

Sugar consumption and breast cancer risk: results from NutriNet-Santé prospective cohort

Charlotte Debras, Eloi Chazelas, Bernard Srour, Laurent Zelek, Emmanuelle Kesse-Guyot, Chantal Julia, Nathalie Druesne-Pecollo, Pilar Galan, Serge Hercberg, Paule Latino-Martel, et al.

▶ To cite this version:

Charlotte Debras, Eloi Chazelas, Bernard Srour, Laurent Zelek, Emmanuelle Kesse-Guyot, et al.. Sugar consumption and breast cancer risk: results from NutriNet-Santé prospective cohort. San Antonio Breast Cancer Symposium, Dec 2019, San Antonio, United States. . inserm-02438216

HAL Id: inserm-02438216 https://inserm.hal.science/inserm-02438216

Submitted on 14 Jan 2020

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Sugar consumption and breast cancer risk: results from NutriNet-Santé prospective cohort.

le cnam

C. Debras¹, E. Chazelas¹, B. Srour¹, L. Zelek^{1,2}, E. Kesse-Guyot¹, C. Julia^{1,3}, N. Druesne-Pecollo¹, P. Galan¹, S. Hercberg^{1,3}, P. Latino-Martel¹, M. Deschasaux¹, M. Touvier¹

¹ Nutritional epidemiology Research Team (Inserm, Inra, Cnam, Paris 13 University), Bobigny, FRANCE

² Oncology Department, Avicenne Hospital, Bobigny, FRANCE

³ Public Health Department, Avicenne Hospital, Bobigny, FRANCE.

Mean (SD)

sugar intake

More oral

contraceptive

(31% vs. 26%)

Less hormona

treatment

(4,2% vs. 5,3%)

Less menopaused

(22% vs. 33%)

Less children

(1,15 vs. 1,34)

24%

2,5

Ö 2,0

All simple sugars

† 1,51

54.3 (11.6)



ABSTRACT

UNIVERSITÉ PARIS 13

Objective To prospectively investigate the association between the consumption of sugar and risk of breast cancer.

Design Population based prospective cohort study.

Setting and participants 79,742 female participants aged ≥ 18y (mean age: 41.0±14.0y) from the French NutriNet-Santé cohort (2009-2019) were included. Consumption of sugar were assessed using repeated 24h-dietary records, designed to register participants' usual consumption for more than 3,500 different food and beverages items.

Main outcome measures Prospective associations between sugar consumption and risk of breast (premenopausal, postmenopausal and both) cancer were assessed by multivariable Cox proportional hazard models adjusted for known risk factors.

Results The consumption of sugar was significantly associated with higher breast cancer risk (n=783 cases, $HR_{Q_4 \text{ vs. } Q_1}$ =1.51, 95% confidence interval 1.14 to 2.00, P for trend=0.0007), so was the consumption of added sugar (HR $_{Q_4 \text{ vs.}}$ $_{Q_1}$ =1.47, 95% CI 1.12 to 1.91, P=0.02) and more specifically with premenopausal breast cancer (n=459 cases, HR_{Q4 vs. Q1 of simple sugars}=1.77, 95% CI 1.13 to 2.77, P for trend=0.003). Sugars from sugary drinks, dairy products and milk-based desserts were significantly associated with breast cancer (P for trends were 0.002, 0.01 and 0.02, respectively). Overall consumption of sugars, excluding fruits, or excluding drinks were significantly associated with breast cancer risk (P for trends were 0.0007 and 0.003, respectively). Concerning specific types of sugar, higher sucrose intake was associated with increased risk of breast cancer (HR_{Q₄ vs. Q₁}=1.36, 95% CI 1.04 to 1.78, P=0.01).

CONTEXT

Increasing consumption of sugar

• France: 20 to 30% of adults consume more than 100 g/d of total sugars ¹ USA: mean energy intake from sugar > 13% ², whereas WHO recommends sugar to account for no more than 5 to 10% of energy intake ³

is a risk factor for ^{1,2,4,5} Type 2 diabetes, cardiovascular diseases, etc. But, limited level of Most common cancer among women. evidence concerning 6 29% of cancer cases in 2018 7 cancer weight gain, overweight ⁶ resistance 8,9,10

Recent prospective study within **NutriNet-Santé** cohort found a positive association between sugary drinks and cancer risks, in particular breast cancer 11 Independently of weight gain and BMI

OBJECTIVES





MATERIALS & METHODS

NutriNet-Santé cohort

Sugar

- Largest web-based cohort in the world
- Population study 79,742 women including 783 incident breast cancers

Dietary data collection

• **Dietary data:** at least 2 sets of web-based 24h dietary records during the first 2 years of follow-up (1 set = 3 non-consecutive days within two weeks)

Sugar intake

- Food composition database: >3,500 food items, includes details on sugar composition (glucose, fructose, sucrose, lactose, galactose, maltose)
- Sugary foods clustered in groups: biscuit/cakes/pastries, sugary products, breakfast cereals, milk-based desserts, sugary drinks, fruits, dairy products

Validation of incident breast cancer cases

• Online self-declaration → Validation by a medical committee, based on medical report + Link with medical/administrative databases and the national mortality registry

Statistical analysis

- Quartiles of sugar intakes
- Cox proportional hazard models adjusted for age, BMI, height, physical activity, educational level, smoking status, family history of cancer, number of 24h records, energy intake, alcohol, sodium, SFA, dietary fibers, dietary patterns, cardiometabolic risk factors at inclusion, age at menarche, number of biological children, oral contraceptive, menopausal status, hormonal treatment for menopause + sugar from other sources or other types of sugar (when studying sugars from sources **or** specific sugars)
- Sensibility analysis: further adjustments, stratified analysis, restriction of the study population, etc. \rightarrow notably to further investigate a mechanism involving weight gain and weight status

RESULTS

participants

(n=79,742)

89.7 (30.8)

130.0 (23.5)

More energy

(2103 vs. 1461 kcal/d)

More carbohydrates

(242 vs. 141 g/d)

More added sugars

(60 vs. 19 g/d)

(2.8 vs. 2.4 g/d)

(37 vs. 28 g/d)

(4.7 vs. 7.4 g/d)

More sodium

More SFA

Less alcohol

Added sugars only

Added sugars intake

1,59

1,36

53%

1,47

Quartiles of sugar intake

1 (n=19,935) | 2 (n=19,936) | 3 (n=19,936) | 4 (n=19,935)

96.4 (5.7)

Less family history of

cancer (33% vs. 38%)

Less type 2 diabetes

(81 cases vs. 302)

Lower educational

level (≥ 2 years : 70%

vs. 60%)

Less smokers

(current: 14% vs.

Contribution of each sugary food group to overall and added sugars intake

Milk-based desserts

■ Biscuits cakes and

■ Sugary drinks

Sugary products

1,35

Dairy products

Fruits

78.2 (5.2)

Median follow-up time: **5.8 years**

Younger

(38 vs. 43 years)

Sugar consumers

(quartile 4 vs. 1)

All simple sugars intake

Sugars from drinks, dairy products, milk-based desserts, all sugary foods excepts fruits, all sugary foods excepts drinks associated with breast cancer risk

Sucrose associated with breast cancer risk

 $(HR_{Q_4 \text{ vs. } Q_1} = 1.36, _{95\%}CI \ 1.04 \text{ to } 1.78, P=0.01)$

Sensitivity analysis showed similar results

- With no adjustment on BMI, with BMI as a time dependent variable, stratification on BMI (<25 and \geq 25 kg/m²), with weight gain
- Other sensitivity analysis

DISCUSSION – CONCLUSION

Higher sugar intake was associated with increased risk of breast cancer

Potential mechanisms

- Weight gain, overweight status
 - → sensitivity analysis suggest that associations were not only explained by BMI status and weight gain
- Other mechanisms ¹⁰
 - Higher glycemia
 - > Inflammation
- Oxidative stress

Perspectives for primary breast cancer prevention

- Strengthen nutritional recommendations
- Public health policies and taxes

REFERENCES

- 1. ANSES 2016
- 2. 2015-2020 Dietary Guidelines health.gov
- 3. WHO 2015

7. IARC/WHO. Global Cancer Observatory

- 5. Te Morenga et al. *BMJ* 2012 6. WCRF/AICR 2018
- 8. Malik et al. *Diabetes care* 2010 9. Barrio-Lopez et al. *Br J Nutr* 2013 4. Howard, Wylie-Rosett. Circulation 2002 10. Makarem et al. *Annu Rev Nutr* 2018
 - 11. Chazelas et al. BMJ 2019