



Nut consumption and risk of colorectal cancer in women

Citation

Yang, M, F B Hu, E L Giovannucci, M J Stampfer, W C Willett, C S Fuchs, K Wu, and Y Bao. 2015. "Nut Consumption and Risk of Colorectal Cancer in Women." *Eur J Clin Nutr* (May 6). doi:10.1038/ejcn.2015.66.

Published Version

10.1038/ejcn.2015.66

Permanent link

<http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:23683684>

Terms of Use

This article was downloaded from Harvard University's DASH repository, and is made available under the terms and conditions applicable to Other Posted Material, as set forth at <http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:dash.current.terms-of-use#LAA>

Share Your Story

The Harvard community has made this article openly available. Please share how this access benefits you. [Submit a story](#).

[Accessibility](#)

1 **Nut consumption and risk of colorectal cancer in women**

2

3 Meng Yang, PhD, MPH^{1,3}

4 Frank B. Hu, MD, PhD^{1,2,3}

5 Edward L. Giovannucci, MD, ScD^{1,2,3}

6 Meir J. Stampfer, MD, DrPH^{1,2,3}

7 Walter C. Willett, MD, DrPH^{1,2,3}

8 Charles S. Fuchs, MD, MPH^{1,4}

9 *Kana Wu, MD, PhD, MPH^{1,3}

10 *Ying Bao, MD, ScD¹

11

12 ¹ Channing Division of Network Medicine, Department of Medicine, Brigham and Women's
13 Hospital, and Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA

14 ² Department of Epidemiology, Harvard School of Public Health, Boston, MA

15 ³ Department of Nutrition, Harvard School of Public Health, Boston, MA

16 ⁴ Department of Medical Oncology, Dana-Farber Cancer Institute, Boston, MA

17 *These authors contributed equally to this work and shared the last authorship.

18

19 Corresponding Author: Ying Bao, MD, ScD, Channing Division of Network Medicine,
20 Department of Medicine, Brigham and Women's Hospital and Harvard Medical School, 181
21 Longwood Avenue, Boston, MA 02115. Phone: (617) 525-2099; Fax: (617) 525-2008. E-mail:
22 ying.bao@channing.harvard.ed

23

24 Running title: Nut consumption and colorectal cancer

25

26 Keywords: nut consumption, colorectal cancer, prospective cohort study

27

28 Conflict of Interest: This study is supported by the grants P01 CA87969, P50 CA127003, and

29 1U54CA155626 from the National Institutes of Health, and by the grant from the International

30 Tree Nut Council Nutrition Research & Education Foundation. Dr. Bao reported receiving a

31 research grant from the International Tree Nut Council Nutrition Research & Education

32 Foundation. The sponsors did not participate in the design and conduct of the study; collection,

33 management, analysis, and interpretation of the data; and preparation, review, or approval of the

34 manuscript. Dr. Yang, Dr. Hu, Dr. Giovannucci, Dr. Stampfer, Dr. Willett, Dr. Fuchs and Dr.

35 Wu declare no potential conflict of interest.

36 **ABSTRACT**

37 **Background/Objectives:** Increasing nut consumption has been associated with reduced risk of
38 obesity and type II diabetes, which are risk factors for colorectal cancer. However, the
39 association between nut consumption and colorectal cancer risk is unclear. We aimed to examine
40 the association of long-term nut consumption with risk of colorectal cancer.

41 **Subjects/Methods:** We prospectively followed 75,680 women who were free of cancer at
42 baseline in the Nurses' Health Study, and examined the association between nut consumption
43 and colorectal cancer risk. Nut consumption was assessed at baseline and updated every 2 to 4
44 years. Relative risks (RRs) and 95% confidence intervals (95% CIs) were estimated using Cox
45 proportional hazards models.

46 **Results:** During 2,103,037 person-years of follow-up, we identified 1,503 colorectal cancer
47 cases. After adjustment for other known or suspected risk factors, women who consumed nuts 2
48 or more times per week (i.e., ≥ 56 grams per week) had a 13% lower risk of colorectal cancer
49 compared to those who rarely consumed nuts, but the association was not statistically significant
50 (RR: 0.87; 95% CI: 0.72, 1.05; *P* trend: 0.06). No association was observed for peanut butter.

51 **Conclusions:** In this large prospective cohort of women, frequent nut consumption was not
52 significantly associated with colorectal cancer risk after adjusting for other risk factors.

53

54 INTRODUCTION

55 Colorectal cancer is the second most common cancer in women and the third most
56 common cancer in men worldwide¹. Beyond well-known risk factors such as older age, family
57 history, and inherited genetic conditions, the risk of colorectal cancer is also higher among
58 individuals with excess body weight² or type 2 diabetes³. Since nuts have been associated with
59 improved insulin resistance^{4, 5}, less weight gain^{6, 7}, and a decreased risk of type 2 diabetes⁸⁻¹⁰,
60 increasing nut consumption may result in reduced risk of developing colorectal cancer. In
61 addition, *in vitro* fermented nuts exhibit chemopreventive effects in colon cancer cells¹¹, and nut
62 intake inhibited colorectal cancer growth in mice¹².

63 Nonetheless, few epidemiologic studies have investigated the association between nut
64 consumption and colorectal cancer risk. Earlier case-control studies reported inconsistent
65 results¹³⁻¹⁵. More recent data from prospective cohort studies suggested an inverse association¹⁶⁻
66 ¹⁸, especially among women^{17, 18}. However, the previous studies grouped nuts with seeds or
67 legumes^{13-15, 17}, had only one measure of nut intake¹³⁻¹⁸, had a relatively short follow-up (if
68 cohort studies)^{16, 17}, or had a limited number of colorectal cancer cases^{13, 16, 18}. We therefore
69 examined the association between long-term nut consumption and risk of colorectal cancer in a
70 large cohort of women with a follow-up of 30 years.

71

72 SUBJECTS AND METHODS

73 Study Population

74 The Nurses' Health Study (NHS) was initiated in 1976 and enrolled 121,700 U.S. female
75 nurses aged 30-55 years. Participants completed a baseline questionnaire and biennial follow-up
76 questionnaires to update information on new disease diagnoses and potential risk factors for

77 chronic diseases. In 1980, a validated semi-quantitative food frequency questionnaire was sent to
78 collect dietary information¹⁹. The follow-up rate exceeded 90% in each 2-year cycle.

79 For the present analysis, study baseline was defined as the year of the first food frequency
80 questionnaire (i.e., 1980). At baseline, 92,468 women completed the dietary questionnaire. We
81 excluded 3,670 women who had a history of cancer, 1,141 women who did not provide
82 information on nut intake, and 11,977 women who did not provide information on
83 anthropometric measures or physical activity, or reported implausible nutritional information (>9
84 missing food items or estimated daily energy intake <500 kcal or >3500 kcal). This left 75,680
85 women eligible for the analyses. This study was approved by the Human Research Committee at
86 the Brigham and Women's Hospital.

87

88 **Assessment of Dietary and Non-dietary Factors**

89 Validated semi-quantitative food frequency questionnaires were used to assess dietary
90 intake in 1980, 1984, 1986, and every 4 years thereafter. We asked participants to report their
91 average frequency of intake over the preceding year for a specified serving size of each food. In
92 the 1980 and 1984 dietary questionnaires, the participants were asked how often they had
93 consumed nuts (serving size, 28 g [1 oz]) over the preceding year: never/almost never, 1 to 3
94 times a month, once a week, 2 to 4 times a week, 5 to 6 times a week, once a day, 2 to 3 times a
95 day, 4 to 6 times a day, or more than 6 times a day. In the subsequent questionnaires, the
96 question for nuts was split into peanuts and other nuts. Total nut consumption was the sum of
97 peanuts and other nuts intakes. We also assessed peanut butter consumption (serving size, 15 mL
98 [1 tablespoon]) every 2 to 4 years using the same 9 responses. A validation study of the NHS
99 food-frequency questionnaire demonstrated that nut and peanut butter intakes were reported with

100 reasonable accuracy; the correlation coefficients were 0.75 for nuts and 0.75 for peanut butter
101 between intakes assessed by the 1980 questionnaire and by dietary records collected over four
102 weeks²⁰.

103 In all questionnaires, women were asked about their history of smoking, including
104 smoking status, time since quitting and average number of cigarettes smoked daily. Information
105 on physical activity was assessed at baseline and updated every 2 to 4 years. Body mass index
106 (BMI) was calculated from self-reported height at baseline and weight updated every 2 years.
107 Information on family history of colorectal cancer, use of aspirin and multivitamin, and history
108 of diabetes (incident cases during follow-up), ulcerative colitis, polyps, and lower endoscopy
109 were updated every 2 to 4 years.

110

111 **Identification of Colorectal Cancer Cases**

112 Participants were asked to report specified medical conditions, including cancers, that
113 were diagnosed in the 2-year period between each follow-up questionnaire. Whenever a
114 participant (or next of kin for decedents) reported a diagnosis of colorectal cancer, we asked for
115 permission to access the participant's medical records. We also searched the National Death
116 Index to identify deaths among non-respondents. This method has been shown to capture >98%
117 of deaths²¹. Study physicians who were blinded to participants' risk factor status reviewed
118 medical records and assigned cancer diagnoses and causes of death.

119

120 **Statistical Analysis**

121 The follow-up started from the return date of the 1980 questionnaire to the date of
122 colorectal cancer diagnosis, death from any cause, or the end of follow-up (May 31st, 2010),

123 whichever came first. The cumulative average of nut consumption were calculated from all
124 available dietary questionnaires, using methods for repeated measures, as described previously²².
125 Briefly, we used data from the 1980 questionnaire for the follow-up period from 1980 to 1984,
126 the average of 1980 and 1984 for the interval from 1984 to 1986, and the average of 1980, 1984,
127 and 1986 for the interval from 1986 to 1990, and so forth. For analyses of total nuts, peanuts,
128 other nuts, and peanut butter, we divided women into 4 groups according to their frequency of
129 nut consumption: never/almost never (the reference group), 1 to 3 times a month, once a week,
130 and at least 2 times a week.

131 Cox proportional hazards models were used to estimate relative risk (RR) and 95%
132 confidence intervals (CIs). In multivariable analyses, we adjusted for potential confounding
133 variables including age, physical activity, family history of colorectal cancer, history of previous
134 lower endoscopy, history of ulcerative colitis, history of polyps, aspirin use, multivitamin use,
135 smoking, alcohol intake, and total energy intake. Separately, we then adjusted for BMI and
136 diabetes to see if the observed association was independent of these potential mediators or
137 confounding factors for the association between nut intake and colorectal cancer risk. Additional
138 adjustment for postmenopausal hormone use, red meat, fruits and vegetables, dietary fiber, folate,
139 calcium, vitamin D, or the Mediterranean diet score did not appreciably change the results; thus
140 these variables were omitted from the final models. *P* values for trend were calculated by the
141 Wald test of a score variable that contained median values of intake categories.

142 To test the robustness of our results, we conducted sensitivity analyses excluding
143 individuals with diabetes or ulcerative colitis at baseline. To address the concern of any effect of
144 subclinical colorectal cancer on nut intake, we added a 4-year lag period between nut intake
145 assessment and each follow-up period (follow-up started in 1984 for this analysis), i.e., we used

146 nut intake from the 1980 questionnaire for the follow-up period from 1984 to 1988, the 1984
147 questionnaire for the period from 1988-1992 and so forth.

148 We examined whether the associations of interest were modified by BMI and physical
149 activity. Tests for interaction were performed by the Wald test of cross-product terms. All
150 statistical analyses were performed with the SAS 9.1 statistical package (SAS Institute, Cary,
151 North Carolina) and all *P* values are two sided.

152

153 **RESULTS**

154 Nut consumption remained relatively constant during study follow-up. At baseline,
155 women with higher nut consumption were leaner, less likely to smoke, and more likely to
156 exercise, have lower endoscopy, and take aspirin on a regular basis (Table 1). They also tended
157 to consume more alcohol, multivitamin supplements, fruits, vegetables as well as calcium, fiber
158 and folate.

159 During 30 years of follow-up (2,103,037 person-years), we documented 1,503 colorectal
160 cancer cases. The multivariable RR of colorectal cancer for women consuming nuts 2 times or
161 more per week versus women rarely consuming nuts was 0.86 (95% CI: 0.72, 1.04; *P*
162 trend=0.04) (Table 2). The inverse association attenuated after further adjusting for BMI and
163 diabetes (RR: 0.87; 95% CI: 0.72, 1.05; *P* trend=0.06) (Table 2). Separate analyses of colon and
164 rectal cancer showed no substantial differences in relation to nut intake, although the *P* value for
165 trend was statistically significant for colon cancer (RR: 0.86; 95% CI: 0.70, 1.07; *P* trend=0.04)
166 (Table 2). We further divided colon cancer into proximal and distal colon cancer. The RRs
167 comparing 2 or more times per week with never were 0.95 (95% CI: 0.72, 1.27; *P* trend=0.10)
168 for proximal colon cancer and 0.78 (95% CI: 0.56, 1.10; *P* trend=0.20) for distal colon cancer (*P*

169 for heterogeneity=0.99). No association was observed between peanut butter and colorectal
170 cancer risk (RR comparing 2 or more times per week with never: 0.94; 95% CI: 0.80, 1.11; *P*
171 trend=0.72).

172 The association between nut consumption and colorectal cancer risk remained virtually
173 unchanged when we excluded diabetes at baseline, when we restricted to those without ulcerative
174 colitis at baseline, or when we excluded the first 4 years of follow-up and added a 4-year lag
175 period between nut intake assessment and each follow-up period (Supplementary Table 1).
176 Moreover, the association was not different across strata of BMI and physical activity (*P* for
177 interaction \geq 0.14) (Table 3). In separate analyses of the types of nuts consumed (assessed in
178 1986), the RRs comparing 2 or more times per week with never were 0.85 (95% CI: 0.66, 1.09)
179 for peanuts and 0.93 (95% CI: 0.71, 1.23) for other nuts (*P* for heterogeneity=0.98)
180 (Supplementary Table 2).

181

182 **DISCUSSION**

183 In this large prospective cohort of women, frequent nut consumption was not
184 significantly associated with colorectal cancer risk after adjusting for other known or suspected
185 risk factors of colorectal cancer, although an inverse association was suggested. This observation
186 is compatible with previous prospective cohort studies. The Adventist Health Study found a
187 suggestive lower risk of colon cancer with higher nut intake (RR comparing >4 times/week with
188 never to <once/week: 0.68; 95% CI: 0.45, 1.04; *P* trend=0.22)¹⁶. The European Prospective
189 Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition (EPIC) study found that among women, the consumption
190 of nuts and seeds was associated with a nonsignificant reduction in colorectal cancer risk (RR
191 comparing >6.2 g/d with 0 g/d: 0.81; 95% CI: 0.63, 1.04; *P* trend=0.07) and a significant

192 reduction in colon cancer risk (RR comparing >6.2 g/d with 0 g/d: 0.69; 95% CI: 0.50, 0.95; *P*
193 trend: 0.04)¹⁷. In contrast, no association was observed among men. Similarly, a Taiwan study
194 reported that frequent intake of peanut and its products was associated with a significantly
195 reduced risk of colorectal cancer among women only (RR comparing ≥ 2 times/week with
196 \leq once/week: 0.42; 95% CI: 0.21, 0.84; *P* trend = 0.01)¹⁸.

197 The mechanisms underlying the health benefits of nuts are unclear and need to be
198 elucidated²³. However, nuts are rich sources of unsaturated fatty acids, fibers, vitamins, minerals,
199 and phytochemicals, which may provide antioxidant, anti-inflammatory, and anticarcinogenic
200 properties²⁴. Indeed, intervention studies have demonstrated beneficial effects of nuts on
201 intermediate markers of cancer, including oxidative stress^{25, 26}, inflammation²⁷, and insulin
202 resistance^{4, 5}. Moreover, observational studies have also shown that increasing nut intake was
203 associated with reduced waist circumference²⁸ and a reduced risk of obesity⁷, metabolic
204 syndrome²⁹, and type 2 diabetes⁸⁻¹⁰, all of which are risk factors for colorectal cancer.

205 The strengths of this study include its prospective design, large sample size, 30 years of
206 follow-up with excellent follow-up rate, and repeated measures of diet and lifestyle variables. In
207 addition, the inverse association trend persisted for colon cancer when we added a 4-year lag
208 period between nut intake and each follow-up period. Our study also has limitations. Self-
209 reported dietary data has inherent measurement error. Nevertheless, we were able to reduce the
210 error by averaging nut intake cumulatively. In addition, although we examined peanuts and tree
211 nuts separately, we were not able to examine different types of tree nuts, such as walnuts, in this
212 analysis. Moreover, although we cannot eliminate residual confounding by other risk factors for
213 colorectal cancer, our study provided detailed information on diet and lifestyle, and we were also

214 able to adjust for dietary patterns. Restriction to female nurses could reduce the generalizability
215 of the results, but it also potentially minimizes residual confounding by socioeconomic status.

216 In conclusion, frequent nut consumption was not significantly associated with colorectal
217 cancer risk in this large prospective cohort of women, although a possible inverse association
218 was suggested. Further studies are warranted.

219

220 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

221 This study is supported by the grants P01 CA87969, P50 CA127003, and
222 1U54CA155626 from the National Institutes of Health, and by the grant from the International
223 Tree Nut Council Nutrition Research & Education Foundation. We would like to thank the
224 participants and staff of the Nurses' Health Study for their valuable contributions as well as the
225 following state cancer registries for their help: AL, AZ, AR, CA, CO, CT, DE, FL, GA, ID, IL,
226 IN, IA, KY, LA, ME, MD, MA, MI, NE, NH, NJ, NY, NC, ND, OH, OK, OR, PA, RI, SC, TN,
227 TX, VA, WA, WY. In addition, this study was approved by the Connecticut Department of
228 Public Health (DPH) Human Investigations Committee. Certain data used in this publication
229 were obtained from the DPH. The authors assume full responsibility for analyses and
230 interpretation of these data.

231

232 **CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

233 Dr. Bao reported receiving a research grant from the International Tree Nut Council
234 Nutrition Research & Education Foundation. The sponsors did not participate in the design and
235 conduct of the study; collection, management, analysis, and interpretation of the data; and
236 preparation, review, or approval of the manuscript. Dr. Yang, Dr. Hu, Dr. Giovannucci, Dr.
237 Stampfer, Dr. Willett, Dr. Fuchs and Dr. Wu declare no potential conflict of interest.

238

239 Supplementary information is available at European Journal of Clinical Nutrition's website.

240

241 **REFERENCES**

- 242 1. Jemal A, Bray F, Center MM, Ferlay J, Ward E, Forman D. Global cancer statistics. *CA*
243 *Cancer J Clin* 2011; **61**: 69-90.
- 244 2. Bardou M, Barkun AN, Martel M. Obesity and colorectal cancer. *Gut* 2013; **62**: 933-947.
- 245 3. Larsson SC, Orsini N, Wolk A. Diabetes mellitus and risk of colorectal cancer: a meta-
246 analysis. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 2005; **97**: 1679-1687.
- 247 4. Casas-Agustench P, Lopez-Uriarte P, Bullo M, Ros E, Cabre-Vila JJ, Salas-Salvado J.
248 Effects of one serving of mixed nuts on serum lipids, insulin resistance and inflammatory
249 markers in patients with the metabolic syndrome. *Nutr Metab Cardiovasc Dis* 2011; **21**:
250 126-135.
- 251 5. Tapsell LC, Batterham MJ, Teuss G, Tan SY, Dalton S, Quick CJ *et al*. Long-term
252 effects of increased dietary polyunsaturated fat from walnuts on metabolic parameters in
253 type II diabetes. *Eur J Clin Nutr* 2009; **63**: 1008-1015.
- 254 6. Bes-Rastrollo M, Sabate J, Gomez-Gracia E, Alonso A, Martinez JA, Martinez-Gonzalez
255 MA. Nut consumption and weight gain in a Mediterranean cohort: The SUN study.
256 *Obesity (Silver Spring)* 2007; **15**: 107-116.
- 257 7. Bes-Rastrollo M, Wedick NM, Martinez-Gonzalez MA, Li TY, Sampson L, Hu FB.
258 Prospective study of nut consumption, long-term weight change, and obesity risk in
259 women. *Am J Clin Nutr* 2009; **89**: 1913-1919.

- 260 8. Jiang R, Manson JE, Stampfer MJ, Liu S, Willett WC, Hu FB. Nut and peanut butter
261 consumption and risk of type 2 diabetes in women. *JAMA* 2002; **288**: 2554-2560.
- 262
263 9. Villegas R, Gao YT, Yang G, Li HL, Elasy TA, Zheng W *et al*. Legume and soy food
264 intake and the incidence of type 2 diabetes in the Shanghai Women's Health Study. *Am J*
265 *Clin Nutr* 2008; **87**: 162-167.
- 266 10. Pan A, Sun Q, Manson JE, Willett WC, Hu FB. Walnut consumption is associated with
267 lower risk of type 2 diabetes in women. *J Nutr* 2013; **143**: 512-518.
- 268 11. Lux S, Scharlau D, Schlormann W, Birringer M, Gleis M. In vitro fermented nuts exhibit
269 chemopreventive effects in HT29 colon cancer cells. *Br J Nutr* 2012; **108**: 1177-1186.
- 270 12. Nagel JM, Brinkoetter M, Magkos F, Liu X, Chamberland JP, Shah S *et al*. Dietary
271 walnuts inhibit colorectal cancer growth in mice by suppressing angiogenesis. *Nutrition*
272 2012; **28**: 67-75.
- 273 13. Pickle LW, Greene MH, Ziegler RG, Toledo A, Hoover R, Lynch HT *et al*. Colorectal
274 cancer in rural Nebraska. *Cancer Res* 1984; **44**: 363-369.
- 275 14. Kune S, Kune GA, Watson LF. Case-control study of dietary etiological factors: the
276 Melbourne Colorectal Cancer Study. *Nutr Cancer* 1987; **9**: 21-42.
- 277 15. Peters RK, Pike MC, Garabrant D, Mack TM. Diet and colon cancer in Los Angeles
278 County, California. *Cancer Causes Control* 1992; **3**: 457-473.
- 279 16. Singh PN, Fraser GE. Dietary risk factors for colon cancer in a low-risk population. *Am J*
280 *Epidemiol* 1998; **148**: 761-774.
- 281 17. Jenab M, Ferrari P, Slimani N, Norat T, Casagrande C, Overvad K *et al*. Association of nut
282 and seed intake with colorectal cancer risk in the European Prospective Investigation into
283 Cancer and Nutrition. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev* 2004; **13**: 1595-1603.

- 284 18. Yeh CC, You SL, Chen CJ, Sung FC. Peanut consumption and reduced risk of colorectal
285 cancer in women: a prospective study in Taiwan. *World J Gastroenterol* 2006; **12**: 222-
286 227.
- 287 19. Willett WC, Sampson L, Stampfer MJ, Rosner B, Bain C, Witschi J *et al.* Reproducibility
288 and validity of a semiquantitative food frequency questionnaire. *Am J Epidemiol* 1985;
289 **122**: 51-65.
- 290 20. Salvini S, Hunter DJ, Sampson L, Stampfer MJ, Colditz GA, Rosner B *et al.* Food-based
291 validation of a dietary questionnaire: the effects of week-to-week variation in food
292 consumption. *Int J Epidemiol* 1989; **18**: 858-867.
- 293 21. Rich-Edwards JW, Corsano KA, Stampfer MJ. Test of the National Death Index and
294 Equifax Nationwide Death Search. *Am J Epidemiol* 1994; **140**: 1016-1019.
- 295 22. Hu FB, Stampfer MJ, Manson JE, Rimm E, Colditz GA, Rosner BA *et al.* Dietary fat
296 intake and the risk of coronary heart disease in women. *N Engl J Med* 1997; **337**: 1491-
297 1499.
- 298 23. Russo P, Siani A. The role of nuts in the optimal diet: time for a critical appraisal?
299 Nutrition, metabolism, and cardiovascular diseases : NMCD 2012; 22: 1019-1023.
- 300 24. Gonzalez CA, Salas-Salvado J. The potential of nuts in the prevention of cancer. *Br J*
301 *Nutr* 2006; **96 Suppl 2**: S87-94.
- 302 25. J Jenkins DJ, Kendall CW, Josse AR, Salvatore S, Brighenti F, Augustin LS *et al.*
303 Almonds decrease postprandial glycemia, insulinemia, and oxidative damage in healthy
304 individuals. *J Nutr* 2006; **136**: 2987-2992.

- 305 26. Torabian S, Haddad E, Rajaram S, Banta J, Sabate J. Acute effect of nut consumption on
306 plasma total polyphenols, antioxidant capacity and lipid peroxidation. *J Hum Nutr Diet*
307 2009; **22**: 64-71.
- 308 27. Jiang R, Jacobs DR, Jr., Mayer-Davis E, Szklo M, Herrington D, Jenny NS *et al.* Nut and
309 seed consumption and inflammatory markers in the multi-ethnic study of atherosclerosis.
310 *Am J Epidemiol* 2006; **163**: 222-231.
- 311 28. Salas-Salvado J, Fernandez-Ballart J, Ros E, Martinez-Gonzalez MA, Fito M, Estruch R
312 *et al.* Effect of a Mediterranean diet supplemented with nuts on metabolic syndrome
313 status: one-year results of the PREDIMED randomized trial. *Arch Intern Med* 2008; **168**:
314 2449-2458.
- 315 29. Fernandez-Montero A, Bes-Rastrollo M, Beunza JJ, Barrio-Lopez MT, de la Fuente-
316 Arrillaga C, Moreno-Galarraga L *et al.* Nut consumption and incidence of metabolic
317 syndrome after 6-year follow-up: the SUN (Seguimiento Universidad de Navarra,
318 University of Navarra Follow-up) cohort. *Public Health Nutr* 2012: 1-9.

Table 1. Characteristics of person-years by nut consumption*

	Frequency of nut consumption (28g serving)			
	Never	1-3 times/month	Once/week	≥ 2 times/week
Nut intake, servings/d	0	0.01-0.09	0.10-0.19	≥ 0.20
Person-years	363,578	936,896	396,362	406,201
Age, y, mean (SD)	55.8(10.9)	59.3(10.8)	60.4(10.8)	61.0(10.7)
BMI, kg/m ² , mean (SD)	26.1(5.3)	26.2(5.2)	25.9(5.0)	25.3(4.8)
Physical activity, metabolic equivalents-hours/week, mean (SD)	13.8(20.5)	15.6(20.9)	17.4(22.1)	19.5(25.0)
Current smoking, %	20.7	15.5	13.8	13.5
Family history of colorectal cancer, %	11.3	12.6	12.7	12.6
History of previous lower endoscopy, %	11.7	15.2	16.8	16.5
History of diabetes mellitus, %	7.8	7.0	6.6	6.0
Multivitamin use, %	32.6	42.4	46.5	50.0
Aspirin use, %	43.2	48.6	49.7	50.3
Red meat, servings/d, mean (SD)	1.1(0.7)	1.1(0.6)	1.1(0.6)	1.1(0.6)
Vegetables, servings/d, mean (SD)	2.3(1.2)	2.6(1.2)	2.8(1.2)	3.0(1.3)
Fruits, servings/d, mean (SD)	2.0(1.2)	2.1(1.1)	2.3(1.2)	2.5(1.3)
Alcohol, g/d, mean (SD)	5.2(9.4)	5.6(9.0)	6.6(9.3)	7.3(10.2)
Vitamin D, IU/d, mean (SD)	344 (237)	345(212)	349(223)	362(225)
Calcium, mg/d, mean (SD)	870(366)	915(349)	925(342)	942(345)
Folate, µg/d, mean (SD)	406(249)	438(250)	457(261)	481(267)
Fiber, g/d, mean (SD)	14.0(4.7)	15.8(4.3)	16.3(4.2)	17.4(4.6)

*All variables (except age) are age-standardized. IU: international unit.

Table 2. Relative risks (RR) and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) for colorectal cancer according to total nut consumption

	Frequency of nut consumption (28g/serving)				<i>P</i> _{trend}
	Never	1-3 times/month	Once/week	≥ 2 times/week	
Nut intake, servings/d	0	0.01-0.09	0.10-0.19	≥ 0.20	
Person-years	363,578	936,896	396,362	406,201	
Colorectal					
No, of cases (n=1,503)	231	698	293	281	
Age-adjusted	1.00	1.01 (0.87, 1.17)	0.98 (0.82, 1.17)	0.87 (0.73, 1.04)	0.04
Multivariable I*	1.00	1.00 (0.86, 1.16)	0.97 (0.81, 1.17)	0.86 (0.72, 1.04)	0.04
Multivariable II †	1.00	1.00 (0.86, 1.16)	0.98 (0.82, 1.17)	0.87 (0.72, 1.05)	0.06
Colon					
No, of cases (n=1,147)	169	540	226	212	
Age-adjusted	1.00	1.06 (0.89, 1.26)	1.02 (0.83, 1.25)	0.88 (0.72, 1.09)	0.05
Multivariable I*	1.00	1.04 (0.87, 1.24)	1.00 (0.81, 1.23)	0.86 (0.69, 1.06)	0.03
Multivariable II †	1.00	1.04 (0.87, 1.24)	1.00 (0.81, 1.23)	0.86 (0.70, 1.07)	0.04
Rectum					
No, of cases (n=323)	55	147	60	61	
Age-adjusted	1.00	0.92 (0.67, 1.26)	0.89 (0.61, 1.29)	0.85 (0.59, 1.23)	0.43
Multivariable I*	1.00	0.93 (0.68, 1.28)	0.92 (0.63, 1.34)	0.88 (0.60, 1.30)	0.60
Multivariable II †	1.00	0.93 (0.67, 1.28)	0.92 (0.62, 1.34)	0.89 (0.60, 1.31)	0.64

* Adjusted for age (month), physical activity (metabolic-equivalents/week, quintiles), family history of colorectal cancer (yes/no), history of previous lower endoscopy (yes/no), history of ulcerative colitis (yes/no), history of polyps (yes/no), aspirin use (<1, 1-3, 3.1-7, >7 tablets/week), multivitamin use (yes/no), pack-years of smoking (never smoker, 1-9, 10-24,25-44, and ≥ 45 pack-years), alcohol intake (never, 0.1-5, 5.1-15, > 15 g/d), and total energy intake (kcal, continuous).

† Multivariable I plus body-mass index (<22, 22-22.9, 23-24.9, 25-28.9, ≥29 kg/m²) and history of diabetes mellitus (yes/no).

Table 3. Total nut consumption and risk of colorectal cancer, stratified by BMI and physical activity *

	Cases	Person-years	Frequency of nut consumption (28g serving)				P_{trend}	$P_{\text{interaction}}$
			Never	1-3 times/month	Once/week	≥ 2 times/week		
Nut intake, servings/d			0	0.01-0.09	0.10-0.19	≥ 0.20		
Body mass index (BMI)								0.14
< 25 kg/m ²	603	943,976	1.00	0.85 (0.66, 1.08)	0.88 (0.67, 1.17)	0.91 (0.69, 1.20)	0.93	
≥ 25 kg/m ²	733	905,415	1.00	1.13 (0.90, 1.42)	1.11 (0.85, 1.45)	0.82 (0.62, 1.09)	0.01	
Physical activity†								0.20
High physical activity	693	1,080,247	1.00	0.97 (0.77, 1.24)	0.95 (0.72, 1.25)	0.78 (0.59, 1.03)	0.02	
Low physical activity	755	910,096	1.00	1.04 (0.84, 1.30)	1.04 (0.80, 1.34)	1.01 (0.78, 1.32)	0.89	
BMI and Physical activity								0.94
BMI<25 and high physical activity	318	565,384	1.00	0.90 (0.63, 1.27)	0.80 (0.53, 1.19)	0.78 (0.53, 1.17)	0.27	
Intermediate group	603	800,522	1.00	1.00 (0.78, 1.29)	1.13 (0.84, 1.50)	0.96 (0.71, 1.30)	0.72	
BMI \geq 25 and low physical activity	399	458,321	1.00	1.07 (0.79, 1.44)	1.01 (0.71, 1.45)	0.78 (0.53, 1.15)	0.07	

*Adjusted for age (month), physical activity (metabolic-equivalents/week, quintiles), family history of colorectal cancer (yes/no), history of previous lower endoscopy (yes/no), history of ulcerative colitis (yes/no), history of polyps (yes/no), aspirin use (<1, 1-3, 3.1-7, >7 tablets/week), multivitamin use (yes/no), pack-years of smoking (never smoker, 1-9, 10-24,25-44, and ≥ 45 pack-years), alcohol intake (never, 0.1-5, 5.1-15, > 15 g/d), and total energy intake (kcal, continuous), body-mass index (<22, 22-22.9, 23-24.9, 25-28.9, ≥ 29 kg/m²), and history of diabetes mellitus (yes/no).

† High physical activity group was defined by metabolic-equivalents/week more than the median level; low physical activity group was defined by metabolic-equivalents per week less than or equal to median level.