# Dietary flavonoid and lignan intake and breast cancer risk according to menopause and hormone receptor status in the European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition (EPIC) Study

Zamora-Ros, Raul; Ferrari, Pietro; Gonzalez, Carlos A.; Tjonneland, Anne; Olsen, Anja; Bredsdorff, Lea; Overvad, Kim; Touillaud, Marina; Perquier, Florence; Fagherazzi, Guy; Lukanova, Annekatrin; Tikk, Kaja; Aleksandrova, Krasimira; Boeing, Heiner; Trichopoulou, Antonia; Trichopoulos, Dimitrios; Dilis, Vardis; Masala, Giovanna; Sieri, Sabina; Mattiello, Amalia; Tumino, Rosario; Ricceri, Fulvio; Bueno-de-Mesquita, H. Bas; Peeters, Petra H. M.; Weiderpass, Elisabete; Skeie, Guri; Engeset, Dagrun; Menendez, Virginia; Travier, Noemie; Molina-Montes, Esther; Amiano, Pilar; Chirlaque, Maria-Dolores; Barricarte, Aurelio; Wallström, Peter; Sonestedt, Emily; Sund, Malin; Landberg, Rikard; Khaw, Kay-Thee; Wareham, Nicholas J.; Travis, Ruth C.; Scalbert, Augustin; Ward, Heather A.; Riboli, Elio; Romieu, Isabelle

*Published in:*
Breast Cancer Research and Treatment

*DOI:*
10.1007/s10549-013-2483-4

2013

# Dietary flavonoid and lignan intake and breast cancer risk according to menopause and hormone receptor status in the European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition (EPIC) study.

Raul Zamora-Ros[1,*], Pietro Ferrari[2], Carlos A. González[1], Anne Tjønneland[3], Anja Olsen[3], Lea Bredsdorff[4], Kim Overvad[5], Marina Touillaud[6,7,8], Florence Perquier[6,7,8], Guy Fagherazzi[6,7,8], Annekatrin Lukanova[9], Kaja Tikk[9], Krasimira Aleksandrova[10], Heiner Boeing[10], Antonia Trichopoulou[11,12], Dimitrios Trichopoulos[11,13,14], Vardis Dilis[11], Giovanna Masala[15], Sabina Sieri[16], Amalia Mattiello[17], Rosario Tumino[18], Fulvio Ricceri[19], H. Bas Bueno-de-Mesquita[20,21], Petra H.M. Peeters[22,23], Elisabete Weiderpass[24,25,26,27], Guri Skeie[24], Dagrun Engeset[24], Virginia Menéndez[28], Noémie Travier[1], Esther Molina-Montes[29,30], Pilar Amiano[30,31], Maria-Dolores Chirlaque[30,32], Aurelio Barricarte[30,33], Peter Wallström[34], Emily Sonestedt[35], Malin Sund[36], Rikard Landberg[37], Kay-Thee Khaw[38], Nicholas J. Wareham[39], Ruth C. Travis[40], Augustin Scalbert[2], Heather A. Ward[23], Elio Riboli[41], Isabelle Romieu[2]

*Author affiliations*

[1]Unit of Nutrition, Environment and Cancer, Catalan Institute of Oncology (ICO-IDIBELL), Barcelona, Spain.

[2]Section of Nutrition and Metabolism, International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC), Lyon, France.

[3]Institute of Cancer Epidemiology, Danish Cancer Society, Copenhagen, Denmark.

[4]Technical University of Denmark, National Food Institute, Soeborg, Denmark.

[5]Section for Epidemiology, Department of Public Health, Aarhus University, Aarhus, Denmark

[6]Inserm, Centre for research in Epidemiology and Population Health (CESP), U1018, Nutrition, Hormones and Women's Health team, F-94805, Villejuif, France

[7]Paris South University, UMRS 1018, Villejuif, France.

[8]Institut Gustave-Roussy (IGR), F-94805, Villejuif, France

[9]Department of Cancer Epidemiology, German Cancer Research Center, Heidelberg, Germany.

[10]Department of Epidemiology, German Institute of Human Nutrition Potsdam-Rehbrücke, Nuthetal, Germany.

[11]Hellenic Health Foundation, Athens, Greece.

[12]WHO Collaborating Center for Food and Nutrition Policies, Department of Hygiene, Epidemiology and Medical Statistics, University of Athens Medical School, Athens, Greece.

[13]Department of Epidemiology, Harvard School of Public Health, Boston, MA, USA

[14]Bureau of Epidemiologic Research, Academy of Athens, Athens, Greece

[15]Molecular and Nutritional Epidemiology Unit, ISPO Cancer Prevention and Research Institute, Florence, Italy

[16]Nutritional Epidemiology Unit, Fondazione IRCCS Istituto Nazionale dei Tumori, Milan, Italy.

[17]Department of Clinical and Experimental Medicine, Federico II University, Naples, Italy.

[18]Cancer Registry and Histopathology Unit, "Civile M.P. Arezzo" Hospital, Ragusa, Italy.

[19]Human Genetics Foundation (HUGEF), Turin, Italy

[20] Institute for Public Health and the Environment (RIVM), Bilthoven, The Netherlands.

[21]Department of Gastroenterology and Hepatology, University Medical Center Utrecht (UMCU), Utrecht, The Netherlands.

[22]Julius Center for Health Sciences and primary Care, University Medical Center Utrecht, The Netherlands.

[23]Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, School of Public Health, Faculty of Medicine, Imperial College, London, UK.

[24]Department of Community Medicine, University of Tromsø, Tromsø, Norway.

[25]Cancer Registry of Norway, Oslo, Norway

[26]Department of Medical Epidemiology and Biostatistics,Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden.

[27]Samfundet Folkhälsan, Helsinki, Finland

[28]Public Health Directorate, Asturias, Spain

[29]Andalusian School of Public Health. Granada, Spain.

[30]CIBER Epidemiología y Salud Pública (CIBERESP), Madrid, Spain.

[31]Public Health Department of Gipuzkoa, Basque Government, San Sebastián, Spain.

[32]Department of Epidemiology, Murcia Regional Health Council, Murcia, Spain

[33]Public Health Institute of Navarra, Pamplona, Spain

[34]Nutrition Epidemiology Research Group, Department of Clinical Sciences, Lund University, Malmö, Sweden.

[35]Diabetes and Cardiovascular disease, Genetic Epidemiology, Department of Clinical Sciences, Lund University, Malmö, Sweden.

[36]Departments of Surgical and Perioperative Sciences, Surgery and Public Health and Clinical Medicine, Nutrition Research, Umeå University, Umeå, Sweden.

[37]Department of Food Science, BioCenter, Swedish University of Agriculture Science, Uppsala, Sweden.

[38]Department of Public Health and Primary Care, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK.

[39]MRC Epidemiology Unit, Cambridge, UK.

[40]Cancer Epidemiology Unit, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK.

[41]School of Public Health, Imperial College, London, UK.

The entire manuscript is 3,557 words (including abstract (245 words), text (3,312 words), 58 references, 5 tables).

[*]To whom correspondence should be addressed:
Raul Zamora-Ros, PhD
Unit of Nutrition, Environment and Cancer, Catalan Institute of Oncology (ICO), Bellvitge Biomedical Research Institute (IDIBELL); Avda Gran Via 199-203, 08907 L'Hospitalet de Llobregat, Spain. Phone 0034-932607401; FAX 0034-932607787; e-mail rzamora@iconcologia.net

**RUNNING TITTLE**: Flavonoids and lignans and breast cancer in EPIC

**KEY WORDS:** Flavonoids, lignans, breast cancer, hormone receptors, EPIC

**LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS:** BC breast cancer; EPIC European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition; ER oestrogen receptor; PR progesterone receptor

**ABSTRACT**

Evidence on the association between dietary flavonoids and lignans and breast cancer (BC) risk is inconclusive, with the possible exception of isoflavones in Asian countries. Therefore, we investigated prospectively dietary total and subclasses of flavonoid and lignan intake and BC risk according to menopause and hormonal receptor status in the European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition (EPIC) cohort. The study included 334,850 women, mostly aged between 35–70 years from 10 European countries. At baseline, country-specific validated dietary questionnaires were used. A flavonoid and lignan food composition database was developed from the US Department of Agriculture, the Phenol-Explorer and the UK Food Standards Agency databases. Cox regression models were used to analyze the association between dietary flavonoid/lignan intake and the risk of developing BC. During an average 11.5-year follow-up, 11,576 incident BC cases were identified. No association was observed between the intake of total flavonoids (hazard ratio comparing fifth to first quintile ($HR_{Q5-Q1}$) 0.97, 95% confidence interval (CI): 0.90 to 1.04; *P*-trend = 0.591), isoflavones ($HR_{Q5-Q1}$ 1.00, 95% CI: 0.91 to 1.10; *P*-trend = 0.734) or total lignans ($HR_{Q5-Q1}$ 1.02, 95% CI: 0.93 to 1.11; *P*-trend = 0.469) and overall BC risk. The stratification of the results by menopausal status at recruitment or the differentiation of BC cases according to oestrogen and progesterone receptors did not affect the results. This study shows no associations between flavonoid and lignan intake and BC risk, overall or after taking into account menopausal status and BC hormone receptors.

## INTRODUCTION

Breast cancer (BC) is a complex and heterogeneous disease, with oestrogen receptor (ER) and progesterone receptor (PR) status being one of the markers for breast tumour classification [1]. Differences have been observed in the aetiology, treatment and prognosis of hormone receptor status-positive and -negative BC [2,3]. Because of the importance of menopause as an effect modifier, studies should stratify for menopause status [1].

Polyphenols are secondary plant metabolites widely spread throughout the plant kingdom [4]. They are usually divided into five classes: flavonoids (anthocyanidins, flavonols, flavanones, flavones, flavanols and isoflavones), phenolic acids, stilbenes, lignans, and other polyphenols. Flavonoids have many biological effects that may play a role in BC prevention, including a reduction of reactive oxygen species production, antimutagenic and antiproliferative properties, regulation of cell signalling and cell cycle, and inhibition of angiogenesis [5,6]. In addition, phyto-oestrogens, such as isoflavones and lignans, have a weak oestrogen-like activity; therefore phyto-oestrogens could interact with oestrogen receptors in the development of BC [7,8].

Previous case-control studies have shown that the intake of some subclasses of flavonoids, especially flavones and flavonols, was associated with a reduced risk of BC [9]. However, evidence from prospective cohort studies remains controversial [10-15]. A recent meta-analysis [16] on the role of isoflavones on BC risk suggested a significantly inverse association in certain Asian countries, particularly in post-menopausal women, in whom soy intake is notably high [17]. To date, no association has been observed in Western countries [16]. With respect to lignans, the evidence is

abundant but inconclusive [18-20]. The French postmenopausal European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition (EPIC)-cohort showed a significant protective association of dietary lignan intake which was limited to ER and PR positive tumours [21]. Indeed, in one of the Swedish EPIC-cohort, the plasma enterolactone concentration, a lignan intake biomarker, was inversely associated with BC risk in ERα positive, particularly when ERβ is negative [22]. However, in the Danish EPIC-cohort, a significant inverse association was only observed between plasma enterolactone concentrations and ER negative tumours [23], whereas no significant associations were reported between dietary, urinary and serum levels of both lignans and isoflavones in the Norfolk-EPIC study [24]. This inconsistency might be due to the limited number of cases by BC subtypes, or low levels and/or low variability of dietary intake. Therefore, larger epidemiological studies are needed to investigate the potential protective association of flavonoid and lignan intakes as well as a possible modification of this effect by menopausal or hormone receptor status.

The aim of the current study was to evaluate the association of dietary intakes of flavonoids and lignans on the risk of BC, by menopause and hormone receptor status, within the EPIC study [25], a large prospective cohort with considerable variability in flavonoid and lignan intakes among participants [26,27].

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

### Subjects and study design

EPIC is a multicentre prospective cohort study primarily designed to investigate the relation between diet, lifestyle and environmental factors and cancer. All participants were enrolled between the years 1992 and 2000 from 23 centres in 10 European

countries: Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, The Netherlands, Norway, Spain, Sweden, and the United Kingdom. Participants were mainly recruited from the general population with some exceptions: Turin and Ragusa (Italy), and Spain recruited mostly blood donors, France recruited mostly teachers, Oxford (United Kingdom) recruited a high proportion of health-conscious individuals, and Utrecht (the Netherlands) and Florence (Italy) recruited women attending mammographic screening programs. The rationale and study design of the EPIC study have been published elsewhere [25,28]. Approval for this study was obtained from the ethical review boards of the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) and from the local ethics committees in participating countries. All cohort members provided a written informed consent.

EPIC recruited 367,903 women, mostly aged between 35 and 70 years. Women with prevalent cancer diagnosis at baseline (n = 19,853), missing diagnosis or censoring date (n = 2,892), missing dietary or lifestyle information (n = 3,339), or in the top and bottom 1% of the ratio of reported total energy intake to estimated energy requirement (n=6,752), were excluded. In addition, 217 non–first BC cases were censored, leaving 334,850 women with complete exposure information for the current analysis.

**Dietary assessment and data collection**

Habitual diet over the previous 12 months was measured by country-specific validated questionnaires [28]. Most centres used self-administered questionnaires, whereas in Greece, Spain and Ragusa (Italy), a face to face interview was performed. Questionnaires in most of the centres were quantitative, estimating portion sizes systematically. In Denmark, Norway, Umeå (Sweden), and Naples (Italy), semiquantitative food-frequency questionnaires were administered. In Malmö (Sweden), a modified diet history method was used, combining a 7-day diet record, a

semiquantitative questionnaire, and 1-h dietary interview. Daily food intakes were calculated in g/day. Ethanol (g/d), total dietary fibre (g/d) and total energy (kcal/d) intakes were computed using the EPIC Nutrient Database [29]. A separate lifestyle questionnaire gathered information on socio-demographic characteristics, lifetime smoking and alcohol consumption, physical activity, education and medical history [25]. In addition, anthropometric measures were obtained at recruitment [30]. Body mass index was calculated as weight (kg) per height (m) squared.

**Identification and follow-up of BC cases**

In most countries (Denmark, Italy, The Netherlands, Norway, Spain, Sweden, and United Kingdom) incident BC cases were identified through a linkage with population-based cancer registries. In Greece, Germany, Naples (Italy), and France, active follow up of cancer was using health insurance records, cancer and pathology registries, and direct contact with participants or their next of kin. In all EPIC centres, cancer diagnosis was confirmed by review of pathology reports. Vital status was collected from regional or national mortality registries. Subjects were followed up from study entry and until cancer diagnosis (except for nonmelanoma skin cancer), death, or emigration or until the end of the follow-up period, whichever occurred first. The follow-up periods ended at the following times: December 2004 Asturias (Spain), December 2006 [Florence, Varese, and Ragusa (Italy); and Granada and San Sebastian (Spain)], December 2007 [Murcia and Navarra (Spain), Oxford (United Kingdom), Bilthoven and Utrecht (the Netherlands), and Denmark], June 2008 Cambridge (United Kingdom), December 2008 [Turin (Italy), Malmö and Umea (Sweden), and Norway]. For study centres with active follow-up, the end of follow-up was considered to be the last known contact with study participants: December 2006 for France and Naples (Italy), December 2008 for Potsdam

(Germany), December 2009 for Greece, and June 2010 for Heidelberg (Germany). We used the Tenth Revision International Classification of Diseases, Injury and Causes of Death (ICD-10), and invasive BC was defined as C50.0–50.9. Information on ER and PR status was provided by each centre on the basis of pathology reports. To standardize the quantification of receptor status, the following criteria for a positive receptor status were applied: ≥ % cells stained, any 'plus-system' description, ≥20 fmol/mg, an Allred score of ≥3, an immunoreactive score (IRS) ≥2, or an H-score ≥10 (31).

**Flavonoid and lignan intake**

Dietary flavonoid and lignan intake was estimated by matching food items on the country-specific dietary questionnaires with a comprehensive food composition database (FCDB) on flavonoids and lignans based on US Department Agriculture FCDBs [32-34], Phenol-Explorer [35], and the UK Food Standards Agency FCDB [24]. Furthermore, our FCDB was expanded using retention factors, calculating flavonoid content of recipes, estimating missing values based on similar foods (by species and plant part), obtaining consumption data for food group items, and employing botanical data for logical zeros. Data on flavonoids and lignans is expressed as aglycones equivalents, after conversion of the flavonoid glycosides into aglycone contents using their respective molecular weights. Our FCDB contains composition data on lignans (secoisolariciresinol, matairesinol, lariciresinol, pinoresinol, enterolactone, and enterodiol) and the six flavonoid subclasses: anthocyanidins, flavanols (including flavan-3-ols monomers, proanthocyanidins and theaflavins), flavonols, flavones, flavanones and isoflavones [26,36-38]. The final FCDB contains 1877 food items, including both raw and cooked foods, and recipes.

**Statistical analysis**

Flavonoid and lignan intakes were assessed by the mean and its standard deviation (SD) as well as the median and the tenth and ninetieth centiles ($P10^{th}$, $P90^{th}$) since the data were skewed to the right. The association between dietary intake of flavonoids and lignans and the risk of developing BC was assessed by means of the hazards ratio (HR) and its 95% confidence interval (CI) using Cox regression models. Tests and graphs based on Schoenfeld residuals were used to assess the proportional hazards assumption [39]. Age was the primary time variable and entry time was defined as age at enrolment and exit time as age at diagnosis (for cases) or censoring (for at-risk subjects). The Breslow method was adopted for handling ties [40]. All models were stratified by centre to control for differences in questionnaire design and follow-up procedures among centres, and by age at baseline (1 year intervals). All models were also adjusted for menopausal status at recruitment (postmenopausal (including surgical) vs. peri or pre-menopausal, as defined in [41]), smoking status (never, former, current, and unknown), educational level (none, primary school, technical/professional school, secondary school, university or higher, and unknown), physical activity (inactive, moderately inactive, moderately active, active, and unknown), age at menarche (<12 y, 12-14 y, >14 y, unknown), age at first full-term birth (nulliparous, <21 y, 21-30, >30 y), ever use of contraceptive pills (ever, never, unknown), ever use of hormones (ever, never, unknown), and age at menopause (≤50 y, >50 y). All models were also adjusted for the following continuous variables height (cm), weight (kg), and total energy (kcal/d), alcohol (g/d), and fibre (g/d) intakes at baseline. The primary exposure of interest, that is, total flavonoids, total lignans and flavonoid subclasses (mg/d) were assessed as cohort-wide quintiles. In addition, tests for linear trend were performed by assigning the median of each quintile as scores. The continuous flavonoid variables (mg/day) were $\log_2$ transformed since they were not normally distributed. The natural logarithm is the

most common transformation used to normalize right-skewed data; however we used a $\log_2$ transformation because it produces the same normalizing effect, but the HR is more easily interpretable because it corresponds to the reduction of BC risk for doubling the intake. Flavonoid and lignan intakes were also energy-adjusted using the residual method [42], but the results did not change substantially. The interactions between BMI status (<25; 25-30; >30kg/$m^2$) or alcohol consumption (as tertiles) and total flavonoid intake were tested using likelihood ratio tests based on the models with and without the interaction terms. In addition, separate models were defined to assess the risk of BC by menopausal status (pre- and post-menopausal status) at the recruitment, after the exclusion of women with a history of ovariectomy and unknown menopausal status. The associations were also evaluated according to ER and PR status, as well as for combinations of them. Sensitivity analyses were performed by excluding women who developed BC during the first 2 years of follow-up from the analysis. All p-values presented are two-tailed and were considered to be statistically significant when $P < 0.05$. All statistical analyses were conducted using SAS version 9.3 software (SAS Institute, Inc., NC).

**RESULTS**

During a median follow-up time of 11.5 years (3,670,436 person-years), 11,576 incident BC cases were identified. The **Table 1** shows the distribution of incident BC cases by country, menopausal and hormone receptor status. ER and PR status were available in only 63% and 52% of cancer cases, respectively, and were distributed as follows: 80% ER-positive ($ER^+$) and 20% $ER^-$ tumours, and 64% $PR^+$ and 36% $PR^-$ tumours.

Women with the highest intakes of total flavonoids were more likely to be older, taller, and with a lower weight and BMI (**Table 2**). Moreover, these women used more oral

contraceptives, had the highest educational level, the lowest tobacco consumption, tended to be more physically active, and had a higher consumption of energy, alcohol and fibre than those in the bottom quintile of the total flavonoid intake. **Table 3** shows the mean, median and percentiles 10 and 90 of total and subclasses of flavonoids and lignans intake and their main food sources.

Total flavonoid intake was not associated with BC overall (hazard ratio comparing fifth to first quintile ($HR_{Q5-Q1}$) 0.97, 95% confidence interval (CI): 0.90 to 1.04; *P*-trend = 0.591), in pre-menopausal women ($HR_{Q5-Q1}$ 0.98, 95% CI: 0.84 to 1.15; *P*-trend = 0.656) or in post-menopausal women ($HR_{Q5-Q1}$ 0.96, 95% CI: 0.86 to 1.06; *P*-trend = 0.622) (**Table 4**). The results obtained for total lignans or flavonoid subclasses (including isoflavones) did not show any association either. For total flavonoid intake, no interaction was observed with BMI status (*P* for interaction 0.864) or alcohol consumption (*P* for interaction 0.674).

BC cases were classified according to oestrogen and progesterone receptors. Baseline characteristics and intakes of flavonoids and lignans of BC cases with and without hormone receptor status information were assessed. No major differences in demographic characteristics and nutritional intake were found between cases without and with available information on ER status, except that BC cases with missing information on PR status were more likely to be postmenopausal.

When cases were stratified by hormone receptor status, no significant association was found between any flavonoid and lignan intakes and $ER^-/PR^-$, $ER^+/PR^-$, $ER^-/PR^+$, and $ER^+/PR^+$ BC incidence (**Table 5**). Although, an inverse trend, but not significant, was observed between doubling in the intake of total lignan (HR for $\log_2$ 0.88, 95% CI: 0.76 to 1.01) and $ER^-/PR^-$ tumours. In a sensitivity analysis, where 136 $ER^-/PR^-$ BC cases

diagnosed within the first 2 years of follow-up were removed, the inverse associations with lignan intake (HR for $\log_2$ 0.85, 95% CI: 0.73 to 0.99) were slightly strengthened in comparison with the results based on the whole cohort. In the rest of sensitivity analysis excluding BC cases diagnosed within the first 2 years of follow-up, the results were almost identical to the whole cohort.

## DISCUSSION

In this large prospective study including women from 10 Western European countries with a large variation in flavonoid and lignan intakes, we found no association between total flavonoid, total lignan and flavonoid subclass intakes and overall, pre- and post-menopausal BC risk. The analyses differentiating BC cases according to oestrogen and progesterone receptors did not show any difference. To our knowledge, this is the largest study with information on hormone receptor status to date to explore this association.

Our results are in agreement with previous prospective studies [10-14], showing no association between the intake of total flavonoids and flavonoid subclasses (not considering isoflavones) and overall, pre- and post-menopausal BC risk. In a nested case-control study, plasma tea polyphenols, basically flavan-3-ol monomers, were not related to overall BC risk [43]. However, several case-control studies, which are susceptible to recall bias, showed inverse associations with flavones and flavonols, and inconsistent results with flavan-3-ol monomers [9]. In a case-control study, stratification by hormone receptor status, showed a reduced risk of BC for increasing flavonol and flavone intakes in $ER^+/PR^+$ post-menopausal women; however BC cases in other subtypes were too low for a meaningful conclusion [44]. No significant associations between BC risk by hormone receptor status and any flavonoid subclasses were

observed in our study. A recent prospective study suggested that flavonoids were inversely associated with overall BC risk in non-to-low alcohol drinkers (<6.5g alcohol/d), and were positively associated in moderate-to-heavy alcohol drinkers [45]. In our study, no significant interaction was observed with alcohol consumption.

For isoflavones, our findings suggest no association with BC risk (overall, by menopausal or hormone receptor status). Studies on BC risk and soy or isoflavones, measured using dietary questionnaires or plasma/urine biomarkers, have found no associations in Western countries [16], as in the previous data on the Dutch-EPIC cohort [46], or even among the vegetarian participants in the EPIC-Oxford (UK) study (47). However, in Asian countries, isoflavones were related to a lower BC incidence and recurrence, particularly in post-menopausal women [16;48]. Menopausal status might be an important modifier of the effect of phyto-oestrogens on the risk for BC, because mechanisms that mediate the effect could involve the ovarian synthesis of sex hormones or the alteration of other menstrual cycle characteristics [49]. However, in our study, we did not observe any association with BC risk in post-menopausal women, even in the double positive receptor status tumours. The large difference in isoflavone intakes between countries (<1mg/d and >30mg/d in Western and Asian countries, respectively) is the most likely explanation of these inconsistent results [17,26]. In addition, the early exposure to phyto-oestrogens (during the childhood and adolescence as observed in Asian countries) may play an important role in their cancer-preventive effects [50]. Further research is needed to evaluate the effect of early phyto-oestrogen intake on hormonal related cancers, such as BC.

In our prospective study, no association was observed between total lignan intake and overall BC risk and by menopausal status. Our results are in concordance with four of

the six prospective studies conducted to date [19,20,24], except the EPIC-French and Swedish postmenopausal cohorts [21;51]. Likewise, most of the case-control studies showed protective associations on BC [18,19]. Of these, one study investigated the role of dietary intake during adolescence reporting a protective effect in adulthood for high plant lignan intake early in life [52]. Using nutritional biomarkers in serum or plasma, to evaluate lignan intake, the results were also inconsistent [18,22,24,53]. In the Danish EPIC-cohort, a significant inverse association was observed between plasma lignan levels and ER negative tumours [23]. Our results show an inverse trend, but not significant, between dietary intake of total lignans and ER-/PR- breast tumours. This borderline association may be observed by chance, although, similarly, a case-control study found an inverse association between dietary total lignan and ER- tumours in premenopausal women [54]. This suggests a potential protective non hormonal-related effect of lignans on BC. A plausible mechanism of action for this effect could be through down-regulation of insulin-like growth factor 1(IGF-1), decreased epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) expression, and tumour vascular endothelial growth factor (VEGF) expression [55]. These growth factors play important roles in tumour growth and progression through stimulation of cell proliferation, such as angiogenesis, synthesis of DNA, RNA and cellular proteins, and inhibition of apoptosis [56;57]. Further epidemiological evidence on the potential association between lignan intake and ER-/PR- breast tumours is warranted.

One of the limitations of the present study is the use of a single baseline assessment of diet and other lifestyle variables. Therefore, changes in lifestyle could not be taken into account in these analyses. Another limitation may be the measurement error in collecting dietary intake, since country-specific validated questionnaires were used [20,25,26]. It is particularly relevant in the case of soya products (the main source of

isoflavones), because some countries did not include soy-based foods in their dietary questionnaires, because they were rarely consumed in the nineties in most of the European countries. In addition, flavonoid and lignan intakes are likely to be underestimated since substantial data was lacking in the flavonoid database (although an extensive common database was used) [26,27] and herb/plant supplement intakes were not taken into account in these analyses (up to 5% in Denmark, the highest consumer country) [58]. This misclassification is likely to be random and therefore any association between intake and disease risk is likely underestimated. Another limitation is the potential modification of diet during the early prediagnostic period of the disease; however, sensitivity analyses excluding incident cases diagnosed in the first two years of follow-up did not alter the associations. Finally, we realize that our study is prone to the well-known drawback of multiple comparisons. The strengths of our study include its prospective and population-based design, detailed information on diet, and a large sample of BC cases with data on hormone receptor status of breast tumours, which allows greater power for subgroup analyses.

In conclusion, this large prospective analysis of flavonoid and lignan intake and BC risk suggests no associations between dietary intake of total flavonoids, total lignans and any flavonoid subclasses and BC risk in Western European women overall or after taking into account menopausal status and oestrogen and progesterone receptors of BC tumours.

## CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

**ACKNOWLEGDEMENTS**

This work was supported by the European Commission: Public Health and Consumer Protection Directorate 1993 to 2004; Research Directorate-General 2005; Ligue contre le Cancer, Institut Gustave Roussy, Mutuelle Générale de l'Education Nationale, Institut National de la Santé et de la Recherche Médicale (INSERM) (France); German Cancer Aid; German Cancer Research Center (DKFZ); German Federal Ministry of Education and Research; Danish Cancer Society: Health Research Fund (FIS) of the Spanish Ministry of Health (RTICC DR06/0020/0091); the participating regional governments from Asturias, Andalucía, Murcia, Navarra and Basque Country and the Catalan Institute of Oncology of Spain; Cancer Research UK; Medical Research Council, UK; Hellenic Health Foundation, Greece; Italian Association for Research on Cancer-AIRC-Milan, Italy; Compagnia San Paolo, Italy; Dutch Ministry of Public Health, Welfare and Sports; Dutch Ministry of Health; Dutch Prevention Funds; LK Research Funds; Dutch ZON (Zorg Onderzoek Nederland); World Cancer Research Fund (WCRF); Statistics Netherlands (The Netherlands); Swedish Cancer Society; Swedish Scientific Council; Regional Government of Skane, Sweden; Nordforsk - Centre of Excellence programme; Some authors are partners of ECNIS, a network of excellence of the 6 Frame Program of the European Commission. R.Z.R. is thankful for a postdoctoral programme Fondo de Investigación Sanitaria (FIS; no. CD09/00133) from the Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation.

References


1. Chen WY, Colditz GA (2007) Risk factors and hormone-receptor status: epidemiology, risk-prediction models and treatment implications for breast cancer. Nat Clin Pract Oncol 4(7):415-423

2. Minami CA, Chung DU, Chang HR (2011) Management options in triple-negative breast cancer. Breast Cancer (Auckl ) 5:175-199

3. Collins LC, Marotti JD, Gelber S et al (2012) Pathologic features and molecular phenotype by patient age in a large cohort of young women with breast cancer. Breast Cancer Res Treat 131(3):1061-1066

4. Perez-Jimenez J, Neveu V, Vos F, Scalbert A (2010) Systematic analysis of the content of 502 polyphenols in 452 foods and beverages: an application of the phenol-explorer database. J Agric Food Chem 58(8):4959-4969

5. Kandaswami C, Lee LT, Lee PP, Hwang JJ, Ke FC, Huang YT, Lee MT (2005) The antitumor activities of flavonoids. In Vivo 19(5):895-909

6. Moon YJ, Wang X, Morris ME (2006) Dietary flavonoids: effects on xenobiotic and carcinogen metabolism. Toxicol In Vitro 20(2):187-210

7. Rice S, Whitehead SA (2008) Phytoestrogens oestrogen synthesis and breast cancer. J Steroid Biochem Mol Biol 108(3-5):186-195

8. Peeters PH, Keinan-Boker L, van der Schouw YT, Grobbee DE (2003) Phytoestrogens and breast cancer risk. Review of the epidemiological evidence. Breast Cancer Res Treat 77(2):171-183

9. Hui C, Qi X, Qianyong Z, Xiaoli P, Jundong Z, Mantian M (2013) Flavonoids, flavonoid subclasses and breast cancer risk: a meta-analysis of epidemiologic studies. PLoS One 8(1):e54318

10. Wang L, Lee IM, Zhang SM, Blumberg JB, Buring JE, Sesso HD (2009) Dietary intake of selected flavonols, flavones, and flavonoid-rich foods and risk of cancer in middle-aged and older women. Am J Clin Nutr 89(3):905-912

11. Adebamowo CA, Cho E, Sampson L, Katan MB, Spiegelman D, Willett WC, Holmes MD. (2005) Dietary flavonols and flavonol-rich foods intake and the risk of breast cancer. Int J Cancer 114(4):628-633

12. Knekt P, Kumpulainen J, Jarvinen R, Rissanen H, Heliövaara M, Reunanen A, Hakulinen T, Aromaa A (2002) Flavonoid intake and risk of chronic diseases. Am J Clin Nutr 76(3):560-568

13. Arts IC, Jacobs DR, Jr., Gross M, Harnack LJ, Folsom AR (2002) Dietary catechins and cancer incidence among postmenopausal women: the Iowa Women's Health Study (United States). Cancer Causes Control 13(4):373-382

14. Knekt P, Jarvinen R, Seppanen R, Hellövaara M, Teppo L, Pukkala E, Aromaa A (1997) Dietary flavonoids and the risk of lung cancer and other malignant neoplasms. Am J Epidemiol 146(3):223-230

15. Hedelin M, Lof M, Olsson M, Adlercreutz H, Sandin S, Weiderpass E (2008) Dietary phytoestrogens are not associated with risk of overall breast cancer but diets rich in coumestrol are inversely associated with risk of estrogen receptor and progesterone receptor negative breast tumors in Swedish women. J Nutr 138(5):938-945

16. Dong JY, Qin LQ (2011) Soy isoflavones consumption and risk of breast cancer incidence or recurrence: a meta-analysis of prospective studies. Breast Cancer Res Treat 125(2):315-323

17. Lee SA, Wen W, Xiang YB et al (2007) Assessment of dietary isoflavone intake among middle-aged Chinese men. J Nutr 137(4):1011-1016

18. Velentzis LS, Woodside JV, Cantwell MM, Leathem AJ, Keshtgar MR (2008) Do phytoestrogens reduce the risk of breast cancer and breast cancer recurrence? What clinicians need to know. Eur J Cancer 44(13):1799-1806

19. Buck K, Zaineddin AK, Vrieling A, Linseisen J, Chang-Claude J (2010) Meta-analyses of lignans and enterolignans in relation to breast cancer risk. Am J Clin Nutr 92(1):141-153

20. Velentzis LS, Cantwell MM, Cardwell C, Keshtgar MR, Leathem AJ, Woodside JV (2009) Lignans and breast cancer risk in pre- and post-menopausal women: meta-analyses of observational studies. Br J Cancer 100(9):1492-1498

21. Touillaud MS, Thiebaut AC, Fournier A, Niravong M, Boutron-Ruault MC, Clavel-Chapelon F (2007) Dietary lignan intake and postmenopausal breast cancer risk by estrogen and progesterone receptor status. J Natl Cancer Inst 99(6):475-486

22. Sonestedt E, Borgquist S, Ericson U, Gullberg B, Olsson H, Adlercreutz H, Landberg G, Wirfält E (2008) Enterolactone is differently associated with estrogen receptor beta-negative and -positive breast cancer in a Swedish nested case-control study. Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev 17(11):3241-3251

23. Olsen A, Knudsen KE, Thomsen BL, Loft S, Stripp C, Overvad K, Møller S, Tjønneland A (2004) Plasma enterolactone and breast cancer incidence by estrogen receptor status. Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev 13(12):2084-2089

24. Ward HA, Kuhnle GG, Mulligan AA, Lentjes MA, Luben RN, Khaw KT (2010) Breast, colorectal, and prostate cancer risk in the European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition-Norfolk in relation to phytoestrogen intake derived from an improved database. Am J Clin Nutr 91(2):440-448

25. Riboli E, Hunt KJ, Slimani N et al (2002) European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition (EPIC): study populations and data collection. Public Health Nutr 5(6B):1113-1124

26. Zamora-Ros R, Knaze V, Lujan-Barroso L et al (2012) Dietary intakes and food sources of phytoestrogens in the European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition (EPIC) 24-hour dietary recall cohort. Eur J Clin Nutr 66(8):932-941

27. Zamora-Ros R, Knaze V, Lujan-Barroso L et al (2013) Differences in dietary intakes, food sources, and determinants of total flavonoids between Mediterranean and non-Mediterranean countries participating in the European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition (EPIC) study. Br J Nutr . doi:10.1017/S0007114512003273

28. Riboli E, Kaaks R (1997) The EPIC Project: rationale and study design. European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition. Int J Epidemiol 26(Suppl 1):S6-S14.

29. Slimani N, Deharveng G, Unwin I et al (2007) The EPIC nutrient database project (ENDB): a first attempt to standardize nutrient databases across the 10 European countries participating in the EPIC study. Eur J Clin Nutr 61(9):1037-1056

30. Haftenberger M, Lahmann PH, Panico S et al (2002) Overweight, obesity and fat distribution in 50- to 64-year-old participants in the European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition (EPIC). Public Health Nutr 5(6B):1147-1162

31. Layfield LJ, Gupta D, Mooney EE (2000) Assessment of Tissue Estrogen and Progesterone Receptor Levels: A Survey of Current Practice, Techniques, and Quantitation Methods. Breast J 6(3):189-196

32. U.S.Departament of Agriculture (2004) USDA Database for the Proanthocyanidin Content of Selected Foods. Beltsville: MD:USDA

33. U.S.Departament of Agriculture (2007) USDA Database for the Flavonoid Content of Selected Foods. Beltsville: MD:USDA

34. U.S.Departament of Agriculture (2008) USDA Database for the Isoflavone Content of Selected Foods. Beltsville: MD:USDA

35. Neveu V, Perez-Jimenez J, Vos F et al (2010) Phenol-Explorer: an online comprehensive database on polyphenol contents in foods. Database (Oxford) 2010:bap024. doi: 10.1093/database/bap024

36. Knaze V, Zamora-Ros R, Luján-Barroso L et al (2012) Intake estimation of total and individual flavan-3-ols, proanthocyanidins and theaflavins, their food sources and determinants in the European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition (EPIC) study. Br J Nutr 108(6):1095-1108

37. Zamora-Ros R, Knaze V, Lujan-Barroso L et al (2011) Estimation of the intake of anthocyanidins and their food sources in the European Prospective Investigation in to Cancer and Nutrition (EPIC) study. Br J Nutr 106(7):1090-1099

38. Zamora-Ros R, Knaze V, Lujan-Barroso L et al (2011) Estimated dietary intakes of flavonols, flavanones and flavones in the European Prospective Investigation

into Cancer and Nutrition (EPIC) 24-h dietary recall cohort. Br J Nutr 106(12):1915-1925

39. Schoenfeld D (1980) Chi-squared goodness of fit tests for the proportional hazards regression model. Biometrika 67(1):145-153

40. Thiebaut AC, Benichou J (2004) Choice of time-scale in Cox's model analysis of epidemiologic cohort data: a simulation study. Stat Med 23(24):3803-3820

41. Romieu I, Ferrari P, Rinaldi S et al (2012) Dietary glycemic index and glycemic load and breast cancer risk in the European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition (EPIC). Am J Clin Nutr 96(2):345-355

42. Willett W, Sampfer MJ (1986) Total energy intake: implications for epidemiological analyses. Am J Epidemiol 124(1):17-27

43. Iwasaki M, Inoue M, Sasazuki S, Miura T, Sawada N, Yamaji T, Shimazu T, Willett WC, Tsugane S (2010) Plasma tea polyphenol levels and subsequent risk of breast cancer among Japanese women: a nested case-control study. Breast Cancer Res Treat 124(3):827-834

44. Fink BN, Steck SE, Wolff MS, Britton JA, Kabat GC, Schroeder JC, Teitelbaum SL, Neugut AI, Gammon MD (2007) Dietary flavonoid intake and breast cancer risk among women on Long Island. Am J Epidemiol 165(5):514-523

45. Touvier M, Druesne-Pecollo N, Kesse-Guyot E, Andreeva VA, Fezeu L, Galan P, Hercberg S, Latino-Martel P (2013) Dual association between polyphenol intake and breast cancer risk according to alcohol consumption level: a prospective cohort study. Breast Cancer Res Treat 137(1):225-236

46. Keinan-Boker L, van der Schouw YT, Grobbee DE, Peeters PH (2004) Dietary phytoestrogens and breast cancer risk. Am J Clin Nutr 79(2):282-288

47. Travis RC, Allen NE, Appleby PN, Spencer EA, Roddam AW, Key TJ (2006) A prospective study of vegetarianism and isoflavone intake in relation to breast cancer risk in British women. Int J Cancer 122(3):705-710

48. Qin LQ, Xu JY, Wang PY, Hoshi K (2006) Soyfood intake in the prevention of breast cancer risk in women: a meta-analysis of observational epidemiological studies. J Nutr Sci Vitaminol (Tokyo) 52(6):428-436

49. Cassidy A, Bingham S, Setchell KD (1994) Biological effects of a diet of soy protein rich in isoflavones on the menstrual cycle of premenopausal women. Am J Clin Nutr 60(3):333-340

50. Messina M, Hilakivi-Clarke L (2009) Early intake appears to be the key to the proposed protective effects of soy intake against breast cancer. Nutr Cancer 61(6):792-798

51. Suzuki R, Rylander-Rudqvist T, Saji S, Bergkvist L, Adlercreutz H, Wolk A (2008) Dietary lignans and postmenopausal breast cancer risk by oestrogen

receptor status: a prospective cohort study of Swedish women. Br J Cancer 98(3):636-640

52. Thanos J, Cotterchio M, Boucher BA, Kreiger N, Thompson LU (2006) Adolescent dietary phytoestrogen intake and breast cancer risk (Canada). Cancer Causes Control 17(10):1253-1261

53. Goodman MT, Shvetsov YB, Wilkens LR, Franke AA, Le Marchand L, Kakazu KK, Nomura AM, Henderson BE, Kolonel LN (2009) Urinary phytoestrogen excretion and postmenopausal breast cancer risk: the multiethnic cohort study. Cancer Prev Res (Phila) 2(10):887-894

54. McCann SE, Kulkarni S, Trevisan M, Vito D, Nie J, Edge SB, Muti P, Freudenheim JL (2006) Dietary lignan intakes and risk of breast cancer by tumor estrogen receptor status. Breast Cancer Res Treat 99(3):309-311

55. Wang L, Chen J, Thompson LU (2005) The inhibitory effect of flaxseed on the growth and metastasis of estrogen receptor negative human breast cancer xenograftsis attributed to both its lignan and oil components. Int J Cancer 116(5):793-798

56. Rinaldi S, Peeters PH, Berrino F et al (2006) IGF-I, IGFBP-3 and breast cancer risk in women: The European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition (EPIC). Endocr Relat Cancer 13(2):593-605

57. Tabernero J (2007) The role of VEGF and EGFR inhibition: implications for combining anti-VEGF and anti-EGFR agents. Mol Cancer Res 5(3):203-220

58. Skeie G, Braaten T, Hjartaker A et al (2009 Use of dietary supplements in the European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition calibration study. Eur J Clin Nutr 63(Suppl 4):S226-S238

**Table 1.** Distribution of participants and breast cancer cases according to menopausal status or breast cancer phenotype in 10 countries participating in the European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition (EPIC) study.

| Country | All | PY | Breast cancer cases | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | All | Premenopausal[1] | Postmenopausal[1] | ER-/PR-[2] | ER-/PR+[2] | ER+/PR-[2] | ER+/PR+[2] |
| France | 67,356 | 699,216 | 3,187 | 755 | 1,417 | 377 | 102 | 487 | 1,359 |
| Italy | 30,498 | 341,417 | 1,047 | 382 | 462 | 123 | 41 | 164 | 496 |
| Spain | 24,846 | 299,575 | 495 | 256 | 164 | 38 | 6 | 39 | 129 |
| United Kingdom | 52,513 | 586,165 | 1,480 | 440 | 787 | 53 | 4 | 36 | 174 |
| The Netherlands | 26,839 | 315,551 | 916 | 184 | 523 | 63 | 5 | 74 | 275 |
| Greece | 15,224 | 148,594 | 198 | 65 | 107 | 9 | 1 | 13 | 45 |
| Germany | 27,390 | 272,011 | 834 | 269 | 407 | 89 | 11 | 46 | 317 |
| Sweden | 26,339 | 349,110 | 1,095 | 122 | 655 | 84 | 25 | 57 | 128 |
| Denmark | 28,693 | 316,601 | 1,340 | 88 | 997 | 108 | 10 | 94 | 296 |
| Norway | 35,152 | 342,195 | 984 | 266 | 353 | 106 | 12 | 123 | 434 |
| Total | 334,850 | 3,670,436 | 11,576 | 2,827 | 5,872 | 1,050 | 217 | 1,133 | 3,653 |

Abbreviations: PY Person-years; ER Estrogen Receptor; PR Progesterone Receptor.

[1]Excluding perimenopausal women 63,340 (18.9%), and women with a bilateral ovariectomy 9,634 (2.9%).

[2]Missing data for ER: 4,308 (37.2%); for PR: 5,508 (47.6%).

**Table 2.** Baseline characteristics according to quintiles of total flavonoid intake in the European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition (EPIC) study.

| | Quintiles of total flavonoids (mg/d) | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Q1: <176 | Q2: 176-275 | Q3: 276-403 | Q4: 404-654 | Q5:>654 |
| No of participants | 66970 | 66970 | 66970 | 66970 | 66970 |
| Age (y)[1] | 50.2 (8.7) | 50.8 (9.4) | 50.8 (9.4) | 51.1 (9.9) | 51.1 (11.4) |
| Height (cm)[1] | 160.9 (7.0) | 161.0 (6.9) | 161.3 (6.9) | 162.1 (6.7) | 163.3 (6.4) |
| Weight (kg)[1] | 67.5 (12.5) | 67.1 (12.1) | 66.6 (11.8) | 66.1 (11.6) | 65.4 (11.4) |
| BMI ($kg/cm^2$)[1] | 26.2 (4.9) | 26.0 84.8) | 25.6 (4.6) | 25.2 (4.4) | 24.5 (4.2) |
| Educational level (%) | | | | | |
| None | 6.0 | 6.6 | 5.7 | 3.4 | 1.0 |
| Primary school | 31.4 | 28.0 | 25.1 | 21.1 | 13.7 |
| Technical school | 27.5 | 21.1 | 17.6 | 19.1 | 22.3 |
| Secondary school | 20.5 | 23.0 | 26.0 | 26.2 | 22.1 |
| University or higher | 13.3 | 19.2 | 23.2 | 26.0 | 31.5 |
| Unknown | 1.3 | 2.0 | 2.5 | 4.3 | 9.4 |
| Smoking status (%) | | | | | |
| Never | 44.4 | 55.8 | 59.5 | 59.9 | 58.7 |
| Former | 21.2 | 20.7 | 20.7 | 23.4 | 26.7 |
| Smoker | 31.7 | 21.2 | 17.6 | 14.5 | 12.3 |
| Unknown | 2.7 | 2.3 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.3 |
| Physical activity (%) | | | | | |
| Inactive | 19.6 | 24.1 | 23.9 | 21.0 | 18.7 |
| Moderately inactive | 22.0 | 31.3 | 34.7 | 35.5 | 34.6 |
| Moderately active | 13.4 | 19.7 | 22.9 | 24.7 | 26.0 |
| Active | 8.3 | 11.8 | 13.8 | 16.7 | 19.1 |
| Missing | 36.7 | 13.1 | 4.7 | 2.1 | 1.5 |
| Use of contraceptive pill (%) | | | | | |
| Never | 41.3 | 43.6 | 42.4 | 39.4 | 34.6 |
| Ever | 55.7 | 54.1 | 54.9 | 58.8 | 62.7 |
| Unknown | 3.0 | 2.3 | 2.7 | 1.7 | 2.7 |
| Use of hormones (%) | | | | | |
| Never | 67.8 | 69.3 | 70.1 | 69.9 | 68.9 |
| Ever | 24.1 | 22.4 | 22.9 | 24.9 | 26.9 |
| Unknown | 8.1 | 8.3 | 6.9 | 5.2 | 4.1 |
| Menopausal status (%) | | | | | |
| Premenopausal | 34.2 | 34.8 | 35.5 | 34.4 | 35.3 |
| Postmenopausal | 40.8 | 42.7 | 42.9 | 44.9 | 45.6 |
| Perimenopausal | 23.0 | 19.8 | 18.5 | 17.5 | 15.8 |
| Bilateral ovariectomy | 2.1 | 2.8 | 3.1 | 3.2 | 3.2 |
| Energy (kcal/d)[1] | 1633 (435) | 1860 (475) | 2006 (522) | 2074 (562) | 2085 (559) |
| Alcohol (g/d)[1] | 4.5 (7.4) | 6.8 (9.9) | 8.8 (11.9) | 10.3 (13.7) | 10.4 (13.8) |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total fibre (g/d)[1] | 17.5 (5.4) | 20.4 (5.7) | 22.5 (6.2) | 24.2 (7.1) | 26.1 (8.6) |

[1]Mean (SD)

Table 3. Total and subclasses of flavonoid and lignan intake (mg/d) and their main food sources in the European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition (EPIC) study.

| | Mean | SD | Median | $P10^{th}$ | $P90^{th}$ | Four main food sources (%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total flavonoids | 434.4 | 330.7 | 332.2 | 123.3 | 922.1 | Tea (21.3%), Apples and pears (19.6%), Wine (8.9%), Stone fruits (6.7%) |
| Flavanols | 350.8 | 304.1 | 246.6 | 82.2 | 808.3 | Tea (49.3%), Apples and pears (16.7%), Wine (6.3%), Stone fruits (5.2%) |
| Flavan-3-ols monomers | 177.5 | 254.1 | 43.8 | 12.4 | 531.6 | Tea (86.3%), Apples and pears (2.9%), Wine (2.4%), Chocolates (1.8%) |
| Proanthocyanidins | 167.5 | 109.6 | 148.5 | 58.8 | 294.7 | Apples and pears (33.2%), Wine (11.0%), Stone fruits (10.0%), Chocolates (6.3%) |
| Teaflavins | 5.9 | 9.8 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 19.3 | Tea (100%) |
| Anthocyanidins | 29.5 | 22.8 | 23.6 | 8.2 | 58.2 | Wine (15.6%), Grapes (15%), Berries (13.3%), Apple and pears (12.6%) |
| Flavonols | 27.2 | 17.6 | 22.2 | 9.8 | 52.4 | Tea (30.3%), Bouillons (9.8%), Leafy vegetables (8.2%), Apple and pears (8.1%) |
| Flavanones | 21.8 | 21.7 | 16.1 | 3.4 | 45.6 | Citrus fruit (49.6%), Fruit juices (42.2%), Wine (3.6%), Jams (0.5%) |
| Flavones | 3.5 | 3.9 | 2.5 | 0.7 | 7.0 | Herbal tea (36.0), Wine (13.6%), Leafy vegetables (8.4%), Citrus fruit (8.4%) |
| Total isoflavones | 1.5 | 4.8 | 0.5 | 0.1 | 2.6 | Soya products (44.3%), Chocolates (7.6%), Coffee (7.3%), Breads (7.1%) |
| Total lignans | 1.4 | 0.8 | 1.2 | 0.7 | 2.4 | Breads (12.4%), Cabbages (12.4%), Tea (12.1%), Coffee (8.0%) |

Table 4. Multivariable HRs (95% CI) for breast cancer by quintile of flavonoid or lignan intake overall and by menopausal status in the European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition (EPIC) study.

| | | Overall | | | Premenopausal | | | Postmenopausal | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | PY | BC cases | HR (95% CI)[1] | PY | BC cases | HR (95% CI)[2] | PY | BC cases | HR (95% CI)[2] |
| Total flavonoids | | | | | | | | | | |
| Quintile 1 | <176.0 | 719,894 | 2110 | 1.00 (ref) | 247,232 | 495 | 1.00 (ref) | 294,306 | 1009 | 1.00 (ref) |
| Quintile 2 | 176.0-276.2 | 734,702 | 2226 | 0.98 (0.92-1.04) | 256,615 | 593 | 1.07 (0.94-1.21) | 312,900 | 1050 | 0.94 (0.86-1.03) |
| Quintile 3 | 276.3-403.6 | 739,302 | 2328 | 0.97 (0.91-1.04) | 266,083 | 571 | 0.95 (0.83-1.09) | 314,406 | 1185 | 0.99 (0.90-1.09) |
| Quintile 4 | 403.7-654.0 | 737,369 | 2482 | 0.99 (0.93-1.07) | 257,394 | 630 | 1.06 (0.92-1.22) | 327,820 | 1286 | 0.98 (0.89-1.08) |
| Quintile 5 | >654.0 | 739,172 | 2430 | 0.97 (0.90-1.04) | 264,713 | 538 | 0.98 (0.84-1.15) | 333,797 | 1342 | 0.96 (0.86-1.06) |
| P-trend | | | | 0.591 | | | 0.656 | | | 0.622 |
| Continuous ($log_2$) | | | | 0.99 (0.97-1.01) | | | 1.00 (0.95-1.04) | | | 0.99 (0.96-1.02) |
| Flavanols | | | | | | | | | | |
| Quintile 1 | <121.2 | 719,289 | 2086 | 1.00 (ref) | 247,785 | 495 | 1.00 (ref) | 292,008 | 991 | 1.00 (ref) |
| Quintile 2 | 121.2-198.7 | 734,056 | 2254 | 0.99 (0.93-1.05) | 255,431 | 583 | 1.05 (0.92-1.19) | 312,505 | 1072 | 0.95 (0.87-1.04) |
| Quintile 3 | 198.8-308.2 | 738,083 | 2348 | 0.98 (0.92-1.05) | 262,448 | 583 | 0.98 (0.86-1.12) | 316,619 | 1187 | 0.98 (0.90-1.08) |
| Quintile 4 | 308.3-550.5 | 738,602 | 2481 | 1.00 (0.94-1.08) | 259,007 | 648 | 1.09 (0.95-1.25) | 327,129 | 1278 | 0.98 (0.89-1.08) |
| Quintile 5 | >550.5 | 740,410 | 2407 | 0.97 (0.90-1.04) | 267,367 | 518 | 0.94 (0.81-1.10) | 334,968 | 1344 | 0.95 (0.86-1.06) |
| P-trend | | | | 0.444 | | | 0.271 | | | 0.524 |
| Continuous ($log_2$) | | | | 0.99 (0.98-1.01) | | | 1.00 (0.96-1.04) | | | 0.99 (0.96-1.02) |
| Flavan-3-ol monomers | | | | | | | | | | |
| Quintile 1 | <18.2 | 717,614 | 1867 | 1.00 (ref) | 254,980 | 503 | 1.00 (ref) | 298,216 | 874 | 1.00 (ref) |
| Quintile 2 | 18.2-31.7 | 733,193 | 2285 | 1.01 (0.94-1.07) | 248,946 | 565 | 1.00 (0.88-1.13) | 308,839 | 1090 | 0.98 (0.89-1.08) |
| Quintile 3 | 31.8-81.0 | 734,331 | 2505 | 1.02 (0.96-1.10) | 257,285 | 620 | 0.97 (0.85-1.11) | 314,824 | 1239 | 1.01 (0.91-1.11) |
| Quintile 4 | 81.1-379.8 | 741,226 | 2500 | 1.00 (0.93-1.08) | 263,690 | 619 | 0.99 (0.86-1.14) | 318,057 | 1281 | 1.00 (0.90-1.10) |
| Quintile 5 | >379.8 | 744,076 | 2419 | 1.01 (0.93-1.09) | 267,137 | 520 | 0.96 (0.82-1.13) | 343,293 | 1388 | 1.00 (0.90-1.11) |
| P-trend | | | | 0.856 | | | 0.700 | | | 0.932 |
| Continuous ($log_2$) | | | | 1.00 (0.99-1.01) | | | 1.00 (0.98-1.02) | | | 1.00 (0.99-1.02) |
| Proanthocyanidins | | | | | | | | | | |
| Quintile 1 | <84.2 | 730,001 | 2175 | 1.00 (ref) | 253,757 | 514 | 1.00 (ref) | 300,710 | 1069 | 1.00 (ref) |
| Quintile 2 | 84.2-126.8 | 740,141 | 2253 | 0.96 (0.90-1.02) | 259,008 | 525 | 0.93 (0.82-1.05) | 318,404 | 1147 | 0.95 (0.87-1.04) |
| Quintile 3 | 126.9-170.7 | 735,051 | 2432 | 1.00 (0.93-1.06) | 254,487 | 596 | 1.00 (0.88-1.14) | 323,897 | 1249 | 0.98 (0.90-1.07) |
| Quintile 4 | 170.8-232.5 | 732,243 | 2379 | 0.95 (0.89-1.01) | 256,883 | 572 | 0.92 (0.80-1.05) | 321,573 | 1231 | 0.94 (0.85-1.03) |
| Quintile 5 | >232.5 | 733,003 | 2337 | 0.96 (0.89-1.04) | 267,903 | 620 | 1.01 (0.86-1.17) | 318,645 | 1176 | 0.91 (0.82-1.01) |
| P-trend | | | | 0.354 | | | 0.724 | | | 0.079 |
| Continuous ($log_2$) | | | | 0.99 (0.97-1.02) | | | 1.01 (0.96-1.06) | | | 0.98 (0.95-1.02) |
| Theaflavins | | | | | | | | | | |
| Quintile 1 | 0 | 1,465,200 | 4435 | 1.00 (ref) | 472,410 | 1061 | 1.00 (ref) | 622,820 | 2115 | 1.00 (ref) |
| Quintile 2 | | | | | | | - | | | |
| Quintile 3 | 0.01-1.98 | 730,975 | 2243 | 1.03 (0.97-1.10) | 294,469 | 641 | 1.06 (0.94-1.20) | 302,026 | 1094 | 1.01 (0.92-1.10) |
| Quintile 4 | 1.99-13.88 | 737,650 | 2502 | 1.02 (0.96-1.08) | 261,076 | 609 | 1.05 (0.93-1.18) | 317,676 | 1285 | 1.01 (0.93-1.10) |
| Quintile 5 | >13.88 | 736,615 | 2396 | 1.02 (0.95-1.10) | 264,085 | 516 | 1.04 (0.90-1.20) | 340,707 | 1378 | 1.02 (0.92-1.12) |
| P-trend | | | | 0.857 | | | 0.988 | | | 0.756 |
| Continuous ($log_2$) | | | | 1.00 (1.00-1.00) | | | 1.00 (1.00-1.01) | | | 1.00 (1.00-1.01) |
| Anthocyanidins | | | | | | | | | | |
| Quintile 1 | <12.1 | 743,639 | 2170 | 1.00 (ref) | 249,795 | 467 | 1.00 (ref) | 339,940 | 1179 | 1.00 (ref) |
| Quintile 2 | 12.1-19.4 | 744,989 | 2141 | 0.99 (0.93-1.05) | 265,622 | 520 | 1.05 (0.92-1.19) | 326,072 | 1128 | 0.98 (0.90-1.07) |
| Quintile 3 | 19.5-28.4 | 736,734 | 2178 | 1.00 (0.94-1.07) | 277,063 | 557 | 1.05 (0.92-1.20) | 308,553 | 1109 | 1.00 (0.91-1.09) |
| Quintile 4 | 28.5-43.6 | 729,323 | 2313 | 0.99 (0.93-1.06) | 275,386 | 642 | 1.09 (0.95-1.26) | 296,365 | 1075 | 0.94 (0.86-1.04) |
| Quintile 5 | >43.6 | 715,754 | 2774 | 1.02 (0.94-1.10) | 224,173 | 641 | 1.09 (0.93-1.28) | 312,299 | 1381 | 1.01 (0.90-1.13) |
| P-trend | | | | 0.560 | | | 0.323 | | | 0.829 |
| Continuous ($log_2$) | | | | 1.01 (0.99-1.03) | | | 1.02 (0.97-1.06) | | | 1.00 (0.97-1.03) |
| Flavonols | | | | | | | | | | |
| Quintile 1 | <12.8 | 730,767 | 2093 | 1.00 (ref) | 261,133 | 544 | 1.00 (ref) | 303,965 | 996 | 1.00 (ref) |
| Quintile 2 | 12.9-18.7 | 737,662 | 2139 | 0.98 (0.92-1.05) | 271,730 | 556 | 0.95 (0.84-1.07) | 308,094 | 1065 | 1.02 (0.93-1.11) |
| Quintile 3 | 18.8-26.7 | 738,205 | 2260 | 0.98 (0.92-1.05) | 267,990 | 592 | 0.94 (0.83-1.07) | 313,212 | 1116 | 1.01 (0.91-1.11) |
| Quintile 4 | 26.8-39.8 | 733,606 | 2485 | 0.98 (0.91-1.05) | 253,619 | 571 | 0.90 (0.78-1.03) | 323,182 | 1275 | 1.00 (0.90-1.10) |
| Quintile 5 | >39.8 | 730,199 | 2599 | 0.96 (0.88-1.03) | 237,567 | 564 | 0.91 (0.78-1.06) | 334,776 | 1420 | 1.00 (0.90-1.12) |
| P-trend | | | | 0.259 | | | 0.316 | | | 0.893 |
| Continuous ($log_2$) | | | | 0.97 (0.95-1.00) | | | 0.95 (0.90-1.01) | | | 0.98 (0.94-1.02) |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Flavanones | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Quintile 1 | <6.2 | 726,556 | 2207 | 1.00 (ref) | 265,038 | 540 | 1.00 (ref) | 303,621 | 1076 | 1.00 (ref) |
| Quintile 2 | 6.2-12.6 | 722,347 | 2418 | 0.97 (0.92-1.03) | 258,848 | 596 | 0.94 (0.83-1.06) | 291,066 | 1168 | 1.03 (0.95-1.12) |
| Quintile 3 | 12.7-20.2 | 727,114 | 2418 | 0.95 (0.90-1.01) | 248,676 | 583 | 0.95 (0.84-1.08) | 314,023 | 1222 | 1.00 (0.91-1.09) |
| Quintile 4 | 20.3-33.0 | 745,491 | 2454 | 1.02 (0.96-1.09) | 254,202 | 585 | 1.05 (0.92-1.19) | 335,356 | 1267 | 1.04 (0.95-1.13) |
| Quintile 5 | >33.0 | 748,931 | 2079 | 0.99 (0.93-1.06) | 265,276 | 523 | 1.02 (0.89-1.18) | 339,163 | 1139 | 1.04 (0.95-1.15) |
| P-trend | | | | 0.562 | | | 0.293 | | | 0.401 |
| Continuous ($log_2$) | | | | | | | 1.00 (0.97-1.02) | | | 1.01 (0.99-1.03) |
| Flavones | | | | | | | | | | |
| Quintile 1 | <1.12 | 733,989 | 2095 | 1.00 (ref) | 263,027 | 527 | 1.00 (ref) | 296,684 | 986 | 1.00 (ref) |
| Quintile 2 | 1.12-2.01 | 738,165 | 2250 | 1.00 (0.94-1.07) | 267,049 | 546 | 0.92 (0.81-1.06) | 319,146 | 1173 | 1.06 (0.97-1.16) |
| Quintile 3 | 2.02-3.04 | 739,074 | 2337 | 0.99 (0.92-1.06) | 266,429 | 573 | 0.90 (0.78-1.05) | 325,942 | 1200 | 1.02 (0.92-1.12) |
| Quintile 4 | 3.05-4.88 | 731,616 | 2570 | 1.03 (0.96-1.11) | 252,599 | 636 | 0.94 (0.81-1.10) | 319,408 | 1312 | 1.11 (1.00-1.23) |
| Quintile 5 | >4.88 | 727,596 | 2324 | 0.99 (0.91-1.07) | 242,934 | 545 | 0.86 (0.73-1.02) | 322,049 | 1201 | 1.10 (0.98-1.23) |
| P-trend | | | | 0.729 | | | 0.162 | | | 0.120 |
| Continuous ($log_2$) | | | | 1.00 (0.98-1.02) | | | 0.95 (0.91-1.00) | | | 1.04 (1.01-1.06) |
| Isoflavones | | | | | | | | | | |
| Quintile 1 | <0.22 | 690,923 | 1903 | 1.00 (ref) | 227,330 | 466 | 1.00 (ref) | 292,501 | 907 | 1.00 (ref) |
| Quintile 2 | 0.22-0.39 | 744,644 | 2378 | 0.98 (0.91-1.06) | 236,820 | 562 | 1.05 (0.90-1.22) | 354,245 | 1269 | 0.95 (0.86-1.05) |
| Quintile 3 | 0.40-0.65 | 748,866 | 2583 | 0.99 (0.92-1.08) | 224,423 | 571 | 1.00 (0.85-1.19) | 351,304 | 1376 | 1.00 (0.90-1.12) |
| Quintile 4 | 0.66-1.36 | 748,014 | 2584 | 0.99 (0.91-1.08) | 234,073 | 570 | 0.97 (0.80-1.17) | 341,279 | 1343 | 0.99 (0.88-1.11) |
| Quintile 5 | >1.36 | 737,992 | 2128 | 1.00 (0.91-1.10) | 369,392 | 658 | 0.94 (0.77-1.16) | 243,899 | 977 | 1.00 (0.87-1.14) |
| P-trend | | | | 0.734 | | | 0.351 | | | 0.702 |
| Continuous ($log_2$) | | | | 1.00 (0.98-1.02) | | | 1.00 (0.96-1.04) | | | 0.99 (0.96-1.02) |
| Lignans | | | | | | | | | | |
| Quintile 1 | <0.82 | 740,984 | 2153 | 1.00 (ref) | 258,427 | 559 | 1.00 (ref) | 315,689 | 1038 | 1.00 (ref) |
| Quintile 2 | 0.82-1.09 | 738,044 | 2247 | 0.98 (0.92-1.04) | 260,129 | 572 | 0.95 (0.84-1.08) | 309,167 | 1079 | 0.96 (0.88-1.05) |
| Quintile 3 | 1.10-1.40 | 732,578 | 2327 | 0.97 (0.91-1.03) | 255,233 | 578 | 0.94 (0.83-1.08) | 311,536 | 1135 | 0.93 (0.84-1.02) |
| Quintile 4 | 1.41-1.89 | 728,584 | 2422 | 0.97 (0.90-1.04) | 250,910 | 573 | 0.97 (0.84-1.12) | 321,476 | 1270 | 0.93 (0.84-1.03) |
| Quintile 5 | >1.89 | 730,249 | 2427 | 1.02 (0.93-1.11) | 267,339 | 545 | 1.04 (0.87-1.24) | 325,361 | 1350 | 0.95 (0.84-1.07) |
| P-trend | | | | 0.469 | | | 0.459 | | | 0.589 |
| Continuous ($log_2$) | | | | 0.98 (0.94-1.03) | | | 1.02 (0.93-1.11) | | | 0.94 (0.89-1.00) |

Abbreviations: PY Person-years, BC breast cancer.

[1]Multivariable model: stratified by centre and age (1y) and adjusted for baseline menopausal status (premenopausal plus unknown, postmenopausal plus women who underwent an ovariectomy), weight (kg), height (cm), smoking status (never, former, current, unknown), educational level (none, primary, technical, secondary, university or higher, unknown), physical activity (inactive, moderately inactive, moderately active, active, unknown), age at menarche (<12 y, 12–14 y, >14 y, unknown), age at first full-term birth (nulliparous; <21 y, 21–30 y, >30 y), ever use of contraceptive pills (never, ever, unknown, ever use of hormones (never, ever, unknown), age at menopause (<=50 y, >50 y), energy intake (kcal/d), alcohol intake (g/d), and fibre intake (g/d).

[2]The model was adjusted as in footnote 1 but without adjustment for menopausal status and with the exclusion of women with a history of ovariectomy or unknown menopausal status.

Table 5. Multivariable HRs (95% CI) for breast cancer by doubling in flavonoid or lignan intake (mg/d) according to breast cancer phenotype in the EPIC study[1]

| | $ER^-/PR^-$ | $ER^-/PR^+$ | $ER^+/PR^-$ | $ER^+/PR^+$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | HR (95% CI)[2] | HR (95% CI)[2] | HR (95% CI)[2] | HR (95% CI)[2] |
| Total flavonoids | 0.99 (0.92-1.07) | 1.00 (0.85-1.19) | 0.99 (0.92-1.07) | 1.02 (0.98-1.06) |
| Flavanols | 0.99 (0.93-1.06) | 1.01 (0.87-1.17) | 0.99 (0.93-1.05) | 1.02 (0.99-1.06) |
| Flavan-3-ol monomers | 0.99 (0.95-1.03) | 1.02 (0.94-1.11) | 0.99 (0.95-1.03) | 1.02 (1.00-1.04) |
| Proanthocyanidins | 1.01 (0.92-1.10) | 0.99 (0.81-1.21) | 0.98 (0.90-1.06) | 1.02 (0.97-1.06) |
| Theaflavins | 1.00 (0.99-1.01) | 1.01 (0.99-1.03) | 1.00 (0.99-1.01) | 1.00 (1.00-1.01) |
| Anthocyanidins | 1.02 (0.95-1.10) | 1.12 (0.94-1.35) | 0.99 (0.92-1.06) | 1.00 (0.96-1.04) |
| Flavonols | 0.96 (0.87-1.05) | 0.94 (0.76-1.17) | 0.98 (0.90-1.08) | 1.01 (0.96-1.06) |
| Flavanones | 0.99 (0.95-1.03) | 1.00 (0.90-1.11) | 0.99 (0.95-1.03) | 1.00 (0.98-1.02) |
| Flavones | 0.99 80.92-1.06) | 1.07 (0.91-1.27) | 0.97 (0.90-1.04) | 1.00 (0.96-1.03) |
| Isoflavones | 0.98 (0.92-1.06) | 0.94 (0.80-1.10) | 1.03 (0.96-1.11) | 0.99 (0.96-1.03) |
| Lignans | 0.88 (0.76-1.01) | 1.17 (0.82-1.68) | 0.89 (0.75-1.05) | 1.04 (0.96-1.13) |

Abbreviations: EPIC European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition; ER Estrogen Receptor; PR Progesterone Receptor.

[1]Number of breast cancer cases by hormone receptor status: $ER^-/PR^-$ (n=1,050), $ER^-/PR^+$ (n=217), $ER^+/PR^-$ (n=1,133), $ER^+/PR^+$ (n=3,653).

[2]Multivariable model: stratified by centre and age (1y) and adjusted for baseline menopausal status (premenopausal plus unknown, postmenopausal plus women who underwent an ovariectomy), weight (kg), height (cm), smoking status (never, former, current, unknown), educational level (none, primary, technical, secondary, university or higher, unknown), physical activity (inactive, moderately inactive, moderately active, active, unknown), age at menarche (<12 y, 12–14 y, >14 y, unknown), age at first full-term birth (nulliparous, <21 y, 21–30 y, >30 y), ever use of contraceptive pills (never, ever, unknown), ever use of hormones (never, ever, unknown), age at menopause (<=50 y, >50 y), energy intake (kcal/d), alcohol intake (g/d), and fibre intake (g/d).