# UC Irvine UC Irvine Previously Published Works

# Title

Glycated Hemoglobin and All-Cause and Cause-Specific Mortality in Singaporean Chinese Without Diagnosed Diabetes: The Singapore Chinese Health Study

**Permalink** https://escholarship.org/uc/item/4v09f9px

**Journal** Diabetes Care, 37(12)

**ISSN** 1066-9442

# Authors

Bancks, Michael P Odegaard, Andrew O Pankow, James S <u>et al.</u>

**Publication Date** 

2014-12-01

# DOI

10.2337/dc14-0390

Peer reviewed



Glycated Hemoglobin and All-Cause and Cause-Specific Mortality in Singaporean Chinese Without Diagnosed Diabetes: The Singapore Chinese Health Study

Diabetes Care 2014;37:3180-3187 | DOI: 10.2337/dc14-0390

Michael P. Bancks,<sup>1</sup> Andrew O. Odegaard,<sup>1</sup> James S. Pankow,<sup>1</sup> Woon-Puay Koh,<sup>2,3</sup> Jian-Min Yuan,<sup>4,5</sup> Myron D. Gross,<sup>1</sup> and Mark A. Pereira<sup>1</sup>

# OBJECTIVE

Glycated hemoglobin (HbA<sub>1c</sub>) is a robust biomarker of the preceding 2 to 3 months average blood glucose level. The aim of this study was to examine the association between HbA<sub>1c</sub> and mortality in a cohort of Southeast Asians.

# **RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODS**

Analysis of 7,388 men and women, mean age 62 years, from the Singapore Chinese Health Study who provided a blood sample at the follow-up I visit (1999–2004) and reported no history of diabetes, previous adverse cardiovascular events, or cancer. A total of 888 deaths were identified through 31 December 2011 via registry linkage. Participants represented a random study sample of potential control subjects for a nested case-control genome-wide association study of type 2 diabetes in the population. Hazard ratios (HRs) for all-cause and cause-specific mortality by six categories of HbA<sub>1c</sub> were estimated with Cox regression models.

# RESULTS

Relative to participants with an HbA<sub>1c</sub> of 5.4–5.6% (36–38 mmol/mol), participants with HbA<sub>1c</sub>  $\geq$ 6.5% ( $\geq$ 48 mmol/mol) had an increased risk of all-cause, cardiovascular, and cancer mortality during an average of 10.1 years of follow-up; HRs (95% Cls) were 1.96 (1.56–2.46), 2.63 (1.77–3.90), and 1.51 (1.04–2.18), respectively. No level of HbA<sub>1c</sub> was associated with increased risk of respiratory mortality. Levels <6.5% HbA<sub>1c</sub> were not associated with mortality during follow-up. The results did not materially change after excluding observation of first 3 years post–blood draw.

# CONCLUSIONS

 $HbA_{1c}$  levels consistent with undiagnosed type 2 diabetes ( $\geq 6.5\%$ ) are associated with an increased risk of all-cause and cause-specific mortality in Chinese men and women.

Glycated hemoglobin (HbA<sub>1c</sub>) is a continuous marker of glycemia, and levels >5.7% (39 mmol/mol) are associated with increased risk for developing type 2 diabetes as well as micro- and macrovascular events (1). Tight glycemic control occurs naturally in healthy individuals, and HbA<sub>1c</sub> represents average glycemia for the prior 2 to 3 months (1). Recently, an International Expert Committee recommended HbA<sub>1c</sub> as a

<sup>1</sup>Division of Epidemiology & Community Health, School of Public Health, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN

<sup>2</sup>Duke-NUS Graduate Medical School Singapore, Singapore

<sup>3</sup>Saw Swee Hock School of Public Health, National University of Singapore, Singapore

<sup>4</sup>Division of Cancer Control and Population Sciences, University of Pittsburgh Cancer Institute, Pittsburgh, PA

<sup>5</sup>Department of Epidemiology, University of Pittsburgh Graduate School of Public Health, Pittsburgh, PA

Corresponding author: Mark A. Pereira, map@ umn.edu.

Received 11 February 2014 and accepted 19 August 2014.

The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the National Institutes of Health.

© 2014 by the American Diabetes Association. Readers may use this article as long as the work is properly cited, the use is educational and not for profit, and the work is not altered. test to diagnose type 2 diabetes mellitus, which has been recognized by the American Diabetes Association (1,2). With the establishment of these guidelines and a burgeoning research base, the examination of  $HbA_{1c}$  with outcomes across populations will further the application and understanding of this biomarker.

Indeed, HbA<sub>1c</sub> has been shown to better assess risk of cardiovascular disease (CVD) or death from all causes compared with fasting plasma glucose, especially at glycemic levels deemed prediabetic (3). Previous studies have reported that elevated levels of HbA<sub>1c</sub> below the diabetes threshold (<6.5%) are associated with an increased risk for cardiovascular morbidity and mortality (3-12). Yet, this research base is not comprehensive, and data from Chinese populations are scant, especially in those without diabetes. This gap in the literature is important since Southeast Asian populations are experiencing epidemic rates of type 2 diabetes and related comorbidities with a substantial global health impact (13-16).

Overall, there are few cohort studies that have examined the etiologic association between HbA<sub>1c</sub> levels and allcause and cause-specific mortality. There is even lesser insight on the nature of the relationship between HbA<sub>1c</sub> and significant clinical outcomes in Southeast Asian populations. Therefore, we examined the association between HbA<sub>1c</sub> and all-cause and cause-specific mortality in the Singapore Chinese Health Study (SCHS).

#### **RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODS**

The design of the SCHS has been previously summarized (17). Briefly, the cohort was drawn from men and women, aged 45-74 years, who belonged to one of the major dialect groups (Hokkien or Cantonese) of Chinese in Singapore. Singapore is a unique population, due to its geographic location, independence, and industrialization over last 50 years, resulting in accelerated advances in medical care, disease prevention, and health promotion, leading to a high standard of living. Between April 1993 and December 1998, 63,257 individuals completed an in-person interview that included questions on usual diet, demographics, height and weight, use of tobacco, usual physical activity, menstrual and reproductive history (women only), medical history including history of diabetes diagnosis by a physician, and family history of cancer. Informed subject consent was provided with completion of the baseline interview, and Institutional Review at the National University of Singapore, University of Pittsburgh, and the University of Minnesota granted approval of this study.

#### Evaluation of Participant Characteristics

At the follow-up interview (F1), which occurred in 1999-2004, subjects were asked to update their baseline interview information. All participant characteristics in this analysis reflect the F1 interview. Consistent in both interviews was inquiry on smoking habits/status (age started/quit, amount, frequency, and type) and typical consumption of alcoholic beverages (beer, wine, Western hard liquor, and Chinese hard liquor). Participants were asked to choose from eight frequency categories and four portion sizes, and levels of alcohol intake were expressed in units of drinks per week to facilitate comparison with Western populations. One drink was defined as 375 mL of beer (13.6 g of ethanol), 118 mL of wine (11.7 g of ethanol), and 30 mL of Western or Chinese hard liquor (10.9 g of ethanol). Other risk factors assessed include self-reported hypertensive status (yes/no) as diagnosed by a physician and BMI, calculated with selfreported height (m) and weight (kg) as kg/m<sup>2</sup>. Self-report of body weight has been shown to be highly valid across many populations, as well as specifically in Asians (18).

#### Type 2 Diabetes and CVD Assessment

Diabetes status was assessed by the following question: "Have you been told by a doctor that you have diabetes (high blood sugar)?" If yes: "Please also tell me the age at which you were first diagnosed?" A validation study of the self-report of diabetes mellitus cases used two different methods and was previously reported (19,20). Similarly, prevalent CVD was assessed by the following questions: "Have you been told by a doctor that you have had a heart attack or angina (chest pain or exertion that is relieved by medication)?" and "Have you been told by a doctor that you have had a stroke?" If yes: "Please tell me the age you were first diagnosed?"

### Analysis Cohort Formation and Blood Collection

The study population derived from 28,346 participants of the total 54,243 who were alive and participated at F1, who provided consent at F1 to collect subsequent blood samples (a consent rate of  $\sim$ 65%). The participants for this study were a random selection of individuals from the full study population who did not report a history of diabetes or CVD at the baseline or follow-up interview and reported no history of cancer. This nondiabetic group was established to serve in future SCHS analyses as a comparison group to incident cases of type 2 diabetes from the full study population (excluded from this analysis) occurring between baseline and the follow-up interview, frequency matched on age ( $\pm 2$  years), time of blood draw, sex, and dialect. All participants with blood samples drawn and analyzed for HbA1c were included in this analysis regardless of HbA<sub>1c</sub> status for a total N = 7,388. Compared with individuals participating at F1 who did not report diabetes, CVD, or cancer, this analytic sample is slightly younger, more male, and reported more smoking, but was similar in respect to dialect, alcohol consumption, education, and BMI. Red blood cells were isolated from whole blood and frozen until analysis that was performed at University of Minnesota. Percentage of HbA<sub>1c</sub> was analyzed in a Clinical Laboratory Improvement Amendments-certified laboratory using an automated high-performance liquid chromatography method in which whole blood samples are treated with EDTA on a Tosoh G7 HPLC Glycohemoglobin Analyzer (Tosoh Medics, Inc., San Francisco, CA). Using the standards developed in the National Glycohemoglobin Standardization Program, this method of percentage of HbA<sub>1c</sub> assessment was calibrated to the reference range of 4.3-6.0% (23-42 mmol/mol) and a laboratory coefficient of variation range 1.4-1.9% (21).

#### Mortality Assessment

Information on date and cause of death was obtained through linkage with the nationwide registry of birth and death in Singapore. Up to six different ICD-9 codes were recorded in the registry. Primary cause of death was used for analysis. Vital status for cohort participants was updated through 31 December 2011. Only 27 persons were lost to follow-up due to migration out of Singapore, suggesting that emigration of the cohort participants was negligible and that vital statistics follow-up was virtually complete. The end points in the analyses in addition to all-cause mortality were: deaths from CVD (ICD-9 codes 394.0-459.0), ischemic/coronary heart disease (CHD) (410.0-414.9, 427.5), cerebrovascular disease (430.0-438.0), respiratory diseases (480.0-496.0), and all cancers (140.0-195.8 and 199-208.9).

#### **Statistical Analysis**

For the primary analyses, HbA<sub>1c</sub> was divided into six categories to align with the distribution of the population, clinical relevance, and cut points used in the literature. The categories were <5.0, 5.0-5.3, 5.4-5.6, 5.7-6.0, 6.1-6.4, and ≥6.5% (corresponding intervals are <31, 31-35, 36-38, 39-42, 43-47, and  $\geq$ 48 mmol/mol). Secondary analyses aimed to clarify a threshold effect further divided the upper HbA<sub>1c</sub> category  $(\geq 6.5\% [\geq 48 \text{ mmol/mol}])$  into four groups to determine if the highest HbA<sub>1c</sub> values would drive any observed association. These groups were 6.5-6.6, 6.7-7.0, 7.1-7.5, and >7.5% (corresponding mmol/mol intervals are 48-49, 50–52, 53–57, and >57). Smoking status was classified as "never smoked." "former smoker," and "current smoker." Alcohol was characterized as routine practice of none ("no routine consumption"), light-moderate ("any up to seven drinks a week"), and heavy ("more than seven drinks a week") for females. Male alcohol consumption categories were characterized according to none ("no routine consumption"), light-moderate ("any up to 14 drinks a week"), and heavy (">14 drinks a week"). In this analysis, education was characterized into three groups: no formal education; primary schooling; and secondary school or beyond. Participant characteristics were calculated across categories. Means and SDs were derived for continuous variables, and proportions were calculated for categorical variables. All-cause mortality and cause-specific mortality hazard ratios (HRs) were calculated by HbA<sub>1c</sub> level. Crude and adjusted HRs and 95% Cls were estimated with Cox proportional hazards models. The HbA<sub>1c</sub> category of 5.4–5.6% was chosen as the reference category to provide a stable comparison, the alignment with previous studies, and so potential clinically relevant ranges above and below could be examined. The main effect crude model included only the HbA<sub>1c</sub> level. Adjusted models were constructed in this manner: Model 1 was adjusted for age, sex, dialect, and interview year. Model 2 was adjusted further for education, smoking status, and alcohol consumption. Model 3 was adjusted for all previous covariates plus BMI. Lastly, model 4 adjusted for the previous covariates of model 3 in addition to hypertension status, except for in the instance of cancer mortality. The authors determined hypertension not to hold the properties of a traditional confounder in the association between HbA<sub>1c</sub> and cancer incidence, refraining from adjustment. In the results table, we present the final model, as the strength and nature of the results did not materially change with covariate adjustment. Tests of linear trend across categories of HbA1c were performed by assigning participants the median of their HbA<sub>1c</sub> category and entering this new variable into a separate Cox proportional hazards regression model. BMI was modeled as a linear continuous variable for CVD, CHD, and cerebrovascular mortality but showed a quadratic association with all-cause. all-cancer. and respiratory mortality and was modeled accordingly. A quadratic model of continuous HbA<sub>1c</sub> values was also used to test for nonlinearity in the overall association. Person-years at risk for mortality (i.e., follow-up time scale) for each participant were calculated as the duration from blood draw to the date of mortality or through end of follow-up, 31 December 2011, whichever came first. Age- and sex-adjusted mortality rates were calculated for each HbA<sub>1c</sub> level by categorizing age into three groups, <60, 60–69 years old, and  $\geq$ 70 years old, and calculating sex-specific crude mortality rates for each age group (events/ person-years). These crude rates were then multiplied by the proportion of person-years each HbA<sub>1c</sub>-specific age category contributed to the overall study person-years at risk total (standardized weight). These rates were summed for each HbA1c level and multiplied by 100,000 to create an ageand sex-adjusted mortality rate. Distribution of time to event was left-skewed, log transformation increased skewness, and time was left untransformed. Using parameter estimates, we computed interaction HRs, 95% CI, and Wald  $\chi^2$ P values. To investigate if HbA<sub>1c</sub> levels differed across levels of sex, BMI, smoking, or age, separate multiplicative interactions were tested by adding product terms to the proportional hazards model. The proportional hazards assumption was assessed by HbA1c category, and no violations were detected. Sensitivity analysis was also performed for each mortality outcome, by excluding observation in the first 2 and 3 years post-blood draw for all 7,388 individuals, for purposes of accounting for possible subclinical disease or underlying poor health. All statistical analysis was performed using SAS statistical software version 9.3 (SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC).

#### RESULTS

During 74,890 person-years of followup, there were 888 total deaths, of which 249 were due to CVD, 388 were due to cancer, and 169 were recorded as respiratory mortality. Participant characteristics at baseline are reported in Table 1. There was a positive association between HbA<sub>1c</sub> and age, BMI, and prevalence of self-reported hypertension, while an inverse association was observed between educational attainment and HbA<sub>1c</sub>. There was a U-shaped association between HbA<sub>1c</sub> and smoking status and male sex.

Fully adjusted HRs and 95% CIs for HbA<sub>1c</sub> level are presented in Table 2 along with age- and sex-standardized mortality rates. The crude mortality rate was 1,186 deaths per 100,000 personyears. The age- and sex-standardized mortality rates for all-cause, CVD, and cerebrovascular each showed a J-shaped pattern according to HbA<sub>1c</sub> level. The CHD and cancer mortality rates were higher for HbA<sub>1c</sub>  $\geq$  6.5% ( $\geq$  48 mmol/mol) and otherwise displayed no apparent pattern. The age- and sex-standardized mortality rate for respiratory diseases appeared U-shaped, with the lowest and highest HbA<sub>1c</sub> categories corresponding to the highest rates. In the Cox regression analysis, HbA<sub>1c</sub> levels  $\geq$ 6.5% ( $\geq$ 48 mmol/mol) were strongly associated with all-cause, overall CVD,

			HbA <sub>1c</sub> (%	6) category [mmc	ol/mol]		
Characteristics	<5.0 [<31]	5.0–5.3 [31–35]	5.4–5.6 [36–38]	5.7–6.0 [39–42]	6.1–6.4 [43–47]	≥6.5 [≥48]	<i>P</i> for trend
N (% of population)	223 (3)	847 (11)	2,131 (29)	2,754 (37)	923 (13)	510 (7)	
Age, years	61.9 (7.3)	61.6 (7.7)	61.5 (7.4)	62.4 (7.5)	64.0 (7.6)	63.9 (7.8)	< 0.001
Female (%)	39.9	50.8	52.5	53.4	51.7	47.1	0.6573
Education (%) Less than primary school Primary schooling Secondary school or beyond	19.3 48.0 32.7	21.0 47.2 31.8	20.1 46.2 33.7	22.9 45.8 31.3	24.3 48.0 27.7	24.1 49.0 26.9	<0.001
Cantonese dialect (%)	55.6	48.6	46.8	50.4	50.0	46.3	0.1783
Smoke (%) Never Former Current	62.8 17.9 19.3	70.5 17.5 12.0	70.0 15.0 15.0	63.8 17.2 19.0	60.4 18.5 21.1	61.6 18.0 20.4	<0.01
Alcohol (%) None 0 to 1 drink/day >1 drink/day	71.3 22.9 5.8	81.6 14.9 3.5	80.3 16.0 3.7	79.7 16.9 3.4	82.7 13.3 4.0	82.8 12.3 4.9	<0.01
BMI, kg/m <sup>2</sup>	22.4 (3.1)	22.1 (3.3)	22.5 (3.3)	23.0 (3.5)	23.8 (3.6)	24.4 (3.5)	< 0.001
Hypertensive (%)	31.4	30.3	28.9	34.2	41.5	47.3	< 0.001

Table 1—Participant characteristics according to	o category of HbA <sub>1c</sub> percentage: the SCHS
--	--

For continuous variables, mean (SD) was calculated and is shown.

as well as CHD and cerebrovascular mortality, and cancer mortality compared with the reference HbA<sub>1c</sub> of 5.4-5.6% (36-38 mmol/mol). These results were not materially altered upon exclusion of observation of the first 2 or 3 years post-blood draw (results not shown). When HbA<sub>1c</sub>  $\geq$ 6.5% ( $\geq$ 48 mmol/mol) was further divided into four groups, significantly increased hazard was observed for each of the four categories for both all-cause mortality and overall CVD mortality (results not shown). When the first 5 years postblood draw were excluded, the association between elevated HbA<sub>1c</sub> (HbA<sub>1c</sub>  $\geq$ 6.5% [ $\geq$ 48 mmol/mol]) and increased risk for cerebrovascular mortality or cancer mortality was no longer significant for these two outcomes. There was no association between any level of HbA<sub>1c</sub> and respiratory causes of death. No other category of HbA<sub>1c</sub> was significantly associated with any outcome in this population.

Fully adjusted HRs and 95% Cls for total mortality, cardiovascular mortality, and cancer mortality are presented in Table 3 stratified by sex, smoking status (never/ever), and hypertensive status. Irrespective of the stratifying factor, we observe a J-shaped pattern for allcause and CVD mortality, consistent with the results of the entire dataset. Akin to the nonstratified analysis, individuals with HbA<sub>1c</sub> levels  $\geq$ 6.5% ( $\geq$ 48 mmol/mol) appear to be at a suggestive increase in hazard for cancer mortality, regardless of the stratifying factor. The formal tests of interaction were not significant for these groups (all outcomes  $P \geq 0.10$ ) aligning with the presented results. Formal tests of interaction by age and BMI were also not significant for any of the outcomes (all outcomes  $P \geq 0.10$ ).

### CONCLUSIONS

Chinese men and women with no history of cancer, reported diabetes, or CVD with an HbA<sub>1c</sub> level  $\geq$ 6.5% ( $\geq$ 48 mmol/mol) were at a significant increased risk of mortality during followup relative to their peers with an HbA<sub>1c</sub> of 5.4-5.6% (36-38 mmol/mol). No other range of HbA<sub>1c</sub> was significantly associated with risk of mortality during follow-up, and in secondary analyses, when the  $HbA_{1c}$  level  $\geq\!6.5\%$  ( $\geq\!48$ mmol/mol) was divided into four categories, this increased risk was observed in all four categories; thus, these data represent a clear threshold association between HbA<sub>1c</sub> and mortality in this population. These results are consistent with previous prospective cohort studies identifying chronically high HbA<sub>1c</sub>, outside of diabetes, to be associated with increased risk for all-cause and CVD-related mortality (3-12,22).

However, these results are not entirely consistent with other populations, including Asian populations, as other studies have reported graduated risk in HbA<sub>1c</sub> levels between normal and < 6.5%. Increased risk for all-cause mortality was found in three unique U.S. populations for individuals with HbA<sub>1c</sub> at or below the prediabetic threshold (HbA<sub>1c</sub> <5.7%) compared with a lower reference value (3,5,8). Two studies of European populations observed increased risk at HbA<sub>1c</sub> >5.5%. and increased risk per each 1-percentage point increase in HbA<sub>1c</sub> concentration (7,11). Moderately elevated HbA<sub>1c</sub> (HbA<sub>1c</sub> >6.0%) was indicative of increased risk in an analysis of Japanese individuals without known diabetes (9). Some previous studies have also observed an increased risk with mortality in the lowest category of  $HbA_{1c}$  (3,5,8). However, the lack of an association in the far left tail of HbA<sub>1c</sub> distribution is consistent across Asian population (9,10). We are also cautious in the interpretation of the cause-specific results in the SCHS population with  $HbA_{1c} < 5.0\%$ due to the low numbers of accumulated outcomes.

Hyperglycemia is a known risk factor for CVD, not limited to individuals with diabetes. This may be in part due to the vascular damage caused by oxidative stress in periods of hypo- and

$\begin{array}{r} \label{eq:1} \label{eq:1} \label{eq:1} \label{eq:1} \label{eq:1} \label{eq:2} \label{eq2} \label{eq:2} \label{eq:2} \label{eq:2} \label{eq:2}$	Table 2—Age- and sex-s	tandardized mortality	rates, HRs, and 95% CIs of	all-cause and cause-specifi	Table 2–Age- and sex-standardized mortality rates, HRs, and 95% CIs of all-cause and cause-specific mortality according to HbA <sub>1c</sub> percentage: the SCHS	$M_{1c}$ percentage: the SCHS	
$ \begin{array}{c} \hline \hline$				$HbA_{1c}$ (%) categ	ory [mmol/mol]		
Deaths/person-years $31/2.186.2$ $88/3/724.0$ $212/21,80.8$ $304/28,023.9$ $11$ All-cause death# (n) $31$ $88$ $212$ $304$		<5.0 (N = 223) [<31]	5.0–5.3 (N = 847) [31–35]	5.4–5.6 (N = 2,131) [36–38]	5.7-6.0 (N = 2,754) [39-42]	6.1–6.4 (N = 923) [43–47]	≥6.5 (N = 510) [≥48]
All-cause death# (n)         31         88         212         304           Mortality rate <sup>8</sup> 1,416         1,040         1,025         1,104           Final model <sup>9</sup> 1,38 (0.94, 2.01)         10 (0.79, 1.29)         100         0.99 (0.83, 1.18)         1.10           CV death (n)         3         1,940         1,02         2,4         5,4         68         246         1.35           CV death (n)         3         1,12         1,09 (0.67, 1.77)         1,00         0,84 (0.58, 1.20)         1.31           CHD death (n)         3         1,12         1,10         0,84 (0.58, 1.20)         1.31           Mortality rate <sup>8</sup> 1,12         1,10 (0.56, 2.177)         1,00         0,84 (0.58, 1.20)         1.11           CHD death (n)         3         1,10 (0.56, 2.177)         1,00         0,87 (0.53, 1.44)         1.11           Mortality rate <sup>8</sup> 1,02 (0.31, 3.36)         1,10 (0.56, 2.177)         1,00         0,87 (0.53, 1.44)         1.11           Cerebrowscular death (n)         3         8         1         1,00         0,87 (0.53, 1.44)         1.11           Cancer death#         1,12 (0.24, 2.33)         1,00         0,81 (0.54, 1.25)         1.00         0,66 (0.34, 1.25)	Deaths/person-years	31/2,186.2	88/8,724.0	212/21,880.8	304/28,023.9	131/9,180.0	122/4,895.1
$ \begin{array}{ccccc} \text{Mortality rate}^{a} & 1,416 & 1,040 & 1,025 & 1,104 \\ \text{Final model}^{b} & 1.38 & (0.34, 2.01) & 1.01 & (0.79, 1.29) & 1.00 & 0.99 & (0.33, 1.18) & 1.11 \\ \text{CVD death } & 1,28 & (0.24, 2.01) & 1.01 & (0.79, 1.29) & 1.00 & 0.99 & (0.33, 1.18) & 1.11 \\ \text{Final model}^{b} & 1.56 & (0.77, 3.16) & 1.09 & (0.67, 1.77) & 1.00 & 0.34 & (0.38, 1.20) & 1.33 \\ \text{Final model}^{b} & 1.56 & (0.77, 3.16) & 1.09 & (0.67, 1.77) & 1.00 & 0.34 & (0.38, 1.20) & 1.31 \\ \text{CHD death } & 1,22 & 155 & 1.11 & 1.22 & 27 & 36 \\ \text{Mortality rate}^{b} & 1.02 & (0.31, 3.36) & 1.10 & (0.56, 2.17) & 1.00 & 0.87 & (0.53, 1.44) & 1.11 \\ \text{Cerebrovascular death } & 1.02 & (0.31, 3.36) & 1.00 & 0.57 & 0.53 & 1.44 & 1.10 \\ \text{Caread death } & 1.02 & (0.34, 5.49) & 1.02 & (0.44, 2.33) & 1.00 & 0.87 & (0.53, 1.44) & 1.10 \\ \text{Caread death } & 1.22 & 0.43 & 5.49 & 1.02 & (0.44, 2.33) & 1.00 & 0.87 & (0.53, 1.44) & 1.10 \\ \text{Caread death } & 1.02 & (0.34, 5.49) & 1.02 & (0.44, 2.33) & 1.00 & 0.87 & (0.53, 1.44) & 1.10 \\ \text{Caread death } & 0.35 & 0.36 & 0.34 & $	All-cause death# (n)	31	88	212	304	131	122
Final model Final model1.38 (0.94, 2.01)1.01 (0.79, 1.29)1.000.99 (0.83, 1.18)1.11CVD death (n)9245468246Mortality rate*354285260246Final model*1.56 (0.77, 3.16)1.09 (0.67, 1.77)1.000.84 (0.58, 1.20)1.31CD death (n)312273636Mortality rate*1.121.2527361.11Crb death (n)31227361.11Cho death (n)31.102 (0.31, 3.36)1.100 (0.55, 2.17)1.1000.87 (0.53, 1.44)1.11Cerebrovascular death (n)3891677Mortality rate*1.162 (0.48, 5.49)1.02 (0.44, 2.33)1.000.87 (0.54, 1.25)1.00Career death# (n)1038916771.12Career death# (n)1038916771.20Career death# (n)1038916771.00Career death# (n)61.22 (0.48, 2.33)1.000.66 (0.34, 1.25)1.00Career death# (n)61.22 (0.44, 2.33)1.000.66 (0.34, 1.25)1.00Career death# (n)61.000.95 (0.50, 1.82)0.93 (0.64, 1.35)1.00Career death# (n)61.01 (0.78, 1.31)1.001.01 (0.78, 1.31)1.00Career death# (n)61.01 (0.55, 1.75)1.000.99 (0.68, 1.46)0.95Final model*	Mortality rate <sup>a</sup>	1,416	1,040	1,025	1,104	1,232	2,284
CVD death (n)         9         24         54         68           Mortality rate <sup>a</sup> 334         285         260         246           Final model <sup>b</sup> 1.56 (0.77, 3.16)         1.09 (0.67, 1.77)         1.00         0.84 (0.58, 1.20)         1.13           CHD death (n)         3         12         27         36         1.30           Mortality rate <sup>a</sup> 1.12         1.12         1.13         1.13         1.13           Mortality rate <sup>a</sup> 1.02 (0.31, 3.36)         1.10 (0.56, 2.17)         1.00         0.84 (0.53, 1.44)         1.11           Creebrovascular death (n)         3         8         1.10         0.87 (0.53, 1.44)         1.11           Caree death (n)         3         8         1.10         0.87 (0.53, 1.44)         1.10           Cance releath (n)         3         8         1.100         0.87 (0.53, 1.44)         1.10           Cancer death (n)         3         8         1.100         0.87 (0.53, 1.44)         1.00           Cancer death (n)         3         8         1.100         0.87 (0.53, 1.25)         1.00           Cancer death (n)         1         1         0.26 (0.50, 1.82)         0.93 (0.64, 1.35)         1.00	Final model <sup>b</sup>	1.38 (0.94, 2.01)	1.01 (0.79, 1.29)	1.00	0.99 (0.83, 1.18)	1.10 (0.88, 1.37)	1.96 (1.56, 2.46)
Mortality rate <sup>3</sup> 354         285         260         246           Final model <sup>b</sup> 1.56 (0.77, 3.16)         1.09 (0.67, 1.77)         1.00         0.84 (0.58, 1.20)         1.13           CHD death (n)         3         12         27         36         1.30           Mortality rate <sup>3</sup> 1.12         1.15         0.11         30         0.84 (0.58, 1.20)         1.13           Mortality rate <sup>3</sup> 1.12         0.35         1.21         27         36         1.10           Mortality rate <sup>3</sup> 1.02         0.31, 3.36)         1.10 (0.56, 2.17)         1.00         0.87 (0.53, 1.44)         1.10           Cerebrowscular death (n)         3         8         19         19         67         1.00           Mortality rate <sup>3</sup> 1.62 (0.48, 5.49)         1.02 (0.44, 2.33)         1.00         0.66 (0.34, 1.25)         1.00           Cancer death# (n)         10         10         1.02         0.44, 2.33)         1.00         0.66 (0.34, 1.25)         1.00           Cancer death# (n)         10         10         0.34         1.20         0.51         1.00           Mortality rate <sup>3</sup> 0.95 (0.50, 1.82)         0.93 (0.64, 1.35)         1.00         0.66 (0.34, 1.25)<	CVD death (n)	6	24	54	68	45	49
Final model Final model1.56 (0.77, 3.16)1.09 (0.67, 1.77)1.000.84 (0.58, 1.20)1.3CHD death (n)3122736Mortality rate <sup>a</sup> 112112110 (0.56, 2.17)1.000.87 (0.53, 1.44)1.11Cerebrovascular death (n)38191867Mortality rate <sup>a</sup> 1.02 (0.31, 3.36)1.10 (0.56, 2.17)1.000.87 (0.53, 1.44)1.11Cerebrovascular death (n)3819677Mortality rate <sup>a</sup> 1.52 (0.48, 5.49)1.02 (0.44, 2.33)1.000.66 (0.34, 1.25)1.00Cancer death# (n)101021.02 (0.44, 2.33)1.000.66 (0.34, 1.25)1.0Cancer death# (n)10381011421.0Mortality rate <sup>a</sup> 0.95 (0.50, 1.82)0.93 (0.64, 1.35)1.001.01 (0.78, 1.31)1.0Mortality rate <sup>a</sup> 0.95 (0.50, 1.82)0.93 (0.64, 1.35)1.001.01 (0.78, 1.31)1.0Mortality rate <sup>a</sup> 1.24 (0.52, 2.93)1.000.93 (0.64, 1.35)1.000.99 (0.68, 1.46)0.8Mortality rate <sup>a</sup> 1.24 (0.52, 2.93)1.000.93 (0.56, 1.45)1.000.99 (0.68, 1.46)0.08Mortality rate <sup>a</sup> 1.24 (0.52, 2.93)1.000.95 for cancer mortality, $P < 0.05$ for cancer mortality, $P < 0$	Mortality rate <sup>a</sup>	354	285	260	246	416	937
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Final model <sup>b</sup>	1.56 (0.77, 3.16)	1.09 (0.67, 1.77)	1.00	0.84 (0.58, 1.20)	1.31 (0.88, 1.95)	2.63 (1.77, 3.90)
Mortality rate <sup>a</sup> 112         155         131         130           Final model <sup>b</sup> 1.02 (0.31, 3.36)         1.10 (0.56, 2.17)         1.00         0.87 (0.53, 1.44)         1.10           Cerebrovascular death (n)         3         8         19         18         67         1.10           Cerebrovascular death (n)         139         88         91         67         1.20           Mortality rate <sup>a</sup> 1.62 (0.48, 5.49)         1.02 (0.44, 2.33)         1.00         0.66 (0.34, 1.25)         1.00           Cancer death# (n)         10         10         101         142         514         1.0           Cancer death# (n)         10         38         101         1.01         1.42         514         1.0           Mortality rate <sup>a</sup> 483         0.93 (0.64, 1.35)         1.00         0.16 (0.38, 1.34)         1.0           Mortality rate <sup>a</sup> 0.95 (0.50, 1.82)         0.93 (0.64, 1.35)         1.00         0.66 (0.34, 1.25)         1.0           Mortality rate <sup>a</sup> 2.12         0.33 (0.64, 1.35)         1.00         0.66 (0.38, 1.46)         0.6           Mortality rate <sup>a</sup> 2.12         2.13         1.00         0.91 (0.58, 1.46)         0.6	CHD death ( <i>n</i> )	ε	12	27	36	19	30
Final model1.02 (0.31, 3.36)1.10 (0.56, 2.17)1.000.87 (0.53, 1.44)1.10Cerebrovascular death (n)389167Cerebrovascular death (n)139889167Mortality rate <sup>a</sup> 1.39889167Final model <sup>b</sup> 1.62 (0.48, 5.49)1.02 (0.44, 2.33)1.000.66 (0.34, 1.25)Cancer death# (n)1010142Cancer death# (n)10142514Mortality rate <sup>a</sup> 4830.95 (0.50, 1.82)0.93 (0.64, 1.35)Final model <sup>b</sup> 0.95 (0.50, 1.82)0.93 (0.64, 1.35)1.001.01 (0.78, 1.31)Mortality rate <sup>a</sup> 2142.322.141.01Mortality rate <sup>a</sup> 2722.322.140.99 (0.68, 1.46)0.8Mortality rate <sup>a</sup> 1.24 (0.52, 2.93)1.02 (0.59, 1.75)1.000.99 (0.68, 1.46)0.8Test of linear trend of HR: $P < 0.001$ for all-cause, CVD, and CHD mortality; $P < 0.05$ for carebrovascular and respiratory. #BMI v*Mortality rate is adjusted for age and per 100,000 person-years using the person-years and age distributions of the SCHS. <sup>b</sup> Adjusted for age, sex, dialect, intervie	Mortality rate <sup>a</sup>	112	155	131	130	177	579
Cerebrovascular death (n)       3       8       19       18       67         Mortality rate <sup>a</sup> 139       88       91       67       7         Mortality rate <sup>a</sup> 139       88       91       67       7         Final model <sup>b</sup> 1.62 (0.48, 5.49)       1.02 (0.44, 2.33)       1.00       0.66 (0.34, 1.25)       1.00         Cancer death# (n)       10       38       101       142       514       1.01         Mortality rate <sup>a</sup> 483       0.95 (0.50, 1.82)       0.93 (0.64, 1.35)       1.00       1.01 (0.78, 1.31)       1.0         Respiratory death# (n)       6       19       43       64       2.14       1.01       1.01 (0.78, 1.31)       1.0         Respiratory death# (n)       6       19       43       64       2.36       1.00       0.99 (0.68, 1.46)       0.8         Mortality rate <sup>a</sup> 2.72       2.32       2.14       2.36       2.36       2.40       2.40       0.95 (0.50, 1.45)       1.00       0.99 (0.68, 1.46)       0.8         Mortality rate <sup>a</sup> 2.12       0.33       2.32       2.14       2.36       2.36       2.44       2.36       2.44       2.36       2.44       0.95 (0.68, 1.46)       <	Final model <sup>b</sup>	1.02 (0.31, 3.36)	1.10 (0.56, 2.17)	1.00	0.87 (0.53, 1.44)	1.10 (0.61, 1.99)	3.22 (1.89, 5.47)
Mortality rate <sup>a</sup> 139         88         91         67           Final model <sup>b</sup> 1.62 (0.48, 5.49)         1.02 (0.44, 2.33)         1.00         0.66 (0.34, 1.25)         1.0.           Cancer death# (n)         10         10         38         101         142         1.0.           Mortality rate <sup>a</sup> 433         440         38         101         142         1.0.           Mortality rate <sup>a</sup> 433         440         38         101         1.21         1.21           Respiratory death# (n)         6         19         64         1.31         1.0         1.00         0.99 (0.58, 1.31)         1.0           Respiratory death# (n)         6         19         64         2.32         2.14         2.36         1.0           Mortality rate <sup>a</sup> 2.72         2.32         2.14         2.36         1.00         0.99 (0.68, 1.46)         0.8           Final model <sup>b</sup> 1.24 (0.52, 2.93)         1.02 (0.59, 1.75)         1.00         0.99 (0.68, 1.46)         0.8           Test of linear trend of HR: $P < 0.001 for all-cause, CVD, and CHD mortality; P < 0.05 for cancer mortality; P > 0.05 for cerebrovascular and respiratory. #BMI w  $	Cerebrovascular death (n)	ς	00	19	18	12	14
Final model <sup>b</sup> 1.62 (0.48, 5.49)         1.02 (0.44, 2.33)         1.00         0.66 (0.34, 1.25)         1.02           Cancer death# (n)         10         38         101         142         142           Mortality rate <sup>a</sup> 483         440         38         101         142         1.0           Mortality rate <sup>a</sup> 483         440         38         101         1.01         1.31         1.0           Respiratory death# (n)         6         19         0.93 (0.64, 1.35)         1.00         1.01 (0.78, 1.31)         1.0           Respiratory death# (n)         6         19         43         64         236           Mortality rate <sup>a</sup> 272         232         214         236         1.00         0.99 (0.68, 1.46)         0.8           Final model <sup>b</sup> 1.24 (0.52, 2.93)         1.02 (0.59, 1.75)         1.00         0.99 (0.68, 1.46)         0.8           Test of linear trend of HR: $P < 0.001$ for all-cause, CVD, and CHD mortality; $P < 0.05$ for cancer mortality; $P > 0.05$ for cerebrovascular and respiratory. #BMI w	Mortality rate <sup>a</sup>	139	88	91	67	109	265
Cancer death# (n)         10         38         101         142           Mortality rate <sup>a</sup> 483         440         844         514           Mortality rate <sup>a</sup> 483         440         844         514           Final model <sup>c</sup> 0.95 (0.50, 1.82)         0.93 (0.64, 1.35)         1.00         1.01 (0.78, 1.31)         1.01           Respiratory death# (n)         6         19         43         64         236           Mortality rate <sup>a</sup> 272         232         214         236         1.00         0.99 (0.68, 1.46)         0.8           Final model <sup>b</sup> 1.24 (0.52, 2.93)         1.02 (0.59, 1.75)         1.00         0.99 (0.68, 1.46)         0.8           Test of linear trend of HR: $P < 0.001$ for all-cause. CVD, and CHD mortality: $P < 0.05$ for cancer mortality; $P > 0.05$ for cerebrovascular and respiratory. #BMI w	Final model <sup>b</sup>	1.62 (0.48, 5.49)	1.02 (0.44, 2.33)	1.00	0.66 (0.34, 1.25)	1.04 (0.50, 2.16)	2.30 (1.14, 4.66)
Mortality rate <sup>a</sup> 483         440         584         514           Final model <sup>c</sup> 0.95 (0.50, 1.82)         0.93 (0.64, 1.35)         1.00         1.01 (0.78, 1.31)         1.01           Respiratory death# (n)         6         19         43         64         236           Mortality rate <sup>a</sup> 272         232         214         236         236           Final model <sup>b</sup> 1.24 (0.52, 2.93)         1.02 (0.59, 1.75)         1.00         0.99 (0.68, 1.46)         0.8           Test of linear trend of HR: $P < 0.001$ for all-cause, CVD, and CHD mortality; $P < 0.05$ for cancer mortality; $P > 0.05$ for cerebrovascular and respiratory. #BMI w	Cancer death# ( <i>n</i> )	10	38	101	142	56	41
Final model <sup>c</sup> 0.95 (0.50, 1.82)         0.93 (0.64, 1.35)         1.00         1.01 (0.78, 1.31)         1.01           Respiratory death# (n)         6         19         43         64           Mortality rate <sup>a</sup> 272         232         214         236           Final model <sup>b</sup> 1.24 (0.52, 2.93)         1.02 (0.59, 1.75)         1.00         0.99 (0.68, 1.46)         0.8           Test of linear trend of HR: $P < 0.001$ for all-cause, CVD, and CHD mortality; $P < 0.05$ for cancer mortality; $P > 0.05$ for cerebrovascular and respiratory. #BMI w	Mortality rate <sup>a</sup>	483	440	484	514	540	767
Respiratory death# (n)6194364Mortality rate272232234236Final model <sup>b</sup> 1.24 (0.52, 2.93)1.02 (0.59, 1.75)1.000.99 (0.68, 1.46)0.8.Test of linear trend of HR: $P < 0.001$ for all-cause, CVD, and CHD mortality; $P < 0.05$ for cancer mortality; $P > 0.05$ for cerebrovascular and respiratory. #BMI w*Mortality rate is adjusted for age and per 100,000 person-years using the person-years and age distributions of the SCHS. <sup>b</sup> Adjusted for age, sex, dialect, intervie	Final model <sup>c</sup>	0.95 (0.50, 1.82)	0.93 (0.64, 1.35)	1.00	1.01 (0.78, 1.31)	1.07 (0.77, 1.49)	1.51 (1.04, 2.18)
Mortality rate272232214236Final model <sup>b</sup> 1.24 (0.52, 2.93)1.02 (0.59, 1.75)1.000.99 (0.68, 1.46)0.8:Test of linear trend of HR: $P < 0.001$ for all-cause, CVD, and CHD mortality; $P < 0.05$ for cancer mortality; $P > 0.05$ for cerebrovascular and respiratory. #BMI w*Mortality rate is adjusted for age and per 100,000 person-years using the person-years and age distributions of the SCHS. <sup>b</sup> Adjusted for age, sex, dialect, intervie	Respiratory death# (n)	9	19	43	64	20	17
Final model <sup>b</sup> 1.24 (0.52, 2.93)1.02 (0.59, 1.75)1.000.99 (0.68, 1.46)0.8:Test of linear trend of HR: $P < 0.001$ for all-cause, CVD, and CHD mortality; $P < 0.05$ for cancer mortality; $P > 0.05$ for cerebrovascular and respiratory. #BMI w <sup>a</sup> Mortality rate is adjusted for age and per 100,000 person-years using the person-years and age distributions of the SCHS. <sup>b</sup> Adjusted for age, sex, dialect, intervie	Mortality rate <sup>a</sup>	272	232	214	236	182	292
Test of linear trend of HR: $P < 0.001$ for all-cause, CVD, and CHD mortality; $P < 0.05$ for cancer mortality; $P > 0.05$ for cerebrovascular and respiratory. #BMI w <sup>a</sup> Mortality rate is adjusted for age and per 100,000 person-years using the person-years and age distributions of the SCHS. <sup>b</sup> Adjusted for age, sex, dialect, intervie	Final model <sup>b</sup>	1.24 (0.52, 2.93)	1.02 (0.59, 1.75)	1.00	0.99 (0.68, 1.46)	0.81 (0.47, 1.39)	1.43 (0.81, 2.52)
hypertension status. "Adjusted for age, sex, dialect, interview year, education, smoking, alcohol, and BMI.	Test of linear trend of HR: <i>P</i> <sup>a</sup> Mortality rate is adjusted fo hypertension status. <sup>c</sup> Adjust	< 0.001 for all-cause, CVE or age and per 100,000 per ed for age, sex, dialect, int	), and CHD mortality; $P < 0.05$ son-years using the person-yea erview year, education, smokir	for cancer mortality; $P > 0.05$ f rs and age distributions of the S0 ng, alcohol, and BMI.	or cerebrovascular and respirato CHS. <sup>b</sup> Adjusted for age, sex, diale	ry. #BMI was modeled as quad ct, interview year, education, s	Iratic opposed to linear. moking, alcohol, BMI, and

hyperglycemia (23,24). For individuals with impaired fasting glucose and impaired glucose tolerance, increased oxidative stress and endothelial dysfunction are present before the onset of diabetes (25). The association between chronically high levels of HbA<sub>1c</sub> and development of and death from cancer is not as well defined (9,26-30). Abnormal metabolism may play a role in cancer development and death. This is important, considering cancer is the leading cause of death in Singapore for adults 15-59 years of age (31). Increased risk for cancer mortality was found in individuals with impaired glucose tolerance (30). Nondiabetic women with elevated HbA1c were found to have increased risk for colorectal cancer (32). Oxidative stress was found to be associated with an increase in colorectal cancer risk in a prospective cohort population independent of diabetes status (33). Oxidative stress also induces DNA methylation, damagepromoting chronic inflammation, and cytokine signaling response promoting cell proliferation and creation of tumor mass (34-36). Lastly, hyperglycemia may be a surrogate measure for high insulin levels. Hyperinsulinemia and IGF-I are associated with increased cancer risk, possibly through mitogenic effects and tumor formation (27,28,37). This is the basis for the insulincancer hypothesis. Simply put, chronic levels of hyperinsulinemia reduce the production of IGF binding proteins 1 and 2. The absence of these proteins results in excess bioactive IGF-I, supporting tumor development (38). Chronic hyperglycemia, indicating high levels of insulin and IGF-I, may explain inhibition of cell apoptosis, increased cell proliferation, and increased cancer risk (39).

The results presented on respiratory mortality are novel. The authors found no previous studies looking at the association between HbA<sub>1c</sub> level and respiratory disease mortality. Our results show no association between HbA<sub>1c</sub>  $\geq$ 6.5% ( $\geq$ 48 mmol/mol) and risk for death from respiratory causes during follow-up.

It is important to recognize the limitations of this study to give the results context. Other clinical measures such as lipids and insulin levels were not measured. Previous studies have not adjusted

and hypertensive status: the SCHS	status: the SCHS		HbA <sub>1c</sub> (%	HbA <sub>1c</sub> (%) category [mmol/mol]			
	<5.0 (N = 223) [<31]	5.0–5.3 (N = 847) [31–35]	5.4–5.6 (N = 2,131) [36–38]	5.7–6.0 (N = 2,754) [39–42]	6.1–6.4 (N = 923) [43–47]	≥6.5 (N = 510) [≥48]	P for trend
All-cause death#							
Males	1.31 (0.83, 2.05)	0.94 (0.69, 1.29)	1.00	0.99 (0.79, 1.23)	1.07 (0.81, 1.42)	1.66 (1.24, 2.23)	< 0.01
Females	1.57 (0.78, 3.15)	1.12 (0.74, 1.69)	1.00	1.01 (0.76, 1.36)	1.14 (0.79, 1.64)	2.60 (1.81, 3.75)	< 0.001
Ever smoke	1.44 (0.87, 2.37)	1.10 (0.79, 1.54)	1.00	1.03 (0.81, 1.31)	1.15 (0.86, 1.55)	1.76 (1.27, 2.44)	< 0.05
Never smoke	1.32 (0.74, 2.36)	0.86 (0.59, 1.25)	1.00	0.98 (0.75, 1.27)	1.08 (0.77, 1.51)	2.24 (1.63, 3.08)	< 0.001
Hypertensive	1.41 (0.77, 2.60)	0.99 (0.67, 1.46)	1.00	0.87 (0.66, 1.16)	0.97 (0.69, 1.37)	2.05 (1.48, 2.84)	< 0.001
Nonhypertensive	1.35 (0.83, 2.19)	1.03 (0.74, 1.42)	1.00	1.08 (0.86, 1.35)	1.20 (0.90, 1.61)	1.81 (1.31, 2.50)	< 0.01
CVD death							
Males	1.63 (0.76, 3.51)	1.01 (0.56, 1.82)	1.00	0.74 (0.47, 1.16)	1.11 (0.66, 1.85)	1.95 (1.18, 3.24)	0.06
Females	0.87 (0.11, 6.58)	1.26 (0.54, 2.94)	1.00	1.10 (0.59, 2.03)	1.85 (0.95, 3.61)	4.59 (2.38, 8.84)	< 0.001
Ever smoke	1.34 (0.52, 3.48)	0.95 (0.49, 1.87)	1.00	0.69 (0.42, 1.12)	1.04 (0.59, 1.82)	2.14 (1.23, 3.72)	< 0.05
Never smoke	1.68 (0.58, 4.89)	1.20 (0.60, 2.39)	1.00	1.02 (0.60, 1.74)	1.83 (1.03, 3.26)	3.42 (1.94, 6.03)	< 0.001
Hypertensive	1.78 (0.68, 4.65)	1.52 (0.83, 2.78)	1.00	0.76 (0.45, 1.27)	1.44 (0.84, 2.45)	2.50 (1.46, 4.30)	< 0.01
Nonhypertensive	1.34 (0.47, 3.83)	0.59 (0.24, 1.42)	1.00	0.95 (0.58, 1.55)	1.13 (0.60, 2.10)	2.81 (1.57, 5.03)	< 0.001
Cancer death#							
Males	1.05 (0.48, 2.32)	0.99 ( $0.61$ , $1.61$ )	1.00	1.17 (0.83, 1.64)	1.29 (0.85, 1.97)	1.78 (1.12, 2.82)	< 0.05
Females	0.87 (0.27, 2.81)	0.86 (0.48, 1.54)	1.00	0.83 (0.56, 1.23)	0.78 (0.45, 1.34)	1.17 (0.62, 2.19)	0.80
Ever smoke	1.18 (0.50, 2.78)	1.11 (0.66, 1.87)	1.00	1.25 (0.87, 1.79)	1.33 (0.85, 2.08)	1.64 (0.97, 2.78)	0.09
	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	0.75 (0.43, 1.28)	1.00	0.84 (0.58, 1.22)	0.86 (0.51. 1.42)	1.45 (0.86, 2.44)	0.13

Table 3—HRs and 95% CIs for all-cause mortality, cardiovascular mortality, and cancer mortality according to category of HbA<sub>1c</sub> percentage and stratified by sex, smoking status,

for insulin but have shown increased lipid levels in association with increased HbA<sub>1c</sub> levels; the individual impact of lipids on all-cause and cardiovascular mortality was not assessed (3,5,7-9,11). Collective adjustment for anthropometric, blood pressure, and lipid measures in these studies slightly attenuated the risk estimates, but did not impact the interpretation of results from previous models. While there is potentially residual confounding from unmeasured lipid values, the results from previous studies suggest this confounding would not significantly impact the interpretation of our results given the magnitude of the point estimates. HbA<sub>1c</sub> is indicative of average glycemia of the prior 2 to 3 months; how representative this one-time measure is of an individual over longer time periods is less clear, but evaluation from a single measure is often used in the clinical setting. A limited sample of participants with  $HbA_{1c} < 5.0\%$  (<31 mmol/mol) reduced the power to detect a signal in the data in some disease-specific mortality categories. Due to the elevated tail for HR of the highest HbA<sub>1c</sub> group, the P for trend statistic should be interpreted cautiously. Self-report of BMI and the lifestyle factors of smoking and alcohol intake leads to some misclassification and likely residual confounding in the models. We did not have other updated lifestyle factors from the baseline assessment (dietary intake and physical activity); however, adjustment for baseline levels of these factors did not alter the results. Strengths of the study also need to be considered. This large Asian population uniquely contributes to the literature on the topic. Other strengths include the high participant response rate, detailed collection of data through faceto-face interview, thorough adjustment for measured confounders, very low level of participants lost to follow-up, and nearly complete mortality assessment with objectively obtained records on

To conclude, in this large cohort of Singaporean Chinese adults without diagnosed diabetes, we observed an increased risk for all-cause, CVD, and cancer mortality during follow-up in individuals with elevated HbA<sub>1c</sub> levels (HbA<sub>1c</sub>  $\geq$ 6.5% [ $\geq$ 48 mmol/mol]). No other level of HbA<sub>1c</sub> was associated

time and cause of death.

with risk of death during follow-up. These results were not materially different when sensitivity analyses were performed excluding observation of the first 2 and 3 years observation post-blood draw. Effect modification by age, sex, or smoking was not apparent in any mortality outcome. These findings contribute to the scientific body of knowledge by adding a large prospective study in an Asian population with clinically relevant HbA<sub>1c</sub> percentage clinical cut points. Additional studies are warranted in order to describe the distribution of HbA1c in Asian populations and to characterize the mortality risk associated with levels of HbA<sub>1c</sub> below the threshold for diabetes.

Acknowledgments. The authors thank Siew-Hong Low of the National University of Singapore for supervising the field work of the SCHS, Kazuko Arakawa and Renwei Wang for the development and maintenance of the cohort study database, the Ministry of Health in Singapore for assistance with the identification of cancer cases and mortality via database linkages, and the founding, long-standing principal investigator of the SCHS, Mimi C. Yu.

**Funding**. The parent cohort study, SCHS, was supported by National Institutes of Health (NIH) grants R01-CA-55069, R35-CA-53890, R01-CA-80205, and R01-CA-144034. The measurement of HbA<sub>1c</sub> was supported by NIH grant R01-DK-080720. M.P.B. was supported by NIH training grant T32-HL-007779 to conduct the current work.

**Duality of Interest.** No potential conflicts of interest relevant to this article were reported. **Author Contributions.** M.P.B. wrote the manuscript and researched the data. A.O.O. researched the data, contributed to the discussion, and edited and reviewed the manuscript. J.S.P. and W.-P.K. edited and reviewed the manuscript. J.-M.Y. and M.A.P. contributed to the discussion and edited and reviewed the manuscript. M.D.G. oversaw HbA<sub>1c</sub> analysis. M.P.B. is the guarantor of this work and, as such, had full access to all the data in the study and takes responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis.

#### References

1. American Diabetes Association. Diagnosis and classification of diabetes mellitus. Diabetes Care 2010;33(Suppl. 1):S62–S69

2. International Expert Committee. International Expert Committee report on the role of the A1C assay in the diagnosis of diabetes. Diabetes Care 2009;32:1327–1334

3. Selvin E, Steffes MW, Zhu H, et al. Glycated hemoglobin, diabetes, and cardiovascular risk in nondiabetic adults. N Engl J Med 2010;362:800– 811 4. Selvin E, Coresh J, Golden SH, Brancati FL, Folsom AR, Steffes MW. Glycemic control and coronary heart disease risk in persons with and without diabetes: the atherosclerosis risk in communities study. Arch Intern Med 2005; 165:1910–1916

5. Carson AP, Fox CS, McGuire DK, et al. Low hemoglobin A1c and risk of all-cause mortality among US adults without diabetes. Circ Cardiovasc Qual Outcomes 2010;3:661– 667

6. Stout RL, Fulks M, Dolan VF, Magee ME, Suarez L. Relationship of hemoglobin A1c to mortality in nonsmoking insurance applicants. J Insur Med 2007;39:174–181

7. Pfister R, Sharp SJ, Luben R, Khaw KT, Wareham NJ. No evidence of an increased mortality risk associated with low levels of glycated haemoglobin in a non-diabetic UK population. Diabetologia 2011;54:2025– 2032

8. Kehl KG, Findeisen HM, Fardo DW, Bruemmer D, Mannino DM, Sanderson WT. Race-ethnicity as an effect modifier of the association between HbAlc and mortality in U.S. adults without diagnosed diabetes. Eur J Endocrinol 2011;165:275–281

9. Nakanishi S, Yamada M, Hattori N, Suzuki G. Relationship between HbA(1)c and mortality in a Japanese population. Diabetologia 2005; 48:230–234

10. Oh HG, Rhee EJ, Kim TW, et al. Higher glycated hemoglobin level is associated with increased risk for ischemic stroke in nondiabetic korean male adults. Diabetes Metab J 2011;35:551–557

11. Khaw KT, Wareham N, Bingham S, Luben R, Welch A, Day N. Association of hemoglobin A1c with cardiovascular disease and mortality in adults: the European prospective investigation into cancer in Norfolk. Ann Intern Med 2004; 141:413–420

12. Levitan EB, Liu S, Stampfer MJ, et al. HbA1c measured in stored erythrocytes and mortality rate among middle-aged and older women. Diabetologia 2008;51:267–275

13. World Health Organization. *The Global Burden of Disease: 2004 Update.* Geneva, Switzerland, WHO Press, 2008, p. 160

14. International Diabetes Federation. *Diabetes Atlas*. 4th ed. Brussels, Belgium, International Diabetes Federation, 2009

15. Yoon KH, Lee JH, Kim JW, et al. Epidemic obesity and type 2 diabetes in Asia. Lancet 2006;368:1681–1688

16. Chan JC, Malik V, Jia W, et al. Diabetes in Asia: epidemiology, risk factors, and pathophysiology. JAMA 2009;301:2129–2140

17. Hankin JH, Stram DO, Arakawa K, et al. Singapore Chinese Health Study: development, validation, and calibration of the quantitative food frequency questionnaire. Nutr Cancer 2001;39: 187–195

18. Wada K, Tamakoshi K, Tsunekawa T, et al. Validity of self-reported height and weight in a Japanese workplace population. Int J Obes (Lond) 2005;29:1093–1099

19. Odegaard AO, Pereira MA, Koh WP, Arakawa K, Lee HP, Yu MC. Coffee, tea, and incident type 2 diabetes: the Singapore Chinese Health Study. Am J Clin Nutr 2008;88: 979–985 20. Odegaard AO, Koh WP, Arakawa K, Yu MC, Pereira MA. Soft drink and juice consumption and risk of physician-diagnosed incident type 2 diabetes: the Singapore Chinese Health Study. Am J Epidemiol 2010;171:701–708

21. Steffes M, Cleary P, Goldstein D, et al. Hemoglobin A1c measurements over nearly two decades: sustaining comparable values throughout the Diabetes Control and Complications Trial and the Epidemiology of Diabetes Interventions and Complications study. Clin Chem 2005;51:753–758

22. de Vegt F, Dekker JM, Ruhé HG, et al. Hyperglycaemia is associated with all-cause and cardiovascular mortality in the Hoorn population: the Hoorn Study. Diabetologia 1999;42: 926–931

23. Ceriello A. Cardiovascular effects of acute hyperglycaemia: pathophysiological underpinnings. Diab Vasc Dis Res 2008;5:260–268

24. Schisano B, Tripathi G, McGee K, McTernan PG, Ceriello A. Glucose oscillations, more than constant high glucose, induce p53 activation and a metabolic memory in human endothelial cells. Diabetologia 2011;54:1219–1226

25. Su Y, Liu XM, Sun YM, et al. The relationship between endothelial dysfunction and oxidative stress in diabetes and prediabetes. Int J Clin Pract 2008;62:877–882

26. Lin J, Ridker PM, Pradhan A, et al. Hemoglobin A1c concentrations and risk of colorectal cancer in women. Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev 2005;14:3010–3012

27. Wei EK, Ma J, Pollak MN, et al. A prospective study of C-peptide, insulin-like growth factor-I, insulin-like growth factor binding protein-1, and the risk of colorectal cancer in women. Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev 2005:14:850–855

28. Wei EK, Ma J, Pollak MN, et al. C-peptide, insulin-like growth factor binding protein-1, glycosylated hemoglobin, and the risk of distal colorectal adenoma in women. Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev 2006;15:750–755

29. Kim BJ, Kim YH, Sinn DH, et al. Clinical usefulness of glycosylated hemoglobin as a predictor of adenomatous polyps in the colorectum of middle-aged males. Cancer Causes Control 2010;21:939–944

30. Saydah SH, Platz EA, Rifai N, Pollak MN, Brancati FL, Helzlsouer KJ. Association of markers of insulin and glucose control with subsequent colorectal cancer risk. Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev 2003;12:412–418

31. Pin PH. Trend in adult mortality in Singapore [Internet], 2010. Available from https:// www.moh.gov.sg/content/moh\_web/home/ Publications/information\_papers/2010/trend\_ in\_adult\_mortamortalityinsing.html. Accessed 23 May 2014

32. Joshu CE, Prizment AE, Dluzniewski PJ, et al. Glycated hemoglobin and cancer incidence and mortality in the atherosclerosis in communities (ARIC) study, 1990-2006. Int J Cancer 2012;131: 1667–1677

33. Jiao L, Taylor PR, Weinstein SJ, et al. Advanced glycation end products, soluble receptor for advanced glycation end products, and risk of colorectal cancer. Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev 2011;20:1430–1438

34. Loft S, Høgh Danielsen P, Mikkelsen L, Risom L, Forchhammer L, Møller P. Biomarkers

of oxidative damage to DNA and repair. Biochem Soc Trans 2008;36:1071–1076

35. Baylin SB. The cancer epigenome: its origins, contributions to tumorigenesis, and translational implications. Proc Am Thorac Soc 2012; 9:64–65

36. Balkwill F, Coussens LM. Cancer: an inflammatory link. Nature 2004;431:405–406 37. Wang Y, Hua S, Tian W, et al. Mitogenic and anti-apoptotic effects of insulin in endometrial cancer are phosphatidylinositol 3-kinase/Akt dependent. Gynecol Oncol 2012; 125:734–741

38. Calle EE, Kaaks R. Overweight, obesity and cancer: epidemiological evidence and proposed mechanisms. Nat Rev Cancer 2004;4:579–591

39. Raile K, Hille R, Laue S, et al. Insulinlike growth factor I (IGF-I) stimulates proliferation but also increases caspase-3 activity, Annexin-V binding, and DNA-fragmentation in human MG63 osteosarcoma cells: coactivation of pro- and anti-apoptotic pathways by IGF-I. Horm Metab Res 2003;35:786– 793