Association between Mediterranean and Nordic diet scores and changes in weight and waist circumference: influence of *FTO* and *TCF7L2* loci^{1–3}

Nina Roswall, Lars Angquist, Tarunveer S Ahluwalia, Dora Romaguera, Sofus C Larsen, Jane N Østergaard, Jytte Halkjær, Karani S Vimaleswaran, Nicolas J Wareham, Benedetta Bendinelli, Domenico Palli, Jolanda MA Boer, Daphne L van der A, Heiner Boeing, Ruth JF Loos, Thorkild IA Sørensen, and Anne Tjønneland

ABSTRACT

Background: Several studies have shown that adherence to the Mediterranean Diet measured by using the Mediterranean diet score (MDS) is associated with lower obesity risk. The newly proposed Nordic Diet could hold similar beneficial effects. Because of the increasing focus on the interaction between diet and genetic predisposition to adiposity, studies should consider both diet and genetics.

Objective: We investigated whether *FTO* rs9939609 and *TCF7L2* rs7903146 modified the association between the MDS and Nordic diet score (NDS) and changes in weight (Δ weight), waist circumference (Δ WC), and waist circumference adjusted for body mass index (BMI) (Δ WC_{BMI}).

Design: We conducted a case-cohort study with a median followup of 6.8 y that included 11,048 participants from 5 European countries; 5552 of these subjects were cases defined as individuals with the greatest degree of unexplained weight gain during followup. A randomly selected subcohort included 6548 participants, including 5496 noncases. Cases and noncases were compared in analyses by using logistic regression. Continuous traits (ie, Δ weight, Δ WC, and Δ WC_{BMI}) were analyzed by using linear regression models in the random subcohort. Interactions were tested by including interaction terms in models.

Results: A higher MDS was significantly inversely associated with case status (OR: 0.98; 95% CI: 0.96, 1.00), Δ WC (β = -0.010 cm/ y; 95% CI: -0.020, -0.001 cm/y), and Δ WC_{BMI} (β = -0.008; 95% CI: -0.015, -0.001) per 1-point increment but not Δ weight (P = 0.53). The NDS was not significantly associated with any outcome. There was a borderline significant interaction between the MDS and *TCF7L2* rs7903146 on weight gain (P = 0.05), which suggested a beneficial effect of the MDS only in subjects who carried 1 or 2 risk alleles. *FTO* did not modify observed associations.

Conclusions: A high MDS is associated with a lower Δ WC and Δ WC_{BMI}, regardless of *FTO* and *TCF7L2* risk alleles. For Δ weight, findings were less clear, but the effect may depend on the *TCF7L2* rs7903146 variant. The NDS was not associated with anthropometric changes during follow-up. *Am J Clin Nutr* 2014;100:1188–97.

INTRODUCTION

When the association between diet and obesity is examined, dietary patterns have received increasing attention over the past decades. It seems more likely that an entire dietary pattern has an effect in relation to obesity rather than the presence or absence of a single specific dietary component (1). Despite some inconsistency, existing observational and experimental studies have

¹ From the Danish Cancer Society Research Center, Copenhagen, Denmark (NR, JH, and AT); the Institute of Preventive Medicine, Bispebjerg and Frederiksberg Hospitals-The Capital Region, Copenhagen, Denmark (LÄ, SCL, and TIAS); the Novo Nordisk Foundation Center for Basic Metabolic Research, Section of Metabolic Genetics, University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark (TSA and TIAS); the Copenhagen Prospective Studies on Asthma in Childhood, Health Sciences, University of Copenhagen and Danish Pediatric Asthma Center, Copenhagen University Hospital, Gentofte, Denmark (TSA); the Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, School of Public Health, Imperial College, London, United Kingdom (DR); the Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria de Palma, Palma de Mallorca, Spain (DR); the Centro de Investigacíon Biomédica en Red Fisiopatologia de la Obesidad y Nutrición, Mallorca, Spain (DR); the Medical Research Council Epidemiology Unit, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, United Kingdom (KSV, NJW, and RJFL); the Hugh Sinclair Unit of Human Nutrition, Department of Food and Nutritional Sciences, School of Chemistry, Food and Pharmacy, University of Reading, Reading, United Kingdom (KSV); the Section for Epidemiology, Department of Public Health, Aarhus University, Aarhus, Denmark (JNØ); the Cancer Research and Prevention Institute-Istituto per lo Studio e la Prevenzione Oncologica, Florence, Italy (BB and DP); the Center for Nutrition, Prevention and Health Services, National Institute for Public Health and the Environment Bilthoven, Netherlands (JMAB and DLvdA); the Department of Epidemiology, German Institute of Human Nutrition Potsdam-Rehbruecke Arthur-Scheunert-Allee 114-116, Nuthetal, Germany (HB); and the Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, The Charles Bronfman Institute for Personalized Medicine, The Mindich Child Health and Development Institute, The Genetics of Obesity and Related Metabolic Traits Program, New York, NY (RIFL)

² This work was carried out as part of the research program of Gene-Diet Interactions in Obesity supported by the Danish Council for Strategic Research (grant 09-067111). The current study was supported by the Diet, Obesity and Genes project supported by the European Community (contract FOOD-CT-2005-513946). NR, LÄ, TSA, JNØ, and SCL were funded by a Genes, Diet and Obesity stipend given by the Danish Council for Strategic Research (grant 09-067111).

³Address reprint requests and correspondence to N Roswall, Danish Cancer Society Research Center, Strandboulevarden 49, DK-2100 Copenhagen Ø, Denmark. E-mail: roswall@cancer.dk.

Received April 7, 2014. Accepted for publication July 8, 2014.

First published online August 6, 2014; doi: 10.3945/ajcn.114.089706.

1189

suggested a beneficial effect of the Mediterranean diet as assessed by using the Mediterranean diet score $(MDS)^4$ on obesity (2–11).

Recently, a Nordic diet score (NDS) was proposed that including rye bread, oat meal, root vegetables, cabbages, fish, shellfish, and apples and pears (12). This score is used to assess adherence to a healthy Nordic diet and has been shown to be associated with a decrease in body weight in Swedish (13) and Danish (14) intervention trials in at-risk populations and lower mortality in a population-based Danish cohort (12), which might be partly explained by a beneficial effect on body weight. However, obesity is caused by a complex interplay between both behavioral and genetic factors (15). This interplay encourages nutrigenetic research that examines the interaction between genes and nutrition. A lack of consideration of the genetic makeup in these studies could explain the conflicting results on the MDS and obesity. To date, FTO and TCF7L2 genes have, in large-scale genome-wide association studies, been shown to be the most important susceptibility genes for obesity (16, 17) and diabetes (18), respectively. The FTO gene, which relates strongly to concurrent obesity, confers an increase in BMI (in kg/m²) of 0.26–0.66 per risk allele (19). However, the gene has not been consistently associated with changes in body weight (20, 21). In contrast, TCF7L2 does not seem to confer its effect on diabetes through an independent effect on BMI (22); on the contrary, it has been suggested to be associated with lower body weight (23). In some studies, TCF7L2 has been shown to interact with diet in relation to weight loss (24-26). These findings suggest that the genetic variation in FTO and TCF7L2 genes could modify the association between the MDS and NDS and anthropometric changes. For the MDS, interactions with FTO have been examined in relation to obesity in 2 previous studies that showed no interaction (27, 28). However, these studies were conducted in high cardiovascular disease risk subjects, which may have presented a different association than that in the general population. To our knowledge, no previous studies have investigated possible interactions between genetic susceptibility and the NDS. Therefore, the aim of the current study was to investigate whether FTO rs9939609 and TCF7L2 rs7903146 modify the association between the MDS and NDS and changes in obesity-related traits in the Diet, Obesity and Genes study (15).

SUBJECTS AND METHODS

Study design and participants

We used data from 6 cohorts in 5 countries participating in the European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition study (29) as follows: Denmark, Germany, Italy, Netherlands (Doetinchem and Amsterdam/Maastricht as 2 separate cohorts because of differences in data collection at follow-up), and the United Kingdom. All cohorts were population-based and included both men and women. Inclusion criteria were as follows: participants were <60 y old at baseline and <65 y old at follow-up; had an available blood sample and baseline information on diet, height, and weight; had follow-up information on weight;

had stable smoking habits; had no previous diagnosis of cancer, cardiovascular disease, or diabetes at baseline or during followup; and had an average annual weight change ≤ 5 kg/y. The study was approved by local review boards of all participating institutions. Written informed consent has been obtained from all participants before joining the study.

Case and subcohort definitions

Cases were defined as participants who experienced the greatest degree of unexplained weight gain identified by using residuals from a regression model of annual weight change on baseline values of age, weight, height, smoking status, and follow-up time. Regression models were run separately for each country and stratified by sex. In all countries except Italy, 600 male and 600 female cases were selected. Because the Italian cohort consisted of a general population-based sample of women who were participating in a population-based breast cancer screening program, men were underrepresented (27%). To follow the sex distribution in the original cohort, 300 male and 900 female cases were selected here.

The subcohort sample consisted of a random sample of the total eligible cohort and was drawn so that the number of noncases in each center equaled the number of cases (n = 1200). This method resulted in some cases also being selected for the random subcohort. Therefore, in all centers except Denmark, where the overlap between cases and the subcohort was negligible (n =79), oversampling of the random subcohort was performed. In the random subcohort, 7061 participants were included of whom 5928 were noncases. In total, 11,928 persons were included in the study. Of these subjects, 11,114 persons had DNA successfully extracted. We lacked information on nutritional or anthropometric variables of 66 participants, which left 11,048 subjects (5552 cases and 5496 noncases; 6548 in the random subcohort) in the final study population (Figure 1). Demographic, anthropometric, and dietary characteristics of cases, noncases, and the random subcohort are shown in Table 1.

DNA extraction and genotyping

Genomic DNA was extracted from buffy coats by using a salting-out method for all participants except UK samples, where whole-genome amplified DNA was used. In total, DNA from 11,114 participants (93%) was extracted. DNA extraction was done at KBioscience. Genomic and amplified DNA samples were quality checked, quantified, and normalized to ~100 ng/mL and 2.0 μ g before genotyping. The quality assessment showed a good yield.

High-throughput single-nucleotide polymorphism (SNP) genotyping was carried out by using the Illumina BeadStation Genotyping System at IntegraGen. Genotyping was considered successful if the following criteria were met: a sample call rate >95%, SNP call rate >95%, and duplicate discordance rate <3%. We used Fisher's exact test to evaluate the Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium for all SNPs for each country separately. If a statistically significant deviance from this equilibrium was shown (P < 0.001), the SNP was excluded for that particular country. For the 2 included SNPs, no such exclusions were necessary.

⁴Abbreviations used: FFQ, food-frequency questionnaire; MDS, Mediterranean diet score; NDS, Nordic diet score; SNP, single-nucleotide polymorphism; WC, waist circumference; WC_{BMI}, waist circumference adjusted for BMI; Δ WC, changes in waist circumference; Δ WC_{BMI}, changes in waist circumference adjusted for BMI; Δ weight, changes in weight.



FIGURE 1. Flowchart of study participants.

SNP selection and linkage disequilibrium

We selected the following 2 genes for the current study: *FTO* and *TCF7L2*, on the basis of their consistent association in published, large-scale, genome-wide association studies with obesity and related traits (*FTO*) and risk of type 2 diabetes (*TCF7L2*) (16–18). For both genes, one SNP each was included as follows: rs9939609 (*FTO*) and rs7903146 (*TCF7L2*). Both SNPs are common variants with the following minor allele frequencies: A = 36% (rs9939609) and T = 22% (rs7903146) [dbSNP (www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/snp/) and HapMap (www.hapmap.org/) databases for individuals with European ancestry (CEU; Hap-Map Phase 3, Genome Build 37.3)].

Dietary data

Validated, country-specific food-frequency questionnaires (FFQs) were used to collect dietary information at baseline, including up to 260 items. In the Netherlands, Italy, and Germany, individual portion sizes were estimated, whereas in the United Kingdom and Denmark, standard portion sizes were assigned (29).

MDS

This study used the previously developed relative MDS (30), which includes 9 components characteristic of the Mediterranean diet. Some components were presumed to be beneficial (vegetables, legumes, fruit and nuts, cereals, fish and seafood, olive oil, and moderate alcohol consumption), and other components were presumed to be detrimental (meat, meat products, and dairy products). Each component (apart from alcohol) was measured in g per 1000 kilocalories (to express intake as energy density). All components (except olive oil and alcohol) were divided into sexspecific tertiles of intake on the basis of the original cohort. For beneficial components, values of 0, 1, and 2 were assigned to first, second, and third tertiles of intake, respectively. The scoring was reversed for the 2 detrimental components. The scoring for olive oil was modified because of the relatively large number of nonconsumers. In the current study, a value of zero was assigned to nonconsumers, a values of one was assigned to subjects with an intake below the median consumption (calculated within olive-oil consumers), and a values of 2 was assigned to subjects with intake at or above the median. For alcohol, a value of 2 was given to subjects with moderate consumption (women: 5–25 g/d; men 10–50 g/d), and a value of zero was assigned otherwise. The MDS ranges from 0 (minimal adherence) to 18 (maximal adherence). *See* Supplemental Figure 1 under "Supplemental data" in the online issue for the distribution.

NDS

The NDS used in the current study was originally developed and tested by Olsen et al (12). They defined it by including foods that were part of their FFQ, were originally grown in the Nordic countries, are commonly consumed in Nordic countries, and have health-beneficial effects (12). This method resulted in the inclusion of the following 6 food groups: whole-grain bread, oatmeal, apples and pears, cabbages, root vegetables, and fish and shellfish. For the current study, we did not have information on oatmeal, and therefore, the NDS consisted of the following 5 components: fish (all types of fish and fish contents in foods), cabbages (broccoli, white cabbage, Brussels sprouts, cauliflower, red cabbage, Savoy cabbage, green cabbage, sauerkraut, and Chinese cabbage), root vegetables (carrot, celery, beet root, turnip, parsnip, radish, and swede), apples and pears (apple, pear, compote of apple, and compote of pear), and dark bread (wholegrain bread, whole-meal bread, rye bread, brown bread, mixedgrain bread, whole-meal crisp bread, and bread sticks). These food items were chosen because of their status as traditional Nordic food items as well as their presumed health benefits. For each component, one point was given for intake above the sex-specific median of the total Diet, Obesity and Genes cohort. The NDS ranges from 0 (minimal adherence) to 5 (maximal

ases, and the random subcohort
ases, and the random
ases, and the
ases, and
ases, a
case
nonc
cases,
ц.
covariates
nud
scores, 2
dietary
measures,
hropometric 1
anth
of
ABLE 1 bistribution

All Mon Wore Mon Wore Mon Wore Mon	MI Mat Mat <th></th> <th></th> <th>Cases</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th>Noncases</th> <th></th> <th>-</th> <th>andom subcohort</th> <th></th> <th></th>			Cases			Noncases		-	andom subcohort				
	Bachle uge (v) 475 ± 75 480 ± 73 484 ± 70 477 ± 75 473 ± 75 473 ± 75 480 ± 73 484 ± 70 477 ± 75 473 ± 75 473 ± 75 484 ± 70 477 ± 75 473 ± 75 484 ± 70 477 ± 75 484 ± 170 473 ± 75 484 ± 170 473 ± 75 473 ± 75 484 ± 170 473 ± 75 482 ± 77 482 ± 77 482 ± 77 482 ± 77 482 ± 75 473 ± 75 482 ± 77 473 ± 75 473 ± 75 473 ± 75 484 ± 170 473 ± 75 <t< th=""><th></th><th>All $(n = 5552)$</th><th>Men (n = 2492)</th><th>Women $(n = 3060)$</th><th>All $(n = 5496)$</th><th>Men$(n = 2490)$</th><th>Women $(n = 3006)$</th><th>All $(n = 6548)$</th><th>Men (n = 3013)</th><th>Women $(n = 3535)$</th><th><i>P</i>-difference</th></t<>		All $(n = 5552)$	Men (n = 2492)	Women $(n = 3060)$	All $(n = 5496)$	Men $(n = 2490)$	Women $(n = 3006)$	All $(n = 6548)$	Men (n = 3013)	Women $(n = 3535)$	<i>P</i> -difference		
		Raseline are (v)	476 + 752	48.0 + 7.4	5 L + 8 LV	48.0 + 7.3	48.4 + 7.0	S L + L LV	2 L + 0 LV	C L + C 8V	VL + LLV	0000		
	$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Deceline height (am)	160 + 0.01	1771 + 60	1627 + 6 4	160.4 ± 0.0	0.7 = 1.01	162.2 + 6.4	50 + 2071	7.7 = 7.01	162.0 + 6.4	0.15		
$ \begin{array}{c ccccc} \mbox{mode} \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \$		Baseline neight (Cm) Raseline weight (Eg)	76.7 + 14.3	$1/1.1 \pm 0.5$ 83.8 + 17.5	103.1 ± 0.4	109.4 - 9.4 70.6 + 13.4	1/0.9 - 0.0 81.0 + 11.1	103.5 - 0.4	C.6 = C.601	1/0.9 - 0.0 81.4 + 11.3	103.2 ± 0.4	00002		
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		Baseline RMI (ba/m ²)	0.4 + 4.0	767 + 37	0.21 - 1.07	75.0 + 3.6	750 + 31	246 + 30	75.4 ± 3.7	0.11 - 1.10	1.11 = 2.00	<0.0001 <0.0001		
Result WC (with the second	matrix (0.15) (0.15) <th colspa="</td"><td>Baseline WC (cm)</td><td>875 + 107</td><td>94.0 + 10.5</td><td>81.6 + 11.1</td><td>84.4 + 12.0</td><td>0.5 + 0.0</td><td>0.0 + 0.77</td><td>84.0 + 12.1</td><td>0.0 + 0.2</td><td>78.3 + 10.1</td><td><0.0001</td></th>	<td>Baseline WC (cm)</td> <td>875 + 107</td> <td>94.0 + 10.5</td> <td>81.6 + 11.1</td> <td>84.4 + 12.0</td> <td>0.5 + 0.0</td> <td>0.0 + 0.77</td> <td>84.0 + 12.1</td> <td>0.0 + 0.2</td> <td>78.3 + 10.1</td> <td><0.0001</td>	Baseline WC (cm)	875 + 107	94.0 + 10.5	81.6 + 11.1	84.4 + 12.0	0.5 + 0.0	0.0 + 0.77	84.0 + 12.1	0.0 + 0.2	78.3 + 10.1	<0.0001	
	Twengin (igy) Ti ± 0.7 Ti	Baseline WC	0.0 + 5.0	0.0 + 4.8	0.0 + 5.4	-0.5 + 4.0	-0.7 + 4.7	-0.2 + 5.0	-0.1 + 5.0	-0.2 + 4.7	-0.1 + 5.1	0.000		
$ \begin{array}{c cccc} \operatorname{matrix}_{1} (x_{1}, x_{1}^{-1}) & \overline{x_{1}} (x_{1}^{-1}, x_{1}^{-1}) & \overline{x_{1}} (x_{1}^{$	$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	AWeight (kg/v)	$\frac{14}{14} + 0.7$	14 + 0.7	15 + 0.7	0.03 + 0.6	0.07 + 0.6	0.04 + 0.6	0.2 = 0.0 0.75 ± 0.8	0.24 + 0.8	0.75 + 0.8	<0.0001		
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$ \begin{array}{c cccc} \operatorname{MCC}(w_{12}) & 1 = 1, \\ \operatorname{MCC}(w_{12}) & 1 = 1, \\ \operatorname{MCC}(w_{12}) & 0 = 0, \\ MCC$	$\frac{1}{4} \operatorname{RMI} \left(\frac{\operatorname{rg}(y)}{\operatorname{k}^{\alpha}} \cdot \frac{\operatorname{m}^{-2}}{\operatorname{m}^{-1}} \right)$	0.5 + 0.0	0.4 ± 0.7	0.6 + 0.3	0.0 = 0.0 0.01 + 0.0	0.01 + 0.0	0.0 + 0.0	0.0 + 0.0	0.27 = 0.0 0.08 + 0.2	0.04 + 0.3	<0.0001		
$ \begin{array}{c} \mbox{Terr} (\mbox{time}) & \mbox{Terr} (tim$	$ \begin{array}{c} \label{eq:constraint} \\ \mbox{Mins} $		16 + 13	0.1 - 0.2	18 + 13	0.01 - 0.2	0.01 = 0.2 0.34 ± 1.0	0.02 = 0.2 0.64 + 1.1	0.07 + 1.1	0.00 - 0.2 0.50 + 1.1	0.0 - 0.0	<0.0001 <0.0001		
Wilds Si $\pm 1, 0$ <t< td=""><td>Ministration (w) was = 3.0 <thwas 3.0<="" =="" th=""></thwas></td><td>ΔWC_{min} (cm/v)</td><td>0.00 + 1.0</td><td>0.03 + 1.0</td><td>0.01 + 1.0</td><td>-0.03 + 0.0</td><td>-0.0 + 20.0 - 0.8</td><td>-0.07 + 1.0</td><td>-0.07 + 0.0</td><td>-0.03 + 0.8</td><td>-0.02 + 1.0</td><td>0.0042</td></t<>	Ministration (w) was = 3.0 was = 3.0 <thwas 3.0<="" =="" th=""></thwas>	ΔWC_{min} (cm/v)	0.00 + 1.0	0.03 + 1.0	0.01 + 1.0	-0.03 + 0.0	-0.0 + 20.0 - 0.8	-0.07 + 1.0	-0.07 + 0.0	-0.03 + 0.8	-0.02 + 1.0	0.0042		
With State 2.3 ± 1.3 2.4 ± 1.2 2.3 ± 1.3 2.4 ± 1.3 2.3 ± 1.3	NIS 2.3 ± 1.3 2.4 ± 1.2 2.3 ± 1.3 2.4 ± 1.3		88 + 30	81+79	03 + 30	0.0 + 3.0	83 + 20	0.5 + 3.0	0.0 + 3.0	83+70	0.6 + 3.0	0.0003		
Simoling status (r (6)) Solution	Sinding status $ r(6) $ Sinding $ r(2) $ Sinding $ r(2) $ Sinding $ r(2) $ Sinding $ r(6) $ Sinding $ r(7) $ Sinding	SUN	23 + 13	2.4 + 1.0	23 + 13	24 + 13	24 + 13	24 + 13	24 + 13	54 + 13	23 + 13	0.0126		
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	New 2404 (43.3) 852 (53.8) 1512 (49.4) 2592 (47.2) 992 (30.1) 5100 (53.2) 3053 (46.4) 1185 (39.3) 1830 (57.2) Former 1217 (22.3) 548 (22.0) 899 (23.0) 1809 (52.2) 999 (40.1) 810 (27.0) 2100 (33.3) 1233 (20.2) 1233 (17.3) 353 (17.7) 730 (27.0) Runse 1217 (22.3) 548 (22.0) 1809 (52.5) 160 (19.3) 3 (0.1) 4 (0.1) 1 (0.0) 3 (0.1) 730 (27.9) 330 (17.0) 3 (0.1) <td< td=""><td>Smoking status $[n \ (\%)]$</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>Ì</td><td>) </td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td><0.0001</td></td<>	Smoking status $[n \ (\%)]$					Ì) 				<0.0001		
France in (54)	Former [91] (3,4) 1052 (3,2) 859 (3,3) 180 (3,7) 210 (3,3,5) 1237 (2,3,3) 548 (2,0) 659 (3,2,5) 199 (3,0) 56 (19,3) 1237 (2,3,3) 548 (2,0) 558 (13,1) 750 (13,2) 550 (19,3) 730 (13,3)	Never	2404 (43.3)	892 (35.8)	1512 (49.4)	2592 (47.2)	992 (39.8)	1500 (53.2)	3035 (46.4)	1185 (39.3)	1850 (52.3)			
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Current 1237 (22.3) 548 (22.6) 689 (22.52) 1095 (199) 499 (200) 596 (19.8) 1323 (20.2) 600 (199) 723 (23.8) Eutoation [r (%)] 13 (0.2) 232 (31.1) 133 (12.7) 552 (21.1) 739 (25.8) 100 301 (12.3) 600 (199) 710 (12.3) 600 (199) 730 (12.7) Primary school 1314 (23.7) 525 (21.1) 739 (25.3) 1800 (33.9) 323 (13.4) 1000 (33.6) 301 (12.3) 607 (12.9) 730 (12.3) 607 (12.3) 1000 (33.5) 733 (13.2) 550 (18.0) 553 (18.0) 553 (18.0) 553 (18.0) 553 (18.0) 553 (18.0) 553 (13.3) 560 (13.2) 731 (12.2) 667 (110 1100 (12.2) 1102 (22.3) 1000 (33.5) 733 (13.2) 733 (13.2) 733 (13.2) 733 (13.2) 733 (13.2) 733 (13.2) 733 (12.2) 667 (110 1102 (22.7) 1000 (33.5) 1102 (22.9) 1102 (22.9) 1102 (22.9) 1102 (22.9) 1102	Former	1911 (34.4)	1052 (42.2)	859 (28.0)	1809 (32.9)	999 (40.1)	810 (27.0)	2190 (33.5)	1228 (40.8)	962 (27.2)			
Education $[n (\%)]$ Education $[n (\%)]$ Education $[n (\%)]$ Education $[n (\%)]$ 13 (0.1) 13 (0.1) 3 (0.1) <th 3<="" colspa="5" td=""><td>Education [n (%)] Education [n (%)] 1 (0.1) 1 (0.1) 1 (0.1) 1 (0.1) 3 (0.1) 1 (0.1) 3 (0.1) <th 3"3<<="" colspa="5" td=""><td>Current</td><td>1237 (22.3)</td><td>548 (22.0)</td><td>689 (22.52)</td><td>1095 (19.9)</td><td>499 (20.0)</td><td>596 (19.8)</td><td>1323 (20.2)</td><td>600 (19.9)</td><td>723 (20.5)</td><td></td></th></td></th>	<td>Education [n (%)] Education [n (%)] 1 (0.1) 1 (0.1) 1 (0.1) 1 (0.1) 3 (0.1) 1 (0.1) 3 (0.1) <th 3"3<<="" colspa="5" td=""><td>Current</td><td>1237 (22.3)</td><td>548 (22.0)</td><td>689 (22.52)</td><td>1095 (19.9)</td><td>499 (20.0)</td><td>596 (19.8)</td><td>1323 (20.2)</td><td>600 (19.9)</td><td>723 (20.5)</td><td></td></th></td>	Education [n (%)] Education [n (%)] 1 (0.1) 1 (0.1) 1 (0.1) 1 (0.1) 3 (0.1) 1 (0.1) 3 (0.1) <th 3"3<<="" colspa="5" td=""><td>Current</td><td>1237 (22.3)</td><td>548 (22.0)</td><td>689 (22.52)</td><td>1095 (19.9)</td><td>499 (20.0)</td><td>596 (19.8)</td><td>1323 (20.2)</td><td>600 (19.9)</td><td>723 (20.5)</td><td></td></th>	<td>Current</td> <td>1237 (22.3)</td> <td>548 (22.0)</td> <td>689 (22.52)</td> <td>1095 (19.9)</td> <td>499 (20.0)</td> <td>596 (19.8)</td> <td>1323 (20.2)</td> <td>600 (19.9)</td> <td>723 (20.5)</td> <td></td>	Current	1237 (22.3)	548 (22.0)	689 (22.52)	1095 (19.9)	499 (20.0)	596 (19.8)	1323 (20.2)	600 (19.9)	723 (20.5)	
None 13 (0.2) 2 (0.1) 11 (0.4) 3 (0.1) 0 (0) 3 (0.1) 4 (0.1) 1 (0.0) 3 (0.1) Primary school 1314 (2.7) 552 (3.1) 788 (25.3) 188 (13.5) 533 (17.5) 533 (17.7) 790 (22.4) Technical school 193 (3.47) 552 (3.1) 788 (53.5) 188 (13.5) 533 (17.5) 533 (17.7) 790 (22.4) Technical school 193 (3.47) 553 (18.0) 156 (3.0) 85 (3.5) 333 (17.2) 533 (17.7) 790 (22.4) Vinknown 166 (3.0) 86 (3.5) 530 (18.0) 156 (2.5) 4 (1.9) 89 (1.0) 71 (12.2) 667 (18.9) Physical activity (r (%) 889 (16.0) 343 (13.8) 546 (17.8) 747 (13.6) 307 (12.3) 193 (12.2) 557 (13.2) 193 (12.2) 657 (18.9) 153 (12.7) 109 (33.5) 783 (12.2) 104 (2.9) 104 (2.9) 104 (2.9) 104 (2.9) 104 (2.9) 104 (2.9) 104 (2.9) 104 (2.9) 104 (2.9) 153 (12.7) 108 (12.3) 104 (12.9) 183 (12.7) 103 (12.9)	None 13 (0.2) 2 (0.1) 11 (0.4) 3 (0.1) 0 (0) 3 (0.1) 4 (0.1) 1 (0.0) 3 (0.1) Pinnay school 1314 (2.7) 553 (3.1) 788 (5.3.3) 186 (13.8) 533 (17.5)	Education $[n \ (\%)]$	~	~	~	×	~	~	×	~	~	< 0.0001		
Primary school 1314 (23.7) 525 (21.1) 789 (25.8) 1081 (19.7) 439 (7.6) 642 (21.4) 1323 (20.2) 533 (17.7) 790 (22.4) Technical school 870 (43.7) 850 (18.0) 883 (53.5) 860 (33.8) 883 (53.9) 911 (12.2) 530 (18.3) 967 (18.9) University 176 (3.0) 86 (3.5) 850 (18.0) 853 (5.5) 303 (12.2) 530 (18.3) 103 (13.2) 530 (18.3) 103 (13.2) 530 (18.3) 104 (2.9) Physical activity $[r_{(%)}]$ 889 (16.0) 343 (13.8) 546 (17.8) 747 (13.6) 307 (12.3) 440 (14.6) 977 (14.2) 543 (12.9) 533 (15.7) 104 (2.9) Physical activity $[r_{(%)}]$ 889 (16.0) 343 (13.8) 546 (17.8) 747 (13.6) 307 (12.3) 440 (14.6) 977 (14.2) 543 (12.7) 104 (2.9) Inactive 1734 (31.2) 667 (21.9) 1730 (21.5) 690 (27.7) 1040 (44.6) 977 (14.2) 344 (12.7) 543 (12.4) 108 (23.1) Inactive 1730 (23.4) 1103 (23.7) 1040 (24.6) 107 (12.2)	Primary school 1314 (23.7) 525 (21.1) 789 (25.8) 1081 (19.7) 439 (17.6) 642 (21.4) 1323 (20.2) 533 (17.7) 790 (24.70) Tennical school 1390 (34.70) 325 (34.19) 1083 (55.23) 1860 (33.85) 332 (33.4) 1003 (35.2) 333 (17.3) 667 (1 Tennical school 1390 (34.70) 853 (3.5.1) 350 (18.0) 853 (3.5.1) 330 (12.2) 533 (17.3) 667 (1 University 166 (3.0) 86 (3.5) 850 (18.0) 1563 (2.8.1) 136 (2.5) 4 (1.9) 89 (3.0) 172 (2.5) 68 (2.3) 104 (2 Physical activity $ Ir (%) $ 889 (16.0) 343 (13.8) 546 (17.8) 747 (13.6) 307 (12.3) 440 (14.6) 927 (14.2) 344 (12.7) 543 (12.7) Moderately active 1734 (31.2) 657 (27.7) 1059 (24.6) 1730 (23.7) 938 (12.0) 333 (27.7) 1208 (3.2) 104 (2 Moderately active 1730 (23.4) 1173 (4.7) 147 (13.6) 100 (4.0) 172 (4.2) 134 (12.7) 134 (12.7) 134 (12.7) 134 (12.7)	None	13 (0.2)	2(0.1)	11 (0.4)	3 (0.1)	0 (0)	3 (0.1)	4 (0.1)	1 (0.0)	3 (0.1)			
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Technical school 1930 (34.76) 852 (34.19) 1078 (35.23) 1860 (33.89) 833 (15.5) 303 (12.2) 550 (18.3) 1038 (15.9) 171 (12.3) 667 (1 Secondary school 870 (15.7) 320 (15.7) 320 (12.8) 553 (18.0) 1563 (33.4) 1038 (15.7) 1038 (15.7) 331 (12.3) 667 (10) Nenown 126 (3.0) 86 (3.5) 80 (2.6) 135 (2.5) 4 (1.9) 89 (3.0) 177 (2.6) 68 (2.3) 104 (2 Physical activity $ n (%) $ 166 (3.0) 853 (15.0) 136 (2.5) 4 (1.9) 89 (3.0) 177 (2.5) 68 (2.3) 104 (2 94 (1.2) 104 (2 94 (1.2) 104 (2 94 (1.2) 104 (2 94 (1.2) 104 (2 94 (1.2) 104 (2 94 (1.2) 104 (2 94 (1.2) 104 (2 93 (12.7) 543 (1.2) 104 (2 94 (1.2) 104 (2 93 (12.7) 93 (12.7) 543 (1.2) 104 (2 94 (1.2) 104 (2 93 (12.7) 94 (1.2) 104 (2 93 (12.7) 104 (2 93 (12.7) 104 (2 104 (2 103 (12.7)<	Primary school	1314 (23.7)	525 (21.1)	789 (25.8)	1081 (19.7)	439 (17.6)	642 (21.4)	1323 (20.2)	533 (17.7)	790 (22.4)			
Secondary school 870 (15.7) 320 (12.8) 550 (18.0) 853 (15.5) 303 (12.2) 550 (18.3) 1038 (15.9) 371 (12.3) 667 (18.9)University 1259 (22.7) 707 (28.4) 552 (18.0) 1563 (23.4) 859 (34.9) 694 (23.1) 172 (22.6) 667 (18.9)Physical activity $[n(6k)]$ 889 (160) 344 (17.8) 747 (13.6) 307 (12.3) 440 (14.6) 927 (14.2) 543 (12.7)Physical activity $[n(6k)]$ 889 (160) 344 (13.8) 546 (17.8) 747 (13.6) 307 (12.3) 440 (14.6) 927 (14.2) 543 (12.7)Moderately inactive 1734 (13.2) 697 (13.6) 307 (12.3) 440 (14.6) 927 (14.2) 543 (12.7)Moderately inactive 1734 (13.2) 697 (13.6) 397 (12.3) 440 (14.6) 927 (14.2) 543 (12.7)Moderately inactive 1734 (13.2) 697 (13.6) 397 (12.3) 440 (14.6) 927 (14.2) 543 (12.7)Moderately inactive 1734 (13.2) 697 (11.6) 697 (11.6) 697 (12.3) 194 (22.1) 546 (32.1)Moderately inactive 117 (41.7) 104 (34.5) 226 (41.1) 100 (40.0) 126 (22.3) 114.7 126 (42.2) 126 (42.2)Moderately inactive 1120 (42.0) 117 (42.0) 126 (42.2) 126 (23.7) 1208 (42.2) 120 (42.2)Moderately active 1408 (76.0) <td>Secondary school 870 (15.7) 320 (12.8) 550 (18.0) 853 (15.5) 303 (12.2) 550 (18.3) 1092 (27.4) 1009 (33.5) 783 (2.3) University 1559 (32.7) 707 (28.4) 552 (18.0) 156 (2.5) 4 (1.9) 89 (3.0) 172 (2.6) 68 (2.3) 104 (2 Physical activity $[n$ (%)] 889 (16.0) 343 (1.3) 546 (17.8) 747 (13.6) 307 (12.3) 440 (14.6) 927 (14.2) 384 (12.7) 1208 (3.7) Inactive 1734 (31.2) 675 (77.7) 1096 (33.5) 733 (3.1) 108 (3.2) 104 (2 Moderately inactive 1734 (31.2) 675 (77.7) 1096 (3.4) 839 (4.0) 126 (3.2) 138 (3.2) 108 (3.2) 104 (3 Moderately inactive 1734 (31.2) 675 (77.1) 1096 (73.1) 1096 (73.2) 108 (7.2) 108 (7.2)</td> <td>Technical school</td> <td>1930 (34.76)</td> <td>852 (34.19)</td> <td>1078 (35.23)</td> <td>1860 (33.89)</td> <td>832 (33.4)</td> <td>1028 (34.2)</td> <td>2219 (33.9)</td> <td>1031 (34.2)</td> <td>1188 (33.6)</td> <td></td>	Secondary school 870 (15.7) 320 (12.8) 550 (18.0) 853 (15.5) 303 (12.2) 550 (18.3) 1092 (27.4) 1009 (33.5) 783 (2.3) University 1559 (32.7) 707 (28.4) 552 (18.0) 156 (2.5) 4 (1.9) 89 (3.0) 172 (2.6) 68 (2.3) 104 (2 Physical activity $[n$ (%)] 889 (16.0) 343 (1.3) 546 (17.8) 747 (13.6) 307 (12.3) 440 (14.6) 927 (14.2) 384 (12.7) 1208 (3.7) Inactive 1734 (31.2) 675 (77.7) 1096 (33.5) 733 (3.1) 108 (3.2) 104 (2 Moderately inactive 1734 (31.2) 675 (77.7) 1096 (3.4) 839 (4.0) 126 (3.2) 138 (3.2) 108 (3.2) 104 (3 Moderately inactive 1734 (31.2) 675 (77.1) 1096 (73.1) 1096 (73.2) 108 (7.2) 108 (7.2) 108 (7.2) 108 (7.2) 108 (7.2) 108 (7.2) 108 (7.2) 108 (7.2) 108 (7.2) 108 (7.2) 108 (7.2) 108 (7.2) 108 (7.2) 108 (7.2)	Technical school	1930 (34.76)	852 (34.19)	1078 (35.23)	1860 (33.89)	832 (33.4)	1028 (34.2)	2219 (33.9)	1031 (34.2)	1188 (33.6)			
$ \begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	$ \begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	Secondary school	870 (15.7)	320 (12.8)	550 (18.0)	853 (15.5)	303 (12.2)	550 (18.3)	1038 (15.9)	371 (12.3)	667 (18.9)			
$ \begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	Unknown 166 (3.0) 86 (3.5) 80 (2.6) 136 (2.5) 4 (1.9) 89 (3.0) 172 (2.6) 68 (2.3) 104 (2.1) Physical activity $[n (\%)]$ 889 (16.0) 343 (13.8) 546 (17.8) 747 (13.6) 307 (12.3) 440 (14.6) 927 (14.2) 384 (127) 543 (1.0) Inactive 1300 (23.4) 618 (24.8) 652 (27.3) 1301 (23.7) 593 (23.9) 706 (23.5) 1334 (12.7) 1208 (3 Moderately inactive 1300 (23.4) 618 (24.8) 652 (22.3) 1301 (23.7) 593 (23.9) 706 (23.6) 584 (12.7) 1208 (3 Moderately active 1300 (23.4) 618 (24.8) 650 (21.7) 100 (4.0) 126 (2.2) 138 (12.7) 1208 (3 Active 1408 (25.4) 710 (21.9) 657 (12.1) 100 (4.0) 126 (4.2) 171 (4.2) 150 (4.2) 156 (4.2) 156 (4.2) 156 (4.2) 156 (4.2) 156 (4.2) 156 (4.2) 156 (4.2) 156 (4.2) 156 (4.2) 156 (4.2) 156 (4.2) 156 (4.2) 157 (4.2) 156 (4.2) 157 (4.2) 150 (6.0) </td <td>University</td> <td>1259 (22.7)</td> <td>707 (28.4)</td> <td>552 (18.0)</td> <td>1563 (28.4)</td> <td>859 (34.9)</td> <td>694 (23.1)</td> <td>1792 (27.4)</td> <td>1009 (33.5)</td> <td>783 (22.2)</td> <td></td>	University	1259 (22.7)	707 (28.4)	552 (18.0)	1563 (28.4)	859 (34.9)	694 (23.1)	1792 (27.4)	1009 (33.5)	783 (22.2)			
Physical activity $[r (%)]$ Physical activity $[r (%)]$ 889 (160) 343 (13.8) 546 (17.8) 747 (13.6) 307 (12.3) 440 (14.6) 927 (14.2) 384 (12.7) 543 (15.4) Inactive 1734 (31.2) 657 (27.7) 1059 (24.6) 1730 (31.5) 690 (27.7) 1040 (34.6) 927 (14.2) 384 (12.7) 543 (15.4) Moderately inactive 1300 (23.4) 168 (24.8) 682 (22.3) 1301 (23.7) 595 (23.9) 706 (23.5) 1534 (23.1) 1208 (34.2) Active 1300 (25.4) 173 (27.2) 193 (23.1) 100 (4.0) 153 (24.2) 150 (23.3) 156 (23.1) Unknown 221 (4.0) 117 (4.7) 104 (3.4) 226 (4.1) 100 (4.0) 126 (4.2) 277 (4.2) 150 (24.2) Menopausal status $[r (%)]$ 1482 (26.7) 0 (0) 143 (26.6) 923 (16.6) 923 (16.0) 93 (16.2) 150 (4.2) Permenopausal status $[r (\%)]$ 126 (4.2) 277 (4.2) 127 (4.2) 150 (4.2) Permenopausal status	Physical activity $[n (\%)]$ S48 (15.0) 546 (17.8) 747 (13.6) 307 (12.3) 440 (14.6) 927 (14.2) 384 (12.7) 543 (13.7) Inactive 1734 (31.2) 675 (27.7) 1059 (24.6) 1730 (31.5) 690 (27.7) 1040 (34.6) 2041 (31.2) 833 (27.7) 1208 (3.7) Moderately inactive 1730 (23.4) 618 (24.8) 1730 (23.7) 1208 (32.4) 1370 (23.4) 618 (23.8) 818 (2.7) 1208 (3.7) 1508 (3.7) 1508 (3.7) 1508 (3.7) 1508 (3.7) 1508 (3.7) 1508 (3.7) 1508 (3.7) 1508 (3.7) 1508 (3.7) 1508 (3.7) 1508 (3.7) 1508 (3.7) 1508 (3.6) 1508 (3.1) 1508 (3.1) 1508 (3.1) 1508 (3.1) 1508 (3.1)	Unknown	166 (3.0)	86 (3.5)	80 (2.6)	136 (2.5)	4 (1.9)	89 (3.0)	172 (2.6)	68 (2.3)	104 (2.9)			
Inactive889 (16.0)343 (13.8)546 (17.8)747 (13.6)307 (12.3)440 (14.6)927 (14.2)334 (12.7)543 (15.4)Moderately inactive1734 (31.2)675 (27.7)1059 (24.6)1730 (31.5)690 (27.7)1040 (34.6)2041 (31.2)833 (27.7)1208 (34.2)Moderately inactive1734 (31.2)675 (27.7)1059 (24.6)1730 (15.3)1391 (23.7)553 (15.4)716 (23.8)818 (23.1)Moderately active1300 (23.4)117 (4.7)1041 (3.4)226 (4.1)100 (4.0)126 (4.2)277 (4.2)1383 (27.7)1208 (23.1)Menopausal818 (14.7)0 (0)1482 (26.7)0 (0)1482 (26.4)1383 (25.1)0 (0)1653 (45.8)Premenopausal815 (14.7)0 (0)815 (26.6)923 (16.8)0 (0)923 (46.0)1653 (42.2)748 (11.4)Postmenopausal815 (14.7)0 (0)815 (26.6)923 (16.8)0 (0)637 (21.2)748 (11.4)0 (0)748 (21.2)Nuknown2492 (44.9)92 (1.7)0 (0)923 (46.9)0 (0)637 (21.2)748 (11.4)0 (0)748 (21.2)Nuknown2495 (46.9)0 (0)2490 (100)0 (0)637 (21.2)748 (11.4)0 (0)748 (21.2)Nuknown2497 (44.9)2490 (100)0 (0)637 (21.2)748 (11.4)0 (0)748 (21.2)Nuknown2492 (46.9)0 (0)2492 (46.9)2491 (45.9)2490 (100)0 (0)2492 (45.0)0 (0)2491 (45.9)2491 (10.1)	Inactive889 (16.0)343 (13.8)546 (17.8)747 (13.6)307 (12.3)440 (14.6)927 (14.2)384 (12.7)543 (12.7)Moderately inactive1734 (31.2)675 (27.7)1059 (24.6)1730 (31.5)690 (27.7)1040 (34.6)2041 (31.2)833 (27.7)1208 (3.8)Moderately active1330 (23.4)618 (24.8)682 (22.3)1301 (23.7)595 (23.9)706 (23.5)1534 (32.4)716 (23.8)818 (2.8)Active1408 (25.4)739 (29.7)104 (3.4)226 (4.1)100 (4.0)126 (4.2)277 (4.2)127 (4.2)150 (4.2)Unknown221 (4.0)117 (4.7)104 (3.4)226 (4.1)100 (4.0)126 (4.2)277 (4.2)127 (4.2)156 (4.2)Wenopausal815 (4.7)0 (0)815 (26.6)923 (16.8)0 (0)923 (30.7)1059 (16.2)0 (0)Perimenpausal815 (14.7)0 (0)815 (26.6)923 (16.8)0 (0)923 (30.7)1059 (16.2)0 (0)Perimenpausal815 (14.2)2490 (100)0 (0)637 (21.2)748 (11.4)0 (0)75 (2)Ndunknown2492 (44.9)0 (0)<	Physical activity [n (%)]										0.006		
$ \begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	Moderately inactive1734 (31.2)675 (27.7)1059 (24.6)1730 (31.5)690 (27.7)1040 (34.6)2041 (31.2)833 (27.7)1208 (3Moderately active1300 (23.4)618 (24.8)682 (22.3)1301 (23.7)595 (23.9)706 (23.5)1534 (23.4)716 (23.8)818 (2Active1300 (23.4)618 (24.8)682 (21.9)1442 (27.2)798 (32.1)694 (23.1)1769 (27.0)953 (31.6)816 (23.6)Active1208 (55.4)739 (29.7)104 (3.4)226 (4.1)100 (4.0)126 (4.2)277 (4.2)127 (4.2)130 (33.6)Menopausal and status [n (%)]1482 (25.7)0 (0)818 (24.7)104 (3.4)226 (4.1)100 (4.0)126 (4.2)277 (4.2)127 (4.2)150 (4.2)Premonopausal and strinenopausal815 (14.7)0 (0)815 (25.0)0 (0)813 (25.24)0 (0)1653 (4.2)776 (4.2)150 (3.6)Premonopausal and of 1 (12.1)0 (0)815 (24.9)1383 (25.1)0 (0)933 (46.0)1653 (4.2)776 (2.2)748 (11.4)70 (0)Preimonopausal of 0 (0)671 (12.1)0 (0)815 (24.9)0 (0)933 (45.0)1653 (4.2)776 (2.2)748 (11.4)748 (2.3)Preimonopausal of 0 (0)671 (12.1)0 (0)815 (24.9)0 (0)933 (45.0)1653 (4.2)756 (2.2)748 (11.4)76 (2.2)748 (11.4)76 (2.2)748 (11.4)76 (2.2)748 (11.4)76 (2.2)748 (11.4)76 (2.2)748 (1.2)748 (2.2) </td <td>Inactive</td> <td>889 (16.0)</td> <td>343 (13.8)</td> <td>546 (17.8)</td> <td>747 (13.6)</td> <td>307 (12.3)</td> <td>440 (14.6)</td> <td>927 (14.2)</td> <td>384 (12.7)</td> <td>543 (15.4)</td> <td></td>	Inactive	889 (16.0)	343 (13.8)	546 (17.8)	747 (13.6)	307 (12.3)	440 (14.6)	927 (14.2)	384 (12.7)	543 (15.4)			
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Moderately active1300 (23.4)618 (24.8)682 (22.3)1301 (23.7)595 (23.9)706 (23.5)1534 (23.4)716 (23.8)818 (2Active1408 (25.4)739 (29.7)669 (21.9)1452 (27.2)798 (32.1)694 (23.1)1769 (27.0)953 (31.6)816 (2Unknown221 (4.0)117 (4.7)104 (3.4)226 (4.1)100 (4.0)126 (4.2)277 (4.2)127 (4.2)150 (4.2)Premenopausal status [n (%)]1482 (26.7)0 (0)1482 (48.4)1383 (25.1)0 (0)126 (4.2)277 (4.2)157 (4.2)Premenopausal815 (14.7)0 (0)815 (26.6)923 (16.8)0 (0)637 (21.2)748 (1.4)0 (0)Postmenopausal815 (14.7)0 (0)637 (11.6)0 (0)637 (21.2)748 (1.4)0 (0)Perimenopausal815 (14.7)0 (0)63 (1.2)0 (0)63 (2.1)748 (2.5)Postmenopausal815 (14.7)0 (0)63 (1.2)748 (1.4)0 (0)748 (2.5)Postmenopausal671 (12.1)0 (0)63 (1.2)748 (1.4)0 (0)748 (2.5)Nuknown2492 (44.9)0 (0)2490 (100)0 (0)3013 (46.0)3013 (100)0 (0)Ndunknown2581 (46.5)2492 (100)89 (2.9)2475 (48.9)2427 (46.9)2490 (100)87 (2.9)3013 (100)NA/unknown2581 (46.5)2492 (100)89 (2.9)2577 (46.9)2478 (80.9)2577 (46.9)2490 (100)87 (2.9)3013 (100)No116 1<	Moderately inactive	1734 (31.2)	675 (27.7)	1059 (24.6)	1730 (31.5)	690 (27.7)	1040 (34.6)	2041 (31.2)	833 (27.7)	1208 (34.2)			
Active $1408 (25.4) 739 (29.7) 669 (21.9) 1452 (27.2) 798 (32.1) 694 (23.1) 1769 (27.0) 953 (31.6) 816 (23.1) Unknown221 (4.0) 117 (4.7) 104 (3.4) 226 (4.1) 100 (4.0) 126 (4.2) 277 (4.2) 127 (4.2) 150 (4.2) 150 (4.2)Menopausal status [n (\%)]Premenopausal status [n (\%)]117 (4.7) 0 (0) 1482 (48.4) 1383 (25.1) 0 (0) 126 (4.2) 277 (4.2) 127 (4.2) 157 (4.2) 150 (4.2) 150 (4.2) 127 (4.2) 150 (4.2) 127 (4.2) 150 (4.2) 127 (4.2) 150 (4.2) 150 (4.2) 127 (4.2) 150 (4.2) 127 (4.2) 150 (4.2) 127 (4.2) 127 (4.2) 150 (4.2) 127 (4.2) 127 (4.2) 120 (4.0) 1653 (4.8) 1482 (4.8) 1482 (4.8) 1482 (4.8) 1183 (4.5) 129 637 (11.6) 0 (0) 923 (10.8) 923 (10.8) 1059 (16.2) 0 (0) 748 (21.2) 148 (11.4) 0 (0) 748 (21.2) 148 (11.4) 0 (0) 748 (21.2) 148 (11.4) 0 (0) 748 (21.2) 148 (11.4) 0 (0) 748 (21.2) 148 (11.4) 0 (0) 748 (21.2) 148 (11.4) 0 (0) 1059 (100) 0 (0) 101 (100) 100 (1) 1059 (100) 0 (0) 100 (100) 100 (1) 1059 (100) 0 (0) 100 (100) 100 (1) 1059 (100) 0 (0) 100 (100) 100 (1) 11 (3.1) 11.3.1)Nolunknown2475 (44.5) 2492 (100) 89 (2.9) 2577 (46.9) 2490 (100) 87 (2.9) 3124 (47.7) 3013 (100) 111 (3.1) 11.3.1)NAlunknown2581 (46.5) 2492 (100) 89 (2.9) 2577 (46.9) 2490 (100) 87 (2.9) 3124 (47.7) 3013 (100) 111 (3.1)$	Active $1408 (25.4)$ $739 (29.7)$ $669 (21.9)$ $1452 (27.2)$ $798 (32.1)$ $694 (23.1)$ $1769 (27.0)$ $953 (31.6)$ $816 (2.2)$ Unknown $221 (4.0)$ $117 (4.7)$ $104 (3.4)$ $226 (4.1)$ $100 (4.0)$ $126 (4.2)$ $277 (4.2)$ $157 (4.2)$ $150 (4.2)$ Menopausal status $[n (\%)]$ $117 (4.7)$ $104 (3.4)$ $226 (4.1)$ $100 (4.0)$ $126 (4.2)$ $277 (4.2)$ $157 (4.2)$ $150 (4.2)$ Premenopausal $815 (14.7)$ $0 (0)$ $1482 (48.4)$ $1383 (25.1)$ $0 (0)$ $1383 (46.0)$ $1653 (25.24)$ $0 (0)$ Postmenopausal $815 (14.7)$ $0 (0)$ $815 (25.6)$ $923 (16.8)$ $0 (0)$ $923 (30.7)$ $1059 (16.2)$ $0 (0)$ Postmenopausal $671 (12.1)$ $0 (0)$ $815 (25.6)$ $923 (16.8)$ $0 (0)$ $748 (2.5)$ Postmenopausal $671 (12.1)$ $0 (0)$ $815 (12.9)$ $637 (11.6)$ $0 (0)$ $637 (21.2)$ $748 (11.4)$ $0 (0)$ Postmenopausal $671 (12.1)$ $0 (0)$ $2490 (45.3)$ $2490 (100)$ $0 (0)$ $637 (21.2)$ $748 (2.9)$ $762 (2.9)$ No/unknown $2492 (44.9)$ $2490 (45.3)$ $2490 (100)$ $0 (0)$ $637 (21.2)$ $748 (2.9)$ $0 (0)$ Hornone use $[n (\%)]$ $2475 (44.6)$ $0 (0)$ $2428 (44.2)$ $0 (0)$ $75 (2.9)$ $0 (0)$ $75 (2.9)$ NoNo $2475 (46.9)$ $2490 (100)$ $0 (0)$ $2428 (80.8)$ $2855 (43.6)$ $0 (0)$ $72 (2.9)$ $0 (0)$ <	Moderately active	1300 (23.4)	618 (24.8)	682 (22.3)	1301 (23.7)	595 (23.9)	706 (23.5)	1534 (23.4)	716 (23.8)	818 (23.1)			
Unknown 221 (4.0) 117 (4.7) 104 (3.4) 226 (4.1) 100 (4.0) 126 (4.2) 277 (4.2) 127 (4.2) 150 (4.2) Menopausal status $[n (\%)]$ Premenopausal 1482 (26.7) 0 (0) 1383 (25.1) 0 (0) 1383 (46.0) 1653 (25.24) 0 (0) 1653 (46.8) Premenopausal 815 (14.7) 0 (0) 815 (26.6) 923 (16.8) 0 (0) 923 (30.7) 1059 (16.2) 0 (0) 748 (21.2) Perimenopausal 671 (12.1) 0 (0) 637 (11.6) 0 (0) 637 (21.2) 748 (11.4) 0 (0) 75 (2.1) NA/unknown 2492 (44.9) 2490 (45.3) 2490 (100) 0 (0) 63 (2.1) 75 (1.2) 0 (0) 75 (2.1) NA/unknown 2492 (44.9) 2490 (45.3) 2490 (100) 0 (0) 63 (2.1) 75 (1.2) 0 (0) 75 (2.1) NA/unknown 2475 (44.6) 0 (0) 2490 (100) 0 (0) 63 (2.1) 76 (1.2) 76 (1.2) 76 (1.2) No 2475 (44.6) 0 (0) 2490 (100) 0 (0)	Unknown 221 (4.0) 117 (4.7) 104 (3.4) 226 (4.1) 100 (4.0) 126 (4.2) 277 (4.2) 127 (4.2) 150 (4.2) Menopausal status $[n (\%)]$ Menopausal status $[n (\%)]$ 1482 (26.7) 0 (0) 1482 (35.6) 923 (16.8) 0 (0) 1533 (46.0) 1653 (25.24) 0 (0) 1653 (3.7) Premenopausal 815 (14.7) 0 (0) 815 (26.6) 923 (16.8) 0 (0) 923 (30.7) 1059 (16.2) 0 (0) 748 (2.9) Perimenopausal 671 (12.1) 0 (0) 637 (11.6) 0 (0) 637 (21.2) 748 (11.4) 0 (0) 748 (2.8) Surgical menopause 92 (1.7) 0 (0) 637 (11.6) 0 (0) 63 (2.1) 75 (12) 0 (0) 748 (2.8) Ndvlmknown 2492 (44.9) 2490 (45.3) 2490 (100) 0 (0) 63 (2.1) 76 (10) 76 (10) 75 (12) 0 (0) 75 (2.8) 80 (0) 75 (12) 0 (0) 75 (12) 0 (0) 75 (2.8) 80 (0) 76 (10) 76 (10) 76 (10) 76 (10) 76 (10)	Active	1408 (25.4)	739 (29.7)	669 (21.9)	1452 (27.2)	798 (32.1)	694 (23.1)	1769 (27.0)	953 (31.6)	816 (23.1)			
Menopausal status [n (%)]Menopausal status [n (%	Menopausal status [n (%)]Menopausal status [n (%	Unknown	221 (4.0)	117 (4.7)	104(3.4)	226 (4.1)	100(4.0)	126 (4.2)	277 (4.2)	127 (4.2)	150 (4.2)			
Premenopausal 1482 (26.7) 0 (0) 1383 (25.1) 0 (0) 1383 (25.1) 0 (0) 1653 (46.8) 0 (0) 1748 (21.2) 1748 (11.4) 0 (0) 1748 (21.2) 1748 (11.4) 0 (0) 1748 (21.2) 1748 (11.4) 0 (0) 1743 (21.2) 1748 (21.2) 1748 (21.2) 1748 (21.2) 1738 (21.2) 1738 (21.2) 1738 (21.2) 1738 (21.2) 1738 (21.2) 1738 (21.2) 1748 (21.2) 1738 (21.2)	Premenopausal $1482 (26.7)$ $0 (0)$ $1482 (48.4)$ $1383 (25.1)$ $0 (0)$ $1383 (45.0)$ $1653 (25.24)$ $0 (0)$ $1653 (325.24)$ $0 (0)$ $1653 (325.24)$ $0 (0)$ $1653 (325.24)$ $0 (0)$ $1653 (325.24)$ $0 (0)$ $1653 (325.24)$ $0 (0)$ $1653 (325.24)$ $0 (0)$ $1653 (325.24)$ $0 (0)$ $1653 (325.24)$ $0 (0)$ $1653 (325.24)$ $0 (0)$ $1653 (325.24)$ $0 (0)$ $1653 (325.24)$ $0 (0)$ $1653 (325.24)$ $0 (0)$ $1653 (32.2)$ $0 (0)$ $1653 (32.2)$ $0 (0)$ $1653 (32.2)$ $0 (0)$ $1263 (32.2)$ $0 (0)$ $1263 (32.2)$ $0 (0)$ $1263 (32.2)$ $0 (0)$ $1248 (23.2)$ $0 (0)$ $1248 (23.2)$ $0 (0)$ $1248 (23.2)$ $0 (0)$ $1248 (23.2)$ $0 (0)$ $1248 (23.2)$ $0 (0)$ $126 (23.2)$ $0 (0)$ $126 (23.2)$ $0 (0)$ $126 (23.2)$ $0 (0)$ $126 (23.2)$ $0 (0)$ $126 (23.2)$ $0 (0)$ $126 (23.2)$ $0 (0)$ $126 (23.2)$ $0 (0)$ $126 (23.2)$ $0 (0)$ $126 (23.2)$ $0 (0)$ $126 (23.2)$ $0 (0)$ $126 (23.2)$ <	Menopausal status [n (%)]										0.003		
Postmenopausal 815 (14.7) 0 (0) 815 (26.6) 923 (16.8) 0 (0) 923 (30.7) 1059 (16.2) 0 (0) 1059 (30.0) 1248 (21.2) 128 (21.2) <th128 (21.2)<="" th=""></th128>	Postmenopausal 815 (14.7) 0 (0) 815 (26.6) 923 (16.8) 0 (0) 923 (30.7) 1059 (16.2) 0 (0) 1059 (3) Perimenopausal 671 (12.1) 0 (0) 673 (11.6) 0 (0) 637 (21.2) 748 (11.4) 0 (0) 748 (2 Surgical menopause 92 (1.7) 0 (0) 671 (21.9) 63 (1.1) 0 (0) 63 (2.1) 75 (1.2) 0 (0) 748 (2 NA/unknown 2492 (44.9) 2492 (100) 0 (0) 2490 (100) 0 (0) 63 (2.1) 75 (1.2) 0 (0) 75 (2 MA/unknown 2492 (44.9) 2492 (100) 0 (0) 2490 (100) 0 (0) 63 (2.1) 75 (1.2) 0 (0) 75 (2 No 2492 (44.6) 0 (0) 2490 (100) 0 (0) 2428 (80.8) 2855 (43.6) 0 (0) 2855 (8) No 2496 (8.9) 0 (0) 2490 (100) 0 (0) 2428 (80.8) 2855 (43.6) 0 (0) 2855 (8) No 2496 (16.2) 491 (16.3) 569 (8.7) 0 (0) 569 (1) <t< td=""><td>Premenopausal</td><td>1482 (26.7)</td><td>0 (0)</td><td>1482 (48.4)</td><td>1383 (25.1)</td><td>0) (0)</td><td>1383 (46.0)</td><td>1653 (25.24)</td><td>0 (0)</td><td>1653 (46.8)</td><td></td></t<>	Premenopausal	1482 (26.7)	0 (0)	1482 (48.4)	1383 (25.1)	0) (0)	1383 (46.0)	1653 (25.24)	0 (0)	1653 (46.8)			
Perimenopausal $671 (12.1)$ $0 (0)$ $671 (21.2)$ $748 (11.4)$ $0 (0)$ $748 (21.2)$ Surgical menopause $92 (1.7)$ $0 (0)$ $92 (3.0)$ $63 (1.2)$ $0 (0)$ $63 (2.1)$ $75 (1.2)$ $0 (0)$ $75 (2.1)$ NA/unknown $2492 (44.9)$ $2492 (100)$ $0 (0)$ $2490 (100)$ $0 (0)$ $3013 (46.0)$ $3013 (100)$ $0 (0)$ Hormone use $[n (\%)]$ $2475 (44.6)$ $0 (0)$ $2428 (44.2)$ $0 (0)$ $2428 (80.8)$ $2855 (43.6)$ $0 (0)$ $2855 (80.8)$ No $2475 (44.6)$ $0 (0)$ $2428 (80.8)$ $2825 (43.6)$ $0 (0)$ $2855 (80.8)$ No $2475 (44.5)$ $0 (0)$ $2428 (80.8)$ $2855 (43.6)$ $0 (0)$ $2855 (80.8)$ No $2475 (44.5)$ $0 (0)$ $2428 (80.8)$ $2855 (43.6)$ $0 (0)$ $569 (8.7)$ $0 (0)$ $569 (16.1)$ NA/unknown $2581 (46.5)$ $2490 (100)$ $87 (2.9)$ $3124 (47.7)$ $3013 (100)$ $111 (3.1)$	Perimenopausal 671 (12.1) 0 (0) 637 (21.2) 748 (11.4) 0 (0) 748 (2 Surgical menopause 92 (1.7) 0 (0) 92 (3.0) 63 (1.2) 0 (0) 63 (2.1) 75 (1.2) 0 (0) 748 (2 NA/unknown 2492 (44.9) 2492 (100) 0 (0) 2490 (100) 0 (0) 53 (2.1) 75 (1.2) 0 (0) 75 (2 Mornone use $[n$ (%) 2492 (44.9) 2492 (100) 0 (0) 2428 (44.2) 0 (0) 63 (2.1) 75 (12) 0 (0) 75 (2 Hormone use $[n$ (%) 2475 (44.6) 0 (0) 2428 (44.2) 0 (0) 2428 (80.8) 2855 (43.6) 0 (0) 2855 (8.7) 0 (0) 2855 (8 No 496 (8.9) 0 (0) 2478 (44.2) 0 (0) 2428 (80.8) 2855 (43.6) 0 (0) 2855 (8.7) 0 (0) 2855 (8 0 (0) 0 (0) 2855 (8 0 (0) 0 (0) 2855 (8 0 (0) 0 (0) 2855 (8 0 (0) 0 (0)	Postmenopausal	815 (14.7)	0 (0)	815 (26.6)	923 (16.8)	0 (0)	923 (30.7)	1059 (16.2)	0 (0)	1059 (30.0)			
Surgical menopause 92 (1.7) 0 (0) 92 (3.0) 63 (1.2) 0 (0) 63 (2.1) 75 (1.2) 0 (0) 75 (2.1) NA/unknown 2492 (44.9) 2492 (100) 0 (0) 2490 (100) 0 (0) 3013 (46.0) 3013 (100) 0 (0) Hormone use $[n (\%)]$ 2475 (44.6) 0 (0) 2490 (100) 0 (0) 2428 (80.8) 2855 (43.6) 3013 (100) 0 (0) No 2475 (44.6) 0 (0) 2475 (80.9) 2428 (44.2) 0 (0) 2428 (80.8) 2855 (43.6) 0 (0) 2855 (80.8) Yes 496 (8.9) 0 (0) 2491 (8.9) 0 (0) 2491 (16.3) 569 (8.7) 0 (0) 569 (16.1) NA/unknown 2581 (46.5) 2490 (100) 87 (2.9) 3124 (47.7) 3013 (100) 111 (3.1)	Surgical menopause 92 (1.7) 0 (0) 92 (3.0) 63 (1.2) 0 (0) 63 (2.1) 75 (1.2) 0 (0) 75 (2) NA/unknown 2492 (44.9) 2492 (100) 0 (0) 2490 (100) 0 (0) 3013 (46.0) 3013 (100) 0 (0) Hormone use $[n (\%)]$ 2475 (44.6) 0 (0) 2475 (80.9) 2475 (80.9) 2428 (44.2) 0 (0) 2428 (80.8) 2855 (43.6) 0 (0) 2855 (8) No 2475 (44.6) 0 (0) 2475 (80.9) 2428 (44.2) 0 (0) 2428 (80.8) 2855 (43.6) 0 (0) 2855 (8) No 496 (8.9) 0 (0) 2491 (8.9) 0 (0) 2428 (80.8) 2855 (43.6) 0 (0) 2855 (8) NA/unknown 2581 (46.5) 2490 (100) 87 (2.9) 3124 (47.7) 3013 (100) 111 (3) A <t< td=""><td>Perimenopausal</td><td>671 (12.1)</td><td>0 (0)</td><td>671 (21.9)</td><td>637 (11.6)</td><td>0 (0)</td><td>637 (21.2)</td><td>748 (11.4)</td><td>0 (0)</td><td>748 (21.2)</td><td></td></t<>	Perimenopausal	671 (12.1)	0 (0)	671 (21.9)	637 (11.6)	0 (0)	637 (21.2)	748 (11.4)	0 (0)	748 (21.2)			
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	NA/unknown 2492 (44.9) 2492 (100) 0 (0) 2492 (46.0) 3013 (100) 0 (0) Hormone use $[n (\%)]$ 2475 (44.6) 0 (0) 2475 (44.6) 0 (0) 2475 (80.8) 2428 (44.2) 0 (0) 2428 (80.8) 2855 (43.6) 0 (0) 2855 (8.7) 0 (0) 2855 (8.7) 0 (0) 2855 (8.7) 0 (0) 2855 (8.7) 0 (0) 2855 (8.7) 0 (0) 2855 (8.7) 0 (0) 569 (1) 11 (3) 569 (8.7) 0 (0) 569 (1) 111 (3) 569 (1) 111 (3) 569 (1) 111 (3) 569 (1) 111 (3) 124 (47.7) 3013 (100) 111 (3) 124 (47.7) 3013 (100) 111 (3) 124 (47.7) 3013 (100) 111 (3) 124 (47.7) 3013 (100) 111 (3) 124 (47.7) 124 (Surgical menopause	92 (1.7)	0 (0)	92 (3.0)	63 (1.2)	0 (0)	63 (2.1)	75 (1.2)	0 (0)	75 (2.1)			
Hormone use $[n (\%)]$ Hormone use $[n (\%)]$ 2475 (44.6) 0 (0) 2475 (80.8) 2475 (80.9) 2475 (80.9) 2475 (80.9) 2475 (80.9) 2475 (80.9) 2428 (44.2) 0 (0) 2428 (80.8) 2855 (43.6) 0 (0) 2855 (80.8) 2855 (80.8) No 496 (8.9) 0 (0) 491 (8.9) 0 (0) 491 (16.3) 569 (8.7) 0 (0) 569 (16.1) NA/unknown 2581 (46.5) 2492 (100) 89 (2.9) 2577 (46.9) 2490 (100) 87 (2.9) 3124 (47.7) 3013 (100) 111 (3.1)	Hormone use [n (%)] No 2475 (44.6) 0 (0) 2475 (80.9) 2428 (44.2) 0 (0) 2428 (80.8) 2855 (43.6) 0 (0) 2855 (8 Yes 496 (8.9) 0 (0) 496 (16.2) 491 (8.9) 0 (0) 491 (16.3) 569 (8.7) 0 (0) 569 (1) NA/unknown 2581 (46.5) 2492 (100) 89 (2.9) 2577 (46.9) 2490 (100) 87 (2.9) 3124 (47.7) 3013 (100) 111 (3)	NA/unknown	2492 (44.9)	2492 (100)	0 (0)	2490 (45.3)	2490 (100)	0 (0)	3013 (46.0)	3013 (100)	0 (0)			
No $2475 (44.6)$ 0 (0) $2475 (80.9)$ $2475 (80.9)$ $2475 (80.9)$ $2428 (44.2)$ 0 (0) $2428 (80.8)$ $2855 (43.6)$ 0 (0) $2855 (80.8)$ Yes $496 (8.9)$ 0 (0) $496 (16.2)$ $491 (8.9)$ 0 (0) $491 (16.3)$ $569 (8.7)$ 0 (0) $569 (16.1)$ NA/unknown $2581 (46.5)$ $2492 (100)$ $89 (2.9)$ $2577 (46.9)$ $2490 (100)$ $87 (2.9)$ $3124 (47.7)$ $3013 (100)$ $111 (3.1)$	No 2475 (44.6) 0 (0) 2475 (80.9) 2475 (80.9) 2475 (80.9) 2475 (80.9) 2475 (80.9) 2428 (80.8) 2855 (43.6) 0 (0) 2855 (8) Yes 496 (8.9) 0 (0) 491 (8.9) 0 (0) 491 (16.3) 559 (8.7) 0 (0) 569 (1) NA/unknown 2581 (46.5) 2490 (100) 87 (2.9) 3124 (47.7) 3013 (100) 111 (3)	Hormone use $[n \ (\%)]$										0.907		
Yes 496 (8.9) 0 (0) 496 (16.2) 491 (8.9) 0 (0) 491 (16.3) 569 (8.7) 0 (0) 569 (16.1) NA/unknown 2581 (46.5) 2492 (100) 89 (2.9) 2577 (46.9) 2490 (100) 87 (2.9) 3124 (47.7) 3013 (100) 111 (3.1)	Yes 496 (8.9) 0 (0) 496 (16.2) 491 (8.9) 0 (0) 491 (16.3) 569 (8.7) 0 (0) 569 (1) NA/unknown 2581 (46.5) 2492 (100) 89 (2.9) 2577 (46.9) 2490 (100) 87 (2.9) 3124 (47.7) 3013 (100) 111 (3)	No	2475 (44.6)	0 (0)	2475 (80.9)	2428 (44.2)	0 (0)	2428 (80.8)	2855 (43.6)	0 (0)	2855 (80.8)			
NA/unknown 2581 (46.5) 2492 (100) 89 (2.9) 2577 (46.9) 2490 (100) 87 (2.9) 3124 (47.7) 3013 (100) 111 (3.1)	NA/unknown 2581 (46.5) 2492 (100) 89 (2.9) 2577 (46.9) 2490 (100) 87 (2.9) 3124 (47.7) 3013 (100) 111 (3	Yes	496 (8.9)	0 (0)	496 (16.2)	491 (8.9)	0 (0)	491 (16.3)	569 (8.7)	0 (0)	569 (16.1)			
		NA/unknown	2581 (46.5)	2492 (100)	89 (2.9)	2577 (46.9)	2490 (100)	87 (2.9)	3124 (47.7)	3013 (100)	111 (3.1)			

of annual weight change on baseline values of age, weight, height, smoking status, and follow-up time. *P*-difference values were calculated by using a 2-sample *t* test on all cases compared with noncases. MDS, Mediterranean diet score; NA, not answered; NDS, Nordic diet score; WC, waist circumference; WC_{BM1}, waist circumference adjusted for BMI; ΔBMI, changes in BMI; ΔWC, changes in waist circumference; ΔWC_{BMI} , changes in waist circumference adjusted for BMI; $\Delta weight$, changes in weight. ² Mean \pm SD (all such values).

Downloaded from https://academic.oup.com/ajcn/article-abstract/100/4/1188/4576558 by guest on 05 December 2018

1191

adherence). See Supplemental Figure 1 under "Supplemental data" in the online issue for the distribution.

Covariates and outcome information

Participants filled in a questionnaire on demographics and lifestyle and health factors, including, among others, age, sex, physical activity [Cambridge Physical Activity Index (31)], education (none, primary school, technical school, secondary school, university, and unknown), smoking status (never, former, or current), and, for women, also hormone use (yes or no) and menopausal status (presurgical, perisurgical, or postsurgical). In addition, anthropometric measures were collected including height, weight, waist circumference (WC), and hip circumference. Participants were recontacted, on average, 6.8 y after enrollment to obtain information on changes in weight (Δ weight), changes in waist circumference (Δ WC), and changes in lifestyle (29).

At baseline, participants were measured for weight, height, and WC. At follow-up, participants in Norfolk (United Kingdom) and Doetinchem (Netherlands) were measured by trained personnel, whereas remaining participants provided self-reported measures according to guidance. In the current study, investigated outcomes were annual Δ weight, Δ WC, and changes in WC adjusted for BMI (Δ WC_{BMI}), which were defined as residuals of WC regressed on BMI (sex- and study-specific regressions; separately for baseline and follow-up values). This outcome was included to assess the association of changes in WC independent of changes in BMI. Changes were calculated as

Follow-up values – baseline values \div follow-up duration (1)

Statistical methods

We examined the association of the MDS and NDS (exposures) with Δ weight, Δ WC, and Δ WC_{BMI} (outcomes) in the random subcohort only by using linear regression analyses. The association with risk of being a weight gainer (case) was investigated by using logistic regression analyses for comparisons of cases with noncases. We examined whether associations differed for men and women by examining 2-factor interactions between diet scores and sex.

When the 2 SNPs were analyzed, participants were categorized according to the 3 genotypes for a SNP as follows: major allele homozygotes, heterozygotes, and minor allele homozygotes. All analyses assumed an additive effect of the minor allele (coded as 0, 1, or 2), which coincides with risk alleles of the *FTO* and *TCF7L2* SNPs for obesity and type 2 diabetes, respectively.

To examine whether genetic variants modified the association between diet scores and anthropometric outcomes, interactions were tested by including an interaction term (diet score \times SNP) and also a SNP main effect term in the regression model including diet main effects. When a reference slope of the diet effect on outcome was considered, derived β s could be interpreted as estimated interaction effects (changes of slope) when increasing the diet score one unit and moving one step up in the number of risk alleles (from 0 to 1 and 1 to 2). We further tested whether interactions differed for men and women by examining 3-factor interactions of genes, diet, and sex.

All analyses were adjusted for sex, physical activity, education, and, for women, also hormone use and menopausal status. Random subcohort analyses were further adjusted for baseline age, height, and outcome measures (all continuous), follow-up time (continuous), and smoking status.

Analyses were initially conducted for each study cohort separately and subsequently meta-analyzed by using a randomeffects model, which accounted for possible heterogeneity across study cohorts. Heterogeneity was tested by using Q statistics (32). Only pooled estimates from meta-analyses are presented in this article paper, whereas individual forest plots of metaanalyzed results can be seen in the supplementary material (*see* Supplemental Figures 2–7 under "Supplemental data" in the online issue). P < 0.05 was considered significant. Statistical analyses were conducted with Stata 11.2/12.1 software (StataCorp LP).

RESULTS

Main effects of SNPs on anthropometric measures

This article focuses on diet-score main effects and interaction analyses of SNP \times diet scores in relation to anthropometric measures. Analyses of SNP main effects are only presented briefly because the main effect of rs9939609 has previously been investigated in this cohort (33). Analyses showed that the A allele was significantly associated with BMI [$\beta \pm$ SE = 0.17 \pm 0.08 per allele (P = 0.034)] and WC [$\beta \pm SE = 0.47 \pm 0.21$ cm/ allele (P = 0.026)] at baseline but not with weight change during follow-up [per allele: $\beta \pm SE = 5.55 \pm 12.5$ g/y (P = 0.66) in the random subcohort]. However, risk of being a weight gainer in the case-noncase analyses was increased (OR: 1.06; 95% CI: 1.00, 1.11; P = 0.045) (33). We analyzed the main effect of rs7903146 and showed no relation to any outcome (Δ WC: β = -0.01; 95% CI: -0.06, 0.04; P = 0.72; ΔWC_{BMI} : $\beta = 0.01$; 95% CI: -0.02, 0.04; P = 0.62); Δ weight: $\beta = -0.03$; 95% CI: -0.07, 0.02; P = 0.21) or case status (OR = 0.92; 95%) CI: 0.82, 1.03; P = 0.13).

Main effects of MDS and NDS on anthropometric measures

In the random subcohort, there was a significant association between the MDS and Δ WC (P = 0.03) and Δ WC_{BMI} (P = 0.02). Every point increase in the MDS was associated with a decrease in WC of -0.01 cm/y (95% CI: -0.02, -0.001 cm/y), and a decrease in WC_{BMI} of -0.008 cm/y (95% CI: -0.015, -0.001 cm/y). There was an inverse association between the MDS and risk of being a weight gainer (case) [OR: 0.98 (95% CI: 0.96, 1.00) per 1 point increment; P = 0.04]. The MDS was not associated with Δ weight (P = 0.53).

Inverse associations were also observed for the NDS. Except for ΔWC_{BMI} , which were larger than for the MDS, effect sizes were of a similar magnitude. However, none of the associations were significant (all $P \ge 0.13$). There were no significant interactions with sex for either the MDS or NDS (**Table 2**).

Gene-diet interactions

There was a borderline significant interaction between the MDS and *TCF7L2* rs7903146 in relation to Δ weight ($\beta = -0.02$; 95% CI: -0.03, 0.00; P = 0.05) (**Table 3**). We showed that, with a low MDS, there was very little difference in effect between genotypes, whereas at a higher MDS, participants with 1 or 2 minor alleles experienced a lower weight gain per year over the

Main effects of Mediterranean and Nordic diet scores on changes in anthropometric measure in the random subcohort and case-noncase analyses¹

		Mediterranean diet score			Nordic diet score					
	P-heterogeneity across cohorts	Values	Р	<i>P</i> -sex interaction	P-heterogeneity across cohorts	Values	Р	<i>P</i> -sex interaction		
Random subcohort analyses ²										
$\Delta WC (cm/y)$	0.50	-0.01 (-0.02, -0.001)	0.03	0.71	0.59	-0.008 (-0.03, 0.010)	0.42	0.24		
$\Delta WC_{BMI} (cm/y)^3$	0.64	-0.008 (-0.015, -0.001)	0.02	0.54	0.71	-0.01 (-0.03, 0.003)	0.13	0.56		
Δ Weight (kg/y)	0.86	-0.002(-0.009, 0.005)	0.53	0.46	0.65	-0.006(-0.02, 0.008)	0.40	0.99		
Case-noncase analyses ⁴										
Risk of being a weight gainer	0.17	0.98 (0.96, 1.00)	0.04	0.61	0.18	0.98 (0.93, 1.02)	0.23	0.38		

 $^{I}\Delta$ WC, changes in waist circumference, Δ WC_{BMI}, changes in waist circumference adjusted for BMI; Δ weight, changes in weight.

² All values are β s; 95% CIs in parentheses. Values were calculated by using linear regression models and adjusted for sex, physical activity (Cambridge Physical Activity Index), educational level, hormone use (women only), menopausal status (women only), baseline age (continuous), baseline height (continuous), baseline outcome measure (continuous), follow-up time (continuous), and smoking status (never, former, and current).

³Defined as sex- and study-specific residuals of waist circumference regressed on BMI.

⁴ All values are ORs; 95% CIs in parentheses. Values were calculated by using logistic regression analysis for comparison of cases with noncases. Cases were defined as 1200 participants from each cohort who experienced the greatest degree of unexplained weight gain over the study period identified by using residuals from a regression model of annual weight change on baseline values of age, weight, height, smoking status, and follow-up time. Values were adjusted for sex, physical activity (Cambridge Physical Activity Index), educational level, hormone use (women only), and menopausal status (women only).

study period, which increased with the number of alleles, than for those homozygous for the major allele (C) (**Figure 2**). The regression-slope for each genotype-specific group was as follows: CC, 0.008, CT, -0.008; and TT, -0.024.

There were no significant interactions in relation to other outcomes or with *FTO* rs9939609. For the NDS, there were no significant interactions with the 2 included SNPs in relation to any of the outcomes (all $P \ge 0.21$).

We observed a significant 3-factor interaction between the *FTO*, NDS, and sex in relation to ΔWC_{BMI} (P = 0.02) (Table 3). In sex-specific analyses, there was an interaction between *FTO* and the NDS in women (P = 0.015) but not men (P = 0.346). For men, the genotype-specific regression-slopes were as follows: major allele homozygous, -0.004; heterozygous, -0.017; and minor allele homozygous, -0.030. For women, the genotype-specific regression-slopes were opposing as follows: major allele

TABLE 3

Interactions between *FTO* rs9939609 and *TCF7L2* rs7903146 and Mediterranean and Nordic diet scores in relation to changes in anthropometric measures in random subcohort and case-noncase analyses¹

		Mediterrane	core	Nordic diet score				
	Risk allele	Values	Р	P-sex interaction	Values	Р	P-sex interaction	
Random subcohort ²								
$\Delta WC (cm/y)$								
FTO rs9939609	А	-0.004 (-0.017 , 0.010)	0.60^{3}	0.99	0.0003 (-0.027, 0.028)	0.98^{3}	0.31	
TCF7L2 rs7903146	Т	-0.015(-0.033, 0.003)	0.11^{3}	0.75	-0.006(-0.051, 0.039)	0.80^{3}	0.69	
$\Delta WC_{BMI} (cm/y)^4$								
FTO rs9939609	А	0.002 (-0.008, 0.011)	0.73^{3}	0.21	0.013 (-0.007, 0.033)	0.21^{3}	0.02	
TCF7L2 rs7903146	Т	-0.003 (-0.017 , 0.012)	0.70^{3}	0.78	0.003(-0.031, 0.036)	0.86^{3}	0.88	
Δ Weight (kg/y)								
FTO rs9939609	А	-0.004 (-0.014 , 0.005)	0.41^{3}	0.33	-0.001 (-0.029 , 0.027)	0.94^{3}	0.64	
TCF7L2 rs7903146	Т	-0.016(-0.032, 0.000)	0.05^{3}	0.50	-0.016(-0.044, 0.011)	0.24^{3}	0.79	
Case-noncase analyses ⁵								
FTO rs9939609	А	0.99 (0.96, 1.01)	0.22	0.92	0.98 (0.94, 1.03)	0.50	0.52	
TCF7L2 rs7903146	Т	0.99 (0.96, 1.01)	0.22	0.59	0.98 (0.93, 1.04)	0.51	0.77	

 $^{1}\Delta$ WC, changes in waist circumference; Δ WC_{BMI}, changes in waist circumference adjusted for BMI; Δ weight, changes in weight.

² All values are β_s ; 95% CIs in parentheses. Values were calculated by using linear regression models. β_s for the interaction term were adjusted for sex, physical activity (Cambridge Physical Activity Index), educational level, hormone use (women only), menopausal status (women only), baseline age (continuous), baseline height (continuous), baseline outcome measure (continuous), follow-up time (continuous), and smoking status (never, former, and current).

³ For gene \times diet interaction.

⁴Defined as sex- and study-specific residuals of waist circumference regressed on BMI.

⁵ All values are ORs; 95% CIs in parentheses. Values were calculated using logistic regression analysis for comparison of cases with noncases. Cases were defined as 1200 participants from each cohort who experienced the greatest degree of unexplained weight gain over the study period identified by using residuals from a regression model of annual weight change on baseline values of age, weight, height, smoking status, and follow-up time. ORs for unexplained weight gain were adjusted for sex, physical activity (Cambridge Physical Activity Index), educational level, hormone use (women only), and menopausal status (women only).



FIGURE 2. Interaction between the MDS and rs7903146 [major allele homozygous: CC (n = 3222); heterozygous: CT (n = 2764); and minor allele homozygous: TT (n = 550)] in the *TCF7L2* gene in relation to weight gain in random subcohort analyses (P = 0.05) calculated by using linear regression analysis. Regression slopes: CC, 0.008; CT, -0.008; and TT, -0.024. MDS, Mediterranean diet score.

homozygotes, -0.038; heterozygous, -0.004; and minor allele homozygous, 0.030, which suggested a beneficial effect of the NDS on ΔWC_{BMI} in major allele homozygotes (TT) only (**Figure 3**).

For both main effects and interaction analyses, no significant heterogeneity was shown between study cohorts (*see* Supplemental Figures 2–7 under "Supplemental data" in the online issue).

DISCUSSION

In this study of 11,048 individuals, we showed that a higher MDS was associated with a decrease in WC and WC_{BMI} as well as risk of being a weight gainer but not with weight change. A higher NDS score was not associated with changes in anthropometric measures during follow-up. The only borderline significant gene \times diet interaction in this study was observed between the MDS and *TCF7L2* rs7903146 in relation to weight gain, which confined beneficial effects of a higher MDS to individuals with 1 or 2 rs7903146 risk alleles (T). The magnitude of effect of the MDS and NDS in relation to outcomes was similar for the 2 scores. However, associations were only significant for the MDS.

Few previous studies have investigated associations between the Nordic diet and anthropometric measures. In line with our results, an intervention study in 200 obese subjects did not find an effect of a diet that was based on Nordic Nutrition Recommendations (34) on body weight over an 18–24-wk period (P =0.10) compared with a control diet that was based on mean nutrient intakes in Nordic countries (35). In contrast, a Swedish intervention trial that compared a habitual Western diet with a Nordic diet, showed a significant decrease in body weight in 88 mildly hypercholesterolemic subjects over 6 wk in adherers to the Nordic diet (-4%, P < 0.01) (13). Furthermore, a Danish intervention trial in 147 obese subjects that compared a New Nordic Diet (high in fruit, vegetables, whole grain, and fish) with an average Danish diet showed a significantly larger decrease in body weight, WC, and hip circumference (all $P \le 0.03$) over 26 wk in the New Nordic Diet group (14). However, these were all intervention studies that targeted obese or otherwise abnormal subpopulations by using a specifically constructed diet with strict criteria for compliance. Thus, direct comparisons with our findings on the NDS are difficult because the NDS was constructed on the basis of the intake distribution in the population (by using sex-specific median intakes as cutoffs) and not by using predefined cutoffs.

The role of the MDS in relation to obesity has been examined more extensively, and despite some discrepancies, several reviews have suggested an inverse association with both the current anthropometric status and anthropometric changes in observational as well as experimental studies (2–6). These finding support our finding of an inverse association between the MDS and changes in overweight and obesity, albeit only for risk of being a weight gainer, Δ WC, and Δ WC_{BMI} but not Δ weight. The finding of an association with risk of being a weight gainer but not Δ weight seemed contradictory because cases were defined as subjects with the largest unexplained weight gain. However, the result may be explained by the fact that cases were defined



FIGURE 3. Interaction between the NDS and rs9939609 [major allele homozygous: TT (n = 996 men and 1255 women); heterozygous: TA (n = 1420 men and 1689 women); and minor allele homozygous: AA (n = 499 men and 562 women)] in the *FTO* gene in relation to changes in waist circumference adjusted for BMI in random subcohort analyses. Sex-specific results, P = 0.346 for men (A), P = 0.015 for women (B). All results were calculated by using linear regression analyses. NDS, Nordic diet score.

as the most-extreme weight gainers. The rather small effect of the MDS may be overlooked when the whole spectrum of weight gain is considered and may only be visible in this extreme group.

A range of plausible biological mechanisms could explain the observed inverse association between the MDS and risk of being a weight gainer. The Mediterranean diet is high in dietary fiber, legumes, fruit, and vegetables, which may increase satiety and lower energy intake. The diet also has high contents of fish and olive oil, which are 2 sources of unsaturated fat that have been shown to entail losses of total weight and fat mass when they replaced saturated fat in intervention studies. Finally, a combined dietary profile with many plant-based foods and few meat and dairy products may lower the energy density of the diet (36). The Nordic dietary pattern has not been reviewed similarly in relation to obesity but several of the previously mentioned mechanisms may hold here as well because the Nordic dietary pattern is also characterized by high intakes of fish, dietary fiber, and plantbased foods (37). Also, several components of the NDS [ie, whole grain (38), cereal fiber (39), cabbage (40), and apples and pears (41, 42)] have individually been associated to lower risk of obesity. The lack of significant effects of the NDS in this study may have been be ascribed to the fact that the NDS contains fewer dietary items and, thus, may not capture a large enough proportion of and variation in participants' diets. The MDS uses a 19-point scale, and the NDS used a 6-point scale; this difference allows for a larger total gain by the MDS. Also, the MDS gives negative points for intakes of dairy and meat, whereas the NDS does not. This difference hampers the comparability of the 2 scales. A study in Swedish women showed that the NDS was positively associated with higher intakes of meat and total energy (Roswall et al, unpublished observations, 2014), which are factors that the NDS does not capture.

Two studies examined interactions between FTO rs939609 and the MDS in relation to obesity and anthropometric changes, and consistent with our results, they showed no interaction (27, 28). We have not identified any studies on interactions between TCF7L2 rs7903146 and the MDS in relation to anthropometric measures. However, one study showed an interaction in relation to cardiovascular disease risk factors, whereby, when the MDS was low, TT homozygotes had higher fasting glucose concentrations than those for CC or CT genotypes, whereas this difference disappeared when the MDS was high. A similar interaction was observed in relation to LDL and total cholesterol, triglycerides, and stroke risk (43). In parallel, the current study suggested a beneficial effect of the MDS in individuals with 1 or 2 risk alleles only (Figure 2). To our knowledge, none of the existing studies on the NDS and obesity included genetic information. This lack encourages the reproduction of our findings.

In this article, we, to a large extent, focused on gene-diet interactions. Such interactions may be seen and interpreted in 2 distinct ways as to which extent the genetic information affects the dietary effect or, reversely, to which extent dietary intake affects the genetic effect. Explicitly, for standard linear regressions, interactions are here fitted as linear interaction effects related to the selected actual respective continuous outcomes and, for logistic regressions (case-noncase analyses), as linear interaction effects on the log-OR scale (and, hence, as corresponding multiplicative effects on the OR scale). In all cases, a strong interaction effect would indicate that it is not enough to consider separate factors independently with respect to, eg, predictions, but also their joint interactive effects are important in this sense.

The strengths of this study included the use of a random-effects model meta-analysis across the included cohorts. The prospective design eliminated risk of a recall bias, and the comprehensive and valid follow-up minimized risk of a selective dropout. All participants provided comprehensive information on diet and potential confounders, allowing for control for these. Because of the standardized and validated FFQs, we could directly compare and combine findings across study centers (29). The inclusion of populations from several countries allowed for the examination of dietary scores and their interactions with genetics in different settings with more or less adherence. The exclusion of persons with type 2 diabetes should have eliminated an ascertainment bias of the association between *TCF7L2* and obesity traits.

The FFQ has been validated in a representative sample of participants (44-46). The collection of one dietary assessment only used as a proxy for the entire period may have been a limitation because changes in dietary habits could have occurred during follow-up. This use may have diluted the effects and, hence, weakened associations. Also, the 2 diet scores only partially captured the entire diet, and, especially for the NDS, this corresponds to a rather small, although presumably quite important, proportion. With the use of a composite dietary index, the magnitude of measurement error may increase; however, most likely, the error will be unsystematic, affecting estimates toward unity. An information bias may have existed for included confounders, which could have induced residual confounding, but the validity of physical activity has been evaluated with positive results (31, 47). Anthropometric measures at follow-up were self-reported in 4 of 6 study centers, which may have induced a misclassification. However, we did not observe heterogeneity between centers that used selfreported and measured data. Furthermore, a previous study showed that correcting self-reported information by methods developed for the European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition study (48) did not significantly change results (49).

In conclusion, the current study shows a small but significant inverse association between the MDS and changes in WC, WC_{BMI}, and extreme weight gain, but not weight gain in general, over 6.8 y follow-up. There was a similar tendency toward an inverse association for the NDS, but this was not significant. The only gene \times diet interaction shown was a borderline significant interaction between the MDS and *TCF7L2* rs7903146 on weight gain over the study period, which confined beneficial effects of a high MDS to individuals with 1 or 2 rs7903146 risk alleles. The replication of our findings in another cohort is recommended.

We acknowledge the contribution of the Diet, Obesity and Genes (DiOGenes) Research and Technological Development Line 3–work package 3.3 on epidemiology: "Obesity, genes and diet at the population level. Studying the long-term role of dietary Glycaemic Index and protein content in relation to obesity and its co-morbidities, in the European population," and the work of Karani S Vimaleswaran, Nabila Bouatia-Naji, and Ruth Loos in relation to identification of candidate genes in the DiOGenes. The parties of the DiOGenes are listed on the website of the project at http:// www.diogenes-eu.org. The authors' responsibilities were as follows—NR, AT, and TIAS: conceived the current study; NR, DR, TIAS, NJW, DP, DLvdA, HB, and RJFL: designed the research; NR, LÄ, and DR: conducted the research; KSV, RJFL, AT, NJW, DP, DLvdA, and HB: provided essential material; LÄ: analyzed data; NR, LÄ, TSA, SCL, JNØ, JH, KSV, BB, JMAB, and RJFL: wrote the manuscript; TIAS and AT: had primary responsibility for the final content of the manuscript. None of the authors had a conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

- Jacobs DR Jr, Gross MD, Tapsell LC. Food synergy: an operational concept for understanding nutrition. Am J Clin Nutr 2009;89:1543S– 8S.
- Kastorini CM, Panagiotakos DB. The role of the Mediterranean diet on the development of the metabolic syndrome. Front Biosci (Elite Ed) 2010;2:1320–33.
- Kastorini CM, Milionis HJ, Goudevenos JA, Panagiotakos DB. Mediterranean diet and coronary heart disease: is obesity a link? - a systematic review. Nutr Metab Cardiovasc Dis 2010;20:536–51.
- Kastorini CM, Milionis HJ, Esposito K, Giugliano D, Goudevenos JA, Panagiotakos DB. The effect of Mediterranean diet on metabolic syndrome and its components: a meta-analysis of 50 studies and 534,906 individuals. J Am Coll Cardiol 2011;57:1299–313.
- Esposito K, Kastorini CM, Panagiotakos DB, Giugliano D. Mediterranean diet and weight loss: meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. Metab Syndr Relat Disord 2011;9:1–12.
- Buckland G, Bach A, Serra-Majem L. Obesity and the Mediterranean diet: a systematic review of observational and intervention studies. Obes Rev 2008;9:582–93.
- Bonaccio M, Di Castelnuovo A, Costanzo S, De Lucia F, Olivieri M, Donati MB, de Gaetano G, Iacoviello L, Bonanni A; Moli-sani Project Investigators. Nutrition knowledge is associated with higher adherence to Mediterranean diet and lower prevalence of obesity. Results from the Moli-sani study. Appetite 2013;68:139–46.
- Boghossian NS, Yeung EH, Mumford SL, Zhang C, Gaskins JA, Wactawski-Wende J, Schisterman EF. Adherence to the Mediterranean diet and body fat distribution in reproductive aged women. Eur J Clin Nutr 2013;67:289–94.
- Schröder H, Marrugat J, Vila J, Covas MI, Elosua R. Adherence to the traditional mediterranean diet is inversely associated with body mass index and obesity in a Spanish population. J Nutr 2004;134:3355–61.
- Tyrovolas S, Bountziouka V, Papairakleous N, Zeimbekis A, Anastassiou F, Gostis E, Metallilnos G, Polychronopoulos E, Lionis C, Panagiotakos D. Adherence to the Mediterranean diet is associated with lower prevalence of obesity among elderly people living in Mediterranean islands: the MEDIS study. Int J Food Sci Nutr 2009;60 (suppl 6):37–50.
- Romaguera D, Norat T, Mouw T, May AM, Bamia C, Slimani N, Travier N, Besson H, Luan J, Wareham N, et al. Adherence to the Mediterranean diet is associated with lower abdominal adiposity in European men and women. J Nutr 2009;139:1728–37.
- Olsen A, Egeberg R, Halkjaer J, Christensen J, Overvad K, Tjonneland A. Healthy aspects of the Nordic diet are related to lower total mortality. J Nutr 2011;141:639–44.
- Adamsson V, Reumark A, Fredriksson IB, Hammarstrom E, Vessby B, Johansson G, Riserus U. Effects of a healthy Nordic diet on cardiovascular risk factors in hypercholesterolaemic subjects: a randomized controlled trial (NORDIET). J Intern Med 2011;269:150–9.
- Poulsen SK, Due A, Jordy AB, Kiens B, Stark KD, Stender S, Holst C, Astrup A, Larsen TM. Health effect of the New Nordic Diet in adults with increased waist circumference: a 6-mo randomized controlled trial. Am J Clin Nutr 2014;99:35–45.
- Saris WH, Harper A. DiOGenes: a multidisciplinary offensive focused on the obesity epidemic. Obes Rev 2005;6:175–6.
- Frayling TM, Timpson NJ, Weedon MN, Zeggini E, Freathy RM, Lindgren CM, Perry JR, Elliott KS, Lango H, Rayner NW, et al. A common variant in the FTO gene is associated with body mass index and predisposes to childhood and adult obesity. Science 2007;316:889– 94.
- 17. Scuteri A, Sanna S, Chen WM, Uda M, Albai G, Strait J, Najjar S, Nagaraja R, Orru M, Usala G, et al. Genome-wide association scan shows genetic variants in the FTO gene are associated with obesityrelated traits. PLoS Genet 2007;3:e115.

- Grant SF, Thorleifsson G, Reynisdottir I, Benediktsson R, Manolescu A, Sainz J, Helgason A, Stefansson H, Emilsson V, Helgadottir V, et al. Variant of transcription factor 7-like 2 (TCF7L2) gene confers risk of type 2 diabetes. Nat Genet 2006;38:320–3.
- Loos RJ. Recent progress in the genetics of common obesity. Br J Clin Pharmacol 2009;68:811–29.
- Haupt A, Thamer C, Machann J, Kirchoff K, Stefan N, Tschritter O, Machicao F, Schick F, Haring HU, Fritsche MA. Impact of variation in the FTO gene on whole body fat distribution, ectopic fat, and weight loss. Obesity (Silver Spring) 2008;16:1969–72.
- Lappalainen TJ, Tolppanen AM, Kolehmainen M, Schwab U, Lindstrom J, Tuomilehto J, Pulkkinen L, Eriksson JG, Laakso M, Gylling H, et al. The common variant in the FTO gene did not modify the effect of lifestyle changes on body weight: the Finnish Diabetes Prevention Study. Obesity (Silver Spring) 2009;17:832–6.
- Hansson O, Zhou Y, Renstrom E, Osmark P. Molecular function of TCF7L2: Consequences of TCF7L2 splicing for molecular function and risk for type 2 diabetes. Curr Diab Rep 2010;10:444–51.
- Helgason A, Palsson S, Thorleifsson G, Grant SF, Emilsson V, Gunnarsdottir S, Adeyemo A, Chen Y, Chen G, Reynisdottir I, et al. Refining the impact of TCF7L2 gene variants on type 2 diabetes and adaptive evolution. Nat Genet 2007;39:218–25.
- Grau K, Cauchi S, Holst C, Astrup A, Martinez JA, Saris WH, Blaak EE, Oppert JM, Arner P, Rossner C, et al. TCF7L2 rs7903146-macronutrient interaction in obese individuals' responses to a 10-wk randomized hypoenergetic diet. Am J Clin Nutr 2010;91:472–9.
- 25. Haupt A, Thamer C, Heni M, Ketterer C, Machann J, Schick F, Machicao F, Stefan N, Claussen CD, Haring HU, et al. Gene variants of TCF7L2 influence weight loss and body composition during lifestyle intervention in a population at risk for type 2 diabetes. Diabetes 2010; 59:747–50.
- Fisher E, Meidtner K, Angquist L, Holst C, Hansen RD, Halkjær J, Masala G, Østergaard JN, Overvad K, Palli D, et al. Influence of dietary protein intake and glycemic index on the association between TCF7L2 HapA and weight gain. Am J Clin Nutr 2012;95:1468–76.
- Razquin C, Martinez JA, Martinez-Gonzalez MA, Bes-Rastrollo M, Fernandez-Crehuet J, Marti A. A 3-year intervention with a Mediterranean diet modified the association between the rs9939609 gene variant in FTO and body weight changes. Int J Obes (Lond) 2010;34: 266–72.
- Corella D, Ortega-Azorin C, Sorli JV, Covas MI, Carrasco P, Salas-Salvado J, Martinez-Gonzalez MA, Aros F, Lapetra J, Serra-Majem L, et al. Statistical and biological gene-lifestyle interactions of MC4R and FTO with diet and physical activity on obesity: new effects on alcohol consumption. PLoS ONE 2012;7:e52344.
- Riboli E, Hunt KJ, Slimani N, Ferrari P, Norat T, Fahey M, Charrondiere UR, Hemon B, Casagrande C, Vignat J, et al. European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition (EPIC): study populations and data collection. Public Health Nutr 2002;5:1113–24.
- Buckland G, Gonzalez CA, Agudo A, Vilardell M, Berenguer A, Amiano P, Ardanaz E, Arriola L, Barricarte A, Basterretxea M, et al. Adherence to the Mediterranean diet and risk of coronary heart disease in the Spanish EPIC Cohort Study. Am J Epidemiol 2009;170:1518– 29.
- Wareham NJ, Jakes RW, Rennie KL, Schuit J, Mitchell J, Hennings S, Day NE. Validity and repeatability of a simple index derived from the short physical activity questionnaire used in the European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition (EPIC) study. Public Health Nutr 2003;6:407–13.
- Higgins JP, Thompson SG. Quantifying heterogeneity in a meta-analysis. Stat Med 2002;21:1539–58.
- 33. Vimaleswaran KS, Ängquist L, Hansen RD, van der A DL, Bouatia-Naji N, Holst C, Tjønneland A, Overvad K, Jakobsen MU, Boeing H. Association between FTO variant and change in body weight and its interaction with dietary factors: the DiOGenes study. Obesity (Silver Spring) 2012;20:1669–74.
- Nordisk Ministerråd. Nordic nutrition recommendations 2004. Integrating nutrition and physical activity. Copenhagen, Denmark: Nordic Council of Ministers, 2004.
- 35. Uusitupa M, Hermansen K, Savolainen MJ, Schwab U, Kolehmainen M, Brader L, Mortensen LS, Cloetens L, Johansson-Persson A, Onning G, et al. Effects of an isocaloric healthy Nordic diet on insulin sensitivity, lipid profile and inflammation markers in metabolic syndrome a randomized study (SYSDIET). J Intern Med 2013;274:52–66.

- Schröder H. Protective mechanisms of the Mediterranean diet in obesity and type 2 diabetes. J Nutr Biochem 2007;18:149–60.
- Bere E, Brug J. Towards health-promoting and environmentally friendly regional diets - a Nordic example. Public Health Nutr 2009;12: 91–6.
- Karl JP, Saltzman E. The role of whole grains in body weight regulation. Adv Nutr 2012;3:697–707.
- 39. Du H, van der A DL, Boshuizen HC, Forouhi NG, Wareham NJ, Halkjaer J, Tjønneland A, Overvad K, Jakobsen MU, Boeing H, et al. Dietary fiber and subsequent changes in body weight and waist circumference in European men and women. Am J Clin Nutr 2010;91: 329–36.
- 40. Choi Y, Kim Y, Park S, Lee KW, Park T. Indole-3-carbinol prevents diet-induced obesity through modulation of multiple genes related to adipogenesis, thermogenesis or inflammation in the visceral adipose tissue of mice. J Nutr Biochem 2012;23:1732–9.
- de Oliveira MC, Sichieri R, Venturim MR. A low-energy-dense diet adding fruit reduces weight and energy intake in women. Appetite 2008;51:291–5.
- Nagasako-Akazome Y, Kanda T, Ohtake Y, Shimasaki H, Kobayashi T. Apple polyphenols influence cholesterol metabolism in healthy subjects with relatively high body mass index. J Oleo Sci 2007;56:417–28.
- 43. Corella D, Carrasco P, Sorli JV, Estruch R, Rico-Sanz J, Martinez-Gonzalez MA, Salas-Salvado J, Covas MI, Coltell O, Aros F, et al. Mediterranean diet reduces the adverse effect of the TCF7L2rs7903146 polymorphism on cardiovascular risk factors and stroke

incidence: a randomized controlled trial in a high-cardiovascular-risk population. Diabetes Care 2013;36:3803–11.

- 44. Kaaks R, Slimani N, Riboli E. Pilot phase studies on the accuracy of dietary intake measurements in the EPIC project: overall evaluation of results. European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition. Int J Epidemiol 1997;26(suppl 1):S26–36.
- 45. Slimani N, Kaaks R, Ferrari P, Casagrande C, Clavel-Chaplon F, Lotze G, Kroke A, Trichopoulos D, Trichopoulou A, Lauria C, et al. European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition (EPIC) calibration study: rationale, design and population characteristics. Public Health Nutr 2002;5:1125–45.
- 46. Tjønneland A, Overvad K, Haraldsdottir J, Bang S, Ewertz M, Jensen OM. Validation of a semiquantitative food frequency questionnaire developed in Denmark. Int J Epidemiol 1991;20:906–12.
- 47. Cust AE, Smith BJ, Chau J, van der Ploeg HP, Friedenreich CM, Armstrong BK, Bauman A. Validity and repeatability of the EPIC physical activity questionnaire: a validation study using accelerometers as an objective measure. Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act 2008;5:33.
- Haftenberger M, Lahmann PH, Panico S, Gonzalez C, Seidell J, Boeing H. Prevalence of overweight, general and central obesity in 50- to 64-yearolds involved in the EPIC cohort. IARC Sci Publ 2002;156:249–52.
- 49. Du H, van der A DL, van Bakel MM, Slimani N, Forouhi NG, Wareham NJ, Halkjaer J, Tjønneland A, Jakobsen MU, Overvad K, et al. Dietary glycaemic index, glycaemic load and subsequent changes of weight and waist circumference in European men and women. Int J Obes (Lond) 2009;33:1280–8.