform: Tolland County had an estimated 10.6% at ages 65 and over in the years 1995-98 compared to 15.2% in New Haven County and 14.3% statewide.

The age-adjusted rate is formulated to control for unequal population distributions by age between areas. Incidence rates are computed for several age groups – in the present study 18 from 0-4 to 80-84 and 85+. The age-specific rates are cumulatively multiplied by the corresponding age segments in a standard population – the standard million for the United States in 1970 here – and the product divided by the total standard. The result is an age-adjusted rate, independent of the area's population distribution by age. Other demographic factors, including socioeconomic levels, vary considerably by county in the state and can affect incidence rates.

The U.S. 1970 standard population, with about 10% at ages 65 and older, usually gave an age-adjusted rate lower than the crude. The Connecticut population in 1995-98 averaged 12%, male and 17%, female at these ages where over half of all malignant tumors were diagnosed.

The age-adjusted rates for males in Tolland County were an exception to the above. Their population aged 65 and above was less than that in the 1970 standard and age-adjustment gave higher observed rates compared to the crude.

The tables show the age-adjusted rates observed in 1995-98 and 2 other rates labeled "lower" and "upper" which are calculated to give a 95% confidence range for the observed rates. This range is derived from a non-symmetric standard distribution fitted to each observed age-adjusted rate. When 2 observed rates have confidence limits without an area of overlap, there is less than a 5% chance that the difference in the observed rates is due to chance alone. Instances in the tables where confidence ranges for county observed rates are entirely outside the Connecticut interval are marked by a footnote. Differences in incidence rates between counties, and between counties and the state can be due to variation in tumor risk factors, other causes unrelated to cancer risk, including screening, and chance factors.

The population estimates for this report were issued by the U.S. Census Bureau before the 2000 data counts were available. When the latest census data for the state is compared to the annual estimates for 1995-98, made as projections from the 1990 census, an underestimate of approximately 3% is likely for the earlier state estimates. Lacking revised estimates of population for the state and counties, a slight overestimate in general may be assumed for the 1995-98 incidence rates in this report.

The data sets and programs used to produce the incidence rates for this report were provided by the SEER program of the National Cancer Institute by means of a compact disk (CD-ROM) issued April, 2001.

¹ Fay MP, Feuer EJ. 1997. Confidence intervals for directly standardized rates: A method based on the gamma distribution. Statistics in Medicine 16:791-801.

Discussion of Results

County incidence rates with 95% confidence ranges that fall outside those for Connecticut raise questions concerning possible sources of tumor risks and the likelihood of lessening or of the elimination of their effects. Some risk factors are not subject to remediation, for example, one's genetic profile. Others, including smoking, unprotected exposure to sunlight and abuse of alcohol, although alterable, may leave permanent effects after cessation of the practice.

Incidence rates of lung cancer among males have been shown to vary by residential area according to socioeconomic status with above average rates associated with lower status and vice versa. Rates in Fairfield, New London and Windham Counties for 1995-98 are consistent with this relationship. Further, with the proportion of adult males in communities who are smokers also shown to be negatively associated with income, promotion of smoking avoidance in higher risk areas offers the possibility of lower incidence and mortality from lung cancer.

The prostate tumor rates in Fairfield and Windham Counties in 1995-98, 156 and 102, respectively, per 100,000 differed by more than 50%. Following the beginning of widespread screening for this tumor in the 1980's by means of the PSA blood test, the incidence rate rose substantially in Connecticut. How much of the current differences in the county incidence rates is a reflection of the extent of all screening -possibly influenced by economic factors-and how much is due to variation in exposure to presumed risk factors, is unknown. For this site, and many others, a better understanding of causation, as well as the impact of screening on incidence and mortality, is needed.

The relation between age and the rate of tumor incidence for many cancers strongly implies that the process of tumor development can occur over extended time periods, reflecting cumulative exposures to risks including those of environmental origin. It follows that the levels of incidence rates in an area for a given time period may reflect earlier exposures to hazards no longer present as well as current conditions of risk.

Table 1 Incidence Rates/100,000 of Invasive Tumors, by County, Site, Sex, 1995-98 All Sites (00.0-80.9)

County	Sex	Tumors	Crude Rate	Age-adj usted Rate <u>95% Confi dence³</u> Observed ² Lower Upper		
						——————————————————————————————————————
			<u>All Ra</u>	<u>ces</u>		
Fai rfi el d	M	8903	554. 4	482. 6	472. 5	492. 9
	F	8845	512. 8	370. 6	362. 6	378. 9
Hartford	M	9312	583. 6	496. 0	485. 8	506. 4
	F	8898	516. 6	366. 6 ⁵	358. 5	374. 9
New Haven	M	8720	571. 7	494. 4	483. 8	505. 1
	F	9214	559. 9	402. 3 ⁶	393. 5	411. 2
New London	M F	2648 2646	526. 5 531. 7	510.6 415.0	491. 1 398. 5	530. 8 432. 1
Li tchfi el d	M	1929	544. 1	474. 2	452. 8	496. 7
	F	1884	515. 0	377. 8	359. 7	396. 9
Mi ddl esex	M	1484	510. 4	477. 2	452. 7	502. 8
	F	1605	530. 2	391. 8	371. 5	413. 2
Tol l and	M	1184	454. 1	495. 0	466. 7	524. 8
	F	1043	401. 5	362. 5	339. 8	386. 5
Wi ndham	M	1008	491. 5	490. 3	460. 0	522. 3
	F	970	454. 1	365. 9	341. 7	391. 6
Conn. ⁴	M	35200	555. 1	490. 6	485. 4	495. 8
	F	35106	521. 4	381. 0	376. 8	385. 3

 $^{^1}$ ICD-0-2 site code shown in parentheses. Includes in situ bladder tumors; excludes epithelial skin tumors for sites other than genital (see text). Age-adjusted directly to the U.S. 1970 standard million.

Estimated limits in the range of variation from the observed age-adjusted rate expected at a probability of 95%.

⁴ Includes 13 tumors-12 male and 1 female-for state residents, county unknown. The 95% confidence limits are outside those for the Conn. age-adjusted rate.

The 99% confidence limits (not shown) are outside those for the Conn. age-adjusted rate.

Table 2 Incidence Rates/100,000 of Invasive Tumors, by County, Site, Sex, 1995-98 Oral Cavity, Pharynx (00.0-14.8)

				Age- a	djusted Ra	ate
			Crude	J		onfi dence ²
County	Sex	Tumors	Rate	$0bserved^1$	Lower	Upper
		_				
			All Races			
Fai rfi el d	M	247	15. 4	13. 2	11.6	15. 0
Hartford	M	260	16. 3	14. 2	12. 5	16. 1
New Haven	M	236	15. 5	14. 3	12. 5	16. 4
New London	M	87	17. 3	17. 0	13. 6	21. 1
Li tchfi el d	M	49	13. 8	13. 1	9. 6	17. 8
Mi ddl esex	M	43	14. 8	14. 2	10. 2	19. 5
Toll and	M	31	11. 9	12. 5	8. 4	18. 0
Wi ndham	M	32	15. 6	16. 2	11. 0	23. 2
wi nunam	171	32	13. 0	10. 2	11. 0	23. 2
Conn.	M	985	15. 5	14. 0	13. 2	15. 0
Fai rfi el d	F	136	7. 9	5. 7	4. 7	6. 9
Hartford	\mathbf{F}	127	7. 4	5. 4	4. 4	6. 5
New Haven	\mathbf{F}	134	8. 1	6. 0	4. 9	7. 2
New London	\mathbf{F}	37	7. 4	6. 1	4. 2	8. 7
Li tchfi el d	F	31	8. 5	6. 9	4. 6	10. 4
Other Three	F	42	5. 4	4. 4	3. 1	6. 1
Counties						
Conn.	F	507	7. 5	5. 6	5. 1	6. 2
Fai rfi el d	T	383	11. 5	9. 1	8. 2	10. 1
Hartford	T	387	11. 7	9. 4	8. 5	10. 5
New Haven	T	370	11. 7	9. 8	8. 8	10. 9
New London	T	124	12. 4	11. 1	9. 2	13. 4
Li tchfi el d	$ar{ extbf{T}}$	80	11. 1	9. 8	7. 7	12. 5
Mi ddl esex	Ť	60	10. 1	9. 0	6. 8	11. 9
Toll and	Ť	43	8. 3	8. 1	5.8	11. 1
Wi ndham	Ť	45 45	10. 7	10. 1	7. 3	13. 8
m nanam	1	-10	10. /	10. 1	7.0	10.0
Conn.	T	1492	11. 4	9. 5	9. 0	10. 0

Age-adjusted directly to the U.S. 1970 standard million.
 Estimated limits in the range of variation from the observed age-adjusted rate expected at a probability of 95%.

 $\begin{array}{c} \text{Table 3} \\ \text{Incidence Rates/100,000 of Invasive Tumors, by County, Site, Sex, 1995-98} \\ \text{Stomach, Esophagus, All Races} \end{array}$

			Crude	Age- a	djusted Ra <u>95% Confi</u>	
County	Sex	Tumors	Rate	0bserved ¹	Lower	Upper
		Sto	omach (16.0)- <u>16. 9)</u>		
Fai rfi el d	M	201	12. 5	10. 6	9. 1	12. 2
Hartford	M	235	14. 7	12. 2	10. 6	13. 9
New Haven	M	231	15. 1	12. 8	11. 2	14. 6
New London	M	39	7. 8	7. 1 ⁴	5. 1	9. 9
Li tchfi el d	M	39	11. 0	9. 2	6. 5	13. 0
Other Three Counties	M	55	7. 3	7. 2 ⁴	5. 4	9. 5
Conn.	M	801 ³	12. 6	10. 9	10. 1	11. 7
Fai rfi el d	F	130	7. 5	4. 6	3. 8	5. 6
Hartford	\mathbf{F}	137	8. 0	4. 6	3.8	5. 5
New Haven	F	147	8. 9	5. 0	4. 2	6. 1
New London	F	31	6. 2	4. 6	3. 0	6. 9
Li tchfi el d	F	27	7. 4	4. 0	2. 6	6. 7
Other Three	\mathbf{F}	32	4. 1	3. 2	2. 1	4. 7
Counti es						
Conn.	F	504	7. 5	4. 5	4. 1	5. 0
		<u>Esc</u>	ophagus (15	5. 0- 15. 9 <u>)</u>		
Fai rfi el d	M	144	9. 0	7. 8	6. 6	9. 3
Hartford	M	144	9. 0	7.8	6. 6	9. 2
New Haven	M	141	9. 2	8. 0	6. 7	9. 5
New London	M	50	9. 9	9. 9	7. 3	13. 2
Li tchfi el d	M	33	9. 3	8. 5	5. 8	12. 3
Mi ddl esex	M	26	8. 9	8. 9	5. 7	13. 3
Other Two Counties	M	34	7. 3	7. 9	5. 4	11. 2
Conn.	M	572	9. 0	8. 1	7. 4	8. 8
Fai rfi el d	F	49	2. 8	2. 1	1. 5	2. 9
Hartford	\mathbf{F}	47	2. 7	1. 6	1. 2	2. 3
New Haven	\mathbf{F}	50	3. 0	2. 0	1. 5	2. 8
Other Five Counties	F	42	2. 6	1. 9	1. 3	2. 7
Conn.	F	188	2. 8	1. 9	1.6	2. 3

Age-adjusted directly to the U.S. 1970 standard million.
 Estimated limits in the range of variation from the observed age-adjusted rate expected at a probability of 95%.

Includes 1 tumor for a state resident, county unknown.

The 95% confidence limits are outside those for the Conn. age-adjusted rate.

Table 4 Incidence Rates/100,000 of Invasive Tumors, by County, Site, Sex, 1995-98 Pancreas (25.0-25.9)

			Crude	Age- adj usted Rate 95% Confi dence ²		
County	Sex	Tumors	Rate	$\mathbf{0bserved}^1$		Upper
		_				
			AII Ka	ices		
Fai rfi el d	M	213	13. 3	11. 3	9. 9	13. 0
Hartford	M	220	13. 8	11.6	10. 1	13. 3
New Haven	M	196	12. 9	11. 1	9. 5	12. 8
New London	M	44	8.8	8. 4	6. 1	11. 4
Li tchfi el d	M	49	13. 8	11. 5	8. 5	15. 6
Mi ddl esex	M	26	8. 9	8. 0	5. 2	12. 2
Tol l and	M	26	10. 0	10. 5	6.8	15. 7
Wi ndham	M	27	13. 2	13. 1	8. 5	19. 4
Conn.	M	801	12. 6	11. 0	10. 2	11. 8
Fai rfi el d	F	234	13. 6	9. 0	7. 8	10. 3
Hartford	F	226	13. 1	8. 0	6. 9	9. 3
New Haven	F	220	13. 4	8. 5	7. 3	9. 9
New London	$ar{\mathbf{F}}$	63	12. 7	8. 9	6. 7	11. 9
Li tchfi el d	F	49	13. 4	8. 5	6. 1	12. 0
Mi ddl esex	F	37	12. 2	7. 8	5. 2	11. 6
Tol l and	\mathbf{F}	32	12. 3	10. 1	6. 7	14. 8
Wi ndham	F	24	*	*	*	*
Conn.	F	885	13. 2	8. 5	7. 9	9. 1
Fai rfi el d	Т	447	13. 4	10. 0	9. 1	11. 0
Hartford	Ť	446	13. 4	9. 7	8.8	10. 7
New Haven	Ť	416	13. 1	9. 6	8. 6	10. 6
New London	Ť	107	10. 7	8. 8	7. 1	10. 7
Litchfield	Ť	98	13. 6	9. 9	7. 9	12. 3
Mi ddl esex	$ar{ extbf{T}}$	63	10. 6	7. 9	6. 0	10. 5
Tol l and	$ar{ extbf{T}}$	58	11. 1	10. 3	7. 8	13. 6
Wi ndham	Ť	51	12. 2	10. 2	7. 5	13. 7
Conn.	T	1686	12. 9	9. 6	9. 2	10. 1

Age-adjusted directly to the U.S. 1970 standard million.
 Estimated limits in the range of variation from the observed age-adjusted rate expected at a probability of 95%.
 * The standard error of the age-adjusted rate is 20% or higher.

Table 5 Incidence Rates/100,000 of Invasive Tumors, by County, Site, Sex, 1995-98 Colon and Rectum (18.0-21.8, 26.0)

			Crude	Age-adjusted Rate <u>95%</u> <u>Confidence</u> ²		
County	Sex	Tumors	Rate	0 bserved 1		Upper
			All Races			
Fai rfi el d	M	986	61. 4	52. 1	48. 9	55. 6
	F	1115	64. 6	41. 5	39. 0	44. 3
Hartford	M	1065	66. 7	55. 0	51. 7	58. 5
	F	1112	64. 6	39. 8	37, 3	42. 5
New Haven	M F	1157 1193	75. 9 72. 5	$63. \ 3^3$ $44. \ 2$	59. 6 41. 5	67. 2 47. 1
New London	M	309	61. 4	58. 7	52. 3	65. 8
	F	358	71. 9	49. 7 ³	44. 4	55. 8
Li tchfi el d	M	239	67. 4	56. 3	49. 2	64. 3
	F	258	70. 5	45. 8	39. 9	52. 8
Mi ddl esex	M	165	56. 7	51. 2	43. 5	60. 0
	F	175	57. 8	36. 4	30. 7	43. 2
Tol l and	M	132	50. 6	54. 7	45. 6	65. 3
	F	94	36. 2	30. 6 ³	24. 4	38. 1
Wi ndham	M	127	61. 9	60. 3	50. 1	72. 1
	F	133	63. 3	43. 9	36. 2	53. 2
Conn.	M	4180	65. 9	56. 6	54. 9	58. 4
	F	4438	65. 9	42. 1	40. 7	43. 4

Age-adjusted directly to the U.S. 1970 standard million.
 Estimated limits in the range of variation from the observed age-adjusted rate expected at a probability of 95%.
 The 95% confidence limits are outside those for the Conn. age-adjusted rate.

Table 6 Incidence Rates/100,000 of Invasive Tumors, by County, Site, Sex, 1995-98 Colon (18.0-18.9, 26.0)

County	Sex	Tumors	Crude Rate	Observed ¹	adj usted F 95% Conf Lower	ate <u>Fi dence²</u> Upper
			<u>All</u> R	aces		
Fai rfi el d	M	696	43. 3	36. 7	34. 0	39. 6
	F	844	48. 9	30. 7	28. 5	33. 0
Hartford	M	720	45. 1	36. 7	34. 0	39. 6
	F	799	46. 4	27. 8	25. 7	30. 0
New Haven	M F	800 891	52. 4 54. 1	43. 3 ³ 32. 3	40. 3 30. 0	46. 5 34. 8
New London	M	210	41. 8	39. 1	33. 9	44. 9
	F	250	50. 2	34. 5	30. 1	39. 6
Li tchfi el d	M	163	46. 0	37. 8	32. 1	44. 6
	F	189	51. 7	32. 0	27. 2	37. 8
Mi ddl esex	M	118	40. 6	37. 2	30. 7	44. 9
	F	144	47. 6	29. 8	24. 7	36. 1
Tol l and	M	82	31. 5	34. 5	27. 3	43. 1
	F	67	25. 8	20. 5 ⁴	15. 6	26. 7
Wi ndham	M	88	42. 9	41. 6	33. 3	51. 7
	F	102	47. 8	31. 9	25. 6	39. 8
Conn.	M	2877	45. 4	38. 7	37. 2	40. 1
	F	3286	48. 8	30. 3	29. 2	31. 5

Age-adjusted directly to the U.S. 1970 standard million.
 Estimated limits in the range of variation from the observed ageadjusted rate expected at a probability of 95%.
 The 95% confidence limits are outside those for the Conn. age-adjusted rate.

⁴ The 99% confidence limits (not shown) are outside those for the Conn. age-adjusted rate.

Table 7 Incidence Rates/100,000 of Invasive Tumors, by County, Site, Sex, 1995-98 Rectum $(19.9\text{-}21.8)^1$

County	Sex	Tumors	Crude Rate	Age- Observed ²	95% Con	<u>fi dence³</u>
County	sex	Tuliors	nate	observed	Lower	Upper
			All Races			
Fai rfi el d	M	290	18. 1	15. 5	13. 7	17. 4
	F	271	15. 7	10. 8	9. 5	12. 4
Hartford	M	345	21. 6	18. 3	16. 4	20. 4
2242 02 02 4	F	313	18. 2	12. 0	10. 6	13. 6
New Haven	M	357	23. 4	20. 0	17. 9	22. 3
New Haven	F	302	23. 4 18. 4	20. 0 11. 9	10. 5	13. 5
	1	302	10. 4	11. 0	10. 5	13. 3
New London	M	99	19. 7	19. 6	15. 9	24. 0
	F	108	21. 7	15. 2	12. 3	18. 8
Li tchfi el d	M	76	21. 4	18. 4	14. 4	23. 5
Litemitera	F	69	18. 9	13. 8	10. 6	18. 2
	•	00	10. 0	10.0	10. 0	10. 2
Mi ddl esex	M	47	16. 2	14. 0	10. 2	19. 0
	F	31	10. 2	6.6^4	4. 2	10. 2
Tol l and	M	50	19. 2	20. 2	14. 9	27. 1
Torrana	F	27	10. 4	10. 1	6. 5	15. 2
	-		10. 1	2012	3. 3	10. 2
Wi ndham	M	39	19. 0	18. 6	13. 2	25. 8
	F	31	14. 5	12. 0	7. 9	17. 8
Conn.	M	1303	20. 5	18. 0	17. 0	19. 0
	F	1152	17. 1	11. 7	11. 0	12. 5

Includes rectosigmoid, anal canal, anus nos.
 Age-adjusted directly to the U.S. 1970 standard million.
 Estimated limits in the range of variation from the observed age-adjusted rate expected at a probability of 95%.
 The 95% confidence limits are outside those for the Conn. age-adjusted rate.

				Age-	adj usted l	Rate
			Crude		95% Conf	fi dence ²
County	Sex	Tumors	Rate	0bserved ¹	Lower	Upper
	<u>Li ver,</u>	Intrahe	epatic Bile	<u>Duct</u> (22. 0-	<u>22.</u> 1)	
Fai rfi el d	M	95	5. 9	5. 2	4. 2	6. 4
Hartford	M	109	6. 8	5. 9	4. 9	7. 2
New Haven	M	116	7. 6	6.8	5. 6	8. 2
New London		35	7. 0	6.8	4. 7	9. 6
Other Four	M	57	7. 0 5. 1	5. 1	3. 8	6. 6
Counties	171	37	J. 1	J. 1	3. 0	0. 0
Conn.	M	412	6. 5	5. 9	5. 3	6. 5
Fai rfi el d	F	55	3. 2	2. 1	1. 6	2. 9
Hartford	F	40	2. 3	1.4	1. 0	2. 1
New Haven	F	66	4. 0	2. 5	1. 9	3. 3
Other Five	F	40	2. 4	2. 3 1. 9	1. 3	3. 3 2. 7
Counties	ľ	40	۵. 4	1. 3	1. 3	۵. ۱
Conn.	F	201	3. 0	2. 0	1. 7	2. 3
	Gallbladder	other	And Unspec.	Biliary Tr	act (23.9-	24. 9)
Fai rfi el d	M	47	2. 9	2. 4	1. 8	3. 3
Hartford	M	45	2. 8	2. 3	1. 7	3. 2
New Haven	M	39	2.6	2. 1	1. 5	2. 9
Other Five	M	45	2. 8	2. 5	1. 8	3. 4
Counties			2. 0	2.0	2.0	0. 1
Conn.	M	176	2. 8	2. 3	2. 0	2. 7
Fai rfi el d	F	44	9 6	1. 6	1. 1	2. 2
Hartford	F	58	2. 6 3. 4			2. 2
	F		3. 4 3. 3	2. 1	1.6	2. 9 2. 7
New Haven	_	55 42		1. 9	1.4	
Other Five Counties	F	42	2. 6	1. 8	1. 2	2. 5
Conn.	F	199	3. 0	1.8	1. 6	2. 2

 $^{^{\}rm 1}$ Age-adjusted directly to the U.S. 1970 standard million. $^{\rm 2}$ Estimated limits in the range of variation from the observed age-adjusted rate expected at a probability of 95%.

 $\begin{array}{c} \text{Table 9} \\ \text{Incidence Rates/100,000 of Invasive Tumors, by County, Site, Sex, 1995-98} \\ \text{Lung, Bronchus and Trachea, Larynx, All Races} \end{array}$

			Crude	Age- a	djusted R 95% Conf	
County	Sex	Tumors	Rate	0bserved ¹	Lower	Upper
		<u>Lung,</u> <u>Bro</u>	onchus, Trachea	<u>(33. 9- 34. 9)</u>	-	
Fai rfi el d	M	1268	79. 0	68 . 7 ³	64. 9	72. 7
Hartford	M	1431	89. 7	76. 1	72. 1	80. 2
New Haven	M	1400	91. 8	79. 2	75. 0	83. 6
New London		437	86. 9	85. 8	77.8	94. 4
Li tchfi el d		276	77. 9	68 . 1	60. 2	77. 1
Mi ddl esex	M	243	83. 6	78. 2	68 . 6	89. 1
Tol l and	M	181	69. 4	77. 0	66 . 0	89. 4
Wi ndham	M	188	91. 7	94 . 5 ³	81. 2	109. 4
Conn.	M	5424	85. 5	75. 7	73. 7	77. 8
Fai rfi el d	F	1105	64. 1	45. 7	42. 9	48. 7
Hartford	F	1139	66. 1	46. 9	44. 1	49. 9
New Haven	F	1262	76. 7	55. 1 ³	51. 9	58. 5
New London		338	67. 9	52. 9	47. 2	59. 4
Litchfield		217	59. 3	42. 7	36. 9	49. 6
Mi ddl esex	$ar{\mathbf{F}}$	200	66. 1	49. 0	42. 1	57. 1
Tol l and	F	139	53. 5	50. 6	42. 2	60. 4
Wi ndham	F	126	59. 0	51. 2	42. 2	61. 9
Conn.	F	4526	67. 2	49. 0	47. 5	50. 6
			<u>Larynx (32.0-3</u>	<u>32. 9)</u>		
Fai rfi el d	M	122	7. 6	6. 7	5. 6	8. 1
Hartford	M	145	7. 6 9. 1	7. 9	5. 6 6. 6	9. 4
New Haven	M	149	9. 1	7. 9 8. 7	7. 3	10. 3
Other Five		120	7. 4	7. 3	6. 0	8.8
Counties	141	120	7. 4	7. 5	0. 0	0. 0
Conn.	M	536	8. 5	7. 6	7. 0	8. 3
Fai rfi el d	F	41	2. 4	1. 8	1. 3	2. 6
Hartford	F	39	2. 3	1. 9	1. 3	2.6
New Haven	F	53	3. 2	2. 4	1. 7	3. 2
Other Five		38	2. 3	2. 0	1. 4	2. 9
Counti es						
Conn.	F	171	2. 5	2. 0	1. 7	2. 4

Age-adjusted directly to the U.S. 1970 standard million.
 Estimated limits in the range of variation from the observed age-adjusted rate expected at a probability of 95%.
 The 95% confidence limits are outside those for the Conn. age-adjusted rate.

Table 10 Incidence Rates/100,000 of Invasive Tumors, by County, Site, Sex, 1995-98 Mel anoma of Skin (44.0-44.9) $^{\rm 1}$

			Crude	Age-adjusted Rate 95% Confidence ³		
County	Sex	Tumors	Rate	0bserved ²	Lower	Upper
			All Races			
Fai rfi el d	M	388	24. 2	20. 7	18. 7	23. 0
	F	321	18. 6	13. 9	12. 4	15. 7
Hartford	M	410	25. 7	22. 0	19. 9	24. 3
	F	299	17. 4	13. 2	11. 7	15. 0
New Haven	M	347	22. 7	19. 8	17. 7	22. 1
	F	285	17. 3	13. 6	12. 0	15. 4
New London	M	140	27. 8	26. 7	22. 3	31. 7
	F	121	24. 3	19. 7 ⁴	16. 2	23. 9
Li tchfi el d	M	95	26. 8	23. 1	18. 6	28. 7
	F	61	16. 7	12. 6	9. 5	17. 0
Mi ddl esex	M	64	22. 0	19. 4	14. 8	25. 2
	F	71	23. 5	19. 6	15. 1	25. 3
Tol l and	M	74	28. 4	29. 9 ⁴	23. 3	38. 1
	F	47	18. 1	15. 3	11. 1	20. 9
Wi ndham	M	42	20. 5	19. 1	13. 7	26. 2
	F	44	20. 6	17. 6	12. 6	24. 3
Conn.	M	1560	24. 6	21. 6	20. 5	22. 7
	F	1249	18. 6	14. 4	13. 5	15. 2

Morphology 8720-8780.
 Age-adjusted directly to the U.S. 1970 standard million.
 Estimated limits in the range of variation from the observed age-adjusted rate expected at a probability of 95%.
 The 95% confidence limits are outside those for the Conn. age-adjusted rate.

				Age-		
			Crude		95% Conf	
County	Sex	Tumors	Rate	0bserved ¹	Lower	Upper
		<u>Bre</u>	east (50.0	<u>- 50. 9)</u>		
Fairfield Hartford New Haven New London Litchfield Middlesex Tolland Windham	F F F F F	2756 2766 2723 782 616 490 343 279	159. 8 160. 6 165. 5 157. 1 168. 4 161. 9 132. 1 130. 6	119. 5 120. 1 124. 8 127. 5 128. 1 125. 3 121. 5 105. 4	115. 0 115. 4 119. 9 118. 3 117. 7 113. 8 108. 5 92. 7	124. 3 124. 9 129. 9 137. 3 139. 6 138. 0 135. 9 119. 8
Conn.	F	10755	159. 7	121. 8	119. 4	124. 2
<u>Prostate</u> (61.9)						
Fai rfi el d	M	2824	175. 9	155. 7 ⁵	150. 0	161. 6
Hartford	M	2664	166. 9	143. 9	138. 4	149. 6
New Haven	M	2157	141. 4	123. 4^5	118. 1	128. 8
New London	M	725	144. 2	143. 0	132. 6	154. 0
Li tchfi el d	M	492	138. 8	123.9^4	113. 0	135. 9
Mi ddl esex	M	394	135. 5	131. 5	118.6	145. 5
Tol l and	M	356	136. 5	154. 4	138. 6	171. 6
Wi ndham	M	210	102. 4	102. 1 ⁵	88. 6	117. 4
Conn.	M	9832^{3}	155. 1	139. 4	136. 7	142. 3
		<u>Tes</u>	stis (62.0	- 62. 9)		
Fai rfi el d	M	78	4. 9	3. 9	3. 1	5. 0
Hartford	M	98	6. 1	5. 2	4. 2	6. 5
New Haven	M	96	6. 3	5. 3	4. 3	6. 6
New London	M	35	7. 0	5. 8	4. 0	8. 4
Other Four Counties	M	72	6. 5	5. 4	4. 2	7. 0
Conn.	M	379	6. 0	5. 0	4. 5	5. 6

Age-adjusted directly to the U.S. 1970 standard million.

Estimated limits in the range of variation from the observed age-adjusted rate expected at a probability of 95%.

Includes 10 tumors for state residents, county unknown.

The 95% confidence limits are outside those for the Conn. age-adjusted rate.

 $^{^{5}}$ The 99% confidence limits (not shown) are outside those for the Conn. age-adjusted rate.

County	Tumors	Crude Rate	Age Observed ¹	- adj usted <u>95%</u> Cor Lower	Rate nfidence ² Upper
	Tumors		observed		оррег
	<u>U</u>	<u>terine</u> <u>Cer</u>	<u>vix (53.0-53.</u>	<u>9)</u>	
Fai rfi el d	154	8. 9	7. 1	6. 0	8. 4
Hartford	162	9. 4	7. 3	6. 2	8. 6
New Haven	179	10. 9	8. 7	7. 4	10. 2
New London	51	10. 2	8. 4	6. 2	11. 4
Li tchfi el d	28	7. 7	6. 0	3. 9	9. 4
Mi ddl esex	29	9. 6	7. 6	5. 0	11.6
Other Two	29	6. 1	5. 0	3. 3	7. 5
Counti es	000	0.4	~ 4	0.0	0 1
Conn.	632	9. 4	7. 4	6. 8	8. 1
	<u>Cor</u>	<u>pus, Uteru</u>	s <u>Nos</u> (54.0-5	<u>5. 9)</u>	
Fai rfi el d	557	32. 3	24. 3	22. 2	26. 5
Hartford	484	28. 1	21. 2	19. 3	23. 4
New Haven	605	36. 8	29. 3 ³	26. 9	31. 9
New London	184	30. 8 37. 0	30. 3	25. 9	31. 9 35. 4
Li tchfi el d	111	30. 3	23. 5	19. 1	29. 0
			33. 1 ³		
Mi ddl esex Tol l and	118 61	39.0 23.5	33. 1 23. 5	27. 1 17. 8	40. 3 30. 6
Wi ndham	53	23. 5 24. 8	23. 3 24. 0	17. 6 17. 7	30. 6 32. 0
vvi iiuiialli	J3	∠4. 0	£4. U	17.7	3£. U
Conn.	2173	32. 3	25. 4	24. 3	26. 5

Age-adjusted directly to the U.S. 1970 standard million.
 Estimated limits in the range of variation from the observed age-adjusted rate expected at a probability of 95%.
 The 95% confidence limits are outside those for the Conn. age-adjusted rate.

Table 13 Incidence Rates/100,000 of Invasive Tumors, by County, Site, Sex, 1995-98 Ovary, Other Female Genital, All Races

		Crude	Age	- adj usted 95% Co	Rate nfidence ²
County	Tumors	Rate	0bserved ¹	Lower	Upper
		<u>0vary</u>	<u>(56. 9)</u>		
Fairfield Hartford New Haven New London Litchfield Middlesex Tolland Windham	318 314 294 78 62 63 37 34	18. 4 18. 2 17. 9 15. 7 16. 9 20. 8 14. 2 15. 9	14. 3 13. 9 14. 0 13. 1 13. 6 15. 6 13. 2 13. 3	12. 7 12. 3 12. 4 10. 2 10. 2 11. 8 9. 1 9. 1	16. 1 15. 7 15. 9 16. 7 18. 1 20. 7 18. 7 19. 2
Conn.	1200	17. 8	14.0	13. 2	14. 9
	<u>Other</u> Fem	ale <u>Genital,</u> (51.0-52.9	<u>Excluding Ut</u> 9. 57. 0-58. 9)	erus, <u>0</u> va	ry ³
Fairfield Hartford New Haven New London Other Four Counties	72 94 83 35 43	4. 2 5. 5 5. 0 7. 0 3. 8	3. 0 3. 7 3. 6 4. 8 2. 6	2. 3 2. 9 2. 8 3. 3 1. 8	3. 9 4. 6 4. 6 7. 1 3. 6
Conn.	327	4. 9	3. 3	3. 0	3. 8

Age-adjusted directly to the U.S. 1970 standard million.
Estimated limits in the range of variation from the observed age-adjusted rate expected at a probability of 95%.

Includes vulva, vagina, fallopian tube, ligaments, other specified, genital nos.

				Age-	adjusted R	
			Crude		<u>95%</u> Con	<u>fi dence²</u>
County	Sex	Tumors	Rate	0bserved ¹	Lower	Upper
			All Races			
Fai rfi el d	M	292	18. 2	15. 8	14. 0	17. 8
Hartford	M	253	15. 9	13. 7	12. 0	15. 6
New Haven	M	301	19. 7	17. 7	15. 7	19. 9
New London	M	73	14. 5	14. 1	11. 0	17. 9
Li tchfi el d	M	64	18. 1	16. 2	12. 4	21. 2
Mi ddl esex	M	53	18. 2	17. 5	13. 0	23. 2
Tol l and	M	33	12. 7	14. 3	9. 8	20. 4
Wi ndham	M	38	18. 5	18. 4	12. 9	25. 6
Conn.	M	1107	17. 5	15. 7	14. 7	16. 6
Fai rfi el d	F	177	10. 3	7. 4	6. 3	8. 7
Hartford	F	168	9. 8	7. 1	6. 0	8. 4
New Haven	F	192	11. 7	8. 5	7. 2	9. 9
New London	F	52	10. 4	7. 9	5. 8	10. 7
Litchfield	F	32	8. 7	6.6	4. 3	10. 1
Mi ddl esex	F	31	10. 2	6.6	4. 3	10. 1
Other Two	F	50	10. 6	9. 1	6. 6	12. 3
Counti es Conn.	F	702	10. 4	7. 6	7. 0	8. 3
F-:C:-1.1	T	400	1.4.1	11 0	10.0	10.0
Fairfield	T	469	14. 1	11. 2	10. 2	12. 3
Hartford	T	421	12. 7	10.0	9. 0	11. 1
New Haven	T	493	15. 5	12. 6	11. 5	13. 8
New London	T	125	12. 5	10. 7	8. 9	12. 9
Litchfield	T	96	13. 3	11. 1	8. 9	13. 8
Mi ddl esex	T	84	14. 2	11.8	9. 3	14. 9
Tol l and	T	57	11.0	11. 1	8. 3	14. 5
Wi ndham	T	64	15. 3	13. 7	10. 5	17. 9
Conn.	T	1809	13. 8	11. 2	10. 7	11.8

Age-adjusted directly to the U.S. 1970 standard million.
 Estimated limits in the range of variation from the observed age-adjusted rate expected at a probability of 95%.

Incidence Rates/100,000 of Invasive Tumors, by County, Site, Sex 1995-98 Bladder $(67.0\text{-}67.9)^1$

			Crude	Age- a		ate fi dence ³
County	Sex	Tumors	Rate	$0bserved^2$	Lower	Upper
			All Race	 <u>S</u>		
Fai rfi el d	M	624	38. 9	33. 4	30. 8	36. 2
Hartford	M	670	42. 0	34. 7	32. 1	37. 6
New Haven	M	682	44. 7	37. 9	35. 0	40. 9
New London	M	198	39. 4	38. 1	32. 9	44. 0
Li tchfi el d	M	165	46. 5	38. 7	32. 9	45. 5
Mi ddl esex	M	122	42. 0	37. 5	31. 0	45. 2
Tol l and	M	80	30. 7	33. 7	26 . 7	42. 3
Wi ndham	M	77	37. 5	37. 6	29. 5	47. 3
Conn.	M	2618	41. 3	35. 7	34. 4	37. 2
Fai rfi el d	F	253	14. 7	10. 0	8. 7	11. 5
Hartford	F	246	14. 3	8. 7	7. 6	10. 1
New Haven	F	291	17. 7	11. 4	10. 1	13. 0
New London	F	87	17. 5	13. 0	10. 3	16. 5
Litchfield	F	50	13. 7	9. 7	7. 0	13. 5
Mi ddl esex	F	49	16. 2	12. 2	8. 9	16. 9
Tol l and	F	33	12. 7	10. 5	7. 0	15. 4
Wi ndham	F	19	*	*	*	*
Conn.	F	1028	15. 3	10. 2	9. 5	10. 9
Fai rfi el d	Т	877	26. 3	19. 9	18. 6	21. 4
Hartford	Ť	916	27. 6	20. 0	18. 6	21. 4
New Haven	Ť	973	30. 7	22. 6	21. 1	$\frac{21.4}{24.2}$
New London	Ť	285	28. 5	23. 7	20. 9	26. 8
Li tchfi el d	Ť	215	29. 8	22. 3	19. 3	25. 9
Mi ddl esex	Ť	171	28. 8	22. 9	19. 4	26. 9
Toll and	Ť	113	21. 7	21.3	17. 4	25. 8
Wi ndham	Ť	96	22. 9	19. 8	15. 9	24. 5
Conn.	T	3646	27. 9	21. 1	20. 4	21. 9

Includes in situ tumors.
 Age-adjusted directly to the U.S. 1970 standard million.
 Estimated limits in the range of variation from the observed age-adjusted rate expected at a probability of 95%.
 * The standard error of the age-adjusted rate is 20% or higher.

Table 16 Incidence Rates /100,000 of Invasive Tumors, by County, Site, Sex, 1995-98 Brain, Cranial Nerves, Cerebral Meninges, All Races $(70.\,0,70.\,9,\ 71.\,0\text{-}\,71.\,9,\ 72.\,2\text{-}\,72.\,5)$

County	Sex	Tumors	Crude Rate	Age Observed ¹	e-adj usted <u>95% Confi</u> Lower	
		Brain, Cranial	<u>Nerves,</u>	Cerebral Men	<u>ni nges</u>	
Fai rfi el d	M	132	8. 2	7. 6	6. 3	9. 1
Hartford	M	103	6. 5	5. 8	4. 7	7. 1
New Haven	M	122	8. 0	7. 2	5. 9	8. 7
New London	M	33	6. 6	6. 4	4. 4	9. 2
Li tchfi el d	M	33	9. 3	8. 6	5.8	12. 6
Mi ddl esex	M	28	9. 6	9. 4	6. 2	14. 0
Other Two Counties	M	36	7. 7	7. 8	5. 4	11. 0
Conn.	M	487	7. 7	7. 1	6. 4	7. 7
Fai rfi el d	F	88	5. 1	4. 2	3. 3	5. 4
Hartford	F	111	6. 4	5. 2	4. 2	6. 4
New Haven	F	97	5. 9	4. 9	3. 9	6. 2
New London	F	26	5. 2	4. 1	2. 6	6. 3
Other Four Counties	F	70	6. 1	5. 2	4. 0	6. 7
Conn.	F	392	5.8	4. 8	4. 3	5. 4
		<u>Br</u>	<u>ain (71.</u>	<u>0-71. 9)</u>		
Fai rfi el d	M	129	8. 0	7. 4	6. 1	8. 9
Hartford	M	102	6. 4	5. 7	4. 7	7. 0
New Haven	M	118	7. 7	6. 9	5. 7	8. 4
New London	M	32	6. 4	6. 2	4. 2	8. 9
Litchfield	M	33	9. 3	8. 6	5. 8	12. 6
Mi ddl esex	M	28	9. 6	9. 4	6. 2	14. 0
Other Two	M	35	7. 5	7. 5	5. 2	10. 7
Counti es						
Conn.	M	477	7. 5	6. 9	6. 3	7. 6
Fai rfi el d	F	87	5. 0	4. 2	3. 3	5. 3
Hartford	F	104	6. 0	4. 9	3. 9	6. 1
New Haven	F	95	5.8	4. 8	3. 8	6. 1
New London	F	26	5. 2	4. 1	2. 6	6. 3
Other Four Counties	F	67	5. 9	4. 9	3. 7	6. 5
Conn.	F	379	5.6	4. 7	4. 2	5. 2

 $^{^1}$ Age-adjusted directly to the U.S. 1970 standard million. 2 Estimated limits in the range of variation from the observed age-adjusted rate expected at a probability of 95%.

 $\begin{array}{c} {\rm Tabl\,e\ 17} \\ {\rm I\,nci\,dence\ Rates/100,\,000\ of\ I\,nvasi\,ve\ Tumors,\ by\ County,\ Site,\ Sex,\ 1995-98} \\ {\rm Lymphomas,\ All\ Races\ (morphology\ 9590-9715)}^{\,1} \end{array}$

			Crude	Age- a	adjusted Ra <u>95% Confi</u>	
County	Sex	Tumors	Rate	0bserved ²	Lower	Upper
	Non-	<u>Hodgki n' s</u>	(morphol ogy	<u>9590-9595,</u> <u>9</u>	9670-9715)	
Fai rfi el d	M	336	20. 9	17. 9	16. 0	20. 0
Hartford	M	399	25 . 0	21. 1	19. 1	23. 4
New Haven	M	414	27. 1	23. 5	21. 2	25. 9
New London	M	107	21. 3	20. 1	16. 5	24. 5
Litchfield	M	90	25. 4	21.6	17. 3	27. 1
Mi ddl esex	M	57	19. 6	17. 3	13. 0	22. 8
Tolland	M	56	21. 5	22. 0	16. 5	28. 9
Wi ndham	M	44	21. 5	21. 2	15. 3	28. 8
Conn.	M	1504^{4}	23. 7	20. 6	19. 5	21. 7
Fai rfi el d	F	371	21. 5	15. 4	13. 8	17. 2
Hartford	\mathbf{F}	362	21. 0	14. 4	12. 8	16. 1
New Haven	F	364	22. 1	15. 0	13. 4	16. 9
New London	F	90	18. 1	13. 7	10. 8	17. 2
Li tchfi el d	F	63	17. 2	12. 3	9. 3	16. 5
Mi ddl esex	F	66	21. 8	14. 6	11. 0	19. 5
Tol l and	\mathbf{F}	34	13. 1	11. 7	8. 0	16. 8
Wi ndham	F	31	14. 5	10. 8	7. 1	16. 1
Conn.	F	1381	20. 5	14. 5	13. 7	15. 3
		<u>Hodgk</u>	in's (morph	ol ogy 9650-96	<u>667)</u>	
Fai rfi el d	M	58	3. 6	3. 2	2. 4	4. 3
Hartford	M	66	4. 1	3.8	2. 9	5. 0
New Haven	M	64	4. 2	4. 3	3. 3	5. 6
Other Five Counties	M	51	3. 2	2. 9	2. 1	3. 8
Conn.	M	239	3. 8	3. 6	3. 1	4. 1
Fai rfi el d	F	60	3. 5	3. 6	2. 7	4. 8
Hartford	\mathbf{F}	63	3. 7	3. 6	2. 7	4. 7
New Haven	\mathbf{F}	42	2. 6	2. 5	1. 7	3. 5
Other Five	F	45	2. 7	2. 5	1. 8	3. 5
Counti es Conn.	F	210	3. 1	3. 0	2. 6	3. 5

Includes any site within this morphological range.
 Age-adjusted directly to the U.S. 1970 standard million.
 Estimated limits in the range of variation from the observed age-adjusted rate expected at a probability of 95%.
 Include 1 tumor for a state resident, county unknown.

			Crude	Ag		d Rate nfidence ³
County	Sex	Tumors	Rate	$0bserved^2$	95% Co. Lower	Upper
						———
		<u>Leukemi a</u>	a (morphol	ogy 9800-9941)_	
Fai rfi el d	M	238	14. 8	13. 3	11.6	15. 2
Hartford	M	280	17. 5	15. 1	13. 4	17. 1
New Haven	M	206	13. 5	11. 7	10. 1	13. 5
New London	M	64	12. 7	11. 9	9. 1	15. 4
Li tchfi el d	M	48	13. 5	12. 1	8. 8	16. 5
Mi ddl esex	M	40	13. 8	14. 0	9. 9	19. 4
Tol l and	M	30	11. 5	12. 2	8. 1	17. 8
Wi ndham	M	41	20. 0	20. 3 ⁴	14. 5	28. 0
VII II	112		20.0			20.0
Conn.	M	947	14. 9	13. 4	12. 5	14. 3
Fai rfi el d	F	172	10. 0	7. 5	6. 4	8. 9
Hartford	F	208	12. 1	8. 9	7. 6	10. 4
New Haven	F	164	10. 0	7. 5	6. 3	9. 0
New London	F	54	10. 9	8. 2	6. 1	11. 1
Litchfield	F	43	11. 8	9. 2	6. 4	13. 2
Mi ddl esex	F	39	12. 9	8. 8	6. 0	12. 9
Other Two	F	48	10. 1	8. 6	6. 2	11. 7
Counties	-	10	10. 1	0. 0	0. 2	11. /
Conn.	F	728	10. 8	8. 1	7. 5	8. 8
		Multiple Mye	eloma (mor	phology 9731-	9732)	
T . 0. 1.1	3.5					
Fai rfi el d	M	99	6. 2	5. 3	4. 3	6. 5
Hartford	M	108	6. 8	5. 7	4. 7	7. 0
New Haven	M	90	5. 9	4. 7	3.8	5. 9
New London	M	28	5. 6	5. 3	3. 5	7.8
Li tchfi el d	M	34	9. 6	7. 9	5. 4	11. 5
Other Three	M	34	4. 5	4. 6	3. 2	6. 6
Counti es						
Conn.	M	393	6. 2	5. 4	4.8	5. 9
Fai rfi el d	F	90	5. 2	3. 7	2. 9	4. 7
Hartford	F	98	5. 7	3. 6	2. 9	4. 6
New Haven	F	93	5. 7	3. 6	2. 9	4. 6
Other Five	F	90	5. 5	3. 9	3. 1	4. 9
Counti es	-					_, _
Conn.	\mathbf{F}	371	5. 5	3. 7	3. 3	4. 2

Tumors primarily of bone marrow (42.1).
 Age-adjusted directly to the U.S. 1970 standard million.
 Estimated limits in the range of variation from the observed age-adjusted rate expected at a probability of 95%.
 The 95% confidence limits are outside those for the Conn. age-adjusted rate.

$\begin{array}{c} & \text{Appendi\,x Tabl\,e A-1} \\ \text{Average Annual Estimated Connecticut Population,} \\ & \text{By County and Sex, } 1995\text{-}98^1 \end{array}$

County	<u>Mal e</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Total</u>
Fai rfi el d	401456	431188	832644
Hartford	398930	430617	829547
New Haven	381330	411434	792764
New London	125725	124417	250142
Li tchfi el d	88628	91455	180083
Mi ddl esex	72693	75683	148376
Tol l and	65180	64937	130117
Wi ndham	51274	53402	104676
Conn.	1585216	1683133	3268349

 $^{^{\}rm 1}$ Based on estimated annual populations from the U.S. Census Bureau.

APPENDIXTable A-2. Connecticut Counties by Town

	<u>Fairfield</u>	<u>Hartford</u>	New Haven
1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10. 11. 12. 13. 14. 15. 16. 17. 18. 19. 20. 21. 22. 23. 24. 25. 26. 27. 28.	Bethel Bridgeport Brookfield Danbury Darien Easton Fairfield Greenwich Monroe New Canaan New Fairfield Newtown Norwalk Redding Ridgefield Shelton Sherman Stamford Stratford Trumbull Westport Weston Wilton	Avon Berlin Bloomfield Bristol Burlington Canton East Granby East Hartford East Windsor Enfield Farmington Glastonbury Granby Hartford Hartland Manchester Marlborough New Britain Newington Plainville Rocky Hill Simsbury South Windsor Suffield West Hartford Wethersfield Windsor	Ansonia Beacon Falls Bethany Branford Cheshire Derby East Haven Guilford Hamden Madison Meriden Middlebury Milford Naugatuck New Haven North Branford North Haven Orange Oxford Prospect Seymour Southbury Wallingford Waterbury West Haven Wolcott Woodbridge
29.		Windsor Locks	

APPENDIX

Table A-2. Connecticut Counties by Town (Cont.d)

	Novelondon	Litabiliald	Middlesey
1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10. 11. 12. 13.	New London Bozrah Colchester East Lyme Franklin Griswold Groton Lebanon Ledyard Lisbon Lyme Montville New London North Stonington Norwich	Litchfield Barkhamsted Bethlehem Bridgewater Canaan Colebrook Cornwall Goshen Harwinton Kent Litchfield Morris New Hartford New Milford Norfolk	Middlesex Chester Clinton Cromwell Deep River Durham East Haddam East Hampton Essex Haddam Killingworth Middlefield Middletown Old Saybrook Portland
14. 15. 16. 17. 18. 19. 20. 21. 22. 23. 24. 25. 26.	Old Lyme Preston Salem Sprague Stonington Voluntown Waterford Tolland	North Canaan Plymouth Roxbury Salisbury Sharon Thomaston Torrington Warren Washington Watertown Winchester Woodbury Windham	Westbrook
1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10. 11. 12. 13. 14.	Andover Bolton Columbia Coventry Ellington Hebron Mansfield Somers Stafford Tolland Union Vernon Willington	Ashford Brooklyn Canterbury Chaplin Eastford Hampton Killingly Plainfield Pomfret Putnam Scotland Sterling Thompson Windham Woodstock	