

HHS Public Access

Author manuscript *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol.* Author manuscript; available in PMC 2024 June 01.

Published in final edited form as:

Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol. 2023 June ; 21(6): 1657–1659.e3. doi:10.1016/j.cgh.2022.04.011.

Proinflammatory diet is associated with increased risk of fecal incontinence among older women: prospective results from the Nurses' Health Study

Keming Yang^{1,8}, Fred K. Tabung^{2,3}, William E. Whitehead⁴, Edward L. Giovannucci^{2,5}, Andrew T. Chan^{1,6,7,8,9}, Kyle Staller^{1,8}

¹Clinical and Translational Epidemiology Unit, Department of Medicine, Massachusetts General Hospital and Harvard Medical School, Boston, Massachusetts

²Department of Nutrition, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, Boston, Massachusetts

³Division of Medical Oncology, Department of Internal Medicine, The Ohio State University College of Medicine and Comprehensive Cancer Center, Columbus, Ohio

⁴Center for Functional Gastrointestinal and Motility Disorders and Division of Gastroenterology and Hepatology, School of Medicine, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, North Carolina, USA

⁵Department of Epidemiology, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, Boston, Massachusetts

⁶Broad Institute of Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts

⁷Department of Immunology and Infectious Diseases, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, Boston, Massachusetts

⁸Division of Gastroenterology, Department of Medicine, Massachusetts General Hospital and Harvard Medical School, Boston, Massachusetts

⁹Channing Division of Network Medicine, Department of Medicine, Brigham and Women's Hospital

Corresponding author: Kyle Staller, MD, MPH. Division of Gastroenterology, Massachusetts General Hospital, 55 Fruit Street, Boston, MA 02114, USA. kstaller@mgh.harvard.edu.

Author contributions to manuscript: KY and KS led the study design. KY analyzed the data and drafted the manuscript. KS supervised the study. All authors (KY, FKT, WEW, ELG, ATC, KS) contributed to the interpretation of the results and revision of the manuscript critically for important intellectual content. All authors, external and internal, had full access to all data (including statistical reports and tables) in the study and can take responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis.

Publisher's Disclaimer: This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

IRB approval status: The study protocol was approved by the Institutional Review Boards of the Brigham and Women's Hospital and the Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health.

Keywords

Dietary Inflammatory Pattern; Fecal Incontinence; Nurses' Health Study

Fecal incontinence (FI) is a debilitating gastrointestinal (GI) disorder with a devastating impact on quality of life,^{1, 2} particularly on older women partly because of unique risk factors including parity and menopause.^{2, 3} Therefore, identifying modifiable factors, such as diet, are crucial for developing effective prevention strategies for FI among those at risk. We previously found higher dietary fiber intake was associated with lower FI risk,⁴ providing the first population-based data to connect diet and FI prevention. However, prospective evidence on other dietary factors and FI risk has been limited. Dietary patterns may be associated with gut microbiome characteristics which may influence inflammatory responses in the GI tract⁵ and drive neurosensory disturbances.⁶ Moreover, chronic inflammation may drive reduced muscle mass and function,⁷ and pelvic floor dysfunction is an established FI risk factor.^{1, 2} We hypothesized that a proinflammatory dietary pattern may be associated with increased FI risk and tested this hypothesis in Nurses' Health Study (NHS).

We used prospective data from NHS, an ongoing US cohort started in 1976.⁸ Every two to four years, participants complete follow-up questionnaires and update their lifestyle and health information. Our current analysis included 57,432 participants with completed dietary data who reported no prevalent FI on the 2008 questionnaire. Participants with histories of inflammatory bowel disease, colorectal cancer and/or inability to walk were excluded. Incident FI was defined as a report of at least one liquid or solid FI episode per month in the past year on the 2010 or 2012 questionnaires; weekly FI episodes denoted severe FI.

Proinflammatory dietary pattern was quantified by the energy-adjusted Empirical Dietary Inflammatory Pattern (EDIP) Score, a previously-validated, weighted sum of 18 food groups most predictive of three established plasma inflammatory markers: C-reactive protein, interleukin-6, and tumor necrosis factor alpha-receptor 2.⁹ Higher scores indicate more proinflammatory diets while lower scores indicate anti-inflammatory diets.

We used Cox proportional hazards regression models to estimate hazard ratios (HRs) and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) for the association between recent EDIP (2006, updated through 2010) and FI risk. Three models were built: 1). Model 1: Cox models stratified by age and time period; 2). Model 2: Covariates included in model 1 + race, smoking status, body mass index, physical activity, menopausal hormone use, parity, history of hypertension, diabetes, neurologic disease, hysterectomy, and cholecystectomy; 3). Model 3: Covariates included in model 2 + dietary fiber intake. Potential effect modification by above-listed covariables on the EDIP-FI relationship were assessed by including a cross-product term of EDIP quintiles and each variable in Model 3; significance of the interaction term was evaluated by Wald tests. To demonstrate the robustness of our findings, two secondary analyses were performed: 1). Using severe weekly FI as outcome; 2). Using long-term pro-inflammatory diet captured by cumulative average EDIP (1984-2010) score as the exposure. Analyses were performed using SAS (Unix 9.4). Detailed descriptions of methods can be found in the Supplementary Methods.

Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2024 June 01.

Yang et al.

Baseline participant characteristics according to EDIP quintiles are presented in Table S1. Among 57,432 participants, 6,896 FI cases were identified over 190,000 person-years of follow-up. Proinflammatory diet was significantly associated with increased FI risk. Compared to the lowest quintile of recent EDIP, women in the highest quintile had 17%, 26%, and 19% increased risk of overall FI [HR (95% CI) = 1.17 (1.08, 1.27), P-trend <0.0001], solid stool FI [HR (95% CI) =1.26 (1.13, 1.41), P-trend <0.0001], and liquid stool FI [HR (95% CI) = 1.19 (1.08, 1.31), P-trend <0.0001] after adjusting for dietary fiber and other covariates (Table 1).

In secondary analyses, the association became stronger when we examined severe (weekly) FI [Q5 vs Q1, Overall FI: HR (95% CI) = 1.25 (1.14, 1.38), P-trend <0.0001, Solid: HR (95% CI) = 1.29 (1.14, 1.45), P-trend <0.0001, Liquid: HR (95% CI) = 1.27 (1.11, 1.45), P-trend = 0.0003] (Table S2). Long term proinflammatory diet represented by the cumulative average EDIP score (1984-2006) was also associated with increased FI risk [Q5 vs Q1, Overall FI: HR (95% CI) = 1.10 (1.02, 1.19), P-trend = 0.0006, Solid: HR (95% CI) = 1.18 (1.05, 1.32), P-trend =0.0004, Liquid: HR (95% CI) =1.09 (0.99, 1.21), P-trend = 0.007]. We did not observe significant effect modification by the covariates listed in Model 3 (P values for interaction > 0.05).

We observed an increased risk of overall FI, as well as both solid and liquid stool FI, among older women consuming a proinflammatory diet, providing the first prospective evidence identifying proinflammatory dietary pattern as a risk factor for FI.

Fiber supplementation is a first line treatment for FI¹⁰ and dietary fiber may also have a beneficial role in FI prevention.⁴ We previously demonstrated that higher fiber intake was associated with lower risk of liquid stool FI but not solid stool FI,⁴ perhaps because fiber normalizes stool consistency through water absorption with stool bulking.¹⁰ However, the current study shows that the association of proinflammatory diet with FI was independent of fiber intake and appeared to be stronger for solid (HR: 1.26) than liquid stool FI (HR: 1.19). The pathophysiology of solid and liquid stool FI differ; whereas chronic bowel disturbances are more likely to lead to liquid stool FI, solid stool FI is more influenced by mechanical risk factors such as pelvic floor injury from obstetric trauma.^{1, 2} Proinflammatory diet may contribute to liquid stool FI, proinflammatory diet may have a direct impact on neuromuscular continence mechanisms, as inflammation may diminish the neuromuscular function and integrity of the pelvic floor.⁷

Our study has several strengths, most notably our prospective design with capture of *incident* FI and minimization of reverse influence of *prevalent* FI on lifestyle habits. We also acknowledge some limitations, specifically residual confounding that can occur in any observational study despite controlling for many known and putative FI risk factors.

In summary, dietary modifications aimed at reducing dietary proinflammatory potential may represent an effective FI prevention strategy. Future translational studies are needed to explore the potential role of inflammation in the pathogenesis of FI.

Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2024 June 01.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgements and Funding:

This work is supported by NIH grants UM1 CA186107 and K23 DK120945. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the National Institutes of Health. We would like to thank the participants and staff of the Nurses' Health Study (NHS) for their valuable contributions. The authors assume full responsibility for analyses and interpretation of these data.

Conflicts of Interest:

KS has received research support from Ironwood and Urovant and has served as a consultant for Arena, Boston Pharmaceuticals, Gelesis, GI Supply, and Shire/Takeda. No other declarations.

Data availability statement:

The data of this study are available upon reasonable request. Further information including the procedures to obtain and access data from the Nurses' Health Studies is described at https://www.nurseshealthstudy.org/researchers (contact nhsaccess@channing.harvard.edu).

References

1. Heitmann PT, et al. Nat Rev Gastroenterol Hepatol 2021;18:751-769. [PubMed: 34373626]

2. Rao SS, et al. Gastroenterology 2016. S0016-5085(16)00175-X.

3. Staller K, et al. Gastroenterology 2017;152:1915–1921.e1. [PubMed: 28209529]

- 4. Staller K, et al. Gastroenterology 2018;155:661–667.e1. [PubMed: 29758215]
- 5. Bolte LA, et al. Gut 2021;70:1287–1298. [PubMed: 33811041]
- 6. Shin A, et al. Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol 2019;17:256-274. [PubMed: 30153517]
- 7. Karanth SD, et al. Nutrients 2021;13(11):3957 [PubMed: 34836213]
- 8. Colditz GA, et al. Nat Rev Cancer 2005;5:388-96. [PubMed: 15864280]
- 9. Tabung FK, et al. J Nutr 2016;146:1560-70. [PubMed: 27358416]

10. Whitehead WE, et al. Am J Gastroenterol 2015;110:138-46; quiz 147. [PubMed: 25331348]

2
t
Б
ō
¥
_
\leq
S =
Mar
Man
7
SDI
IUSC
SDI
IUSCL
IUSCL

Yang et al.

Table 1.

Pro-inflammatory diet and risk of fecal incontinence in older women (NHS1)

			Quintiles of EDIP score	f EDIP score		
	ō	62	Q	Q4	Ś	P-trend
Overall						
Person-years	38064	37996	38095	38134	38270	
Cases, n	1215	1327	1379	1461	1514	
Model 1	ref	1.08 (1.00, 1.17)	1.14(1.06, 1.23)	1.22 (1.13, 1.31)	1.30 (1.20, 1.40)	<0.0001
Model 2	ref	$1.06\ (0.98,\ 1.14)$	$1.09\ (1.01,\ 1.18)$	1.14 (1.05, 1.23)	1.17 (1.08, 1.26)	< 0.0001
Model 3	ref	1.06 (0.98, 1.15)	1.10 (1.02, 1.19)	1.15 (1.06, 1.24)	1.17 (1.08, 1.27)	<0.0001
Solid stool						
Person-years	38641	38586	38716	38797	38985	
Cases, n	588	683	702	739	738	
Model 1	ref	1.15 (1.03, 1.28)	1.20 (1.07, 1.33)	1.27 (1.14, 1.42)	1.32 (1.19, 1.47)	<0.0001
Model 2	ref	1.13 (1.01, 1.27)	1.17 (1.05, 1.30)	1.23 (1.10, 1.37)	1.24 (1.11, 1.39)	<0.0001
Model 3	ref	1.13 (1.02, 1.27)	1.18 (1.05, 1.31)	$1.24\ (1.11,\ 1.38)$	1.26 (1.13, 1.41)	<0.001
Liquid stool						
Person-years	38480	38477	38566	38617	38738	
Cases, n	752	803	860	924	1010	
Model 1	ref	1.06 (0.96, 1.17)	1.15 (1.04, 1.27)	1.24 (1.13, 1.37)	1.38 (1.25, 1.52)	<0.0001
Model 2	ref	1.02 (0.93, 1.13)	1.08 (0.97, 1.19)	1.12 (1.02, 1.24)	1.19 (1.08, 1.31)	<0.0001
Model 3	ref	1.03 (0.93, 1.14)	1.09 (0.99, 1.20)	1.13 (1.03, 1.25)	1.19 (1.08, 1.31)	< 0.0001

Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2024 June 01.

diabetes mellitus (yes or no), neurologic disease (yes or no), and history of cholecystectomy (yes or no); Model 2 + dietary fiber intake. P for trend was calculated using the median of each quintile

of EDIP score as a continuous variable. All EDIP scores are energy-adjusted.

18-26, 27+ metabolic equivalent of task-hours/week), menopausal hormone use (never users, past users, current users), parity (number of live births), hysterectomy (yes or no), hypertension (yes or no),