Cancer Incidence in Connecticut Counties, 1990-2002



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

Release Date: March, 2006

CANCER INCIDENCE IN CONNECTICUT COUNTIES, 1990-2002

CONNECTICUT TUMOR REGISTRY

CONNECTICUT DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH

P. O. BOX 340308

410 CAPITOL AVENUE, MS# 13TMR

HARTFORD, CT 06134-0308

MARCH 2006

This work was supported in part by Contract NO1-PC-35133 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

Introduction	1
Data Sources, Methods	1-2
Summary, All Sites	2
Summary by Site	2-3
Rate Comparison: Black/White Ratios	3
Comments: Some Interpretations of the Data	3
References	3
Tabl es	
(1) All Sites	4-5
(2) Lung, Bronchus, Trachea	6
(3) Prostate	7
(4) Female Breast	8
(5) Colon, Rectum, Anus	9
(6) Col on	10
(7) Rectum, Anus	11
(8) Bl adder	12
(9) Ki dney	13
(10) Uterine Cervix, Corpus	14
(11) Stomach	15
(12) Leukemi a	16
(13) Lymphoma	17
(14) Pancreas	18
(15) Oral Cavity, Pharynx	19
(16) Ovary, Thyroid	20
(17) Myel oma	21
(18) Incidence Rate Ratios, Black-to-White	22-23
<u>Appendix A</u> - Computation of Incidence Rates, Standard Errors and a Test for Differences in Rates.	24
Appendix B - Obtaining 95% Confidence Limits for Incidence Rates.	25-26
Appendix C - Tumors by Race, Sex, Period of Diagnosis.	27
$\frac{\text{Appendix D}}{\text{Of Diagnosis}} \text{ - Population Estimates by County, Race, Sex, Period } \\ 0 \text{f Diagnosis}.$	28

Introduction

This is the fourth monograph presenting cancer incidence data for Connecticut residents by county. It covers the reporting periods 1990-1997 and 1998-2002. The tables have incidence rates by county, site, period and sex for all races combined and separately for white and black residents. Tables 1-6 also have rates for other specified races combined. Appendices C and D have listings of tumors and county population estimates, respectively, by race, sex and period. Towns in each county can be found in a previous incidence monograph for Conn. counties during the years 1995-98, located on the State of Conn. website at http://www.dph.state.ct.us/.

The Conn. Tumor Registry, as a participating member, submits each year a tumor incidence file for state residents to the SEER (Surveillance, Epidemiology and and End Results) program of the National Cancer Institute. The current file includes tumors reported up to Nov. of 2004. The registry obtained internet access to this file from SEER, supplemented with population estimates and software (SEER*Stat) to compute incidence rates, standard errors and 95% confidence intervals (not included in the tables). Populations for the intercensal years were revised by the U.S. Census Bureau, which also made the projected estimates to 2002.

<u>Data Sources</u>, <u>Methods</u>

Invasive tumors newly-reported by Conn. hospitals and diagnostic laboratories for the 13-year period, 1990-2002 comprised the major sources (about 98%) of new primaries. Available reports of cancers diagnosed for state residents at out-of-state facilities are also included. Less than 2% of the cases came only from death certificates that included cancer as a contributing cause, or from reports of tumors that were diagnosed after death by autopsy. Skin tumors, if of a non-epithelial histology, or of any type and occurring in a genital site, are included. With the exception of the bladder, "in situ" tumors are excluded. Bladder "in situ" tumors have been found difficult to distinguish from those that are found to be malignant by pathological analysis. In previous reports cystadenomas of the ovary were counted as malignant. Under current rules these tumors are classified as of uncertain malignancy. This change removed over 360 ovarian tumors from malignant status, which were diagnosed in the 13-year period.

It is not uncommon for a person to be diagnosed with more than one tumor of the same or different site at one or more times. Among the 232,205 tumors reported for the 13-year period, about 20% were ones representing second or subsequent primary tumors diagnosed for an individual. Detailed guidelines are followed in these cases to insure the existence of a new tumor.

The 17 tables of incidence rates have data for all the major sites and several others also. As in earlier reports, tumors of any site having a lymphoma histology are combined and not shown by site. The tables include numbers of tumors, crude and adjusted rates per 100,000 population, with standard errors for the latter. Rates with standard errors (SE's) greater than 20% and less than 25% are marked; those with SE'S of 25% or more are not shown.

The standard error of an incidence rate measures the variation in the rate expected to occur, due primarily to chance factors, if the population at risk were to be sampled at different times with no change in the underlying risk. The standard error varies inversely with the size of the population.

Age-adjusted rates that show changes at or below the 5% probability level are also marked in the tables. For age adjustment, the U.S. standard million population for 2000 was selected. The age-specific incidence rates for many tumor sites rise with increasing age. The higher the concentration of a population at older ages, the higher the crude rate (total tumors divided by the population at risk) will usually be. To allow for differences in age composition, the age-adjusted rate is obtained by taking a weighted average of the age-specific rates. The result is comparable to rates, age-adjusted with the same standard, for populations structured differently by age, including those for residents of the same geographic area at another period. Computing formulas for incidence rates, standard errors, 95% confidence intervals and a test of the "significance" of the county and state rate changes are in Appendices A and B.

The rates for colon cancer by sex for the state provide an example of why age-adjustment is needed. The crude rates in the study period were about 3% higher for women but, because of the high concentration of cases at the oldest age groups in the population, where women outnumber men and are at generally lower risk of this tumor, their age-adjusted rate was about 25% below that of males. For purposes of analysis, only the age-adjusted incidence rates are referenced in this report.

The incidence rate ratios, blacks compared to whites, are shown in Table 18 for each site and principally, but not exclusively, for the 3 largest counties, Fairfield, Hartford and New Haven. Appendix B can be used to obtain 95% confidence limits for the incidence rates by use of adjusting factors for the number of tumors diagnosed. Appendix C shows diagnosed tumors by race, including those for specified races other than white and black (SEER coding).

Summary, All Sites (Table 1)

During the years 1990-97 the age-adjusted incidence rate/100,000 per year for males, all sites and all races combined, was 607. Subsequently, during 1998-02, the rate declined to 598. The comparable rates among females were 440 and 450. By county and sex the rate for male residents ranged from 621 in Hartford to 582 in Litchfield during 1990-97. The high and low rates in the subsequent 5 years for males occurred in Tolland and Windham Counties, 620 and 575, respectively. New London County had the highest rates for females in each reporting period, 460 and 477. During 1990-97 Windham had the lowest female rate of 414 with Hartford and Tolland Counties each at the low rate of 433 for the 1998-02 diagnosis period.

The incidence rates among those of the white race were within 1-2% of the rates for all races combined due to the racial make-up of the state, which was 88%, white, and 12% black and all other races combined, at the time of the 2000 U.S. census. With one exception, the highest age-adjusted rates in each reporting period, by the 5 single counties for whites and blacks of Table 1, were for black males. Among black residents, the highest rate in the 5 counties listed separately was for New Haven County in each diagnosis period. For the counties of Litchfield, Tolland and Windham, the combined rate for black males increased by 8.5% from 1990-97 to 1998-02 while the total Conn. rate for this racial group decreased by 13.1%.

In each period of diagnosis, the age-adjusted rates, ranked in decreasing order, for all counties combined, were those for black males, white males, white females and black females with the lowest rates computed for all other races combined, among males, and lastly, females. For males in the state, the rate for blacks exceeded that for whites by 22% in the 1990-97 period and by 7% in 1998-02. By comparison, the rates for black females were 11% and 16% less than those for whites females, respectively, in the 2 reporting periods at all sites combined.

Among the 2 major races black males had the largest decline in the invasive tumor rate from 1990-97 to 1998-02, one of 13%. This decline was in contrast to decreases of just over 1% for white males and of about 4% for black females. By comparison, the rate for white females rose by less than 1% while the rate for the combined other races was higher by 18% among males and by 22% for females.

Summary by Site (Tables 2-17)

The changes in the rates, plus and minus, from 1990-97 to 1998-02, by site, are labeled \underline{stable} (0- 4.9%), $\underline{moderate}$ (5.0- 9.9%) and \underline{high} (10.0% and above). For white females, thyroid and kidney had high rates of increase, the former site by over 60%. Stomach, cervix and the oral cavity and pharynx sites showed high rates of decline while ovarian tumors declined at a moderate rate. Breast cancer was relatively stable, increasing by less than 3% among whites. Thyroid, rectal and lymphatic tumors increased at high rates for black females, who also had high rates of decline for the stomach, cervix, pancreas and ovary.

Among males of both major races in the state, kidney tumors rose at high rates from 1990-97 to 1998-02, by over 28% for blacks who also had declines in their age-adjusted rates at high levels for lung, colon, bladder, lymphomas and tumors of the oral cavity and pharynx. White males showed a moderate rate of decline for oral and pharynx and for lung, colon and rectum. This degree of decrease in the study period was also seen for the prostate, stomach, rectum and pancreas among black males.

Rate Comparison: Black/White Ratios (Table 18)

The black-to-white ratios of the age-adjusted rates are listed in Table 18 by county, period, site and sex. For males those sites with the highest ratios for the 13-year period were myeloma and stomach, 1.95 and 1.86, respectively. Thyroid at 0.44 and bladder, 0.43, were lowest for males. Females had high levels of this ratio for stomach, cervix and myeloma, 1.66, 1.78 and 2.21. Ratios of 0.62, bladder, 0.64, corpus, 0.56, thyroid and 0.49 for the ovary were lowest for females reflecting black incidence rates at these sites well below the corresponding rates for white females in the study period.

Table 18 also gives black/white ratios for 1990-97 and 1998-02. By site, the ratio increased for kidney and stomach for males with no change in Leukemia. Decreased ratios occurred at the other sites for males. Among females, the black-to-white ratio of the age-adjusted rates rose in the study period for lung, colon, rectum and Lymphoma and decreased for the remaining sites. The ratio for myeloma among females was essentially stable. Standard errors were omitted for these ratios.

Comments: Some Interpretations of the Data

In noting changes in the rates that show a probability of a chance occurrence below the 5% level, it is also useful to consider the amount and rate of change. The rates for kidney tumors among males (Table 9) provide an example. In the state, the age-adjusted rate for white males rose "significantly" (p<.05) from 17.3 to 19.2 as the black rate increased from 14.8 to 19.0 from 1990-97 to 1998-02. While not significant at 5%, the percentage increase for black males of 28% was well above that for white males, 11%. The explanation for this is the difference in the size of the standard errors, which were 4 times greater for blacks because of the difference in the populations at risk. This demonstrates that whether an observed change in a rate has less than a 5% probability of occurring by chance may depend on the size of the population at risk. Taken further, an observed rate difference at this level of "statistical significance" may not always be sufficient for assessing the importance of the change.

Results from epidemiological studies indicate that the rates for some cancer sites correlate with levels of socioeconomic status variables. The studies have found a gradient in the cancer rate among the levels of variables of this type. The black-to-white incidence rate ratios of Table 18 show that either race, depending on the site, can have the higher cancer rate in comparison to the other race. While the Conn. ratios were not tested for "statistical significance", the diversity and the range in these ratios argue for multiple contributing factors including, presumably, some that are related to socioeconomic status.

References

- 1 Haenszel, Loveland and Sirken; Lung Cancer Mortality White Males Journal of The National Cancer Institute, vol.28, no. 4, April, 1962.
- 2 Fay MP AND Feuer EJ Confidence Intervals for Directly Standardized Rates A Method Based on the Gamma Distribution *Statistics in Medicine* vol.16 1957.

Table 1 Incidence of Invasive Tumors, Rates/100,000, by County, Race, Sex, 1990-2002 All Sites $\left(00.0\text{-}80.9\right)^1$

<u>County</u>	<u>Tumors</u>	Crude <u>Rate</u>	Age-adj us <u>Observed</u>		<u>Tumors</u>	Crude <u>Rate</u>	Age-adj usted <u>Observed²</u>	Rate <u>SE³</u>
		<u> 1990-19</u>	997			<u> 1998 -</u>	2002	
				All Rac	ces ⁴ - <u>Male</u>			
Fairfield Hartford New Haven New London Litchfield Middlesex Tolland Windham Conn. ⁵	17783 19141 17743 5144 3791 2968 2182 2005 70770	547. 6 585. 5 571. 0 502. 2 546. 6 519. 5 419. 5 487. 2 551. 0	604. 1 620. 8 609. 7 603. 6 581. 6 584. 3 582. 9 593. 4 606. 6	4. 6 4. 6 8. 7 9. 6 10. 9 13. 1 13. 5 2. 3	12222 12341 11135 3492 2639 2181 1707 1338 47071	573. 598. 561. 544. 589. 575. 495. 496.	3 604.4* 1 581.0* 1 592.5 9 585.0 2 596.5 8 619.6 3 574.8	5. 6 5. 5 5. 5 10. 1 11. 5 12. 9 15. 5 15. 9 2. 8
				All Races	s ⁴ - <u>Female</u>			
Fairfield Hartford New Haven New London Litchfield Middlesex Tolland Windham	17690 17327 17758 5016 3566 2984 1990 1892	506. 3 491. 1 527. 6 489. 9 492. 1 496. 8 382. 8 440. 6	447. 5 422. 2 454. 1 459. 8 425. 2 441. 6 428. 7 413. 7	3. 4 3. 3 3. 5 6. 6 7. 2 8. 2 9. 6 9. 7	11753 11594 11846 3484 2578 2090 1450 1318	515. 520. 552. 532. 551. 524. 422. 476.	9 432.5 6 467.4* 3 476.5 0 451.6* 5 443.2 7 432.9	4. 2 4. 1 4. 4 8. 1 9. 0 9. 8 11. 4 12. 1
Conn. ⁵	68232	498. 5	440. 1	1. 7	46132	524.	7 450.4*	2. 1
				<u>Whi te</u>	- <u>Mal e</u>			
Fairfield Hartford New Haven New London Middlesex Other Three Counties	16351 17530 16357 4937 2880 7825	579. 1 622. 7 605. 5 524. 4 536. 2 499. 1	598. 0 613. 2 602. 2 605. 0 582. 5 583. 7	4. 8 4. 7 4. 8 8. 9 11. 0 6. 7	11081 11110 10091 3308 2101 5527	607. 643. 599. 574. 595. 545.	4 599. 2 9 574. 0* 4 595. 0 3 594. 8	5. 8 5. 7 5. 7 10. 4 13. 1 8. 0
Conn. ⁵	65891	578. 7	600.6	2. 4	43234	602.	5 593.3	2. 9
				Whi te	- <u>Femal e</u>			
Fairfield Hartford New Haven New London Middlesex Other Three Counties	16418 16141 16509 4846 2902 7350	543. 9 531. 5 566. 3 512. 4 513. 6 451. 9	453. 4 428. 2 457. 8 464. 7 442. 9 422. 9	3. 6 3. 5 3. 7 6. 8 8. 4 5. 0	10713 10614 10848 3324 2027 5248	555. 569. 599. 561. 546. 500.	6 440.5* 9 473.3* 0 481.2 1 446.8	4. 5 4. 4 4. 7 8. 4 10. 1 6. 2
Conn. ⁵	64172	530. 0	444. 4	1.8	42790	561.	9 456.0	2. 2

(footnotes shown on second page of table)

Table 1 (cont.) Incidence of Invasive Tumors, Rates/100,000, by County, Race, Sex, 1990-2002 All Sites $(00.0-80.9)^1$

<u>County</u>	Cr <u>Tumors</u>	ude Age <u>Rate</u>	e-adj usted <u>Observed²</u>	Rate <u>SE³</u>	Cr <u>Tumors</u>	rude Ag <u>Rate</u>	e-adj usted <u>Observed²</u>	Rate <u>SE³</u>
		1990	<u>-1997</u>			1998-2	002	
				BI ack	<u> - Male</u>			
Fairfield Hartford New Haven New London Middlesex Other Three Counties	1249 1434 1275 164 76	381. 3 379. 8 373. 8 278. 3 298. 0 242. 9	733. 8 732. 5 749. 0 684. 2 746. 9 638. 4	23. 5 21. 4 23. 7 68. 3 103. 8 89. 9	847 979 866 125 58 70	379. 0 362. 5 357. 2 281. 0 310. 8 256. 8	637. 2* 628. 6* 651. 0* 611. 3 603. 7 692. 7	23. 9 21. 7 24. 3 60. 3 90. 3 96. 6
Conn.	4274	367. 8	732. 1	12. 6	2945	356. 4	636. 1*	12.8
				BI ack	- <u>Female</u>			
Fai rfi el d Hartford New Haven New London Mi ddl esex Other Three Counti es `	1091 1040 1136 116 60 52	287. 7 251. 5 294. 8 218. 1 224. 7 236. 9	393. 5 373. 6 428. 3 379. 4 405. 0 428. 4	12. 3 11. 9 13. 0 37. 7 55. 9 62. 3	775 803 855 106 38 30	293. 8 272. 6 312. 4 265. 9 197. 8 159. 2	367. 8 360. 4 428. 8 397. 0 292. 0 353. 4	13. 5 13. 0 15. 0 40. 0 50. 4 68. 3
Conn.	3495	273. 1	396. 8	6. 9	2608 ⁵	286. 6	382. 4	7. 7
			<u>Other</u> S	Speci fi e	<u>ed Races</u> – <u>Ma</u>	<u>l e</u>		
Fairfield Hartford New Haven New London Other Four	124 113 79 26 37	129. 0 147. 6 122. 0 108. 2 106. 4	307. 7 369. 5 321. 5 186. 4 ⁶ 405. 1 ⁶	34. 5 41. 4 45. 7 46. 3 84. 0	148 158 97 42 40	174. 5 240. 3 162. 4 196. 3 140. 2	352. 5 468. 2 349. 8 360. 3* 360. 7	37. 0 44. 3 41. 0 69. 2 70. 0
Counties Conn.	379	127. 9	322. 3	20. 3	485	186. 4	380. 4*	20. 8
			<u>Other</u> Sp	oeci fi ed	<u> Races</u> – <u>Fem</u>	<u>al e</u>		
Fairfield Hartford New Haven New London Other Four	138 121 78 37 40	143. 1 156. 2 119. 8 147. 7 116. 6	252. 8 269. 8 222. 0 228. 8 264. 8 ⁶	26. 3 27. 3 28. 9 41. 8 58. 9	158 149 111 38 55	181. 0 219. 9 179. 8 172. 0 193. 5	262. 0 355. 1* 302. 6 261. 0 327. 1	24. 3 31. 6 32. 3 44. 3 53. 1
Counties Conn.	414	138. 8	248. 6	14. 2	511	191. 2	302.5*	15. 0

Numbers in parentheses are the site codes for "ICD-0" (<u>International Classification of Diseases For Oncology</u>). As in earlier monographs, in situ bladder tumors are included. Excluded are 374 tumors of "uncertain malignancy", previously classified as malignant and included in earlier monographs, primarily as cystadenomas of the ovary. Excluded also are epithelial type tumors of the skin which are non-reportable except for those occurring at genital sites. Other types of skin tumors are included.

² Age-adjusted directly to the U.S. 2000 standard million.

³ Standard error of the age-adjusted rate.

⁴ Includes tumors for persons not specified as to race.

⁵ Includes state residents for whom the county is not stated.

⁶ The standard error is between 20% and 25% of the observed rate.

^{*} P < .05 (compared to the observed rate in 1990-97).

Table 2 Incidence of Invasive Tumors, Rates/100,000, by County, Race, Sex, 1990-2002 Lung, Bronchus, Trachea (33.9-34.9)

<u>County</u>	<u>Tumors</u>	Crude <u>Rate</u>	Age-adjuste Observed ¹	ed Rate <u>SE²</u>	<u>Tumors</u>	Crude <u>Rate</u>	Age-adj ust <u>Observed¹</u>	ed Rate <u>SE²</u>
		<u> 1990-</u>	<u>-1997</u>			<u>199</u>	98- <u>2002</u>	
Fairfield Hartford New Haven New London Litchfield Middlesex Tolland Windham Conn.	2623 2870 2938 835 563 485 326 365 11005	80. 8 87. 8 94. 5 81. 5 81. 2 84. 9 62. 7 88. 7	88. 6 92. 7 100. 7 98. 2 85. 5 95. 8 88. 7 107. 0 94. 0	All Rac 1.8 1.9 3.5 3.7 4.4 5.1 5.7 0.9	1535 1776 1754 550 370 301 209 235 6735	72. 0 86. 1 88. 4 85. 7 79. 4 60. 7 67. 2 81. 5	78. 0* 87. 2* 91. 8* 93. 6 82. 5 84. 7 79. 0 101. 2 86. 3*	2. 0 2. 1 2. 2 4. 0 4. 3 4. 9 5. 6 6. 7 1. 1
Fairfield Hartford New Haven New London Litchfield Middlesex Tolland Windham Conn.	2104 2133 2371 645 411 388 260 228 8540	60. 2 60. 5 70. 4 63. 0 56. 7 64. 6 50. 0 53. 1 62. 4	52. 4 50. 9 59. 9 58. 7 48. 7 56. 6 56. 9 51. 2 54. 3	All Race 1.1 1.1 1.3 2.3 2.4 2.9 3.5 3.4 0.6	es ³ - Female 1322 1493 1573 512 338 268 197 186 5895 ⁴	57. 9 67. 1 73. 4 78. 2 72. 2 67. 3 57. 4 67. 1	50. 1 54. 4 61. 0 69. 5* 58. 9* 57. 1 60. 4 62. 2 56. 9*	1. 4 1. 4 1. 6 3. 1 3. 2 3. 5 4. 3 4. 6 0. 7
Fairfield Hartford New Haven Other five Conn.	2419 2636 2716 2496 10267	85. 7 93. 6 100. 5 81. 9 90. 2	87. 7 91. 2 99. 3 93. 9 92. 9	Whi to 1.8 1.8 1.9 1.9 0.9	e - <u>Mal e</u> 1400 1613 1603 1617 6238 ⁴	76. 7 93. 4 95. 3 83. 3 86. 9	77. 4* 86. 5* 90. 9* 88. 3 85. 8*	2. 1 2. 2 2. 3 2. 2 1. 1
Fairfield Hartford New Haven Other five Conn.	1977 2004 2232 1898 8111	65. 5 66. 0 76. 6 60. 5 67. 0	53. 3 51. 7 60. 7 55. 0 55. 1	White 1.2 1.2 1.3 1.3 0.6	- <u>Female</u> 1217 1382 1460 1470 5535 ⁴	63. 0 74. 2 80. 7 73. 0 72. 7	50. 8 55. 2 62. 0 63. 0* 57. 8*	1. 5 1. 5 1. 7 1. 7 0. 8
Fairfield Hartford New Haven Other five Conn.	194 226 210 61 691	59. 2 59. 9 61. 6 52. 7 59. 5	109. 4 118. 1 119. 9 143. 2 117. 3	8. 6 8. 7 9. 1 23. 5 4. 9	<u>k - Mal e</u> 118 149 144 35 446	52. 8 55. 2 59. 4 38. 7 54. 0	93. 9 100. 4 113. 1 82. 2* 100. 8*	9. 5 8. 9 10. 1 14. 5 5. 2
Fairfield Hartford New Haven Other five Conn.	120 120 133 24 397	31. 6 29. 0 34. 5 23. 6 31. 0	45. 7 44. 7 50. 2 43. 1 ⁵ 46. 5	Bl ack 4. 3 4. 2 4. 4 9. 2 2. 4	S - Female 93 100 108 27 328	35. 3 33. 9 39. 5 34. 7 36. 0	46. 3 47. 0 56. 9 58. 1 ⁵ 50. 6	4. 9 4. 8 5. 6 11. 6 2. 8
Conn Male Conn Femal	44 e 29	14. 9 9. 7		0ther Sp 6.9 5.6	<u>peci fi ed</u> <u>Race</u> 41 28	e <u>s</u> 15. 8 10. 5	45. 7 20. 6 ⁵	8. 4 4. 4

 $^{^{1}\,}$ Age-adjusted directly to the U.S. 2000 standard million. $^{2}\,$ Standard error of the age-adjusted rate.

³ Includes tumors for persons not specified as to race.

⁴ Includes state residents for whom the county is not stated. $^{\rm 5}$ The standard error is between 20% and 25% of the observed rate.

^{*} p <.05 (compared to the observed rate in 1990-97)

Table 3
Incidence of Invasive Tumors, Rates/100,000, by County, Race, 1990-2002
Prostate (61.9)

<u>County</u>	Cr <u>Tumors</u>	ude Ag <u>Rate</u>	ge-adj usted <u>Observed¹</u>			Cr <u>Tumors</u>	ude Ag <u>Rate</u>	e-adj usted <u>Observed¹</u>	
		<u>1</u>	990-1997				199	8-2002	
					All Rad	ces ³			
Fairfield Hartford New Haven New London Litchfield Middlesex Tolland Windham	5354 5884 4502 1424 1066 815 642 494	164. 9 180. 0 144. 9 129. 2 153. 7 142. 7 123. 4 120. 0	182. 7 189. 5 153. 4 166. 0 165. 4 162. 5 180. 3 152. 6	2. 6 2. 5 2. 3 4. 5 5. 1 5. 8 7. 4 7. 0		4153 3745 2899 972 728 667 553 329	194. 7 181. 6 146. 1 151. 4 162. 7 175. 9 160. 6 122. 0	206. 1* 182. 2 151. 9 164. 1 161. 4 182. 4* 204. 1* 144. 2	3. 2 3. 0 2. 8 5. 3 6. 0 7. 1 8. 9 8. 0
Conn. ⁴	20189	157. 2	173. 3	1. 2		14048	170. 0	177. 8*	1. 5
					<u>Whi te</u>				
Fairfield Hartford New Haven New London Other Four Counties	4866 5280 4097 1355 2964	172. 3 187. 6 151. 7 152. 4 140. 8	177. 3 181. 9 148. 3 164. 6 165. 1	2. 6 2. 5 2. 4 4. 6 3. 1		3658 3252 2556 900 2180	200. 5 188. 3 152. 0 156. 3 159. 6	198. 6* 173. 8* 145. 5 160. 7 169. 0	3. 3 3. 1 2. 9 5. 4 3. 7
Conn. ⁴	18568	163. 1	168. 4	1. 3		12548	174. 9	171. 2	1. 5
					BI acl	<u>k</u>			
Fairfield Hartford New Haven New London Other Four Counties	422 531 379 58 36	128. 8 140. 6 111. 1 98. 4 63. 4	279. 3 298. 2 249. 1 226. 0 195. 2	15. 3 14. 0 14. 1 34. 0 35. 8		382 396 265 51 51	171. 0 146. 6 109. 3 114. 6 111. 1	290. 1 246. 7* 204. 7* 268. 1 268. 9	16. 1 12. 9 13. 7 40. 6 42. 1
Conn.	1426	122. 7	271. 6	8. 0		1145	138. 6	248. 6*	7. 9
			<u>(</u>	Other S	Speci fi	ed Races			
Fai rfi el d	31	32. 2	105. 3 ⁵	22. 6		33	38. 9	90. 2	18. 0
Hartford New Haven Other Five Counties	32 15 7	41. 8 - -	118. 0 - -	23. 2		48 32 31	73. 0 53. 6 62. 1	133. 7 148. 7 135. 2	20. 8 29. 7 26. 9
Conn.	85	28. 7	95. 1	11. 8		144	55. 3	121. 8	11. 3

 $^{^{1}}$ Age-adjusted directly to the U.S. 2000 standard million. 2 Standard error of the age-adjusted rate.

³ Includes tumors for persons not specified as to race.

⁴ Include state residents for whom the county is not stated.

 $^{^{\}rm 5}$ The standard error is between 20% and 25% of the observed rate.

^{*} p <.05 (compared to the corresponding rate in 1990-97).

Table 4
Incidence of Invasive Tumors, Rates/100,000, by County, Race, 1990-2002
Female Breast (50.0-50.9)

<u>County</u>	<u>Tumors</u>	Crude <u>Rate</u>	Age-adj usto Observed ¹	ed Rate <u>SE</u> ²	<u>Tumors</u>	Crude <u>Rate</u>	Age-adj usted <u>Observed¹</u>	Rate <u>SE²</u>
		<u>1</u>	990-1997			<u>1</u>	1998-2002	
				<u> Al I</u>	Races ³			
Fairfield Hartford New Haven New London Litchfield Middlesex Tolland Windham	5573 5433 5249 1502 1128 901 626 544	159. 5 154. 0 155. 9 146. 7 155. 7 150. 0 120. 4 126. 7	144. 6 137. 4 139. 8 141. 0 138. 6 137. 7 134. 7 120. 6	2. 0 1. 9 2. 0 3. 7 4. 2 4. 6 5. 4 5. 2	3752 3641 3610 1030 804 645 468 380	164. 4 163. 6 168. 4 157. 4 171. 8 161. 9 136. 4 137. 0	145. 8 140. 5 147. 1* 142. 8 143. 0 138. 2 137. 7 127. 0	2. 4 2. 4 2. 5 4. 5 5. 1 5. 5 6. 4
Conn. ⁴	20959	153. 1	139. 7	1. 0	14334	163. 0	143. 2*	1. 2
				<u>Wh</u>	<u>i te</u>			
Fairfield Hartford New Haven New London Other Four Counties	5186 5087 4881 1448 3137	171. 8 167. 5 167. 4 153. 1 143. 1	147. 9 141. 0 141. 4 142. 5 134. 4	2. 1 2. 0 2. 1 3. 8 2. 4	3410 3332 3296 983 2246	176. 6 178. 8 182. 3 165. 9 158. 2	148. 4 144. 4 149. 5* 144. 6 138. 3	2. 6 2. 5 2. 7 4. 6 2. 9
Conn. ⁴	19740	163. 0	141. 9	1. 0	13270	174. 3	145. 5*	1. 3
				<u>B</u>	l ack			
Fairfield Hartford New Haven New London Other Four Counties	339 310 341 37 37	89. 4 75. 0 88. 5 69. 6 76. 1	118. 7 106. 6 123. 4 104. 0 133. 2	6. 6 6. 2 6. 9 17. 8 22. 9	252 260 260 29 20	95. 5 88. 3 95. 0 72. 7 52. 6	115. 2 113. 3 126. 2 104. 7 98. 4 ⁵	7. 4 7. 2 8. 0 20. 0 23. 4
Conn.	1064	83. 1	116.0	3. 7	8224	90. 3	116. 7	4. 2
			<u>01</u>	ther Spec	cified Rac	<u>es</u>		
Fairfield Hartford New Haven Other Five Counties	41 31 23 32	42. 5 40. 0 35. 3 53. 9	57. 7 62. 8 69. 5 75. 0	11. 0 12. 2 16. 5 ⁵ 15. 7 ⁵	44 44 43 36	50. 4 64. 9 69. 7 71. 3	60. 4 113. 9* 111. 0 107. 9	10. 1 18. 8 19. 1 19. 1
Conn.	127	42. 6	64. 9	6. 6	167	62. 5	95. 3	8. 4

Age-adjusted directly to the U.S. 2000 standard million. Standard error of the age-adjusted rate.

Includes tumors for persons not specified as to race.

Includes state residents for whom the county is not stated.

The standard error is between 20% and 25% of the observed rate.

^{*} p <.05 (compared to the observed rate in 1990-97).

Table 5
Incidence of Invasive Tumors, Rates/100,000, by County, Race, Sex, 1990-2002
Colon, Rectum, Anus (18.0-21.8, 26.0)

<u>County</u>	<u>Tumors</u>	Crude <u>Rate</u>	Age-adjusted Rate <u>Observed¹ SE²</u>	<u>Tumors</u>	Crude <u>Rate</u>	Age-adj uste <u>Observed</u> 1	ed Rate <u>SE²</u>
		<u>1990</u> -	<u>-1997</u>		<u>199</u>	98-2002	
Fairfield Hartford New Haven New London Litchfield Middlesex Tolland Windham Conn.	2108 2188 2368 631 503 335 238 270 8642 ⁴	64. 9 66. 9 76. 2 61. 6 72. 5 58. 6 45. 8 65. 6	74. 2 1. 7 72. 8 1. 6 83. 2 1. 7 77. 2 3. 2 78. 5 3. 6 67. 6 3. 8 65. 6 4. 5 82. 8 5. 1 76. 2 0. 8	<u>63</u> - <u>Mal e</u> 1383 1437 1435 383 319 213 198 174 5542	64. 8 69. 7 72. 3 59. 7 71. 3 56. 2 57. 5 64. 5	71. 7 71. 1 75. 2* 67. 3* 71. 2 58. 8 73. 2 75. 4 71. 5*	2. 0 1. 9 2. 0 3. 5 4. 0 4. 1 5. 4 5. 8 1. 0
Fairfield Hartford New Haven New London Litchfield Middlesex Tolland Windham Conn.	2124 2245 2366 678 508 341 229 248 8739	60. 8 63. 6 70. 3 66. 2 70. 1 56. 8 44. 1 57. 8 63. 9	All Races 51.2 1.1 51.1 1.1 55.2 1.2 59.6 2.3 56.6 2.5 47.3 2.6 50.2 3.3 50.6 3.3 52.8 0.6	5 ³ - Female 1460 1485 1510 454 340 225 156 182 5813 ⁴	64. 0 66. 7 70. 4 69. 4 72. 7 56. 5 45. 5 65. 6	53. 1 51. 5 54. 4 58. 9 55. 7 45. 3 46. 9 57. 8 53. 1	1. 4 1. 4 1. 4 2. 8 3. 1 3. 1 3. 8 4. 3 0. 7
Fairfield Hartford New Haven Other Five Conn.	1978 2044 2219 1932 8174 ⁴	70. 1 72. 6 82. 1 63. 4 71. 8	White - 74.5 1.7 72.7 1.6 82.9 1.8 75.1 1.8 76.2 0.9	Mal e 1261 1320 1328 1255 5164	69. 1 76. 1 78. 9 64. 6 72. 0	71. 2 71. 3 75. 3* 68. 7* 71. 5*	2. 0 2. 0 2. 1 2. 0 1. 0
Fairfield Hartford New Haven Other Five Conn.	1984 2086 2206 1963 8239	65. 7 68. 7 75. 7 62. 6 68. 0	Mhi te 51. 2 1. 1 50. 5 1. 1 54. 6 1. 2 54. 2 1. 2 52. 8 0. 6	- <u>Femal e</u> 1325 1338 1372 1317 5353 ⁴	68. 6 71. 8 75. 9 65. 4 70. 3	52. 6 50. 4 53. 0 53. 5 52. 3	1. 5 1. 4 1. 5 1. 5 0. 7
Fairfield Hartford New Haven Other Five Conn.	121 134 139 32 426	36. 9 35. 5 40. 8 27. 7 36. 7	77. 0 7. 9 79. 9 7. 8 87. 1 8. 4 63. 1 11. 9 80. 2 4. 4	<u>sk</u> – <u>Mal e</u> 89 87 90 19 285	39. 8 32. 2 37. 1 - 34. 5	70. 3 57. 9* 68. 2 - 63. 3*	8. 2 6. 7 7. 9 - 4. 1
Fairfield Hartford New Haven Other Five Conn.	124 142 153 28 447	32. 7 34. 3 39. 7 27. 5 34. 9	Bl ack 48. 5 4. 5 53. 8 4. 7 61. 2 5. 1 57. 5 11. 3 54. 4 2. 6	- <u>Femal e</u> 119 131 121 21 392	45. 1 44. 5 44. 2 27. 0 43. 1	60. 2 61. 8 63. 2 47. 0 ⁵ 60. 6	5. 7 5. 5 5. 9 10. 5 3. 1
Conn Male Conn Femal	31 e 42	10. 5 14. 1	0ther <u>Spec</u> 31. 7 6. 9 30. 2 5. 1	cified Race 63 52	<u>s</u> 24. 2 19. 5	57. 0* 31. 7	8. 9 4. 9

Age-adjusted directly to the U.S. 2000 standard million. Standard error of the age-adjusted rate.
Includes tumors for persons not specified as to race.

Includes state residents for whom the county is not stated.

The standard error is between 20% and 25% of the observed rate.

^{*} p <.05 (compared to the observed rate in 1990-97).

Table 6
Incidence of Invasive Tumors, Rates/100,000, by County, Race, Sex, 1990-2002 Colon (18.0-18.9, 26.0)

<u>County</u>		ude <u>Rate</u>	Age-adjusted Rate $\underline{\text{Observed}}^1 \underline{\text{SE}}^2$	(<u>Tumors</u>	Crude <u>Rate</u>	Age-adj usted <u>Observed¹ S</u>	
		199	<u>0-1997</u>		1998	<u>8-2002</u>	
Fairfield Hartford New Haven New London Litchfield Middlesex Tolland Windham Conn.	1482 1513 1641 418 351 226 164 174 5970 ⁴	45. 6 46. 3 52. 8 40. 8 50. 6 39. 6 31. 5 42. 3 46. 5	All Races 52.9 1.4 50.8 1.3 57.9 1.5 51.9 2.6 55.0 3.0 46.0 3.1 45.8 3.8 53.8 4.2 53.2 0.7	63 - Male 972 960 1005 267 220 139 133 114 3810	45. 6 46. 5 50. 6 41. 6 49. 2 36. 7 38. 6 42. 3 46. 1	51. 0 47. 7 52. 7* 47. 2 49. 2 38. 6 49. 4 49. 6 49. 4*	1. 7 1. 5 1. 7 2. 9 3. 3 3. 3 4. 4 4. 7 0. 8
Fairfield Hartford New Haven New London Litchfield Middlesex Tolland Windham Conn.	1606 1664 1749 489 372 265 161 187 6493	46. 0 47. 2 52. 0 47. 8 51. 3 44. 1 31. 0 43. 6 47. 4	All Races 38. 5 1. 0 37. 5 0. 9 40. 2 1. 0 42. 8 2. 0 41. 0 2. 1 36. 5 2. 3 35. 2 2. 8 37. 4 2. 8 38. 9 0. 5	3 - Femal e 1089 1078 1127 321 246 167 120 142 4291 ⁴	47. 7 48. 4 52. 6 49. 0 52. 6 41. 9 35. 0 51. 2 48. 8	39. 2 36. 7 39. 8 41. 4 39. 6 33. 4 36. 4 44. 7 38. 7	1. 2 1. 2 1. 2 2. 3 2. 6 2. 6 3. 3 3. 8 0. 6
Fairfield Hartford New Haven Other Five Conn.	1384 1404 1531 1298 5618 ⁴	49. 0 49. 9 56. 7 42. 6 49. 3	52.8 1.5 50.4 1.4 57.4 1.5 51.0 1.5 52.9 0.7	- <u>Mal e</u> 880 888 929 851 3548	48. 2 51. 4 55. 2 43. 8 49. 4	50. 1 48. 1 52. 6* 46. 8 49. 3*	1. 7 1. 6 1. 7 1. 6 0. 8
Fairfield Hartford New Haven Other Five Conn.	1498 1548 1627 1442 6115	49. 6 51. 0 55. 8 46. 0 50. 5	White - 38.4 1.0 37.0 1.0 39.6 1.0 39.5 1.0 38.6 0.5	Femal e 985 970 1031 963 3950 ⁴	51. 0 52. 1 57. 0 47. 8 51. 9	38. 6 35. 6 38. 8 38. 8 37. 9	1. 3 1. 2 1. 2 1. 3 0. 6
Fairfield Hartford New Haven Other Five Conn.	91 104 100 25 320	27. 8 27. 5 29. 3 21. 6 27. 5	59. 2 7. 0 61. 1 6. 7 64. 9 7. 4 50. 8 ⁵ 10. 8 61. 1 3. 9	- <u>Mal e</u> 65 56 66 12 199	29. 1 20. 7 27. 2 - 24. 1	52. 8 37. 6* 53. 9 - 46. 1*	7. 2 5. 4 7. 3 - 3. 6
Fairfield Hartford New Haven Other Five Conn.	99 108 117 24 348	26. 1 26. 1 30. 4 23. 6 27. 2	38. 9 4. 0 41. 1 4. 1 48. 0 4. 5 49. 8 ⁵ 10. 6 42. 9 2. 4	Female 93 102 84 17 296	35. 3 34. 6 30. 7 21. 8 32. 5	48. 4 49. 1 43. 6 36. 4 46. 4	5. 1 4. 9 4. 9 9. 0 2. 7
ConnMale ConnFemale	22 22	- 7. 4	Other Special	fied Races 40 35	15. 4 13. 1	41. 8 21. 7	8. 0 4. 1

 $^{^{1}}$ Age-adjusted directly to the U.S. 2000 standard million. 2 Standard error of the age-adjusted rate.

Includes tumors for persons not specified as to race.

Includes state residents for whom the county is not stated.

⁵ The standard error is between 20% and 25% of the observed rate.

^{*} p < .05 (compared to the observed rate in 1990-97).

Table 7
Incidence of Invasive Tumors, Rates/100,000, by County, Race, Sex, 1990-2002
Rectum, Anus (19.9-21.8)

County	<u>Tumors</u>	Crude <u>Rate</u>	Age-adj uste <u>Observed</u> ¹	ed Rate <u>SE²</u>	<u>Tumors</u>	Crude <u>Rate</u>	Age-adj uste <u>Observed</u> ¹	ed Rate <u>SE²</u>
		-	1990-1997			<u>19</u>	998-2002	
Fairfield Hartford New Haven New London Litchfield Middlesex Tolland Windham Conn.	626 675 727 213 152 109 74 96 2672	19. 3 20. 6 23. 4 20. 8 21. 9 19. 1 14. 2 23. 3 20. 8	21. 3 21. 9 25. 2 25. 3 23. 5 21. 7 19. 8 29. 0 23. 0	All Races 0. 9 0. 9 1. 0 1. 8 1. 9 2. 1 2. 4 3. 0 0. 5	3 - <u>Mal e</u> 411 477 430 116 99 74 65 60 1732	19. 3 23. 1 21. 7 18. 1 22. 1 19. 5 18. 9 22. 3 21. 0	20. 8 23. 3 22. 5 20. 1* 22. 0 20. 2 23. 9 25. 8 22. 0	1. 0 1. 1 1. 1 1. 9 2. 2 2. 4 3. 1 3. 4 0. 5
Fairfield Hartford New Haven New London Litchfield Middlesex Tolland Windham Conn.	518 581 617 189 136 76 68 61 2246	14. 8 16. 5 18. 3 18. 5 18. 8 12. 7 13. 1 14. 2 16. 4	12. 7 13. 6 15. 0 16. 8 15. 6 10. 8 14. 9 13. 1 14. 0	NII Races 0. 6 0. 6 0. 6 1. 2 1. 4 1. 3 1. 8 1. 7 0. 3	3 - <u>Femal</u> 371 407 383 133 94 58 36 40 1522	e 16. 3 18. 3 17. 9 20. 3 20. 1 14. 6 10. 5 14. 4 17. 3	13. 9 14. 9 14. 6 17. 5 16. 1 11. 9 10. 5 13. 1 14. 5	0. 7 0. 7 0. 8 1. 5 1. 7 1. 6 1. 8 2. 1 0. 4
Fairfield Hartford New Haven Other Five Conn.	594 640 688 634 2556	21. 0 22. 7 25. 5 20. 8 22. 4	21. 7 22. 3 25. 5 24. 2 23. 4	White 0.9 0.9 1.0 1.0 0.5	- <u>Male</u> 381 432 399 404 1616	20. 9 25. 0 23. 7 20. 8 22. 5	21. 1 23. 2 22. 7 21. 9 22. 2	1. 1 1. 1 1. 1 1. 1 0. 6
Fairfield Hartford New Haven Other Five Conn.	486 538 579 521 2124	16. 1 17. 7 19. 9 16. 6 17. 5	12.8 13.5 15.0 14.7 14.0	White - 0.6 0.6 0.6 0.6 0.7 0.3	Femal e 340 368 341 354 1403	17. 6 19. 7 18. 9 17. 6 18. 4	14. 0 14. 8 14. 2 14. 7 14. 4	0. 8 0. 8 0. 8 0. 8 0. 4
Fairfield Hartford New Haven Other Five Conn.	30 30 39 7 106	9. 2 7. 9 11. 4 - 9. 1	17. 8 ⁴ 18. 9 ⁴ 22. 2 - 19. 1	BI ack 3. 7 3. 9 4. 0 - 2. 1	- <u>Mal e</u> 24 31 24 7 86	10. 7 11. 5 9. 9 - 10. 4	17. 5 ⁴ 20. 3 14. 4 ⁴ - 17. 2	4. 0 3. 9 3. 0 - 2. 0
Fairfield Hartford New Haven Other Five Conn.	25 34 36 4 99	6. 6 8. 2 9. 3 - 7. 7	9. 6 ⁴ 12. 8 13. 2 - 11. 5	Bl ack - 2. 0 2. 3 2. 2 - 1. 2	Femal e 26 29 37 4 96	9. 9 9. 8 13. 5 - 10. 5	11. 8 ⁴ 12. 7 19. 6 - 14. 2	2. 4 2. 4 3. 3 - 1. 5

Age-adjusted directly to the U.S. 2000 standard million.
Standard error of the age-adjusted rate.
Includes tumors for persons not specified as to race.
The standard error is between 20% and 25% of the observed rate.

^{*} p < .05 (compared to the observed rate in 1990-97).

Table 8 Incidence of Invasive Tumors, Rates/100,000, by County, Race, Sex, 1990-2002 Bl adder $\left(67.0\text{-}67.9\right)^1$

<u>County</u>	Tumors	Crude <u>Rate</u>	Age-adjusted Rate $\underline{\text{Observed}}^2 \underline{\text{SE}}^3$	<u>Tumors</u>	Crude <u>Rate</u>	Age-adj uste <u>Observed</u> ²	ed Rate <u>SE³</u>
		<u>199</u>	<u>90-1997</u>		<u> 1998</u>	<u>-2002</u>	
Fairfield Hartford New Haven New London Litchfield Middlesex Tolland Windham Conn.	1244 1314 1384 350 288 243 153 168 5144	38. 3 40. 2 44. 5 34. 2 41. 5 42. 5 42. 5 40. 8 40. 0	43.6 1.2 48.3 1.3 41.8 2.3 44.0 2.6 49.0 3.2 42.8 3.6 49.3 3.9	4 - <u>Mal e</u> 890 883 878 268 210 174 114 102 3521 ⁵	41. 7 42. 8 44. 2 41. 8 46. 9 45. 9 33. 1 37. 8 42. 6	46. 1 43. 8 46. 3 47. 9 47. 4 48. 8 43. 4 46. 7 45. 8	1. 6 1. 5 1. 6 3. 0 3. 3 3. 7 4. 2 4. 7 0. 8
Fairfield Hartford New Haven New London Litchfield Middlesex Tolland Windham Conn.	539 473 526 131 104 88 60 48 1969	15. 4 13. 4 15. 6 12. 8 14. 4 14. 7 11. 5 11. 2	11. 9 1. 2 12. 6 1. 4 13. 3 1. 7	- <u>Female</u> 350 325 337 108 62 59 55 30 1326	15. 3 14. 6 15. 7 16. 5 13. 3 14. 8 16. 0 10. 8 15. 1	12. 9 11. 5 12. 5 14. 4 10. 1 11. 9 16. 7 9. 9 12. 3	0. 7 0. 7 0. 7 1. 4 1. 3 1. 6 2. 3 1. 8 0. 3
Fairfield Hartford New Haven Other Five Conn.	1192 1278 1341 1189 5000	42. 2 45. 4 49. 6 39. 0 43. 9		- <u>Mal e</u> 853 852 841 844 3392 ⁵	46. 7 49. 3 50. 0 43. 5 47. 3	47. 9 46. 0 47. 8 47. 1 47. 2	1. 7 1. 6 1. 7 1. 6 0. 8
Fairfield Hartford New Haven Other Five Conn.	514 453 506 425 1898	17. 0 14. 9 17. 4 13. 5 15. 7	Mhi te 13.6 0.6 11.3 0.5 13.2 0.6 12.0 0.6 12.5 0.3	- <u>Female</u> 338 306 324 304 1272	17. 5 16. 4 17. 9 15. 1 16. 7	13. 7 12. 0 13. 2 12. 5 12. 8	0. 8 0. 7 0. 8 0. 7 0. 4
Fairfield Hartford New Haven Other Five Conn.	42 26 39 8 115	12. 8 6. 9 11. 4 - 9. 9	BI ack 25. 2 4. 4 13. 9 ⁶ 2. 9 24. 3 4. 2 21. 5 2. 2	- <u>Mal e</u> 20 22 23 11 76	9. 0 8. 2 9. 5 - 9. 2	16. 5 ⁶ 18. 9 ⁶ -	3. 8 4. 0 4. 4 - 2. 4
Fairfield Hartford New Haven Other Five Conn.	23 18 19 4 64	6. 1 4. 4 4. 9 - 5. 0	9. 4 ⁶ 2. 0 7. 5 ⁶ 1. 8 8. 7 ⁶ 2. 0	- <u>Female</u> 6 14 11 8 39	- - - 4. 3	- - - - 6. 8	- - - - 1. 1

¹ Includes in situ tumors (see text- <u>Data Sources, Methods</u>)
2 Age-adjusted directly to the U.S. 2000 standard million.
3 Standard error of the age-adjusted rate.

⁴ Includes tumors for persons not specified as to race.
5 Includes state residents for whom the county is not stated.

⁶ The standard error is between 20% and 25% of the observed rate.

Table 9
Incidence of Invasive Tumors, Rates/100,000, by County, Race, Sex, 1990-2002
Ki dney (64.9-66.9)

County	<u>Tumors</u>	Crude <u>Rate</u>	Age-adjusted Rat <u>Observed¹ SE²</u>	e <u>Tumors</u>	Crude <u>Rate</u>	Age-adj ust <u>Observed</u>			
		<u>199</u>	<u>0-1997</u>		<u>1998-2002</u>				
Fairfield Hartford New Haven New London Litchfield Middlesex Tolland Windham Conn.	501 510 566 132 103 110 76 65 2063	15. 4 15. 6 18. 2 12. 9 14. 6 19. 3 14. 6 15. 8 16. 1	All Rar 16. 5 0. 8 16. 1 0. 7 19. 2 0. 8 15. 1 1. 4 14. 9 1. 5 21. 3 2. 1 19. 1 2. 3 19. 4 2. 5 17. 3 0. 4	ces ³ - Mal e 420 347 413 99 95 79 52 39 1544	19. 7 16. 8 20. 8 15. 4 21. 2 20. 8 15. 1 14. 5 18. 7	20. 6* 16. 9 21. 4 16. 5 20. 1* 21. 0 17. 7 16. 9 19. 3*	1. 0 0. 9 1. 1 1. 7 2. 1 2. 4 2. 5 2. 7 0. 5		
Fairfield Hartford New Haven New London Litchfield Middlesex Tolland Windham Conn.	334 324 364 100 60 51 41 45 1319	9. 6 9. 2 10. 8 9. 8 8. 3 8. 5 7. 9 10. 5 9. 6	8. 3	es ³ - Femal e 231 253 268 70 53 51 38 27 991	10. 1 11. 4 12. 5 10. 7 11. 3 12. 8 11. 1 9. 7 11. 3	8. 9 9. 5* 10. 6 9. 7 9. 2 11. 2* 11. 7 8. 8 9. 7*	0. 6 0. 6 0. 7 1. 2 1. 3 1. 6 1. 9 1. 7 0. 3		
Fairfield Hartford New Haven Other Five Conn.	470 470 526 474 1940	16. 6 16. 7 19. 5 15. 6 17. 0	Whit 16. 5 0. 8 16. 1 0. 7 19. 2 0. 8 17. 4 0. 8 17. 3 0. 4	<u>e</u> - <u>Mal e</u> 386 317 362 356 1421	21. 2 18. 4 21. 5 18. 3 19. 8	20. 8* 17. 0 20. 5 18. 8 19. 2*	1. 1 1. 0 1. 1 1. 0 0. 5		
Fairfield Hartford New Haven Other Five Conn.	311 298 333 287 1229	10. 3 9. 8 11. 4 9. 1 10. 2	8. 4 0. 5 7. 6 0. 4 9. 4 0. 5 8. 2 0. 5 8. 4 0. 2	- <u>Femal e</u> 208 229 248 230 915	10. 8 12. 3 13. 7 11. 4 12. 0	8. 9 9. 4* 10. 9 10. 0* 9. 8*	0. 6 0. 6 0. 7 0. 7 0. 3		
Fairfield Hartford New Haven	24 34 37	7. 3 9. 0 10. 8	12. 8 ⁴ 2. 8 14. 1 2. 5 19. 2 3. 4	<u>k - Male</u> 26 19 44	11. 6 7. 0 18. 1	19. 7 12. 1 28. 4	4. 2 3. 0 4. 5		
Other Five Conn.	7 102	- 8. 8	 14. 8 1. 6	6 95	- 11. 5	- 19. 0	- 2. 1		
Fairfield Hartford New Haven Other Five Conn.	20 23 30 8 81	5. 3 5. 6 7. 8 - 6. 3	7. 3 ⁴ 1. 7 8. 4 ⁴ 1. 8 12. 1 2. 3 9. 5 1. 1	- <u>Femal e</u> 18 19 18 5 60	6. 8 6. 4 6. 6 - 6. 6	8. 5 ⁴ 8. 2 ⁴ 8. 7 ⁴ - 8. 6	2. 1 1. 9 2. 1 - 1. 1		

¹ Age-adjusted directly to the U.S. 2000 standard million.
2 Standard error of the age-adjusted rate.
3 Includes tumors for persons not specified as to race.
4 The standard error is between 20% and 25% of the observed rate.

^{*} P < .05 (compared to the observed rate in 1990-97).

Table 10
Incidence of Invasive Tumors, Rates/100,000, by County, Race, 1990-2002
Uterine Cervix (53.0-53.9), Corpus (54.0-54.9)

<u>County</u>	<u>Tumors</u>	Crude <u>Rate</u>	Age-adjusted Ra <u>Observed¹ SE²</u>	te <u>Tumors</u>	Crude <u>Rate</u>	Age-adj ust <u>Observed¹</u>	ed Rate <u>SE²</u>
		<u>1990</u>	<u>)-1997</u>		<u>1</u>	998-2002	
Fairfield Hartford New Haven New London Litchfield Middlesex Tolland Windham Conn.	1025 956 1153 298 219 204 117 111 4083	29. 3 27. 1 34. 3 29. 1 30. 2 34. 0 22. 5 25. 9 29. 8	Corpus 26.3 0.8 23.9 0.8 30.9 0.9 27.9 1.6 26.6 1.8 31.7 2.2 25.5 2.4 26.0 2.5 27.1 0.4	- All Races 731 628 722 244 154 136 77 82 2774	32. 0 28. 2 33. 7 37. 3 32. 9 34. 1 22. 4 29. 6 31. 5	28. 5 23. 8 29. 6 34. 1* 27. 7 29. 5 23. 0 28. 4 27. 7	1. 1 1. 0 1. 1 2. 2 2. 3 2. 5 2. 6 3. 2 0. 5
Fairfield Hartford New Haven Other Five Conn.	957 915 1078 934 3884	31. 7 30. 1 37. 0 29. 8 32. 1	26.8 0.9 25.0 0.8 31.6 1.0 28.0 0.9 27.7 0.5	W <u>hi te</u> 681 587 668 673 2609	35. 3 31. 5 36. 9 33. 4 34. 3	29. 7* 24. 8 30. 4 29. 5 28. 5	1. 1 1. 0 1. 2 1. 1 0. 6
Fairfield Hartford New Haven Other Five Conn.	54 32 64 12 162	14. 2 7. 7 16. 6 - 12. 7	19.8 2.8 11.2 2.0 24.9 3.2 	BI ack 36 29 45 10 120	13. 6 9. 8 16. 4 - 13. 2	16. 7 13. 0 22. 4 - 17. 5	2. 8 2. 5 3. 4 - 1. 6
			<u>Other</u> <u>S</u>	pecified Rad	<u>ces</u>		
Conn.	24	8. 0	14. 2 3. 1	31	11. 6	18. 9	3. 6
Fairfield Hartford New Haven New London Litchfield Middlesex Tolland	357 297 329 109 56 58 25	10. 2 8. 4 9. 8 10. 6 7. 7 9. 7 4. 8	9.7 0.5 7.9 0.5 9.4 0.5 10.4 1.0 7.0 0.9 8.9 1.2 4.8 ⁴ 1.0	- All Races 197 148 190 61 39 27 13	8. 6 6. 6 8. 9 9. 3 8. 3 6. 8	7. 9* 6. 1* 8. 3 8. 8 7. 4 6. 0 - 6. 7 ⁴	0. 6 0. 5 0. 6 1. 1 1. 2 1. 2 -
Wi ndham Conn.	42 1273	9. 8 9. 3	9. 8 1. 5 8. 8 0. 2	694	6. 9 7. 9	6. <i>1</i> 7. 3*	0.3
Fairfield Hartford New Haven Other Five Conn.	286 241 278 280 1085	9. 5 7. 9 9. 5 8. 9 9. 0	8. 7	Whi te 163 128 157 147 595	8. 4 6. 9 8. 7 7. 3 7. 8	7. 5 6. 2 7. 9 6. 7* 7. 0*	0. 6 0. 6 0. 6 0. 6 0. 3
Fairfield Hartford New Haven Other Five Conn.	62 46 45 5 158	16. 3 11. 1 11. 7 - 12. 3	18.8 2.5 15.4 2.4 15.6 2.4 	Bl ack 28 17 28 9 82	10. 6 5. 8 10. 2 - 9. 0	12. 1* 7. 2 ⁴ * 13. 4 - 11. 0*	2. 3 1. 8 2. 6 - 1. 2
Conn	21		<u>utner</u>	Specified R	<u>aces</u>		
Conn.	∠ I	-		1.1	-	-	-

Age-adjusted directly to the U.S. 2000 standard million.
Standard error of the age-adjusted rate.
Includes tumors for persons not specified as to race.

The standard error is between 20% and 25% of the observed rate.
* p <.05 (compared to the observed rate in 1990-97).</p>

Table 11
Incidence of Invasive Tumors, Rates/100,000, by County, Race, Sex, 1990-2002
Stomach (16.0-16.9)

<u>County</u>	<u>Tumors</u>	Crude <u>Rate</u>	Age-adj uste Observed	d Rate 1 <u>SE</u> 2	<u>Tumors</u>	Crude <u>Rate</u>	Age-adj usted <u>Observed¹</u>	Rate <u>SE²</u>
		<u>19</u>	90-1997			<u>199</u>	98-2002	
Fairfield Hartford New Haven New London Litchfield Middlesex Tolland Windham Conn.	406 492 442 100 84 54 35 31 1645	12. 5 15. 0 14. 2 9. 8 12. 1 9. 5 6. 7 7. 5	14. 7 16. 2 15. 7 12. 5 13. 6 10. 8 9. 9 9. 2 14. 6	All Ra 0.8 0.7 0.8 1.3 1.5 1.5 1.7 0.4	1000 - Male 256 291 268 53 56 35 43 28 1030	12. 0 14. 1 13. 5 8. 3 12. 5 9. 2 12. 5 10. 4 12. 5	13. 1 14. 5 14. 0 9. 5 12. 6 9. 7 16. 0 12. 5 13. 3*	0.8 0.8 0.9 1.3 1.7 1.6 2.5 2.4
Fairfield Hartford New Haven New London Litchfield Middlesex Tolland Windham Conn.	279 316 314 64 47 33 22 35 1110	8. 0 9. 0 9. 3 6. 3 6. 5 5. 5 4. 2 8. 2 8. 1	6. 6 7. 2 7. 2 5. 7 5. 1 4. 7 4. 8 ⁵ 7. 1 6. 6	All Ra 0. 4 0. 4 0. 7 0. 8 0. 8 1. 0 1. 2 0. 2	ces ³ - Female 170 180 171 35 40 21 14 9 640	7. 5 8. 1 8. 0 5. 3 8. 5 5. 3	6. 2 6. 0 6. 0 4. 4 6. 4 4. 1 ⁵	0. 5 0. 5 0. 5 0. 7 1. 0 0. 9
Fai rfi el d Hartford New Haven Other Fi ve Conn. Fai rfi el d	358 439 403 289 1490	12. 7 15. 6 14. 9 9. 5 13. 1	13. 9 15. 5 15. 2 11. 4 14. 0	0.8 0.8 0.8 0.7 0.4	<u>e</u> - <u>Mal e</u> 224 254 236 200 914 - <u>Femal e</u> 154	12. 3 14. 7 14. 0 10. 3 12. 7	12. 5 13. 8 13. 4 11. 1 12. 7	0. 8 0. 9 0. 9 0. 8 0. 4
Hartford New Haven Other Five Conn.	276 280 194 1001	9. 1 9. 6 6. 2 8. 3	6. 7 6. 8 5. 3 6. 3	0. 4 0. 4 0. 4 0. 2	159 155 117 585	8. 5 8. 6 5. 8 7. 7	5. 7 5. 9 4. 6 5. 6*	0. 5 0. 5 0. 4 0. 2
Fairfield Hartford New Haven Other Five Conn.	43 44 36 12 135	13. 1 11. 7 10. 6 - 11. 6	29. 1 24. 0 23. 2 25. 5	BI acl 5. 0 4. 0 4. 5 - 2. 5	<u>K - Male</u> 23 33 27 12 95	10. 3 12. 2 11. 1 - 11. 5	19. 4 ⁵ 23. 6 27. 7 ⁵ - 24. 2	4. 2 4. 6 5. 9 - 2. 7
Fairfield Hartford New Haven Other Five Conn.	23 38 30 2 93	6. 1 9. 2 7. 8 - 7. 3	9. 7 ⁵ 14. 4 12. 8 - 11. 7	Bl ack 2. 1 2. 4 2. 4 - 1. 3	- <u>Femal e</u> 13 18 15 2 48	- 6. 1 - - 5. 3	- 8. 6 ⁵ - - 7. 7*	- 2. 1 - - 1. 1

Age-adjusted directly to the U.S. 2000 standard million.
Standard error of the age-adjusted rate.
Includes tumors for persons not specified as to race.
Includes state residents for whom the county is not stated.

 $^{^{5}}$ The standard error is between 20% and 25% of the observed rate.

^{*} p < .05 (compared to the observed rate in 1990-97).

Table 12 Incidence of Invasive Tumors, Rates/100,000, by County, Race, Sex, 1990-2002 Leukemia (site 42.1, morphology 9800-9948)

<u>County</u>	<u>Tumors</u>	Crude <u>Rate</u>	Age-adj uste <u>Observed¹</u>	d Rate <u>SE²</u>	<u>Tumors</u>	Crude <u>Rate</u>	Age-adj ust <u>Observed¹</u>	ted Rate <u>SE²</u>
		<u>19</u>	<u> 1997 - 1997 - </u>			<u>199</u>	<u>98-2002</u>	
Fairfield Hartford New Haven New London Litchfield Middlesex Tolland Windham Conn.	496 535 439 115 102 80 47 61 1876 ⁴	15. 3 16. 4 14. 1 11. 2 14. 7 14. 0 9. 0 14. 8 14. 6	17. 3 17. 4 15. 0 13. 2 15. 4 15. 9 12. 2	0. 8 0. 8 0. 7 1. 3 1. 5 1. 8 1. 9 2. 2 0. 4	3- Mal e 308 364 260 98 58 51 54 36 1229	14. 4 17. 6 13. 1 15. 3 13. 0 13. 5 15. 7 13. 4	15. 4 18. 0 13. 6 16. 6 13. 1 14. 0 20. 5* 15. 4	0. 9 0. 9 0. 8 1. 7 1. 7 2. 0 2. 9 2. 6 0. 5
Fairfield Hartford New Haven New London Litchfield Middlesex Tolland Windham Conn.	380 430 350 97 82 70 47 47 1504	10. 9 12. 2 10. 4 9. 5 11. 3 11. 7 9. 0 10. 9 11. 0	9. 5 10. 4 8. 9 8. 8 9. 6 10. 0 9. 9	0. 5 0. 5 0. 5 0. 5 0. 9 1. 1 1. 2 1. 4 1. 5 0. 3	3 - Female 223 271 226 73 60 42 35 28 959 ⁴	9. 8 12. 2 10. 5 11. 2 12. 8 10. 5 10. 2 10. 1 10. 9	8. 6 10. 1 8. 6 10. 1 10. 6 8. 9 10. 7 9. 0 9. 3	0. 6 0. 6 0. 6 1. 2 1. 4 1. 4 1. 8 1. 7 0. 3
Fairfield Hartford New Haven Other Five Conn.	466 502 413 392 1774 ⁴	16. 5 17. 8 15. 3 12. 9 15. 6	17. 3 17. 4 15. 0 14. 6 16. 3	Whi te 0. 8 0. 8 0. 7 0. 8 0. 4	- <u>Mal e</u> 284 328 240 288 1140	15. 6 19. 0 14. 3 14. 8 15. 9	15. 7 18. 0 13. 8 15. 9	0. 9 1. 0 0. 9 0. 9 0. 5
Fairfield Hartford New Haven Other Five Conn.	353 392 330 331 1406	11. 7 12. 9 11. 3 10. 6 11. 6	9. 2 9. 4	White - 0. 5 0. 5 0. 5 0. 5 0. 5 0. 3 Black	Femal e 202 248 214 230 895 ⁴ - <u>Mal e</u> 9	10. 5 13. 3 11. 8 11. 4 11. 8	8. 7 10. 2 9. 2 9. 9 9. 6	0. 6 0. 7 0. 7 0. 7 0. 3
Fairfield Hartford New Haven Other Five Conn.	22 28 24 3 77	7. 4 7. 0 - 6. 6	11. 1 ⁵ -	2. 7 2. 6 - 1. 6	9 23 17 3 52	8. 5 - - 6. 3	- 17. 5 ⁵ - - 11. 5	- 4. 3 - - 1. 9
Fairfield Hartford New Haven Other Five Conn.	23 35 16 10 84	6. 1 8. 5 - 6. 6	8. 3 ⁵ 11. 6 - - 9. 0	Bl ack 1. 8 2. 1 - - 1. 0	- <u>Female</u> 17 19 11 4 51	6. 4 6. 4 - - 5. 6	7. 4 ⁵ 8. 2 ⁵ - 7. 2	1. 8 2. 0 - - 1. 0

Age-adjusted directly to the U.S. 2000 standard million.
Standard error of the age-adjusted rate.
Includes tumors for persons not specified as to race.
Includes state residents for whom the county is not stated.
The standard error is between 20% and 25% of the observed rate.

 $^{^{\}star}$ p < .05 (compared to the observed rate in 1990-97).

Table 13 Incidence of Invasive Tumors, Rates/100,000, by County, Race, Sex, 1990-2002 Lymphomas (morphology 9590-9729)¹

<u>County</u>	<u>Tumors</u>	Crude <u>Rate</u>	Age-adjuste Observed ²	ed Rate <u>SE³</u>	<u>Tumors</u>	Crude <u>Rate</u>	Age-adjuste <u>Observed²</u>	ed Rate <u>SE³</u>
		<u>199</u>	<u>90-1997</u>			<u>199</u>	<u>98-2002</u>	
Fairfield Hartford New Haven New London Litchfield Middlesex Tolland Windham Conn.	845 895 946 229 156 141 114 89 3415	26. 0 27. 4 30. 4 22. 4 22. 5 24. 7 21. 9 21. 6 26. 6	27. 7 28. 6 32. 0 25. 7 23. 4 26. 4 27. 8 24. 2 28. 4	All Races 1. 0 1. 0 1. 1 1. 8 1. 9 2. 3 2. 8 2. 6 0. 5	54 - Male 557 594 567 150 158 93 79 56 2254	26. 1 28. 8 28. 6 23. 4 35. 3 24. 6 22. 9 20. 8 27. 3	27. 4 29. 0 29. 2 25. 3 34. 8* 25. 0 28. 5 23. 1 28. 2	1. 2 1. 2 1. 2 2. 1 2. 8 2. 6 3. 3 3. 1 0. 6
Fairfield Hartford New Haven New London Litchfield Middlesex Tolland Windham Conn.	825 800 802 207 136 130 73 85 3058	23. 6 22. 7 23. 8 20. 2 18. 8 21. 6 14. 0 19. 8 22. 3	21. 1 19. 4 20. 6 18. 8 16. 2 19. 0 15. 4 18. 5 19. 7	11 Races ⁴ 0.7 0.7 0.7 1.3 1.4 1.7 1.8 2.0 0.4	- Femal 6 539 537 526 139 102 84 60 55 2042	2 23. 6 24. 1 24. 5 21. 2 21. 8 21. 1 17. 5 19. 8 23. 2	21. 1 20. 2 20. 7 19. 2 18. 2 18. 1 17. 9 18. 7 20. 2	0. 9 0. 9 0. 9 1. 6 1. 8 2. 0 2. 3 2. 5 0. 5
Fairfield Hartford New Haven Other Five Conn.	781 832 864 704 3181	27. 7 29. 6 32. 0 23. 1 27. 9	28. 1 29. 3 32. 0 25. 3 28. 7	White 1.0 1.0 1.1 1.1 1.0 0.5	- <u>Mal e</u> 517 541 528 518 2104	28. 3 31. 3 31. 4 26. 7 29. 3	28. 2 29. 6 30. 3 27. 7 28. 8	1. 2 1. 3 1. 3 1. 2 0. 6
Fairfield Hartford New Haven Other Five Conn.	766 754 762 621 2903	25. 4 24. 8 26. 1 19. 8 24. 0	21. 4 20. 1 21. 4 18. 1 20. 2	Whi te 0. 8 0. 8 0. 8 0. 7 0. 4	Female 483 506 483 424 1896	25. 0 27. 2 26. 7 21. 1 24. 9	21. 2 21. 4 21. 2 18. 5 20. 6	1. 0 1. 0 1. 0 0. 9 0. 5
Fairfield Hartford New Haven Other Five Conn.	54 60 64 19 197	16. 5 15. 9 18. 8 - 17. 0	23. 2 21. 9 25. 8 - 23. 6	BI ack 3. 7 3. 0 3. 4 - 1. 9	- <u>Male</u> 27 46 30 12 115	12. 1 17. 0 12. 4 - 13. 9	17. 4 ⁵ 25. 9 16. 4* - 19. 9	3. 7 4. 4 3. 1 - 2. 1
Fairfield Hartford New Haven Other Five Conn.	51 43 32 6 132	13. 4 10. 4 8. 3 - 10. 3	15. 2 15. 6 10. 4 - 13. 4	Bl ack 2. 2 2. 4 1. 9 - 1. 2	- <u>Female</u> 38 28 40 7 113	14. 4 9. 5 14. 6 - 12. 4	16. 6 11. 2 18. 0* - 14. 8	2. 8 2. 2 3. 0 - 1. 4

Numbers in parentheses are the current histologic listings in the <u>International Classification of Diseases For Oncology</u>. Lymphomas of any site are included.

Age-adjusted directly to the U.S. 2000 standard million.

³ Standard error of the age-adjusted rate.

Includes tumors for persons not specified as to race.

The standard error is between 20% and 25% of the observed rate.

^{*} p < .05 (compared to the observed rate in 1990-97).

Table 14
Incidence of Invasive Tumors, Rates/100,000, by County, Race, Sex, 1990-2002
Pancreas (25.0-25.9)

<u>County</u>	<u>Tumors</u>	Crude <u>Rate</u>	Age-adj uste <u>Observed¹</u>	ed Rate <u>SE²</u>	<u>Tumors</u>	Crude <u>Rate</u>	Age-adj uste <u>Observed¹</u>	ed Rate <u>SE²</u>
		<u>19</u>	<u>990-1997</u>			<u>1</u>	998-2002	
Fairfield Hartford New Haven New London Litchfield Middlesex Tolland Windham Conn.	380 442 352 107 86 54 56 44 1521	11. 7 13. 5 11. 3 10. 4 12. 4 9. 5 10. 8 10. 7 11. 8	AI 13. 0 14. 3 12. 4 12. 9 13. 3 10. 7 15. 3 12. 8 13. 2	I Races 0.7 0.7 0.7 1.3 1.5 1.5 2.2 2.0 0.3	- <u>Mal e</u> 249 263 279 86 63 51 36 38 1066	11. 7 12. 8 14. 1 13. 4 14. 1 13. 5 10. 5 14. 1	12. 7 12. 9 14. 6 14. 4 14. 0 13. 9 14. 3 16. 0 13. 6	0. 8 0. 8 0. 9 1. 6 1. 8 2. 0 2. 5 2. 6 0. 4
Fairfield Hartford New Haven New London Litchfield Middlesex Tolland Windham Conn.	442 454 410 127 81 82 60 55 1711 ³	12. 7 12. 9 12. 2 12. 4 11. 2 13. 7 11. 5 12. 8 12. 5	10. 6 10. 2 9. 6 11. 1 9. 1 11. 2 13. 2 11. 4 10. 3	Races - 0.5 0.5 0.5 1.0 1.0 1.3 1.7 1.6 0.3	Female 314 273 286 66 65 52 29 34 1119	13. 8 12. 3 13. 3 10. 1 13. 9 13. 1 8. 5 12. 3	11. 5 9. 2 10. 4 8. 7 10. 6 10. 9 8. 9 10. 3 10. 2	0. 7 0. 6 0. 6 1. 1 1. 3 1. 5 1. 7 1. 8 0. 3
Fairfield Hartford New Haven Other Five Conn.	341 411 311 336 1399	12. 1 14. 6 11. 5 11. 0 12. 3	12. 6 14. 3 11. 7 12. 8 12. 9	White - 0.7 0.7 0.7 0.7 0.7 0.7 0.4	Mal e 226 242 251 263 983 ⁴	12. 4 14. 0 14. 9 13. 5 13. 7	12. 5 13. 0 14. 2* 14. 3 13. 5	0. 8 0. 8 0. 9 0. 9 0. 4
Fairfield Hartford New Haven Other Five Conn.	407 421 370 395 1593	13. 5 13. 9 12. 7 12. 6 13. 2	10. 5 10. 1 9. 2 10. 9 10. 1	White - 0.5 0.5 0.5 0.5 0.6 0.3	Femal <u>e</u> 281 251 257 237 1026	14. 6 13. 5 14. 2 11. 8 13. 5	11. 2 9. 2 10. 1 9. 7 10. 0	0. 7 0. 6 0. 6 0. 6 0. 3
Fairfield Hartford New Haven Other Five Conn.	34 27 39 9 109	10. 4 7. 2 11. 4 - 9. 4	20. 8 14. 1 20. 9 - 18. 7	Bl ack 4. 1 2. 9 3. 5 - 2. 0	- <u>Mal e</u> 20 18 28 9 75	9. 0 - 11. 5 - 9. 1	15. 8 ⁵ 21. 0 16. 9	3. 9 - 4. 3 - 2. 1
Fairfield Hartford New Haven Other Five Conn.	32 31 40 9 112	8. 4 7. 5 10. 4 - 8. 8	13. 9 12. 4 17. 0 - 14. 7	Bl ack - 2.5 2.3 2.7 - 1.4	Femal e 26 17 27 7 77	9. 9 5. 8 9. 9 - 8. 5	13. 3 8. 4 ⁵ 14. 9 - 12. 4	2. 7 2. 1 2. 9 - 1. 4

Age-adjusted directly to the U.S. 2000 standard million.
Standard error of the age-adjusted rate.
Includes tumors for persons not specified as to race.
Includes state residents for whom the county is not stated.

 $^{^{\}rm 5}$ The standard error is between 20% and 25% of the observed rate.

^{*} p <.05 (compared to the observed rate in 1990-97).

Table 15
Incidence of Invasive Tumors, Rates/100,000, by County, Race, Sex, 1990-2002
Oral Cavity, Pharynx (00.0-14.8)

<u>County</u>	<u>Tumors</u>	Crude <u>Rate</u>	Age-adj usto <u>Observed</u> ¹	ed Rate <u>SE²</u>	<u>Tumors</u>	Crude <u>Rate</u>	Age-adj usted <u>Observed¹</u>	Rate <u>SE²</u>
		<u>1</u>	1990-1997			199	8-2002	
Fairfield Hartford New Haven New London Litchfield Middlesex Tolland Windham Conn.	533 581 494 172 110 87 53 56 2086	16. 4 17. 8 15. 9 16. 8 15. 9 15. 2 10. 2 13. 6 16. 2	19. 3 16. 8 16. 4 13. 2 15. 3	All Rad 0.8 0.8 0.8 1.5 1.6 1.8 1.9 2.0 0.4	298 332 299 99 65 57 43 35 1228	e 14. 0 16. 1 15. 1 15. 4 14. 5 15. 0 12. 5 13. 0	15. 9 15. 4 16. 5 13. 7 14. 7 13. 4 14. 8	0. 9 0. 9 0. 9 1. 7 1. 7 2. 0 2. 1 2. 5 0. 4
Fairfield Hartford New Haven New London Litchfield Middlesex Tolland Windham Conn.	288 291 282 76 58 49 31 23 1098	8. 2 8. 2 8. 4 7. 4 8. 0 8. 2 6. 0 5. 4 8. 0	7. 1 7. 4 7. 1 7. 3 7. 1 6. 7 5. 3	All Rac 0. 4 0. 5 0. 8 1. 0 1. 2 1. 1 0. 2	es ³ - Fema 183 152 167 37 33 34 17 15 638	8.0 6.8 7.8 5.7 7.1 8.5 5.0 -	5. 8* 6. 7 5. 0 5. 7 7. 1 4. 9	0. 5 0. 5 0. 5 0. 8 1. 0 1. 2 1. 2
Fairfield Hartford New Haven Other Five Conn.	466 500 420 459 1845	16. 5 17. 8 15. 5 15. 1 16. 2	16. 4 17. 5 15. 7 16. 6 16. 5	Whi te 0. 8 0. 8 0. 8 0. 8 0. 4	e - <u>Mal e</u> 267 293 256 290 1106	14. 6 17. 0 15. 2 14. 9 15. 4	15. 6 14. 6 14. 9	0. 9 0. 9 0. 9 0. 9 0. 4
Fairfield Hartford New Haven Other Five Conn.	261 270 255 225 1011	8. 6 8. 9 8. 7 7. 2 8. 3	7. 2 6. 7	Whi te 0. 4 0. 4 0. 5 0. 4 0. 2	Female 165 128 149 134 576	8. 5 6. 9 8. 2 6. 7 7. 6	5. 4* 6. 6 5. 7	0. 5 0. 5 0. 6 0. 5 0. 3
Fairfield Hartford New Haven Other Five Conn.	61 68 69 15 213	18. 6 18. 0 20. 2 - 18. 3		Bl ack 3. 8 3. 7 4. 1 - 2. 1	- <u>Male</u> 27 33 38 2 100	12. 1 12. 2 15. 7 - 12. 1	20. 7 26. 2	3. 4 3. 9 4. 6 - 2. 1
Fairfield Hartford New Haven Other Five Conn.	23 18 25 8 74	6. 1 4. 4 6. 5 - 5. 8	7. 8 ⁴ 6. 0 ⁴ 8. 5 ⁴ - 7. 8	Bl ack - 1. 6 1. 4 1. 7 - 0. 9	Female 11 18 14 1	- 6. 1 - - 4. 8	- 7. 7 ⁴ - - 6. 6	- 1. 9 - - 1. 0

¹ Age-adj usted directly to the U.S. 2000 standard million.
2 Standard error of the age-adj usted rate.
3 Includes tumors for persons not specified as to race.
4 The standard error is between 20% and 25% of the observed rate.

^{*} P < .05 (compared to the observed rate in 1990-97).

Table 16 Incidence of Invasive Tumors, Rates/100,000, by County, Race, Sex, 1990-2002 Ovary (56.9) Thyroid (73.9)

<u>County</u>	<u>Tumors</u>	Crude <u>Rate</u>	Age-adjusted Rate Observed SE ³	e <u>Tumors</u>	Crude <u>Rate</u>	Age-adj ust <u>Observed²</u>	ed Rate <u>SE³</u>
		<u> 1990-</u>	<u> 1997</u>		<u>1998-2</u>	002	
Fairfield Hartford New Haven New London Litchfield Middlesex Tolland Windham Conn. ⁵	613 555 566 175 123 105 66 68 2272	17. 5 15. 7 16. 8 17. 1 17. 5 12. 7 15. 8 16. 6	0vary - 15.9 0.6 13.9 0.6 14.8 0.6 16.4 1.3 14.9 1.4 16.2 1.6 14.2 1.7 15.1 1.9 15.0 0.3	All Races 380 322 373 100 71 64 34 48 1394	16. 7 14. 5 17. 4 15. 3 15. 2 16. 1 9. 9 17. 3	14. 7 12. 0* 15. 2 13. 7 12. 8 13. 6 9. 9 15. 9 13. 8*	0.8 0.7 0.8 1.4 1.5 1.7 1.7 2.3
Fairfield Hartford New Haven Other Five Conn. ⁵	585 521 542 533 2182	19. 4 17. 2 18. 6 17. 0 18. 0	16. 8 0. 7 14. 3 0. 6 15. 5 0. 7 15. 9 0. 7 15. 6 0. 3	White 357 311 342 310 1322	18. 5 16. 7 18. 9 15. 4 17. 4	15. 4 13. 1 15. 4 13. 4 14. 3	0.8 0.8 0.9 0.8
Fairfield Hartford New Haven Other Five Counties Conn.	24 27 22 4	6. 3 6. 5 5. 7 -	8. 4 ⁶ 1. 8 8. 6 ⁶ 1. 7 7. 9 ⁶ 1. 7 	BI ack 11 8 23 4	- - 8. 4 - 5. 1	- 11. 3 ⁶ - 6. 5	- - 2. 4 -
Fairfield Hartford New Haven New London Litchfield Other Three Conn.	105 95 123 34 26	3. 2 2. 9 4. 0 3. 3 3. 5 1. 9 3. 2	<u> </u>	hyroi d Al I Races ⁴ 104 82 102 34 17 44 383	4. 9 4. 0 5. 1 5. 3 3. 8 4. 4 4. 6	4. 8* 3. 9 5. 2 5. 5 3. 5 4. 4* 4. 6*	0. 5 0. 4 0. 5 1. 0 0. 9 0. 7 0. 2
Fairfield Hartford New Haven New London Litchfield Middlesex Tolland Windham Conn.	275 263 264 79 69 52 32 24 1058	7.9 7.5 7.8 7.7 9.5 8.7 6.2 5.6	7. 4 0. 5 7. 3 0. 5 7. 6 0. 5 7. 6 0. 9 9. 3 1. 1 8. 1 1. 1 6. 2 1. 1 5. 4 1. 1 7. 4 0. 2	- All Races 314 224 308 73 78 40 43 25 1106 ⁵	13.8 10.1 14.4 11.2 16.7 10.0 12.5 9.0 12.6	13. 3* 9. 6* 14. 0* 10. 5 15. 4* 9. 5 12. 3* 9. 1 ⁶ 12. 1*	0.8 0.7 0.8 1.2 1.8 1.5 1.9
Conn.	979	8. 1	7.7 <u>Femal e</u>	- <u>Whi te</u> 1003	13. 2	12. 5*	0. 4
Conn.	51	4. 0	4.8 <u>Female</u> 0.7	- <u>BI ack</u> 50	5. 5	6. 1	0. 9

¹ Excludes 366 cystadenomas, earlier classified as malignant in the "ICD-0" (<u>International Classification of Diseases For Oncology</u>), now listed as of "uncertain malignancy".

² Age-adjusted directly to the U.S. 2000 standard million.

³ Standard error of the age-adjusted rate.

⁴ Includes tumors for persons not specified as to race.

Includes state residents for whom the county is not stated.

The standard error is between 20% and 25% of the observed rate. * p < .05 (compared to the observed rate in 1990-97).

Table 17 Incidence of Invasive Tumors, Rates/100,000, by County, Race, Sex, 1990-2002-Myeloma (site 42.1, morphology 9831-9832)

<u>County</u>	<u>Tumors</u>	Crude <u>Rate</u>	Age-adj ust <u>Observed</u>		<u>Tumors</u>	Crude Ag <u>Rate</u>	ge-adj usted <u>Observed¹</u>	
		<u>19</u>	990-1997			<u> 1998-</u>	2002	
Fairfield Hartford New Haven New London Litchfield Middlesex Tolland Windham	201 215 165 56 53 28 18 27	6. 2 6. 6 5. 3 5. 5 7. 6 4. 9 3. 5 6. 6	7. 0 7. 0 5. 8 7. 0 8. 4 5. 6 4. 4 ⁴ 7. 7	All Races 0.5 0.5 0.5 1.0 1.2 1.1 1.1	63- Mal e 144 144 125 33 24 25 21	6. 8 7. 0 6. 3 5. 1 5. 4 6. 6 6. 1 7. 0	7. 4 7. 1 6. 5 6. 0 5. 4 6. 8 7. 6 ⁴ 7. 8 ⁴	0. 6 0. 6 0. 6 1. 1 1. 1 1. 4 1. 7
Conn.	763	5. 9	6. 7	0. 2	535	6. 5	6. 8	0. 3
Fairfield Hartford New Haven New London Litchfield Middlesex Tolland Windham	197 175 180 56 45 34 18	5. 6 5. 0 5. 3 5. 5 6. 2 5. 7 3. 5 4. 4	4. 8 4. 0 4. 3 4. 8 4. 9 4. 8 4. 1 ⁴ 3. 7 ⁴		<u>s³ Femal e</u> 116 125 107 37 19 15 19	5. 1 5. 6 5. 0 5. 7 4. 1 - 5. 5	4. 4 4. 5 4. 1 4. 9 3. 2 ⁴ - 5. 7 ⁴	0. 4 0. 4 0. 4 0. 8 0. 7 - 1. 3
Conn.	724	5. 3	4. 4	0. 2	449	5. 1	4. 3	0. 2
Fairfield Hartford New Haven Other Five	172 181 144 178	6. 1 6. 4 5. 3 5. 8	6. 4 6. 4 5. 4 6. 9	Whi te 0. 5 0. 5 0. 5 0. 5 0. 5	- <u>Mal e</u> 126 129 113 118	6. 9 7. 5 6. 7 6. 1	7. 0 7. 0 6. 3 6. 5	0. 6 0. 6 0. 6 0. 6
Conn.	675	5. 9	6. 3	0. 2	486	6.8	6. 7	0. 3
Fai rfi el d Hartford	171 152	5. 7 5. 0	4. 4 3. 7	White - 0.3	Femal e 98	5. 1 5. 3	4. 1 3. 8	0. 4 0. 4
New Haven Other Five	150 169	5. 1 5. 4	3. 8 4. 6	0. 3 0. 4	91 98	5. 0 4. 9	3. 7 4. 0	0. 4 0. 4
Conn.	642	5. 3	4. 1	0. 2	386	5. 1	3. 9	0. 2
Fairfield Hartford New Haven Other Five	27 30 19 3	8. 2 7. 9 - -	18. 3 ⁴ 14. 2	BI ack 4.1 2.8 - -	- <u>Male</u> 14 14 11 4	- - - -	- - - -	- - -
Conn.	79	6.8	14. 7	1. 9	43	5. 2	9.8	1. 7
Fairfield Hartford New Haven Other Five	23 22 28 2	6. 1 5. 3 7. 3	8. 6 ⁴ 8. 3 ⁴ 11. 7	Bl ack - 1. 8 1. 8 2. 3	Femal e 18 22 15 1	6. 8 7. 5 - -	8. 9 ⁴ 9. 9 ⁴ -	2. 2 2. 1 - -
Conn.	75	5. 9	9. 1	1. 1	58	6. 4	8. 7	1. 2

Age-adjusted directly to the U.S. 2000 standard million.
Standard error of the age-adjusted rate.
Includes tumors for persons not specified as to race.
The standard error is between 20% and 25% of the observed rate.

Table 18
Ratios of Black-to-White Age-adjusted Incidence Rates by County,
Site, Diagnosis Period, Sex, 1990-2002¹

	<u>Fairt</u> <u>M</u>	fi el d <u>F</u>	<u>Hart</u> <u>M</u>	ford <u>F</u>	<u>New</u> <u>Ha</u>	<u>ven</u> <u>F</u>	<u>AII</u> 01	thers ² <u>F</u>	<u>Cor</u> <u>M</u>	<u>nn.</u> <u>F</u>
1990-97 1998-02 1990-02	1. 23 1. 05 1. 15	0. 87 0. 81 0. 84	1. 19 1. 05 1. 13	0. 87 0. 82 0. 85	AII <u>Sites</u> 1. 24 1. 13 1. 20	0. 94 0. 91 0. 92	1. 09 1. 18 1. 14	1. 01 0. 80 0. 90	1. 22 1. 07 1. 15	0. 89 0. 84 0. 87
1990-97 1998-02 1990-02	1. 25 1. 21 1. 23	0. 86 0. 91 0. 88	1. 29 1. 16 1. 23	Lung, B 0. 86 0. 85 0. 86	ronchus, 1. 21 1. 24 1. 22	<u>Frachea</u> 0.83 0.92 0.87	1. 53 0. 93 1. 23	0. 78 0. 92 0. 86	1. 26 1. 17 1. 22	0. 84 0. 88 0. 86
1990-97 1998-02 1990-02	1. 58 1. 46 1. 53	- - -	1. 64 1. 42 1. 54	- - -	Prostate 1. 68 1. 41 1. 56	- - -	1. 18 1. 59 1. 41	- - -	1. 61 1. 45 1. 54	- - -
1990-97 1998-02 1990-02	- - -	0. 80 0. 78 0. 79	- - -	0. 76 0. 78 0. 77	emale Brea - - -	0. 87 0. 84 0. 86	- - -	0. 99 0. 71 0. 85	- - -	0. 82 0. 80 0. 81
1990-97 1998-02 1990-02	1. 03 0. 99 1. 01	0. 95 1. 14 1. 03	1. 10 0. 81 0. 96	Col o 1. 07 1. 23 1. 14	<u>n, Rectum,</u> 1.05 0.91 0.99	Anus 1. 12 1. 19 1. 15	0. 84 - 0. 78	1. 06 0. 88 0. 97	1. 05 0. 89 0. 98	1. 03 1. 16 1. 09
1990-97 1998-02 1990-02	1. 12 1. 05 1. 09	1. 01 1. 25 1. 12	1. 21 0. 78 1. 01	1. 11 1. 38 1. 22	<u>Col on</u> 1. 13 1. 02 1. 09	1. 21 1. 12 1. 17	1. 00 - 0. 86	1. 26 0. 94 1. 11	1. 16 0. 94 1. 06	1. 11 1. 22 1. 16
1990-97 1998-02 1990-02	0. 82 0. 83 0. 82	0. 75 0. 84 0. 79	0. 85 0. 88 0. 85	0. 95 0. 86 0. 91	Rectum, An 0.87 0.63 0.77	<u>us</u> 0. 88 1. 38 1. 09	- - -	- - -	0. 82 0. 77 0. 80	0. 82 0. 99 0. 90
1990-97 1998-02 1990-02	0. 57 0. 32 0. 46	0. 69 - 0. 50	0. 31 0. 36 0. 33	0. 66 - 0. 66	BI adder 0. 49 0. 40 0. 45	0. 66 - 0. 59	-	- - -	0. 46 0. 39 0. 43	0. 70 0. 53 0. 62
1990-97 1998-02 1990-02	0. 78 0. 95 0. 86	0. 87 0. 96 0. 91	0. 88 0. 71 0. 81	1. 11 0. 87 0. 99	Ki dney 1. 00 1. 39 1. 17	1. 29 0. 80 1. 07	- - -	- - -	0. 86 0. 99 0. 92	1. 13 0. 88 1. 02
1990-97 1998-02 1990-02	- - -	0. 74 0. 56 0. 66	- - -	0. 45 0. 52 0. 48	Corpus - - -	0. 79 0. 74 0. 77	- - -	- 0. 72	- - -	0. 67 0. 61 0. 64
1990-97 1998-02 1990-02	- - -	2. 16 1. 61 1. 94	- - -	2. 14 1. 16 1. 73	<u>Cervi x</u> - - -	1. 75 1. 70 1. 72	- - -	- - -	- - -	1. 94 1. 57 1. 78

(footnotes shown on second page of table)

Table 18 (cont.)
Ratios of Black-to-White Age-adjusted Incidence Rates by County,
Site, Diagnosis Period, Sex; 1990-2002¹

	<u>Fairf</u> <u>M</u>	<u>field</u> <u>F</u>	<u>Hart</u> <u>M</u>	ford <u>F</u>	New <u>Haven</u> <u>M</u> <u>F</u>	All Othe	ers ² <u>F</u>	Conr <u>M</u>	<u>1.</u> <u>F</u>
1990-97 1998-02 1990-02	2. 09 1. 55 1. 86	1. 52 - 1. 34	1. 55 1. 71 1. 61	2. 15 1. 51 1. 88	<u>Stomach</u> 1. 53 1. 88 2. 07 - 1. 77 1. 70	- - 2. 71	- - -	1. 82 1. 91 1. 86	1. 86 1. 38 1. 66
1990-97 1998-02 1990-02	- 0. 56	0. 86 0. 85 0. 84	0. 73 0. 97 0. 82	1. 13 0. 80 0. 99	<u>Leukemi a</u> 0. 74 0. 81 0. 60	- - -	- - -	0. 72 0. 72 0. 72	0. 93 0. 75 0. 85
1990-97 1998-02 1990-02	0. 83 0. 62 0. 74	0. 71 0. 78 0. 74	0. 75 0. 88 0. 81	0. 78 0. 52 0. 66	<u>Lymphoma</u> 0.81 0.49 0.54 0.85 0.69 0.65	- - 0. 81	- - -	0. 82 0. 69 0. 77	0. 66 0. 72 0. 69
1990-97 1998-02 1990-02	1. 65 1. 26 1. 48	1. 32 1. 19 1. 26	0. 99 - 0. 98	1. 23 0. 91 1. 09	<u>Pancreas</u> 1. 79 1. 85 1. 48 1. 48 1. 65 1. 69	- - -	- - -	1. 45 1. 25 1. 37	1. 46 1. 24 1. 35
1990-97 1998-02 1990-02	1. 71 1. 17 1. 48	1. 11 - 0. 95	1. 61 1. 33 1. 48	0. 83 1. 43 1. 05	<u>Oral,</u> <u>Pharynx</u> 2.08 1.18 1.79 - 1.96 1.18	- - -	- - -	1. 77 1. 33 1. 58	1. 11 1. 08 1. 09
1990-97 1998-02 1990-02	- - -	0. 50 - 0. 43	- - -	0. 60 - 0. 47	<u>0vary</u> - 0. 51 - 0. 73 - 0. 60	- - -	- - -	- - -	0. 53 0. 45 0. 49
1990-97 1998-02 1990-02	- - -	- 0. 34	- - -	- 0. 62	<u>Thyroi d</u> - 0. 69	- - -	- - -	- 0. 44	0. 62 0. 49 0. 56
					<u>Myeloma</u>				
1990-97 1998-02 1990-02	2. 86 - 2. 21	1. 95 2. 17 2. 02	2. 22 - 1. 86	2. 24 2. 61 2. 39	- 3. 08 2. 12 2. 65	- - -	- - -	2. 33 1. 46 1. 95	2. 22 2. 23 2. 21

Ratios for Counties Not Included in "All Others" by Site

	New Lo	ondon <u>F</u>	<u>Mi ddl e</u> <u>M</u>	esex <u>F</u>	<u>New Lo</u> <u>M</u>	ondon <u>E</u>	<u>1</u> !	<u>New</u> <u>L</u> M	ondon <u>E</u>
1990-97 1998-02 1990-02	<u>ALL</u> <u>Si</u> 1. 13 1. 03 1. 07	<u>tes</u> 0. 82 0. 83 0. 81	<u>ALL Si</u> 1. 28 1. 01 1. 16	<u>tes</u> 0. 91 0. 65 0. 78	Prosta 1.37 1.67 1.51	<u>ite</u> - - -		<u>. Bre</u> - -	e <u>ast</u> 0. 73 0. 72 0. 72

 $^{^{\}underline{1}}$ Ratio not shown if either of the rates has a standard error of 25% or greater.

For <u>All Sites</u>, combined data for Litchfield, Tolland and Windham is shown, with ratios for New London and Middlesex given at the end of the table. For the Prostate and Breast, the data is combined for 4 counties: Middlesex and the 3 above for <u>All Sites</u>, with the New London County ratios shown at the end. The data of 5 counties, New London, Middlesex, Litchfield, Tolland and Windham, are combined for each of the remaining sites as "All Others".

Appendi x A

Formulas For Computing Incidence Rates and Standard Errors,
Per 100,000, Including Age-adjusted Rates, Directly Standardized
to the U.S. Standard Million For 2000

Vari abl es

N - Number of tumors diagnosed, all ages

P - Total population at risk - sum of the annual estimates

 n_i - Number of tumors diagnosed under age 5, 5-9, succeeding 5-year age groups to 80-84, and 85+

 p_{i} _ Population estimate for the above age groups

 $\text{U.\,S.\,}2000_i$ – Age-specific sub-total of the standard million for the United States in 2000 for the above age groups

Age-specific Rate
$$(r_i) = n_i \times 100,000/ p_i$$

= $n_i / (p_i \times .00001)$

 $\underline{\text{Crude}} \ \underline{\text{Rate}} = N \ x \ 100,000 \ / \ P$

$$= N / (P x .00001)$$

 $\frac{\text{Age-adjusted}}{\text{Rate }} = \text{Sum } [r_i \times \text{U.S.} 2000_i)] / 1,000,000$

= Sum $[r_i \times (U.S.2000_i \times .000001)]$ for all age groups.

Standard Error of the Age-adjusted Rate (se)

= Square root $[r_i \ X \ (\underline{U.S.} \ \underline{2000_i} \ x \ .000001)^2 / (p_i \ x.00001)]$ of the sum

for all age groups with the superscript 2 indicating the quantity inside the inner brackets () is squared for each value of " 2000_i ".

 $\frac{\text{Test for difference}}{\text{of } 2 \text{ rates}} = (AAR2 - AAR1) / \text{Square root}[se_i^2 + se_i^2]$

Values of the test above $\underline{1.96}$ have a probability of less than 5% of occurring by chance (p < .05).

Appendi x B

Method of Calculating 95% Confidence Limits Incidence Rates

The following details a` procedure for computing 95% confidence limits for the observed incidence rates shown in Tables 1-17. The example, taken from Table 1, is for the age-adjusted rates among Middlesex County female residents Of black ancestry. The rates were 405.0 and 292.0 in 1990-97 and 1998-02, based On 60 and 38 diagnosed tumors, respectively.

The table below gives "Lower" and "Upper" adjustment factors for "No." = 60 0f 0.770 and 1.30. These factors are multiplied by the age-adjusted rate.

```
Estimated 95% probability Limits
For a rate of 405.0 with 60 tumors = lower: 405.0 x 0.770 = 311.9
(diagnosed 1990-97) Upper: 405.0 x 1.30 = 526.5
```

The limits for the rate in 1998-02 of 292.0 based on 38 diagnosed tumors requires an interpolation of the tabled values for "No" = 35 and 40.

```
Lower factor for "No" 38 = (38-35/40-35) \times (0.714-0.697) = (0.60 \times .017) + 0.697 = .707

Lower limit for the age-adj. rate = .707 x 292.0 = 206.4

Upper factor for "No" 38 = 1.39 - 0.60 \times (1.39-1.36) = 1.39 - .018 = 1.37
```

upper limit for the age-adj. rate = $1.37 \times 292.0 = 400.0$

The adjustment factors used for obtaining the above confidence limits are based on tabled values and a computing formula in an article by Haenszel et al. published in 1962^1 . An alternate method for obtaining 95% confidence limits for an age-adjusted rate was published by Fay and Feuer in 1997^2 .

No.	Lower	<u>Upper</u>	<u>No.</u>	Lower	<u>Upper</u>
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30	0. 560 0. 572 0. 583 0. 593 0. 602 0. 611 0. 619 0. 627 0. 634 0. 641 0. 647 0. 653 0. 659 0. 665 0. 670 0. 675	1. 65 1. 62 1. 60 1. 58 1. 56 1. 54 1. 53 1. 51 1. 50 1. 49 1. 48 1. 47 1. 46 1. 45 1. 44	225 250 275 300 350 400 450 500 600 700 800 900 1000 1100 1200 1300 1400	0. 876 0. 882 0. 887 0. 899 0. 906 0. 911 0. 915 0. 922 0. 928 0. 932 0. 936 0. 939 0. 942 0. 945 0. 947 0. 949	1. 14 1. 13 1. 13 1. 12 1. 11 1. 10 1. 10 1. 09 1. 08 1. 07 1. 07 1. 06 1. 06 1. 06 1. 06 1. 05
35 40 45 50 55 60 65 70 75 80 85 90 95 100	0. 697 0. 714 0. 729 0. 742 0. 756 0. 770 0. 778 0. 785 0. 792 0. 798 0. 804 0. 809 0. 813 0. 818	1. 39 1. 36 1. 34 1. 32 1. 31 1. 30 1. 28 1. 27 1. 26 1. 25 1. 24 1. 24 1. 23 1. 22	1500+	0. 950	1. 05
110 120 130 140 150 160` 170 180 190 200	0. 826 0. 833 0. 839 0. 844 0. 849 0. 854 0. 858 0. 862 0. 865 0. 868	1. 21 1. 20 1. 19 1. 18 1. 18 1. 17 1. 17 1. 16 1. 16			

Adapted from "Lung cancer mortality - white males", Haenszel, Loveland and Sirken; Journal of The National Cancer Institute, Vol 28, no. 4, April, 1962.

Appendix C Incidence of Malignant Tumors Diagnosed 1990-2002 by Race, Sex, and Period of Diagnosis

	<u>199</u>	<u>0-1997</u>	<u>199</u>	8-2002
Race	<u>Mal e</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Mal e</u>	<u>Femal e</u>
<u>Whi te</u>	65891	64172	43234	42790
BI ack	4274	3495	2945	2608
<u>American</u> <u>Indian,</u> <u>Native</u> <u>Alaskan</u>	30	25	20	19
Asian, Pacific Islander:	286	330	283	335
<u>Chi nese</u>	69	51	49	52
<u>Japanese</u>	4	36	12	23
<u>Filipino</u>	55	49	42	53
<u>Asian Indian,</u> <u>Pakistani</u>	92	65	74	67
<u>Korean</u>	13	25	8	19
<u>Vi etnamese</u>	12	41	21	23
<u>Laoti an</u>	12	18	4	6
<u>Other Asian.</u> <u>Pacific Islander</u>	29	45	73	92
Other Races	63	59	182	157
<u>Unknown</u> <u>Race</u>	226	151	407	223
<u>Total</u>	70770	68232	47071	46132

Appendix D Sum of Annual County Population Estimates by Race, Sex and Diagnosis Period; Connecticut, $1990-2002^1$

County	<u>Whi te</u>	BI ack	All Other	<u>Total</u>
	<u>1990-97</u> – <u>Mal e</u>			
Fairfield Hartford New Haven New London Litchfield Middlesex Tolland Windham	2823549 2815101 2701584 941442 677229 537131 491366 399198	327554 377536 341094 58921 8005 25501 16235 7046	96141 76543 64732 24021 8352 8681 12485 5267	3247244 3269180 3107410 1024384 693586 571313 520086 411511
Conn.	11386600	1161892	296222	12844714
	<u> 1990-97</u> - <u>Femal e</u>			
Fairfield Hartford New Haven New London Litchfield Middlesex Tolland Windham	3018378 3037124 2915449 945658 709260 565003 499105 418073	379219 413507 385361 53179 6991 26701 8823 6132	96410 77478 65112 25055 8354 8919 11872 5170	3494007 3528109 3365922 1023892 724605 600623 519800 429375
Conn.	12108050	1279913	298370	13686333
	<u>1998-2002</u> - <u>Mal e</u>			
Fairfield Hartford New Haven New London Litchfield Middlesex Tolland Windham	1824762 1726740 1682128 575929 434347 352950 320872 257835	223456 270077 242467 44490 6069 18663 13778 7410	84806 65743 59736 21394 6978 7531 9676 4351	2133024 2062560 1984331 641813 447394 379144 344326 269596
Conn.	7175563	826410	260215	8262188
	<u>1998-2002</u> - <u>Femal e</u>			
Fairfield Hartford New Haven New London Litchfield Middlesex Tolland Windham	1930594 1863494 1808399 592542 455308 371170 326596 267091	263824 294601 273651 39870 5496 19209 7290 6053	87271 67756 61721 22096 7086 8071 9122 4143	2281689 2225851 2143771 654508 467890 398450 343008 277287
Conn.	7615194	909994	267266	8792454

Revised intercensal estimates and projections to 2002, based on the 1990 and 2000 U.S. Censuses. Includes Hispanics and allocations of multiracial and unspecified racial categories to the 3 listed.