

**Age-standardized (world) incidence rates (per 100,000)  
of microscopically verified cases by histological type**

**Hodgkin lymphoma (C81) - Male**

	Nodular lymphocytic	Classical Lymphocyte-rich	Nodular sclerosis	Mixed cellularity	Lymphocytic depletion	Unspec.	Number of cases	
							MV	Total
<b>Africa</b>								
*Algeria, Batna	–	–	0.7	0.4	–	0.1	23	23
*Algeria, Tizi Ouzou	–	0.1	1.4	0.0	–	0.7	38	38
*Benin, Cotonou	–	–	–	–	–	0.4	5	5
*France, La Réunion	0.3	0.1	1.2	0.3	–	0.2	35	35
*Kenya, Eldoret	–	–	0.1	0.1	–	0.8	20	20
*Kenya, Nairobi	–	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.0	0.6	69	69
Mauritius	–	–	0.1	–	0.0	0.7	27	27
*Morocco, Casablanca	–	0.0	0.5	0.1	–	0.8	155	155
*Seychelles	–	–	–	0.4	–	1.4	4	4
*South Africa, Eastern Cape	–	–	–	–	–	0.1	1	1
*Uganda, Kyadondo County	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.1	0.0	0.7	52	52
*Uganda, Gulu	–	–	0.4	0.1	–	0.3	6	6
*Zimbabwe, Bulawayo : African	–	–	0.3	0.2	–	0.6	16	16
*Zimbabwe, Harare : African	–	–	0.2	0.4	0.0	0.3	32	32
<b>America, Central and South, and Caribbean</b>								
*Argentina, Entre Ríos Province	0.1	–	0.4	0.2	–	0.8	30	30
*Argentina, Mendoza	0.2	0.1	0.4	0.1	0.0	1.3	99	99
Brazil, Aracaju	0.1	–	1.0	0.1	0.1	0.4	21	21
*Brazil, Barretos	–	–	0.5	0.6	–	0.3	18	19
Brazil, Belo Horizonte	0.1	–	0.8	0.3	0.1	0.8	125	134
*Brazil, Campinas	–	0.1	1.1	0.3	0.0	0.7	54	54
*Brazil, Curitiba	0.1	0.1	0.5	0.2	0.2	0.6	66	70
Brazil, Goiânia	–	0.0	0.9	0.3	0.0	0.7	57	57
*Brazil, Jaú	–	–	1.4	0.2	–	–	7	7
Brazil, João Pessoa	–	–	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.7	12	12
Brazil, Recife	–	0.0	0.3	0.1	0.0	0.5	24	28
Chile, Region of Antofagasta	–	–	0.3	0.1	–	0.3	8	8
Chile, Valdivia	–	–	0.4	0.6	0.2	0.2	13	13
Colombia, Bucaramanga	–	0.1	0.8	0.5	0.0	0.8	66	67
Colombia, Cali	0.2	0.1	0.7	0.2	0.0	0.8	116	116
Colombia, Manizales	0.1	0.4	1.0	0.1	–	0.5	22	23
Colombia, Pasto	–	0.1	0.2	0.3	–	0.4	10	10
Costa Rica	0.0	0.1	0.7	0.1	0.0	0.6	156	156
Ecuador, Guayaquil	–	0.1	0.7	0.3	–	0.3	81	81
Ecuador, Manabí	0.1	–	0.5	0.3	0.1	0.1	39	39
Ecuador, Quito	0.1	0.0	0.3	0.4	0.0	0.6	65	65
*France, Guadeloupe	0.1	0.2	0.8	0.1	0.1	0.1	16	16
*France, Martinique	0.1	–	1.0	0.1	–	–	10	10
*Peru, Lima	0.0	0.1	0.4	0.4	0.0	0.2	161	171
*Trinidad and Tobago	–	–	0.3	0.0	–	0.6	20	20
USA, Puerto Rico	0.3	0.1	0.8	0.2	0.0	1.0	230	240
*Uruguay	0.1	0.1	1.4	0.3	0.0	0.7	236	238
<b>America, North</b>								
Canada, Alberta	0.3	0.1	1.4	0.4	0.0	0.5	314	314
Canada, British Columbia	0.3	0.1	1.5	0.2	0.0	0.5	346	346
*Canada, Manitoba	0.5	0.0	1.6	0.6	–	0.3	116	116
*Canada, New Brunswick	0.7	–	0.8	0.7	–	1.0	66	66
*Canada, Newfoundland	0.3	0.1	0.8	0.3	–	0.7	33	33
Canada, Ontario	0.3	0.1	1.4	0.2	0.0	0.7	1006	1066
*Canada, Prince Edward Island	0.3	–	0.3	0.7	–	0.3	6	13
Canada, Quebec	0.2	0.1	1.7	0.4	0.0	0.6	732	736
Canada, Saskatchewan	0.3	0.0	0.9	0.3	0.0	0.5	73	73
*Canada, Yukon	–	–	1.7	0.9	–	0.9	3	3
USA	0.3	0.1	1.2	0.3	0.0	0.8	23507	23888
USA : White	0.2	0.1	1.3	0.3	0.0	0.8	19328	19647
USA : Black	0.4	0.1	1.0	0.3	0.0	0.9	3100	3146
USA, NPCR	0.3	0.1	1.2	0.3	0.0	0.8	22680	23052
USA, NPCR : White	0.2	0.1	1.3	0.3	0.0	0.8	18633	18944
USA, NPCR : Black	0.4	0.1	1.0	0.3	0.0	0.9	3046	3092
USA, NPCR : Asian and Pacific Islander	0.1	0.0	0.7	0.1	0.0	0.4	683	691
USA, NPCR : American Indian	0.1	0.0	0.3	0.1	–	0.3	90	93
*USA, SEER (18 registries)	0.3	0.1	1.1	0.3	0.0	0.8	6262	6313
*USA, SEER (18 registries) : White	0.2	0.1	1.2	0.3	0.0	0.8	4952	4993
*USA, SEER (18 registries) : Non-Hispanic White	0.3	0.1	1.5	0.3	0.0	0.8	3926	3956
*USA, SEER (18 registries) : Hispanic White	0.1	0.1	0.8	0.3	0.0	0.8	1026	1037
*USA, SEER (18 registries) : Black	0.4	0.1	1.0	0.3	0.0	0.9	805	811
*USA, SEER (18 registries) : Asian and Pacific Islander	0.1	0.0	0.7	0.1	0.0	0.4	350	352
*USA, SEER (9 registries)	0.3	0.1	1.2	0.2	0.0	0.9	2253	2268
*USA, SEER (9 registries) : White	0.3	0.1	1.3	0.2	0.0	0.9	1746	1758
*USA, SEER (9 registries) : Black	0.5	0.1	0.9	0.3	0.0	1.3	314	316
USA, Alabama	0.2	0.1	0.9	0.2	0.0	0.9	309	320
USA, Alabama : White	0.1	0.1	1.0	0.2	0.0	0.8	218	225

Rates based on less than 10 cases are in italics

\*Important. See note on population page.

**Age-standardized (world) incidence rates (per 100,000)  
of microscopically verified cases by histological type**

**Hodgkin lymphoma (C81) - Male (Contd)**

	Nodular lymphocytic	Classical Lymphocyte-rich	Nodular sclerosis	Mixed cellularity	Lymphocytic depletion	Unspec.	Number of cases	
							MV	Total
<b>America, North (contd)</b>								
USA, Alabama : Black	0.3	<i>0.1</i>	0.7	<i>0.3</i>	<i>0.0</i>	1.2	85	88
USA, Alaska	<i>0.3</i>	–	1.0	<i>0.1</i>	–	0.6	41	42
*USA, Alaska : Alaska, Natives	<i>0.7</i>	–	–	–	–	<i>0.3</i>	3	3
USA, Arizona	0.2	0.1	0.9	0.2	<i>0.0</i>	0.7	411	427
USA, Arizona : White	0.1	0.2	0.9	0.2	<i>0.0</i>	0.7	360	375
USA, Arizona : Black	<i>0.5</i>	<i>0.1</i>	0.9	<i>0.5</i>	–	1.3	35	36
*USA, Arizona : Asian and Pacific Islander	–	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.3</i>	<i>0.4</i>	–	<i>0.7</i>	12	12
USA, Arizona : American Indian	–	–	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.1</i>	4	4
USA, Arkansas	0.3	0.2	1.2	0.3	<i>0.0</i>	0.7	218	222
USA, Arkansas : White	0.3	0.1	1.2	0.3	<i>0.1</i>	0.6	176	180
USA, Arkansas : Black	<i>0.5</i>	<i>0.5</i>	1.1	<i>0.2</i>	–	1.1	39	39
USA, California	0.2	0.1	1.0	0.2	0.0	0.7	2394	2423
USA, California : White	0.2	0.1	1.1	0.3	<i>0.0</i>	0.7	1967	1993
USA, California : Black	0.2	<i>0.1</i>	1.0	0.2	<i>0.0</i>	0.6	164	165
USA, California : Asian and Pacific Islander	0.1	<i>0.0</i>	0.7	0.1	<i>0.0</i>	0.4	222	224
*USA, California, Los Angeles County	0.2	0.1	0.9	0.3	<i>0.0</i>	0.6	586	588
*USA, California, Los Angeles County : White	0.2	0.1	1.0	0.3	<i>0.0</i>	0.6	472	473
*USA, California, Los Angeles County : Non-Hispanic White	0.3	<i>0.1</i>	1.4	0.4	–	0.8	246	246
*USA, California, Los Angeles County : Hispanic White	0.1	0.1	0.7	0.4	<i>0.0</i>	0.6	226	227
*USA, California, Los Angeles County : Black	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.1</i>	0.8	<i>0.2</i>	–	0.5	51	51
*USA, California, Los Angeles County : Chinese	–	–	<i>0.6</i>	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	9	9
*USA, California, Los Angeles County : Filipino	<i>0.0</i>	–	<i>0.3</i>	–	–	<i>0.7</i>	10	10
*USA, California, Los Angeles County : Korean	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	–	–	<i>0.3</i>	3	4
*USA, California, Los Angeles County : Asian and Pacific Islander	<i>0.0</i>	–	0.5	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	0.4	44	45
*USA, California, San Francisco Bay Area	0.2	<i>0.1</i>	1.1	0.2	<i>0.0</i>	0.8	301	301
*USA, California, San Francisco Bay Area : White	0.2	<i>0.1</i>	1.2	0.2	<i>0.0</i>	1.0	216	216
*USA, California, San Francisco Bay Area : Non-Hispanic White	0.3	<i>0.0</i>	1.4	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.0</i>	1.0	160	160
*USA, California, San Francisco Bay Area : Hispanic White	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.1</i>	0.8	<i>0.3</i>	–	1.1	56	56
*USA, California, San Francisco Bay Area : Black	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.2</i>	1.3	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.7</i>	27	27
*USA, California, San Francisco Bay Area : Asian and Pacific Islander	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.0</i>	1.0	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.0</i>	0.3	55	55
USA, Colorado	0.3	0.1	0.9	0.2	<i>0.0</i>	0.8	370	379
USA, Colorado : White	0.2	0.1	1.0	0.2	<i>0.0</i>	0.8	337	346
*USA, Colorado : Black	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.8</i>	<i>0.6</i>	–	<i>0.4</i>	17	17
*USA, Colorado : Asian and Pacific Islander	<i>0.3</i>	–	<i>0.3</i>	<i>0.4</i>	–	<i>0.8</i>	9	9
USA, Connecticut	0.4	0.1	1.4	0.2	<i>0.0</i>	1.1	337	338
USA, Connecticut : White	0.4	<i>0.1</i>	1.5	0.2	<i>0.0</i>	1.1	273	274
USA, Connecticut : Black	<i>0.8</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.7</i>	–	<i>0.1</i>	1.5	37	37
USA, District of Columbia	–	<i>0.1</i>	1.0	<i>0.3</i>	–	0.9	44	45
USA, District of Columbia : White	–	–	1.2	<i>0.3</i>	–	<i>1.0</i>	24	24
USA, District of Columbia : Black	–	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.7</i>	<i>0.3</i>	–	<i>0.6</i>	17	18
USA, Florida	0.2	0.1	1.3	0.3	0.0	1.1	1869	1890
USA, Florida : White	0.2	0.1	1.4	0.3	0.0	1.1	1537	1554
USA, Florida : Black	0.3	0.1	0.9	0.2	<i>0.1</i>	1.0	241	243
USA, Florida : Asian and Pacific Islander	<i>0.0</i>	–	<i>0.5</i>	<i>0.1</i>	–	0.7	24	24
USA, Georgia	0.3	0.1	0.9	0.2	<i>0.0</i>	0.9	670	677
USA, Georgia : White	0.2	0.1	1.0	0.2	<i>0.0</i>	0.9	429	433
USA, Georgia : Black	0.4	<i>0.0</i>	0.9	0.2	<i>0.0</i>	1.1	228	231
USA, Georgia : Asian and Pacific Islander	–	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.4</i>	<i>0.3</i>	–	<i>0.3</i>	12	12
*USA, Georgia, Atlanta	0.3	<i>0.0</i>	0.8	0.1	<i>0.0</i>	1.3	250	252
*USA, Georgia, Atlanta : White	0.2	<i>0.0</i>	0.9	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.0</i>	1.1	125	125
*USA, Georgia, Atlanta : Black	0.4	–	0.8	<i>0.1</i>	–	1.8	119	121
USA, Idaho	0.4	<i>0.1</i>	1.3	<i>0.2</i>	–	0.4	108	108
USA, Indiana	0.3	0.1	1.4	0.2	–	0.7	519	526
USA, Indiana : White	0.3	0.1	1.6	0.2	–	0.7	470	477
USA, Indiana : Black	<i>0.4</i>	<i>0.1</i>	0.7	<i>0.3</i>	–	1.0	41	41
*USA, Iowa	0.4	<i>0.1</i>	1.6	0.3	–	0.6	268	268
USA, Kentucky	0.3	<i>0.1</i>	1.3	0.4	–	0.6	327	331
USA, Louisiana	0.3	0.1	1.3	0.2	<i>0.0</i>	0.9	350	355
USA, Louisiana : White	0.2	<i>0.1</i>	1.4	0.2	<i>0.0</i>	0.9	233	236
USA, Louisiana : Black	0.4	<i>0.1</i>	1.1	<i>0.2</i>	–	1.0	111	113
*USA, Louisiana, New Orleans	<i>0.3</i>	<i>0.1</i>	1.2	<i>0.3</i>	–	0.8	64	64
*USA, Louisiana, New Orleans : White	<i>0.4</i>	<i>0.1</i>	1.3	<i>0.5</i>	–	0.9	40	40
*USA, Louisiana, New Orleans : Black	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.1</i>	1.1	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.8</i>	21	21
USA, Maine	0.5	<i>0.2</i>	1.7	<i>0.2</i>	–	0.7	114	115
USA, Maryland	0.2	0.1	1.1	0.3	<i>0.0</i>	0.8	420	431
USA, Maryland : White	0.2	0.1	1.3	0.2	<i>0.0</i>	0.7	272	276
USA, Maryland : Black	0.3	<i>0.2</i>	0.9	0.3	<i>0.1</i>	0.9	129	134
USA, Maryland : Asian and Pacific Islander	–	–	<i>0.9</i>	<i>0.3</i>	–	<i>0.6</i>	18	20
USA, Massachusetts	0.3	0.1	1.3	0.3	<i>0.0</i>	0.8	517	518
USA, Massachusetts : White	0.3	0.1	1.4	0.3	<i>0.0</i>	0.8	455	456
USA, Massachusetts : Black	<i>0.4</i>	<i>0.2</i>	0.7	<i>0.2</i>	–	1.1	43	43
USA, Massachusetts : Asian and Pacific Islander	–	–	<i>0.5</i>	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.5</i>	15	15

Rates based on less than 10 cases are in italics

\*Important. See note on population page.

**Age-standardized (world) incidence rates (per 100,000)  
of microscopically verified cases by histological type**

**Hodgkin lymphoma (C81) - Male (Contd)**

	Nodular lymphocytic	Classical Lymphocyte-rich	Nodular sclerosis	Mixed cellularity	Lymphocytic depletion	Unspec.	Number of cases	
							MV	Total
<b>America, North (contd)</b>								
USA, Michigan	0.2	0.1	1.3	0.3	<i>0.0</i>	0.7	730	742
USA, Michigan : White	0.2	0.1	1.4	0.2	<i>0.0</i>	0.7	614	625
USA, Michigan : Black	0.4	<i>0.1</i>	1.1	0.5	–	0.7	103	104
USA, Michigan : Asian and Pacific Islander	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.3</i>	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	7	7
*USA, Michigan, Detroit	0.3	0.1	1.7	0.4	<i>0.0</i>	0.7	329	329
*USA, Michigan, Detroit : White	0.3	<i>0.1</i>	1.9	0.3	<i>0.0</i>	0.7	242	242
*USA, Michigan, Detroit : Black	<i>0.4</i>	<i>0.2</i>	1.4	0.6	–	0.9	81	81
USA, Minnesota	0.5	0.1	1.5	0.2	<i>0.0</i>	0.7	465	468
USA, Minnesota : White	0.5	0.1	1.7	0.2	<i>0.0</i>	0.7	424	427
USA, Minnesota : Black	<i>0.6</i>	<i>0.3</i>	<i>0.4</i>	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.9</i>	22	22
*USA, Minnesota : Asian and Pacific Islander	<i>0.3</i>	–	<i>0.5</i>	<i>0.2</i>	–	<i>0.2</i>	9	9
USA, Mississippi	0.3	<i>0.1</i>	0.9	0.3	<i>0.1</i>	0.8	198	201
USA, Missouri	0.2	0.1	1.3	0.1	<i>0.0</i>	0.8	452	458
USA, Missouri : White	0.2	0.1	1.4	0.1	<i>0.0</i>	0.9	399	405
USA, Missouri : Black	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.1</i>	1.2	<i>0.3</i>	<i>0.1</i>	0.7	48	48
USA, Montana	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.0</i>	1.1	<i>0.3</i>	<i>0.0</i>	0.6	66	68
*USA, Montana : American Indian	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
USA, Nebraska	0.3	<i>0.1</i>	1.5	0.5	–	0.6	162	166
USA, Nebraska : White	0.3	<i>0.1</i>	1.5	0.5	–	0.6	153	156
*USA, Nebraska : Black	–	<i>0.4</i>	–	<i>0.4</i>	–	<i>0.4</i>	3	3
USA, Nevada	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.1</i>	0.7	0.1	–	0.7	136	138
USA, Nevada : White	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.1</i>	0.8	<i>0.1</i>	–	0.7	117	119
USA, Nevada : Black	<i>0.6</i>	–	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.7</i>	13	13
*USA, Nevada : Asian and Pacific Islander	–	–	<i>0.2</i>	–	–	<i>0.2</i>	3	3
USA, New Jersey	0.3	0.1	1.6	0.3	0.0	0.7	768	780
USA, New Jersey : White	0.3	0.1	1.9	0.4	<i>0.0</i>	0.8	623	633
USA, New Jersey : Black	0.6	<i>0.1</i>	1.2	0.3	<i>0.1</i>	0.6	101	102
USA, New Mexico	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.0</i>	0.6	0.3	–	1.3	153	160
USA, New Mexico : White	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.0</i>	0.6	0.3	–	1.3	140	146
USA, New Mexico : Non-Hispanic White	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.1</i>	0.8	0.4	–	1.6	78	80
USA, New Mexico : Hispanic White	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.0</i>	0.6	<i>0.3</i>	–	1.3	62	66
*USA, New Mexico : American Indian	–	–	<i>0.3</i>	<i>0.2</i>	–	<i>0.5</i>	6	7
USA, New York State	0.3	0.1	1.5	0.4	0.0	0.7	1700	1713
USA, New York State : White	0.3	0.1	1.7	0.4	<i>0.0</i>	0.8	1326	1337
USA, New York State : Black	0.5	0.1	1.0	0.4	<i>0.1</i>	0.8	277	279
USA, New York State : Asian and Pacific Islander	0.2	<i>0.0</i>	0.9	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.0</i>	0.4	82	82
USA, North Carolina	0.2	0.1	1.3	0.2	0.0	0.7	706	733
USA, North Carolina : White	0.2	0.1	1.3	0.3	<i>0.0</i>	0.7	519	540
USA, North Carolina : Black	0.3	<i>0.1</i>	1.4	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.0</i>	0.7	163	169
USA, North Carolina : Asian and Pacific Islander	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.1</i>	0.8	–	–	0.3	12	12
*USA, North Carolina : American Indian	–	–	<i>0.4</i>	<i>0.5</i>	–	<i>0.6</i>	7	7
USA, North Dakota	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.1</i>	1.6	<i>0.2</i>	–	1.1	73	73
USA, Ohio	0.3	0.1	1.2	0.3	0.0	0.7	884	903
USA, Ohio : White	0.2	0.1	1.3	0.3	<i>0.0</i>	0.7	769	787
USA, Ohio : Black	0.4	<i>0.2</i>	0.8	0.3	<i>0.1</i>	0.9	105	106
*USA, Ohio : Asian and Pacific Islander	–	–	<i>0.4</i>	<i>0.2</i>	–	<i>0.3</i>	7	7
USA, Oklahoma	0.2	0.1	0.9	0.2	<i>0.0</i>	0.6	239	243
USA, Oklahoma : White	0.2	0.1	1.1	0.3	<i>0.0</i>	0.6	201	204
USA, Oklahoma : Black	<i>0.5</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.5</i>	<i>0.1</i>	–	1.2	21	21
USA, Oklahoma : American Indian	<i>0.3</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.5</i>	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.3</i>	14	15
USA, Oregon	0.2	0.1	1.0	0.2	<i>0.0</i>	0.7	255	258
USA, Oregon : White	0.2	0.1	1.0	0.2	<i>0.0</i>	0.8	235	238
*USA, Oregon : Black	<i>0.7</i>	–	<i>0.3</i>	–	–	<i>0.4</i>	4	4
*USA, Oregon : Asian and Pacific Islander	–	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.9</i>	–	–	<i>0.2</i>	7	7
USA, Rhode Island	<i>0.4</i>	<i>0.1</i>	1.2	<i>0.3</i>	<i>0.1</i>	1.1	93	94
USA, Rhode Island : White	<i>0.3</i>	<i>0.1</i>	1.3	<i>0.3</i>	<i>0.1</i>	1.3	87	87
*USA, Rhode Island : Black	<i>1.2</i>	–	<i>0.5</i>	–	–	<i>0.5</i>	5	6
USA, South Carolina	0.3	0.1	1.1	0.3	<i>0.0</i>	0.7	334	342
USA, South Carolina : White	0.2	0.1	1.1	0.3	<i>0.0</i>	0.7	233	238
USA, South Carolina : Black	0.4	<i>0.1</i>	1.0	0.3	<i>0.1</i>	0.8	95	98
USA, South Dakota	<i>0.3</i>	<i>0.1</i>	1.1	<i>0.1</i>	–	0.7	59	59
USA, Tennessee	0.2	0.1	1.3	0.2	<i>0.0</i>	0.7	468	475
USA, Tennessee : White	0.2	0.1	1.3	0.3	<i>0.0</i>	0.7	378	384
USA, Tennessee : Black	0.4	<i>0.1</i>	1.1	<i>0.2</i>	–	1.0	81	81
USA, Texas	0.2	0.1	0.8	0.2	0.0	0.9	1670	1744
USA, Texas : White	0.2	0.1	0.8	0.2	0.0	0.9	1370	1436
USA, Texas : Black	0.4	0.1	0.9	0.2	<i>0.1</i>	1.0	247	254
USA, Texas : Asian and Pacific Islander	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.1</i>	0.6	<i>0.1</i>	–	0.5	47	47
USA, Utah	0.2	<i>0.0</i>	1.2	0.1	<i>0.0</i>	0.6	178	181
USA, Vermont	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.2</i>	1.2	<i>0.2</i>	–	1.1	49	49
USA, Washington State	0.3	0.1	1.1	0.2	<i>0.0</i>	0.8	512	517
*USA, Washington, Seattle	0.4	<i>0.1</i>	1.1	0.2	<i>0.0</i>	0.8	368	369

*Rates based on less than 10 cases are in italics*

\*Important. See note on population page.

**Age-standardized (world) incidence rates (per 100,000)  
of microscopically verified cases by histological type**

**Hodgkin lymphoma (C81) - Male (Contd)**

	Nodular lymphocytic	Classical Lymphocyte-rich	Nodular sclerosis	Mixed cellularity	Lymphocytic depletion	Unspec.	Number of cases	
							MV	Total
<b>America, North (contd)</b>								
USA, West Virginia	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.0</i>	1.3	0.3	<i>0.0</i>	0.8	136	137
USA, Wyoming	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.1</i>	1.3	<i>0.1</i>	–	0.5	40	40
<b>Asia</b>								
Bahrain : Bahrainis	<i>0.2</i>	–	0.7	0.7	–	1.5	50	51
Brunei Darussalam	–	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.7</i>	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.5</i>	18	21
*China, Anfu County	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.2</i>	5	5
*China, Anguo City	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.4</i>	6	6
*China, Anshan City	–	–	–	<i>0.0</i>	–	0.3	22	22
*China, Aohan District, Chifeng City	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	–	–	<i>0.4</i>	7	7
*China, Arun District	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
*China, Baoding City	–	–	–	–	–	0.5	18	18
*China, Beijing City	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	0.2	0.1	–	0.2	149	149
*China, Binhai County	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
*China, Cangzhou City	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.2</i>	4	4
China, Changfeng County	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
China, Changzhou City	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	–	0.3	37	38
China, Ci Xian County	–	<i>0.1</i>	–	–	–	<i>0.4</i>	8	8
China, Cixi City	–	<i>0.1</i>	–	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	9	9
*China, Dafeng District, Yancheng City	–	<i>0.1</i>	–	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	7	7
China, Dalian City	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	0.2	<i>0.0</i>	0.1	37	37
*China, Dancheng County	–	–	–	–	–	0.3	10	10
China, Dangtu County	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	1	1
*China, Danyang City	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	–	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	6	8
*China, Dawukou District, Shizuishan City	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.2</i>	2	2
*China, Dehui City	–	<i>0.1</i>	–	–	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	4	4
*China, Donggang City	–	–	–	–	–	0.7	16	16
*China, Dongguan City	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	–	–	<i>0.2</i>	12	12
China, Donghai County	–	<i>0.0</i>	–	–	–	<i>0.0</i>	3	3
*China, Dongtai City	–	–	–	–	–	0.2	12	12
China, Duanzhou District, Zhaoqing City	<i>0.1</i>	–	–	–	–	<i>0.3</i>	3	3
*China, Ewenkizu Zizhiqi	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
*China, Faku County	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.3</i>	2	2
*China, Fangcheng County	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.3</i>	10	10
*China, Feicheng County	–	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	7	7
China, Feixi County	–	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.0</i>	–	–	<i>0.2</i>	15	15
China, Fuqing City	–	–	<i>0.0</i>	–	–	<i>0.3</i>	8	8
*China, Ganyu District, Lianyungang City	–	<i>0.0</i>	–	<i>0.0</i>	–	–	2	2
*China, Ganzhou District, Zhangye City	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.3</i>	3	3
*China, Gaocheng City	–	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.0</i>	–	<i>0.1</i>	5	5
China, Gaomi City	–	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.5</i>	14	14
China, Gong'an County	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.2</i>	7	7
*China, Guang'an District, Guang'an City	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	2	2
China, Guanghan City	<i>0.1</i>	–	–	<i>0.0</i>	–	–	2	2
China, Guangzhou City	<i>0.0</i>	0.0	0.2	0.1	<i>0.0</i>	0.1	95	95
*China, Guanyun County	–	–	<i>0.0</i>	–	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	3	3
China, Guilin City	–	–	–	<i>0.0</i>	–	<i>0.4</i>	10	10
*China, Hai'an City	–	–	–	<i>0.0</i>	–	<i>0.2</i>	10	10
China, Hailar District, Hulun Buir City	–	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.2</i>	4	4
China, Haimen City	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	4	4
China, Haining City	–	–	–	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.2</i>	7	7
China, Hangzhou City	<i>0.0</i>	0.1	0.1	0.1	<i>0.0</i>	0.1	82	84
China, Hebi City	–	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.1</i>	–	2.6	35	35
China, Hefei City	–	–	–	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	0.3	29	29
China, Hengdong	–	<i>0.1</i>	–	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	3	3
*China, Hengfeng County	–	–	–	<i>0.2</i>	–	<i>1.2</i>	7	7
*China, Hepu County	–	<i>0.0</i>	–	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	5	5
China, Honghu City	–	–	<i>0.0</i>	–	–	<i>0.0</i>	2	2
China, Hongshan District, Chifeng City	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	1	1
*China, Hongta District, Yuxi City	–	–	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.2</i>	2	2
*China, Huaiyin District, Huai'an City	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	3	3
*China, Yinzhou District, Ningbo City	–	<i>0.1</i>	–	–	–	<i>0.2</i>	3	3
*China, Jiange County	<i>0.1</i>	–	–	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	3	3
China, Jiangmen City	–	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.2</i>	–	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	7	7
*China, Jiangyin City	<i>0.0</i>	–	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.0</i>	–	<i>0.0</i>	9	9
*China, Jiashan County	–	<i>0.0</i>	–	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	3	3
China, Jiaxing City	–	<i>0.0</i>	–	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.0</i>	4	5
China, Jiayu County	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.5</i>	2	2
*China, Jinan City	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.0</i>	–	0.1	23	23
*China, Jingtai County	<i>0.3</i>	–	–	–	–	<i>0.3</i>	3	3
*China, Jingxian	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.0</i>	–	<i>1.1</i>	10	10
*China, Jintan District, Changzhou City	–	<i>0.0</i>	–	–	–	<i>0.2</i>	6	6
*China, Jiulongpo District, Chongqing City	–	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.0</i>	–	<i>0.3</i>	7	7

*Rates based on less than 10 cases are in italics*

\*Important. See note on population page.

**Age-standardized (world) incidence rates (per 100,000)  
of microscopically verified cases by histological type**

**Hodgkin lymphoma (C81) - Male (Contd)**

	Nodular lymphocytic	Classical Lymphocyte-rich	Nodular sclerosis	Mixed cellularity	Lymphocytic depletion	Unspec.	Number of cases	
							MV	Total
<b>Asia (contd)</b>								
*China, Jiyuan City	–	–	<i>0.0</i>	–	–	<i>0.2</i>	5	5
China, Kaihua County	–	<i>0.2</i>	–	–	–	<i>0.4</i>	5	5
China, Kunshan City	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.1</i>	–	–	<i>0.4</i>	9	9
China, Langzhong City	<i>0.1</i>	–	–	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	2	2
*China, Liangshan County	–	–	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	–	<i>0.2</i>	6	6
*China, Lianshui County	<i>0.0</i>	–	–	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	5	5
China, Lianyungang City	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	4	4
China, Linhe District, Bayannur City	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	1	1
China, Linqu County	–	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.2</i>	14	14
*China, Linzhou City	–	–	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.2</i>	11	11
China, Liuzhou City	<i>0.0</i>	–	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.3</i>	18	18
China, Liyang City	–	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.2</i>	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	8	8
*China, Longquan City	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
China, Lucheng District, Wenzhou City	<i>0.1</i>	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.2</i>	4	4
China, Luoding City	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	–	<i>0.1</i>	–	–	3	3
*China, Luohe City	–	<i>0.3</i>	<i>0.0</i>	–	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	19	19
*China, Luoyang City	–	<i>0.0</i>	–	<i>0.0</i>	–	<i>0.3</i>	15	15
*China, Luquan City	–	–	<i>0.2</i>	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	4	4
China, Ma'anshan City	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.2</i>	4	4
*China, Macheng City	–	–	–	<i>0.0</i>	–	<i>0.0</i>	2	2
China, Meihekou City	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
*China, Mengjin County	<i>0.1</i>	–	–	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	2	2
China, Nangang District, Harbin City	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.0</i>	6	6
*China, Nanhai District, Foshan City	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.1</i>	10	10
*China, Nantong City	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.4</i>	19	20
*China, Nanxiong City	–	–	<i>0.2</i>	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	3	3
China, Neixiang County	–	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.1</i>	–	–	<i>0.4</i>	14	14
*China, Qianxi County	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
China, Qidong County	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.2</i>	5	5
China, Qingyang District, Chengdu City	<i>0.0</i>	–	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.4</i>	22	22
China, Qingzhou City	–	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.0</i>	–	<i>0.2</i>	9	9
*China, Rudong County	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.6</i>	38	38
*China, Rugao City	–	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	–	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.3</i>	30	30
*China, Rural areas of Shanghai City	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.3</i>	117	127
China, Ruyang County	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.2</i>	3	3
*China, Shan County	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	1	1
China, Shanghai City	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.0</i>	–	<i>0.3</i>	92	94
China, Shangyu District, Shaoxing City	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.0</i>	–	<i>0.0</i>	–	<i>0.1</i>	8	8
*China, Shapingba District, Chongqing City	–	–	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.4</i>	13	13
China, She Xian County	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.4</i>	5	5
China, Sheyang County	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.0</i>	1	1
*China, Shijiazhuang City	–	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	22	22
China, Shunde District, Foshan City	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	–	–	–	<i>0.0</i>	4	4
*China, Song County	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
China, Suzhou City	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.0</i>	–	<i>0.2</i>	41	43
*China, Tengzhou City	–	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.0</i>	–	<i>0.1</i>	11	11
*China, Wangdu County	–	–	<i>0.5</i>	<i>0.3</i>	<i>0.8</i>	<i>0.1</i>	10	10
*China, Wanzai County	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
*China, Wu'an City	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
China, Wuhan City	–	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.2</i>	72	72
*China, Wuhu City	–	<i>0.0</i>	–	<i>0.0</i>	–	<i>0.2</i>	8	8
China, Wuxi City	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.1</i>	24	24
China, Wuzhou City	–	<i>0.2</i>	–	–	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	5	5
China, Xiangfu District, Kaifeng City	–	<i>0.1</i>	–	–	–	<i>0.3</i>	7	7
China, Xianju County	–	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.2</i>	5	5
*China, Xin'an County	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.3</i>	3	3
*China, Xining City	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.2</i>	5	5
*China, Xinji City	–	–	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	–	<i>0.0</i>	3	3
*China, Xinluo District, Longyan City	–	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.2</i>	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	3	3
*China, Xinzhou District, Shangrao City	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.4</i>	6	6
China, Xiping County	–	<i>0.3</i>	<i>0.0</i>	–	–	<i>0.0</i>	9	9
*China, Xishan District, Kunming City	–	–	–	<i>0.2</i>	–	<i>0.5</i>	6	6
*China, Xuyi County	–	–	–	–	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	2	2
*China, Ya'an City	–	–	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	–	<i>0.4</i>	21	21
*China, Yakeshi City	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	1	1
China, Yancheng	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	3	4
*China, Yangquan City	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.2</i>	5	5
*China, Yangzhong City	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
*China, Yanji City	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	1	1
*China, Yanshi City	–	<i>0.2</i>	–	–	–	<i>0.0</i>	4	4
China, Yanting County	–	<i>0.3</i>	–	–	–	<i>1.5</i>	19	19
*China, Yi'an District, Tongling City	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–

Rates based on less than 10 cases are in italics

\*Important. See note on population page.

**Age-standardized (world) incidence rates (per 100,000)  
of microscopically verified cases by histological type**

**Hodgkin lymphoma (C81) - Male (Contd)**

	Nodular lymphocytic	Classical Lymphocyte-rich	Nodular sclerosis	Mixed cellularity	Lymphocytic depletion	Unspec.	Number of cases	
							MV	Total
<b>Asia (contd)</b>								
*China, Yingdong District, Fuyang City	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	2	2
*China, Yiyuan County	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
China, Yong'an City	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	–	–	<i>0.2</i>	4	4
*China, Yongding District, Longyan City	–	<i>0.3</i>	–	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.2</i>	8	8
China, Yongkang City	–	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.0</i>	–	–	<i>0.2</i>	7	7
*China, Yucheng County	–	–	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	–	<i>0.3</i>	8	8
China, Yueyanglou District, Yueyang City	–	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.2</i>	3	3
China, Yunmeng County	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	–	–	3.0	49	49
*China, Yunyang District, Shiyao City	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.2</i>	3	3
China, Chongqing Yuzhong District	–	–	–	–	–	0.7	13	14
*China, Zhanhuang County	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
*China, Zhangjiagang City	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	4	4
*China, Zhaoyuan City	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.2</i>	1	1
*China, Zhengding County	–	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.1</i>	5	5
*China, Zhongshan City	–	<i>0.1</i>	0.2	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.0</i>	19	19
China, Zhongxiang City	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.2</i>	16	16
*China, Zhuanghe City	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	5	5
*China, Zhuhai City	<i>0.0</i>	–	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.1</i>	12	12
India, Ahmedabad, Urban	–	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	0.7	117	117
India, Aurangabad	–	–	–	–	–	0.6	21	21
India, Bangalore	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.0</i>	0.6	<i>0.0</i>	0.8	201	205
India, Barshi, Paranda, and Bhum	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.2</i>	4	4
*India, Bhopal	–	–	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	–	0.7	24	24
India, Chandigarh	<i>0.0</i>	–	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.1</i>	–	0.5	25	25
*India, Chennai	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	0.2	<i>0.0</i>	0.9	145	146
India, Dibrugarh	–	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	–	–	<i>0.2</i>	11	11
*India, Dindigul, Ambilikkai	–	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	–	<i>0.0</i>	0.5	31	32
India, Kamrup Urban District	–	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	–	<i>0.1</i>	0.6	21	21
India, Kollam	–	<i>0.1</i>	0.7	0.3	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.2</i>	64	64
*India, Manipur	–	–	–	–	–	0.3	15	15
India, Meghalaya	–	<i>0.0</i>	–	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	7	9
India, Mizoram	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
India, Mumbai	<i>0.0</i>	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.3	0.4	316	320
*India, New Delhi	–	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	–	1.7	459	463
India, Poona	–	<i>0.1</i>	–	–	0.1	0.6	102	103
*India, Sangrur district	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.3</i>	9	9
India, SAS Nagar	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.1</i>	0.6	25	25
*India, Tamil Nadu	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	<i>0.0</i>	0.5	1331	1333
*India, Tripura	–	–	–	–	–	0.4	30	30
India, Trivandrum	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.0</i>	0.7	0.4	–	0.5	114	114
India, Wardha	–	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	–	0.6	24	24
India, West Arunachal	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.0</i>	1	1
*Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ardabil Province	<i>0.3</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.1</i>	–	0.9	35	36
*Iran (Islamic Republic of), Golestan Province	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.3</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.0</i>	1.2	47	47
Israel	0.1	0.1	1.3	0.4	<i>0.0</i>	1.7	770	776
*Israel : Jewish	0.1	0.1	1.3	0.4	<i>0.0</i>	1.8	596	602
*Israel : Arabs	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.0</i>	1.3	0.5	–	1.4	144	144
Japan	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.3	0.0	0.1	2292	2293
Japan, Aichi Prefecture	0.1	<i>0.0</i>	0.3	0.3	<i>0.0</i>	0.1	135	135
*Japan, Akita Prefecture	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.4</i>	–	<i>0.0</i>	13	13
Japan, Aomori	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	0.6	0.4	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	53	53
Japan, Gunma Prefecture	<i>0.1</i>	–	0.2	0.2	–	<i>0.1</i>	32	32
Japan, Hiroshima Prefecture	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	0.3	0.2	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	71	71
Japan, Miyagi Prefecture	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.1</i>	0.3	0.3	–	0.1	74	74
Japan, Osaka Prefecture	<i>0.0</i>	0.1	0.2	0.3	<i>0.0</i>	0.2	168	168
Kuwait	0.2	<i>0.0</i>	0.6	0.5	<i>0.0</i>	0.7	217	217
*Kuwait : Kuwaitis	<i>0.3</i>	<i>0.0</i>	1.1	1.2	–	0.9	109	109
*Kuwait : Non-Kuwaitis	0.1	<i>0.0</i>	0.4	0.2	<i>0.0</i>	0.7	108	108
*Philippines, Manila	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	0.1	<i>0.0</i>	–	0.4	102	102
*Qatar : Qatari	<i>0.6</i>	<i>0.3</i>	<i>1.6</i>	<i>1.2</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.8</i>	30	30
*Republic of Korea, Busan	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	0.2	0.1	<i>0.0</i>	0.2	66	66
*Republic of Korea, Daegu	–	<i>0.0</i>	0.3	0.1	<i>0.0</i>	0.1	44	44
*Republic of Korea, Daejeon	–	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	23	23
*Republic of Korea, Gwangju	–	<i>0.1</i>	0.3	<i>0.2</i>	–	<i>0.1</i>	26	26
Republic of Korea, Incheon	–	<i>0.0</i>	0.2	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.0</i>	0.2	43	43
Republic of Korea, Jeju	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.0</i>	–	<i>0.2</i>	6	6
Republic of Korea, Seoul	<i>0.0</i>	0.0	0.3	0.1	<i>0.0</i>	0.2	200	200
Republic of Korea, Ulsan	–	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.1</i>	19	19
Republic of Korea	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.1	0.0	0.2	892	893
Singapore	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	0.6	0.2	–	0.1	99	99
Singapore : Chinese	<i>0.0</i>	–	0.5	0.2	–	<i>0.1</i>	61	61
Singapore : Indian	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.4</i>	<i>0.4</i>	–	<i>0.4</i>	15	15

Rates based on less than 10 cases are in italics

\*Important. See note on population page.



**Age-standardized (world) incidence rates (per 100,000)  
of microscopically verified cases by histological type**

**Hodgkin lymphoma (C81) - Male (Contd)**

	Nodular lymphocytic	Classical Lymphocyte-rich	Nodular sclerosis	Mixed cellularity	Lymphocytic depletion	Unspec.	Number of cases	
							MV	Total
<b>Asia (contd)</b>								
Singapore : Malay	–	–	1.1	0.2	–	0.2	21	21
Thailand, Bangkok	–	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.3	65	65
*Thailand, Chiang Mai	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.0	0.3	35	35
*Thailand, Khon Kaen	–	0.1	0.0	0.1	–	0.2	18	18
Thailand, Lampang	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.3	17	17
Thailand, Lopburi Province	–	–	–	0.1	–	0.3	7	7
*Thailand, Songkhla	0.1	0.0	0.3	0.3	0.0	0.0	27	27
Türkiye, Antalya	0.0	0.1	1.0	0.3	–	0.4	106	106
Türkiye, Bursa	0.1	0.1	0.6	0.4	0.0	0.6	133	133
*Türkiye, Edirne	0.1	0.2	0.5	0.6	0.1	0.6	22	22
*Türkiye, Erzurum	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.9	0.1	0.9	42	42
Türkiye, Eskişehir	0.1	0.1	0.8	0.5	–	0.7	52	52
Türkiye, Gaziantep	0.0	0.2	0.8	0.9	0.0	0.4	109	109
*Türkiye, Izmir	0.1	0.1	0.9	0.9	0.1	0.4	282	282
Türkiye, Malatya	0.1	0.6	0.8	0.5	0.0	0.6	53	53
Türkiye, Samsun	0.0	0.1	0.5	0.7	0.1	0.4	64	64
Türkiye, Trabzon	0.2	0.1	0.6	0.8	0.0	0.5	48	48
<b>Europe</b>								
Austria	0.1	0.1	0.6	0.1	0.0	0.9	470	503
Austria, Carinthia	0.3	0.2	1.1	0.3	–	0.6	38	40
Austria, Tyrol	0.4	0.2	1.6	0.2	–	0.6	63	63
Austria, Vorarlberg	0.1	0.3	0.8	0.3	–	1.3	35	35
Belarus	0.1	0.1	1.4	0.6	0.1	0.2	583	583
*Belgium	0.4	0.2	2.1	0.4	0.0	0.3	1021	1021
Croatia	0.1	0.1	1.1	0.3	0.0	0.8	253	261
Cyprus	0.5	0.2	2.2	0.9	–	0.5	100	100
*Czech Republic	0.2	0.1	1.0	0.6	0.0	0.5	780	780
Denmark	0.2	0.2	1.2	0.6	–	0.4	435	435
Estonia	0.1	0.1	1.4	0.6	–	0.4	89	89
Finland	0.6	0.2	1.6	0.4	0.0	0.2	480	482
*France, Bas-Rhin	0.1	–	2.1	0.7	–	0.2	77	77
*France, Calvados	0.5	0.1	2.1	0.3	0.1	0.1	51	51
*France, Doubs	0.1	0.3	2.2	0.3	–	0.3	47	47
*France, Gironde	0.5	0.2	2.6	0.6	–	0.3	168	168
*France, Haut-Rhin	0.5	0.0	2.6	0.8	0.1	0.1	83	83
*France, Hérault	0.4	0.0	2.7	0.8	0.0	0.2	117	117
*France, Isère	0.3	0.1	2.4	0.3	0.0	0.3	109	110
*France, Lille-Métropole	0.6	0.2	2.0	0.3	0.1	0.4	78	78
*France, Limousin	0.5	–	2.8	0.2	–	0.1	36	36
*France, Loire-Atlantique	0.7	0.1	1.8	0.6	–	0.3	119	119
*France, Manche	0.5	0.1	2.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	37	37
*France, Poitou-Charentes	0.6	0.1	2.3	0.4	0.1	0.2	178	178
*France, Somme	0.5	0.1	1.2	0.5	–	0.2	38	38
*France, Tarn	0.6	0.3	1.2	0.5	–	0.1	30	30
*France, Territoire de Belfort	0.6	–	2.0	0.3	–	–	10	10
*France, Vendée	0.4	–	2.0	0.3	0.0	0.4	50	50
Germany, Baden-Württemberg	0.2	0.2	0.7	0.4	0.0	0.3	372	507
Germany, Bavaria	0.2	0.3	1.1	0.4	0.0	0.6	972	1017
Germany, Bremen	0.4	0.1	1.1	1.2	0.1	0.3	59	64
Germany, Hamburg	0.1	0.1	1.2	0.5	0.1	0.7	155	184
Germany, Lower Saxony	0.3	0.1	1.0	0.5	0.0	0.7	598	642
Germany, North Rhine-Westphalia	0.3	0.2	1.1	0.5	0.0	0.4	1273	1576
Germany, Rhineland-Palatinate	0.3	0.1	1.1	0.4	0.0	0.5	275	295
Germany, Saarland	0.2	–	1.2	0.5	0.1	0.4	60	68
Germany, Schleswig-Holstein	0.5	0.2	1.2	1.0	0.0	0.6	283	316
Iceland	0.4	–	1.6	0.5	–	0.6	29	29
Ireland	0.2	0.1	1.7	0.5	0.0	0.7	428	437
*Italy, Aosta Valley	–	0.7	0.9	–	–	0.5	8	8
*Italy, Avellino	0.4	0.1	3.9	1.1	0.1	0.3	38	38
Italy, Basilicata	0.5	0.1	2.5	0.3	0.1	0.2	55	67
*Italy, Benevento	0.1	0.2	2.1	1.4	0.3	0.9	32	32
Italy, Bergamo	0.3	0.1	1.8	0.5	0.0	1.5	125	125
*Italy, Brescia	0.2	–	0.5	0.1	0.0	2.9	121	122
Italy, Brianza (Lecco + Monza e Brianza)	0.4	0.2	2.0	0.6	0.1	0.8	71	71
Italy, Calabria	0.1	0.2	2.8	0.5	–	0.9	65	67
*Italy, Caserta	0.1	0.4	3.3	0.4	0.1	0.5	86	86
*Italy, Catania, Messina and Enna	0.5	0.3	2.4	0.5	0.0	0.9	220	220
Italy, Emilia-Romagna	0.3	0.1	2.4	0.2	0.0	0.8	375	376
Italy, Friuli-Venezia Giulia	–	0.5	2.6	0.8	0.0	0.5	137	137
Italy, Genova	0.4	0.3	3.1	1.0	–	0.2	90	94
*Italy, Lombardy, South, Pavia	0.2	0.3	0.9	0.3	0.3	1.0	43	43
Italy, Mantova and Cremona	0.2	0.0	2.1	0.2	–	0.8	54	54

Rates based on less than 10 cases are in italics

\*Important. See note on population page.

**Age-standardized (world) incidence rates (per 100,000)  
of microscopically verified cases by histological type**

**Hodgkin lymphoma (C81) - Male (Contd)**

	Nodular lymphocytic	Classical Lymphocyte-rich	Nodular sclerosis	Mixed cellularity	Lymphocytic depletion	Unspec.	Number of cases	
							MV	Total
<b>Europe (contd)</b>								
Italy, Marche	<i>0.1</i>	0.4	2.1	0.5	<i>0.2</i>	0.7	135	135
Italy, Milan	0.2	0.3	1.9	0.7	0.1	0.8	350	350
Italy, Molise	–	<i>0.4</i>	<i>0.7</i>	–	–	<i>1.2</i>	15	17
*Italy, Naples Centre	<i>0.4</i>	–	2.1	0.8	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.3</i>	56	56
*Italy, Naples North	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.1</i>	1.8	0.7	–	1.1	84	84
*Italy, Naples South	0.4	<i>0.3</i>	2.5	0.6	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.3</i>	116	116
*Italy, Nuoro	<i>1.2</i>	–	<i>1.1</i>	<i>1.4</i>	–	<i>0.1</i>	10	10
*Italy, Palermo	0.3	0.2	1.9	0.3	–	0.9	124	125
Italy, Puglia	0.2	0.1	2.7	0.4	<i>0.0</i>	0.7	418	420
*Italy, Ragusa and Caltanissetta	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.3</i>	2.3	0.6	–	<i>0.1</i>	52	52
*Italy, Salerno	<i>0.3</i>	<i>0.3</i>	1.7	0.5	–	0.7	80	80
Italy, Sassari	–	<i>0.3</i>	<i>1.8</i>	<i>0.5</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.8</i>	22	24
*Italy, Sondrio	–	–	<i>0.8</i>	<i>0.7</i>	–	<i>0.7</i>	13	13
Italy, South Tyrol	<i>0.4</i>	<i>0.1</i>	2.1	<i>0.2</i>	–	<i>0.4</i>	46	46
*Italy, Syracuse	<i>0.6</i>	<i>0.1</i>	1.2	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.7</i>	32	32
Italy, Trento	<i>0.4</i>	<i>0.0</i>	2.1	0.7	–	1.3	59	59
Italy, Turin	0.1	0.2	1.4	0.3	<i>0.1</i>	1.4	199	200
*Italy, Tuscany	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.1</i>	3.1	0.5	<i>0.0</i>	0.8	222	240
Italy, Umbria	–	<i>0.0</i>	1.6	0.6	–	0.9	60	62
Italy, Varese	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.2</i>	2.3	1.0	<i>0.0</i>	0.6	57	57
Italy, Veneto	0.3	0.2	2.1	0.5	<i>0.0</i>	0.9	501	506
Latvia	–	0.3	1.4	0.3	<i>0.1</i>	0.5	122	132
*Liechtenstein	–	–	–	<i>1.4</i>	–	<i>1.4</i>	3	3
*Lithuania	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	1.3	0.3	–	<i>0.1</i>	124	124
Malta	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.3</i>	1.7	<i>0.3</i>	–	0.8	44	47
*The Netherlands	0.4	0.1	1.2	0.3	<i>0.0</i>	0.9	1356	1356
Norway	0.5	0.1	1.3	0.4	<i>0.0</i>	0.5	443	446
Poland, Kielce	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.1</i>	1.0	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.0</i>	0.6	71	71
*Portugal, Azores	<i>0.2</i>	–	2.7	<i>0.6</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.9</i>	27	27
Russian Federation, Arkhangelsk	–	<i>0.0</i>	1.3	0.6	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.1</i>	71	71
Russian Federation, Kaliningrad	–	<i>0.4</i>	0.4	0.5	<i>0.0</i>	0.6	49	49
Russian Federation, Karelia	–	<i>0.2</i>	0.7	<i>0.3</i>	–	0.5	30	30
*Russian Federation, Komi Republic	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.1</i>	1.2	0.9	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.3</i>	62	62
Russian Federation, Murmansk	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.2</i>	2.0	<i>0.4</i>	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.1</i>	57	57
*Russian Federation, Orenburg	–	0.4	1.1	0.3	<i>0.1</i>	0.3	114	122
Russian Federation, Pskov	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.0</i>	1.1	0.8	<i>0.4</i>	<i>0.5</i>	54	54
*Russian Federation, Samara	<i>0.0</i>	0.3	1.2	0.6	0.1	0.1	191	200
Russian Federation, Vologda Region	–	0.7	1.6	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.2</i>	79	79
Slovenia	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.1</i>	1.1	1.1	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.1</i>	139	139
Spain, Asturias	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.2</i>	1.1	<i>0.5</i>	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.4</i>	40	41
Spain, Basque Country	0.6	0.3	1.8	0.9	<i>0.1</i>	0.5	207	207
Spain, Canary Islands	<i>0.3</i>	<i>0.1</i>	1.1	0.4	<i>0.0</i>	0.2	83	83
Spain, Castellón	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.1</i>	1.1	1.0	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.2</i>	44	44
Spain, Girona	<i>0.4</i>	<i>0.0</i>	1.4	0.8	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.3</i>	58	58
Spain, Granada	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.2</i>	1.7	<i>0.2</i>	–	<i>0.3</i>	61	61
Spain, La Rioja	<i>0.3</i>	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.9</i>	<i>0.7</i>	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.4</i>	27	27
Spain, Murcia	0.3	0.2	1.7	0.6	<i>0.0</i>	0.5	129	129
Spain, Navarra	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.5</i>	1.6	0.9	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.2</i>	48	48
Spain, Salamanca	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.4</i>	2.0	<i>0.5</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.7</i>	38	38
Spain, Tarragona	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.2</i>	1.6	0.5	–	0.5	68	68
*Sweden	0.2	0.1	1.1	0.3	<i>0.0</i>	0.5	622	622
Switzerland, Aargau	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.3</i>	1.2	0.5	–	<i>0.2</i>	48	48
Switzerland, Basel	<i>0.2</i>	–	1.3	<i>0.7</i>	–	<i>0.5</i>	33	33
Switzerland, Berne Solothurn	0.7	<i>0.2</i>	0.9	1.0	<i>0.1</i>	0.8	86	86
Switzerland, East	0.4	<i>0.1</i>	1.3	0.7	–	0.6	71	72
*Switzerland, Fribourg	<i>0.4</i>	<i>0.3</i>	1.9	<i>0.6</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.6</i>	35	35
Switzerland, Geneva	<i>0.5</i>	<i>0.4</i>	1.7	0.9	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.1</i>	53	53
*Switzerland, Graubünden Glarus	<i>0.3</i>	<i>0.1</i>	2.2	<i>0.5</i>	–	<i>1.0</i>	31	31
*Switzerland, Lucerne	<i>0.5</i>	<i>0.1</i>	0.6	0.8	–	0.8	43	43
*Switzerland, Neuchâtel and Jura	<i>0.4</i>	<i>0.2</i>	3.2	<i>0.8</i>	–	<i>0.7</i>	29	29
Switzerland, Ticino	<i>0.3</i>	<i>0.1</i>	2.3	1.4	–	<i>0.5</i>	48	48
Switzerland, Valais	<i>0.6</i>	<i>0.2</i>	<i>1.1</i>	<i>0.4</i>	–	<i>0.4</i>	25	25
Switzerland, Vaud	<i>0.4</i>	<i>0.0</i>	1.5	0.7	<i>0.0</i>	0.5	68	69
Switzerland, Zurich and Zug	0.6	<i>0.2</i>	2.6	0.4	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	166	166
Ukraine	<i>0.0</i>	0.2	0.8	0.5	0.1	0.7	2109	2118
UK, England	0.4	0.1	1.2	0.4	0.0	1.0	4889	5038
UK, Northern Ireland	0.6	<i>0.1</i>	1.4	0.6	<i>0.0</i>	0.6	180	182
UK, Scotland	0.4	0.2	1.2	0.6	0.1	0.5	464	466
UK, Wales	0.4	<i>0.1</i>	1.3	0.4	<i>0.0</i>	0.4	239	266
<b>Oceania</b>								
*Australia, NSW/ACT	0.2	0.1	1.3	0.4	<i>0.0</i>	0.6	592	599
*Australia, Northern Territory	–	–	<i>0.5</i>	<i>0.5</i>	–	<i>0.2</i>	9	9

*Rates based on less than 10 cases are in italics*

\*Important. See note on population page.



Age-standardized (world) incidence rates (per 100,000)  
of microscopically verified cases by histological type

Hodgkin lymphoma (C81) - Male (Contd)

	Nodular lymphocytic	Classical Lymphocyte-rich	Nodular sclerosis	Mixed cellularity	Lymphocytic depletion	Unspec.	Number of cases	
							MV	Total
<b>Oceania (contd)</b>								
*Australia, Northern Territory : Non-Indigenous	–	–	<i>0.7</i>	<i>0.2</i>	–	<i>0.3</i>	7	7
*Australia, Northern Territory : Indigenous	–	–	–	<i>1.1</i>	–	–	2	2
*Australia, Queensland	0.4	0.1	1.1	0.2	0.0	0.7	358	365
Australia, South Australia	0.3	<i>0.1</i>	0.9	0.3	0.0	0.8	122	122
Australia, Tasmania	<i>0.3</i>	<i>0.2</i>	1.6	<i>0.4</i>	0.0	0.8	49	50
*Australia, Victoria	0.3	0.1	1.4	0.4	0.0	0.8	531	541
*Australia, Western Australia	0.2	0.2	1.0	0.2	–	0.5	155	160
*New Caledonia	<i>0.5</i>	–	<i>0.8</i>	<i>0.5</i>	–	<i>0.9</i>	20	20
New Zealand	0.3	0.1	1.2	0.3	0.0	0.3	291	294
*New Zealand : Maori	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.1</i>	1.0	<i>0.4</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.5</i>	36	36
*New Zealand : Pacific peoples	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.3</i>	1.3	<i>0.4</i>	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.1</i>	18	18
*New Zealand : Other	0.4	0.1	1.4	0.3	0.0	0.3	214	216
USA, Hawaii	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.0</i>	0.6	0.3	–	0.5	69	70
USA, Hawaii : White	<i>0.3</i>	<i>0.0</i>	0.9	<i>0.2</i>	–	0.8	33	34
*USA, Hawaii : Japanese	–	–	<i>0.5</i>	<i>0.0</i>	–	<i>0.4</i>	8	8
*USA, Hawaii : Chinese	–	–	–	<i>0.3</i>	–	<i>0.2</i>	2	2
*USA, Hawaii : Hawaiian	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.8</i>	<i>0.2</i>	–	<i>0.1</i>	13	13
*USA, Hawaii : Filipino	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.5</i>	–	<i>0.2</i>	6	6

Rates based on less than 10 cases are in italics

\*Important. See note on population page.

**Age-standardized (world) incidence rates (per 100,000)  
of microscopically verified cases by histological type**

**Hodgkin lymphoma (C81) - Female**

	Nodular lymphocytic	Classical Lymphocyte-rich	Nodular sclerosis	Mixed cellularity	Lymphocytic depletion	Unspec.	Number of cases	
							MV	Total
<b>Africa</b>								
*Algeria, Batna	–	–	1.4	<i>0.2</i>	–	<i>0.1</i>	37	37
*Algeria, Tizi Ouzou	–	<i>0.1</i>	1.2	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.1</i>	1.1	53	53
*Benin, Cotonou	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	1	1
*France, La Réunion	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.1</i>	1.5	<i>0.1</i>	–	–	30	30
*Kenya, Eldoret	–	–	–	–	–	0.8	14	14
*Kenya, Nairobi	–	–	0.1	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.1</i>	0.4	44	44
Mauritius	<i>0.0</i>	–	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.1</i>	–	1.0	37	37
*Morocco, Casablanca	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	0.6	<i>0.0</i>	–	0.9	174	175
*Seychelles	–	–	–	<i>0.3</i>	–	2.2	6	6
*South Africa, Eastern Cape	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	2	2
*Uganda, Kyadondo County	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	0.2	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.1</i>	0.8	51	51
*Uganda, Gulu	–	–	–	<i>0.4</i>	<i>0.2</i>	0.8	10	10
*Zimbabwe, Bulawayo : African	–	–	<i>0.4</i>	<i>0.3</i>	–	<i>0.4</i>	15	15
*Zimbabwe, Harare : African	–	–	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.3</i>	23	23
<b>America, Central and South, and Caribbean</b>								
*Argentina, Entre Ríos Province	–	–	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.1</i>	–	0.5	18	18
*Argentina, Mendoza	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.0</i>	0.3	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	1.0	76	76
Brazil, Aracaju	–	–	<i>0.5</i>	<i>0.0</i>	–	<i>0.2</i>	11	11
*Brazil, Barretos	<i>0.1</i>	–	1.2	<i>0.0</i>	–	<i>0.2</i>	15	16
Brazil, Belo Horizonte	<i>0.1</i>	–	0.7	0.2	–	0.5	112	115
*Brazil, Campinas	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	1.0	<i>0.2</i>	–	0.6	49	49
*Brazil, Curitiba	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	0.9	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.0</i>	0.4	58	59
Brazil, Goiânia	–	<i>0.1</i>	0.9	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.0</i>	0.4	50	50
*Brazil, Jaú	–	–	<i>0.6</i>	–	–	<i>0.5</i>	5	5
Brazil, João Pessoa	–	–	<i>0.3</i>	–	–	0.7	14	14
Brazil, Recife	–	<i>0.0</i>	0.5	<i>0.1</i>	–	0.3	28	31
Chile, Region of Antofagasta	–	–	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.4</i>	7	7
Chile, Valdivia	<i>0.2</i>	–	<i>0.7</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.2</i>	19	19
Colombia, Bucaramanga	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.0</i>	0.6	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.0</i>	0.3	40	41
Colombia, Cali	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	0.5	<i>0.0</i>	–	0.6	83	83
Colombia, Manizales	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.3</i>	<i>0.3</i>	–	<i>0.1</i>	11	11
Colombia, Pasto	–	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.3</i>	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.2</i>	8	8
Costa Rica	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	0.7	<i>0.1</i>	–	0.6	139	139
Ecuador, Guayaquil	–	–	0.7	0.3	–	0.2	81	82
Ecuador, Manabí	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.0</i>	0.4	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.0</i>	25	25
Ecuador, Quito	<i>0.1</i>	–	0.3	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.0</i>	0.4	50	50
*France, Guadeloupe	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>1.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.0</i>	15	15
*France, Martinique	–	–	<i>0.4</i>	<i>0.2</i>	–	0.7	10	10
*Peru, Lima	–	<i>0.0</i>	0.2	0.2	<i>0.0</i>	0.2	98	109
*Trinidad and Tobago	–	–	<i>0.2</i>	–	–	0.6	19	19
USA, Puerto Rico	0.1	<i>0.0</i>	0.9	0.1	<i>0.0</i>	0.9	212	220
*Uruguay	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	1.3	0.2	<i>0.0</i>	0.5	195	196
<b>America, North</b>								
Canada, Alberta	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.1</i>	1.3	0.1	–	0.5	219	219
Canada, British Columbia	0.1	<i>0.0</i>	1.3	0.1	<i>0.0</i>	0.3	242	242
*Canada, Manitoba	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.0</i>	1.3	0.3	–	<i>0.2</i>	73	73
*Canada, New Brunswick	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	1.1	<i>0.3</i>	<i>0.1</i>	0.4	47	47
*Canada, Newfoundland	–	<i>0.1</i>	1.5	<i>0.2</i>	–	0.6	33	33
Canada, Ontario	0.1	0.0	1.4	0.1	<i>0.0</i>	0.6	848	918
*Canada, Prince Edward Island	–	–	<i>1.2</i>	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	6	9
Canada, Quebec	0.1	0.0	2.0	0.3	<i>0.0</i>	0.4	627	628
Canada, Saskatchewan	<i>0.2</i>	–	0.9	<i>0.1</i>	–	0.6	59	61
*Canada, Yukon	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
USA	0.1	0.1	1.2	0.1	0.0	0.6	19003	19276
USA : White	0.1	0.1	1.4	0.1	0.0	0.6	15483	15710
USA : Black	0.3	0.1	0.9	0.1	0.0	0.6	2639	2676
USA, NPCR	0.1	0.1	1.2	0.1	0.0	0.6	18404	18671
USA, NPCR : White	0.1	0.1	1.4	0.1	0.0	0.6	14985	15206
USA, NPCR : Black	0.3	0.1	0.9	0.1	0.0	0.6	2597	2634
USA, NPCR : Asian and Pacific Islander	0.1	0.0	0.6	0.1	<i>0.0</i>	0.3	541	545
USA, NPCR : American Indian	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	0.4	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	0.2	83	86
*USA, SEER (18 registries)	0.1	0.0	1.2	0.1	0.0	0.5	4989	5026
*USA, SEER (18 registries) : White	0.1	0.0	1.3	0.1	0.0	0.6	3950	3980
*USA, SEER (18 registries) : Non-Hispanic White	0.1	0.0	1.5	0.1	0.0	0.6	3089	3113
*USA, SEER (18 registries) : Hispanic White	0.1	0.0	0.9	0.2	<i>0.0</i>	0.5	861	867
*USA, SEER (18 registries) : Black	0.3	0.1	0.9	0.1	<i>0.0</i>	0.5	646	651
*USA, SEER (18 registries) : Asian and Pacific Islander	0.1	<i>0.0</i>	0.6	0.1	<i>0.0</i>	0.3	284	284
*USA, SEER (9 registries)	0.1	0.0	1.3	0.1	<i>0.0</i>	0.6	1742	1750
*USA, SEER (9 registries) : White	0.1	0.1	1.4	0.1	<i>0.0</i>	0.6	1337	1345
*USA, SEER (9 registries) : Black	0.3	<i>0.0</i>	1.0	0.1	<i>0.0</i>	0.8	249	249
USA, Alabama	0.1	<i>0.1</i>	1.0	0.1	0.1	0.5	266	269
USA, Alabama : White	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.1</i>	1.1	0.1	0.1	0.5	177	179

Rates based on less than 10 cases are in italics

\*Important. See note on population page.

**Age-standardized (world) incidence rates (per 100,000)  
of microscopically verified cases by histological type**

**Hodgkin lymphoma (C81) - Female (Contd)**

	Nodular lymphocytic	Classical Lymphocyte-rich	Nodular sclerosis	Mixed cellularity	Lymphocytic depletion	Unspec.	Number of cases	
							MV	Total
<b>America, North (contd)</b>								
USA, Alabama : Black	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.1</i>	0.9	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.2</i>	0.7	81	81
USA, Alaska	<i>0.0</i>	–	0.8	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.4</i>	26	28
*USA, Alaska : Alaska, Natives	–	–	<i>0.3</i>	–	–	<i>0.6</i>	3	4
USA, Arizona	<i>0.0</i>	0.1	0.9	0.1	<i>0.0</i>	0.5	328	337
USA, Arizona : White	<i>0.0</i>	0.1	1.0	0.1	<i>0.0</i>	0.5	297	306
USA, Arizona : Black	<i>0.3</i>	–	<i>0.8</i>	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.6</i>	17	17
*USA, Arizona : Asian and Pacific Islander	–	–	<i>0.7</i>	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.4</i>	9	9
USA, Arizona : American Indian	–	–	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.2</i>	5	5
USA, Arkansas	0.2	<i>0.1</i>	1.1	0.1	<i>0.0</i>	0.6	183	184
USA, Arkansas : White	0.2	<i>0.1</i>	1.1	0.1	<i>0.0</i>	0.6	147	148
USA, Arkansas : Black	<i>0.3</i>	<i>0.1</i>	1.1	–	–	0.7	30	30
USA, California	0.1	0.0	1.0	0.1	<i>0.0</i>	0.5	1930	1958
USA, California : White	0.1	0.0	1.2	0.1	<i>0.0</i>	0.6	1591	1616
USA, California : Black	<i>0.3</i>	<i>0.1</i>	0.8	0.1	–	0.4	132	134
USA, California : Asian and Pacific Islander	0.1	<i>0.0</i>	0.6	0.1	<i>0.0</i>	0.3	169	169
*USA, California, Los Angeles County	0.1	0.0	1.0	0.2	<i>0.0</i>	0.3	477	480
*USA, California, Los Angeles County : White	0.1	<i>0.0</i>	1.1	0.2	<i>0.0</i>	0.4	368	371
*USA, California, Los Angeles County : Non-Hispanic White	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.1</i>	1.7	<i>0.1</i>	–	0.4	182	185
*USA, California, Los Angeles County : Hispanic White	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.0</i>	0.8	0.3	<i>0.0</i>	0.4	186	186
*USA, California, Los Angeles County : Black	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.1</i>	1.0	<i>0.2</i>	–	0.2	50	50
*USA, California, Los Angeles County : Chinese	–	–	<i>0.7</i>	<i>0.1</i>	–	–	7	7
*USA, California, Los Angeles County : Filipino	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.6</i>	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.5</i>	16	16
*USA, California, Los Angeles County : Korean	–	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.1</i>	2	2
*USA, California, Los Angeles County : Asian and Pacific Islander	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	0.6	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	43	43
*USA, California, San Francisco Bay Area	<i>0.1</i>	0.1	1.1	0.1	<i>0.0</i>	0.6	247	247
*USA, California, San Francisco Bay Area : White	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.1</i>	1.3	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.0</i>	0.8	177	177
*USA, California, San Francisco Bay Area : Non-Hispanic White	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.0</i>	1.6	<i>0.1</i>	–	0.8	130	130
*USA, California, San Francisco Bay Area : Hispanic White	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.2</i>	0.8	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.0</i>	0.8	47	47
*USA, California, San Francisco Bay Area : Black	<i>0.3</i>	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.7</i>	<i>0.2</i>	–	<i>0.5</i>	25	25
*USA, California, San Francisco Bay Area : Asian and Pacific Islander	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	0.6	<i>0.0</i>	–	0.3	39	39
USA, Colorado	0.1	<i>0.0</i>	1.1	0.1	–	0.5	266	272
USA, Colorado : White	0.1	<i>0.0</i>	1.1	0.1	–	0.5	241	246
*USA, Colorado : Black	–	–	<i>0.6</i>	<i>0.2</i>	–	<i>0.7</i>	10	11
*USA, Colorado : Asian and Pacific Islander	<i>0.2</i>	–	<i>0.7</i>	<i>0.2</i>	–	<i>0.3</i>	8	8
USA, Connecticut	0.1	<i>0.0</i>	1.4	0.1	<i>0.0</i>	0.8	252	256
USA, Connecticut : White	0.1	<i>0.0</i>	1.5	0.1	<i>0.0</i>	0.8	204	208
USA, Connecticut : Black	<i>0.5</i>	–	1.1	<i>0.2</i>	–	<i>0.3</i>	26	26
USA, District of Columbia	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.1</i>	0.9	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.0</i>	1.1	52	52
USA, District of Columbia : White	–	–	0.9	<i>0.1</i>	–	1.3	22	22
USA, District of Columbia : Black	<i>0.3</i>	<i>0.3</i>	<i>0.8</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.8</i>	26	26
USA, Florida	0.1	0.1	1.3	0.2	0.0	0.9	1542	1554
USA, Florida : White	0.1	0.1	1.4	0.2	0.0	0.8	1216	1225
USA, Florida : Black	0.3	<i>0.1</i>	0.9	0.2	–	0.7	218	218
USA, Florida : Asian and Pacific Islander	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.6</i>	<i>0.0</i>	–	<i>0.1</i>	15	16
USA, Georgia	0.1	0.1	1.0	0.1	<i>0.0</i>	0.7	560	567
USA, Georgia : White	0.1	0.0	1.1	0.1	<i>0.0</i>	0.7	354	359
USA, Georgia : Black	0.3	<i>0.1</i>	0.7	0.1	–	0.7	191	193
USA, Georgia : Asian and Pacific Islander	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.5</i>	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.3</i>	12	12
*USA, Georgia, Atlanta	0.1	<i>0.0</i>	1.0	<i>0.1</i>	–	0.8	219	219
*USA, Georgia, Atlanta : White	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	1.2	<i>0.1</i>	–	0.6	97	97
*USA, Georgia, Atlanta : Black	0.2	<i>0.0</i>	1.0	<i>0.1</i>	–	1.1	112	112
USA, Idaho	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.0</i>	1.4	<i>0.1</i>	–	0.3	89	90
USA, Indiana	0.1	0.1	1.3	0.1	<i>0.0</i>	0.4	367	368
USA, Indiana : White	0.1	0.1	1.4	0.1	<i>0.0</i>	0.5	331	332
USA, Indiana : Black	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.1</i>	0.9	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.4</i>	27	27
*USA, Iowa	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.1</i>	1.6	0.2	–	0.6	206	207
USA, Kentucky	0.1	<i>0.1</i>	1.4	0.2	<i>0.0</i>	0.3	244	247
USA, Louisiana	0.2	<i>0.0</i>	1.2	0.1	–	0.7	298	299
USA, Louisiana : White	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.0</i>	1.3	0.1	–	0.8	206	207
USA, Louisiana : Black	0.3	<i>0.1</i>	1.0	<i>0.1</i>	–	0.5	86	86
*USA, Louisiana, New Orleans	<i>0.3</i>	<i>0.0</i>	1.2	<i>0.2</i>	–	0.6	59	59
*USA, Louisiana, New Orleans : White	<i>0.1</i>	–	1.4	<i>0.2</i>	–	<i>0.6</i>	31	31
*USA, Louisiana, New Orleans : Black	<i>0.4</i>	<i>0.1</i>	0.9	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.6</i>	24	24
USA, Maine	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.1</i>	2.0	<i>0.2</i>	–	0.2	97	99
USA, Maryland	0.2	0.1	1.2	0.1	<i>0.0</i>	0.7	360	375
USA, Maryland : White	0.1	<i>0.1</i>	1.4	0.1	<i>0.0</i>	0.7	220	230
USA, Maryland : Black	0.3	<i>0.1</i>	1.0	<i>0.1</i>	–	0.7	126	131
USA, Maryland : Asian and Pacific Islander	–	–	<i>0.6</i>	–	–	<i>0.5</i>	13	13
USA, Massachusetts	0.2	0.1	1.4	0.2	<i>0.0</i>	0.6	461	464
USA, Massachusetts : White	0.1	0.1	1.7	0.2	<i>0.0</i>	0.6	415	418
USA, Massachusetts : Black	<i>0.4</i>	–	<i>0.5</i>	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.5</i>	27	27
USA, Massachusetts : Asian and Pacific Islander	–	–	<i>0.6</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.4</i>	15	15

Rates based on less than 10 cases are in italics

\*Important. See note on population page.

**Age-standardized (world) incidence rates (per 100,000)  
of microscopically verified cases by histological type**

**Hodgkin lymphoma (C81) - Female (Contd)**

	Nodular lymphocytic	Classical Lymphocyte-rich	Nodular sclerosis	Mixed cellularity	Lymphocytic depletion	Unspec.	Number of cases	
							MV	Total
<b>America, North (contd)</b>								
USA, Michigan	0.2	0.0	1.3	0.1	0.0	0.5	583	586
USA, Michigan : White	0.1	0.0	1.4	0.1	0.0	0.5	486	489
USA, Michigan : Black	0.3	0.0	1.0	0.1	0.0	0.4	80	80
USA, Michigan : Asian and Pacific Islander	–	–	0.7	–	–	0.4	10	10
*USA, Michigan, Detroit	0.1	0.1	1.5	0.1	0.0	0.5	244	244
*USA, Michigan, Detroit : White	0.1	0.1	1.8	0.1	–	0.5	183	183
*USA, Michigan, Detroit : Black	0.2	0.0	1.1	0.1	0.0	0.4	53	53
USA, Minnesota	0.1	0.0	1.4	0.1	–	0.5	325	327
USA, Minnesota : White	0.1	0.1	1.5	0.1	–	0.5	302	304
USA, Minnesota : Black	0.2	–	0.6	0.3	–	0.2	12	12
*USA, Minnesota : Asian and Pacific Islander	0.1	–	0.4	–	–	0.3	7	7
USA, Mississippi	0.2	0.1	1.0	0.1	0.0	0.5	163	165
USA, Missouri	0.1	0.1	1.3	0.1	0.0	0.6	377	380
USA, Missouri : White	0.1	0.1	1.4	0.1	0.0	0.6	326	329
USA, Missouri : Black	0.3	0.0	1.0	0.3	0.0	0.7	49	49
USA, Montana	0.3	0.2	1.0	0.1	–	0.4	57	57
*USA, Montana : American Indian	–	–	1.0	–	–	0.6	3	3
USA, Nebraska	0.1	0.1	1.6	0.3	–	0.3	120	121
USA, Nebraska : White	0.1	0.0	1.5	0.3	–	0.3	102	103
*USA, Nebraska : Black	0.4	0.8	3.0	0.8	–	0.8	15	15
USA, Nevada	0.1	0.0	0.7	0.1	–	0.8	127	128
USA, Nevada : White	0.1	0.0	0.7	0.1	–	0.8	99	100
USA, Nevada : Black	–	0.1	0.5	–	–	1.3	16	16
*USA, Nevada : Asian and Pacific Islander	–	0.2	0.5	–	–	0.3	7	7
USA, New Jersey	0.2	0.0	1.8	0.2	0.0	0.6	649	654
USA, New Jersey : White	0.1	0.0	1.9	0.2	0.0	0.6	510	513
USA, New Jersey : Black	0.3	–	1.6	0.2	0.1	0.5	106	108
USA, New Mexico	0.1	0.0	0.8	0.1	–	0.7	96	97
USA, New Mexico : White	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.1	–	0.7	87	88
USA, New Mexico : Non-Hispanic White	0.1	–	1.1	0.2	–	0.6	44	44
USA, New Mexico : Hispanic White	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.0	–	0.8	43	44
*USA, New Mexico : American Indian	–	–	–	–	–	0.1	1	1
USA, New York State	0.2	0.1	1.7	0.2	0.0	0.6	1536	1546
USA, New York State : White	0.2	0.0	2.0	0.2	0.0	0.6	1182	1191
USA, New York State : Black	0.5	0.1	1.2	0.2	0.0	0.6	280	281
USA, New York State : Asian and Pacific Islander	0.1	0.0	0.7	0.1	–	0.3	63	63
USA, North Carolina	0.1	0.0	1.2	0.1	0.0	0.4	556	564
USA, North Carolina : White	0.1	0.0	1.4	0.1	0.0	0.4	404	410
USA, North Carolina : Black	0.3	0.0	1.1	0.1	0.0	0.5	139	141
USA, North Carolina : Asian and Pacific Islander	0.2	–	0.3	–	–	0.4	6	6
*USA, North Carolina : American Indian	–	–	0.3	–	–	0.2	2	2
USA, North Dakota	0.1	–	1.1	0.1	–	0.5	36	36
USA, Ohio	0.1	0.1	1.3	0.2	0.0	0.5	710	718
USA, Ohio : White	0.1	0.1	1.4	0.2	0.0	0.5	602	610
USA, Ohio : Black	0.3	0.1	1.0	0.2	–	0.5	97	97
*USA, Ohio : Asian and Pacific Islander	–	–	0.5	0.2	–	0.1	6	6
USA, Oklahoma	0.1	0.0	1.2	0.1	0.0	0.4	202	206
USA, Oklahoma : White	0.1	0.1	1.3	0.1	0.0	0.4	169	173
USA, Oklahoma : Black	0.5	–	0.9	0.2	–	0.4	19	19
USA, Oklahoma : American Indian	–	–	0.9	–	–	0.1	11	11
USA, Oregon	0.0	0.0	1.3	0.1	0.0	0.6	226	232
USA, Oregon : White	0.0	0.0	1.4	0.1	0.0	0.6	210	215
*USA, Oregon : Black	–	–	0.7	–	–	0.8	4	4
*USA, Oregon : Asian and Pacific Islander	–	0.2	0.7	–	–	0.2	6	7
USA, Rhode Island	0.2	0.0	1.5	0.1	–	1.3	93	94
USA, Rhode Island : White	0.2	0.0	1.6	0.1	–	1.3	84	85
*USA, Rhode Island : Black	0.4	–	1.1	–	–	0.8	6	6
USA, South Carolina	0.2	0.0	1.1	0.2	–	0.4	276	280
USA, South Carolina : White	0.0	0.0	1.2	0.1	–	0.5	191	195
USA, South Carolina : Black	0.4	0.0	1.0	0.2	–	0.4	82	82
USA, South Dakota	0.1	–	1.5	0.1	–	0.4	43	43
USA, Tennessee	0.1	0.1	1.2	0.2	0.0	0.6	378	380
USA, Tennessee : White	0.1	0.1	1.2	0.2	0.0	0.5	313	315
USA, Tennessee : Black	0.3	–	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.6	59	59
USA, Texas	0.1	0.0	0.9	0.1	0.0	0.7	1367	1433
USA, Texas : White	0.1	0.0	0.9	0.1	0.0	0.7	1134	1186
USA, Texas : Black	0.2	0.1	0.7	0.1	0.0	0.8	193	205
USA, Texas : Asian and Pacific Islander	0.1	0.0	0.4	0.1	0.0	0.3	37	39
USA, Utah	0.1	0.1	1.6	0.1	–	0.3	166	167
USA, Vermont	0.0	0.1	1.1	0.0	–	1.0	42	42
USA, Washington State	0.1	0.0	1.2	0.1	0.0	0.5	381	386
*USA, Washington, Seattle	0.1	0.0	1.3	0.1	–	0.5	267	268

Rates based on less than 10 cases are in italics

\*Important. See note on population page.

**Age-standardized (world) incidence rates (per 100,000)  
of microscopically verified cases by histological type**

**Hodgkin lymphoma (C81) - Female (Contd)**

	Nodular lymphocytic	Classical Lymphocyte-rich	Nodular sclerosis	Mixed cellularity	Lymphocytic depletion	Unspec.	Number of cases	
							MV	Total
<b>America, North (contd)</b>								
USA, West Virginia	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.0</i>	1.3	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.0</i>	0.6	105	105
USA, Wyoming	<i>0.1</i>	–	0.9	<i>0.0</i>	–	<i>0.4</i>	23	24
<b>Asia</b>								
Bahrain : Bahrainis	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.5</i>	<i>0.5</i>	–	1.1	36	36
Brunei Darussalam	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	–	–	<i>0.4</i>	5	5
*China, Anfu County	–	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.4</i>	3	3
*China, Anguo City	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.3</i>	4	4
*China, Anshan City	–	–	–	–	–	0.1	10	10
*China, Aohan District, Chifeng City	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	2	2
*China, Arun District	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.3</i>	2	2
*China, Baoding City	–	–	–	–	–	0.3	10	10
*China, Beijing City	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	0.2	<i>0.0</i>	–	0.2	95	95
*China, Binhai County	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	3	3
*China, Cangzhou City	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	1	1
China, Changfeng County	–	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.2</i>	4	4
China, Changzhou City	–	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	11	13
China, Ci Xian County	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.1</i>	–	–	–	<i>0.3</i>	9	9
China, Cixi City	–	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.0</i>	–	<i>0.1</i>	9	9
*China, Dafeng District, Yancheng City	–	<i>0.1</i>	–	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	2	2
China, Dalian City	–	–	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.0</i>	16	16
*China, Dancheng County	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.2</i>	7	7
China, Dangtu County	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
*China, Danyang City	–	<i>0.1</i>	–	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	6	6
*China, Dawukou District, Shizuishan City	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	1	1
*China, Dehui City	–	–	–	<i>0.0</i>	–	<i>0.0</i>	2	2
*China, Donggang City	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.7</i>	18	18
*China, Dongguan City	–	–	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.0</i>	–	<i>0.1</i>	13	13
China, Donghai County	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	3	3
*China, Dongtai City	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	5	5
China, Duanzhou District, Zhaoqing City	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.1</i>	–	–	–	<i>0.2</i>	3	3
*China, Ewenkizu Zizhiqi	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.3</i>	1	1
*China, Faku County	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.3</i>	4	4
*China, Fangcheng County	–	<i>0.1</i>	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	0.6	16	16
*China, Feicheng County	–	–	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	–	–	2	2
China, Feixi County	–	<i>0.1</i>	–	–	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	10	10
China, Fuqing City	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	4	4
*China, Ganyu District, Lianyungang City	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.0</i>	1	1
*China, Ganzhou District, Zhangye City	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	1	1
*China, Gaocheng City	–	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.0</i>	–	<i>0.0</i>	4	4
China, Gaomi City	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.3</i>	8	8
China, Gong'an County	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	2	2
*China, Guang'an District, Guang'an City	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
China, Guanghan City	–	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.1</i>	2	2
China, Guangzhou City	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	0.1	0.1	<i>0.0</i>	0.1	78	78
*China, Guanyun County	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
China, Guilin City	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	3	3
*China, Hai'an City	–	–	–	–	–	0.4	13	13
China, Hailar District, Hulun Buir City	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.3</i>	3	3
China, Haimen City	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	2	2
China, Haining City	–	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.0</i>	–	–	–	2	2
China, Hangzhou City	<i>0.0</i>	0.1	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	0.1	53	53
China, Hebi City	–	<i>0.1</i>	–	–	–	1.5	18	18
China, Hefei City	–	<i>0.0</i>	–	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	0.1	15	15
China, Hengdong	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
*China, Hengfeng County	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.3</i>	2	2
*China, Hepu County	–	<i>0.0</i>	–	–	–	–	1	1
China, Honghu City	–	–	<i>0.0</i>	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	3	3
China, Hongshan District, Chifeng City	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.3</i>	3	3
*China, Hongta District, Yuxi City	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
*China, Huaiyin District, Huai'an City	–	–	<i>0.0</i>	–	–	–	1	1
*China, Yinzhou District, Ningbo City	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	1	1
*China, Jiange County	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.2</i>	4	4
China, Jiangmen City	–	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.1</i>	8	8
*China, Jiangyin City	<i>0.0</i>	–	–	<i>0.0</i>	–	<i>0.1</i>	6	6
*China, Jiashan County	–	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.1</i>	–	–	–	2	2
China, Jiaxing City	–	–	<i>0.3</i>	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	5	6
China, Jiayu County	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	1	1
*China, Jinan City	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	–	<i>0.1</i>	18	18
*China, Jingtai County	–	–	–	–	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.2</i>	2	2
*China, Jingxian	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.2</i>	2	2
*China, Jintan District, Changzhou City	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.1</i>	–	–	5	5
*China, Jiulongpo District, Chongqing City	–	–	–	<i>0.0</i>	–	<i>0.1</i>	5	5

Rates based on less than 10 cases are in italics

\*Important. See note on population page.

**Age-standardized (world) incidence rates (per 100,000)  
of microscopically verified cases by histological type**

**Hodgkin lymphoma (C81) - Female (Contd)**

	Nodular lymphocytic	Classical Lymphocyte-rich	Nodular sclerosis	Mixed cellularity	Lymphocytic depletion	Unspec.	Number of cases	
							MV	Total
<b>Asia (contd)</b>								
*China, Jiyuan City	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.2</i>	4	4
China, Kaihua County	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	1	1
China, Kunshan City	–	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	5	5
China, Langzhong City	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
*China, Liangshan County	–	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.0</i>	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	5	5
*China, Lianshui County	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
China, Lianyungang City	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.0</i>	1	1
China, Linhe District, Bayannur City	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.4</i>	5	5
China, Linqiu County	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	–	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.1</i>	7	7
*China, Linzhou City	–	–	–	–	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.2</i>	4	4
China, Liuzhou City	–	–	<i>0.0</i>	–	–	<i>0.2</i>	6	6
China, Liyang City	–	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	–	<i>0.2</i>	9	9
*China, Longquan City	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	1	1
China, Lucheng District, Wenzhou City	–	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.1</i>	–	2	2
China, Luoding City	–	–	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	–	–	2	2
*China, Luohe City	–	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.1</i>	14	14
*China, Luoyang City	–	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	–	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.2</i>	10	10
*China, Luquan City	<i>0.1</i>	–	–	–	–	<i>0.2</i>	4	4
China, Ma'anshan City	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.2</i>	3	3
*China, Macheng City	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.2</i>	3	3
China, Meihekou City	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
*China, Mengjin County	–	–	<i>0.2</i>	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	2	2
China, Nangang District, Harbin City	<i>0.0</i>	–	–	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	4	4
*China, Nanhai District, Foshan City	–	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	8	8
*China, Nantong City	<i>0.0</i>	–	–	–	–	<i>0.2</i>	13	13
*China, Nanxiong City	–	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.1</i>	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	3	3
China, Neixiang County	–	<i>0.2</i>	–	–	–	<i>0.2</i>	10	10
*China, Qianxi County	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
China, Qidong County	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.3</i>	9	9
China, Qingyang District, Chengdu City	<i>0.1</i>	–	–	<i>0.0</i>	–	<i>0.4</i>	14	14
China, Qingzhou City	–	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.2</i>	–	–	–	5	5
*China, Rudong County	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.3</i>	17	17
*China, Rugao City	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.4</i>	20	20
*China, Rural areas of Shanghai City	–	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.0</i>	–	<i>0.1</i>	54	56
China, Ruyang County	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
*China, Shan County	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	1	1
China, Shanghai City	–	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.2</i>	54	57
China, Shangyu District, Shaoxing City	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.2</i>	–	–	–	–	3	3
*China, Shapingba District, Chongqing City	–	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	–	<i>0.1</i>	6	6
China, She Xian County	<i>0.1</i>	–	–	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	2	2
China, Sheyang County	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	2	2
*China, Shijiazhuang City	–	–	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	14	14
China, Shunde District, Foshan City	–	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	–	–	<i>0.0</i>	5	5
*China, Song County	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	1	1
China, Suzhou City	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.0</i>	–	–	<i>0.2</i>	32	32
*China, Tengzhou City	–	–	<i>0.0</i>	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	4	4
*China, Wangdu County	–	<i>0.2</i>	–	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.9</i>	–	9	9
*China, Wanzai County	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
*China, Wu'an City	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
China, Wuhan City	–	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	56	61
*China, Wuhu City	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	–	–	<i>0.0</i>	5	5
China, Wuxi City	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.0</i>	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	22	22
China, Wuzhou City	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	1	1
China, Xiangfu District, Kaifeng City	–	<i>0.2</i>	–	–	–	<i>0.2</i>	7	7
China, Xianju County	–	<i>0.1</i>	–	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	2	2
*China, Xin'an County	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	1	1
*China, Xining City	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	4	4
*China, Xinji City	–	–	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.0</i>	4	4
*China, Xinluo District, Longyan City	–	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.2</i>	2	2
*China, Xinzhou District, Shangrao City	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	1	1
China, Xiping County	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.0</i>	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	8	8
*China, Xishan District, Kunming City	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.3</i>	4	4
*China, Xuyi County	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
*China, Ya'an City	–	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.1</i>	10	10
*China, Yakeshi City	–	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.1</i>	2	2
China, Yancheng	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	3	3
*China, Yangquan City	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
*China, Yangzhong City	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
*China, Yanji City	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.2</i>	3	3
*China, Yanshi City	–	<i>0.1</i>	–	–	–	–	1	1
China, Yanting County	–	<i>0.3</i>	–	–	–	<i>0.5</i>	11	11
*China, Yi'an District, Tongling City	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–

Rates based on less than 10 cases are in italics

\*Important. See note on population page.



**Age-standardized (world) incidence rates (per 100,000)  
of microscopically verified cases by histological type**

**Hodgkin lymphoma (C81) - Female (Contd)**

	Nodular lymphocytic	Classical Lymphocyte-rich	Nodular sclerosis	Mixed cellularity	Lymphocytic depletion	Unspec.	Number of cases	
							MV	Total
<b>Asia (contd)</b>								
*China, Yingdong District, Fuyang City	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.0</i>	1	1
*China, Yiyuan County	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.2</i>	2	2
China, Yong'an City	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.1</i>	–	–	2	2
*China, Yongding District, Longyan City	–	<i>0.3</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.1</i>	6	6
China, Yongkang City	–	–	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.0</i>	–	–	4	4
*China, Yucheng County	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
China, Yueyanglou District, Yueyang City	–	–	<i>0.5</i>	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	3	3
China, Yunmeng County	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.1</i>	–	–	–	1.2	24	24
*China, Yunyang District, Shiyan City	–	<i>0.2</i>	–	–	–	<i>0.2</i>	4	4
China, Chongqing Yuzhong District	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.5</i>	9	9
*China, Zhanhuang County	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
*China, Zhangjiagang City	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	4	4
*China, Zhaoyuan City	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	1	1
*China, Zhengding County	–	–	<i>0.3</i>	<i>0.1</i>	–	–	6	6
*China, Zhongshan City	–	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.0</i>	13	13
China, Zhongxiang City	–	<i>0.0</i>	–	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.3</i>	11	11
*China, Zhuanghe City	–	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.2</i>	–	<i>0.0</i>	6	6
*China, Zhuhai City	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.0</i>	–	–	3	3
India, Ahmedabad, Urban	–	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	0.5	67	67
India, Aurangabad	–	<i>0.0</i>	–	–	–	0.4	14	14
India, Bangalore	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	0.3	<i>0.0</i>	0.5	110	113
India, Barshi, Paranda, and Bhum	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	–	–	–	1	1
*India, Bhopal	–	–	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	–	<i>0.3</i>	11	11
India, Chandigarh	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	–	–	<i>0.3</i>	10	10
*India, Chennai	–	–	0.1	0.1	–	0.6	106	107
India, Dibrugarh	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	3	3
*India, Dindigul, Ambilikkai	–	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	–	0.3	20	20
India, Kamrup Urban District	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	–	–	0.6	19	19
India, Kollam	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	0.2	<i>0.1</i>	–	0.2	34	34
*India, Manipur	–	–	–	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	11	11
India, Meghalaya	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	3	3
India, Mizoram	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	1	1
India, Mumbai	<i>0.0</i>	0.1	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	0.2	0.3	196	196
*India, New Delhi	<i>0.0</i>	–	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	0.9	224	224
India, Poona	–	<i>0.0</i>	–	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	0.3	59	59
*India, Sangrur district	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	–	–	<i>0.4</i>	12	12
India, SAS Nagar	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.3</i>	13	13
*India, Tamil Nadu	<i>0.0</i>	0.0	0.0	0.0	<i>0.0</i>	0.2	671	672
*India, Tripura	–	–	<i>0.0</i>	–	–	0.2	17	17
India, Trivandrum	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.0</i>	0.4	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.0</i>	0.3	68	68
India, Wardha	–	–	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	–	0.2	13	13
India, West Arunachal	–	–	–	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	2	2
*Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ardabil Province	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.3</i>	<i>0.1</i>	–	0.7	24	24
*Iran (Islamic Republic of), Golestan Province	–	<i>0.1</i>	0.5	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.0</i>	0.9	46	46
Israel	0.1	0.1	1.5	0.2	<i>0.0</i>	1.3	682	691
*Israel : Jewish	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.0</i>	1.5	0.2	<i>0.0</i>	1.3	501	509
*Israel : Arabs	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	1.8	0.3	–	1.2	150	150
Japan	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.1	0.0	0.1	1512	1512
Japan, Aichi Prefecture	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	0.4	0.1	<i>0.0</i>	0.1	102	102
*Japan, Akita Prefecture	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.1</i>	10	10
Japan, Aomori	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.0</i>	0.2	<i>0.2</i>	–	<i>0.1</i>	29	29
Japan, Gunma Prefecture	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.1</i>	20	20
Japan, Hiroshima Prefecture	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	0.3	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.1</i>	35	35
Japan, Miyagi Prefecture	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.2</i>	0.1	–	0.2	38	38
Japan, Osaka Prefecture	<i>0.0</i>	0.0	0.2	0.2	<i>0.0</i>	0.1	127	127
Kuwait	<i>0.1</i>	–	1.0	0.3	<i>0.0</i>	0.7	153	153
*Kuwait : Kuwaitis	<i>0.1</i>	–	1.3	<i>0.3</i>	<i>0.1</i>	1.1	91	91
*Kuwait : Non-Kuwaitis	<i>0.0</i>	–	0.9	0.3	<i>0.0</i>	0.4	62	62
*Philippines, Manila	–	–	0.1	<i>0.0</i>	–	0.4	96	96
*Qatar : Qatari	<i>0.3</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.7</i>	<i>0.6</i>	–	<i>0.7</i>	17	17
*Republic of Korea, Busan	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.0</i>	–	0.1	36	36
*Republic of Korea, Daegu	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	0.2	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.1</i>	26	26
*Republic of Korea, Daejeon	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.1</i>	14	14
*Republic of Korea, Gwangju	–	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.0</i>	14	14
Republic of Korea, Incheon	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	0.2	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	34	34
Republic of Korea, Jeju	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.1</i>	3	3
Republic of Korea, Seoul	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	0.3	0.0	<i>0.0</i>	0.1	132	132
Republic of Korea, Ulsan	–	–	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.1</i>	7	7
Republic of Korea	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.1	529	530
Singapore	–	<i>0.0</i>	0.8	<i>0.1</i>	–	0.1	93	93
Singapore : Chinese	–	–	0.8	<i>0.0</i>	–	<i>0.1</i>	57	57
Singapore : Indian	–	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.6</i>	–	–	<i>0.1</i>	7	7

Rates based on less than 10 cases are in italics

\*Important. See note on population page.

**Age-standardized (world) incidence rates (per 100,000)  
of microscopically verified cases by histological type**

**Hodgkin lymphoma (C81) - Female (Contd)**

	Nodular lymphocytic	Classical Lymphocyte-rich	Nodular sclerosis	Mixed cellularity	Lymphocytic depletion	Unspec.	Number of cases	
							MV	Total
<b>Asia (contd)</b>								
Singapore : Malay	–	–	1.3	0.3	–	0.3	27	27
Thailand, Bangkok	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	–	0.2	61	61
*Thailand, Chiang Mai	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.2	21	21
*Thailand, Khon Kaen	–	0.0	0.0	0.1	–	0.2	15	15
Thailand, Lampang	–	–	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.2	8	8
Thailand, Lopburi Province	–	–	–	–	–	0.2	4	4
*Thailand, Songkhla	0.0	–	0.2	0.1	–	0.2	23	23
Türkiye, Antalya	–	0.1	0.8	0.2	0.0	0.4	81	81
Türkiye, Bursa	0.0	0.1	0.7	0.2	0.0	0.4	101	101
*Türkiye, Edirne	–	–	0.7	0.4	–	0.1	14	14
*Türkiye, Erzurum	–	0.1	0.5	0.2	–	0.4	21	21
Türkiye, Eskişehir	–	0.1	0.6	0.1	0.1	0.4	31	31
Türkiye, Gaziantep	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.3	0.0	0.2	45	45
*Türkiye, Izmir	0.0	0.1	1.0	0.3	0.0	0.2	181	182
Türkiye, Malatya	–	0.2	0.7	0.2	0.0	0.2	28	28
Türkiye, Samsun	–	–	0.9	0.4	0.0	0.3	60	60
Türkiye, Trabzon	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.2	–	0.4	32	32
<b>Europe</b>								
Austria	0.0	0.1	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.7	363	389
Austria, Carinthia	–	0.1	1.3	0.2	–	0.1	26	26
Austria, Tyrol	0.1	0.2	1.5	0.2	–	0.4	49	49
Austria, Vorarlberg	0.2	0.1	0.8	0.1	–	0.6	20	20
Belarus	0.0	0.1	1.9	0.4	0.0	0.1	679	679
*Belgium	0.1	0.0	1.8	0.3	0.0	0.3	707	707
Croatia	0.1	0.1	1.4	0.2	0.0	0.7	263	273
Cyprus	0.1	0.1	2.7	0.4	–	0.3	87	90
*Czech Republic	0.1	0.1	1.1	0.4	0.0	0.4	606	606
Denmark	–	0.0	1.4	0.3	–	0.2	280	290
Estonia	0.1	0.0	2.0	0.4	–	0.2	100	101
Finland	0.2	0.1	1.8	0.2	0.0	0.1	345	351
*France, Bas-Rhin	0.1	–	2.0	0.3	0.0	0.2	63	63
*France, Calvados	0.2	0.0	2.1	0.1	–	0.1	41	41
*France, Doubs	0.1	–	3.0	–	–	–	36	36
*France, Gironde	0.1	0.1	2.0	0.1	0.0	0.2	109	109
*France, Haut-Rhin	0.0	0.0	2.3	0.2	0.1	–	52	52
*France, Hérault	0.2	–	2.1	0.3	–	0.1	79	79
*France, Isère	0.1	0.0	2.5	0.1	–	0.2	91	91
*France, Lille-Métropole	0.1	0.1	2.2	0.1	–	0.1	56	56
*France, Limousin	0.4	–	2.2	0.1	–	0.1	30	30
*France, Loire-Atlantique	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.1	0.0	0.2	84	84
*France, Manche	–	–	3.5	0.5	–	0.2	42	42
*France, Poitou-Charentes	0.1	0.1	2.5	0.1	–	0.3	137	137
*France, Somme	0.1	0.1	1.9	0.1	–	0.3	37	37
*France, Tarn	–	0.2	2.9	0.8	–	0.0	34	34
*France, Territoire de Belfort	–	–	2.4	–	–	0.1	9	9
*France, Vendée	0.1	0.0	3.6	0.4	–	0.5	67	67
Germany, Baden-Württemberg	0.1	0.1	0.9	0.2	0.0	0.3	300	419
Germany, Bavaria	0.1	0.2	0.9	0.2	0.0	0.5	704	742
Germany, Bremen	0.1	0.1	1.5	0.5	–	0.5	56	57
Germany, Hamburg	0.2	0.1	1.2	0.2	0.0	0.5	118	136
Germany, Lower Saxony	0.1	0.1	1.1	0.4	0.0	0.5	459	498
Germany, North Rhine-Westphalia	0.1	0.1	1.1	0.2	0.0	0.3	869	1104
Germany, Rhineland-Palatinate	0.1	0.1	1.2	0.3	–	0.6	242	257
Germany, Saarland	0.2	0.0	1.7	0.4	0.0	0.3	67	69
Germany, Schleswig-Holstein	0.1	0.0	1.2	0.4	0.0	0.4	168	197
Iceland	–	–	3.0	–	–	0.0	26	26
Ireland	0.1	0.1	1.7	0.2	–	0.5	331	334
*Italy, Aosta Valley	–	0.0	3.8	–	–	–	7	7
*Italy, Avellino	–	0.6	3.5	0.6	0.1	–	33	33
Italy, Basilicata	0.2	0.1	2.6	0.5	–	–	42	52
*Italy, Benevento	–	0.2	2.3	1.5	0.2	1.1	28	28
Italy, Bergamo	0.1	–	2.3	0.2	0.0	1.2	96	96
*Italy, Brescia	0.1	–	0.5	0.1	–	2.3	92	92
Italy, Brianza (Lecco + Monza e Brianza)	0.1	0.1	2.9	0.2	0.2	0.5	70	70
Italy, Calabria	0.0	0.1	1.9	0.3	–	0.7	46	48
*Italy, Caserta	0.1	–	4.0	0.4	0.0	0.7	89	89
*Italy, Catania, Messina and Enna	0.0	0.1	2.4	0.2	0.0	0.5	147	147
Italy, Emilia-Romagna	0.1	0.0	2.6	0.1	0.0	0.7	301	302
Italy, Friuli-Venezia Giulia	–	0.4	2.9	0.2	0.1	0.5	108	108
Italy, Genova	0.1	0.1	3.2	0.1	–	0.2	55	58
*Italy, Lombardy, South, Pavia	0.2	–	1.1	0.0	–	1.3	32	33
Italy, Mantova and Cremona	0.1	0.2	3.1	0.2	0.0	1.1	64	64

Rates based on less than 10 cases are in italics

\*Important. See note on population page.

**Age-standardized (world) incidence rates (per 100,000)  
of microscopically verified cases by histological type**

**Hodgkin lymphoma (C81) - Female (Contd)**

	Nodular lymphocytic	Classical Lymphocyte-rich	Nodular sclerosis	Mixed cellularity	Lymphocytic depletion	Unspec.	Number of cases	
							MV	Total
<b>Europe (contd)</b>								
Italy, Marche	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	2.6	0.3	<i>0.0</i>	0.6	113	114
Italy, Milan	<i>0.0</i>	0.1	2.1	0.3	<i>0.1</i>	0.7	284	284
Italy, Molise	–	–	<i>1.3</i>	–	–	<i>1.0</i>	11	13
*Italy, Naples Centre	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.1</i>	3.4	0.6	<i>0.1</i>	0.7	76	76
*Italy, Naples North	<i>0.1</i>	–	1.9	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.1</i>	1.2	74	74
*Italy, Naples South	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	3.1	0.4	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.3</i>	110	110
*Italy, Nuoro	–	<i>0.2</i>	<i>1.9</i>	<i>1.0</i>	–	<i>0.3</i>	11	11
*Italy, Palermo	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	2.5	0.3	<i>0.0</i>	0.5	113	113
Italy, Puglia	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.1</i>	2.7	0.2	<i>0.0</i>	0.5	349	360
*Italy, Ragusa and Caltanissetta	<i>0.0</i>	–	2.5	<i>0.3</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.3</i>	48	48
*Italy, Salerno	<i>0.3</i>	<i>0.1</i>	2.7	0.5	–	0.9	99	99
Italy, Sassari	–	–	2.9	<i>0.3</i>	–	<i>0.8</i>	19	22
*Italy, Sondrio	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.3</i>	<i>0.8</i>	<i>0.2</i>	–	<i>0.9</i>	13	13
Italy, South Tyrol	<i>0.1</i>	–	2.0	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.3</i>	34	34
*Italy, Syracuse	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.2</i>	2.7	<i>0.2</i>	–	<i>0.1</i>	29	29
Italy, Trento	–	–	1.5	<i>0.4</i>	<i>0.1</i>	1.4	44	44
Italy, Turin	<i>0.0</i>	0.1	2.2	0.2	<i>0.1</i>	0.9	175	177
*Italy, Tuscany	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	2.7	0.2	<i>0.0</i>	0.6	170	179
Italy, Umbria	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	2.4	0.5	–	<i>0.4</i>	63	65
Italy, Varese	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.3</i>	2.0	<i>0.4</i>	–	0.8	42	42
Italy, Veneto	0.1	0.0	2.7	0.3	<i>0.0</i>	0.8	460	463
Latvia	–	<i>0.1</i>	1.4	0.3	<i>0.0</i>	0.2	117	126
*Liechtenstein	<i>1.4</i>	<i>0.3</i>	–	–	–	–	2	2
*Lithuania	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.0</i>	1.5	0.1	–	0.2	137	137
Malta	–	<i>0.2</i>	2.4	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.7</i>	38	40
*The Netherlands	0.1	0.1	1.3	0.2	<i>0.0</i>	0.7	1006	1006
Norway	0.2	0.1	1.2	0.2	<i>0.0</i>	0.4	291	292
Poland, Kielce	–	–	1.2	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.0</i>	0.6	67	67
*Portugal, Azores	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>1.7</i>	<i>0.0</i>	–	<i>0.7</i>	15	15
Russian Federation, Arkhangelsk	–	<i>0.1</i>	1.1	0.4	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	56	56
Russian Federation, Kaliningrad	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	1.5	0.5	<i>0.2</i>	0.6	69	69
Russian Federation, Karelia	–	<i>0.3</i>	1.3	<i>0.0</i>	–	0.6	36	36
*Russian Federation, Komi Republic	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.0</i>	0.7	1.1	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.2</i>	58	58
Russian Federation, Murmansk	–	<i>0.1</i>	1.8	<i>0.2</i>	–	<i>0.0</i>	39	39
*Russian Federation, Orenburg	–	0.4	1.2	0.1	<i>0.0</i>	0.1	108	114
Russian Federation, Pskov	<i>0.3</i>	<i>0.1</i>	1.1	0.6	<i>0.1</i>	1.1	62	62
*Russian Federation, Samara	<i>0.0</i>	0.3	1.5	0.5	0.2	0.1	242	245
Russian Federation, Vologda Region	<i>0.1</i>	0.8	1.4	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.3</i>	76	76
Slovenia	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	1.7	0.5	<i>0.0</i>	0.2	127	127
Spain, Asturias	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.1</i>	1.5	0.4	–	<i>0.1</i>	42	42
Spain, Basque Country	0.3	<i>0.1</i>	1.7	0.4	<i>0.0</i>	0.5	122	122
Spain, Canary Islands	<i>0.1</i>	–	1.1	<i>0.2</i>	–	0.4	68	68
Spain, Castellón	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.0</i>	1.2	<i>0.4</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.2</i>	35	35
Spain, Girona	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.0</i>	1.9	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.1</i>	42	42
Spain, Granada	–	–	2.0	<i>0.0</i>	–	–	47	47
Spain, La Rioja	<i>0.3</i>	<i>0.6</i>	2.4	<i>0.3</i>	–	<i>0.4</i>	30	30
Spain, Murcia	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.1</i>	1.6	0.5	<i>0.0</i>	0.3	111	112
Spain, Navarra	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.1</i>	1.8	<i>0.2</i>	–	<i>0.3</i>	38	38
Spain, Salamanca	<i>0.3</i>	<i>0.3</i>	2.4	<i>0.8</i>	–	<i>0.6</i>	40	40
Spain, Tarragona	–	<i>0.2</i>	1.4	0.3	–	0.5	51	51
*Sweden	0.1	0.1	1.1	0.2	<i>0.0</i>	0.4	490	491
Switzerland, Aargau	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.2</i>	1.1	<i>0.5</i>	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	36	36
Switzerland, Basel	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.1</i>	1.2	<i>0.6</i>	–	<i>0.1</i>	28	28
Switzerland, Berne Solothurn	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.1</i>	1.8	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	52	52
Switzerland, East	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.1</i>	1.8	<i>0.3</i>	–	<i>0.4</i>	58	59
*Switzerland, Fribourg	<i>0.1</i>	–	1.8	–	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.4</i>	21	21
Switzerland, Geneva	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.3</i>	2.1	0.5	–	<i>0.2</i>	40	40
*Switzerland, Graubünden Glarus	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.3</i>	<i>1.6</i>	<i>0.2</i>	–	<i>0.3</i>	21	21
*Switzerland, Lucerne	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.1</i>	1.5	<i>0.4</i>	–	<i>0.5</i>	34	34
*Switzerland, Neuchâtel and Jura	–	<i>0.4</i>	<i>1.6</i>	<i>0.3</i>	–	<i>0.1</i>	16	16
Switzerland, Ticino	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.0</i>	2.4	<i>0.2</i>	–	<i>0.4</i>	33	33
Switzerland, Valais	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.2</i>	1.9	<i>0.3</i>	–	<i>0.9</i>	29	29
Switzerland, Vaud	<i>0.3</i>	<i>0.1</i>	1.6	<i>0.2</i>	–	<i>0.3</i>	53	54
Switzerland, Zurich and Zug	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	1.9	0.3	–	<i>0.1</i>	100	100
Ukraine	<i>0.0</i>	0.1	1.1	0.4	0.1	0.8	2447	2455
UK, England	0.2	0.1	1.2	0.2	0.0	0.7	3659	3771
UK, Northern Ireland	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.1</i>	1.7	0.3	<i>0.0</i>	0.3	125	127
UK, Scotland	0.1	0.1	1.3	0.3	<i>0.0</i>	0.5	371	373
UK, Wales	0.1	<i>0.1</i>	1.6	0.2	–	0.1	182	205
<b>Oceania</b>								
*Australia, NSW/ACT	0.1	0.1	1.5	0.2	<i>0.0</i>	0.4	505	517
*Australia, Northern Territory	<i>0.2</i>	–	<i>0.6</i>	<i>0.3</i>	–	<i>0.6</i>	10	10

Rates based on less than 10 cases are in italics

\*Important. See note on population page.

Age-standardized (world) incidence rates (per 100,000)  
of microscopically verified cases by histological type

Hodgkin lymphoma (C81) - Female (Contd)

	Nodular lymphocytic	Classical Lymphocyte-rich	Nodular sclerosis	Mixed cellularity	Lymphocytic depletion	Unspec.	Number of cases	
							MV	Total
<b>Oceania (contd)</b>								
*Australia, Northern Territory : Non-Indigenous	<i>0.4</i>	–	<i>0.8</i>	–	–	<i>0.9</i>	8	8
*Australia, Northern Territory : Indigenous	–	–	–	<i>1.1</i>	–	–	2	2
*Australia, Queensland	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>1.3</i>	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.5</i>	306	311
Australia, South Australia	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>1.2</i>	<i>0.4</i>	–	<i>0.7</i>	114	115
Australia, Tasmania	–	–	<i>1.4</i>	<i>0.3</i>	–	<i>0.5</i>	29	29
*Australia, Victoria	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>1.6</i>	<i>0.2</i>	–	<i>0.5</i>	416	421
*Australia, Western Australia	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>1.3</i>	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.3</i>	131	132
*New Caledonia	–	–	<i>0.9</i>	<i>0.2</i>	–	–	7	7
New Zealand	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>1.3</i>	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.2</i>	235	238
*New Zealand : Maori	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>1.2</i>	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.1</i>	31	31
*New Zealand : Pacific peoples	<i>0.4</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>1.1</i>	<i>0.3</i>	–	<i>0.2</i>	16	16
*New Zealand : Other	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>1.6</i>	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.2</i>	176	179
USA, Hawaii	<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>0.7</i>	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.2</i>	45	45
USA, Hawaii : White	<i>0.3</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>1.0</i>	<i>0.2</i>	–	<i>0.5</i>	17	17
*USA, Hawaii : Japanese	–	–	<i>0.5</i>	<i>0.2</i>	–	<i>0.1</i>	5	5
*USA, Hawaii : Chinese	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
*USA, Hawaii : Hawaiian	–	–	<i>0.8</i>	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.3</i>	11	11
*USA, Hawaii : Filipino	–	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.6</i>	<i>0.1</i>	–	<i>0.3</i>	9	9

Rates based on less than 10 cases are in italics

\*Important. See note on population page.