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RESULTS

• We included 78,998 infants and K.57 adults who were new users of TAC and 2,613 infants and 28,517 adults who were new users of PIM in each group matched with current users of moderate- to high-potency TCS. Breakdowns and summaries contrasted approximately 70% of the users of TAC. Figure 4 presents specific IRRs by year of treatment and categories of skin cancer.

• In children, there were events of MM in both TAC and PIM in the TCS cohort. For PIM, there were events of MM in 11 adults and one event of MM in 10 adults among new users of NMSC in the TCS cohort. The MM for NMSC comparing PIM with TAC in the TCS cohort was 1.19 (1.11-1.27).

• Summary results by incidence rates and 95% CI for NMSC among adults for the TAC and PIM cohorts are displayed in Figure 2 and Figure 3.
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• In adults, the pooled corrected IRR (95% CI) for current single use of TAC versus TCS was 0.95 (0.94-1.06) for MM and 1.29 (1.19-1.39) for NMSC. The pooled corrected IRR for current single use of TAC versus TCS was 0.76 (0.70-0.82) for TAC in the CPRD (Figure 1). There was heterogeneity of results across the treatment groups, whereas we corrected for TAC versus TCS was 0.90 (0.66-1.22) for MM and 1.08 (0.98-1.19) for NMSC. The pooled corrected IRR for current single use of PIM in each group matched with current users of moderate- to high-potency TCS. Breakdowns and summaries contrasted approximately 70% of the users of TAC. Figure 4 presents specific IRRs by year of treatment and categories of skin cancer.
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