

Role of treatments for diabetes and hyperlipidaemia in risk and mortality of primary and secondary brain tumours

Jamie W Robinson¹, Richard M Martin^{1,2,3}, Mio Ozawa⁴, Martha M C Elwenspoek^{2,5}, Maria Theresa Redaniel^{2,5}, Kathreena M Kurian^{1,6*}, Yoav Ben-Shlomo^{2,5*}

*Joint senior authors

Affiliations

1. MRC Integrative Epidemiology Unit, University of Bristol, Bristol, BS8 2BN, UK (JWR, RMM, KMK, YBS)
2. Department of Population Health Sciences, University of Bristol, Bristol, BS8 1UD, UK (RMM, MMCE, MTR, YBS)
3. National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Bristol Biomedical Research Centre, University Hospitals Bristol and University of Bristol, Bristol, UK (RMM)
4. Population, Policy and Practice Research and Teaching Department, UCL Great Ormond Street Institute of Child Health, 30 Guilford Street, London, WC1N 1EH (MO)
5. The National Institute for Health Research Applied Research Collaboration West (NIHR ARC West), University Hospitals Bristol NHS Foundation Trust, BS1 2NT Bristol, UK (MMCE, MTR, YBS)
6. Brain Tumour Research Centre, Bristol, BS10 5NB, UK (KMM)

Running Title

Fibrates and glitazones, and risk of Brain Tumours

Corresponding Author

Jamie Robinson – [Jamie.robinson\[at\]Bristol.ac.uk](mailto:Jamie.robinson[at]Bristol.ac.uk); +44 (0)117 331 0098.

Oakfield House, Oakfield Grove, Clifton, Bristol, BS8 2BN

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](#).

Running Title: Fibrates and glitazones, and risk of Brain Tumours

Funding

The MRC/University of Bristol Integrative Epidemiology Unit (IEU) is supported by the MRC and the University of Bristol (MC_UU_12013/1, MC_UU_12013/2). JWR is supported by a joint studentship from NHS North Bristol Trust and Bristol Tumour Bank (SOCS/SJ1447). RMM is supported by a Cancer Research UK Programme Grant, the Integrative Cancer Epidemiology Programme (C18281/A19169). JWR and RMM are members of the MRC IEU which is supported by the Medical Research Council and the University of Bristol (MC_UU_12013/1-9). RMM is supported by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Bristol Biomedical Research Centre which is funded by the National Institute for Health Research and is a partnership between University Hospitals Bristol NHS Trust and the University of Bristol. The views expressed in this publication are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the NIHR or the UK Department of Health and Social Care. This work was supported by funding from the Brain Tumour Bank and Research Fund, North Bristol NHS Trust Charitable Funds (Registered Charity Number: 1055900), and University of Bristol Campaigns and Alumni funding. This work was supported by CRUK [grant number C18281/A19169], as part of the Integrative Cancer Epidemiology Programme. MTR, MMCE, and YBS are supported by the NIHR Applied Research Collaboration West (NIHR ARC West). The views expressed in this article are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the NIHR or the Department of Health and Social Care.

Conflict of Interest

The authors have no competing interests to declare.

Authorship

Performed data management and statistical analyses: JWR, MO. Writing of the initial versions of the manuscript: JWR, RMM & YBS. Extraction of CPRD data: MMCE, MTR. Conceptualisation of analysis plan: MO, MTR, RMM, KMK, YBS. All authors read, reviewed and provided feedback for final manuscript.

Abstract

Background

In vivo and observational studies suggest anti-hyperlipidaemic and -diabetic medications (fibrates and glitazones respectively) may have a role in primary prevention and progression of brain tumours by targeting PPAR- α and - γ , respectively.

Methods

We conducted a case-control and clinical cohort study within the UK Clinical Practice Research Datalink. We identified adults (aged 18 years+) with primary or secondary brain tumours diagnosed between 2000-2016 prescribed either fibrates or glitazones and identified four controls based on age, sex and drug exposure duration. Multivariable logistic regression analysis estimated an association between drug exposure and brain tumour status. Cox's survival models were used to look at risk of mortality.

Results

1,916 cases were prescribed a fibrate and 445 cases a glitazone. Our analyses showed little evidence of an association between fibrates and either risk or mortality of brain tumours (adjusted odds ratio for ever exposed PPAR- α 0.98, 95% CI: 0.77, 1.23; adjusted hazard ratio for ever exposed 0.91; 95% CI: 0.76, 1.09). We observed a reduced risk with a per-year increase in exposure duration for glitazones (adjusted odds ratio 0.88, 95% CI: 0.81, 0.96, $P=0.002$) but no major mortality benefit (adjusted hazard ratio 0.99, 95% CI: 0.80, 1.23).

Conclusions

Our results suggest longer duration exposure to glitazones is associated with a reduced risk of primary and secondary brain tumours but no large effect on mortality. We failed to find any strong evidence of a protective effect on risk or mortality for fibrate exposure. Further studies are required for replication and to provide more precise effect estimates.

Key Words

Primary and secondary brain tumours, fibrates, glitazones, observational epidemiology

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](#).

Running Title: Fibrates and glitazones, and risk of Brain Tumours

Key Points

- Repurposing existing drugs that target PPAR- α and - γ receptors may have a role in prevention and progression of brain tumours.
- We observed a reduced risk between duration of glitazones and both primary and secondary brain tumours but no major reduction on mortality
- We observed no major reduction of risk or mortality with fibrates
- Future studies need to be undertaken to ensure replication and obtain more precise estimates

Importance of Study

The incidence of brain tumours appears to be increasing with a growing impact on years of life lost.

Therapeutic options are limited, either for primary prevention or to prevent mortality of disease once developed. We investigated whether two commonly prescribed families of drugs (fibrates and glitazones) could offer potential drug-repurposing options in reducing brain tumour incidence or progression as informed by previous *in vivo* and observational studies. Our analyses suggest that glitazones are associated with a decreased brain tumour risk. These results can help guide future research into drug re-repurposing for brain tumour treatment.

Introduction

Brain, other central nervous system (CNS) and intracranial tumours are the 9th most common cancer in the UK with an incidence of 18 per 100,000 individuals in 2016¹. Brain cancer prognosis varies greatly by histological grade. Glioblastoma (WHO grade IV) has an extremely poor outlook, with roughly 5% of patients alive after five years². Drug companies are increasingly withdrawing from the development of novel drugs due to significant costs and high failure rates, which is especially true for cancer therapeutics³. However, re-purposing existing approved drugs for different diseases than originally designed provides significant advantages over how drugs are traditionally developed saving substantial time and costs involved in conducting new clinical trials.

Nuclear hormone receptors (NHR) have crucial roles in cellular homeostasis and have been implicated in the development of cancer. Peroxisome proliferator-activated receptors (PPARs) are a family of ligand-activated transcription factors that regulate the expression of genes and, as a subtype of NHRs, are involved in the control of proliferation and differentiation of cells⁴⁻⁶. This has marked PPARs as potential candidates in the treatment of cancer, with some studies showing beneficial outcomes in animal models and some early-stage human trials⁷⁻¹⁰. There are three isoforms of PPARs which are designed as α -, β/δ and γ . The genes regulated by these transcription factors are also involved in the transport, metabolism and storage of fatty acids, inflammation and diabetes mellitus^{5,11,12}. PPAR- α and γ are of considerable clinical significance due to the existence of agonistic compounds that these bind to, namely hypolipidaemic fibrates and thiazolidinediones (glitazones) respectively.

PPAR- α expression has been seen to be enriched within the classical glioblastoma subtype and constituted an independent prognostic marker for improved overall survival¹³. PPAR- γ is increased in human breast cancer, and ligand activation of this receptor results in a more differentiated and thus less malignant state of the disease¹⁴ and reduced growth of colon cancer cells¹⁵. Pioglitazone, a

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](#).

Running Title: Fibrates and glitazones, and risk of Brain Tumours

PPAR- γ agonist, showed a dose-dependent reduction of glioma tumour invasion in murine glioma models when combined with 6-OH-11-O-hydroxyfenantrene (IIF) ¹⁶.

Human evidence is limited with a meta-analysis of 17 randomised placebo-controlled trials, and a separate phase II trial, suggesting that PPAR- α agonists may not succeed as anti-cancer agents in general ^{17 18}. However, the first of these studies did not look directly at CNS cancer and the second of these studies did not have a large cohort of CNS cancer cases (n = 97). A previous case control study found that diabetic glioblastoma patients were less likely to be treated with a PPAR- γ agonist when compared to a hip fracture control population ¹⁹, though the study was potentially biased as thiazolidinedione use may be over-represented amongst people with fractures ^{20,21}. We have explored whether PPAR- α or - γ agonists are associated with a reduced risk of developing brain tumours or mortality risk using a large population-based database from primary care.

Methods and Materials

To examine the effects of PPAR- α and - γ exposure, we undertook two nested case-control studies and a case-only clinical cohort study within the UK Clinical Practice Research Datalink (CPRD). CPRD is a primary care database with clinical information on over 11 million people from more than 670 UK GP practices ²². The study was approved by the Independent Scientific Advisory Committee (ISAC) for the UK Medicines and Healthcare Products Regulatory Agency (ISAC protocol number: 18_149R ²³). The data were extracted from CPRD GOLD and linked to ONS death registration data and census data on area deprivation (see below).

Participants

All participants in the study were 18 years or older and were registered within the CPRD between 1st January 2000 to 1st January 2016, the former being the first year that glitazones were licensed within the UK. Follow-up was stopped when one of the following occurred: death; brain tumour diagnosis; end of registration at a CPRD GP practice; or the end-date of the study. We specified for inclusion

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](#).

Running Title: Fibrates and glitazones, and risk of Brain Tumours

that brain tumour patients must have received their diagnosis after registration at a CPRD participating GP practice, due to the possibility that their prescription history may be missing or incomplete.

All participants in the case control study had to be treated with either an anti-hyperlipidaemic or anti-diabetic medication before the end date of the study to reduce the likelihood of confounding by indication. However, those people treated solely with insulin therapy were dropped so as to exclude subjects with type I diabetes. Participants who started on oral medication, but at some point received insulin therapy, were still eligible for inclusion. We did not exclude people on combination therapy (for example, both glitazone plus another anti-diabetic medication) that included the drug of interest; these participants were considered as exposed, if one of the therapies was the drug of interest. Similarly, some people were exposed to both fibrates and glitazones and we considered these exposed for both analyses.

In the cohort study, all brain tumour patients, regardless of fibrate or glitazone drug exposure were included so long as they had a minimum of one year of follow-up of observation prior to censoring.

Cases and Controls

We defined cases as those patients who were diagnosed with a brain tumour (primary or secondary) and had this diagnosis recorded in the CPRD. We included secondary tumours as fibrates and glitazones may theoretically effect risk of other tumours having metastatic spread to the brain. A list of the read codes and CPRD descriptions of these can be found in **Supplementary Table 1**.

Up to four controls, without diagnosis of a brain tumour and contemporaneously registered within the CPRD, were selected per case using incidence density sampling. Controls were subject to the same selection criteria as cases and were strata matched by age group (<20, 20-29, 30-39, 40-49, 50-59, 60-69, 70-79 and ≥80) and sex. To address time-window bias²⁴, controls were required to have the same retrospective duration of potential exposure (any drug treatment for either

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](#).

Running Title: Fibrates and glitazones, and risk of Brain Tumours

hyperlipidaemia or diabetes) within the CPRD as cases, based on the case index date plus or minus six months. For example, if a case had 6.3 years of retrospective drug history from their index date in 2013, then only controls who also had between 5.8 and 6.8 years of drug exposure over the same secular time period were sampled. This meant that both cases and controls have the same potential for recorded exposure to the drugs of interest.

Exposures

Our drug exposures were PPAR- α and - γ agonists for the treatment of hyperlipidaemia and type II diabetes as compared to another drug treatment (unexposed group), respectively, with product codes used to determine this given in **Supplementary Tables 2 and 3**.

We created two exposure variables. Firstly, a binary variable to indicate ever exposed to either drug as compared to another potential drug for the management of diabetes or hyperlipidaemia.

Secondly, the total time the participant had been exposed to one of the drugs before censoring, which we categorised into an ordinal variable representing years of exposure for use in the logistic regression model. This was calculated by summing each uninterrupted prescription duration for each person. We defined an interruption as a break of at least 90 days between prescriptions, which started a new uninterrupted duration. The longest of these prescription durations were used to determine exposure duration. As we did not know whether any latency period is required to have a physiological effect, we used this duration variable to investigate a potential dose-response relationship. Exposure duration was categorised into yearly categories: 0 or exposure ≤ 1 year, >1 and ≤ 2 years, >2 and ≤ 3 years, >3 and ≤ 4 years, >4 and ≤ 5 years, >5 and ≤ 6 years, >6 and ≤ 7 years and > 7 years exposure due to small numbers of people reaching this length of exposure.

Potential Confounders

We considered the following variables as potential confounders that might influence both risk of developing or dying from a brain tumour as well as potential influencing the choice of drug agent

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](#).

Running Title: Fibrates and glitazones, and risk of Brain Tumours

that a doctor might prescribe; these were age, sex and socioeconomic status (SES). We used an ecological proxy measure, the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2015 (IMD)²⁵, to proxy for socioeconomic status. This is a commonly used measure in the United Kingdom that uses census data on a wide variety of economic and health factors to derive a postcode-based deprivation score so that a higher score indicates less deprivation. These were grouped into five equal sized groups after sorting (quintiles).

In the analyses for diabetic medications, we felt it was important to adjust for the severity or degree of diabetic control as a potential confounder. We did this by using, where available, HbA1c levels. Units were converted and standardised to the International Federation of Clinical Chemistry (IFCC) units in mmols/mol. We created an ordinal variable with three levels: 1, indicating well controlled diabetes for levels ≤ 58 mmols/mol; 2, indicating sub-optimally controlled diabetes for levels > 58 mmols/mol and ≤ 75 mmols/mol; and 3, indicating poorly controlled diabetes for levels > 75 mmols/mol. If no measures of the participant's HbA1c levels were identified in the database, we assumed they had mild or well controlled diabetes and assigned these participants into the lowest ordinal level based on the assumption that the clinician did not feel it necessary to do the blood test. However, we also conducted sensitivity analyses to test this assumption (see below).

For the cohort analysis we assumed patients with more comorbidities would be more likely to die and this may also influence choice of medication. We therefore derived the Charlson comorbidity index score²⁶ in the cohort analysis and included this as a covariate. The list of read codes used was taken from Khan, *et al*,²⁷ and result in an ordinal score. We calibrated this to 4 units (half the interquartile range) so that the model coefficient is for a 4-unit change in Charlson comorbidity index score.

Statistical Methods

The fibrate and glitazone case-control analyses were conducted using logistic regression to compute odds ratios (OR) and 95% confidence intervals (CI) for exposure status to fibrate and glitazone drugs and exposure duration of the two types of drugs and case control status. We ran unadjusted and multivariable models adjusting for age, sex, quintile IMD score, drug treatment duration and HbA1c for the glitazone study. We chose to run an unmatched logistic rather than conditional logistic model as this may introduce bias but we treated matching variables as covariates²⁸. Dose exposure was analysed both as a continuous ordinal variable but also as a “dummy” variable so we could check for any evidence of non-linearity in the pattern of the odds ratios.

The cohort analysis consisted of both unadjusted Kaplan-Meier graphs and adjusted Cox proportional hazards models with estimated hazard ratios (HR) and 95% confidence intervals. The proportional hazards assumption was tested by examination of the scaled Schoenfeld residuals.

Sensitivity Analyses

We repeated the analyses with primary and secondary brain tumours, rather than the combined group, to see if there was any evidence of heterogeneity of effect. We also investigated our assumption that missing HbA1c levels should be allocated to the well-controlled group. We undertook multiple imputation to predict missing HbA1c levels based on case control status, age, IMD, sex, drug treatment duration, PPAR-γ ever exposure and number of consultations, defined as each day the patient had at least one in-person consultation. We generated 55 datasets, roughly equal to the missingness of the data, and these were then combined using Rubin’s rules. We also repeated the analyses on the complete case subset so that any subjects with missing HbA1c levels were dropped.

Libraries and Code

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](#).

Running Title: Fibrates and glitazones, and risk of Brain Tumours

We used Python and the Pandas²⁹ library to clean the data and construct the summary statistics for the models. The logistic regression and Kaplan-Meier curves were conducted in R using the Survival library³⁰. The Survminer library³¹ in R was also used for the Cox proportional hazards model. MICE³² was used to impute missing HbA1c levels.

Results

After data extraction, cleaning and linkage, the study populations consisted of 9,741 participants with 129,356 person years in the fibrate study and 2,400 participants with 30,871 person years of follow up in the glitazone study (see flow charts for participant selection in **Supplementary Figures 1-3**).

Cases and controls had similar distributions for sex, age group and quintile IMD score (see **Table 1**). Cases appeared to have similar probability of exposure to fibrates but less exposure to glitazones compared to controls. This was supported by the multivariable models (**Table 2**). For fibrates there was little evidence that ever exposed (adjusted OR (aOR)=0.98; 95% CI: 0.77 to 1.23; P=0.84) or per year increase in duration of exposure (aOR=0.97; 95% CI: 0.91 to 1.03; P=0.34) was associated with risk. There was also little evidence of a dose-response relationship between fibrate exposure and brain tumour risk either as a continuous or dummy variable (see **Supplementary Table 4**).

For glitazones, the association with ever exposure was consistent with chance (aOR=0.84; 95% CI: 0.66, 1.08; P=0.18) but there was an inverse association with duration of exposure (aOR per year = 0.88; 95% CI: 0.81, 0.96; P=2.00x10⁻³). Analysis by duration period was consistent with an effect only being observed after 4 years (see **Supplementary Table 5**) as all the odds ratio were less than one, however the confidence intervals for the shorter duration periods were sufficiently wide as to not exclude any effect for earlier periods. These results were almost identical when we imputed the missing HbA1c values (aOR=0.88, 95% CI: 0.82, 0.94, P=1x10⁻³) or if we did not adjust for HbA1c (see **Supplementary Table 6**). However, in the complete case analysis the effect was attenuated to the

null (aOR 0.96, 95% CI 0.85, 1.08, $P > 0.05$). We noted that higher HbA1C levels were also associated with a reduced risk (aOR=0.61; 95% CI: 0.48, 0.77; $P = 2.41 \times 10^{-5}$). However, in both the imputed and complete case analysis there was no association between HbA1c and case control status (aOR=0.99, 95% CI: 0.82 to 1.20 and aOR=0.94, 95% CI: 0.71, 1.24) (see **Supplementary Table 6**).

The repeat analysis looking at primary and secondary tumours alone found similar results (aOR=0.89 and 0.87 respectively) (see **supplementary table 7**). We were underpowered to examine whether any effects may have differed by type of specific cancers e.g. lung, breast that were the primary source for the secondary brain tumours.

In the cohort study, there was little evidence that exposure to fibrates improved survival rates when compared to the non-exposed population (unadjusted exposed median survival time = 3.26 months; 95% CI: 2.60, 4.15 months versus unadjusted unexposed median survival time = 3.49 months; 95% CI: 3.26, 3.75 months) (**Figure 1**). There was also little evidence to suggest that glitazones were associated with survival rates (unadjusted exposed median survival time = 3.29 months; 95% CI: 2.86, 5.43 months versus unadjusted unexposed median survival time = 4.64; 95% CI: 3.92, 5.56 months) (**Figure 2**). There was little evidence of an association between fibrate exposure and risk of death (adjusted hazard ratio, aHR=0.91; 95% CI: 0.76, 1.09; $P = 0.30$). There was also little evidence of a decreased risk of death associated with glitazones (aHR=0.99; 95% CI: 0.80, 1.23; $P = 0.95$).

Discussion

To the best of our knowledge, this is the first pharmacoepidemiological study of the effects of fibrate and glitazone prescription on risk and progression of brain tumours. We found little evidence that fibrates were protective against brain tumour risk or mortality, in contrast to some previous literature³³. We did observe that ever exposure to glitazones showed an inverse effect with risk which seemed most marked for exposure duration of 4 or more years. This observation was consistent when we used multiple imputation for missing HbA1C levels rather than assume this reflected good glycaemic control. However, the effect was attenuated in the complete case analysis.

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](#).

Running Title: Fibrates and glitazones, and risk of Brain Tumours

The latter however resulted in far fewer cases and reduced precision in our estimated risk (95% CI: 0.85, 1.08) which were still consistent with our original observation. It is also more prone to collider bias³⁴, whereby controlling for a common effect of both the exposure (glitazone prescription) and the outcome (brain tumour) distorts the association between the two. This would introduce an artefactual association between treatment and brain tumours if glitazones and brain tumours are associated with having a HbA1c test. This is possible as in the UK, glitazones are recommended as second line therapy for diabetes³⁵ and hence given to less easy to control diabetics who are more likely to require greater monitoring. Brain tumour risk may also be associated with testing if risk factors or confounders are associated with probability of testing.

If our observed association with glitazones is causal, then there may be a potential protective effect for glitazones, although this observation requires replication with ideally a larger sample size so one can test if there is a genuine threshold effect with duration. Similar effects were seen when considering only primary or only secondary brain tumours but due to limited power we could not test whether there were differences by type of cancer for those subjects with secondary brain tumours. In the case of fibrates, however, no such effect was observed suggesting that they do not alter brain tumour risk or mortality.

This study uses CPRD a large and well-established database which has been validated by numerous sources³⁶⁻³⁸. It should be free of selection bias as almost all UK residents are registered with a general practitioner and the population captured by CPRD practices is representative of the general population²². Exposure is well measured as it is recorded from medical records and collected prospectively (avoiding recall bias). Our sampling methodology should have avoided any immortal time bias. We tried to reduce confounding by indication by only sampling cases and controls who could have been exposed to fibrates or glitazones because of a clinical indication. However, this design feature greatly reduced the number of cases and hence reduced our statistical power to detect modest effects. In addition, although we tried to adjust for diabetes severity using HbA1c,

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](#).

Running Title: Fibrates and glitazones, and risk of Brain Tumours

there was a considerable amount of missing data. We used multiple imputation to take this into account and believe this provides a less biased estimate than the complete case analysis.

Adjustment for SES was only possible for linked practices which also had a negative impact on power but is unlikely to be biased as linkage was based on practice rather than individual consent. We could not test whether specific types of primary cancers such as lung cancer were more, less or equally likely to show a reduced risk.

There have been various *in vivo* studies that have suggested fibrate exposure may be protective for brain tumours, specifically gliomas, by modulating PPAR- α inhibition^{13,39-41}. There is similar evidence available for the consideration of glitazones as a treatment option from *in vivo* studies^{19,42-44}.

However, prior to this study, there have been no other pharmacoepidemiological studies that examine whether fibrates or glitazones affect brain tumour risk and survival. A previously published study sought to investigate whether diabetes and use of anti-diabetic medications altered glioma risk in CPRD⁴⁵, however, the authors did not specifically look at glitazones as a drug of interest.

Our study has shown evidence that fibrates do not have an effect on glioma risk or prognosis. In contrast, longer exposure to glitazones was associated with a decreased risk of being diagnosed with primary or secondary brain tumours. Further research needs to try to replicate this finding using independent datasets preferably larger in size and/or with better data on glycaemic control and confounders. We hope our observations may lead to a better understanding of the pathophysiological mechanisms and potential therapies for the prevention of cancer. If the reduced risk with secondary tumours is causal and consistent across all types then this could be easily translated into a therapeutic option so that patients diagnosed with these cancers are started on these drugs as a tertiary prevention strategy to prevent brain metastases. This could be tested in a future clinical trial if these results are replicated in other cancer cohorts.

Funding

The MRC/University of Bristol Integrative Epidemiology Unit (IEU) is supported by the MRC and the University of Bristol (MC_UU_12013/1, MC_UU_12013/2). JWR is supported by a joint studentship from NHS North Bristol Trust and Bristol Tumour Bank (SOCS/SJ1447). RMM is supported by a Cancer Research UK Programme Grant, the Integrative Cancer Epidemiology Programme (C18281/A19169). JWR and RMM are members of the MRC IEU which is supported by the Medical Research Council and the University of Bristol (MC_UU_12013/1-9). RMM is supported by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Bristol Biomedical Research Centre which is funded by the National Institute for Health Research and is a partnership between University Hospitals Bristol NHS Trust and the University of Bristol. The views expressed in this publication are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the NIHR or the UK Department of Health and Social Care. This work was supported by funding from the Brain Tumour Bank and Research Fund, North Bristol NHS Trust Charitable Funds (Registered Charity Number: 1055900), and University of Bristol Campaigns and Alumni funding. This work was supported by CRUK [grant number C18281/A19169], as part of the Integrative Cancer Epidemiology Programme. MTR, MMCE, and YBS are supported by the NIHR Applied Research Collaboration West (NIHR ARC West). The views expressed in this article are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the NIHR or the Department of Health and Social Care.

References

1. CRUK. Brain, other CNS and intracranial tumours statistics. <https://www.cancerresearchuk.org/health-professional/cancer-statistics/statistics-by-cancer-type/brain-other-cns-and-intracranial-tumours>. Accessed 20/08/2019, 2019.
2. Society AC. Survival Rates for Selected Adult Brain and Spinal Cord Tumors. 2017; <https://www.cancer.org/cancer/brain-spinal-cord-tumors-adults/detection-diagnosis-staging/survival-rates.html>. Accessed 20/08/2019.
3. Hutchinson L, Kirk R. High drug attrition rates--where are we going wrong? *Nat Rev Clin Oncol*. 2011; 8(4):189-190.
4. Kitamura S, Miyazaki Y, Shinomura Y, Kondo S, Kanayama S, Matsuzawa Y. Peroxisome proliferator-activated receptor gamma induces growth arrest and differentiation markers of human colon cancer cells. *Jpn J Cancer Res*. 1999; 90(1):75-80.
5. Poulsen L, Siersbaek M, Mandrup S. PPARs: fatty acid sensors controlling metabolism. *Semin Cell Dev Biol*. 2012; 23(6):631-639.
6. Rosen ED, Spiegelman BM. PPARgamma : a nuclear regulator of metabolism, differentiation, and cell growth. *J Biol Chem*. 2001; 276(41):37731-37734.
7. Barak Y, Liao D, He W, et al. Effects of peroxisome proliferator-activated receptor delta on placentation, adiposity, and colorectal cancer. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2002; 99(1):303-308.
8. Demetri GD, Fletcher CD, Mueller E, et al. Induction of solid tumor differentiation by the peroxisome proliferator-activated receptor-gamma ligand troglitazone in patients with liposarcoma. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 1999; 96(7):3951-3956.
9. Mueller E, Smith M, Sarraf P, et al. Effects of ligand activation of peroxisome proliferator-activated receptor gamma in human prostate cancer. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2000; 97(20):10990-10995.
10. Smallridge RC, Copland JA, Brose MS, et al. Efatutazone, an oral PPAR-gamma agonist, in combination with paclitaxel in anaplastic thyroid cancer: results of a multicenter phase 1 trial. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab*. 2013; 98(6):2392-2400.
11. Kliewer SA, Sundseth SS, Jones SA, et al. Fatty acids and eicosanoids regulate gene expression through direct interactions with peroxisome proliferator-activated receptors alpha and gamma. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 1997; 94(9):4318-4323.
12. Varga T, Czimmerer Z, Nagy L. PPARs are a unique set of fatty acid regulated transcription factors controlling both lipid metabolism and inflammation. *Biochim Biophys Acta*. 2011; 1812(8):1007-1022.
13. Haynes HR, White P, Hares KM, et al. The transcription factor PPARalpha is overexpressed and is associated with a favourable prognosis in IDH-wildtype primary glioblastoma. *Histopathology*. 2017; 70(7):1030-1043.
14. Mueller E, Sarraf P, Tontonoz P, et al. Terminal Differentiation of Human Breast Cancer through PPARγ. *Molecular Cell*. 1998; 1(3):465-470.
15. Sarraf P, Mueller E, Jones D, et al. Differentiation and reversal of malignant changes in colon cancer through PPARgamma. *Nat Med*. 1998; 4(9):1046-1052.
16. Papi A, Tatenhorst L, Terwel D, et al. PPARgamma and RXRgamma ligands act synergistically as potent antineoplastic agents in vitro and in vivo glioma models. *J Neurochem*. 2009; 109(6):1779-1790.
17. Bonovas S, Nikolopoulos GK, Bagos PG. Use of fibrates and cancer risk: a systematic review and meta-analysis of 17 long-term randomized placebo-controlled trials. *PLoS One*. 2012; 7(9):e45259.
18. Robison NJ, Campigotto F, Chi SN, et al. A phase II trial of a multi-agent oral antiangiogenic (metronomic) regimen in children with recurrent or progressive cancer. *Pediatr Blood Cancer*. 2014; 61(4):636-642.

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](#).

Running Title: Fibrates and glitazones, and risk of Brain Tumours

19. Grommes C, Conway DS, Alshekhlee A, Barnholtz-Sloan JS. Inverse association of PPARgamma agonists use and high grade glioma development. *J Neurooncol*. 2010; 100(2):233-239.
20. Dormuth CR, Carney G, Carleton B, Bassett K, Wright JM. Thiazolidinediones and fractures in men and women. *Arch Intern Med*. 2009; 169(15):1395-1402.
21. Meier C, Kraenzlin ME, Bodmer M, Jick SS, Jick H, Meier CR. Use of thiazolidinediones and fracture risk. *Arch Intern Med*. 2008; 168(8):820-825.
22. Herrett E, Gallagher AM, Bhaskaran K, et al. Data Resource Profile: Clinical Practice Research Datalink (CPRD). *Int J Epidemiol*. 2015; 44(3):827-836.
23. CPRD. Understanding the impact of the routine use of anti-diabetic (PPAR gamma)/anti-hyperlipidaemic (PPAR alpha) medication on risk of brain tumours and case fatality. 2018; <https://www.cprd.com/protocol/understanding-impact-routine-use-anti-diabetic-ppar-gammaanti-hyperlipidaemic-ppar-alpha>.
24. Suissa S, Dell'aniello S, Vahey S, Renoux C. Time-window bias in case-control studies: statins and lung cancer. *Epidemiology*. 2011; 22(2):228-231.
25. Government DoCaL. The English Indices of Deprivation 2015 Statistical Release. In: Government DoCaL, ed2015.
26. Hall WH, Ramachandran R, Narayan S, Jani AB, Vijayakumar S. An electronic application for rapidly calculating Charlson comorbidity score. *BMC Cancer*. 2004; 4:94.
27. Khan NF, Perera R, Harper S, Rose PW. Adaptation and validation of the Charlson Index for Read/OXMIS coded databases. *BMC Fam Pract*. 2010; 11:1.
28. Pearce N. Analysis of matched case-control studies. *BMJ*. 2016; 352:i969.
29. McKinney W. Data Structures for Statistical Computing in Python. *Proceedings of the 9th Python in Science Conference*. 2010.
30. Therneau TM, Grambsch PM. *Modeling Survival Data: Extending the Cox Model*. New York: Springer; 2000.
31. Kassambara A, Kosinski M, Biecek P. survminer: Drawing Survival Curves using 'ggplot2'. 2019; <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=survminer>.
32. Buuren Sv, Groothuis-Oudshoorn K. mice: Multivariate Imputation by Chained Equations in R. *Journal of Statistical Software*. 2011; 45(3).
33. Panigrahy D, Kaipainen A, Huang S, et al. PPARAlpha agonist fenofibrate suppresses tumor growth through direct and indirect angiogenesis inhibition. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2008; 105(3):985-990.
34. Cole SR, Platt RW, Schisterman EF, et al. Illustrating bias due to conditioning on a collider. *International Journal of Epidemiology*. 2010; 39(2):417-420.
35. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. Type 2 diabetes in adults: management. 2019; NG28:<https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng28/chapter/Key-priorities-for-implementation>. Accessed 03/08/2020.
36. Herrett E, Thomas SL, Schoonen WM, Smeeth L, Hall AJ. Validation and validity of diagnoses in the General Practice Research Database: a systematic review. *Br J Clin Pharmacol*. 2010; 69(1):4-14.
37. Herrett E, Shah AD, Boggon R, et al. Completeness and diagnostic validity of recording acute myocardial infarction events in primary care, hospital care, disease registry, and national mortality records: cohort study. *BMJ*. 2013; 346:f2350.
38. Jick SS, Kaye JA, Vasilakis-Scaramozza C, et al. Validity of the general practice research database. *Pharmacotherapy*. 2003; 23(5):686-689.
39. Binello E, Mormone E, Emdad L, Kothari H, Germano IM. Characterization of fenofibrate-mediated anti-proliferative pro-apoptotic effects on high-grade gliomas and anti-invasive effects on glioma stem cells. *J Neurooncol*. 2014; 117(2):225-234.

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](#).

Running Title: Fibrates and glitazones, and risk of Brain Tumours

40. Wilk A, Urbanska K, Grabacka M, et al. Fenofibrate-induced nuclear translocation of FoxO3A triggers Bim-mediated apoptosis in glioblastoma cells in vitro. *Cell Cycle*. 2012; 11(14):2660-2671.
41. Wilk A, Wyczechowska D, Zapata A, et al. Molecular mechanisms of fenofibrate-induced metabolic catastrophe and glioblastoma cell death. *Mol Cell Biol*. 2015; 35(1):182-198.
42. Grommes C, Landreth GE, Sastre M, et al. Inhibition of in Vivo Glioma Growth and Invasion by Peroxisome Proliferator-Activated Receptor γ Agonist Treatment. *Molecular Pharmacology*. 2006; 70(5):1524-1533.
43. Perez-Ortiz JM, Tranque P, Vaquero CF, et al. Glitazones differentially regulate primary astrocyte and glioma cell survival. Involvement of reactive oxygen species and peroxisome proliferator-activated receptor-gamma. *J Biol Chem*. 2004; 279(10):8976-8985.
44. Perez-Ortiz JM, Tranque P, Burgos M, Vaquero CF, Llopis J. Glitazones induce astrogloma cell death by releasing reactive oxygen species from mitochondria: modulation of cytotoxicity by nitric oxide. *Mol Pharmacol*. 2007; 72(2):407-417.
45. Seliger C, Ricci C, Meier CR, et al. Diabetes, use of antidiabetic drugs, and the risk of glioma. *Neuro Oncol*. 2016; 18(3):340-349.

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](#).

Running Title: Fibrates and glitazones, and risk of Brain Tumours

Figure 1 Kaplan-Meier curve for cohort analysis investigating exposure to fibrates (PPAR- α agonist).

Figure 2 Kaplan-Meier curve for cohort analysis investigating exposure to glitazones (PPAR- γ agonist).

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](#).

Running Title: Fibrates and glitazones, and risk of Brain Tumours

Table 1 Patient characters in each of the three datasets we used.

		Fibrates Case-Control		Glitazones Case-Control		Cohort
		Cases	Controls	Cases	Controls	Cases
		N = 1950	N = 7791	N = 480	N = 1920	N = 7496
Sex	Male	1118 (57.3%)	4469 (57.4%)	277 (57.7%)	1108 (57.7%)	3803 (50.7%)
	Female	832 (42.7%)	3322 (42.6%)	203 (42.3%)	812 (42.3%)	3693 (49.3%)
Age, years	< 20	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.2%)	1 (0.1%)	118 (1.6%)
	20 – 29	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.2%)	7 (0.4%)	167 (2.2%)
	30 – 39	2 (0.1%)	5 (0.1%)	3 (0.6%)	11 (0.6%)	170 (2.3%)
	40 – 49	6 (0.3%)	29 (0.4%)	7 (1.5%)	28 (1.5%)	293 (3.9%)
	50 – 59	40 (2.1%)	193 (2.5%)	15 (3.1%)	76 (4.0%)	658 (8.8%)
	60 – 69	220 (11.3)	848 (10.9%)	56 (11.7%)	233 (12.1%)	1152 (15.4%)
	70 – 79	561 (28.8%)	2279 (29.3%)	135 (28.1%)	535 (27.9%)	1901 (25.4%)
	≥ 80	1121 (57.5%)	4437 (57.0%)	262 (54.6%)	1029 (53.6%)	3037 (40.5%)
Fibrates Exposed		95 (4.9%)	387 (5.0%)	-	-	132 (1.8%)
Glitazones Exposed		-	-	97 (20.2%)	460 (24.0%)	99 (1.3%)
Mean Exposure duration, days (SD) ^a		695.0 (884.4)	832.0 (1023.1)	606.8 (582.8)	872.1 (759.6)	-
HbA1c ^b	1	-	-	81 (16.9%)	493 (25.7%)	-
	2	-	-	45 (9.4%)	347 (18.1%)	-
	3	-	-	16 (3.3%)	101 (5.3%)	-
	Missing			338 (70.4%)	979 (51.0%)	
At least one comorbidity on the Charlson Index ^c		-	-	-	-	6385 (85.1%)

(a) Includes only those exposed to either a fibrate or glitazone of interest.

(b) HbA1c is coded as an ordinal variable from 1 to 3. This represents severity of diabetes: 1, “well controlled”, where HbA1c ≤ 58 mmols/mol; 2, sub-optimally controlled, where HbA1c > 58 mmols/mol and ≤ 75 mmols/mol; and “poorly” controlled, where HbA1c levels > 75 mmols/mol. HbA1c levels were calculated by taking the mean of all available readings of the patient’s HbA1c levels in the CPRD. Initially, missing HbA1c levels were allocated to level 1.

(c) The Charlson comorbidity index categorises comorbidities of chronic illness, including cancer, dementia and diabetes, which may have an effect on mortality.

Table 2 Results from the fibrate and glitazone logistic regressions.

	Variable	Crude OR (95% CI)	Adjusted OR (95% CI)	P Value
Fibrates Ever exposed	Ever Exposed	0.98 (0.78, 1.23)	0.98 (0.77, 1.23)	0.84
	Age	1.02 (0.96, 1.08)	1.01 (0.95, 1.08)	0.67
	IMD	0.98 (0.95, 1.02)	0.99 (0.95, 1.02)	0.42
	Sex	1.00 (0.91, 1.10)	1.00 (0.91, 1.11)	0.98
	Treatment duration	1.01 (0.95, 1.06)	1.00 (0.95, 1.06)	0.89
Fibrates Per year exposure duration	Exposure duration (per year)	0.97 (0.91, 1.03)	0.97 (0.91, 1.03)	0.34
	Age	1.02 (0.96, 1.08)	1.01 (0.95, 1.08)	0.69
	IMD	0.98 (0.95, 1.02)	0.99 (0.95, 1.02)	0.43
	Sex	1.00 (0.91, 1.10)	1.00 (0.91, 1.11)	0.97
	Treatment duration	1.01 (0.95, 1.06)	1.00 (0.95, 1.07)	0.78
Glitazones Ever exposed	Ever Exposed	0.80 (0.63, 1.03)	0.84 (0.66, 1.08)	0.18
	Age	1.03 (0.93, 1.13)	1.00 (0.91, 1.12)	0.94
	IMD	0.94 (0.88, 1.01)	0.96 (0.89, 1.03)	0.28
	Sex	1.00 (0.82, 1.22)	1.02 (0.83, 1.26)	0.84
	HbA1c (per group)	0.59 (0.47, 0.75)	0.61 (0.48, 0.77)	2.39x10 ⁻⁵
	Treatment duration	1.00 (0.82, 1.08)	1.02 (0.95, 1.10)	0.57
Glitazones Per year exposure duration	Exposure duration (per year)	0.88 (0.81, 0.95)	0.88 (0.81, 0.96)	2.00x10 ⁻³
	Age	1.03 (0.93, 1.13)	1.00 (0.91, 1.12)	0.89
	IMD	0.94 (0.88, 1.01)	0.96 (0.89, 1.03)	0.26
	Sex	1.00 (0.82, 1.22)	1.00 (0.82, 1.24)	0.94
	HbA1c (per group)	0.59 (0.47, 0.75)	0.61 (0.48, 0.77)	2.41x10 ⁻⁵
	Treatment duration	1.00 (0.82, 1.08)	1.02 (0.95, 1.10)	0.51


It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](#).

Running Title: Fibrates and glitazones, and risk of Brain Tumours

Table 3 Results from the fibrates and glitazones Cox proportional hazards model.

	Variable	Adjusted HZ (95% CI)	P Value
Fibrates Ever exposed	Ever Exposed	0.90 (0.75, 1.07)	0.24
	Age	1.36 (1.29, 1.43)	$< 2.00 \times 10^{-16}$
	IMD	1.02 (0.99, 1.05)	0.28
	Sex	0.92 (0.84, 1.00)	0.05
	Charlson	1.14 (1.11, 1.17)	$< 2.00 \times 10^{-16}$
Glitazones Ever Exposed	Ever Exposed	0.97 (0.78, 1.20)	0.77
	Age	1.23 (1.16, 1.31)	4.79×10^{-11}
	IMD	0.99 (0.94, 1.04)	0.65
	Sex	0.96 (0.84, 1.11)	0.60
	Charlson	1.14 (1.09, 1.20)	1.71×10^{-7}

Kaplan-Meier Curve Assessing PPAR α Exposure on Survival



Kaplan-Meier Curve Assessing PPAR- Exposure on Survival

