Original Article Red and processed meat consumption and the risk of lung cancer: a dose-response meta-analysis of 33 published studies

Xiu-Juan Xue¹, Qing Gao², Jian-Hong Qiao¹, Jie Zhang³, Cui-Ping Xu¹, Ju Liu¹

¹Qianfoshan Hospital, Shandong University, Jinan, China; ²Taishan Medical College, Tai'an, China; ³Shandong Medical College, Jinan, China

Received April 28, 2014; Accepted June 10, 2014; Epub June 15, 2014; Published June 30, 2014

Abstract: This meta-analysis was to summarize the published studies about the association between red/processed meat consumption and the risk of lung cancer. 5 databases were systematically reviewed, and random-effect model was used to pool the study results and to assess dose-response relationships. Results shown that six cohort studies and twenty eight case-control studies were included in this meat-analysis. The pooled Risk Radios (RR) for total red meat and processed meat were 1.44 (95% CI, 1.29-1.61) and 1.23 (95% CI, 1.10-1.37), respectively. Dose-response analysis revealed that for every increment of 120 grams red meat per day the risk of lung cancer increases 35% and for every increment of 50 grams red meat per day the risk of lung cancer increases 20%. The present dose-response meta-analysis suggested that both red and processed meat consumption showed a positive effect on lung cancer risk.

Keywords: Lung cancer, red meat, processed meat, meta-analysis

Introduction

Lung cancer is a leading cause of death in China and the other countries [1]. Up to now, smoking is considered as the only undisputed primary risk factor for lung cancer. It can attribute approximately 85% incidence of lung cancer [2]. However, smoking cannot explain the high incidence of lung cancer in females. Studies on lung cancer in women suggested that other factors including the dietary factors should be noticed, which could act as independent risk factors or as modifiers on lung cancer [3, 4]. Since the mortality of this disease remains high and most patients live less than one year after diagnosis, identification of additional risk factors will be very helpful for prevention and early detection of lung cancer.

In the past two decades, numerous experimental and epidemiological studies have shown that red and/or processed meat consumption might be related to the incidence of lung cancer [5-9]. Most the published literatures found a positive relationship between meat consumption and lung cancer. For example, Linseisen [5] found that red meat was directly related to men who had never or ever smokers. In the study by Balder [7], processed meat was found to increase about 15% risk of lung cancer. However, some authors hold controversial opinions, Tasevska [10] found neither red meat nor processed meat consumption had an association with lung cancer, and the same conclusion were supported by Lim [11]. In addition, World Cancer Research Funder (WCRF) in 2007 reported that the existing evidence was not enough to conclude an association between red and/or processed meat intake and the risk of lung cancer [2]. Even for recent publications, controversies still exist.

A primary meta-analysis has been available on meat consumption and lung cancer risk [12]. It included 11 cohort studies and 23 case-controls. The pooled results found that it was red meat rather than processed meat that played a positive effect on lung cancer. However, the dose-response relationship essential for proving causality is still unknown. Considering several literatures about meat intake and lung cancer risk have published recently, we conducted the present systematic and quantitative doseresponse meta-analysis to explore the relationship between red and processed meat consumption and the risk of lung cancer. Besides, we aim to expand upon the scientific evidence for red and processed meat consumption in different geographic and histologic subtypes of lung cancer.

Methods

Literature search and selection

A systematic literature search was performed from their inception until June 31, 2013. The database included PubMed, Embase, Web of science, the National Knowledge Infrastructure and Wanfang Database. The key words were as follows: 1) lung cancer or lung tumor or lung neoplasm or lung carcinoma; 2) dietary or food or red meat or beef or pork or lamb or processed meat or preserved meat or bacon or sausage or salted meat. In order to obtain all relevant studies, we scrutinized the reference lists of the published articles to identify additional relevant studies. The included criteria were: 1) the type of included studies were designed in cohort or case-control; 2) the exposure factors were red meat and/or processed meat; 3) the outcomes were the incidence or mortality of lung cancer; and 4) Relative Risk (RR) or Odds Ratios (OR) with 95% confidence interval (CI) were provided.

Data extraction

The information was extracted by two investigators independently. The extracted information included: the first author's name, publication year, average or range of population ages, study design (cohort or case-control), country, sample size, the followed-up years (only for cohort studies), histologic subtypes, RR or OR with 95% CI for comparisons between the highest and lowest categories of meat intakes as well as the confounders taken into account.

Statistical analysis

The synthetic RR and 95% CI were calculated via fixed or random-effect model for the comparison between the highest versus the lowest category for red and/or processed meat. The

model selection was depended on the outcome of heterogeneity text between studies. If moderate or lower heterogeneity ($I^2 < 50\%$) was found, we chose the fixed effect model (FEM) as the pooling method, otherwise the random effect model (REM), which considers both within-study and between-study variations, was adopted ($I^2 > 50\%$). The heterogeneity was detected by I² test used by Higgins and Thompson [13]. Subgroup analysis was performed to investigate the influences by study design and other factors. The subgroups included: study design (cohort or case-control), source of controls for case-control studies (population-based or hospital-based), and countries where the study was performed.

When possible, a linear dose-response analysis of red meat and processed meat was conducted. The generalized least-squares trend estimation (GLST) proposed by Greenland and Orsini [14, 15] was used to pool the correlated RR estimates on the basis of categories of consumption. This method required the number of cases, the number of control subjects or person-years, and the adjusted OR or RR with 95% CI at least three exposure levels. As the included studies used different consumption units, such as grams or servings, we converted the intake dose stated "times" or "servings" into grams (g). We used 120 g as the average serving size for red meat and 50 g for processed meat. The median or mean level for each category was used to assign each corresponding RR estimate. If the mean or median intake categories were reported in articles, we use them directly. If the value was unavailable, the midpoints were used as the relative risk of the corresponding category. For studies with unrestricted lowest and highest category, we employed zero consumption as the low boundary and the amplitude of the nearest category was used for the highest category. The methods for rescaling have been used in previous dose-response meta-analysis [16-18]. All the analyses were conducted using Stata 12 software (Stata Corp LP, College Station, TX, USA).

Results

Literature search

Based on a systematic review of the databases, a total of 466 articles were obtained. After screening the titles and abstracts, 421 irrele-



Figure 1. Flow chart for literature research.

vant articles were excluded, leaving 45 studies for full papers. After reading the full papers in detail, 14 were excluded. Besides, we reviewed previous meta-analysis and 2 additional studies were identified [19, 20]. Finally a total of 33 studies were included in this present doseresponse meta-analysis [1, 4, 5, 8, 10, 11, 15, 19-44]. The Flow chart of studies selection was shown in **Figure 1**.

Characteristics of studies

Characteristics of the 33 observed studies were shown in Table 1. 27 studies were designed in case-control [1, 4, 8, 11, 15, 20, 21, 24-42, 44] and 6 in cohort [5, 10, 19, 22, 23, 43, 45]. 7 studies were conducted in Uruguaya [21, 25-29, 46], 8 in Europe [5, 15, 19, 30, 31, 36, 37, 44], 5 in Asia [11, 32, 38, 39, 41], 9 in the United States [1, 8, 10, 22, 23, 33, 40, 42, 43], 3 in Canada [4, 34, 35] and 1 in Australia [20]. The study population in 19 [5, 10, 19, 21-23, 25-27, 29-35, 38, 41, 43] studies included both men and women, 4 studies included only man [20, 24, 28, 40] and 9 included only women [1, 4, 8, 11, 15, 36, 37, 39, 44]. 5 studies didn't give the estimated risk adjusted for smoking [4, 10, 15, 19, 43] and 3 without age adjust [19, 20, 41]. In 3 studies [27-29], the history of lung disease and family history were also adjusted.

Red meat (highest vs lowest category) (**Figure 2**)

28 studies [1, 4, 5, 10, 11, 19-24, 26, 27, 29-34, 36-40, 42-44] were used to examine the relationship between red meat consumption and the risk of lung cancer. The pooled outcome indicated that red meat played a positive effect on lung cancer incidence with a pooled RR was 1.44 (95% CI, 1.29-1.61). However, a significant heterogeneity was found in casecontrol studies with I2 was 77% (p = 0.000). Subgroup analysis based on countries revealed that the highest red meat consumption showed a stronger effect in Asia than all the other countries (P for heterogeneity = 0.000). Positive relationships of comparable strengths were found in all subgroups including gender, source of control population and countries (Table 2).

Beef, lamb and pork

6 studies explored the association between beef and lung cancer risk. The estimated RR was 1.39 (95% CI, 1.14, 1.69) and no significant heterogeneity was detected (*P* for heterogeneity = 0.433). 4 studies assessed the association between intake of lamb and risk of lung cancer. The pooled results showed a weak positive effect of lamb (RR: 1.25, 95% CI, 0.97-1.61) and no evidence of heterogeneity was

Table 1. Summary of included studies

Age	Source of	Intake comparison	Red meat	Processed meat		
(year) 20-70	population-based	highest vs lowest	Red meat: 1.4 (0.7-2.8)	Sausage: 0.7 (0.2-2.5) Bacon: 1.5 (0.9-2.5)	age, province, education, social class and total energy intake	
40-84	population-based	> 9.8 vs < 3.5 (T/W)	Red meat: 3.3 (1.7-7.6)		age, education, pack-years, smoking history, fruits/fruit juices intake, nutrient-density calories, previous lung disease, alcohol consumption, and BMI (for red meat); Age, nutrient density calories (for white meat)	
23-89	hospital-based	250-600 vs < 150 (g/ day) (Red) 250-525 vs < 150 (g/day) (Beef) 40-259 vs 0-10 (g/day) (Processed)	Red meat: 2.17 (1.52-3.10) Beef: 1.67 (1.17-2.39)	Processed meat: 1.70 (1.28- 2.25)	age, sex, residence, education, income, interviewer, smoking status, cigarettes per day, duration of smoking, age at starting, years since quitting, alcohol, dairy foods, grains, fatty foods, mate drinking, BMI and energy intake	yes
NM	NHIS study	> 2.0 vs < 0.5 (Beef) > 1.0 vs < 0.02 (Pork) > 1.1 vs 0 (Bacon/Sau- sage)	Red meats: 1.6 (1.0-2.6)	Processed meats: 0.8 (0.5-1.4)	age, gender, smoking duration (years), and packs per day smoked	Meat/ poultry/®sh
50-71	(NIH)-AARP study	highest quintile vs lowest	Red meat: 1.20 (1.10-1.31)	Processed meat: 1.16 (1.06-1.26)	age, sex, education, marital status, family history of cancer, race, BMI, smoking, energy, alcohol, and fruit and vegetable intake	
30-89	hospital-based	high vs low	Red meat: 1.92 (1.27-2.90)	Processed meat: 0.83 (0.55- 1.26)	age, residence, urban/rural status, education, body mass index, tobacco smoking, and total energy intake.	
62.5/62.7	hospital-based	4th vs 1st quartile	Red meat: 1.25 (0.78-1.99) Beef: 1.11 (0.77-1.61) Lamb: 1.24 (0.81-1.89) Fried meat: 1.54 (1.01-2.35)	Processed meat: 1.19 (0.75- 1.89) Sausage: 1.05 (0.69-1.59) Salted meat: 1.19 (0.68-2.09)	age, residence, education, family history of lung cancer, BMI, alpha-carotene, smoking, total energy intake	White meat Poultry: Fish
30-89	hospital-based	> 9.1 vs < 5 (S/W) (Red) > 4.6 vs < 1.1 (S/W) (Processed)	Red meat: 2.33 (1.63-3.32)	Processed meat: 1.79 (1.22- 2.65)	age, residence, education, family history of lung cancer, BMI, smoking total energy intake, total vegetables and fruits, reduced glutathione, and nonmeat fatty foods intakes	white meat
30-89	hospital-based	<pre>> 1.8 vs < 0 (S/W) (Salted red meat) > 3.8 vs < 1 (S/W) (Fried red meat)</pre>		Salted meat: 2.90 (1.99-4.25)	age, residence, hospital, education, family history of lung cancer, BMI, smoking, alcohol drinking, mate amount, total fruits, total energy intake, non-meat fatty foods, and each meat type preparation	yes
62.1/59.4	hospital-based	> 28.3 vs 11.4 (g/day)		processed meat: 2.54 (1.12- 5.79)	age, residence, body mass index, smoking status, smoking, alcohol drinking, total energy, total vegetables and fruits, total white meat, and red meat intake	
30-79	hospital-based	4th vs 1th	Red meat: 1.55 (0.88-2.74)	0.85 (0.47-1.56)	age, residence, education, family history of lung cancer, BMI, pack-years, total energy intake	yes
≥35	hospital-based	> 2 vs < 1 (T/W)	Pork: 0.36 (0.18-0.69) Beef: 1.89 (0.94-3.82)		sex, age, smoking habit and having worked in risk occupations for lung cancer	
35-90	hospital-based	> 4 vs < 1 (T/W)	Red meat: 1.00 (0.55-1.83)		sex, age, smoking habit, interaction sex, smoking, and residence	White meat Fish
56.2/46.5	hospital-based	Ever vs never	Red meat: 6.1 (4.3-8.5)		smoking, alcohol, coffee and milk consumption, chilli consumption, exposure to pesticides	chicken, fish
50≥65	COSMOS screen- ing study	Q4 vs Q1	Red meat: 1.73 (1.15-2.61)		baseline risk probability and total energy, fruits and vegetables	

Meat consumption and lung cancer

20-70	population-based	> 5.42 vs < 0.94		Processed meat: 1.4 (1.1-1.7)	age, province, education, body mass index sex, alcohol drinking, smoking, total vegetable and fruit intake, and total energy intake	
62/60	hospital-based	Daily vs Never or monthly		Sausages: 0.99 (0.61-1.62)	age and region	
25-89	hospital-based	Daily vs Never or monthly	Red meat: 1.40 (0.94-2.08)		age, residence, education, and pack-years of smoking	
25-89	hospital-based	at least once/week vs never	Red meat: 1.53 (0.94-2.48)		age, residence, education, and pack-years of smoking	Poultry, Fish
35-79	population-based		Red meat: 1.8 (1.5-2.2)	Processed meat: 1.7 (1.4-2.1)	age, gender, area of residence, education, BMI , alcohol, smoking intensity in pack-year per day	
63.5/66	hospital-based	3rd tertile vs 1st tertile 2nd tertile vs 1st tertile (Bacon)	Pork: 1.15 (0.80-1.64)	Processed meat: 0.83 (0.55- 1.25) Bacon: 1.51 (1.06-2.16) Sausages: 1.00 (0.69, 1.43)	for age, history of cancer in first-degree relative, country of origin, dwelling type, yr of education, usual body mass index, and fruit and vegetable intake (only for meat variables)	Yes
44-75	hospital-based	> 7 (T/W) vs < 3 (T/W)	Red meat: 0.71 (0.43-1.18)		education, age, cooking oil fume, use of fume extractor, and \ensuremath{ETS} .	Yes
25-70	EPIC study	≥ 80 vs <9 (g/day)	Red meat: 1.19 (0.94-1.50)	0.92 (0.73-1.17)	sex, center, age, smoking, body weight and height, energy intake, intake of alcohol, fruits and vegetables, physical activity, education	
63/61	population-based	Tertile 3 vs Tertile 1	Red meat: 0.9 (0.5-1.9)		age, ethnicity, and smoking	Fish, Poultry
67.3/66.5	hospital-based	high vs low	Beef: 0.86 (0.37-2.00) Lamb: 0.74 (0.28-1.93)		smoking	Poultry
53	population-based	Frequently vs Rarely		Preserved meats: 0.5 (0.35-0.71)	age, sex, literacy, lung cancer in first-degree relatives, hours spent at home per day, non-malignant lung disease history, coal mine work history, ever smoking, passive smoking, coal type at birth, food.	
30-84	population-based	90th percentile vs 10th	Red meat: 1.8 (1.2-2.7)		age, fat intake, calories, smoking, BMI , fruit and vegetable intake as continuous variables, education, other meat variables	White meat
35-84	population-based	> 11.9 vs < 4.2 (T/W)	Red meat: 1.89 (1.2-3.0)		adjusted for age, total kcal, education, pack-years of smoking, body mass index (kg/m²), fruit and vegetable intake	Yes
50-71	NIH-AARP Diet	5th vs 1th	Red meat: M 1.22 (1.09-1.38) W: 1.13 (0.97-1.32)	Processed meat: M 1.23 (1.10- 1.37) W: 1.00 (0.87-1.15)	age, energy intake	
55-74	PLCO Cancer Screening Trial	5th vs 1th	Red meat: M 1.11 (0.79-1.56) W: 1.30 (0.87-1.95)	Processed meat M: 1.52 (1.13- 2.03) W: 0.98 (0.68-1.41)	for age and energy intake	
25-89	hospital-based	Daily vs Never or monthly	Red meat: 1.21 (0.68 -2.15) (Adenocarcinoma) Red meat: 1.81 (1.04-3.18) (other type)			
30-84	population-based	Q4 vs Q1	Beef: 0.9 (0.5-1.4) Pork: 1.4 (0.9-2.2)	Bacon: 2.9 (1.8-4.6) Sausage: 3.4 (2.0-6.0)	age, ethnicity, smoking status, pack-years of cigarette use, and beta-carotene intake	
20-76	population-based	Q4 vs Q1	Red meat: 1.3 (1.1-1.5)	Processed meat: 1.4 (1.1-1.7)	age, province, education, body mass index, sex, alcohol use, smoking, total of vegetable and fruit intake, total energy intake	

Meat consumption and lung cancer

In member member member member member Start Start Start Start Start Start Start Start Start Start De Sein Start Start Start Start De Sein Start Start Start Start Start Start Start Start Start Start Start Start Start Start Start Start Start Start Start Start Start Start Start Start Start Start Start Start Start Start Start Start Start Start Start Start Start Start Start Start Start Start S	Study		%
Piet and March 2000 270 (16.0 4.68) 210 New X80% 270 (16.2 1.68) 210 Dis Scient 1907 230 (10.1 1.11) 230 Dis Scient 1907 230 (10.1 2.11) 230 Dis Scient 1907 230 (10.1 2.11) 230 Dis Scient 2007 100 (10.5 2.11) 230 Dis Scient 2007 100 (10.5 2.11) 230 Concent August 1000 100 (10.5 2.11) 230<	ID	rr (95% CI)	Weight
Namege 2001	Red meat		
Ame above 2.71 (13.1.00) 2.70 Coss SADT 2.74 (13.1.00) 2.70 De statest 197 2.74 (12.1.20) 2.70 De statest 207 2.70 (13.1.00) 2.70 De statest 207 1.70 (13.2.00) 2.70 Conservaluest 1000 1.70 (13.2.00) 2.70 Nacro 2020 1.70 (10.2.00) 2.70 State 1000 1.70 (10.2.00) 2.70 State 2020 1.70 (10.2.00) 2.70 State 2020 1.70 (10.2.00) 2.70 Taceada 2020 M 1.70 (10.2.00) 2.70 State 2020 1.70 (10.2.00) 2.70	Alavanja 2001	2.70 (1.60, 4.50)	2.10
Cons 2007 200 Relatin 1907	Aune 2009	2.17 (1.52, 3.10)	2.76
bs/shori 12/8/12,150 2.8 bs/shori 2.8 2.9 bs/shori 2.8 2.9 bs/shori 2.8 2.9 bs/shori 2.8 2.9 bs/shori 2.9 2.9 bs/shori 1.9 1.9 Companding 19/9 1.9 1.9 Companding 2013 1.9 1.9 Companding 2013 1.9 1.9 Companding 2013 1.9 1.9 Companding 2014 1.9 2.9	Cross 2007	1.20 (1.10, 1.31)	3.78
DS Seder: 2007 120 (12.1.2.00) 2.11 DS Seder: 2007 130 (00.1.2.00) 130 Conscribution 130 (00.1.2.00) 130 Conscribution 130 (00.1.2.00) 2.31 Conscribution 130 (00.1.2.00) 2.31 No.2002 130 (00.1.2.00) 140 No.2002 130 (00.1.2.00	De stefani 1997	1.25 (0.78, 1.99)	2.28
Dis Starter 2.11 (6.1.2.1.2) 2.11 (6.1.2.1.2) 101 Forme 2007 100 (6.1.2.2.2) 100 (6.1.2.2.2) 101 Granze 2017 100 (6.1.2.2.2) 101 (6.1.2.2.2) 101 Granze 2017 100 (6.1.2.2.2) 101 (6.1.2.2.2) 101 Granze 2017 101 (6.1.2.2.2) 101 (6.1.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.	De Stefani 2002	1.92 (1.27, 2.90)	2.51
Description 150 (22) 101 Green 2011 101 (2010) 201 Green 2011 101 (2010) 201 Green 2011 100 (2010) 201 Karn X020 100 (2010) 201 Sere X020 100 (2010) 201	De Stefani 2009	2.33 (1.63, 3.32)	2.76
Funs. 200 ¹ 100 145 0.8.00 100 Congenetiti 2013 100 104 0.8.00 130 H2 200 100 104 20.00 130 Kall 100 104 20.00 130 Kall 100 104 20.00 231 Lan 200 100 104 20.00 232 Lan 200 100 104 20.00 232 Lan 201 100 104 20.00 232 Kall 100 104 20.00 232 Sea 200 100 102 20.20 244 Sea 200 100 120 2.20 244 Sea 200 W 101 100 7.150 231 Tasseka 200 W 101 100 7.150 235 Zatewak 201 W 100 102 2.150 255 Zatewak 201 W 100 102 2.150 135 Sea 200 W 101 100 7.150 236 Lan 200 100 102 2.150 135 Sea 200 N 100 102 2.150 135 Sea 200 N 100 100 2.150 235 Sea 200 N <td>Deneo-Pellegrini 1996</td> <td>1.55 (0.88, 2.74)</td> <td>1.91</td>	Deneo-Pellegrini 1996	1.55 (0.88, 2.74)	1.91
Genes 2011 Genes 2011 Genes 2	Fortes 2003	1.00 (0.55, 1.83)	1.80
Cangarda 2013 17,11,12,210 2,31 142 202 130,110,150 2,60 Kan/P, 2020 130,100,150 2,60 Kan/P, 2020 100,000,42,00 2,21 Lam 200 100,000,42,00 2,21 Lam 200 100,000,42,00 2,21 Lam 200 100,000,42,00 2,21 Lam 200 100,000,41,00 2,10 Sen 200 100,000,100 3,01 Sen 200 100,000,200 3,01 Sen 200 110,000,200 2,01 Sen 200 110,000,200 3,01 Tassocka 200 W 110,00,130 2,01 Tassocka 200 W 101,00,130 2,01 Lassocka 200 W 101,00,130 2,01 Tassocka 200 W 101,00,130 2,51 Zakoka 100,01 101,00,130 2,51 Zakoka 100,01 100,01,100 2,51 Zakoka 100,01 100,01,100 2,51 Zakoka 100,01 100,00,100 2,51 Satasot (copared = 2,00,0, 00 100,00,100 2,51 Satasot (copared = 0,00, 00 100,00,100 <td>Ganesh 2011</td> <td>6.10 (4.30, 8.50)</td> <td>2.83</td>	Ganesh 2011	6.10 (4.30, 8.50)	2.83
11.2002 100 (10.00 (2.00) 1.31 12.2012 131.00.94, 2.40) 2.21 Add7h, 2002 131.00.94, 2.40) 2.81 1.2020 0.71 (10.4, 1.10) 2.14 Linssinn 2011 0.90 (90.5, 1.90) 1.80 Markmat 2022 0.90 (90.5, 1.90) 1.80 Shen 2003 0.90 (90.5, 1.90) 1.80 Shen 2004 0.90 (90.5, 1.90) 1.80 Shen 2005 0.90 (90.5, 1.90) 1.80 Tacewaka 2004 M 1.80 (97.1.32) 2.50 Tacewaka 2004 M 1.80 (97.1.32) 2.50 Tacewaka 2004 M 1.10 (97.1.30) 2.50 Tacewaka 2005 (9) 1.50 (1.57.10) 2.50 Zabukal 2003 (9) 1.90 (97.2.20) 2.50 Zabukal 2003 (9) 1.90 (98.7.2.00) 1.50 (1.57.10) Saberb 1907 1.90 (98.7.2.00) 1.50 (1.57.10) 2.50 Deskner 2002 1.90 (98.7.2.00) 1.50 (1.57.10) 2.51 <td>Gnagnarella 2013</td> <td>1.73 (1.15, 2.61)</td> <td>2.53</td>	Gnagnarella 2013	1.73 (1.15, 2.61)	2.53
19:008 100110.15.00 3.00 Ruf77.2007 130 004, 4.200 2.21 Lam 2000 0.71 (0.4.1.00) 3.22 Lam 201 0.71 (0.4.1.00) 3.22 Lam 202 0.71 (0.4.1.00) 3.22 Lam 201 0.71 (0.4.1.00) 3.22 Lam 201 0.71 (0.4.1.00) 3.21 Lam 202 0.71 (0.4.1.00) 3.21 Shen 2001 1.10 (0.7.1.02) 3.21 Laneexha 2011 M 1.10 (0.7.1.02) 2.31 Laneexha 2011 M 1.30 (0.0.1.02) 2.31	Hu 2002	1.40 (0.70, 2.80)	1.53
No/F 2022 130 094, 2,00 2,22 No/F 2024 130 014, 0,200 2,52 Line 2005 0,70 10,41, 110 2,14 Line 2007 0,90 8,01, 100 3,00 Marchard 2002 0,90 8,01, 300 1,00 10, 20, 200 Solan 2005 0,90 8,01, 300 1,00 10, 20, 200 Solan 2005 0,90 8,01, 300 1,00 10, 20, 200 Solan 2005 110 (20, 13, 200 2,54 Solan 2005 110 (20, 13, 200 2,54 Solan 2005 110 (20, 13, 200 2,54 Solan 2005 110 (20, 13, 200 2,56 Solan 2005 110 (20, 13, 107) 2,56 Solan 2005 120 (20, 21, 30, 17, 70) 2,56 Solan 2005 120 (20, 13, 17, 70) 2,57 Solan 2005 120 (20, 13, 17, 70) 2,57 Solan 2005 120 (20, 21, 30, 17, 70) 2,57 Solan 2005 120 (20, 21, 30, 17, 70) 2,50 Solan 2007 130 (20, 21, 21, 20, 20) 2,51 Solan 2007 120 (20, 21, 21, 20, 20) 1,50 Solan 2007 120 (20, 21, 21, 20) 1,50 S	Hu 2008	1.30 (1.10, 1.50)	3.60
ku/72 2001 10 004 200 2.81 Line 2007 0.71 00.44. 2.00 2.82 Line 2017 0.71 00.44. 2.00 3.20 Line 2017 0.70 00.44. 1.10 2.14 Line 2017 0.90 00.54. 1.00 3.20 Shen 2000 0.90 00.54. 1.00 3.20 Shen 2000 1.00 00.20.20 1.00 Shen 2000 1.00 00.20.20 1.00 Shen 2000 1.00 00.20.20 1.00 Tarsonka 2000 W 1.00 00.20.20 2.20 Tarsonka 2000 W 1.00 00.20.20 2.20 Tarsonka 2000 W 1.00 00.7.100 2.50 Zatouka 2000 (S) 1.00 00.7.100 2.50 Zatouka 2000 (S) 1.00 00.7.100 2.50 Zatouka 2000 (S) 1.00 00.7.100 2.50 Satour 100 (S) 1.00 00.7.100 2.50	Kub??k 2002	1.53 (0.94, 2.48)	2.22
Lim 2000 170 (1 40, 200) 3.22 Lin 2112 110 (0 40, 10) 2.14 Lin 2012 000 0.50, 100 100 Lin 2012 000 0.50, 100 100 Shen 2000 41 (4 0, 40; 2) 2.14 Shen 2001 100 (0 40, 10) 2.04 Shen 2001 100 (0 40, 10) 2.04 Shen 2001 120 (0 40, 10) 2.04 Tassenka 2001 M 110 (0 7, 20) 2.04 Tassenka 2011 M 110 (0 7, 10) 2.05	Kub??k 2004	1.40 (0.94, 2.08)	2.58
Li 2012 Li xoskan 2011 Li xoskan 2011 Li xoskan 2021 Shen 2008 Shen 2008 Shen 2008 Shen 2008 Shen 2008 Shen 2009 NG (0.0.130) Li 2007, 0.2.00 Li 20	Lam 2009	1.70 (1.40, 2.00)	3.52
Linselar 2011 Linselar 201 She 200 Linselar 200 She 200 Linselar 200 Lins	Lin 2012	0.71 (0.43, 1.18)	2.14
Machany 2022 Image: Control of the section of the sectin of the section of the section of the section of the s	Linseisen 2011	1.19 (0.94, 1.50)	3.30
Sense 2008 I I 4.41 (2.40.17) 1.78 Sinha 1996 1.80 (12.0.2.70) 2.54 Savaraon 1997 1.22 (1.00.1.38) 3.71 Tasevaka 2001 M 1.22 (1.00.1.38) 2.51 Tasevaka 2011 W 1.11 (0.79, 1.30) 2.55 Tasevaka 2020 J(A) 1.31 (1.04.3.18) 1.55 Tasevaka 2020 J(A) 1.31 (1.04.3.18) 1.55 Zatokał 2023 J(S) 1.81 (1.04.3.18) 1.55 Satotal 2020 J(A) 1.30 (0.87, 1.23) 2.67 Zatokał 2023 J(S) 1.30 (0.82, 1.21) 2.76 Satotal 2020 J(A) 1.30 (0.87, 1.20) 2.76 Berd 1.10 (7.17, 2.39) 2.76 Berdow 2000 1.30 (0.87, 1.20) 2.21 De slofan 1977 1.30 (0.87, 1.20) 2.21 De slofan 2002 1.30 (0.87, 1.20) 1.30 (0.87, 1.20) 1.31 De slofan 2002 1.30 (0.87, 1.80) 1.81 1.81 De slofan 2002 1.30 (0.87, 1.80) 1.81 1.81 De slofan 197 1.30 (0.87, 1.80) 1.81 1.81 De slofan 197 1.30 (0.87, 1.80)	Marchand 2002	0.90 (0.50, 1.90)	1.60
Sheh 1996 100 (120, 2.00) 2.54 Swanson 1997 126 (0, 0, 2.20) 1.00 Tasevida 2000 MC 1110 09, 1.20 3.01 Tasevida 2001 W 110 (107, 1.50) 2.63 Tasevida 2011 W 100 (0.57, 1.65) 2.55 Tasevida 2011 W 100 (0.57, 1.65) 2.55 Zatokal 2003 (N) 121 (0.68, 2.15) 1.69 Subical 2003 (N) 156 (1.57, 2.39) 7.67 Statokal 2003 (N) 110 (0.77, 1.63) 2.76 Section 2002 110 (0.70, 1.63) 2.76 Berlew 2000 1110 (0.77, 1.61) 2.70 De statis 2003 (N) 2.76 1.66 (0.93, 2.60) 1.91 De statis 2002 1110 (0.77, 1.61) 2.70 1.91 De statis 2003 1.91 2.76 1.92 1.91 De statis 2004 1.90 (1.72, 2.90) 2.51 1.91 1.92 De statis 2005 1.91 (0.71, 7.39) 2.76 1.92 1.91 1.92 De statis 2004 1.91 (0.71, 7.39) 2.76 1.92 1.91 1.92 1.91 1.91 1.91 1.91 1.91	Shen 2008	4.41 (2.40, 8.12)	1.78
Swamma 1997 128 (0.0, 2.20) 1.90 Isservice 2009 M 122 (0.0, 1.30) 3.71 Tasservice 2011 M 1.11 (0.71, 1.50) 2.83 Tasservice 2013 (A) 1.21 (0.8, 2.15) 1.89 Zatockai 2003 (A) 1.21 (0.8, 2.15) 1.89 Satothai (Figuared = 8.0%, p = 0.00) 1.50 (1.17, 2.39) 2.76 Berl 1.30 (0.80, 2.80) 1.88 Desideni 1997 1.50 (0.12, 2.90) 2.70 Desideni 1997 1.89 (0.43, 3.80) 1.88 Desideni 1997 1.89 (0.43, 3.80) 1.89 Desideni 1997 1.29 (0.12, 2.29) 2.51 Desideni 1997 1.29 (0.12, 2.29) 2.51 Desideni 1997 1.24 (0.81, 1.80)	Sinha 1998	1.80 (1.20, 2.70)	2.54
Tasserada 2009 M 122 (0.0, 1.30) 3.71 Tasserada 2009 W 113 (0.97, 1.22) 2.60 Tasserada 2011 M 1.30 (0.07, 1.59) 2.55 Tasserada 2003 (N) 1.30 (0.07, 1.59) 2.55 Zatioukal 2003 (S) 1.81 (1.0.4, 3.10) 1.59 Suitoral (Lequared = 83.0%, p = 0.000) 1.81 (1.0.4, 3.10) 1.59 Suitoral (Lequared = 83.0%, p = 0.000) 1.81 (1.0.4, 3.10) 2.76 Tasserada 2003 (S) 1.81 (1.0.4, 3.10) 2.76 Beelson 2000 1.30 (0.08, 2.10) 2.76 Beelson 2000 1.30 (0.08, 2.10) 2.76 De solard 1997 1.30 (0.08, 2.00) 1.51 De solard 1997 1.98 (0.94, 3.82) 1.51 De solard 1997 1.98 (0.94, 3.82) 1.51 Parce 1980 0.66 (0.37, 2.69) 1.52 Coltard Lequared = 0.0%, p = 0.43) 1.52 (0.1, 2.29) 2.53 De solard 1997 1.52 (0.1, 2.29) 2.51 De	Swanson 1997	1.26 (0.70, 2.20)	1.90
Tassexba 2009 W 111 (0 73, 1.32) 3.60 Tassexba 2011 W 111 (0 73, 1.56) 2.83 Tassexba 2011 W 121 (0 68, 2.15) 1.80 Załozkał 2003 (S) 151 (1 34, 318) 1.95 Załozkał 2003 (S) 153 (1 37, 706) 8.49 C 130 (0 67, 1.72) 2.76 Berl 130 (0 67, 1.76) 2.70 Anne 2009 130 (0 60, 2.10) 2.76 Berly 130 (0 67, 1.76) 2.70 De słodni 1997 110 (0 7, 1.61) 2.70 De słodni 1997 190 (0 60, 2.02) 1.81 De słodni 1997 190 (0 4, 3.82) 1.51 De słodni 1997 190 (0 4, 3.82) 1.51 De słodni 1997 190 (0 4, 3.82) 1.51 Stototat (I squared - 0.0%, p - 0.43) 1.92 1.92 Stototat (I squared - 0.0%, p - 0.43) 2.47 1.52 (1 0, 1.22) 2.53 De słodni 1997 124 (0 81, 1.89) 2.47 1.56 (1 0, 2.29) 2.53 De słodni 1997 124 (0 81, 1.89) 2.47 1.56 (1 0, 2.29) 2.51 Stototati (I squared - 0.0%, p - 0.48) 1.92 <td< td=""><td>Tasevska 2009 M</td><td>1.22 (1.09, 1.38)</td><td>3.71</td></td<>	Tasevska 2009 M	1.22 (1.09, 1.38)	3.71
Tasersda 2011 M 110 (07, 1.56) 2.83 Tasersda 2011 W 130 (0.87, 1.56) 2.55 Tasersda 2031 W 130 (0.87, 1.56) 2.55 Zatokak 2033 (S) 181 (1 (04, 3.16) 1.99 Statestal (1 segured + 83.0%, p + 0.000) 185 (1, 35, 1.77) 08.49 Image: Comparison of the comparison of	Tasevska 2009 W	1.13 (0.97, 1.32)	3.60
Taserska 2011 W 130 (0.87, 1.96) 2.55 Załokak 2003 (A) 121 (0.82, 2.16) 1.69 Załokak 2003 (S) 131 (1.04, 3.18) 1.95 Subtoli (I-squaret = 83.0%, p = 0.00) 155 (1.35, 1.77) 08.49 Bef 130 (0.87, 1.96) 2.76 Stototi (I-squaret = 83.0%, p = 0.00) 130 (0.80, 2.10) 2.23 De stefari 1997 130 (0.81, 3.29) 1.81 1.81 Do Stototi 2022 1.84 (0.83, 2.90) 1.81 Do Stototi 2022 1.96 (0.83, 2.90) 1.81 Do Stototi 2022 1.96 (0.83, 2.90) 1.81 Do Stototi 2022 1.97 1.91 (0.11, 1.81) 1.227 Lamb 1.52 (1.01, 2.29) 2.53 Stototi (I-squaret = 0.0%, p = 0.489) 1.42 (0.41, 1.89) 2.42 De Stefari 1997 1.40 (0.41, 1.89) 2.42 1.51 De Stefari 1997 1.42 (0.41, 1.89) 2.42 1.51 De Stefari 1997	Tasevska 2011 M	1.11 (0.79, 1.56)	2.83
Założakaj 2003 (s) 121 (0.68, 2.19) 1.89 Założakaj 2003 (s) 135 (1.04, 3.18) 1.95 Założakaj 2003 (s) 1.55 (1.35, 1.77) 68, 49 Jaczakaj 2003 (s) 1.57 (1.17, 2.39) 2.76 Berd 1.30 (0.80, 2.10) 2.23 De stefari 1997 1.66 (0.53, 2.69) 1.88 De Stefari 2002 1.89 (0.84, 3.22) 1.51 De Stefari 2002 1.89 (0.84, 3.22) 1.51 Jaczakaj 2003 (s) 1.89 (0.84, 3.22) 1.51 De Stefari 2002 1.89 (0.84, 3.22) 1.51 Jaczakaj 2003 (s) 1.89 (0.84, 3.22) 1.51 De stefari 2002 1.89 (0.84, 3.22) 1.51 Jaczakaj 2002 1.52 (1.01, 2.29) 2.53 De stefari 2002 1.52 (0.81, 1.89) 1.64 Jaczakaj 2002 1.54 (1.52, 1.51) 7.82 De stefari 2002 1.64 (0.82, 1.83) 1.64 Jaczakaj 2003 (s) 1.64	Tasevska 2011 W	1.30 (0.87, 1.95)	2.55
Zatokad 2003 (S) 18 (1 0.4.3.18) 1.95 Subtactal (1:squared = 83.0%, p = 0.000) 1.55 (1.35, 1.77) 68.49 Image: Subscription of the standard st	Zatloukal 2003 (A)	1.21 (0.68, 2.15)	1.89
Subtoal (isquared = 83.0%, p = 0.000) 1.55 (1.35, 1.77) 68.49 Image: Subtoal (isquared = 83.0%, p = 0.000) 1.55 (1.35, 1.77) 68.49 Image: Subtoal (isquared = 83.0%, p = 0.000) 1.55 (1.35, 1.77) 68.49 Image: Subtoal (isquared = 83.0%, p = 0.000) 1.55 (1.35, 1.77) 68.49 Image: Subtoal (isquared = 83.0%, p = 0.000) 1.55 (1.35, 1.77) 68.49 Image: Subtoal (isquared = 83.0%, p = 0.000) 1.55 (1.35, 1.77) 68.49 Image: Subtoal (isquared = 80.0%, p = 0.43) 1.11 (107, 1.61) 2.70 Image: Subtoal (isquared = 0.0%, p = 0.43) 1.39 (1.41, 1.69) 1.227 Image: Subtoal (isquared = 0.0%, p = 0.43) 1.39 (1.41, 1.69) 1.227 Image: Subtoal (isquared = 0.0%, p = 0.43) 1.39 (1.41, 1.69) 1.227 Image: Subtoal (isquared = 0.0%, p = 0.489) 1.52 (1.01, 2.29) 2.53 Image: Subtoal (isquared = 0.0%, p = 0.489) 1.25 (0.97, 1.61) 7.82 Image: Subtoal (isquared = 0.0%, p = 0.489) 1.25 (0.97, 1.61) 7.82 Image: Subtoal (isquared = 0.0%, p = 0.489) 1.25 (0.97, 1.61) 7.82 Image: Subtoal (isquared = 0.0%, p = 0.489) 1.25 (0.97, 1.61) 7.82 Image: Subtoal (isquared = 0.0%, p = 0.489) <td>Zatloukal 2003 (S)</td> <td>1.81 (1.04, 3.18)</td> <td>1.95</td>	Zatloukal 2003 (S)	1.81 (1.04, 3.18)	1.95
Image: Constraint of the state of the	Subtotal (I-squared = 83.0%, p = 0.000)	1.55 (1.35, 1.77)	68.49
Beef Anne 2000 Brestow 2000 De stefani 1997 De Stefani 2002 De Stefani 2002 De Stefani 2002 Coordinal 2003 Coordinal 2004 Coordinal 2005 De Stefani 2007 Lamb Anne 2006 De Stefani 2007 De Stefani 2007 Coordinal 2007 De Stefani 2007 De Stefani 2007 Coordinal 2007 De Stefani 20			
Anne 2009 16 (1, 1, 2, 39) 2, 76 Bresdow 2000 1, 30 (0.8, 2, 10) 2, 33 De stefani 1997 1, 11 (0, 77, 1.61) 2, 70 De stefani 2002 1, 66 (0.93, 2, 96) 1, 88 Dosh-D72ar 2007 1, 89 (0.94, 3, 82) 1, 51 Pierce 1998 0, 86 (0.37, 2, 00) 1, 19 Subtotal (I-squared = 0,0%, p = 0.433) 1, 22, 70 1, 22, 10, 2, 29) 2, 53 Lamb 1 1, 24 (0, 81, 1, 169) 2, 247 Lamb 1 1, 24 (0, 81, 1, 169) 2, 47 De stefani 1997 1, 24 (0, 81, 1, 189) 2, 47 De stefani 2002 1, 10 (0, 0, 57, 1, 16) 1, 84 Pierce 1998 0, 74 (0, 28, 193) 0, 98 Subtotal (I-squared = 0, 0%, p = 0.489) 1, 60 (1, 00, 2, 70) 2, 17 Oscidman 1992 W 0, 36 (0, 18, 0.69) 1, 59 Coodman 1992 M 0, 36 (0, 18, 0.69) 1, 59 Goodman 1992 W 0, 36 (0, 12, 0, 50, 0) 1, 41 Lim 201 0, 40 2, 75 Pierce 1998 0, 63 (0, 27, 1, 45) 1, 20 Subtotal (I-squared = 77, 0%, p = 0.000) 1,	Beef		0.70
bressow 2000 1.30 (0.50, 2.10) 2.23 De stefani 2002 1.66 (0.93, 2.96) 1.88 Dosil-D77az 2007 1.89 (0.94, 3.82) 1.51 Pierce 1998 0.86 (0.37, 2.00) 1.19 Subtotal (1-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.43) 1.30 (0.14, 1.09) 2.27 Lamb . . . Aune 2009 . . . De stefani 2002 . . . Pierce 1998 . . . Subtotal (1-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.489) Pork Breskow 2000 Dosib/D72x2 2077 . .	Aune 2009	1.67 (1.17, 2.39)	2.76
La stefan 1997 La stefan 2002 De stefan 2002 De stefan 2002 De stefan 2002 De stefan 2002 Lamb Auro 2009 De stefan 1997 Lamb Auro 2009 De stefan 1997 De stefan 2002 De stefan 2	Breslow 2000	1.30 (0.80, 2.10)	2.23
Does Untransition 100 (0.93, 5, 2.90) 1.00 Disclip 2722 2007 18.9 (0.94, 3.82) 1.51 Pierce 1998 0.86 (0.37, 2.00) 1.19 Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.433) 1.39 (1.14, 1.69) 1.227 Lamb . . . Anne 2009 1.52 (1.01, 2.29) 2.53 De stefani 1997 1.24 (0.81, 1.89) 2.47 De Stefani 2002 . . . Pierce 1998 Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.489) . Pork Breslow 2000 Goodman 1992 W Lim 2011 Vereid I-squared = 75.2%, p = 0.001) Overall (I-squared = 77.0%, p = 0.000)	De Stefani 2002	1.11(0.77, 1.01)	2.70
Done finds: Looy 1.00 (0.94, 0.02) 1.19 Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.433) 1.39 (1.14, 1.69) 1.227 Lamb 1.26 (1.01, 2.29) 2.53 Aune 2009 1.52 (1.01, 2.29) 2.53 De stefani 1997 1.24 (0.81, 1.89) 2.47 De Stefani 2002 1.03 (0.57, 1.85) 1.84 Pierce 1988 0.74 (0.28, 1.93) 0.98 Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.489) 1.25 (0.97, 1.61) 7.82 r Pork 1.60 (1.00, 2.70) 2.17 Desilow 2000 1.60 (1.00, 2.70) 2.17 Desilow 2000 1.60 (1.00, 2.70) 2.17 Desilow 2000 2.60 (1.20, 5.60) 1.34 Lim 2011 1.15 (0.80, 1.64) 2.75 Pierce 1988 0.63 (0.27, 1.45) 1.20 Subtotal (I-squared = 75.2%, p = 0.001) 1.10 (0.70, 1.73) 1.42 Overall (I-squared = 77.5%, p = 0.001) 1.44 (1.29, 1.61) 100 000 NOTE: Weights are from random effects analysis . . .	DesiLD22az 2007	1.89 (0.94, 3.82)	1.00
Interest 1930 Condensity, Exoly 1.13 Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.433) 1.39 (1.4, 1.69) 12.27 Lamb 1.52 (1.01, 2.29) 2.53 De stefani 1997 1.24 (0.81, 1.89) 2.47 De Stefani 2002 1.03 (0.57, 1.85) 1.84 Pierce 1980 0.03 (0.57, 1.85) 1.84 Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.489) 1.25 (0.97, 1.61) 7.82 . Pork 1.25 (0.97, 1.61) 7.82 Pork 1.59 1.59 1.59 Goodman 1992 M 1.60 (1.00, 2.70) 2.17 Dosit-077az 2007 0.36 (0.18, 0.69) 1.59 Goodman 1992 W 1.60 (1.20, 5.60) 1.34 Lim 2011 1.15 (0.80, 1.64) 2.75 Pierce 1998 0.63 (0.27, 1.45) 1.20 Subtotal (I-squared = 75.2%, p = 0.001) 1.44 (1.29, 1.61) 100.00 NOTE: Weights are from random effects analysis 1.44 (1.29, 1.61) 100.00		0.86 (0.37, 3.02)	1.01
Lando 1.52 (1.01, 2.29) 2.53 Lamb 1.24 (0.81, 1.89) 2.47 De Stefani 2002 1.03 (0.57, 1.85) 1.84 Pierce 1998 0.74 (0.28, 1.93) 0.98 Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.489) 1.25 (0.97, 1.61) 7.82 . Pork 1.25 (0.07, 2.07) 2.17 Dosit-DY?az 2007 0.36 (0.18, 0.69) 1.59 Goodman 1992 M 1.40 (0.90, 2.20) 2.37 Goodman 1992 W 2.60 (1.20, 5.60) 1.34 Lim 2011 1.15 (0.80, 1.64) 2.75 Pierce 1998 0.63 (0.27, 1.45) 1.20 Subtotal (I-squared = 75.2%, p = 0.001) 1.44 (1.29, 1.61) 100.00 NOTE: Weights are from random effects analysis 1.44 (1.29, 1.61) 100.00	Subtotal (L-squared = 0.0% p = 0.433)	1 39 (1 14 1 69)	12 27
Lamb Aune 2009 De stefani 1997 De Stefani 2002 Piece 1998 Subtoal (Isquared = 0.0%, p = 0.489) Pork Breslow 2000 Do sil-D??az 2007 Goodman 1992 M Goodman 1992 M Goodman 1992 W Lim 2011 Piece 1998 Subtoal (Isquared = 75.2%, p = 0.01) Overall (Isquared = 75.2%, p = 0.001) Dorsi Lin 2014 Dorsi		100 (111) 100)	12.27
Aune 2009 1.52 (1.01, 2.29) 2.53 De stefani 1997 1.24 (0.81, 1.89) 2.47 De Stefani 2002 1.03 (0.57, 1.85) 1.84 Pierce 1998 0.74 (0.28, 1.39) 0.98 Subtotal (Isquared = 0.0%, p = 0.489) 1.25 (0.97, 1.61) 7.82 Pork 1.50 (1.00, 2.70) 2.17 Dosil-D?raz 2007 0.36 (0.18, 0.69) 1.59 Coodman 1992 M 2.60 (1.20, 5.60) 1.54 Goodman 1992 W 2.60 (1.20, 5.60) 1.34 Lim 2011 1.15 (0.80, 1.64) 2.75 Pierce 1998 0.63 (0.27, 1.45) 1.20 Subtotal (Isquared = 75.2%, p = 0.001) 1.00 (70, 1.73) 1.12 Overall (I-squared = 77.0%, p = 0.000) . . . NOTE: Weights are from random effects analysis . . .	Lamb		
De stefani 1997 1.24 (0.81, 1.89) 2.47 De Stefani 2002 1.03 (0.57, 1.85) 1.84 Pierce 1998 0.74 (0.28, 1.93) 0.98 Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.489) 1.25 (0.97, 1.61) 7.82 Pork 1.50 (1.00, 2.70) 2.17 Dosil-D2?az 2007 0.36 (0.18, 0.69) 1.59 Goodman 1992 M 1.40 (0.90, 2.20) 2.37 Goodman 1992 W 2.60 (1.20, 5.60) 1.34 Lim 2011 1.15 (0.80, 1.64) 2.75 Pierce 1998 0.63 (0.27, 1.45) 1.20 Subtotal (I-squared = 75.2%, p = 0.001) 1.10 (0.70, 1.73) 1.12 1.00 (70, 1.73) 1.42 Overall (I-squared = 75.2%, p = 0.001) Overall (I-squared = 77.0%, p = 0.000)	Aune 2009	1.52 (1.01, 2.29)	2.53
De Stefani 2002 1.03 (0.57, 1.85) 1.84 Pierce 1998 0.74 (0.28, 1.93) 0.98 Subtolal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.489) 1.25 (0.97, 1.61) 7.82 r 7 7.82 7.82 Pork 1.60 (1.00, 2.70) 2.17 Dosil-D??az 2007 0.36 (0.18, 0.69) 1.59 Goodman 1992 M 1.40 (0.90, 2.20) 2.37 Goodman 1992 W 2.60 (1.20, 5.60) 1.34 Lim 2011 1.15 (0.80, 1.64) 2.75 Pierce 1998 0.63 (0.27, 1.45) 1.20 Subtolal (I-squared = 75.2%, p = 0.01) 1.10 (0.70, 1.73) 1.42 · . . . Overall (I-squared = 77.0%, p = 0.000) . . . NOTE: Weights are from random effects analysis . . .	De stefani 1997	1.24 (0.81, 1.89)	2.47
Pierce 1998 0.74 (0.28, 1.93) 0.98 Subtotal (i-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.489) 1.25 (0.97, 1.61) 7.82 Pork 1.60 (1.00, 2.70) 2.17 Dosil-D77az 2007 0.36 (0.18, 0.69) 1.59 Goodman 1992 M 1.40 (0.90, 2.20) 2.37 Goodman 1992 W 2.60 (1.20, 5.60) 1.34 Lim 2011 1.15 (0.80, 1.64) 2.75 Pierce 1998 0.63 (0.27, 1.45) 1.20 Subtotal (i-squared = 75.2%, p = 0.001) 1.10 (0.70, 1.73) 1.42 · Overall (i-squared = 77.0%, p = 0.000) 1.44 (1.29, 1.61) 100.00 NOTE: Weights are from random effects analysis 0.71 0.72 1.72	De Stefani 2002	1.03 (0.57, 1.85)	1.84
Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.489) 1.25 (0.97, 1.61) 7.82 Pork 1.60 (1.00, 2.70) 2.17 Breslow 2000 1.60 (1.00, 2.70) 2.17 Dosil-D72az 2007 0.36 (0.18, 0.69) 1.59 Goodman 1992 M 2.60 (1.20, 5.60) 1.34 Lim 2011 1.15 (0.80, 1.64) 2.75 Pierce 1998 0.63 (0.27, 1.45) 1.20 Subtotal (I-squared = 75.2%, p = 0.001) 1.10 (0.70, 1.73) 11.42 Overall (I-squared = 77.0%, p = 0.000) NOTE: Weights are from random effects analysis	Pierce 1998	0.74 (0.28, 1.93)	0.98
Pork 1.60 (1.00, 2.70) 2.17 Breslow 2000 0.36 (0.18, 0.69) 1.59 Goodman 1992 M 1.40 (0.90, 2.00) 2.37 Goodman 1992 W 2.60 (1.20, 5.60) 1.34 Lim 2011 1.15 (0.80, 1.64) 2.75 Picce 1998 0.63 (0.27, 1.45) 1.20 Subtotal (I-squared = 75.2%, p = 0.00) 1.44 (1.29, 1.61) 10.00 NOTE: Weights are from random effects analysis 1.44 (1.29, 1.61) 100.00	Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.489)	1.25 (0.97, 1.61)	7.82
Pork 1.60 (1.00, 2.70) 2.17 Bresiow 2000 0.36 (0.18, 0.69) 1.59 Dosil-D7?az 2007 1.40 (0.90, 2.00) 2.37 Goodman 1992 M 2.60 (1.20, 5.60) 1.34 Lim 2011 1.15 (0.80, 1.64) 2.75 Pierce 1998 6.63 (0.27, 1.45) 1.20 Subtotal (I-squared = 75.2%, p = 0.00) 1.44 (1.29, 1.61) 100.00 NOTE: Weights are from random effects analysis 1 1 1			
Breslow 2000 1.60 (1.00, 2.70) 2.17 DosiL077az 2007 0.36 (0.18, 0.69) 1.59 Goodman 1992 M 1.40 (0.90, 2.20) 2.37 Goodman 1992 W 2.60 (1.20, 5.60) 1.34 Lim 2011 1.15 (0.80, 1.64) 2.75 Pierce 1998 0.63 (0.27, 1.45) 1.20 Subtotal (I-squared = 75.2%, p = 0.00) 1.14 (1.29, 1.61) 100.00 NOTE: Weights are from random effects analysis 1 1 10.00	Pork		
Dosi-D0?az 2007 0.36 (0.18, 0.69) 1.59 Goodman 1992 M 1.40 (0.90, 2.20) 2.37 Goodman 1992 W 2.60 (1.20, 5.60) 1.34 Lim 2011 1.15 (0.80, 1.64) 2.75 Pierce 1998 0.63 (0.27, 1.45) 1.20 Subtotal (I-squared = 75.2%, p = 0.001) 1.10 (0.70, 1.73) 11.42 Overall (I-squared = 77.0%, p = 0.000) 1.44 (1.29, 1.61) 100.00 NOTE: Weights are from random effects analysis 1.44 (1.29, 1.61) 100.00	Breslow 2000	1.60 (1.00, 2.70)	2.17
Goodman 1992 M 1.40 (0.90, 2.20) 2.37 Goodman 1992 W 2.60 (1.20, 5.60) 1.34 Lim 2011 1.15 (0.80, 1.64) 2.75 Pierce 1998 0.63 (0.27, 1.45) 1.20 Subtotal (I-squared = 75.2%, p = 0.001) 1.10 (0.70, 1.73) 1.42 Overall (I-squared = 77.0%, p = 0.000) 1.44 (1.29, 1.61) 100.00	Dosil-D??az 2007	0.36 (0.18, 0.69)	1.59
Goodman 1992 W 2.60 (1.20, 5.60) 1.34 Lim 2011 1.15 (0.80, 1.64) 2.75 Pierce 1998 0.63 (0.27, 1.45) 1.20 Subtotal (I-squared = 75.2%, p = 0.001) 1.10 (0.70, 1.73) 11.42 Overall (I-squared = 77.0%, p = 0.000) 1.44 (1.29, 1.61) 100.00 NOTE: Weights are from random effects analysis . .	Goodman 1992 M	1.40 (0.90, 2.20)	2.37
Lim 2011 1.15 (0.80, 1.64) 2.75 Pierce 1998 0.63 (0.27, 1.45) 1.20 Subtotal (I-squared = 75.2%, p = 0.001) 1.10 (0.70, 1.73) 11.42 Overall (I-squared = 77.0%, p = 0.000) 1.44 (1.29, 1.61) 100.00 NOTE: Weights are from random effects analysis	Goodman 1992 W	2.60 (1.20, 5.60)	1.34
Pierce 1998 0.63 (0.27, 1.45) 1.20 Subtotal (I-squared = 75.2%, p = 0.001) 1.10 (0.70, 1.73) 11.42 Overall (I-squared = 77.0%, p = 0.000) 1.44 (1.29, 1.61) 100.00 NOTE: Weights are from random effects analysis . .	Lim 2011	1.15 (0.80, 1.64)	2.75
Subtotal (I-squared = 75.2%, p = 0.001) 1.10 (0.70, 1.73) 11.42 Overall (I-squared = 77.0%, p = 0.000) 1.44 (1.29, 1.61) 100.00 NOTE: Weights are from random effects analysis 1 1.44 (1.29, 1.61) 100.00	Pierce 1998	0.63 (0.27, 1.45)	1.20
Overall (I-squared = 77.0%, p = 0.000) 1.44 (1.29, 1.61) 100.00 NOTE: Weights are from random effects analysis 1 1	Subtotal (I-squared = 75.2%, p = 0.001)	1.10 (0.70, 1.73)	11.42
Overail (+squared = /1.0%, p = 0.000) 1.44 (1.29, 1.61) 100.00 NOTE: Weights are from random effects analysis 1 1		4 44 (4 00 4 64)	100.00
NOTE: Weights are from random effects analysis	Overall (I-squared = //.0%, p = 0.000)	1.44 (1.29, 1.61)	100.00
	NOTE: Weights are from random effects analysis		
5 1 16			

Figure 2. Forest plot for red meat. M: Man; W: Woman; A: Adenocarcinoma; S: Squamous carcinoma.

found (*P* for heterogeneity = 0.489). No association was found between pork consumption and lung cancer from five related studies (RR: 1.10, 95% CI, 0.70-1.73) and a significant heterogeneity was detected (*P* for heterogeneity = 0.001). The results were shown in **Table 2**.

Dose-response meta-analysis

Only red meat was given dose-response analysis. A total of 11 studies were included [5, 21, 22, 24, 25, 31, 36, 38, 39, 42, 44]. The reasons were as follows: 1) no case and/or con-

	yoio or rea meat a		mout
Meat type	Pooled effect (RR, 95% Cl)	P for hetero- geneity	No. of studies
total red meat	1.44 (1.29, 1.61)	p = 0.000	28
By meat type			
Red meat	1.55 (1.35, 1.77)	p = 0.000	24
Beef	1.39 (1.14, 1.69)	p = 0.433	6
Lamb	1.25 (0.97, 1.61)	p = 0.489	4
Pork	1.10 (0.70, 1.73)	p = 0.001	5
By study type			
Cohort studies	1.21 (1.14, 1.28)	p = 0.712	6
Population-based CC	1.70 (1.36, 2.11)	p = 0.001	9
Hospital-based CC	1.37 (1.10, 1.72)	p = 0.000	15
By areas		,	
The US	1.30 (1.17, 1.44)	p = 0.057	8
Furope	1.30 (1.05, 1.61)	p = 0.002	9
Asia	2.16 (0.76, 6.19)	p = 0.000	4
Uruguay	1.58 (1.34, 1.86)	p = 0.089	4
Canada	1.30 (1.12, 1.52)	p = 0.838	2
By genders	,,	p 0.000	-
Both	1 54 (1 30 1 83)	n = 0.000	14
Men	1 21 (0.94, 1.55)	p = 0.000	6
Women	1.39 (1.17, 1.65)	p = 0.000	12
Total processed meat	1.00(1.17, 1.00) 1.23(1.10, 1.37)	p = 0.010	23
By meat type	1120 (1110, 1101)	p 0.000	20
processed meat	1.17 (1.06, 1.30)	p = 0.000	15
Bacon	1.67 (1.09, 2.56)	p = 0.016	4
Preserved meat	0.50(0.35, 0.71)	n = ?	1
Salted meat	1.61 (0.87, 2.99)	p = 0.001	- 3
Sausage	1.33 (0.91, 1.94)	p = 0.008	5
By study type	,	p 0.000	Ū.
Cohort studies	1.09 (0.99, 1.19)	p = 0.095	5
Population-based CC	1 46 (1 08 1 97)	p = 0.000	8
Hospital-based CC	1 23 (1 01 1 49)	p = 0.000	8
By areas	(,,)	p 0.000	C
The United States	1.29 (1.09, 1.53)	p = 0.000	6
Furope	1 13 (0 78 1 63)	p = 0.000	3
Asia	0.89 (0.56, 1.42)	p = 0.000	2
Uruguay	1 27 (1 00 1 60)	p = 0.000	7
Canada	1 46 (1 24 1 71)	p = 0.600	3
By genders	1.40 (1.24, 1.11)	p 0.001	0
Both	1 11 (0 96 1 28)	n = 0.000	12
Men	1 95 (1 34 2 84)	p = 0.000	5
Women	1 09 (0 94 1 28)	p = 0.000	6
By cancer type	1.00 (0.04, 1.20)	p 0.112	0
Adenocarcinoma	1.19 (0.92 1.54)	p = 0.002	6
Large cell carcinoma	1.31 (0.95 1 80)	p = 0.002	3
Small cell	1.31 (0.97, 1.77)	p = 0.131	5
Squamous carcinoma	1.31 (0.97. 1.78)	p = 0.020	6
			-

Table 2. Subgroup analysis of red meat and processed meat

trols reported [27, 29, 33, 34, 40, 43]; and 2) only 1 level or 2 levels of exposure [5, 8, 20, 32, 37, 41]. The results were shown in **Table 2**. The estimated RR associated with consumption of 120 g per day was 1.35 (95% CI, 1.25-1.46), and significant heterogeneity between studies was detected.

Processed meat (the highest vs lowest category) (**Figure 3**)

A total of 23 studies were included in the highest versus lowest analysis of processed meat intake and lung cancer. The pooled result showed that risk of lung cancer was 1.23 (95% CI, 1.10-1.37) with evidence of significant heterogeneity (P for heterogeneity = 0.000). Table 2 showed the subgroup analysis of processed meat. The synthetic RR was significantly elevated in both Population-based case-control subgroup (RR: 1.46, 95% Cl, 1.08-1.97) and Hospitalbased case-control studies (RR: 1.23, 95% CI, 1.01-1.49). The RR was significant for studies conducted in the US (RR: 1.29, 95% CI, 1.09-1.53) and Canada (RR: 1.46, 95% CI, 1.24-1.71), but nonsignificant for studies in Europe (RR: 1.13, 95% CI, 0.78-1.63) and Asia (RR: 0.89, 95% CI, 0.56-1.42) (Table 2).

Bacon, salted meat, sausage

4 studies explored the association between beef and the risk of lung cancer. The pooled RR was 1.67 (95% Cl, 1.09-2.56), and a significant heterogeneity was detected (*P* for heterogeneity = 0.016). No association were found between salted meat and sausage. The result were showed in **Table 2**.

Dose-response meta-analysis

Eleven studies were included in the dose-response meat analysis for total red meat. Whereas, stud-

Study ID	rr (95% CI)	% Weight
Processed meat		
Aune 2009	1.70 (1.28, 2.25)	3.92
Breslow 2000	0.80 (0.50, 1.40)	2.44
Cross 2007	1.16 (1.06, 1.26)	5.12
De stefani 1997	1.19 (0.75, 1.89)	2.73
De Stefani 2002	0.83 (0.55, 1.26)	3.01
De Stefani 2009	1.79 (1.22, 2.65)	3.19
Deneo-Pellegrini 1996	0.70 (0.38, 1.31)	1.97
Hu 2008	1.40 (1.10, 1.70)	4.38
Hu 2011	1.60 (1.20, 2.10)	3.94
Kreuzer 2002	0.99 (0.61, 1.62)	2.58
Lam 2009	1.50 (1.20, 1.80)	4.48
Lim 2011	0.83 (0.55, 1.25)	3.04
Linseisen 2011	0.92 (0.73, 1.17)	4.25
Tasevska 2009 M	1.23 (1.10, 1.37)	5.02
Tasevska 2009 W	1.00 (0.87, 1.15)	4.87
Tasevska 2011 M	1.12 (0.83, 1.53)	3.75
Tasevska 2011 W	0.98 (0.68, 1.41)	3.34
Subtotal (I-squared = 65.0%, p = 0.000)	1.17 (1.06, 1.30)	62.03
Salted meat		
De stefani 1997	1.19 (0.68, 2.09)	2.22
De Stefani 2010	2.90 (1.99, 4.25)	3.24
De Stefani 2012	1.18 (0.89, 1.56)	3.93
Subtotal (I-squared = 86.6%, p = 0.001)	1.61 (0.87, 2.99)	9.39
Sausaa		
De stefani 1997	1.05 (0.69, 1.59)	3.00
De Stefani 1997	1.03 (0.03, 1.03)	3.42
Goodman 1992 M	3 40 (2 00 6 00)	2.28
Goodman 1992 W	1.30 (0.50, 3.20)	1 11
Hu 2002	0 70 (0 20 2 50)	0.66
Lim 2011	1.00 (0.69, 1.43)	3.34
Subtotal (I-squared = 68.1% p = 0.008)	1 33 (0 91, 1 94)	13.81
,	1.00 (0.01, 1.01)	10.01
Bacon		
De Stefani 2012	0.72 (0.40, 1.68)	1.62
Goodman 1992 M	2.90 (1.80, 4.60)	2.69
Goodman 1992 W	2.70 (1.10, 6.50)	1.19
Hu 2002	1.50 (0.90, 2.50)	2.47
Lim 2011	1.51 (1.06, 2.16)	3.40
Subtotal (I-squared = 67.2%, p = 0.016)	1.67 (1.09, 2.56)	11.36
Preserved meat		
Shen 2008 M	0.50 (0.35, 0.71)	3.41
Subtotal (I-souared = .% p = .)	0.50 (0.35, 0.71)	3.41
	0.00 (0.00, 0.11)	0.41
Overall (I-squared = 75.7%, p = 0.000)	1.23 (1.10, 1.37)	100.00
NOTE: Weights are from random effects analysis		
.5 1 1.5		

Figure 3. Forest plot for processed meat.

ies were excluded, the reasons was only no case and/or controls reported, one study was with less than 3 levels. The estimate RR associated with consumption of 50 g per day was 1.20 (95% CI, 1.11-1.29) and significant heterogeneity between studies was detected.

Discussion

The quantitative studies on the risk of lung cancer and meat consumption suggested that excessive intake of red and processed meat are associated with an increase of incidence of lung cancer. Our findings were partially different with the previous meta-analysis by Yang [12], which concluded that processed meat had no effect on lung cancer. It included a total of 20 studies on red meat and 17 studies on processed meat. We added 2 additional studies [19, 20], all of them find processed meat showed an positive effect on the risk of lung cancer. Dose-response analysis showed that consumption of red meat for 120 g per day might increase the risk of lung cancer by 35%, and consumption of processed meat for 50 g per day might increase the risk of lung cancer by 20%.

Mechanisms for a potential association between meat, especially red and processed meat, and lung cancer has been discussed in many publications. First, preservation, cooking and/or processed methods could introduce mutagens and carcinogens such as N-Nitroso compounds (NOCs), heterocyclic amines (HCAs) and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PHAs) [47, 48]. NOCs are potent carcinogens which can induce tumors in human and animal studies [49]. Besides, HCAs and PAHs have also been proved as carcinogens in animal experiments [50, 51]. Another mechanism is that the haeme iron, which is higher in red meat than white meat, is carcinogenic in animals and humans by forming free radicals and saturated fat in red meat may have association with lung cancer [12].

To our knowledge, this is the first comprehensive dose-response meta-analysis of red and processed meat and lung cancer risk based on high versus low categories. The majority of the studies included and the sample size contained were the largest up to now. Most of the included studies have evaluated the multiple confounders including age, BMI, smoking, total energy intake and so on. We also conducted subgroup analysis by counties and source of control subjects in case-control. Because the dietary habits may be varied considerably among countries and the source of control subjects played an important role in recall bias, subgroup analysis for the above two aspects would be helpful to identify the source of heterogeneity.

Despite of the advantages we have made, the limitations should be noted. First, the heterogeneity in our study was obvious both in major comparison and in the subgroup analysis. Meta-analysis was to combine the outcomes from different studies, which the areas, the methods, the populations were different and thus easily cause heterogeneity. In the present meta-analyses, heterogeneity was found more frequently in case-control studies than cohort studies. When the outcomes were pooled,

more countries were included. It is reported that observational studies are prone to cause recall and selection bias. Although the effectsize was similar in case-control and cohort studies, the follow-up periods were usually long in cohort study. It was usually more than 8 years for cohort study while in case-control studies the time interval from the first dietary assessment to the disease was usually 1-5 years. However, we considered that recall bias is unlikely to contribute to the positive association between red/processed meat and lung cancer risk because more than 80% included studies were case-control designed and recall bias mainly from cohort studies might be weakened. Moreover, more than half studies were hospital-based and selection bias is concerned in these studies. For participates with pre-diagnostic early symptoms, changes in dietary habits would cause difference from those likely to be more healthy. Our findings were in accordance with most studies carried out in the United States and Europe. In western countries, dietary were mainly on meat and less vegetables which was virtually a protected factor for lung cancer and most of the results in western countries were positive. However, for the other geographical areas of the world, the evidence was not enough to obtain meaningful estimates.

Additional methodological issues were the dietary measurement and their validation. Because more than 90% measurement questionnaire was the Food Frequency Questionnaire (FFQ), we could not conduct the subgroup analysis by type of the measurement tools for insufficient information. Compared to the quantitative effect-size, the results from subjective scale were less precise. It is estimated that the typical degrees of random measurement error caused by subjective scale could cause at least 2-fold underestimation of the pooled results. The effect may be strengthened if the assessment was not conducted in the exposure period. Besides, no data from dietary questionnaire validation studies was available. We decided not to apply formal corrections for the measurement error, otherwise an increased pooled estimation would be performed.

The positive association between red meat and processed meat and the risk of lung cancer was potentially affected by the uncontrolled factors. Although some known or suspected risk factors including smoking, age and BMI have been adjusted in most studies, other unknown factors may contribute to the positive association. For example, the relative risks in multiple meat types such as total meat, red meat, processed meat were usually evaluated than the studies with red meat or processed only. Nevertheless, the pool results were in agreement with the summary relative risk per gram of intake estimated from the doseresponse relationship.

Although the dose-response approach has more advantages than traditional methodology, the consumption levels should be recalculated. For example, we need to consider the open-ended borderline level and/or the median level of consumption for category when the information was missing in individual studies. The estimation of "dose" value would cause methodological bias. Besides, the consumption levels of some studies were expressed in servings and we rescaled these servings category into grams.

Conclusions

In summary, findings of this dose-response meta-analysis support the hypothesis that consumption of red and processed meat may be associated with the risk of lung cancer, but we do not suggest that red meat should be completely avoided because of the balance of diet. A low intake of red and processed meat should be recommended.

Disclosure of conflict of interest

None.

Address correspondence to: Dr. Cui-Ping Xu, Qianfoshan Hospital, Shandong University, Jinan, China. E-mail: hejx@thepbpc.org

References

- Chen W, Zheng R, Zhang S, Zou X, Zhao P, He J. Lung cancer incidence and mortality in China, 2009. Thoracic Cancer 2013; 4: 102-8.
- [2] Wiseman M. The second World Cancer Research Fund/American Institute for Cancer Research expert report. Food, nutrition, physical activity, and the prevention of cancer: a global perspective. Proc Nutr Soc 2008; 3: 253-6.
- [3] Brownson RC, Alavanja MC, Caporaso N, Simoes EJ, Chang JC. Epidemiology and preven-

tion of lung cancer in nonsmokers. Epidemiol Rev 1998; 2: 218-36.

- [4] Hu J, Mao Y, Dryer D, White K. Risk factors for lung cancer among Canadian women who have never smoked. Cancer Detect Prev 2002; 2: 129-38.
- Linseisen J, Rohrmann S, Bueno-de-Mesquita [5] B, Büchner FL, Boshuizen HC, Agudo A, Gram IT, Dahm CC, Overvad K, Egeberg R, Tjønneland A, Boeing H, Steffen A, Kaaks R, Lukanova A, Berrino F, Palli D, Panico S, Tumino R, Ardanaz E, Dorronsoro M, Huerta JM, Rodríguez L. Sánchez MJ. Rasmuson T. Hallmans G. Manjer J, Wirfält E, Engeset D, Skeie G, Katsoulis M, Oikonomou E, Trichopoulou A, Peeters PH, Khaw KT, Wareham N, Allen N, Key T, Brennan P, Romieu I, Slimani N, Vergnaud AC, Xun WW, Vineis P, Riboli E. Consumption of meat and fish and risk of lung cancer: results from the European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition. Cancer Causes Control 2011; 6: 909-18.
- [6] Ozasa K, Watanabe Y, Ito Y, Suzuki K, Tamakoshi A, Seki N, Nishino Y, Kondo T, Wakai K, Ando M, Ohno Y. Dietary habits and risk of lung cancer death in a large-scale cohort study (JACC Study) in Japan by sex and smoking habit. Jpn J Cancer Res 2001; 12: 1259-69.
- [7] Balder HF, Goldbohm RA, van den Brandt PA. Dietary patterns associated with male lung cancer risk in the Netherlands Cohort Study. Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev 2005; 2: 483-90.
- [8] Sinha R, Kulldorff M, Curtin J, Brown CC, Alavanja MCR, Swanson CA. Fried, well-done red meat and risk of lung cancer in women (United States). Cancer Causes Control 1998; 6: 621-30.
- [9] Mohr DL, Blot WJ, Tousey PM, Van Doren ML, Wolfe KW. Southern cooking and lung cancer. Nutr Cancer 1999; 1: 34-43.
- [10] Tasevska N, Cross AJ, Dodd KW, Ziegler RG, Caporaso NE, Sinha R. No effect of meat, meat cooking preferences, meat mutagens or heme iron on lung cancer risk in the prostate, lung, colorectal and ovarian cancer screening trial. Int J Cancer 2011; 2: 402-11.
- [11] Lim WY, Chuah KL, Eng P, Leong SS, Lim E, Lim TK, Ng A, Poh WT, Tee A, Teh M, Salim A, Seow A. Meat consumption and risk of lung cancer among never-smoking women. Nutr Cancer 2011; 6: 850-59.
- [12] Yang WS, Wong MY, Vogtmann E, Tang RQ, Xie L, Yang YS, Wu QJ, Zhang W, Xiang YB. Meat consumption and risk of lung cancer: evidence from observational studies. Ann Oncol 2012; 12: 3163-70.
- [13] Higgins JP, Thompson SG. Quantifying heterogeneity in a meta-analysis. Stat Med 2002; 11: 1539-58.

- [14] Greenland S, Longnecker MP. Methods for trend estimation from summarized dose-response data, with applications to meta-analysis. Am J Epidemiol 1992; 11: 1301-9.
- [15] Kreuzer M, Heinrich J, Kreienbrock L, Rosario AS, Gerken M, Wichmann HE. Risk factors for lung cancer among nonsmoking women. Int J Cancer 2002; 6: 706-13.
- [16] Norat T, Lukanova A, Ferrari P, Riboli E. Meat consumption and colorectal cancer risk: doseresponse meta-analysis of epidemiological studies. Int J Cancer 2002; 2: 241-56.
- [17] Salehi M, Moradi-Lakeh M, Salehi MH, Nojomi M, Kolahdooz F. Meat, fish, and esophageal cancer risk: a systematic review and dose-response meta-analysis. Nutr Rev 2013; 5: 257-67.
- [18] Wallin A, Orsini N, Wolk A. Red and processed meat consumption and risk of ovarian cancer: a dose-response meta-analysis of prospective studies. Br J Cancer 2011; 7: 1196-201.
- [19] Gnagnarella P, Maisonneuve P, Bellomi M, Rampinelli C, Bertolotti R, Spaggiari L, Palli D, Veronesi G. Red meat, Mediterranean diet and lung cancer risk among heavy smokers in the COSMOS screening study. Ann Oncol Ann Oncol 2013; 24: 2606-11.
- [20] Pierce RJ, Kune GA, Kune S, Watson LF, Field B, Merenstein D, Hayes A, Irving LB. Dietary and alcohol intake, smoking pattern, occupational risk, and family history in lung cancer patients: results of a case-control study in males. Nutr Cancer 1989; 3: 237-48.
- [21] Aune D, De Stefani E, Ronco A, Boffetta P, Deneo-Pellegrini H, Acosta G, Mendilaharsu M. Meat consumption and cancer risk: a casecontrol study in Uruguay. Asian Pac J Cancer Prev 2009; 3: 429-36.
- [22] Breslow RA, Graubard BI, Sinha R, Subar AF. Diet and lung cancer mortality: A 1987 National Health Interview Survey cohort study. Cancer Causes Control 2000; 5: 419-31.
- [23] Cross AJ, Leitzmann MF, Gail MH, Hollenbeck AR, Schatzkin A, Sinha R. A prospective study of red and processed meat intake in relation to cancer risk. PLoS Med 2007; 12: 1973-84.
- [24] De Stefani E, Boffetta P, Deneo-Pellegrini H, Ronco AL, Aune D, Acosta G, Brennan P, Mendilaharsu M, Ferro G. Meat intake, meat mutagens and risk of lung cancer in Uruguayan men. Cancer Causes Control 2009; 9: 1635-43.
- [25] De Stefani E, Boffetta P, Ronco AL, Deneo-Pellegrini H, Correa P, Acosta G, Mendilaharsu M, Luaces ME, Silva C. Processed meat consumption and risk of cancer: a multisite case-control study in Uruguay. Br J Cancer 2012; 9: 1584-8.
- [26] De Stefani E, Brennan P, Boffetta P, Mendilaharsu M, Deneo-Pellegrini H, Ronco A, Olivera

L, Kasdorf H. Diet and adenocarcinoma of the lung: a case-control study in Uruguay. Lung Cancer 2002; 1: 43-51.

- [27] De Stefani E, Fontham ET, Chen V, Correa P, Deneo-Pellegrini H, Ronco A, Mendilaharsu M. Fatty foods and the risk of lung cancer: a casecontrol study from Uruguay. Int J Cancer 1997; 5: 760-6.
- [28] De Stefani E, Ronco AL, Boffetta P, Deneo-Pellegrini H, Acosta G, Mendilaharsu M. Meat consumption, meat cooking and risk of lung cancer among Uruguayan men. Asian Pac J Cancer Prev 2010; 6: 1713-17.
- [29] Deneo-Pellegrini H, De Stefani E, Ronco A, Mendilaharsu M, Carzoglio JC. Meat consumption and risk of lung cancer; a case-control study from Uruguay. Lung Cancer 1996; 14: 195-205.
- [30] Dosil-Diaz O, Ruano-Ravina A, Gestal-Otero JJ, Barros-Dios JM. Meat and fish consumption and risk of lung cancer: A case-control study in Galicia, Spain. Cancer Lett 2007; 1: 115-22.
- [31] Fortes C, Forastiere F, Farchi S, Mallone S, Trequattrinni T, Anatra F, Schmid G, Perucci CA. The protective effect of the Mediterranean diet on lung cancer. Nutr Cancer 2003; 1: 30-37.
- [32] Ganesh B, Sushama S, Monika S, Suvarna P. A case-control study of risk factors for lung cancer in Mumbai, India. Asian Pac J Cancer Prev 2011; 2: 357-62.
- [33] Goodman MT, Hankin JH, Wilkens LR, Kolonel LN. High-fat foods and the risk of lung cancer. Epidemiology 1992; 4: 288-99.
- [34] Hu J, La Vecchia C, DesMeules M, Negri E, Mery L; Canadian Cancer Registries Epidemiology Research Group. Meat and fish consumption and cancer in Canada. Nutr Cancer 2008; 3: 313-24.
- [35] Hu J, La Vecchia C, Morrison H, Negri E, Mery L. Salt, processed meat and the risk of cancer. Eur J Cancer Prev 2011; 2: 132-39.
- [36] Kubik A, Zatloukal P, Tomasek L, Pauk N, Petruzelka L, Plesko I. Lung cancer risk among nonsmoking women in relation to diet and physical activity. Neoplasma 2004; 2: 136-43.
- [37] Kubik AK, Zatloukal P, Tomasek L, Petruzelka L. Lung cancer risk among Czech women: A case-control study. Prev Med 2002; 4: 436-44.
- [38] Lam TK, Cross AJ, Consonni D, Randi G, Bagnardi V, Bertazzi PA, Caporaso NE, Sinha R, Subar AF, Landi MT. Intakes of red meat, processed meat, and meat mutagens increase lung cancer risk. Cancer Res 2009; 3: 932-9.
- [39] Lin Y, Cai L. Environmental and dietary factors and lung cancer risk among chinese women: A case-control study in Southeast China. Nutr Cancer 2012; 4: 508-14.
- [40] Marchand JL, Luce D, Goldberg P, Bugel I, Salomon C, Goldberg M. Dietary factors and the

risk of lung cancer in New Caledonia (South Pacific). Nutr Cancer 2002; 1: 18-24.

- [41] Shen M, Chapman RS, He X, Liu LZ, Lai H, Chen W, Lan Q. Dietary factors, food contamination and lung cancer risk in Xuanwei, China. Lung Cancer 2008; 3: 275-82.
- [42] Swanson CA, Brown CC, Sinha R, Kulldorff M, Brownson RC, Alavanja MCR. Dietary fats and lung cancer risk among women: The Missouri women's health study (United states). Cancer Causes Control 1997; 6: 883-92.
- [43] Tasevska N, Sinha R, Kipnis V, Subar AF, Leitzmann MF, Hollenbeck AR, Caporaso NE, Schatzkin A, Cross AJ. A prospective study of meat, cooking methods, meat mutagens, heme iron, and lung cancer risks. Am J Clin Nutr 2009; 6: 1884-94.
- [44] Zatloukal P, Kubik A, Pauk N, Tomasek L, Petruzelka L. Adenocarcinoma of the lung among women: risk associated with smoking, prior lung disease, diet and menstrual and pregnancy history. Lung Cancer 2003; 3: 283-93.
- [45] Khan MM, Goto R, Kobayashi K, Suzumura S, Nagata Y, Sonoda T, Sakauchi F, Washio M, Mori M. Dietary habits and cancer mortality among middle aged and older Japanese living in hokkaido, Japan by cancer site and sex. Asian Pac J Cancer Prev 2004; 1: 58-65.

- [46] De Stefani E, Aune D, Boffetta P, Deneo-Pellegrini H, Ronco AL, Acosta G, Brennan P, Ferro G, Mendilaharsu M. Salted meat consumption and the risk of cancer: a multisite case-control study in Uruguay. Asian Pac J Cancer Prev 2009; 5: 853-7.
- [47] Lijinsky W. N-Nitroso compounds in the diet. Mutat Res 1999; 443: 129-38.
- [48] Skog KI, Johansson MA, Jagerstad MI. Carcinogenic heterocyclic amines in model systems and cooked foods: a review on formation, occurrence and intake. Food Chem Toxicol 1998; 36: 879-96.
- [49] Tricker AR, Preussmann R. Carcinogenic N-nitrosamines in the diet: occurrence, formation, mechanisms and carcinogenic potential. Mutat Res 1991; 259: 277-89.
- [50] Bingham SA. High-meat diets and cancer risk. Proc Nutr Soc 1999; 2: 243-8.
- [51] Sugimura T. Nutrition and dietary carcinogens. Carcinogenesis 2000; 3: 387-95.