Fruit and Vegetable Intakes Are Associated with Lower Risk of Breast Fibroadenomas in Chinese Women^{1–3}

Zakia Coriaty Nelson,⁴ Roberta M. Ray,⁵ Chunyuan Wu,⁵ Helge Stalsberg,⁶ Peggy Porter,⁵ Johanna W. Lampe,⁵ Jackilen Shannon,⁷ Neilann Horner,⁵ Wenjin Li,⁵ Wenwan Wang,⁸ Yongwei Hu,⁹ Daoli Gao,⁸ and David B. Thomas⁵*

⁴National Center for Health Statistics, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Hyattsville, MD 20782; ⁵Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center, Seattle, WA 98109; ⁶Institute of Medical Biology, University of Tromsø, N-9035, Tromsø, Norway; ⁷Oregon Health and Science University, Portland, OR 97239; ⁸Department of Epidemiology, Zhong Shan Hospital Cancer Center, Shanghai 200052, China; and ⁹Department of Pathology, Shi Dong Hospital, Shanghai 200438, China

Abstract

Fibroadenomas are common benign breast conditions among women and account for ~50% of breast biopsies performed. Dietary factors are known to influence benign breast conditions in the aggregate, but little is known of their association specifically with fibroadenoma. Our objective in this study was to evaluate the association between dietary and other factors and fibroadenoma risk. A case-control study, nested in a randomized trial of breast self-examination (BSE) in Chinese textile workers in Shanghai, China, was conducted between 1989 and 2000. The study sample included 327 affected women and 1070 controls. Women were administered a FFQ and a questionnaire that elicited reproductive and gynecological history and other information. Odds ratios, as estimates of relative risks, were calculated using multivariate conditional logistic regression. Significant decreasing trends in risk of fibroadenoma were observed with intake of fruits and vegetables and with number of live births, and a reduced risk was also associated with natural menopause, oral contraceptive use, and moderate exercise (walking and gardening). Increased risk of fibroadenoma was associated with heavy physical activity in one's 20s, breast cancer in a first-degree relative, and a history of prior benign breast lumps; and significant increasing trends in risk were observed with numbers of BSE per year and years of education. In conclusion, a diet rich in fruits and vegetables and the use of oral contraceptives may reduce risk of fibroadenoma. J. Nutr. 140: 1294–1301, 2010.

Introduction

Fibroadenomas are benign lesions that arise in the terminal duct lobular unit of the breast and usually present during a woman's reproductive years (1–3). They are the most common breast lesions in U.S. women <25 y of age (4) and account for 50% of all breast biopsies performed (5). In Western populations, fibroadenomas are present in 7–13% of patients examined in breast clinics (6) and ~1 in 350 women in Shanghai may be diagnosed with a fibroadenoma before the age of 60 y (7). Incidence rates in adult women decrease with age (7), particularly at menopause (8,9). Because their presence often leads to diagnostic procedures to rule out malignant disease, women with a fibroadenoma can experience considerable psychological distress, financial burden, and further health complications. The role of diet in the etiology of fibroadenoma has not been extensively investigated. Studies of nutritional factors in relation to benign breast diseases in the aggregate that have included women with fibroadenomas have yielded inconclusive results (10–13), and 1 study reported that the risk of fibroadenoma tended to be inversely associated with the intake of β -carotene and vitamin C (14).

Several hormonal risk factors for fibroadenoma have been identified. An earlier prospective study in Shanghai demonstrated a strong decrease in risk of fibroadenoma with increasing parity (7), but results of prior studies elsewhere have been inconsistent (4,8,15–18). Increased risk has been related to estrogen replacement therapy (19–21), endogenous estrogen levels (22), premenstrual mastalgia (15), and polymorphisms in genes responsible for the production of estrogen-metabolizing enzymes (23). Cigarette smoking has antiestrogenic effects (24– 28) and has been related to reduced risk (29–31) as have combined oral contraceptives (7,23), suggesting that progestins may be protective (17,32). Given these findings, dietary behaviors that decrease endogenous estrogen exposure may also be important in reducing fibroadenoma risk. We conducted the

© 2010 American Society for Nutrition. Manuscript received December 7, 2009. Initial review completed January 7, 2010. Revision accepted May 4, 2010.

First published online May 19, 2010; doi:10.3945/jn.109.119719.

¹ This study was funded by US National Cancer Institute grant R01CA75332.

² Author disclosures: Z. Coriaty Nelson, R. M. Ray, C. Wu, H. Stalsberg, P. Porter, J. W. Lampe, J. Shannon, N. Horner, W. Li, W. Wang, Y. Hu, D. Gao, and D. B. Thomas, no conflicts of interest.

³ Supplemental Table 1 is available with the online posting of this paper at jn. nutrition.org.

^{*} To whom correspondence should be addressed. E-mail: dbthomas@fhcrc.org.

present study to assess the role of nutritional factors in the etiology of fibroadenomas as well as to elucidate further the role of hormonal and other factors in the etiology of this condition.

Methods

Study setting and participants. This study was nested within a randomized trial of breast self-examination $(BSE)^{10}$ in the Shanghai Textile Industry Bureau (STIB) (33,34). A total of 266,064 women born between 1925 and 1958 were interviewed and enrolled into the trial between 1989 and 1991 and followed through July of 2000. All women received their primary medical care in clinics in their factory of employment. When a woman developed a breast problem, she was evaluated by a medical worker in her factory clinic and, if indicated, referred for further evaluation and treatment to 1 of 3 hospitals operated by the STIB or to other hospitals that had contractual agreements with individual factories. The histologic diagnosis was abstracted from the pathology records of all women with confirmed benign or malignant breast lesions. Histological slides of all tumors were sent to Seattle for future review.

All women who were diagnosed with histologically confirmed fibroadenoma at 1 of the 3 STIB hospitals between September 1995 and July 2000 and who had no prior or concurrent breast malignancy were eligible for this study. Of the 381 eligible women, 327 (85.9%) were interviewed. These cases were selected as part of 2 studies that also included women with fibrocystic conditions and breast cancer, 1 conducted between September 1995 and August 1997 (35) and the other between September 1997 and July 2000 (36).

Control women for the present study were also selected in conjunction with these 2 concurrent investigations. In both studies, they were randomly selected from women in the BSE trial with no breast biopsy. For each benign and malignant case enrolled in the first study, 20 potential controls of the same age were randomly selected and listed. Potential controls were contacted, starting with the first 2 names on the list, until 2 women of the same age and menstrual status as their matched case were recruited. A total of 367 controls were recruited in this manner (64% of the eligible women contacted). Controls for the cases that were enrolled in the second study were frequency matched to cases by 5-y age group and hospital affiliation of their factories at baseline. Then 703 (82%) of 862 controls selected in this manner were interviewed. In the present study, the individual matching in the first study was not retained and the cases were compared with all interviewed controls from both studies.

Validation of diagnoses. A reference pathologist reviewed slides from 158 of the 327 fibroadenomas without knowing the initial diagnosis (7): 136 (86.1%) were identified as fibroadenoma, 6 (3.8%) as "phyllodes tumor," and 16 (10.1%) as other benign breast conditions. Because of this high concordance, the diagnoses made by the pathologists in Shanghai were used for this investigation.

Data collection. Cases were interviewed in hospital clinics prior to biopsy. Controls were interviewed in their home or factory by the same team of interviewers that interviewed the cases. Informed consent was obtained from each woman prior to interview. The study was approved by the Institutional Review Boards of the Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center and the Station for Prevention and Treatment of Cancer of the STIB, in accordance with an assurance filed with the Office for Human Research Protections of the US Department of Health and Human Services.

Information was ascertained on accepted and suspected risk factors for breast cancer, alcohol and smoking habits, and physical activity. Information on prior breast surgery was obtained from the baseline questionnaire for the BSE trial. A FFQ, based on a previously validated instrument (37,38) was used to assess the frequency of consumption of 99 types of food during adult life. Seasonality of fruits and vegetables was accounted for by asking participants to report how many months of the year they consumed each item.

Data analysis. The foods were categorized into 19 mutually exclusive groups (13). The annual frequencies of intake for the foods in each group were summed to create total values for consumption of all foods in the group. For sesame and soybean oil, the amount consumed by each participant per day was estimated by dividing the amount of each oil used by her family per day by the number of family members. Intake of fruits and vegetables was classified further into groups based on botanical taxonomy (13). A complete listing of the botanical groupings and their respective foods is in **Supplemental Table 1**.

Portion size was estimated from the median portion size reported by women in the 1992 Chinese Health and Nutrition Survey or from defined standard portion sizes from Bowes and Church (39). The nutrient composition of each food item was based on data from Chinese Food Composition Tables (40). The amount of any specific nutrient in each food was summed over all foods in the frequencies eaten to estimate total intake of specific macronutrients and micronutrients and total energy intake (based on macronutrients, cooking oils, and alcohol). Proportions of energy from fat, protein, and carbohydrates were calculated by multiplying the grams of the macronutrient consumed per day by the kJ/g (38 for fat and 17 for carbohydrates and protein) and dividing by total daily energy intake.

Dietary intakes of interest were categorized into quartiles based on the distribution of consumption in the controls. Dichotomous variables were created when too little variation precluded division into quartiles. The age-adjusted odds ratio (OR) and corresponding 95% CI associated with each variable were estimated using multivariate conditional logistic regression (41). Because controls were interviewed after their corresponding cases, all analyses were conditioned on year of interview (1995–1996, 1997, 1998–1999, 2000–2001), as well as age (<40, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45–50, 51–59, 60–69 y).

Statistical models for food groups were further adjusted for total energy intake (42) and models for botanical families and nutrients were adjusted for total intake of fruits and vegetables. The significance of trends in risk with level of exposure was calculated by assigning scores to the categorized levels of exposure and treating the scores as a continuous variable in the regression models. For sample sizes smaller than 5, exact logistic regression was used to calculate OR and 95% CI estimates. Parity was included in all dietary models; it was the only nondietary factor found to be a confounder of some of the other relationships.

The associations of each food and botanical group with risk of fibroadenoma were also examined in multiple nutrient density models (42). The nutritional density was computed for each food group (food group intake/total daily energy) and entered with total daily energy, age, and parity in a multiple logistic regression model, conditioned on year of interview.

To test for multiplicative interactions, the likelihood ratio test was used to measure the difference in the deviance between a model with and without a set of interaction terms (41).

Results

General risk factors. Because the controls were selected for women with all breast conditions, including breast cancer and fibrocystic conditions as well as fibroadenomas, as expected, the fibroadenoma cases were younger than the combined control group utilized in this study (**Table 1**); 96% of the 327 cases were younger than 50 y. Compared with menstruating women of the same age, women who had gone through natural menopause were at reduced risk (**Table 2**). Too few cases were postmenopausal to adequately assess risk in relation to age at menopause. Risk decreased significantly with number of live births after adjusting for age at first live birth, but risk was not significantly associated with age at first live birth after adjusting for number of live births. After adjustment for parity, risk was not associated

¹⁰ Abbreviations used: BSE, breast self-examination; OR, odds ratio; STIB, Shanghai Textile Industry Bureau.

 TABLE 1
 Age distribution of breast fibroadenoma cases and controls

	Ca	Cases		Controls		
Age, y	п	%	п	%		
35–39	70	21.4	13	1.2		
40-44	193	59.0	470	43.9		
45–49	52	15.9	219	20.5		
50–59	7	2.1	124	11.6		
≥60	5	1.5	244	22.8		
Total	327	100.0	1070	100.0		

with duration of lactation. None of these associations were appreciably altered by controlling for dietary variables.

Use of oral contraceptives was significantly associated with a reduced risk. Too few women were long-term users to assess risk in relation to duration of use. We did not observe any significant trends in risk with age at menarche or numbers of miscarriages, stillbirths, or abortions, and no association was observed with outcome of first pregnancy, use of an intrauterine device, or hysterectomy (not shown). Too few women had used contraceptive injections or had an oophorectomy or tubal ligation to assess their possible influence on risk.

We did not observe any significant associations with weight or BMI (not shown). Risk was not related to overall physical activity between the ages of 20 and 49 y. However, heavy physical activity in one's 20s was significantly associated with an increased risk, and ever regularly walking and gardening, which presumably reflect more moderate and recent behavior, were associated with a reduced risk. A reduced risk was also observed in relation to running regularly [OR (95% CI) = 0.3, (0.1–1.9)] and ever smoking [OR (95% CI) = 0.6 (0.1–2.7)], but the OR estimates are based on small numbers of runners and smokers and have wide CI. No association was observed with alcohol use or spousal smoking (not shown).

Risk tended to be greater, but was not significant, in women with a first-degree female relative with breast cancer; it was unchanged after adjustment for prior benign breast lumps and practice of BSE. Risk increased with increasing educational level and this trend was not attenuated after adjustment for practice of BSE. Risk was increased in women with a history of benign breast lumps, but no trend in risk was observed with number of lumps. Risk increased with frequency of BSE. The associations with benign breast lumps and frequency of BSE remained significant after adjustment for each other and BSE was not associated with any other risk factor identified (not shown). Clinical breast examination was associated with a 50% increase in risk [OR (95% CI) = 1.5: (1.1, 2.3)]. Although strong decreasing trends in risk were observed with times since last BSE and last clinical breast examination (not shown; P-value for both trends < 0.001), these associations may reflect breast examinations that resulted in diagnoses that led to the participants' entry into the study.

Food groups. Because risk was somewhat higher in the lowest quartile of daily energy intake than in the other 3 quartiles (Table 3), we included energy intake in models that assessed risk in relation to specific food groups. There were significant decreasing trends in risk with increasing consumption of both fruits and vegetables. The results for vegetables were similar across strata of fruit intake and vice versa (not shown). Risk was not significantly associated with soy foods or other legumes,

1296 Coriaty Nelson et al.

TABLE 2	Risk of breast fibroadenomas in Chinese women in
	relation to general risk factors

Exposure	Cases, n = 327	Controls, <i>n</i> = 1070	0R ¹	95% CI	<i>P-</i> trend ²
Menonause					
No	305	687	1 0	Reference	
Yes	22	383	0.3		
Rosen for monopouso	22	505	0.5	0.2, 0.0	
Natural	ō	221	0.1	01 02	
Surgical	9 12	50	1.5	0.1, 0.3	
Sulyical	13	00	1.5	0.0, 3.0	
Livebirtins, 77	10	44			
None	10	41	1.0		
1	300	/13	1.0	Reference	
2	IZ	124	0.2	0.1, 0.5	-0.0045
≥3	5	188	0.1	0.04, 0.4	<0.001°
Age at first live birth,", y					
≤24	24	273	1.0	Reference	
25–29	227	600	1.1	0.6, 2.3	
≥30	66	152	1.3	0.6, 2.8	0.54
Duration of lactation,' mo					
Never	72	188	1.0	Reference	
≤ 6	89	209	1.2	0.7, 2.1	
>6	156	628	1.1	0.6, 1.8	0.93
Oral contraceptive use					
Never	316	978	1.0	Reference	
Ever	11	92	0.4	0.2, 0.9	
Physical activity in twenties					
Light	89	224	1.0	Reference	
Medium	175	648	1.2	0.8, 1.9	
Heavy	64	198	1.9	1.1, 3.4	0.04
Walking					
Never	313	947	1.0	Reference	
Ever	14	122	0.3	0.1, 0.5	
Gardening					
Never	322	1,016	1.0	Reference	
Ever	5	54	0.3	0.1, 0.9	
First-degree relative					
with breast cancer					
Never	320	1,053	1.0	Reference	
Ever	7	17	3.2	0.8, 13.6	
Education					
Elementary school or lower	11	211	1.0	Reference	
Middle school	301	827	3.0	1.2, 7.0	
Colleae or higher	15	31	4.1	1.2, 13.7	0.01
Prior benian breast lump ⁸⁻¹⁰				,	
Never	259	1.010	1.0	Reference	
Fver	53	32	61	30 126	
Frequency of BSE ^{10,11}	50	02	0.1	0.0, 12.0	
Never	131	725	10	Reference	
1_6 times/v	75	137	2 N	12 35	
7_{12} times/y	7 J 11 3	192	∠.∪ 3.2	1.2, J.J 20 51	
>13 times/v	7	7	9.2 9.1	14 58 1	< 0 001
— 10 times/ y	/	/	J.U	1. 4 , JU.1	~0.001

¹ Adjusted for age, stratified on year of interview.

² Test for trend, baseline category included unless otherwise noted.

³ Additionally adjusted for age at first live birth.

⁴ Includes nulligravid women.

⁵ Test for trend among exposed; baseline category excluded.

⁶ Additionally adjusted for number of live births.

⁷ Restricted to parous women.

⁸ Additionally adjusted for practice of BSE.

⁹ At administration of baseline questionnaire.

¹⁰ Women with unknown values excluded from analyses.

¹¹ Additionally adjusted for prior benign breast lump.

TABLE 3	Risk of breast fibroadenomas in Chinese women in
	relation to energy intake and absolute intake of food
	groups

TABLE 3 Continued

Exposure	Cases, n = 327	Controls, <i>n</i> = 1070	OR ¹	95% CI	<i>P-</i> trend
Energy intake k 1/d					
< 6892	98	267	1 0	Reference	
6892-7817	85	268	0.7	0411	
7818-8904	80	268	0.6	0.4 1.0	
>8904	64	267	0.7	0412	0.12
Fruit intake times/v	0.	207	0.7	0.1, 1.2	0.12
< 202	74	268	10	Reference	
202-306	85	267	0.8	0414	
>306 to <435	84	268	0.6	0.4.1.2	
>435	84	267	0.0	0.2 0.8	0 004
Venetable intake ² times/ v	04	207	0.4	0.2, 0.0	0.004
<538	89	268	1 በ	Reference	
≥538_735	81	268	0.6		
>735-957	76	268	0.0	0.4 1 3	
>957	81	266	0.7	0.4, 1.0	0 007
Dairy intake times/y	01	200	0.4	0.2, 0.7	0.007
<12	78	252	1 በ	Reference	
>12-134	98	279	1.0		
> 12/134	9/	267	1.0	0.0, 1.7	
> 375 3	57	207	1.2	0.7, 2.1	0.75
Rice intake times/d	57	212	1.0	0.0, 1.0	0.75
>1	5	8	1 በ	Reference	
2	95 95	378	0.4		
3	237	68/	0.4	0.03, 3.0	0.20
Other arain product intake ³	237	004	0.0	0.1, 4.2	0.20
times/u					
<163	96	267	1.0	Roforanco	
103 164_284	50 76	207	1.0		
285_152	70 97	200	1.0	0.0, 1.0	
20J-4J2 \/IE2	68	207	1.4	0.0, 2.3	0.06
Preserved vegetable intake	00	211	1.0	0.3, 3.4	0.00
times/v					
<5	66	252	1.0	Roforanco	
<u></u> 5_16	70	275	0.5		
25-10 17-56	80	273	0.5	0.3, 1.0	
>56	111	275	0.7	0.4, 1.2	0.29
Sov food intako ⁴ timos/v		270	0.7	0.4, 1.1	0.23
<121	88	266	1.0	Reference	
>121_219	100	200	0.8		
>719_369	7/	203	0.0 N Q	0.5, 1.4	
>219-303	65	207	0.0	0.3, 1.3	0.1/
Formonted been curd	00	200	0.0	0.4, 1.1	0.14
intako					
Novor	110	116	1.0	Roforanco	
Ever	200	624	1.0		
Other legume intake	209	024	1.1	0.7, 1.0	
timos //					
(1111es/y ~07.7	02	260	1.0	Poforonco	
 07137 ຊ	ອວ ດາ	200 2€2	1.U 0.0		
J./-1J/.0	<u>ბ</u> კ	207	U.9	U.J, I./	
> 137.0-201.2	۲۵ مح	20/ 200	1.0	U.D, I.8	0.00
>ZUI.Z	/U	268	U.6	0.3, 1.0	0.09
neu meat intake," <i>times/y</i>	00	007	1.0	Deferre	
≤148 > 140,000	62	267	1.0	Keterence	
>148-220	66	259	1.0	U.5, 1.8	
>220-302	83	273	1.1	0.6, 2.1	c
>302	116	271	0.9	0.5, 1.6	0.73

10		/1
11:01	ntiniii	ndi
11.111	11111111	-111
1001	1011100	Jul

Exposure	Cases, n = 327	Controls, <i>n</i> = 1070	0R ¹	95% CI	<i>P-</i> trend
Fish intake, ⁶ <i>times/y</i>					
≤65	68	266	1.0	Reference	
>65-116	84	327	0.9	0.5, 1.5	
>116-168	83	233	1.1	0.6, 2.0	
>168	92	244	0.9	0.5. 1.7	0.92
Cured meat and fish				,	
intake, <i>times/v</i>					
≤4	77	268	1.0	Reference	
>4–9	99	284	1.1	0.7, 1.9	
>9-16	78	254	1.4	0.8. 2.4	
>16	73	264	0.9	0515	0 77
Poultry intake times/v		201	0.0	0.0, 1.0	0.77
<74	85	255	10	Reference	
24 to <48	83	270	0.9	05 16	
48-64	91	287	1.0	0.6, 1.0	
>64	68	258	1.0	0.6, 1.7	N 97
For intake times/v	00	200	1.0	0.0, 1.7	0.07
<104	69	257	1 0	Reference	
104-156	62	190	1.0	07 23	
>156_311	102	3/6	1.5	0.7, 2.3	
>312	88	277	1.1	0.7, 2.0 Ng 2g	0.16
Shellfish intake	00	211	1.0	0.3, 2.3	0.10
timos/v					
(11) (12)	5/	152	1.0	Roforanco	
12 12 12 12 12	94 80	261	1.0 n a		
12 to < 52	75	201	1.0	0.5, 1.0	
>52	118	1224	0.7	0.3, 2.0	0.36
Sosamo oil intako a/d	110	422	0.7	0.4, 1.5	0.00
	166	227	1.0	Roforanco	
0.55 0.56_1.10	100	115	0.5		
1 11_1 65	10	/62	0.0	0.2, 1.4	
1.11-1.0J	22	402	0.0	0.4, 0.3	0 002
Sovboan oil intako a/d	32	100	0.4	0.2, 0.0	0.002
	10/	262	1.0	Roforanco	
20.0 28 8_38 /	104	202	1.U N Q		
20.0-30.4	104 E4	200	1.0	0.0, 1.0	
30.5−49.3 > 40.2	04 CE	209	1.0	0.0, 1.0	0 50
≥49.0 Fried food intoko	CO	290	0.0	0.0, 1.3	0.59
timoo (v					
unies/y	60	262	1.0	Deference	
≥oo > oo_ca	00	203	1.0		
∕JJ-04	00	211	0.U	U.J, I.I	
>04-122	89 110	205	U.X	U.4, I.4	0.01
	IΙδ	205	U.8	U.4, I.5	U.81
Never	100	EFC	1.0	Deference	
ivever	123	000	1.0		
EVER	204	514	0.9	U.b, 1.4	

¹ Adjusted for age, energy, and parity and stratified on year of interview.

 2 Excluding preserved vegetables, soy, legumes, powders, flavorings, and extracts. 3 Excluding corn and rice.

⁴ Excluding fermented bean curd.

⁵ Excluding cured meats.

⁶ Excluding cured fish.

although a reduced risk of borderline significance was observed for the highest quartiles of consumption of both of these food groups. These findings were similar for both fresh and dried products (not shown). A significant decreasing trend in risk was observed with increasing consumption of sesame oil, but not with soybean oil. There were no significant associations with any of the other food groups shown in Table 3 or with fried

TABLE 4Risk of breast fibroadenomas in Chinese women in
relation to absolute intake of botanical families of
foods

times/yn = 327n = 1070OR195% ClP-trendNo2748611.0ReferenceYes532091.20.7, 2.0Composite ≤ 8 742361.0Reference9-21.21022941.20.7, 2.121.3-56592870.70.4, 1.30.23Convolvaceae/Dioscoreaceae No 1003051.0ReferenceYes2277650.80.5, 1.30.23Convolvaceae/Dioscoreaceae No 1003051.0ReferenceYes2277650.80.5, 1.30.23Courderae $=$ $=$ $=$ $=$ $=$ <161.7962691.0Reference $=379.3$ 532680.80.4, 1.70.60Cucurbitaceae $=$ $=$ $=$ $=$ $= 143$ 862671.00.5, 1.9>243812681.00.5, 2.10.74Laminaiceae $=$ $=$ $=$ $= 2-6$ 852240.70.4, 1.37-13632381.10.6, 2.0>13973450.60.4, 1.00.14Leguminosae $=$ $=$ < 257 932691.0Reference $2-57$ 932691.0Reference $2-57$ 932651.00.6, 1.8 $=555.1$ 74277	Exposure,	Cases,	Controls,			
Araliaceae No 274 861 1.0 Reference Yes 53 209 1.2 0.7, 2.0 Composite \leq 8 74 226 1.0 Reference 9–21.2 102 294 1.2 0.7, 2.1 21.3–56 92 253 1.0 0.5, 1.7 >56 59 267 0.7 0.4, 1.3 0.23 Convolvaceae/Dioscoreaceae No 100 305 1.0 Reference 161.8 257 765 0.8 0.5, 1.3 Cruciferae - 11 0.6, 1.9 >251–379.2 91 267 1.0 0.5, 1.8 \geq 379.3 53 268 0.3 0.7, 2.4 >186 267 1.0 Reference \leq 143 66 267 1.0 Reference 266 1.3 0.7, 2.4 >188.6 28 1.3 0.7, 2.4 >188 26 1.0 0.5, 1.9 >243 81 266 <th>times/y</th> <th>n = 327</th> <th><i>n</i> = 1070</th> <th>OR^1</th> <th>95% CI</th> <th>P-trend</th>	times/y	n = 327	<i>n</i> = 1070	OR^1	95% CI	P-trend
Na 274 861 1.0 Reference Yes 53 209 1.2 0.7, 2.0 Compositae - - 0.7, 2.1 0.7, 2.1 21.3 56 52 253 1.0 0.5, 1.7 >56 59 287 0.7 0.4, 1.3 0.23 Convolvaceae/Dioscoreaeeae No 100 305 1.0 Reference Yes 227 765 0.8 0.5, 1.3 Crucifrae <161.7	Aralianan					
No 2.74 OIT 1.0 Interence Yes 53 209 1.2 0.7, 2.0 Compositae -21.2 102 294 1.2 0.7, 2.1 21.3-56 52 253 10 0.5, 1.7 >56 59 287 0.7 0.4, 1.3 0.23 Convolvaceae/Dioscreaceae No 100 305 1.0 Reference Yes 227 765 0.8 0.5, 1.3 Cruciferae <161.7	No	274	861	1.0	Roforonco	
Tes 3.3 2.03 1.2 0.7, 2.0 Composite ≤ 3 7.4 236 1.0 Reference 9-21.2 102 294 1.2 0.7, 2.1 21.3-56 92 253 1.0 0.5, 1.7 >56 59 207 0.4, 1.3 0.23 Convolvaceae/Dioscoreaceae No 100 305 1.0 Reference 161.8-251 87 266 1.1 0.6, 1.9 >251-379.2 91 267 1.0 0.5, 1.8 ≥ 379.3 33 268 1.3 0.7, 2.4 >186 >33 27, 2.4 >184.6 98 268 1.3 0.7, 2.4 >186 >243 81 268 1.0 0.5, 1.1 >243 81 268 1.0 0.5, 2.1 0.74 Laminariaceae ≤ 24 0.7 0.4, 1.3 0.71 ≤ 257 93 269 1.0 Reference $257-31 92 266 1.4 0.8, 2.4 320-55 74 267$	NU	Z/4 52	200	1.0		
Construction of the set of the	Compositao	55	203	1.2	0.7, 2.0	
So 74 2.0 1.0 Interence 9-21.2 102 294 12 0.7, 2.1 21.3-56 92 253 1.0 0.5, 1.7 >56 59 207 0.4, 1.3 0.23 Convolvaceae/Dioscoreaceae No 100 305 1.0 Reference Ves 227 765 0.8 0.5, 1.3 Cruciferae ≤11.7 96 269 1.0 Reference ≤143 86 267 1.0 0.5, 1.9 >243 81 268 1.0 0.5, 2.1 0.74 Laminariaceae ≤27 93 269 1.0 Reference 2757 93 269 1.0 Reference		74	236	1.0	Boforonco	
3-21.2 102 294 1.2 0.7, 2.1 >56 59 267 0.7 0.4, 1.3 0.23 Convolvaceae/Dioscoreaceae No 100 305 1.0 Reference Yes 227 765 0.8 0.5, 1.3 Cruciferae <161.7	≥o 0.21.2	102	230	1.0		
213-30 92 233 1.0 0.5, 1.7 >>56 59 287 0.7 0.4, 1.3 0.23 Convolvaceae/Disscoreacceae 0.8 0.5, 1.3 0.7 0.4, 1.3 0.23 Cruciferae - - - 0.8 0.5, 1.3 0.7 0.4, 1.3 0.23 Clourbiaceae - - 100 305 1.0 Reference - 161.8-251 87 266 1.1 0.6, 1.9 - - - - - 0.5, 1.8 - - - 0.60 0.5, 1.8 - - 0.60 0.5, 1.9 - 0.60 0.00	9-21.2 21.2 EG	102	254	1.Z	U.7, Z.1	
>36 37 27 0.7	21.3-30	92	200	1.0	0.0, 1.7	0.22
No 100 305 1.0 Reference Yes 277 765 0.8 0.5, 1.3 Cruciferae -	>00	59	287	0.7	0.4, 1.3	0.23
No 100 305 1.0 Reterence Yes 227 765 0.8 0.5, 1.3 Cruciferae - - - - - <161.7	CUIIVUIVaceae/DIU:	100	205	1.0	Deference	
Yes 227 765 0.8 0.5, 1.3 Cruciferae - <t< td=""><td>NO</td><td>100</td><td>305</td><td>1.0</td><td>Reterence</td><td></td></t<>	NO	100	305	1.0	Reterence	
Crucierate <161.7	Yes	227	/65	0.8	0.5, 1.3	
< 161.7	Cruciferae	00		4.0	D (
161.8-251 87 266 1.1 0.6, 1.9 >251-379.2 91 267 1.0 0.5, 1.8 \geq 379.3 53 268 0.8 0.4, 1.7 0.60 Cucurbitaceae \leq 143 86 267 1.0 Reference \leq 143-188.6 98 268 1.3 0.7, 2.4 >188.6-243 62 267 1.0 0.5, 1.9 >243 81 268 1.0 0.5, 2.1 0.74 Laminariaceae \leq 1 82 263 1.0 Reference \leq -6 85 224 0.7 0.4, 1.3 7.13 63 238 1.1 0.6, 2.0 >13 97 345 0.6 0.4, 1.0 0.14 Leguminosae <257 93 269 1.0 Reference 38 255 51 74 267 1.0 0.6, 1.8 39 35 33 33 33 34 34 36 36 36 36 36 36 36 33 31 35 36	<161.7	96	269	1.0	Reference	
>251-37.9.2 91 267 1.0 0.5, 1.8 ≥379.3 53 268 0.8 0.4, 1.7 0.60 Cucurbitaceae ≤143 86 267 1.0 Reference >143-188.6 98 268 1.3 0.7, 2.4 >188.6-243 62 267 1.0 0.5, 1.9 >243 81 268 1.0 0.5, 2.1 0.74 Laminariaceae ≤1 82 263 1.0 Reference 2-6 85 224 0.7 0.4, 1.3 7-13 63 238 1.1 0.6, 2.0 >13 97 345 0.6 0.4, 1.0 0.14 Leguminosae <257 93 269 1.0 Reference 257-381 92 266 1.4 0.8, 2.4 382-555.1 74 267 1.0 0.6, 1.8 ≥555.2 68 268 1.0 0.5, 1.7 0.63 Liliaceae ≤38 122 267 1.0 Reference ≤38 122 267 1.0 Reference ≤39-156 96 265 0.9 0.6, 1.5 157-370.9 65 264 1.3 0.7, 2.3 ≥371 44 274 0.5 0.3, 0.9 0.16 Nymphaeceae <2 100 256 1.0 Reference 2-3 54 239 0.6 0.3, 1.1 >3-5 84 266 1.0 0.6, 1.8 ≥6 89 309 0.9 0.5, 1.5 0.95 Rosaceae ≤49 67 265 1.0 Reference ≤49 67 265 1.0 Reference >49-99.5 81 270 1.0 0.5, 1.8 100-188.6 98 269 0.8 0.4, 1.4 >100-188.6 98 269 0.8 0.4, 1.4 >100-198.6 98 269 0.8 0.4, 1.4 >100-	161.8–251	87	266	1.1	0.6, 1.9	
	>251-379.2	91	267	1.0	0.5, 1.8	
Cucurbitaceae ≤ 143 86 267 1.0 Reference >143-188.6 98 268 1.3 0.7, 2.4 >188.6-243 62 267 1.0 0.5, 1.9 >243 81 268 1.0 0.5, 2.1 0.74 Laminariaceae ≤1 82 263 1.0 Reference 2-6 85 224 0.7 0.4, 1.3 7 -13 63 238 1.1 0.6, 2.0 >13 97 345 0.6 0.4, 1.0 0.14 Leguminosae - - 257 93 269 1.0 Reference <257,381	≥379.3	53	268	0.8	0.4, 1.7	0.60
	Cucurbitaceae					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	≤143	86	267	1.0	Reference	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	>143-188.6	98	268	1.3	0.7, 2.4	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	>188.6-243	62	267	1.0	0.5, 1.9	
Laminariaceae ≤1 82 263 1.0 Reference 2-6 85 224 0.7 0.4, 1.3 7-13 63 238 1.1 0.6, 2.0 >13 97 345 0.6 0.4, 1.0 0.14 Leguminosae <257 93 269 1.0 Reference 257-381 92 266 1.4 0.8, 2.4 382-555.1 74 267 1.0 0.6, 1.8 ≥555.2 68 268 1.0 0.5, 1.7 0.63 Liliaceae ≤38 122 267 1.0 Reference 39-156 96 265 0.9 0.6, 1.5 157-370.9 65 264 1.3 0.7, 2.3 ≥371 44 274 0.5 0.3, 0.9 0.16 Nymphaeceae < 2 100 256 1.0 Reference 2-3 54 239 0.6 0.3, 1.1 >3-5 84 266 1.0 0.6, 1.8 ≥6 89 309 0.9 0.5, 1.5 0.95 Rosaceae ≤49 67 265 1.0 Reference ≤49 67 265 1.0 Reference ≤49 67 265 1.0 Reference ≤49 67 265 1.0 Reference ≤13 78 282 1.0 Reference ≤2 93 217 1.0 Reference 	>243	81	268	1.0	0.5, 2.1	0.74
$ \leq 1 \qquad 82 \qquad 263 \qquad 1.0 \qquad \text{Reference} \\ 2-6 \qquad 85 \qquad 224 \qquad 0.7 \qquad 0.4, 1.3 \\ 7-13 \qquad 63 \qquad 238 \qquad 1.1 \qquad 0.6, 2.0 \\ >13 \qquad 97 \qquad 345 \qquad 0.6 \qquad 0.4, 1.0 \qquad 0.14 \\ \text{Leguminosae} \\ <257 \qquad 93 \qquad 269 \qquad 1.0 \qquad \text{Reference} \\ 257-381 \qquad 92 \qquad 266 \qquad 1.4 \qquad 0.8, 2.4 \\ 382-555.1 \qquad 74 \qquad 267 \qquad 1.0 \qquad 0.6, 1.8 \\ \ge 555.2 \qquad 68 \qquad 268 \qquad 1.0 \qquad 0.5, 1.7 \qquad 0.63 \\ \text{Liliaceae} \\ \\ \leq 38 \qquad 122 \qquad 267 \qquad 1.0 \qquad \text{Reference} \\ 39-156 \qquad 96 \qquad 265 \qquad 0.9 \qquad 0.6, 1.5 \\ 157-370.9 \qquad 65 \qquad 264 \qquad 1.3 \qquad 0.7, 2.3 \\ \ge 371 \qquad 44 \qquad 274 \qquad 0.5 \qquad 0.3, 0.9 \qquad 0.16 \\ \text{Nymphaeceae} \\ \\ < 2 \qquad 100 \qquad 256 \qquad 1.0 \qquad \text{Reference} \\ 2-3 \qquad 54 \qquad 239 \qquad 0.6 \qquad 0.3, 1.1 \\ >3-5 \qquad 84 \qquad 266 \qquad 1.0 \qquad 0.6, 1.8 \\ \ge 6 \qquad 89 \qquad 309 \qquad 0.9 \qquad 0.5, 1.5 \qquad 0.95 \\ \text{Rosaceae} \\ \\ \\ \leq 49 \qquad 67 \qquad 265 \qquad 1.0 \qquad \text{Reference} \\ \leq 49 \qquad 67 \qquad 265 \qquad 1.0 \qquad \text{Reference} \\ \leq 49 \qquad 67 \qquad 265 \qquad 1.0 \qquad \text{Reference} \\ >49-99.5 \qquad 81 \qquad 270 \qquad 1.0 \qquad 0.5, 1.8 \\ 100-188.6 \qquad 98 \qquad 269 \qquad 0.8 \qquad 0.4, 1.4 \\ >188.6 \qquad 81 \qquad 266 \qquad 0.9 \qquad 0.5, 1.9 \qquad 0.71 \\ \text{Rutaceae} \\ \\ \\ \leq 13 \qquad 78 \qquad 282 \qquad 1.0 \qquad \text{Reference} \\ = 13 \qquad 78 \qquad 282 \qquad 1.0 \qquad \text{Reference} \\ = 13 \qquad 78 \qquad 282 \qquad 1.0 \qquad \text{Reference} \\ = 13 \qquad 78 \qquad 282 \qquad 1.0 \qquad \text{Reference} \\ = 213 \qquad 78 \qquad 282 \qquad 1.0 \qquad \text{Reference} \\ \\ \leq 13 \qquad 78 \qquad 282 \qquad 1.0 \qquad \text{Reference} \\ = 413 \qquad 78 \qquad 282 \qquad 1.0 \qquad \text{Reference} \\ = 213 \qquad 78 \qquad 282 \qquad 1.0 \qquad \text{Reference} \\ = 213 \qquad 78 \qquad 282 \qquad 1.0 \qquad \text{Reference} \\ = 413 \qquad 78 \qquad 282 \qquad 1.0 \qquad \text{Reference} \\ = 413 \qquad 78 \qquad 282 \qquad 1.0 \qquad \text{Reference} \\ = 413 \qquad 78 \qquad 282 \qquad 1.0 \qquad \text{Reference} \\ = 413 \qquad 78 \qquad 282 \qquad 1.0 \qquad \text{Reference} \\ = 413 \qquad 78 \qquad 282 \qquad 1.0 \qquad \text{Reference} \\ = 413 \qquad 78 \qquad 283 \qquad 0.7 \qquad 0.4, 1.2 \qquad 0.13 \\ \text{Sapindaceae} \\ \\ \leq 2 \qquad 93 \qquad 265 \qquad 0.7 \qquad 0.4, 1.2 \qquad 0.13 \\ \text{Sapindaceae} \\ \\ < 2 \qquad 93 \qquad 217 \qquad 1.0 \qquad \text{Reference} \\ = 43 \qquad 6.5, 1.4 \qquad 3.5 \\ 2-5 \qquad 78 \qquad 285 \qquad 0.7 \qquad 0.4, 1.3 \\ = 56 \qquad 89 \qquad 293 \qquad 217 \qquad 1.0 \qquad \text{Reference} \\ \\ \qquad = 52 \qquad 93 \qquad 217 \qquad 1.0 \qquad \text{Reference} \\ \qquad = 52 \qquad 93 \qquad 217 \qquad 1.0 \qquad \text{Reference} \\ = 52 \qquad 93 \qquad 217 \qquad 1.0 \qquad \text{Reference} \\ \qquad = 52 \qquad 93 \qquad 217 \qquad 1.0 \qquad \text{Reference} \\ \qquad = 52 \qquad 93 \qquad 217 \qquad 1.0 \qquad 1.0 \qquad 0.02 \\ $	Laminariaceae					
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	≤1	82	263	1.0	Reference	
$7-13$ 63 238 1.1 $0.6, 2.0$ >1397345 0.6 $0.4, 1.0$ 0.14 Leguminosae 257 93 269 1.0 Reference $257-381$ 92 266 1.4 $0.8, 2.4$ $382-555.1$ 74 267 1.0 $0.6, 1.8$ ≥ 555.2 68 268 1.0 $0.5, 1.7$ 0.63 Liliaceae ≤ 38 122 267 1.0 Reference $39-156$ 96 265 0.9 $0.6, 1.5$ $157-370.9$ 65 264 1.3 $0.7, 2.3$ ≥ 371 44 274 0.5 $0.3, 0.9$ 0.16 Nymphaceae </td <td>2–6</td> <td>85</td> <td>224</td> <td>0.7</td> <td>0.4, 1.3</td> <td></td>	2–6	85	224	0.7	0.4, 1.3	
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	7–13	63	238	1.1	0.6, 2.0	
Leguminosae <257 93 269 1.0 Reference 257–381 92 266 1.4 0.8, 2.4 382–555.1 74 267 1.0 0.6, 1.8 ≥555.2 68 268 1.0 0.5, 1.7 0.63 Liliaceae <38 122 267 1.0 Reference 39–156 96 265 0.9 0.6, 1.5 157–370.9 65 264 1.3 0.7, 2.3 ≥371 44 274 0.5 0.3, 0.9 0.16 Nymphaeceae <2 100 256 1.0 Reference 2–3 54 239 0.6 0.3, 1.1 >3–5 84 266 1.0 0.6, 1.8 ≥6 89 309 0.9 0.5, 1.5 0.95 Rosaceae <49 67 265 1.0 Reference >49-99.5 81 270 1.0 0.5, 1.8 100–188.6 98 269 0.8 0.4, 1.4 >188.6 81 266 0.9 0.5, 1.9 0.71 Rutaceae ≤13 78 282 1.0 Reference ≤13 78 282 0.7 0.4, 1.2 0.13 Sapindaceae <2 93 217 1.0 Reference <2 93 217 0.5 0.3 0.9 0.02	>13	97	345	0.6	0.4, 1.0	0.14
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Leguminosae					
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	<257	93	269	1.0	Reference	
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	257–381	92	266	1.4	0.8, 2.4	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	382-555.1	74	267	1.0	0.6, 1.8	
Liliaceae ≤38 122 267 1.0 Reference 39–156 96 265 0.9 0.6, 1.5 157–370.9 65 264 1.3 0.7, 2.3 ≥371 44 274 0.5 0.3, 0.9 0.16 Nymphaeceae < 2 100 256 1.0 Reference 2-3 54 239 0.6 0.3, 1.1 >3–5 84 266 1.0 0.6, 1.8 ≥6 89 309 0.9 0.5, 1.5 0.95 Rosaceae ≤49 67 265 1.0 Reference >49-99.5 81 270 1.0 0.5, 1.8 100–188.6 98 269 0.8 0.4, 1.4 >188.6 81 266 0.9 0.5, 1.9 0.71 Rutaceae ≤13 78 282 1.0 Reference 14-34.7 99 348 0.9 0.5, 1.5 >34.7–52 57 175 0.6 0.3, 1.1 >52 93 265 0.7 0.4, 1.2 0.13 Sapindaceae < 2 93 217 1.0 Reference 2-3 107 297 0.8 0.5, 1.4 3-5 78 285 0.7 0.4, 1.3 ≥6 49 271 0.5 0.3 0.9 0.92	≥555.2	68	268	1.0	0.5, 1.7	0.63
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Liliaceae					
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	≤38	122	267	1.0	Reference	
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	39–156	96	265	0.9	0.6, 1.5	
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	157-370.9	65	264	1.3	0.7, 2.3	
Nymphaeceae < 2 1002561.0Reference2-3542390.60.3, 1.1 $>3-5$ 842661.00.6, 1.8 ≥ 6 893090.90.5, 1.50.95Rosaceae ≤ 49 672651.0Reference $>49-99.5$ 812701.00.5, 1.8100-188.6982690.80.4, 1.4>188.6812660.90.5, 1.90.71Rutaceae ≤ 13 782821.0Reference14-34.7993480.90.5, 1.50.52>34.7-52571750.60.3, 1.10.13>52932650.70.4, 1.20.13Sapindaceae $<$ 2932171.0Reference < 2 932171.0Reference2-31072970.80.5, 1.4 $3-5$ 782850.70.4, 1.3260.90.90.9	≥371	44	274	0.5	0.3, 0.9	0.16
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Nymphaeceae					
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	< 2	100	256	1.0	Reference	
>3-5842661.00.6, 1.8≥6893090.90.5, 1.50.95Rosaceae≤49672651.0Reference>49-99.5812701.00.5, 1.8100-188.6982690.80.4, 1.4>188.6812660.90.5, 1.90.71Rutaceae </td <td>2–3</td> <td>54</td> <td>239</td> <td>0.6</td> <td>0.3, 1.1</td> <td></td>	2–3	54	239	0.6	0.3, 1.1	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	>3–5	84	266	1.0	0.6, 1.8	
Rosaceae ≤49 67 265 1.0 Reference >49–99.5 81 270 1.0 0.5, 1.8 100–188.6 98 269 0.8 0.4, 1.4 >188.6 81 266 0.9 0.5, 1.9 0.71 Rutaceae 282 1.0 Reference ≤13 78 282 1.0 Reference 14–34.7 99 348 0.9 0.5, 1.5 >34.7–52 57 175 0.6 0.3, 1.1 0.13 Sapindaceae 2 93 217 1.0 Reference 2–3 107 297 0.8 0.5, 1.4 3–5 78 285 0.7 0.4, 1.3 ≥6 49 271 0.5 0.3 0.9 0.92	≥6	89	309	0.9	0.5, 1.5	0.95
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Rosaceae					
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	≤49	67	265	1.0	Reference	
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	>49-99.5	81	270	1.0	0.5, 1.8	
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	100	98	269	0.8	0.4, 1.4	
Rutaceae ≤13 78 282 1.0 Reference $14-34.7$ 99 348 0.9 0.5, 1.5 $>34.7-52$ 57 175 0.6 0.3, 1.1 >52 93 265 0.7 0.4, 1.2 0.13 Sapindaceae 297 0.8 0.5, 1.4 $3-5$ 78 285 0.7 0.4, 1.3 ≥ 6 49 271 0.5 0.3 0.92 0.92	>188.6	81	266	0.9	0.5, 1.9	0.71
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Rutaceae					
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	≤13	78	282	1.0	Reference	
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	14-34.7	99	348	0.9	0.5, 1.5	
> 52 93 265 0.7 0.4, 1.2 0.13 Sapindaceae < 2 93 217 1.0 Reference 2-3 107 297 0.8 0.5, 1.4 3-5 78 285 0.7 0.4, 1.3 ≥ 6 49 271 0.5 0.3 0.9 0.02	>34 7-52	57	175	0.6	0311	
Sapindaceae Sapindaceae Sapindaceae Sapindaceae Sapindaceae $2-3$ 107 297 0.8 0.5, 1.4 $3-5$ 78 285 0.7 0.4, 1.3 ≥ 6 49 271 0.5 0.3 0.9	>52	93	265	0.7	0.4, 1.2	0.13
< 2 93 217 1.0 Reference 2-3 107 297 0.8 0.5, 1.4 3-5 78 285 0.7 0.4, 1.3 ≥ 6 49 271 0.5 0.3 0.9 0.02	Sapindaceae		200	0.7	5.1, 1. <u>C</u>	0.10
$2-3$ 107 297 0.8 $0.5, 1.4$ $3-5$ 78 285 0.7 $0.4, 1.3$ ≥ 6 49 271 0.5 0.3 0.02	< 7	93	217	10	Reference	
3-5 78 285 0.7 0.4, 1.3 ≥ 6 49 271 0.5 0.3 0.9 0.02	2-3	107	297	0.8	0514	
≥6 49 271 05 03.00 0.02	2_5 3_5	79	207	0.0	0.0, 1. 4 0/1 1 2	
	>6	ΔQ	200	0.7 0 5	0, 1.0 () ()	በ በን

(Continued)

TABLE 4	Continued
---------	-----------

Exposure,	Cases,	Controls,			
times/y	<i>n</i> = 327	<i>n</i> = 1070	0R ¹	95% CI	P-trend
Solanaceae					
≤80	110	268	1.0	Reference	
>80-127	100	264	1.0	0.6, 1.7	
>127-182	46	273	0.8	0.4, 1.5	
>182	71	265	1.3	0.7, 2.5	0.54
Umbellifereae					
<13	76	256	1.0	Reference	
13–23	91	273	1.3	0.7, 2.3	
24–39	75	274	1.4	0.8, 2.5	
>39	85	267	1.7	0.9, 3.1	0.08
Vitaceae					
<4	55	174	1.0	Reference	
4–13	87	357	1.1	0.6, 2.0	
14–25	72	229	0.8	0.4, 1.5	
≥26	113	310	1.0	0.6, 1.9	0.91
Zingiberaceae					
<208	127	264	1.0	Reference	
208-260	49	219	1.0	0.5, 1.8	
261-365	28	156	2.0	0.9, 4.2	
≥365	123	431	1.1	0.7, 1.8	0.47

 $^{1}\mbox{ Adjusted}$ for age, total fruits and vegetables, and parity, and stratified on year of interview.

foods or desserts (not shown). None of the possible relationships we observed with any of the individual food groups were found to be confounded by total intake of fruits and vegetables or by any of the nondietary factors associated with risk. No associations were observed with percentages of energy from fat, protein, or carbohydrates (not shown).

Botanical families. After adjusting for total fruit and vegetable intake, we observed reduced risks in the highest quartiles of intake of *Laminariaceae* (seaweed) and *Liliaceae* (mostly garlic and onions) and a significant decreasing linear trend in risk with intake of *Sapindaceae* (lychees) (Table 4). We did not observe any significant associations with any of the other botanical groups shown in the table or with *Chenopodiaceae*, *Ebenaceae*, and *Musaceae* (results not shown due to low levels of exposure). The OR estimates in Table 4 were also adjusted for total energy intake and the observed associations were not appreciably different from those presented (not shown).

The results of the multiple nutrient density models were similar to those presented above (not shown).

Micronutrients. After controlling for total fruit and vegetable intake, no significant associations were observed with total intake of vitamins E or C, total carotenoids, iron, copper, potassium, magnesium, or crude fiber (**Table 5**). Results for α -, β -, γ -, and δ -tocopherol, which are subcomponents of vitamin E, were similar to those for total vitamin E. In addition, significant associations were not observed with intake of nonbotanic sources of vitamin A, niacin, riboflavin, thiamin, zinc, manganese, and phosphorous (not shown).

Discussion

To our knowledge, this is the first report of strong decreasing trends in risk of fibroadenoma with increasing consumption of fruits and vegetables. However, the only specific botanic family

TABLE 5	Risk of breast fibroadenomas in Chinese women in
	relation to daily intake of specific micronutrients and
	minerals

Exposure	Cases, n = 327	Controls, <i>n</i> = 1070	0R ²	95% CI	<i>P-</i> trend
Total vitamin E_{i}^{1} ma α -TE/d					
<13.9	94	268	1.0	Reference	
13.9–17.5	93	267	1.4	0.8, 2.5	
17.6–22.9	72	267	0.9	0.5, 1.6	
>22.9	68	268	1.2	0.7, 2.3	0.88
Total carotenoids, $\mu g/d$					
<874.0	81	267	1.0	Reference	
874.0-1138.9	94	268	1.2	0.7, 2.3	
1139.0-1450.5	70	267	0.9	0.4, 1.8	
>1450.5	82	268	0.9	0.4, 1.9	0.51
Vitamin C, <i>mg/d</i>					
<55.0	98	267	1.0	Reference	
55.0-73.4	78	268	0.5	0.3, 1.1	
73.5–96.7	86	268	0.9	0.4, 2.2	
>96.7	65	267	0.5	0.2, 1.5	0.31
lron, <i>mg/d</i>					
<12.0	82	267	1.0	Reference	
12.0–14.5	81	268	1.2	0.6, 2.1	
14.6–17.5	81	268	1.2	0.6, 2.2	
>17.5	83	267	0.8	0.4, 1.5	0.39
Copper, <i>mg/d</i>					
<1.5	90	270	1.0	Reference	
1.5–1.8	106	267	1.4	0.8, 2.3	
1.9–2.1	68	266	1.1	0.6, 2.1	
>2.1	63	267	0.9	0.5, 1.6	0.57
Potassium, <i>mg/d</i>					
<1514.9	96	268	1.0	Reference	
1514.9-1832.2	94	267	1.4	0.7, 2.5	
1832.3-2164.3	71	268	0.8	0.4, 1.6	
>2164.3	66	267	1.0	0.5, 2.2	0.73
Magnesium, <i>mg/d</i>					
<275.9	89	267	1.0	Reference	
275.9-327.5	105	268	1.0	0.6, 1.8	
327.6-382.0	71	267	0.9	0.5, 1.7	
>382.0	62	268	0.9	0.5, 1.8	0.70
Total crude fiber, g/d					
<7.6	84	267	1.0	Reference	
7.6–9.6	105	268	1.3	0.7, 2.4	
6.7–11.8	73	267	1.0	0.5, 2.1	
>11.8	65	268	0.7	0.3, 1.6	0.29

¹ TE, Tocopherol equivalents.

 $^{\rm 2}$ Adjusted for age, total fruits and vegetables, and parity, and stratified on year of interview.

that was significantly associated with a reduced risk was *Sapindaceae* (lychee fruit) and no associations with individual micronutrients were observed, suggesting that a dietary pattern rich in fruits and vegetables, rather than intake of 1 or more specific foods or nutrients, may reduce risk of fibroadenoma. These findings are compatible with the findings of our dietary biomarker study (43),which show no association between plasma carotenoids or vitamin C concentrations and fibroadenoma risk. The possible reduction in risk in women who consumed soy and other legumes more than once a day may be due to chance but could also indicate that the threshold of consumption necessary to observe an effect on risk was not

reached by sufficient numbers of women in our study for a protective effect to be clearly observed. The inverse association between plasma isoflavone concentrations and fibroadenoma risk observed in our biomarker study (43) is consistent with the latter conclusion that there is an association but that the exposure was not captured as effectively by dietary question-naire as it was by the objective biomarker.

No relationship between risk of fibroadenoma and fried foods, desserts, or red meat was found. However, a linear decrease in risk was significantly associated with increasing intake of sesame oil. Although this could suggest a potential protective effect of certain unsaturated fats or of antioxidants in sesame oil (44), sesame oil is consumed primarily with uncooked vegetables in China, and the observed association could also be a result of residual confounding by vegetable intake.

Although mean serving size was used to calculate intake for all of the food groups, this would bias risk estimates toward the null. This effect is probably small, because most variability in food consumption is due to frequency of intake, not portion size (42). The results of several related analyses suggest that the FFQ provided a reasonably valid assessment of consumption of soy, fruits, and vegetables and of exposure to some specific carotenoids. Soy intake, estimated from the FFQ and Chinese food tables, was positively correlated with daidzein and genistein concentrations in plasma samples collected within 1 wk of completion of the questionnaire (45); estimated fruit intake levels were correlated with plasma concentrations of α -tocopherol, β cryptoxanthin, lycopene, α -carotene, β -carotene, retinyl palmitate, and vitamin C; and vegetable intake was correlated with plasma concentrations of γ -tocopherol, β -cryptoxanthin, and vitamin C (C. Frankenfeld, J. Lampe, J. Shannon, D. Gao, W. Li, R. Ray, C. Chen, I. King, D. Thomas, unpublished data). In addition, the intake of foods high in lycopene and high β -cryptoxanthin were positively associated plasma concentrations of lycopene and β -cryptoxanthin, respectively (unpublished data).

We have confirmed results of prior studies that risk of fibroadenoma is reduced in women who have gone through natural menopause (7,29) and who have used oral contraceptives (7,19). Although prior studies have yielded inconsistent results for parity (4,8,15-18), we also demonstrated a strong inverse relationship with increasing number of live births. Confounding by nonnutritional risk factors for fibroadenoma is unlikely to account for our results regarding nutritional factors, because we tested for confounding by all known risk factors for fibroadenoma and a broad spectrum of other potential confounding factors. Parity was the only factor found to be a confounding variable in the analyses of associations with any of the nutritional factors, and all OR estimates were accordingly adjusted for number of live births. The decline in risk of fibroadenoma with increasing parity suggests that the incidence of this disease in China may be greater in birth cohorts of women whose reproductive years included the period in which the 1-child-per-family policy was enforced than in earlier birth cohorts.

Women with prior benign breast lesions were at increased risk of fibroadenoma, which is consistent with results of previous studies that showed multiple occurrence (46) and recurrence (4,47) of this condition. Because we were not able to determine whether prior lumps were fibroadenoma or some other benign breast lesion, risk estimates in relation to prior fibroadenoma may be higher than the adjusted OR of 6.1 observed in relation to a history of all types of benign breast conditions. The significant linear trend in observed risk with frequency of BSE clearly represents increased detection, and other studies have similarly shown that BSE results in an increase in benign breast biopsies (34). However, BSE practice was not associated with any of the risk factors identified in this study and therefore confounding by BSE cannot explain any of our results.

The strong positive association with education was unchanged after adjustment for BSE and consumption of fruits and vegetables; thus, other factors associated with education may play a role in the etiology of fibroadenoma. The possible increase in risk in women with a family history of breast cancer could result from shared environmental or genetic risk factors for both conditions or reflect more complete ascertainment of family history from cases than controls. This last possibility is unlikely, because an increased risk in women with a family history of breast cancer was also observed in a cohort study conducted in this same population (7). The decrease in risk for smokers in this and other (24) studies may be a result of the reduction in estrogen levels in smokers. Given the inconsistency of the observed associations between fibroadenoma and physical exercise, further examination of the relationship is needed.

Many fibroadenomas are never clinically detected, so some women with fibroadenomas were undoubtedly classified as nondiseased in this study, introducing conservative bias into the OR estimates. Although some misclassification of exposure may have occurred due to inaccurate self-reporting, it would likely be similar for cases and controls, because the cases were not ill, and this would also tend to bias the results toward the null.

Our results suggest that risk of fibroadenoma could be reduced with a diet rich in fruits and vegetables as well as by use of oral contraceptives.

Acknowledgments

D.B.T. and J.S. designed research; H.S., P.P, W.W., Y.H., D.G., and Q.C. conducted research; Z.C.N., R.M.R., C.W., N.H., and W.L. analyzed data; Z.C.N., J.W.L., and D.B.T. wrote the paper. D.B.T. had primary responsibility for final content. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Literature Cited

- 1. Dent DM, Cant PJ. Fibroadenoma. World J Surg. 1989;13:706-10.
- Dixon JM. Cystic disease and fibroadenoma of the breast: natural history and relation to breast cancer risk. Br Med Bull. 1991;47:258–71.
- Hindle WH. Other benign breast problems. Clin Obstet Gynecol. 1994;37:916–24.
- 4. Organ CH Jr, Organ BC. Fibroadenoma of the female breast: a critical clinical assessment. J Natl Med Assoc. 1983;75:701–4.
- Schuerch C III, Rosen PP, Hirota T, Itabashi M, Yamamoto H, Kinne DW, Beattie EJ Jr. A pathologic study of benign breast diseases in Tokyo and New York. Cancer. 1982;50:1899–903.
- Clare SE, Morrow M. Management of the palpable breast mass. In: Harris JR, ed. Diseases of the breast. 2nd ed. Philadelphia: Lippincotte, Williams & Wilkins; 2000. p. 37–45.
- Coriaty Nelson Z, Ray RM, Gao DL, Thomas DB. Risk factors for fibroadenoma in a cohort of female textile workers in Shanghai, China. Am J Epidemiol. 2002;156:599–605.
- Cole P, Mark Elwood J, Kaplan SD. Incidence rates and risk factors of benign breast neoplasms. Am J Epidemiol. 1978;108:112–20.
- 9. Ory H, Cole P, MacMahon B, Hoover R. Oral contraceptives and reduced risk of benign breast diseases. N Engl J Med. 1976;294: 419–22.
- Lubin F, Wax Y, Ron E, Black M, Chetrit A, Rosen N, Alfandary E, Modan B. Nutritional factors associated with benign breast disease etiology: a case-control study. Am J Clin Nutr. 1989;50:551–6.
- Rohan TE, Cook MG, Potter JD, McMichael AJ. A case-control study of diet and benign proliferative epithelial disorders of the breast. Cancer Res. 1990;50:3176–81.

- Webb PM, Byrne C, Schnitt SJ, Connolly JL, Jacobs TW, Baer HJ, Willett WC, Colditz GA. A prospective study of diet and benign breast disease. Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev. 2004;13:1106–13.
- Wu C, Ray RM, Lin MG, Gao DL, Horner NK, Nelson ZC, Lampe JW, Hu YW, Shannon J, et al. A case-control study of risk factors for fibrocystic breast conditions: Shanghai Nutrition and Breast Disease Study, China, 1995–2000. Am J Epidemiol. 2004;160:945–60.
- Yu H, Rohan TE, Cook MG, Howe GR, Miller AB. Risk factors for fibroadenoma: a case-control study in Australia. Am J Epidemiol. 1992;135:247–58.
- Sitruk-Ware R, Thalabard JC, Benotmane A, Mauvais-Jarvis P. Risk factors for breast fibroadenoma in young women. Contraception. 1989;40:251–68.
- Canny PF. The epidemiology of fibroadenoma. New Haven (CT): Yale University School of Medicine; 1983.
- 17. Brinton LA, Vessey MP, Flavel R, Yeates D. Risk factors for benign breast disease. Am J Epidemiol. 1981;113:203-14.
- Ravnihar B, Seigel DG, Lindtner J. An epidemiologic study of breast cancer and benign breast neoplasias in relation to the oral contraceptive and estrogen use. Eur J Cancer. 1979;15:395–405.
- Canny PF, Berkowitz GS, Kelsey JL, LiVolsi VA. Fibroadenoma and the use of exogenous hormones. A case-control study. Am J Epidemiol. 1988;127:454–61.
- Thomas DB. Role of exogenous female hormones in altering the risk of benign and malignant neoplasms in humans. Cancer Res. 1978;38: 3991–4000.
- 21. Trapido EJ, Brinton LA, Schairer C, Hoover R. Estrogen replacement therapy and benign breast disease. J Natl Cancer Inst. 1984;73:1101-5.
- 22. Pasqualini JR, Cortes-Prieto J, Chetrite G, Talbi M, Ruiz A. Concentrations of estrone, estradiol and their sulfates, and evaluation of sulfatase and aromatase activities in patients with breast fibroadenoma. Int J Cancer. 1997;70:639–43.
- 23. Hefler LA, Tempfer CB, Grimm C, Lebrecht A, Ulbrich E, Heinze G, Leodolter S, Schneeberger C, Mueller MW, et al. Estrogen-metabolizing gene polymorphisms in the assessment of breast carcinoma risk and fibroadenoma risk in Caucasian women. Cancer. 2004;101:264–9.
- 24. Baron JA. Smoking and estrogen-related disease. Am J Epidemiol. 1984;119:9–22.
- Baron JA, La Vecchia C, Levi F. The antiestrogenic effect of cigarette smoking in women. Am J Obstet Gynecol. 1990;162:502–14.
- Michnovicz JJ, Hershcopf RJ, Naganuma H, Bradlow HL, Fishman J. Increased 2-hydroxylation of estradiol as a possible mechanism for the anti-estrogenic effect of cigarette smoking. N Engl J Med. 1986;315: 1305–9.
- Spangler JG. Smoking and hormone-related disorders. Prim Care. 1999;26:499–511.
- Zeller WJ, Berger MR. Nicotine and estrogen metabolism: possible implications of smoking for growth and outcome of treatment of hormone-dependent cancer? Discussion of experimental results. J Cancer Res Clin Oncol. 1989;115:601–3.
- Rohan TE, Miller AB. A cohort study of cigarette smoking and risk of fibroadenoma. J Epidemiol Biostat. 1999;4:297–302.
- Kelsey JL, Lindfors KK, White C. A case-control study of the epidemiology of benign breast diseases with reference to oral contraceptive use. Int J Epidemiol. 1974;3:333–40.
- Berkowitz GS, Canny PF, Vivolsi VA, Merino MJ, O'Connor TZ, Kelsey JL. Cigarette smoking and benign breast disease. J Epidemiol Community Health. 1985;39:308–13.
- 32. Effect on hypertension and benign breast disease of progestagen component in combined oral contraceptives. Lancet. 1977;1:624.
- 33. Thomas DB, Gao DL, Self SG, Allison CJ, Tao Y, Mahloch J, Ray R, Qin Q, Presley R, et al. Randomized trial of breast self-examination in Shanghai: methodology and preliminary results. J Natl Cancer Inst. 1997;89:355–65.
- 34. Thomas DB, Gao DL, Ray RM, Wang WW, Allison CJ, Chen FL, Porter P, Hu YW, Zhao GL, et al. Randomized trial of breast self-examination in Shanghai: final results. J Natl Cancer Inst. 2002;94:1445–57.
- Yu SZ, Lu RF, Xu DD, Howe GR. A case-control study of dietary and nondietary risk factors for breast cancer in Shanghai. Cancer Res. 1990;50:5017–21.
- 36. Li W, Ray RM, Lampe JW, Lin MG, Gao DL, Wu C, Nelson ZC, Fitzgibbons ED, Horner N, et al. Dietary and other risk factors in

women having fibrocystic breast conditions with and without concurrent breast cancer: a nested case-control study in Shanghai, China. Int J Cancer. 2005;115:981–93.

- 37. Whittemore AS, Wu-Williams AH, Lee M, Zheng S, Gallagher RP, Jiao DA, Zhou L, Wang XH, Chen K, et al. Diet, physical activity, and colorectal cancer among Chinese in North America and China. J Natl Cancer Inst. 1990;82:915–26.
- Lee MM, Lee F, Ladenla SW, Miike R. A semiquantitative dietary history questionnaire for Chinese Americans. Ann Epidemiol. 1994;4: 188–97.
- Pennington JAT, Bowes ADP, Chrurch HN. Bowes & Church's food values of portions commonly used. 17th ed. Philadelphia, (PA): Lippincott Williams & Wilkins Publishers; 1998.
- 40. Institute of Nutrition and Food Hygiene CAoPM. Chinese food composition tables. 2nd ed. Beijing: New China Press; 1991.
- Breslow NE, Day NE. Statistical methods in cancer research. 1st vol. The analysis of case-control studies: IARC Scientific Publications No. 32. Lyon (France): International Agency for Research on Cancer, 1980.

- 42. Willett W. Nutritional epidemiology. 2nd ed. New York: Oxford University Press; 1998.
- 43. Dijkstra SC, Lampe JW, Ray RR, Brown R, Wu C, Li W, Chen C, King IB, Goa D, et al. Biomarkers of dietary exposure are associated with risk of breast fibroadenomas among women in Shanghai, China. J Nutr. 2010;140:1302–10.
- 44. Sankar D, Sambandam G, Ramakrishna Rao M, Pugalendi KV. Modulation of blood pressure, lipid profiles and redox status in hypertensive patients taking different edible oils. Clin Chim Acta. 2005;355:97–104.
- 45. Frankenfeld CL, Lampe JW, Shannon J, Gao DL, Ray RM, Prunty J, Kalhorn TF, Wähälä K, Patterson RE, et al. Frequency of soy food consumption and serum isoflavone concentrations among Chinese women in Shanghai. Public Health Nutr. 2004;7:765–72.
- Hindle WH, Alonzo LJ. Conservative management of breast fibroadenomas. Am J Obstet Gynecol. 1991;164:1647–50, discussion 50–1.
- 47. Nigro DM, Organ CH Jr. Fibroadenoma of the female breast. Some epidemiologic surprises. Postgrad Med. 1976;59:113–7.