



Published in final edited form as:

*Sci Total Environ.* 2008 June 25; 396(2-3): 196–200.

## The Conundrum of unmeasured confounding: “can some of the detrimental neurodevelopmental effects attributed to lead be due to pesticides? by Brian Gulson”

Bruce P. Lanphear<sup>1</sup>, Richard W. Hornung<sup>1</sup>, Jane Khoury<sup>1</sup>, Kim N. Dietrich<sup>1</sup>, Deborah A. Cory-Slechta<sup>2</sup>, and Richard L. Canfield<sup>3</sup>

*1Cincinnati Children's Environmental Health Center, Department of Pediatrics and of Environmental Health, Cincinnati Children's Hospital Medical Center, The University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio, USA*

*2Department of Environmental Medicine, The University of Rochester School of Medicine and Dentistry, Rochester, New York*

*3Division of Nutritional Sciences, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York*

### Keywords

confounder; children; environmental epidemiology; observational studies; lead toxicity; pesticide; unmeasured confounder

---

In their quest to control or conquer disability, disease and death, epidemiologists strive to isolate the unique contribution of a specific risk factor. But it isn't easy. Indeed, it isn't unusual for an epidemiologist to spend his or her entire career trying to identify and quantify the contribution of a risk factor, or exposure variable, for a disease. Beyond the practical problem of obtaining funds to conduct their research, investigators must deal with a variety of confounders that can bias the estimated effect of an exposure variable.

Confounding, the erroneous attribution of an effect to an exposure variable, results from a failure to account for risk factors that are associated with both the exposure variable and the outcome. The effect of confounding on the exposure variable can either be positive or negative – that is, the effect of the confounder, if it is ignored, is to increase or decrease the effect of the exposure variable. Many reviewers, however, focus on positive confounding when the estimated exposure effect is positive. To qualify as a confounder, a risk factor must not be on the causal pathway between the exposure variable and the outcome. Investigators can design observational studies to minimize confounding by precisely measuring all of the potential confounders and accurately characterizing their association with the exposure variable, but it is difficult to eliminate it (Lawlor, 2004; Bellinger, 2007).

Unmeasured confounding can be a particularly troublesome problem in observational epidemiology. There are usually reasons that confounders aren't measured. Unmeasured confounders may represent exposures that occurred in the distant past or there may not be

---

Corresponding Author: Bruce Lanphear, Mail location 7035, 3333 Burnet Avenue, Cincinnati OH 45206, Phone: 513-636-3778, Fax: 513-636-4402, E-mail: [bruce.lanphear@cchmc.org](mailto:bruce.lanphear@cchmc.org).

**Publisher's Disclaimer:** This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final citable form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

validated instruments or biomarkers to measure them. It is difficult and expensive, for example, to precisely measure prenatal exposures for a disease that arises in adolescence. Nobody would fault epidemiologists for failing to adjust for pesticide exposures in published studies of lead-exposed children; it has only recently become feasible to routinely measure biomarkers of pesticide exposure in epidemiologic studies. Finally, even after a new study is published showing that the effects of an environmental toxicant persists after incorporating a risk factor that was previously suspected of acting as an unmeasured confounder, there is always another unmeasured confounder lurking in the imagination of an industry consultant or on the freshly printed pages of a peer-reviewed publication.

The problem described by Dr. Brian Gulson - confounding by unmeasured exposure to pesticides - is only the most recent in a series of potential unmeasured confounders cited to explain the observed effect of lead on children's intellectual abilities or behavioral problems (Gulson, 2007). Other investigators have written about potential confounding from unmeasured or poorly measured variables, such as poor parenting, maternal depression, iron status, tobacco exposure, poverty and pica (Pocock, 1994; CDC, 2005; Ernhart, 2006).

On the surface, Dr. Gulson is right to be concerned about pesticide exposure acting as a potential confounder of lead toxicity. Pesticides have been shown to be associated with diminished cognition and behavioral problems in children, if only in a few studies (Fenster, 2007; Rauh, 2006; Eskenazi, 2007). It shouldn't be surprising if we find that some pesticides are associated with cognitive deficits; pesticides were designed to be neurotoxic. Finally, children who have higher blood lead concentrations often have higher exposures to other environmental toxicants than children with lower blood lead concentrations (Mannino, 2003).

While the data are sparse, the most commonly used and widely studied pesticides, organophosphorous insecticides, have not been shown to be correlated with blood lead levels in maternal (prenatal) samples. Although blood lead concentrations were only available for a subset of children (n=89) in the study by Rauh et al., there was no significant correlation between maternal blood lead levels and serum Chlorpyrifos levels ( $r=0.08$ ,  $p=0.49$ ) (Rauh, 2006). Similarly, in a preliminary analysis of our unpublished Health Outcomes and Measures of the Environment (HOME) Study (n=187), we found no statistically significant correlation of maternal blood lead concentrations with organophosphorous (OP) insecticide exposure measured using two creatinine-adjusted metabolites of OP insecticides, dimethylphosphate ( $r=-0.03$ ,  $p=0.67$ ) and diethylphosphate ( $r=0.07$ ,  $p=0.31$ ) in maternal urine. These data diminish, but do not dismiss concerns about pesticides acting as unmeasured confounders for the observed effects of environmental lead toxicity.

Despite some uncertainties – and the persistent problem of unmeasured confounders – there are several lines of evidence implicating lead as a toxicant at blood lead levels < 10  $\mu\text{g}/\text{dL}$ . First, in striking contrast with pesticides, there is considerable evidence from numerous studies linking low-level lead exposure with cognitive deficits and behavioral problems, even after controlling for a variety of potential confounders (Needleman, 1979; Needleman 1990; Needleman, 1996; Bellinger, 1992; Baghurst, 1992; Burns 1999; Wasserman 1997; Dietrich 2001; Canfield, 2003; Lanphear, 2005a; Braun, 2006). Second, the consistency of evidence from diverse cohorts – and distinct, if not always directly measured potential confounders - enhances our confidence that the lead effect observed at blood lead levels < 10  $\mu\text{g}/\text{dL}$  is not attributable to unmeasured confounders (Lanphear, 2000; Canfield, 2003; Wasserman, 2003; Lanphear, 2005a; Tellez-Rojo, 2006; Kordas 2006; Schnaas, 2006; Hu, 2006; Surkan, 2007).

Despite the consistent evidence, there are a plethora of other variables – mouthing behaviors, breastfeeding, maternal depression, iron status and imprecisely measured exposure to prenatal tobacco smoke, to name only a few - that may be acting as unmeasured or poorly measured

confounders in epidemiologic studies of lead toxicity. Tobacco exposure and iron status are the two most obvious potential confounders for lead toxicity. Investigators have reported that iron deficiency and tobacco smoke exposure are both associated with a higher blood lead concentration and cognitive deficits (Mannino, 2003; Wright, 1999; Fried, 2003; Yolton, 2005). Although iron deficiency is arguably on the causal pathway for lead absorption (Wright, 1999), and there is considerable room to improve the measurement of iron status and tobacco exposure in studies of low-level lead exposure in children, the effects of lead exposure have persisted in several studies after adjustment for iron status and tobacco exposure (Dietrich, 1987; Lanphear, 2000; Wasserman, 1997; Wasserman, 2003; Canfield, 2003; Lanphear, 2005a). Thus, it is unlikely that the lead effect is confounded by tobacco exposure or iron deficiency.

In their review of the adverse effects at blood lead concentrations  $<10$   $\mu\text{g/dL}$ , the Centers for Disease Control Advisory Committee for Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention singled out mouthing behaviors as a particularly important unmeasured confounder (CDC, 2005). Mouthing behaviors, which are a normal part of child development, are a risk factor for having an elevated blood lead concentration (Clark, 1991; Lanphear 2002, Malcoe, 2002), but they have not been shown to be associated with intellectual abilities. More importantly, mouthing behaviors (e.g., ingestion of lead-contaminated house dust, soil or paint chips) sit precisely on the causal pathway between lead exposure and children's blood lead concentration. Thus, it would be inappropriate to consider mouthing behaviors as a confounder.

On the other hand, mouthing behaviors may be vulnerable to reverse causation. That is, children who have lower intellectual ability may exhibit more frequent or persistent mouthing behaviors, ingest more lead and subsequently have higher blood lead concentrations.

Using data from our previously published study (Canfield, 2003), we evaluated whether children ( $n=172$ ) who exhibited mouthing behaviors had lower intellectual ability. Mouthing behaviors, collected when the children were 6, 12, 18 and 24 months of age, were based on parent report of their child putting soil, dirt or paint chips in their mouths (Lanphear, 2002). IQ was measured using the Stanford–Binet at 3 and 5 years of age (Canfield, 2003). The mean IQ for the 96 (56%) children who were ever reported to put soil or dirt in their mouths during the first two years of life was not significantly different than those who reportedly did not put soil or dirt in their mouths (90.1 versus 89.3,  $p=0.58$ ). Similarly, the mean IQ for the 31 (18%) children who were ever reported to put paint chips in their mouths during the first two years of life was not different than those who reportedly did not put paint chips in their mouths (89.4 versus 90.0,  $p=0.75$ ).

Although mouthing behaviors are on the causal pathway of lead exposure and intellectual deficits, and thus cannot be a true confounder, we tested whether the inclusion of mouthing behaviors and breastfeeding in our multivariable analysis attenuated or extinguished the estimated effect of lead exposure on children's intellectual ability (Canfield, 2003). In our reanalysis of the Rochester Lead Study, the inclusion of parent-reported mouthing behaviors and breastfeeding status (ever/never) did not attenuate the effect of lead exposure on children's intellectual function (Table). Thus, the lead effect was not confounded by either mouthing behaviors or breastfeeding status. Still, the skeptical epidemiologist might reasonably argue that no study has tested whether maternal depression or pesticide exposures are acting as unmeasured confounders and that there are always more potential unmeasured confounders lying in-wait.

Although we can never entirely dismiss unmeasured confounding in observational studies, we can rely on experimental studies of lead-exposed animals to confirm whether a metal or a chemical is a toxicant. The profile of behavioral changes seen in lead-exposed children is

paralleled by observations from animal studies. In a recent study, we reported that children from the Rochester cohort exhibited specific deficits in tests that evaluated reaction time, memory, learning and reversal learning, and planning/executive function (Canfield, 2004). Similar impairments in learning and reversal learning or memory have been reported in rodents and non-human primates (Cory-Slechta, 1995; Cory-Slechta, 2003; Rice, 1993). Experimental trials also show that such behavioral changes appear to reflect perseverative behavior, increased distractibility and impulsivity (Brockel, 1998; Rice, 1993). The effects observed in experimental models occur at levels of exposure similar to those experienced by contemporary children. Discrimination reversal deficits in monkeys were found with developmental exposures resulting in peak blood lead levels of 15 to 25  $\mu\text{g}/\text{dL}$  and steady state levels of 11 to 13  $\mu\text{g}/\text{dL}$  (Rice, 1993). Increased impulsivity in rodent models was observed at blood lead levels of 9 to 11  $\mu\text{g}/\text{dL}$  (Brockel, 1998; Rice 1993). Finally, in vitro studies have shown that disruptive effects of lead on intracellular processes and neurite growth occur at picomolar concentrations (Bressler, 1999; Schneider, 2003).

In our quest to isolate the unique contribution of a risk factor, we shouldn't forget that the inclusion of competing risk factors and exposure misclassification may inappropriately diminish lead's effect. It has, for example, become conventional for studies of environmental toxicants to include the HOME Inventory, a measure that reflects the quality and quantity of emotional and cognitive stimulation in the home environment, as well as an objective measure of housing condition. Because housing condition is a surrogate for lead exposure, its inclusion may attenuate or diminish the effect estimate for blood lead concentration (Bellinger, 2004). Imperfect measures of lead exposure that result in exposure misclassification can also diminish the estimated effect of lead exposure on neurodevelopmental effects (Bellinger, 2007). Indeed, two studies using innovative biomarkers of lead exposure – bone lead and plasma lead – indicate that observational studies using whole blood lead concentration may have underestimated lead's effect on cognitive abilities or behavioral problems (Wasserman, 2003; Hu, 2006).

## Conclusions

While we must remain vigilant for unmeasured or poorly measured confounders, it is crucial to balance the endless search for confounders with the evidence of toxicity and the need to take action to protect public health. The conundrum of unmeasured confounding described by Dr. Gulson thus raises another quandary; if we can never entirely eliminate the potential for unmeasured confounders from observational studies, is it possible to know enough to take action or promulgate a new standard for lead and other environmental toxicants? This quandary makes it imperative to establish a formal classification scheme to guide scientists and policymakers in making inferences about the causal association of exposures to environmental chemicals and metals with neurobehavioral endpoints. This classification scheme, analogous with those used by the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) and the National Academies of Science (IARC, 1987; IOM, 2000), should be used to categorize evidence as sufficient for a causal relationship, sufficient for an association, limited or suggestive for an association, inadequate or insufficient for an association, and limited or no evidence for an association. The primary value of this categorization is that it would allow us to acknowledge the limitations of observational epidemiology without prohibiting us from taking action to protect public health. The alternative, to perpetually permit children to be exposed to lead and other emerging toxicants, is both absurd and unacceptable.

## References

- Baghurst PA, McMichael AJ, Wigg NR, et al. Environmental exposure to lead and children's intelligence at the age of seven years. *N Engl J Med* 1992;327:1279–1284. [PubMed: 1383818]

- Bellinger DC, Stiles KM, Needleman HL. Low-level lead exposure, intelligence and academic achievement: A long-term follow-up study. *Pediatrics* 1992;90:855–861. [PubMed: 1437425]
- Bellinger DC. Assessing environmental neurotoxicant exposures and child neurobehavior: Confounded by confounding? *Epidemiology* 2004;15:383–384. [PubMed: 15232396]
- Bellinger DC. Lead neurotoxicity in children: Decomposing the variability in dose-effect relationships. *Am J Ind Med* 2007;50:720–728. [PubMed: 17290364]
- Braun J, Kahn RS, Froehlich T, Auinger P, Lanphear BP. Exposures to environmental toxicants and attention deficit hyperactivity disorder in U.S. children. *Environ Health Perspect* 2006;114:1904–1909. [PubMed: 17185283]
- Bressler J, Kim KA, Chakraborti T, Goldstein G. Molecular mechanisms of lead neurotoxicity. *Neurochem. Res* 1999;24:595–600. [PubMed: 10227691]
- Brockel BJ, Cory-Slechta DA. Lead, attention, and impulsive behavior: Changes in a fixed-ratio waiting-for-reward paradigm. *Pharmacology Biochemistry and Behavior* 1998;60:545–552.
- Burns JM, Baghurst PA, Sawyer MG, McMichael AJ, Tong SL. Lifetime low-level exposure to environmental lead and children's emotional and behavioral development at ages 11–13 years. The Port Pirie Cohort Study. *Am J Epidemiol* 1999;149:740–749. [PubMed: 10206624]
- Canfield RL, Henderson CR, Cory-Slechta DA, Cox C, Jusko TA, Lanphear BP. *New Engl J Med* 2003;348:1517–1526. [PubMed: 12700371]
- Canfield RL, Gendle MH, Cory-Slechta DA. Impaired neuropsychological functioning in lead-exposed children. *Developmental Neuropsychology* 2004;26:513–540. [PubMed: 15276907]
- Centers for Disease Control Advisory Committee on Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention. A review of evidence of adverse health effects associated with blood lead levels < 10 µg/dL in children. Atlanta, Georgia: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; 2005.
- Clark S, Bornschein R, Succop P, Roda S, Peace B. Urban lead exposures of children in Cincinnati, Ohio. *Chemical Speciation Bioavailability* 1991;3:163–171.
- Cory-Slechta DA. Lead-induced impairments in complex cognitive function: offerings from experimental studies. *Neuropsychol Dev Cogn Sect C Child Neuropsychol* 2003;9:54–75.
- Cory-Slechta DA. Relationships between lead-induced learning impairments and changes in dopaminergic, cholinergic and glutamatergic neurotransmitter system functions. *Annual Review of Pharmacology and Toxicology* 1995;35:391–415.
- Dietrich KN, Berger OG, Succop PA, Hammond PB, Bornschein RL. The developmental consequences of low to moderate prenatal and postnatal lead exposure: intellectual attainment in the Cincinnati Lead Study cohort following school entry. *Neurotoxicol Teratol* 1993;15:37–44. [PubMed: 8459787]
- Dietrich K, Ris M, Succop P, Berger O, Bornschein R. Early exposure to lead and juvenile delinquency. *Neurotox Teratol* 2001;23:511–518.
- Ernhart CB. Effects of lead on IQ in children. *Environ Health Perspect* 2006;114:A85–A86. [PubMed: 16451840]
- Eskenazi B, Marks AR, Bradman A, et al. Organophosphate pesticide exposure and neurodevelopment in young Mexican-American children. *Environ Health Perspect* 2007;115:792–798. [PubMed: 17520070]
- Fenster L, Eskenazi B, Anderson M, Bradman A, Hubbard A, Barr DB. In utero exposure to DDT and performance on the Brazelton neonatal behavioral assessment scale. *Neurotoxicology* 2007;28:471–477. [PubMed: 17287022]
- Fried PA, Watkinson B, Gray R. Differential effects on cognitive functioning in 13- to 16-year-olds prenatally exposed to cigarettes and marijuana. *Neurotoxicol Teratol* 2003;25:427–436. [PubMed: 12798960]
- Gulson B. Can some of the detrimental neurodevelopmental effects attributed to lead be due to pesticides? *Science Total Environment* 2008;XX:XX–XX.
- Hu H, Téllez-Rojo MM, Bellinger D, et al. Fetal lead exposure at each stage of pregnancy as a predictor of infant mental development. *Environ Health Perspect* 2006;114:1730–1735. [PubMed: 17107860]
- IARC (International Agency for Research on Cancer). Overall evaluations on Carcinogenicity: An Updating of IARC Monographs. Volumes 1–42. France: Lyon; 1987.

- Institute of Medicine. Clearing the Air: Asthma and Indoor Air Exposures. Washington, DC: National Academy Press; 2000.
- Kordas K, Canfield RL, López P, et al. Deficits in cognitive function and achievement in Mexican first-graders with low blood lead concentrations. *Environ Res* 2006;100:371–386. [PubMed: 16169549]
- Lanphear BP, Dietrich KN, Auinger P, Cox C. Cognitive deficits associated with blood lead levels <10 µg/dl in U.S. children and adolescents. *Public Health Rep* 2000;115:521–529. [PubMed: 11354334]
- Lanphear BP, Dietrich KN, Auinger P, Cox C. Cognitive deficits associated with blood lead levels < 10 µg/dL in US children. *Public Health Reports* 2000;115:521–529. [PubMed: 11354334]
- Lanphear BP, Hornung R, Ho M, Howard CR, Eberly S, Knauf K. Environmental lead exposure during early childhood. *Journal of Pediatrics* 2002;140:40–47. [PubMed: 11815762]
- Lanphear BP, Hornung R, Khoury J, et al. Low-level Environmental Lead Exposure and Children's Intellectual Function: An International Pooled Analysis. *Environ Health Perspect* 2005a;113:894–899. [PubMed: 16002379]
- Lawlor DA, Davey Smith G, Ebrahim S. The hormone replacement-coronary heart disease conundrum: is this the death of observational epidemiology? *Int J Epidemiol* 2004;33:464–467. [PubMed: 15166201]
- Malcoe LH, Lynch RA, Kegler MC, Skaggs VJ. Lead sources, behaviors and socioeconomic factors in relationship to blood lead of Native American and White children: A community based assessment of a former mining area. *Environ Health Perspect* 2002;110:221–231. [PubMed: 11929732]
- Mannino DM, Albalak R, Grosse S, Repace J. Second-hand smoke exposure and blood lead levels in U.S. children. *Epidemiology* 2003;14:719–727. [PubMed: 14569189]
- Needleman HL, Gunnoe C, Leviton A, Reed R, Peresie H, Maher C, Barrett P. Deficits in psychological and classroom performance of children with elevated dentine lead levels. *N Engl J Med* 1979;300:689–695. [PubMed: 763299]
- Needleman HL, Reiss JA, Tobin MJ, Biesecker GE, Greenhouse JB. Bone lead levels and delinquent behavior. *JAMA* 1996;275:363–369. [PubMed: 8569015]
- Needleman HL, Schell A, Bellinger D, Leviton A, Allred EN. The long-term effects of exposure to low doses of lead in childhood: An 11-year follow-up report. *N Engl J Med* 1990;322:83–88. [PubMed: 2294437]
- Pocock SJ, Smith M, Baghurst P. Environmental lead and children's intelligence: a systematic review of the epidemiological evidence. *BMJ* 1994;309:1189–1197. [PubMed: 7987149]
- Rauh VA, Garfinkel R, Perera FP, et al. Impact of prenatal chlorpyrifos exposure on neurodevelopment in the first 3 years of life among inner-city children. *Pediatrics* 2006;118:e1845–e1859. [PubMed: 17116700]
- Rice DC. Lead-induced changes in learning: Evidence for behavioral mechanisms from experimental animal studies. *Neurotoxicology* 1993;14:167–178. [PubMed: 8247391]
- Schnaas L, Rothenberg SJ, Flores MF, Martinez S, Hernandez C, Osorio E, Velasco SR, Perroni E. Reduced intellectual development in children with prenatal lead exposure. *Environ Health Perspect* 2006;114:791–797. [PubMed: 16675439]
- Schneider JS, Huang FN, Vemuri MC. Effects of low-level lead exposure on cell survival and neurite length in primary mesencephalic cultures. *Neurotox Teratology* 2003;25:555–559.
- Surkan PJ, Zhang, Trachtenberg F, Daniel DB, McKinaly S, Bellinger DC. Neuropsychological function in children with blood lead levels < 10 µg/dL. *Neurotoxicology* 2007;28:1170–1177. [PubMed: 17868887]
- Tellez-Rojo M, Bellinger DC, Arroyo-Quiroz C, et al. Longitudinal associations between blood lead concentrations lower than 10 mg/dL and neurobehavioral development in environmentally exposed children in Mexico City. *Pediatrics* 2006;118:e323–e330. [PubMed: 16882776]
- Wasserman GA, Liu X, Lolocono NJ, et al. Lead exposure and intelligence in 7-year-old children: the Yugoslavia Prospective Study. *Environ Health Perspect* 1997;105:956–962. [PubMed: 9410739]
- Wasserman GA, Factor-Litvak P, Liu X, Todd AC, Kline JK, Slavkovich V, Popovac D, Graziano JH. The relationship between blood lead, bone lead and child intelligence. *Child Neuropsychol* 2003;9:22–34. [PubMed: 12815520]

Wright RO, Shannon MW, Wright RJ, Hu H. Association between iron deficiency and low-level lead poisoning in an urban primary care clinic. *Am J Public Health* 1999;89:1049–1053. [PubMed: 10394314]

Yolton K, Auinger P, Dietrich KN, Lanphear BP, Hornung R. Exposure to environmental tobacco smoke and cognitive abilities among US children and adolescents. *Environ Health Persp* 2005;113:98–103.

**Table**

Adjusted Changes in Children's IQ for each 1 microgram per deciliter increase in Concurrent and Lifetime Average Blood Lead Concentration

	Original Adjusted Results $\beta \pm SE$	p value	Adjusted for Breastfeeding and Mouthing Behaviors* $\beta \pm SE$	p value
<b>Total Sample (n=172)</b>				
Lifetime Average	-0.46 $\pm$ 0.15	.004	-0.48 $\pm$ 0.16	.003
Concurrent	-0.46 $\pm$ 0.14	.002	-0.49 $\pm$ 0.15	.001
<b>Peak Blood Lead &lt;10 <math>\mu</math>g/dL (n=101)</b>				
Lifetime Average	-1.37 $\pm$ 0.60	.026	-1.45 $\pm$ 0.61	.021
Concurrent	-1.58 $\pm$ 0.46	.001	-1.61 $\pm$ 0.47	.001

Both models were adjusted for maternal IQ, maternal education, prenatal tobacco exposure, household income, race, HOME Inventory, child's sex, birth weight, preterm birth and iron status. The second model is adjusted for all of these variables as well as breastfeeding and parent-reported mouthing behaviors (soil and paint chip ingestion) during the first two years of life.