Healthy lifestyle and Agent Orange exposure modulate inherited prostate cancer risk: An analysis of the Million Veteran Program.

Meghana Pagadala[1], Asona Lui[1], Julie Lynch[2], Matthew Panizzon[1], Hannah Carter[1], Richard Hauger[1], Anna Plym[3], Adam Kibel[4], Brent Rose[1], Tyler Seibert[1]

[1] UC San Diego School of Medicine, [2] Department of Veterans Affairs, [3] Harvard TH Chan School of Public Health, [4] Harvard School of Medicine

Abstract

Prostate cancer risk is understood to be mostly unchangeable and inherited. Currently, the strongest known risk factors for developing prostate cancer are age, race/ethnicity, family history and some specific genetic elements. The impact of healthy lifestyle on prostate cancer survivorship is a research priority because of potential impact on quality of life, progression of disease, and tolerance to treatment. Several studies have identified an association between tobacco use, low physical activity, and obesity with increased risk of prostate cancer progression and prostate cancer-related death. Additionally, environmental exposure to carcinogens is known to increase cancer risk including Agent Orange, a chemical agent used in the Vietnam War (1955-1975). Recent studies suggest a healthy lifestyle can mitigate a high inherited prostate cancer risk and risk of lethal prostate cancer, as shown in a combined analysis of two cohorts of health professionals.

In this study, we utilize data from over 870,000 participants in the Million Veteran Program (MVP) to investigate the association of modifiable, environmental, and other factors on prostate cancer risk in a diverse population when accounting for the common major inherited risk factors: race/ethnicity, family history, and polygenic risk. The healthy lifestyle score (Range 0-4) is tabulated using answers to 60 questions in the MVP database for each participant, with a point assigned for each of the following: not a current smoker, healthy weight (body mass index [BMI] ≤30), strenuous activity >4 days per week, and a healthier than average diet.

In this cohort, race/ethnicity, family history were associated with higher prostate cancer risks. When accounting for race/ethnicity and family history of prostate cancer, Agent Orange exposure was an independent factor for prostate cancer diagnosis (HR 1.06, 95% CI 1.04-1.09). Healthy lifestyle score was associated with a lower risk of metastatic prostate cancer (HR 0.80, 95% CI 0.77 – 0.82) and of fatal prostate cancer (HR 0.81, 95% CI 0.76 – 0.85) in the MVP cohort. Importantly, healthy lifestyle score was independently associated with reduced metastatic (HR 0.90, 95% CI 0.87-0.93) and fatal prostate cancer (HR 0.89, 95% CI 0.83-0.96) when accounting for race/ethnicity, family history, and genetic risk (PHS290).

We report that environmental exposures are independently associated with prostate cancer risk when accounting for major inherited risk factors (family history, ancestry, and polygenic risk). Adherence to a healthy lifestyle is associated with lower risk of prostate cancer and with lower risk of dying from prostate cancer, which offsets high inherited risk.

Introduction

Prostate cancer risk is understood to be mostly unchangeable and inherited. Currently, the strongest known risk factors for developing prostate cancer are age, race/ethnicity, family history and some specific genetic elements, including both common polygenic features and rare variants with high penetrance.[1-7] Guidelines for early detection recommend stronger consideration of screening in men with highest risk, including Black men and men with a brother or father diagnosed with prostate cancer (i.e., positive family history).[8] We have developed a polygenic hazard score using 290 common genetic variants (PHS290) that reliably risk stratifies men for age-dependent genetic risk of prostate cancer. PHS290 scores are associated with age at diagnosis of prostate cancer in addition to age at metastatic cancer development and prostate cancer death.[5] PHS290 performs well in diverse datasets and is independently associated with prostate cancer risk, even when accounting for family history and race/ethnicity.[1,9]

In addition to the major known inherited risk factors, there is growing evidence of a role for modifiable factors in prostate cancer risk. Assessments of men that move between countries with different baseline prostate cancer incidence have identified geography as an independent predictor of prostate cancer diagnosis, suggesting that environmental factors and behavior can also impact risk.[10] The impact of healthy lifestyle on prostate cancer survivorship is a research priority because of potential impact on quality of life, progression of disease, and tolerance to treatment.[11] Several recent meta-analyses of observational studies have identified an association between tobacco use, low physical activity, and obesity with increased risk of prostate cancer progression and prostate cancer-related death.[10,12-14] Specific dietary factors linked to increased prostate cancer risk include consumption of high-fat milk and meats high in saturated fats.[15] Conversely, high circulating levels of lycopene (from tomato products) and a-tocopherol (from nuts and seeds) are inversely associated with risk of advanced stage and aggressive prostate cancer. [16] Additionally, environmental exposure to carcinogens is known to increase cancer risk. Agent Orange, a mixture of herbicides used predominately in the Vietnam war to clear dense vegetation and destroy food crops, contains a dioxin, a known carcinogen that has been proposed to increase prostate cancer risk among US Vietnam War veterans.[17,18]

Intriguing recent studies suggest a healthy lifestyle can mitigate a high inherited prostate cancer risk and risk of lethal prostate cancer, as shown in a combined analysis of two cohorts of health professionals.[19] A healthy lifestyle, including regular exercise and a wholesome diet (low in saturated fats but high in fruits, vegetables, low-fat dairy and fish) is known to reduce the risks of cardiovascular disease in addition to the development of colorectal and breast cancer.[20-22] However, it is not known whether the protective effect of a healthy lifestyle on prostate cancer diagnosis and outcome holds true for more diverse populations especially when accounting for race/ethnicity and family history.

In this study, we investigate the association of modifiable, environmental, and other factors on prostate cancer risk in a diverse population when accounting for the common major inherited risk factors: race/ethnicity, family history, and polygenic risk. We utilize data from the Million Veteran Program (MVP), a population-based cohort with genotyping, long-term follow-up, and

linked clinical records for over 870,000 participating US veterans. The MVP is one of the largest and most diverse genome-wide association studies (GWAS) in the world, with a unique structure that allows for detailed investigation into the interactions between inherited risk, lifestyle, and Agent Orange exposure.[23] We tested a healthy lifestyle score and Agent Orange exposure for associations with age at prostate cancer diagnosis, age at diagnosis of prostate cancer metastasis, and lifetime prostate-cancer-specific mortality. Key subgroup analyses were completed for ethnic/racial groups.

Methods

Participants

We retrospectively obtained data from the MVP, composed of individuals between ages 19 to over 100 years who were recruited from 63 Veterans Affairs Medical Centers across the United States (US). Recruitment for the MVP started in 2011, and all veterans were eligible for participation. Consent to participate and permission to re-contact were provided after counseling by research staff and mailing of informational materials. Study participation included consenting to access the participant's electronic health records for research purposes. The MVP received ethical and study protocol approval from the VA Central Institutional Review Board in accordance with the principles outlined in the Declaration of Helsinki. Only men were included in this prostate cancer study.

Healthy lifestyle score

MVP included approximately 60 detailed diet and behavior questions that allow for calculating a healthy lifestyle score for each participant. We evaluate a healthy lifestyle score previously shown to be associated with reduced cardiovascular disease and very similar to a score very recently shown to be associated with reduced prostate cancer risk.[20 24] The healthy lifestyle score used here ranges from 0 to 4, with a point assigned for each of the following: not a current smoker, healthy weight (body mass index [BMI] ≤30), strenuous activity >4 days per week, and a healthier than average diet. BMI was calculated from the participants' baseline height and weight obtained at time of enrollment in MVP. The diet score was calculated from the participants' responses to 60 questions on their typical consumption of an array of food items (**Supplemental Table 1**). Frequent consumption of the following was considered healthier: fruits, nut, vegetables, dairy products, whole grains, and fish. Conversely, frequent consumption of the following was considered less healthy: refined grain, red meat, sugary beverages, trans fats, and sodium. The mean and standard deviation were calculated across the entire male MVP cohort for each dietary question, and a point was given for the overall healthy lifestyle score for each MVP participant whose sum of diet *z*-scores was greater than that of the population mean.

Agent Orange exposure

Exposure to Agent Orange was by self-report on the baseline MVP participant survey, with responses "No," "Yes," "Not sure," or missing response. Analyses of Agent Orange

exposure in the present study were limited to those who were on active duty during the Vietnam War era (1955-1975) and who gave a response of “Yes” or “No.”

Genotype data

All study participants provided blood samples for DNA extraction and genotyping. Researchers are provided data that is de-identified except for dates. Blood samples were collected by phlebotomists and banked at the VA Central Biorepository in Boston, MA, where DNA was extracted and shipped to two external centers for genotyping. DNA extracted from buffy coat was genotyped using a custom Affymetrix Axiom biobank array. The MVP 1.0 genotyping array contains a total of 723,305 variants, enriched for low frequency variants in African and Hispanic populations and variants associated with diseases common to the VA population[25]. Details on quality control and imputation have been described previously[26].

Clinical data extraction

Comprehensive description of clinical endpoints used for prostate cancer Cox proportional hazards analysis were described previously.[9] Briefly, prostate cancer diagnosis, age at diagnosis, and date of last follow-up were retrieved from the VA Corporate Data Warehouse based on ICD codes and VA Central Cancer Registry data. Metastatic prostate cancer was determined through a validated natural language processing tool described previously[27]. Age at diagnosis of metastatic prostate cancer indicated the age of the participant when diagnosed with either nodal or distant metastases, regardless of whether this was at time of initial prostate cancer diagnosis or at a later cancer recurrence. Fatal prostate cancer information was determined from National Death Index. Participants with ICD10 code “C61” as underlying cause of death were considered to have died from prostate cancer.

Polygenic hazard score (PHS290) and family history

PHS290 score calculation was described previously.[1,5] Briefly, PHS290 was calculated as the vector product of participants’ genotype dosage (X_i) for 290 variants and the corresponding parameter estimates (β_i) from Cox proportional hazards regression:

$$PHS = \sum_{i}^{n} X_i \beta_i$$

Family history was recorded as either the presence or absence of (one or more) first-degree relatives with prostate cancer.

Cox proportional hazards analysis

We evaluated association of each Agent Orange and healthy lifestyle score with age at diagnosis of prostate cancer, age at diagnosis of metastatic prostate cancer, and age at death from prostate cancer. Cox proportional hazards models were used to assess these associations in the full dataset and in each racial/ethnic group. Individuals not meeting the endpoint of interest were censored at age at last follow-up. We also evaluated associations of each component of the healthy lifestyle score with the three prostate cancer endpoints. For these univariable lifestyle analyses, BMI and the diet variable (sum of *z*-scores) were evaluated as a continuous variables, while smoking status remained binary categorical, and exercise was

evaluated as an ordered categorical variable (exercise vigorous enough to work up a sweat rarely/never, 1-3 times a month, once a week, 2-4 times a week, 5-6 times a week, or daily).

Healthy lifestyle score or Agent Orange exposure when accounting for race/ethnicity, family history, and genetic risk (PHS290)

We previously reported results of a multivariable Cox model that included the two common guideline-recommended risk factors used to guide prostate cancer early detection strategies (race/ethnicity and family history), as well as PHS290. As reported elsewhere, Black race, family history, and PHS290 were each independently associated with prostate cancer endpoints.[1] Here, we tested whether the healthy lifestyle score was independently associated with prostate cancer endpoints when accounting for those other factors.

Family history was recorded as either the presence or absence of (one or more) first-degree relatives with prostate cancer. Cox proportional hazards models tested associations with any, metastatic, or fatal prostate cancer. For PHS290, the effect size was illustrated via the hazard ratio for the highest 20% vs. lowest 20% of genetic risk and between other strata of PHS290. It is important to note that these percentiles refer to previously defined thresholds of PHS290 derived from European men unaffected by prostate cancer and <70 years old. Fixed thresholds are necessary for multivariable analyses. Further discussion of the implications of this, as well as impact of using alternate strategies in the MVP population, is described elsewhere.[5,9] Hazard ratios for racial/ethnic groups were estimated using Non-Hispanic White as the reference.

The @anova function from the *R* 'survival' package (version 3.2-13; Therneau 2021) was used to compare the baseline multivariable Cox model to the model with addition of healthy lifestyle score, based on the log partial likelihood of the model fits. Significance was set at a two-tailed alpha of 0.01.

Analogous analyses were conducted to evaluate whether Agent Orange exposure was independently associated with prostate cancer outcomes when accounting for race/ethnicity, family history, and PHS290. Agent Orange analyses were limited to those MVP participants who were on active duty during the Vietnam War.

Exploratory environmental exposure analysis

The primary healthy lifestyle analyses tested for associations of the healthy lifestyle score with relevant prostate cancer endpoints. The healthy lifestyle score was selected because previous work has shown that higher healthy lifestyle score was associated with reduced risk of cardiovascular disease, colorectal cancer, and breast cancer.[20-22] Elements of this score also include the three most important lifestyle factors (BMI ≤30, vigorous physical activity, and smoking status) in a recent study of healthy lifestyle impact on prostate cancer risk.[24] However, lifestyle and diet are complex, and it is not clear which factors might be most strongly associated with prostate cancer risk. Therefore, we conducted an exploratory analysis in which each of the 987 lifestyle and exposure questions was tested via univariable Cox proportional hazards for association with the three prostate cancer endpoints. Cox model *p*-values and hazard ratios (with 95% confidence intervals) were tabulated to inform future studies. Bonferroni correction

was applied to the *p*-values, though this is conservative because many of these variables are not actually independent of each other.

Results

Association of healthy lifestyle score with prostate cancer diagnosis and outcome

Healthy lifestyle score was associated with a lower risk of metastatic prostate cancer (HR 0.80, 95% CI 0.77 – 0.82) and of fatal prostate cancer (HR 0.81, 95% CI 0.76 – 0.85) in the full MVP cohort (**Table 1**). The hazard ratio is per unit/point of healthy lifestyle score. There was a similar but smaller association of healthy lifestyle with lower risk of any prostate cancer in the full cohort (HR 0.94, 95% CI 0.93-0.95). Significant associations in the same direction were found among Black participants, with healthy lifestyle associated with reduced risk of metastatic (HR 0.84, 95% CI 0.80-0.90) and fatal prostate cancer (HR 0.79, 95% CI 0.70-0.91), as well as a slightly reduced risk of any prostate cancer (0.97, 95% 0.96-0.99). Analogous patterns were seen in the subgroups of non-Hispanic White and Hispanic White participants, while other racial/ethnic groups—with fewer participants—did not show statistically significant associations on subgroup analysis.

Healthy lifestyle score and inherited prostate cancer risk

When accounting for race/ethnicity, family history, and genetic risk (PHS290), healthy lifestyle score was independently associated with reduced metastatic (HR 0.90, 95% CI 0.87-0.93) and fatal prostate cancer (HR 0.89, 95% CI 0.83-0.96) (**Table 2**). In this multivariable analysis, healthy lifestyle score was not associated with reduced risk of prostate cancer diagnosis (HR 1.0, 95% CI 0.99-1.01). Healthy lifestyle scores were similar across all races (**Supplemental Figure 1**).

Cause-specific cumulative incidence curves for prostate cancer, metastatic prostate cancer, and prostate cancer death diverged for men with high (3-4) and low (0-1) healthy lifestyle scores (**Figure 1**). A high healthy lifestyle score mitigated the cumulative incidence of prostate cancer diagnosis, metastasis, and specific mortality even for the highest risk group: men of African ancestry with a family history of prostate cancer (**Figure 2**). High healthy lifestyle score is associated with reduced cumulative incidence of metastatic and fatal prostate cancer to rates comparable to that of non-Hispanic-White men.

Univariable analyses of each component of the healthy lifestyle score (**Table 3**) revealed men who were not smokers at time of enrollment on MVP were less likely to be diagnosed with prostate cancer (HR 0.90 [0.88-0.91]) and far less likely to develop metastatic prostate cancer (HR 0.52, 95% CI 0.49-0.55) or fatal prostate cancer (HR 0.34, 95% CI 0.30-0.38). The relatively minor effect on any prostate cancer was not significant in populations other than non-Hispanic White, but the protective effect of not smoking for metastatic and fatal prostate cancer was largely consistent across racial/ethnic subgroups. BMI as a continuous variable showed that larger BMI was associated with reduced risk of fatal prostate cancer (HR 0.94, 95% CI 0.93-0.95) and reduced risk of metastatic prostate cancer (HR 0.99, 0.98-0.99), but not associated with diagnosis of any prostate cancer. Number of days with vigorous exercise and

healthy diet sum of *z*-scores were not strongly associated with reduced prostate cancer risk on univariable analysis.

Agent Orange exposure and prostate cancer risk

Among men who were on active duty during the Vietnam War, exposure to Agent Orange was significantly associated with prostate cancer diagnosis (HR 1.2, 95% CI 1.18-1.23), metastasis (HR 1.54, 95% CI 1.42-1.67) and specific mortality (HR 1.52, 95% CI 1.25-1.82) on univariable analysis (**Table 4**). Race/ethnicity and family history were also risk factors in this group of MVP participants on univariable analysis. When accounting for race/ethnicity and family history of prostate cancer, Agent Orange exposure was an independent factor for prostate cancer diagnosis (HR 1.06, 95% CI 1.04-1.09), but not for prostate cancer metastasis (HR 1.08, 95% CI 0.99-1.17) or death (HR 1.02, 95% CI 0.84-1.22) (**Table 5**).

Exploratory environmental exposure analysis

Answers to 987 baseline questionnaire questions were used in exploratory univariable Cox proportional hazards models (**Supplemental File 1**). In the exploratory analysis of 987 baseline survey questions, 156 variables had statistically significant association with fatal prostate cancer after conservative Bonferroni correction (**Supplemental File 2**). Hazard ratios are reported for each of these variables.

Discussion

In this study we found that healthy lifestyle, as measured by the healthy lifestyle score, mitigates high inherited risk of prostate cancer and of poor prostate cancer outcomes in a diverse, population-based cohort of US veterans. The robust nature of the MVP dataset allowed for subgroup analyses by ancestry and multiple prostate cancer clinical endpoints of interest. Most notably, we found that a high healthy lifestyle score protects against high inherited risk of metastatic and fatal prostate cancer in men of multiple races/ethnicities. Even though the strongest effect of a high healthy lifestyle score was seen in non-Hispanic-White men, a significant mitigation of prostate cancer risk was also seen in Black men. This is important because Black men are, on average, at high risk of prostate cancer mortality and represent the one group highlighted by current screening guidelines. Additionally, healthy lifestyle score was independently associated with lower risk of metastatic and fatal prostate cancer even when accounting for the strong effects of family history, race/ethnicity and genetic risk (PHS290). Together these findings offer an opportunity for patients to possibly counteract their inherited risks for prostate cancer and suggests that healthy lifestyle interventions should be studied prospectively as a means of reducing the incidence of clinically significant prostate cancer among men with high inherited risk.

It should be noted that the relationships between ancestry, family history, and genetic risk are especially complicated in the US due to a variety of factors, including but not limited to high diversity, structural racism, and social biases. As such, the three measures of inherited prostate cancer risks used in this study are likely interrelated. Although race is a social construct, it may be associated with genetic risk and is certainly associated with social

determinants of health known to drive prostate cancer risks and outcomes. [25-28] In an effort to mirror current clinical guidelines and because genetic ancestry is typically not available in current clinical encounters, we chose to use self-reported ancestry for our primary analyses rather than genetic ancestry. Self-reported race/ethnicity, as a social construct, may also more faithfully reflect the social determinants of health associated with prostate cancer. Analyses using genetic ancestry rather than self-reported ancestry yielded essentially unchanged results.[1,5] Family history of prostate cancer is also likely measuring a combination of genetic risk, social determinants of health, and even learned behaviors that affect the healthy lifestyle score.

Though the concept of healthy lifestyle mitigating inherited risk was validated in the present work, an optimal healthy lifestyle score remains to be determined. The univariable results for the individual components of the score used here show that most of the healthy lifestyle effect was driven by not smoking. Diet is complex and requires more careful study, as do the other components of the score used here.

We also investigated Agent Orange exposure as a prostate cancer risk factor specific to the veteran population in the US. Agent Orange is an officially classified carcinogen with proven associations with hematologic malignancies and soft tissue sarcomas. [18,29] There is also some evidence suggesting a role in lung, head and neck, renal cell, bladder, and prostate cancer risk, but those associations remain under investigation.[17] Previous studies in cohorts of patients treated in the Veterans Affairs (VA) system, have found a slight decrease in age at diagnosis, higher incidence of stage IV disease and lower rates of biochemical control, but no differences in overall survival or other clinical outcomes.[17,30,31] We report here for the first time a clear association between Agent Orange exposure and prostate cancer diagnosis, metastasis and specific mortality among MVP participants. Additionally, it was not previously known how prostate cancer risks associated with Agent Orange exposure might interact with inherited risk. When accounting for family history, ancestry and genetic risk, Agent Orange exposure was associated only with prostate cancer diagnosis and not with metastasis or specific death. Our finding that Agent Orange exposure among MVP participants has a stronger association with prostate cancer diagnosis than with aggressive cancer outcomes may be reassuring when counseling men in this population.

This study was conducted using the MVP dataset and so the results and conclusions may not be generalizable beyond the VA population. The GWAS data available does not include sequencing for rare germline mutations; therefore, we are not able to assess the impact of a healthy lifestyle on risk arising from germline *BRCA2* mutations, for example. The MVP dataset includes over 60 questions about diet and lifestyle. While more accurate ways of measuring healthy lifestyle may be developed, we chose the healthy lifestyle score because it has been demonstrated validity in studies of prostate cancer and other medical outcomes.[19] Also, healthy lifestyle score was only measured at the time of MVP enrollment, and so does not capture natural fluctuations in behaviors and lifestyle over time. Future work should evaluate how longitudinal lifestyle factors (duration, age of adoption, timing before or after diagnosis, years since quitting smoking etc.) impact a man's prostate cancer risk.

In addition to the previously mentioned nuances of ancestry, Hispanic ethnicity is another complicated social construct in the US. Here, Hispanic ethnicity was considered separately within men with self-reported White race but not within Black and other races due to small numbers. Recent work suggests distinct differences in prostate cancer risks among US Hispanic men based on country of origin, with one study finding 50% higher prostate cancer specific mortality among Puerto-Rican men than non-Hispanic US men of African ancestry.[7,32] Future work into the impact of a healthy lifestyle on prostate cancer risks would benefit from the ability to conduct subgroup comparisons among Hispanic/Latino US men.

Conclusion

We have found that environmental exposures are independently associated with prostate cancer risk when accounting for major inherited risk factors (family history, ancestry, and polygenic risk). Adherence to a healthy lifestyle is associated with lower risk of prostate cancer and with lower risk of dying from prostate cancer, which offsets high inherited risk. Prospective studies should investigate whether healthy lifestyle interventions can reduce prostate cancer risks in men identified as having high genetic risk of clinically significant prostate cancer.

1 Pagadala, M. S. *et al.* Polygenic risk of any, metastatic, and fatal prostate cancer in the Million Veteran Program. *medRxiv*, 2021.2009.2024.21264093 (2022). https://doi.org:10.1101/2021.09.24.21264093
2 Seibert, T. M. *et al.* Polygenic hazard score to guide screening for aggressive prostate cancer: development and validation in large scale cohorts.
3 Darst, B. F. *et al.* Combined Effect of a Polygenic Risk Score and Rare Genetic Variants on Prostate Cancer Risk.
4 Conti, D. V. *et al.* Trans-ancestry genome-wide association meta-analysis of prostate cancer identifies new susceptibility loci and informs genetic risk prediction.
5 Huynh-Le, M. A.-O. *et al.* Prostate cancer risk stratification improvement across multiple ancestries with new polygenic hazard score. LID - 10.1038/s41391-022-00497-7 [doi].
6 Huynh-Le, M. A.-O. *et al.* Age dependence of modern clinical risk groups for localized prostate cancer-A population-based study.
7 Chinea, F. M. *et al.* Ethnic heterogeneity and prostate cancer mortality in Hispanic/Latino men: a population-based study. *Oncotarget* **8**, 69709-69721 (2017). https://doi.org:10.18632/oncotarget.19068
8 (NCCN), N. C. C. N. *NCCN Guidelines Prostate Cancer Early Detection Version 4.2022*, 2022 May 10).
9 Pagadala, M. *et al.* Evaluating a polygenic hazard score to predict risk of developing metastatic or fatal prostate cancer in the multi-ancestry Million Veteran Program cohort. *Journal of Clinical Oncology* **40**, 155-155 (2022). https://doi.org:10.1200/JCO.2022.40.6_suppl.155
10 Wilson, K. M. & Mucci, L. A. Diet and Lifestyle in Prostate Cancer.
11 Narayan, V. *et al.* Improving research for prostate cancer survivorship: A statement from the Survivorship Research in Prostate Cancer (SuRECaP) working group. *Urol Oncol* **38**, 83-93 (2020). https://doi.org:10.1016/j.urolonc.2019.10.006
12 Rivera-Izquierdo, M. A.-O. *et al.* Obesity and biochemical recurrence in clinically localised prostate cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis of 86,490 patients. LID - 10.1038/s41391-021-00481-7 [doi].
13 Zhang, X. *et al.* Impact of obesity upon prostate cancer-associated mortality: A meta-analysis of 17 cohort studies.
14 Islami, F., Moreira, D. M., Boffetta, P. & Freedland, S. J. A systematic review and meta-analysis of tobacco use and prostate cancer mortality and incidence in prospective cohort studies.
15 Langlais, C. S. *et al.* Post-Diagnostic Dietary and Lifestyle Factors and Prostate Cancer Recurrence, Progression, and Mortality. *Current oncology reports* **23**, 37-37 (2021). https://doi.org:10.1007/s11912-021-01017-x
16 Key, T. A.-O. X. *et al.* Carotenoids, retinol, tocopherols, and prostate cancer risk: pooled analysis of 15 studies.
17 Chang, C., Benson, M. & Fam, M. M. A review of Agent Orange and its associated oncologic risk of genitourinary cancers.
18 Polychlorinated dibenzo-para-dioxins.
19 Plym, A. *et al.* Abstract 822: Can the genetic risk of prostate cancer be attenuated by a healthy lifestyle. *Cancer Research* **81**, 822-822 (2021). https://doi.org:10.1158/1538-7445.am2021-822
20 Khera, A. V. *et al.* Genetic Risk, Adherence to a Healthy Lifestyle, and Coronary Disease.
21 Arthur, R. S., Wang, T., Xue, X., Kamensky, V. & Rohan, T. E. Genetic Factors, Adherence to Healthy Lifestyle Behavior, and Risk of Invasive Breast Cancer Among Women in the UK Biobank. *JNCI: Journal of the National Cancer Institute* **112**, 893-901 (2020). https://doi.org:10.1093/jnci/djz241

22 Choi, J., Jia, G., Wen, W., Shu, X. O. & Zheng, W. Healthy lifestyles, genetic modifiers, and colorectal cancer risk: a prospective cohort study in the UK Biobank.
23 Gaziano, J. M. *et al.* Million Veteran Program: A mega-biobank to study genetic influences on health and disease.
24 Plym, A. *et al.* A Healthy Lifestyle in Men at Increased Genetic Risk for Prostate Cancer. *Eur Urol* (2022). https://doi.org:10.1016/j.eururo.2022.05.008
25 Rebbeck, T. R. Prostate Cancer Disparities by Race and Ethnicity: From Nucleotide to Neighborhood. LID - 10.1101/cshperspect.a030387 [doi] LID - a030387.
26 Graham-Steed, T. *et al.* 'Race' and prostate cancer mortality in equal-access healthcare systems.
27 Coughlin, S. S. A review of social determinants of prostate cancer risk, stage, and survival.
28 Zavala, V. A. *et al.* Cancer health disparities in racial/ethnic minorities in the United States.
29 National Academies of Sciences, E., and Medicine & Division, H. a. M. Committee to Review the Health Effects in Vietnam Veterans of Exposure to Herbicides (Eleventh Biennial Update). *Board on Population Health and Public Health Practice* (2018).
30 Tward, A. E. & Tward, J. D. The Stage at Presentation and Oncologic Outcomes for Agent Orange Exposed and Non-Exposed United States Veterans Diagnosed With Prostate Cancer.
31 Everly, L. *et al.* Prostate cancer control and survival in Vietnam veterans exposed to Agent Orange.
32 Stern, M. C. *et al.* Variability in Cancer Risk and Outcomes Within US Latinos by National Origin and Genetic Ancestry.

Race/Ethnicity	clinical endpoint	HLS	P
All (n=590,750)	**fatal prostate cancer**	0.81 [0.76-0.85]	<0.001*
Non-Hispanic White (n=420,473)		0.85 [0.80-0.9]	<0.001*
Black or African American (n=102,203)		0.79 [0.70-0.91]	<0.001*
White Hispanic (n=27,651)		0.79 [0.59-1.06]	0.126
Native American (n=5,835)		1.06 [0.54-2.24]	0.877
Pacific Islander (n=3,246)		0.7 [0.38-1.19]	0.613
Other (n=8,226)		1.11 [0.60-2.01]	0.711
Unknown (n=16,472)		1.01 [0.70-1.45]	0.973
All (n=590,750)	**metastatic prostate cancer**	0.80 [0.77-0.82]	<0.001*
Non-Hispanic White (n=420,473)		0.83 [0.81-0.87]	<0.001*
Black or African American (n=102,203)		0.84 [0.80-0.9]	<0.001*
White Hispanic (n=27,651)		0.87 [0.74-1.01]	0.788
Native American (n=5,835)		0.84 [0.62-1.13]	0.281
Pacific Islander (n=3,246)		0.58 [0.30-0.98]	0.097
Other (n=8,226)		0.92 [0.70-1.24]	0.552
Unknown (n=16,472)		0.99 [0.81-1.22]	0.940
All (n=590,750)	**prostate cancer**	0.94 [0.93-0.95]	<0.001*
Non-Hispanic White (n=420,473)		0.98 [0.97-0.99]	<0.001*
Black or African American (n=102,203)		0.97 [0.96-0.99]	0.005*
White Hispanic (n=27,651)		1.04 [0.99-1.09]	0.137
Native American (n=5,835)		1.02 [0.93-1.13]	0.641
Pacific Islander (n=3,246)		0.99 [0.85-1.16]	0.924
Other (n=8,226)		0.93 [0.85-1.01]	0.078
Unknown (n=16,472)		0.91 [0.84-0.99]	0.033

Table 1: Association of Healthy Lifestyle Score (HLS) with any, metastatic and fatal prostate cancer. Cox proportional hazards model results from HLS association with age at prostate cancer, metastatic prostate cancer (nodal or distant) and death from prostate cancer. *P*-values reported are from univariable models using HLS as the sole predictor variable. Significant predictors are indicated by *.

Clinical Endpoints	Self-Reported Race/Ethnicity						
	Black or African American	White Hispanic	Asian	Native American	Other	Pacific Islander	Unknown
fatal prostate cancer	1.96 [1.67-2.27]***	1.04 [0.68-1.41]	0.69 [0.16-1.4]	0.97 [0.3-1.89]	1.89 [1.09-2.82]	1.73 [0.0-4.59]	0.72 [0.0-1.86]
metastatic prostate cancer	2.23 [2.04-2.4]***	1.32 [1.1-1.57]*	1.34 [0.85-1.93]	1.38 [0.96-1.86]	1.66 [1.28-2.12]*	1.13 [0.23-2.23]	1.51 [0.74-2.36]
any prostate cancer	1.83 [1.78-1.88]****	1.1 [1.04-1.16]*	1.28 [1.14-1.42]*	1.04 [0.94-1.16]	1.2 [1.1-1.28]*	0.98 [0.76-1.25]	0.9 [0.73-1.07]

	PHS290 $HR_{80/20}$	FH	HLS
fatal prostate cancer	4.17 [3.59-4.89]***	1.67 [1.38-1.98]*	0.89 [0.83-0.96]*
metastatic prostate cancer	4.15 [3.81-4.52]***	1.52 [1.39-1.67]***	0.9 [0.87-0.93]*
any prostate cancer	4.69 [4.57-4.82]***	1.78 [1.73-1.83]***	1.0 [0.99-1.01]

Table 2: Multivariable models combining self-reported Race/Ethnicity, Family History (FH), Healthy Lifestyle Score (HLS) and PHS290 for three prostate cancer clinical endpoints. Cox proportional hazards results for association with age at death from prostate cancer, at diagnosis of metastatic prostate cancer, and age at diagnosis with prostate cancer. *P*-values reported are from multivariable models using self-reported race/ethnicity, family history, HLS and PHS290. For PHS290, effect size was illustrated via the hazard ratio ($HR_{80/20}$) for the highest 20% vs. lowest 20% of genetic risk. Hazard ratios for race/ethnicity were estimated using Non-Hispanic White as the reference. Hazard ratios for family history were for one or more first-degree relatives diagnosed with prostate cancer. This multivariable analysis was limited to the 375,763 participants who provided family history information in baseline survey data. Numbers in brackets are 95% confidence intervals. Significant predictors in the multivariable model are indicated by *($p<0.01$) and *** ($p<10^{-16}$).

		Current Smoking Status		Exercise		Healthy diet score		BMI	
race/ethnicity	**clinical endpoint**	**HR**	**p**	**HR**	**p**	**HR**	**p**	**HR**	**p**
All (n=590,750)	fatal prostate cancer	0.34 [0.3-0.38]	<0.001*	1.04 [1.0-1.07]	0.04	0.97 [0.74-1.26]	0.80	0.94 [0.93-0.95]	<0.001*
Non-Hispanic White (n=420,473)		0.36 [0.31-0.41]	<0.001*	1.03 [0.99-1.07]	0.10	0.93 [0.72-1.21]	0.60	0.95 [0.94-0.96]	<0.001*
Black or African American (n=102,203)		0.34 [0.27-0.43]	<0.001*	1.05 [0.96-1.16]	0.32	0.76 [0.39-1.4]	0.38	0.92 [0.9-0.95]	<0.001*
White Hispanic (n=27,651)		0.54 [0.27-1.9]	0.13	1.0 [0.8-1.29]	0.97	0.54 [0.17-1.54]	0.37	0.94 [0.87-1.01]	0.04*
Native American (n=5,835)		0.65 [0.2-84678570.82]	0.59	1.08 [0.61-51465445.76]	0.75	7.52 [0.09-22.75]	0.00	0.89 [0.74-1.05]	0.08
Pacific Islander (n=3,246)		0.29 [0.05-80364715.21]	0.31	0.52 [0.0-0.78]	0.19	0.12 [0.01-0.45]	0.64	0.87 [0.72-0.98]	0.18
Other (n=8,226)		0.42 [0.16-2.25]	0.13	1.09 [0.8-1.62]	0.56	2.92 [0.33-10.42]	0.19	0.97 [0.86-1.07]	0.51
Unknown (n=16,472)		0.38 [0.2-0.93]	0.01	0.93 [0.82-1.06]	0.85	2.06 [0.15-16.03]	0.59	0.89 [0.82-0.95]	<0.001*
All (n=590,750)	metastatic prostate cancer	0.52 [0.49-0.55]	<0.001*	1.01 [0.99-1.03]	0.43	1.07 [0.93-1.23]	0.32	0.99 [0.98-0.99]	$<10^{-9}$
Non-Hispanic White (n=420,473)		0.53 [0.49-0.58]	<0.001*	1.01 [0.98-1.03]	0.63	1.1 [0.93-1.28]	0.25	0.99 [0.99-1.0]	0.01
Black or African American (n=102,203)		0.65 [0.58-0.73]	<0.001*	0.99 [0.95-1.04]	0.64	0.82 [0.61-1.08]	0.18	0.98 [0.97-0.99]	<0.001*
White Hispanic (n=27,651)		0.49 [0.35-0.74]	<0.001*	0.94 [0.84-1.04]	0.22	0.68 [0.35-1.28]	0.29	0.96 [0.94-0.99]	0.01*
Native American (n=5,835)		0.48 [0.26-0.98]	0.03*	1.1 [0.92-1.36]	0.38	2.88 [0.21-6.17]	0.08	1.0 [0.93-1.07]	0.98
Pacific Islander (n=3,246)		0.4 [0.15-2.06]	0.12	0.56 [0.0-1.0]	0.06	0.04 [0.0-0.18]	0.04	0.98 [0.9-1.05]	0.65
Other (n=8,226)		0.34 [0.21-0.62]	<0.001*	1.12 [0.98-1.31]	0.13	1.9 [0.53-5.47]	0.21	0.99 [0.94-1.03]	0.63
Unknown (n=16,472)		0.67 [0.44-1.13]	0.09	1.2 [0.78-2.76]	0.34	1.56 [0.37-5.67]	0.51	0.97 [0.93-1.0]	0.04
All (n=590,750)	any prostate cancer	0.9 [0.88-0.91]	<0.001*	0.99 [0.99-1.0]	0.004	0.98 [0.94-1.02]	0.33	1.0 [1.0-1.0]	0.71
Non-Hispanic White (n=420,473)		0.93 [0.9-0.95]	<0.001*	0.99 [0.98-0.99]	$<10^{-3}$	0.96 [0.92-1.0]	0.11	1.0 [1.0-1.0]	0.66
Black or African American (n=102,203)		1.03 [1.0-1.08]	0.1	0.98 [0.97-1.0]	0.01	0.96 [0.87-1.05]	0.32	1.0 [1.0-1.01]	<0.001*
White Hispanic (n=27,651)		1.04 [0.91-1.2]	0.6	1.02 [0.99-1.05]	0.26	0.95 [0.77-1.17]	0.67	1.0 [0.99-1.01]	0.58
Native American (n=5,835)		1.05 [0.84-1.32]	0.67	1.04 [0.98-1.1]	0.24	0.68 [0.4-1.12]	0.11	0.99 [0.98-1.01]	0.22
Pacific Islander (n=3,246)		1.09 [0.76-1.65]	0.67	0.85 [0.73-0.97]	0.04	0.83 [0.32-1.75]	0.67	0.99 [0.97-1.01]	0.30
Other (n=8,226)		1.0 [0.82-1.26]	1	0.96 [0.92-1.01]	0.08	1.25 [0.85-1.71]	0.19	1.01 [0.99-1.02]	0.40
Unknown (n=16,472)		0.89 [0.77-1.06]	0.18	1.02 [0.9-1.16]	0.76	1.05 [0.62-1.74]	0.86	1.0 [0.99-1.01]	0.64

Table 3: Univariable association of each component of healthy lifestyle score, separately, with any, metastatic and fatal prostate cancer. Cox proportional hazards model results from association with age at prostate cancer, metastatic prostate cancer (nodal or distant) and death from prostate cancer. *P*-values reported are from univariable models using each component of the healthy lifestyle score, respectively, as the sole predictor variable. The hazard ratios (HR) for Smoking Status are for non-smokers, with smokers as the reference. The HR for exercise is for number of days in a typical week with rigorous activity, with 0 days as the reference. The HR for Diet is for a participant's sum of *z*-scores across a variety of dietary questions.

Race/Ethnicity	Clinical Endpoint	Hazards Ratio	P
All	**fatal prostate cancer**	1.01 [0.82-1.22]	0.945
Non-Hispanic White		1.1 [0.88-1.34]	0.401
Black or African American		0.9 [0.57-1.38]	0.654
White Hispanic		0.6 [0.0-1.99]	0.438
Native American		1.08 [0.0-654966547.2]	0.949
Pacific Islander		-	-
Other		0.4 [0.0-1.35]	0.237
Unknown		-	-
All	**metastatic prostate cancer**	1.05 [0.97-1.15]	0.232
Non-Hispanic White		1.17 [1.06-1.3]	0.002*
Black or African American		0.86 [0.69-1.04]	0.142
White Hispanic		0.84 [0.49-1.32]	0.488
Native American		0.89 [0.2-2.37]	0.831
Pacific Islander		-	-
Other		0.88 [0.43-1.63]	0.689
Unknown		0.75 [0.0-3.17]	0.685
All	**any prostate cancer**	1.04 [1.01-1.06]	0.003*
Non-Hispanic White		1.09 [1.06-1.12]	<0.001*
Black or African American		1.01 [0.95-1.07]	0.858
White Hispanic		0.99 [0.85-1.15]	0.937
Native American		1.31 [1.02-1.65]	0.038*
Pacific Islander		1.25 [0.66-2.35]	0.494
Other		0.91 [0.75-1.1]	0.330
Unknown		0.85 [0.44-1.49]	0.586

Table 4: Association of Agent Orange with any, metastatic and fatal prostate cancer. Cox Proportional Hazards model results from Agent Orange exposure with age at prostate cancer, metastatic prostate cancer (nodal or distant) and death from prostate cancer. *P*-values reported are from univariable models using Agent Orange exposure (yes or no) as the sole predictor variable.

Clinical Endpoints	Self-Reported Race/Ethnicity						Family History	Agent Orange
	Black or African American	White Hispanic	Asian	Native American	Other	Pacific Islander		
fatal prostate cancer	2.37 [1.87-2.92]**	1.09 [0.58-1.65]	0.27 [0.0-0.84]	0.79 [0.0-1.82]	2.06 [1.01-3.28]	-	1.92 [1.47-2.39]*	1.02 [0.84-1.22]
metastatic prostate cancer	2.51 [2.27-2.75]***	1.23 [0.97-1.55]	1.05 [0.58-1.60]	0.94 [0.51-1.38]	1.46 [1.07-1.92]	0.57 [0.0-1.52]	1.50 [1.33-1.70]*	1.08 [0.99-1.17]
any prostate cancer	2.20 [2.14-2.21]***	1.02 [0.95-1.10]*	0.88 [0.75-1.02]	1.02 [0.91-1.15]	1.06 [0.96-1.16]	0.91 [0.65-1.21]	1.86 [1.80-1.92]***	1.06 [1.04-1.09]*

Table 5: Multivariable models combining self-reported Race/Ethnicity, Family History and Agent Orange Exposure for three prostate cancer clinical endpoints. Cox proportional hazards results for association with age at death from prostate cancer, at diagnosis of metastatic prostate cancer, and age at diagnosis with prostate cancer. *P*-values reported are from multivariable models using self-reported race/ethnicity, family history, and Agent Orange exposure (yes or no). Hazard ratios for race/ethnicity were estimated using Non-Hispanic White as the reference. Hazard ratios for family history were for one or more first-degree relatives diagnosed with prostate cancer. This multivariable analysis was limited to the 375,763 participants who provided family history information in baseline survey data. Numbers in brackets are 95% confidence intervals. Significant predictors in the multivariable model are indicated by *(p<0.01), **(p<0.05) and *** (p<0.001).



Figure 1. Million Veteran Program (MVP) Cause-Specific Cumulative Incidence based on Inherited Prostate Cancer Risk and Healthy Lifestyle. Cause-specific cumulative incidence within MVP, stratified by Healthy Lifestyle Score (HLS) 0-1 and 3-4 for PHS290 80th percentile, for **(A)** fatal prostate cancer, **(B)** metastatic prostate cancer, and **(C)** prostate cancer. The *y*-axis scale was adjusted for (A) and (B) to show the higher incidence values for any prostate cancer.



Figure 2. Million Veteran Program (MVP) Cause-Specific Cumulative Incidence based on Inherited Prostate Cancer Risk and Healthy Lifestyle, among Black Participants. Cause-specific cumulative incidence within MVP Black men (self-identified race/ethnicity Black or African American), stratified by HLI scores 0-1 and 3-4 for PHS290 80th percentile, for **(A)** fatal prostate cancer, **(B)** metastatic prostate cancer, and **(C)** prostate cancer. The *y*-axis scale was adjusted for (A) and (B) to show the higher incidence values for any prostate cancer.

Supplemental Table 1: Variables included in diet score.

LIFESTYLE VARIABLE	DESCRIPTION	CATEGORY	MIN	MAX
QBACON	Subject's average consumption of bacon (2 slices), in the last year	negative	1	9
QBEEF	Subject's average consumption of Beef, pork, or lamb as a sandwich or mixed dish, in the last year	negative	1	9
QBEEF_2	Subject's average consumption of beef, pork, or lamb as a main dish (4-6 oz) in the last year	negative	1	9
QBEER	Subject's average consumption of beer (1 glass, bottle, can) in the last year	negative	1	9
QCAKE	Subject's average consumption of cake (slice) in the last year	negative	1	9
QCANDY	Subject's average consumption of candy without chocolate (1 oz.) in the last year	negative	1	9
QCARBBEV	Subject's average consumption of carbonated beverages with sugar in the last year	negative	1	9
QCHIPS	Subject's average consumption of potato chips or corn chips (small bag or 1 oz.) in the last year	negative	1	9
QCHOC	Subject's average consumption of chocolate (1 oz.) in the last year	negative	1	9
QCOOKIE	Subject's average consumption of cookies (1) in the last year	negative	1	9
QDBTTR	Subject's average consumption of butter (pat), added to food or bread, in the last year	negative	1	9
QDICECRM	Subject's average consumption of ice cream (1 cup) in the last year	negative	1	9
QDMARG	Subject's average consumption of margarine (pat), added to food or bread, in the last year	negative	1	9
QFRYAWAY	Subject's consumption of fried foods away from home	negative	1	4
QFRYHOME	Subject's consumption of fried foods at home	negative	1	4
QHAMBRG	Subject's average consumption of hamburger (1 patty), in the last year	negative	1	9
QHTDOG	Subject's average consumption of hot dogs (1), in the last year	negative	1	9
QLIQUOR	Subject's average consumption of liquor (1 drink or shot) in the last year	negative	1	9
QPIEHM	Subject's average consumption of homemade pie (slice) in the last year	negative	1	9
QPIERM	Subject's average consumption of ready made pie (slice) in the last year	negative	1	9
QPROCMEAT	Subject's average consumption of processed meats e.g., sausage, salami, bologna, etc (piece or slice), in the last year	negative	1	9
QSUGAR	Teaspoons of sugar that subject adds to beverages or food daily	negative	0	984
QWINE	Subject's average consumption of wine (4 oz. glass) in the last year	negative	1	9
FRYLARD	Subject uses lard for frying or sauteeeing at home	negative	0	1
FRYMARG	Subject uses real butter for frying or sauteeeing at home	negative	0	1
FRYVEGOIL	Subject uses margarine for frying or sauteeeing at home	negative	0	1
QDCOTTAGE	Subject's average consumption of cottage or ricotta cheese (1/2 cup) in the last year	positive	1	9
QDOTHCHS	Subject's average consumption of other cheese (1 slice or 1 oz. serving) in the last year	positive	1	9
QDRKBRD	Subject's average consumption of dark bread, including wheat pita bread (slice), in the last year	positive	1	9
QDSKIM	Subject's average consumption of skim or low fat milk (8 oz. glass) in the last year	positive	1	9
QDWHL	Subject's average consumption of whole milk (8 oz. glass) in the last year	positive	1	9
QDYOG	Subject's average consumption of yogurt (1 cup) in the last year	positive	1	9
QFAPPL	Subject's average consumption of fresh apples or pears, in the last year	positive	1	9
QFBANAN	Subject's average consumption of bananas in the last year	positive	1	9
QFISH	Subject's average consumption of fish (3-5 oz.) in the last year	positive	1	9
QFORNG	Subject's average consumption of oranges, in the last year	positive	1	9
QFOTH	Subject's average consumption of other fruits (fresh, frozen, or canned) in the last year	positive	1	9
QFPEACH	Subject's average consumption of peaches, apricots, or plums (1 fresh, or 1/2 cup canned), in last year	positive	1	9
QNUTS	Subject's average consumption of nuts (small packet or 1 oz.) in the last year	positive	1	9
QPB	Subject's average consumption of peanut butter (1 Tbs) in the last year	positive	1	9
QRXDIETCHOL	Subject follows a low cholesterol diet	positive	0	1
QRXDIETFAT	Subject follows a low-fat diet	positive	0	1
QRXDIETSOD	Subject follows a low sodium diet	positive	0	1
QRXDIETTRIG	Subject follows a low triglyceride diet	positive	0	1
QRXDIETWTRED	Subject follows a weight reduction (low calorie) diet	positive	0	1
QVBEAN	Subject's average consumption of baked or dried beans or lentils (1/2 cup) in the last year	positive	1	9
QVBROC	Subject's average consumption of broccoli (1/2 cup) in the last year	positive	1	9
QVCARCOOK	Subject's average consumption of cooked carrots (1/2 carrot or 2-4 sticks) in the last year	positive	1	9
QVCARRAW	Subject's average consumption of raw carrots (1/2 carrot or 2-4 sticks) in the last year	positive	1	9
QVCBG	Subject's average consumption of cabbage, cauliflower or Brussels sprouts (1/2 cup) in the last year	positive	1	9
QVCORN	Subject's average consumption of corn (1 ear or 1/2 cup frozen or canned) in the last year	positive	1	9
QVPEA	Subject's average consumption of peas or lima beans (1/2 cup fresh, frozen canned) in the last year	positive	1	9
QVSPIN	Subject's average consumption of cooked spinach or collard greens (1/2cup) in the last year	positive	1	9
QVSQSH	Subject's average consumption of yellow (winter) squash (1/2 cup) in the last year	positive	1	9
QVSTNGBNS	Subject's average consumption of string beans (1/2 cup) in the last year	positive	1	9
QVTOM	Subject's average consumption of tomatoes (1) or tomato juice (small glass) in the last year	positive	1	9
QVYAM	Subject's average consumption of yams or sweet potatoes (1/2 cup) in the last year	positive	1	9
VITD	Subject regularly takes Vitamin D	positive	0	1
VITE	Subject regularly takes Vitamin E	positive	0	1
VITSEL	Subject regularly takes Selenium	positive	0	1



Supplemental Figure 1: Healthy Lifestyle Score (HLS) distribution in self-reported race/ethnicity groups. HLS was calculated with four criteria: 1) BMI < 30, 2) not a current smoker, 3) physical activity and 4) healthier-than-average diet. Self-reported race/ethnic groups are described in Table 1.