

1 **Consumption of processed meat and its interactions with alcohol drinking and polygenic risk**
2 **scores on breast cancer risk: a cohort study in the UK biobank**

3 Pingxiu Zhu¹, Yanyu Zhang¹, Shuqing Zou¹, Xingxing Yu¹, Mengjie Song¹, Moufeng Lin², Haomin
4 Yang^{1,3}

5 **Author affiliations:**

- 6 1. Department of Epidemiology and Health Statistics, School of Public Health, Fujian Medical
7 University, 350122, Fuzhou, China
8 2. No.5 Hospital of Fuqing City, Fuzhou, 350319, China
9 3. Department of Medical Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Karolinska Institutet, Nobels Väg 12A,
10 171 77 Stockholm, Sweden.

11 ***Corresponding author:**

12 Haomin Yang, PhD. Email: haomin.yang@ki.se; Phone: 0086-13581540402; Fax: 0086-591-22862510.
13 Department of Epidemiology and Health Statistics, School of Public Health, Fujian Medical University,
14 Xuefu North Road 1, University Town, Fuzhou, China. Department of Medical Epidemiology and
15 Biostatistics, Karolinska Institutet, Nobels Väg 12A, 171 77 Stockholm, Sweden.

16 **Tables:4; Supplementary Tables: 2; References: 40**

17 **Word count:** 245 (abstract); 2279 (text excluding abstract, acknowledgement, reference, tables)

18 **Running title:** Processed meat and breast cancer

19

20

21 **Abstract**

22 **Background:** Processed meat and alcohol have been consistently associated with breast cancer risk, but
23 evidence for their effects in women with different genetic susceptibility of breast cancer is scarce, and
24 little is known about their interactions.

25 **Methods:** We analyzed data from 260,779 female participants in the UK Biobank. Multivariable
26 adjusted Cox proportional hazards models were used to estimate hazard ratios (HR) and 95% confidence
27 intervals (CI) for associations between processed meat and breast cancer risk. We further assessed its
28 interaction with alcohol intake and polygenic risk score (PRS) for breast cancer.

29 **Results:** Processed meat intake more than once a week was positively associated with risk of breast
30 cancer, especially in women took alcohol $\geq 1/d$ (HR=1.50, 95% CI=1.17-1.93), and in women who
31 usually took alcohol together with meals (HR=1.70, 95% CI=1.21-2.39, P for interaction=0.048). The
32 association between processed meat and breast cancer did not differ by menopausal status. When further
33 stratified by PRS, processed meat more than once a week intake was associated with risk of breast cancer
34 (HR=1.17, 95% CI=1.02-1.35) in women with the highest quantile of PRS, and additive interaction was
35 found between them.

36 **Conclusions:** Processed meat was associated with risk of breast cancer in women, and the effect was
37 stronger in those who took alcohol together with the meal and with high PRS of breast cancer, suggesting
38 the focus of future preventive measures on these women.

39 **Funding:** This work was supported by the Natural Science Foundation of Fujian Province [grant no:
40 2021J01721], the Startup Fund for High-level Talents of Fujian Medical University [grant no:
41 XRCZX2020007], Startup Fund for Scientific Research, Fujian Medical University [grant no:
42 2019QH1002] and Laboratory Construction Program of Fujian Medical University [grant no:
43 1100160208].

44

45

46

47 **Introduction**

48 On a global scale, breast cancer is the most common cancer among women and the second leading
49 cause of cancer death^[1]. Given the international variations in breast cancer rates and trends^[2], it's
50 important to identify modifiable lifestyle risk factors to reduce the risk of breast cancer, such as physical
51 activity, breast feeding and alcohol consumption. Processed meat consumption has been identified as a
52 risk factor for breast cancer in several studies^[3], while there is less information on the effect among
53 different subgroups of women. Identification of subgroups of women with higher risk of breast cancer
54 associated with processed meat consumption could result to targeted intervention for women and
55 increase the cost effectiveness of interventions.

56 Alcohol consumption has long been thought to play a major role in the development of breast
57 cancer^[4]. Some epidemiological studies have investigated the association between alcohol intake and
58 breast cancer risk^[5,6]. However, the interaction between processed meat and alcohol consumption has
59 been shown in esophageal cancer^[7], while no study has assessed their synergistic effect on risk of breast
60 cancer.

61 Besides the interaction with other life style factors on breast cancer risk, the association between
62 processed meat and breast cancer could also be influenced by genetic factors. Recent GWAS studies has
63 reveals 313 SNPs to be associated with breast cancer risk and could be used as a tool for risk stratification.
64 However, it is still unclear whether the effect of processed meat differs according to different genetic
65 predisposition to breast cancer, which is important for personalized prevention.

66 The aim of this study was to evaluate the association between processed meat intake and the risk
67 of breast cancer, and to investigate whether the association was influenced by alcohol consumption,
68 especially when the alcohol was taken with meals. We also examined the association between processed
69 meat intake and breast cancer risk according to genetic susceptibility to breast cancer measured using
70 polygenic risk score.

71

72 **Methods**

73 **Study population, exposure and outcome**

74 Between 2006 and 2010, 503 317 participants (women N= 273,382) consented to participate the

75 baseline assessment of the UK Biobank study^[8]. Participants were followed up from their date of
76 enrollment until the date of diagnosis of breast cancer, date of withdrawal from the study, date of death,
77 loss of follow up or until the end of follow-up (31 March 2016 for England and Wales, 31 October 2015
78 for Scotland), whichever came first. Information on breast cancer diagnosis, was obtained by using
79 unique personal identification numbers to link the cohort to the National Health Service (NHS) Digital
80 for England and Wales, and National Records of Scotland, NHS Central Register for Scotland. The ICD-
81 10 code C50 was used to identify breast cancer diagnoses in the cancer register. Women with breast
82 cancer before participating in the UK biobank were excluded from the analysis. The date of death was
83 retrieved from death certificates held by the NHS Information Center and the NHS Central Register. The
84 study was approved by The National Information Governance Board for Health and Social Care and the
85 NHS North West Multicentre Research Ethics Committee (06/MRE08/65), and participants provided
86 informed consent at baseline and to be followed up using data-linkage. The inclusion and exclusion
87 criteria for the study populations are shown in supplementary figure 1.

88 **Diet group classification**

89 Dietary intake data were collected at recruitment using a self-reported touchscreen questionnaire
90 (<http://biobank.ctsu.ox.ac.uk/showcase/showcase/docs/TouchscreenQuestionsMainFinal.pdf>).
91 Processed meats included bacon, ham, sausages, meat pies, kebabs, burgers and chicken nuggets.
92 Frequency of consumption were coded into three categories (never, less than once a week and more than
93 once a week). Participants with missing information or reported “prefer not to answer” or “do not know”
94 were excluded from the analysis. Frequency of alcohol drinking was also collected in the questionnaire,
95 and we dichotomized them into whether or not had daily alcohol drinking. We further included the
96 question on whether the alcohol was usually taken with meal.

97 **Polygenic risk score**

98 Blood samples from the participants were collected when they joined the cohort and were
99 genotyped using the UK Biobank Axiom array. A brief description of the procedure for genotype calling,
100 array design, sample handling, quality control, and imputation for the UK biobank samples were
101 described elsewhere^[9]. To assess whether the effect of processed meat intake differed according to
102 genetic susceptibility to breast cancer, significant SNPs reported in a recent meta-analysis of breast

103 cancer GWAS were selected to construct polygenic risk scores for breast cancer overall and by estrogen
104 receptor (ER) status^[10]. For all individuals, to calculate the weighted polygenic risk score (PRS) by the
105 following formula:

$$106 \quad \text{PRS} = \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \dots + \beta_k X_k \dots + \beta_n X_n$$

107 where β_k is the per-allele log odds ratio (OR) of breast cancer associated with SNP k, x_k is the allele
108 dose of the same SNP (0, 1, 2), and n is the total number of the breast cancer SNPs contained in the
109 configuration file. The overall, ER+ and ER- PRS were respectively categorized into quartiles. Detailed
110 information of PRS score generation is provided in the Supplementary Table 2.

111 **Statistical analysis**

112 Cox proportional hazards models were used to assess the associations between processed meat
113 intake and with breast cancer risk adjusting for age, smoking (never, previous, current), ethnicity (five
114 groups where possible: White, Mixed other, Asian or Asian British, Black or Black British, and unknown),
115 physical activity level (metabolic equivalents task units in quartiles), Townsend deprivation index
116 (quintile), alcohol intake frequency ($\geq 1/d$, $< 1/d$), employment status (in paid employment, pension, not
117 in paid employment), educational qualifications (college or university degree/vocational qualification;
118 national examination at ages 17-18 years; national examination at age 16 years; other qualifications were
119 treated as missing), body mass index (BMI, < 18.5 , < 25 , < 30 , ≥ 30 kg/m²), 22 UKB centers, number of
120 births (0, 1, 2, ≥ 3), age at menarche—years (< 13 , 13-15, > 15 and < 30), menopausal status (no, yes, not
121 sure - had a hysterectomy, not sure - other reason), age at first birth—years (< 23 , 23-27, > 27), ever use
122 of oral contraceptive pill use (no, yes), ever use of hormone replacement therapy (no, yes), family history
123 of breast cancer (no, yes). Missingness in the covariates were categorized into a separate category.

124 To test for multiplicative interaction between the processed meat intake and alcohol consumption,
125 and the processed meat intake and PRS, an interaction term was included in the regression models and
126 we tested the interaction using likelihood ratio (LR) test. Interaction in the additive scale for processed
127 meat and PRS was estimated using relative excess risk due to interaction (RERI), and a bootstrap
128 approach was used to estimate the p-values. We further stratified the analysis by alcohol intake frequency,
129 alcohol taken with meal, quartile of PRS, and menopausal status.

130 All statistical analyses were performed using Stata 15.1. All P values were two-sided, and a P value

131 of less than 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

132 **Results**

133 Baseline characteristics

134 Among all the 273,382 women in the UK Biobank, 54 were dropped and withdrew consent, 1,078
135 women did not have available data on processed meat intake and 11,471 women were excluded due to
136 breast cancer diagnosis before baseline, resulting in 260,779 participants and 5,523 incident breast
137 cancer cases in our study. The median follow-up time was 6.7 years and the incidence rate was
138 318.761/100000 person-year in the cohort.

139

140 **Table 1.** Baseline characteristics in the UK Biobank, by frequency of processed meat consumption (N=
141 260,779).

Characteristics	Processed meat intake		
	Never	Less than once a week	More than once a week
Number of participants	32929	99066	128784
Smoking			
Never	19939(0.606)	59029(0.596)	76280(0.592)
Previous	10394(0.316)	31470(0.318)	39318(0.305)
Current	2460(0.075)	8263(0.083)	12690(0.099)
Ethnicity			
White	28545(0.867)	89114(0.900)	118088(0.917)
Mixed other	1516(0.046)	3485(0.035)	4196(0.033)
Asian or British Asian	1873(0.057)	4667(0.047)	4655(0.036)
Black or Black British	310(0.009)	538(0.005)	593(0.005)
Unknown	534(0.016)	984(0.010)	953(0.007)
Physical activity level			
Quartile 1	5589(0.170)	18804(0.190)	26055(0.203)
Quartile 2	6255(0.190)	19377(0.196)	24826(0.193)
Quartile 3	6889(0.209)	19774(0.200)	23778(0.185)
Quartile 4	7712(0.234)	19589(0.198)	23107(0.179)
Townsend deprivation index			
Quartile 1	5678(0.172)	20406(0.206)	26017(0.202)
Quartile 2	5860(0.178)	20230(0.204)	25998(0.202)
Quartile 3	6266(0.190)	20007(0.202)	25834(0.201)
Quartile 4	7283(0.221)	19552(0.197)	25249(0.196)
Quartile 5	7804(0.237)	18763(0.189)	25522(0.198)
Alcohol intake frequency			
≥1/d	4615(0.140)	15999(0.161)	21206(0.165)
<1/d	28273(0.859)	83010(0.838)	107479(0.835)
Employment			
In paid employment	19342(0.587)	55198(0.557)	69914(0.543)

Characteristics	Processed meat intake		
	Never	Less than once a week	More than once a week
Retired	9850(0.299)	34711(0.350)	44857(0.348)
Not in paid employment	3547(0.108)	8823(0.089)	13561(0.105)
Qualification			
College/university degree/NVQ	16820(0.511)	43666(0.441)	52676(0.409)
National examination at ages 17–18	4105(0.125)	14404(0.145)	18315(0.142)
National examination at age 16	9665(0.294)	33891(0.342)	49259(0.382)
Others/unknown	2339(0.071)	7105(0.072)	8534(0.066)
Body mass index(kg/m ²)			
<18.5	520(0.016)	645(0.007)	819(0.006)
<25	15985(0.485)	39769(0.401)	45395(0.352)
<30	10713(0.325)	36739(0.371)	47637(0.370)
≥30	5473(0.166)	21475(0.217)	34392(0.267)
Number of births			
0	8247(0.250)	19194(0.194)	21310(0.165)
1	4633(0.141)	13189(0.133)	16977(0.132)
2	12500(0.380)	43251(0.437)	58151(0.452)
≥3	7484(0.227)	23333(0.236)	32207(0.250)
Age at menarche—years			
<13	12284(0.373)	37775(0.381)	48262(0.375)
13-15	17417(0.529)	52750(0.532)	69384(0.539)
>15,<30	2155(0.065)	5574(0.056)	7248(0.056)
Menopausal status			
No	8327(0.253)	22036(0.222)	33010(0.256)
Yes	19950(0.606)	61062(0.616)	74998(0.582)
Not sure - had a hysterectomy	3240(0.098)	11747(0.119)	14861(0.115)
Not sure - other reason	1314(0.040)	4111(0.041)	5654(0.044)
Age at first birth—years			
<23	6020(0.183)	19136(0.193)	26169(0.203)
23-27	7765(0.236)	27568(0.278)	36131(0.281)
>27	6199(0.188)	19880(0.201)	28057(0.218)
Oral contraceptive pill use			
No	7153(0.217)	17677(0.178)	23845(0.185)
Yes	25603(0.778)	81130(0.819)	104513(0.812)
Hormone replacement therapy			
No	21401(0.650)	59410(0.600)	79796(0.620)
Yes	11347(0.345)	39354(0.397)	48474(0.376)
Family history			
No	27355(0.831)	82033(0.828)	105872(0.822)
Yes	3150(0.096)	10283(0.104)	13075(0.102)

142 NVQ national vocational qualification.

143 Premenopausal and postmenopausal are classified according to UKB menopausal status.

144

145 Table 1 shows characteristics of all participants by categories of processed meat intake. There were

146 49% of participants consumed processed meat once or more weekly. Participants reporting higher
147 processed meat intakes were more likely among those with smoking, White ethnicity, less physically
148 activity, more affluent areas (measured by Townsend score), more alcohol drinking, paid employment,
149 a university/college degree/NVQ, two or more children, postmenopausal status, age at first birth more
150 than 23 years old, oral contraceptives pill, hormone replacement therapy, no family history of breast
151 cancer, and a higher BMI.

152 Processed meat intake was positively associated with risk of breast cancer, (HR more than once a
153 week =1.13, 95% CI=1.04-1.24, Table 2). Among women took alcohol $\geq 1/d$, processed meat intake was
154 associated with a higher risk of breast cancer (HR=1.50, 95% CI=1.17-1.93), while we did not observe
155 this association among women who took alcohol $<1/d$. When stratified the analysis by menopausal status,
156 processed meat was associated with risk of breast cancer in postmenopausal women, especially in those
157 took alcohol $\geq 1/d$, while no association or interaction was observed in premenopausal women
158 (Supplementary Table 1).

159

160 Table 2. The association between processed meat and breast cancer risk, by frequency of alcohol consumption

	Total No.	No. of cases	Haz. Ratio;95%
Overall			
Processed meat intake			
No	32929	608	1.00 (REF)
Less than once a week	99066	2114	1.11(1.01-1.21)
More than once a week	128784	2801	1.13(1.04-1.24)
In women took alcohol $<1/d$			
Processed meat intake			
No	28273	534	1.00 (REF)
Less than once a week	83010	1749	1.07(0.97-1.18)
More than once a week	107479	2279	1.08(0.98-1.19)
In women took alcohol $\geq 1/d$			
Processed meat intake			
No	4615	73	1.00 (REF)
Less than once a week	15999	365	1.40(1.09-1.80)
More than once a week	21206	520	1.50(1.17-1.93)
P for interaction			0.060

161 Multivariable Cox regression model adjusted for age at recruitment, smoking, ethnicity, physical activity level,
162 Townsend deprivation index, alcohol intake frequency, employment status, educational qualifications, BMI, 22 UKB
163 centers, number of births, age at menarche, menopausal status, age at first birth, ever use of oral contraceptive pill use,

164 ever use of hormone replacement therapy, family history of breast cancer, stratified by alcohol intake frequency.

165

166 For women who usually took alcohol together with the meal, processed meat intake more than once
 167 a week was associated with increased risk of breast cancer (HR=1.20, 95% CI=1.03-1.40), while the
 168 effect was attenuated in those who did not usually took alcohol with the meal. Furthermore, the
 169 interaction between processed meat and alcohol on breast cancer risk was only observed in those who
 170 usually took alcohol together with the meal (Table 3, P for interaction=0.048). In these women, processed
 171 meat intake was associated with 70% increased risk of breast cancer (HR=1.70, 95% CI=1.21-2.39).

172

173 **Table 3.** The interaction between processed meat and alcohol on breast cancer risk, by alcohol and meal

	Alcohol usually taken with meals (Yes)			Alcohol usually taken with meals (No)		
	Total No.	No. of cases	Haz. Ratio;95%	Total No.	No. of cases	Haz. Ratio;95%
Overall						
Processed meat intake						
No	11297	206	1.00 (REF)	9846	175	1.00 (REF)
Less than once a week	38670	830	1.13(0.97-1.32)	33443	720	1.15(0.97-1.36)
More than once a week	46121	1046	1.20(1.03-1.40)	48816	1037	1.14(0.97-1.34)
In women took alcohol <1/d						
Processed meat intake						
No	8733	168	1.00 (REF)	7795	140	1.00 (REF)
Less than once a week	29491	626	1.049(0.88-1.25)	26625	559	1.12(0.93-1.35)
More than once a week	34961	762	1.08(0.92-1.29)	38775	801	1.12(0.93-1.34)
In women took alcohol ≥1/d						
Processed meat intake						
No	2564	38	1.00 (REF)	2051	35	1.00 (REF)
Less than once a week	9179	204	1.48(1.05-2.10)	6818	161	1.28(0.88-1.84)
More than once a week	11160	284	1.70(1.21-2.39)	10041	236	1.25(0.87-1.79)
P for interaction	0.048			0.397		

174 Multivariable Cox regression model adjusted for age at recruitment, smoking, ethnicity, physical activity level,
 175 Townsend deprivation index, alcohol intake frequency, employment status, educational qualifications, BMI, 22 UKB
 176 centers, number of births, age at menarche, menopausal status, age at first birth, ever use of oral contraceptive pill use,
 177 ever use of hormone replacement therapy, family history of breast cancer, stratified by alcohol intake frequency, alcohol
 178 and meal.

179

180

181

182

183 When stratified by genetic susceptibility to breast cancer using PRS in quartiles, (Table 4). The only
184 observed associations between processed meat intake and breast cancer risk were in women with highest
185 quartile of overall PRS (HR=1.16, 95% CI = 1.01-1.34) and ER+ PRS (HR=1.18, 95% CI=1.02-1.36).
186 The RERI of PRS, ER+ PRS and ER- PRS were 0.437, 0.455 and 0.334, respectively. A statistical
187 significant additive interaction between ER+ PRS and processed meat intake was observed in the highest
188 quartile (p for RERI=0.034).

189 **Discussion**

190 We observed a significant association between processed meat consumption and risk of breast
191 cancer, especially in those women with high frequency of alcohol intake, and in women with alcohol
192 usually taken with meals. We also found stronger association between processed meat and breast cancer
193 in women with higher ER+ PRS.

194 Evidence from several previous prospective studies and meta-analysis supported these findings and
195 has also shown an association between processed meat intake and breast cancer risk^[11,12]. Processed red
196 meat was high in added nitrites/nitrates, amines and heme iron, while in animal and human
197 biomonitoring studies, this combination has been shown to increase endogenous NOC formation^[13,14].
198 Moreover, high-temperature cooking methods used in processed meat can result in the formation of
199 compounds such as HCAs (including PhIP) and PAHs^[15,16] which have been associated with breast
200 tumors in animal studies^[17-19] and human^[20-25]. These compounds exert carcinogenic effects either
201 through direct DNA damage (formation of DNA adducts) or through other mechanisms (such as the
202 estrogenic properties of PhIP)^[26,27].

203

204 **Table 4.** The interaction between processed meat and polygenic risk score on breast cancer risk
 205

	Overall PRS			ER+ PRS			ER- PRS		
	Total No.	No. of cases	Haz. Ratio;95%	Total No.	No. of cases	Haz. Ratio;95%	Total No.	No. of cases	Haz. Ratio;95%
Quartile 1									
Processed meat intake									
No	7841	78	1.00 (REF)	7852	83	1.00 (REF)	7844	88	1.00 (REF)
Less than once a week	24001	285	1.14(0.88-1.46)	23977	280	1.06(0.83-1.36)	23972	323	1.13(0.89-1.43)
More than once a week	31295	354	1.09(0.85-1.40)	31308	363	1.07(0.84-1.37)	31321	402	1.10(0.87-1.39)
Quartile 2									
Processed meat intake									
No	7794	110	1.00 (REF)	7840	110	1.00 (REF)	7932	115	1.00 (REF)
Less than once a week	23845	379	1.06(0.85-1.31)	23875	383	1.07(0.87-1.33)	23903	437	1.22(0.99-1.50)
More than once a week	31498	532	1.15(0.93-1.41)	31422	519	1.12(0.91-1.38)	31302	584	1.26(1.02-1.54)
Quartile 3									
Processed meat intake									
No	7953	157	1.00 (REF)	7890	154	1.00 (REF)	8061	171	1.00 (REF)
Less than once a week	24204	563	1.12(0.94-1.34)	24179	549	1.11(0.92-1.33)	24127	578	1.07(0.90-1.28)
More than once a week	30980	723	1.13(0.95-1.35)	31068	734	1.16(0.97-1.38)	30949	720	1.06(0.89-1.25)
Quartile 4									
Processed meat intake									
No	8217	238	1.00 (REF)	8223	236	1.00 (REF)	7968	209	1.00 (REF)
Less than once a week	23978	819	1.12(0.97-1.30)	23997	834	1.15(1.00-1.33)	24026	708	1.07(0.91-1.25)
More than once a week	30942	1106	1.17(1.02-1.35)	30917	1099	1.18(1.02-1.36)	31143	1009	1.17(1.01-1.36)
P for multiplicative interaction			0.959			0.992			0.495
RERI			0.437			0.455			0.334

206 Multivariable Cox regression model adjusted for age at recruitment, smoking, ethnicity, physical activity level, Townsend deprivation index, alcohol intake
 207 frequency, employment status, educational qualifications, BMI, 22 UKB centers, number of births, age at menarche, menopausal status, age at first birth, ever
 208 use of oral contraceptive pill use, ever use of hormone replacement therapy, family history of breast cancer, stratified by quartile of PRS. P values for the excess
 209 risk due to interaction (RERI) of overall PRS, ER+ PRS and ER- PRS are 0.052, 0.034, and 0.136 respectively.

210 We found an interaction between processed meat intake and alcohol consumption on breast
211 cancer risk. Recent large prospective studies found that alcohol intake was related to breast cancer
212 risk^[28-30], which was probably hormonally driven^[31-33]. Alcohol has also been suggested to have
213 toxic effects and these effects were mediated by DNA damage and carcinogenic effects of alcohol
214 and through mutagenesis by acetaldehyde and by induction of oxidative damage^[34-36]. Simultaneous
215 consumption of processed meat and alcohol might increase CYP2E1 expression, leading to
216 increased oxidative stress and DNA damage. CYP2E1 then enhanced the activation of DNA
217 damaged ROS by ethanol and ROS production, and activated PhIP through a single electron
218 oxidation, which could trigger or maintain the tumor environment^[34]. One plausible mechanisms for
219 the synergic effect between processed meat and alcohol is that, when alcohol is consumed together
220 with processed meat, alcohol may enhance the penetration of carcinogenic compounds (the
221 genotoxicity of PhIP in the presence of ethanol) in processed meat as a solvent^[7]. This possibility
222 was further confirmed by our finding that the interaction was only observed among women who
223 usually took alcohol together with the meal.

224 In the current study, we observed the association between processed meat intake and risk of
225 breast cancer in women with the highest quartile of the PRSs. Moreover, the slight higher risk of
226 breast cancer among women with high processed meat and ER+ PRS than overall PRS may reflect
227 a stronger association with ER-positive disease^[39,40]. Our finding of the additive interaction between
228 ER+ PRS and processed meat further suggested the role of genetic testing in individualized dietary
229 intervention for breast cancer. However, to date, fewer studies to our knowledge have examined the
230 combined effect of processed meat and breast cancer associated genes on breast cancer risk. Further
231 studies are need to confirm our findings.

232 The main strength of our study is having a large sample size and a population-based cohort
233 design. Other strengths include the UK Biobank cohort containing rich lifestyle and genetic data,
234 which allowed us to explore the gene and lifestyle interactions for the associations investigated.
235 However, our study has several limitations. For one hand, there is no real ration of alcohol
236 consumption, but by frequency of alcohol consumption. For another, the data from the touchscreen
237 dietary questionnaire might suffer from recall bias. Finally, given the observational nature of this
238 study, it is possible that there is still unmeasured confounding, or residual confounding in our

239 analysis.

240 In conclusion, our findings support the view that processed meat can boost the risk of breast
241 cancer, and it's more obvious in postmenopausal women and women with genetic predisposition to
242 breast cancer. Furthermore, the association between breast cancer and processed meat were stronger
243 in women took alcohol, especially when the alcohol was usually taken with meals. A combined
244 intervention by reducing alcohol consumption with meals or avoiding processed meats when taking
245 alcohol might contribute to the prevention of breast cancer in women with genetically high risk.

246 **Funding**

247 This work was supported by the Natural Science Foundation of Fujian Province [grant no:
248 2021J01721], the Startup Fund for High-level Talents of Fujian Medical University [grant no:
249 XRCZX2020007], Startup Fund for Scientific Research, Fujian Medical University [grant no:
250 2019QH1002] and Laboratory Construction Program of Fujian Medical University [grant no:
251 1100160208]. The funders had no role in the study design, data collection, analyses, data
252 interpretation, writing the manuscript, or in the decision to submit the manuscript for publication.

253

254 **DECLARATIONS:**

255 **Competing interests:** The authors declare no competing interest.

256 **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

257 The UK Biobank was approved by the National Information Governance Board for Health and
258 Social Care and the National Health Service North West Centre for Research Ethics Committee
259 (Ref: 11/NW/0382, 17 June 2011). All participants gave informed consent to participate and be
260 followed-up.

261 **Author contributions:**

262 PZ, YZ and HY had full access to all data, and take responsibility for the integrity of the data and
263 the accuracy of the analysis. HY and ML conceived and designed the study. All authors acquired,
264 analyzed, or interpreted the data. PZ and HY drafted the manuscript. All authors critically revised
265 the manuscript for important intellectual content. PZ performed the statistical analysis. HY
266 obtained the funding. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

267 **Acknowledgements**

268 Not applicable.

269 **Date availability**

270 This research was conducted using the UK Biobank Resource under Application 61083. It has been
271 stated in the Material Transfer Agreement of this project that data may be used solely by the
272 Applicant PI and the related Applicant Researchers. However, data from the UK Biobank are open
273 to researchers upon application to conduct health-related research in the public interest. Researcher
274 can apply for the data through the link [https://www.ukbiobank.ac.uk/enable-your-research/apply-](https://www.ukbiobank.ac.uk/enable-your-research/apply-for-access)
275 [for-access](https://www.ukbiobank.ac.uk/enable-your-research/apply-for-access). The UK Biobank team will review the application.

276 **Code availability**

277 All statistical analyses were conducted by the following software tool: Stata 15.1. All codes
278 associated with the current submission is available, and can be requested by contacting the
279 corresponding authors.

280 **Authors' information**

281 Not applicable.

282


283 **References**

- 284 1. Ferlay J, Soerjomataram I, Dikshit R, et al. Cancer incidence and mortality worldwide: sources,
285 methods and major patterns in GLOBOCAN2012. *Int J Cancer* 2015;136:E359–86.
- 286 2. <http://globocan.iarc.fr/old/FactSheets/cancers/breast-new.asp>
- 287 3. Farvid MS, Stern MC, Norat T, et al. Consumption of red and processed meat and breast cancer
288 incidence: a systematic review and meta-analysis of prospective studies. *Int J Cancer*.
289 2018;143(11):2787–99.
- 290 4. Arthur RS, Wang T, Xue X, et al. Genetic Factors, Adherence to Healthy Lifestyle Behavior, and
291 Risk of Invasive Breast Cancer Among Women in the UK Biobank. *J Natl Cancer Inst*. 2020 Sep
292 1;112(9):893-901.
- 293 5. Cauchi JP, Camilleri L, Scerri C. Environmental and lifestyle risk factors of breast cancer in
294 Malta-a retrospective case-control study. *EPMA J*. 2016 Sep 20;7(1):20.
- 295 6. World Cancer Research Fund–American Institute for Cancer Research. Continuous update project
296 report. Food, nutrition, physical activity, and the prevention of breast cancer. [Wcrf.org/breast-](http://wcrf.org/breast-cancer-2017)
297 [cancer-2017](http://wcrf.org/breast-cancer-2017). Published 2017. Accessed May 31, 2017.
- 298 7. Lin S, Wang X, Huang C, Liu X, Zhao J, Yu IT, Christiani DC. Consumption of salted meat and
299 its interactions with alcohol drinking and tobacco smoking on esophageal squamous-cell carcinoma.
300 *Int J Cancer*. 2015 Aug 1;137(3):582-9. doi: 10.1002/ijc.29406. Epub 2015 Jan 8. PMID: 25544988.
- 301 8. Fry A, Littlejohns TJ, Sudlow C, et al. Comparison of sociodemographic and health-related
302 characteristics of UK Biobank participants with those of the general population. *Am J Epidemiol*
303 2017;186:1026–34.
- 304 9. Bycroft, C., Freeman, C., Petkova, D. et al. The UK Biobank resource with deep phenotyping and
305 genomic data. *Nature* 562, 203–209 (2018).
- 306 10. Mavaddat N, et al. Polygenic risk scores for prediction of breast cancer and breast cancer
307 subtypes. *Am. J. Hum. Genet*. 2019;104:21–34.
- 308 11. Guo J, Wei W, Zhan L. Red and processed meat intake and risk of breast cancer: a meta-analysis
309 of prospective studies. *Breast Cancer Res Treat*. 2015;151:191–8.
- 310 12. Anderson JJ, Darwis NDM, Mackay DF, et al. Red and processed meat consumption and breast

- 311 cancer: UKbiobank cohort study and meta-analysis. *Eur J Cancer* 2018;90:73–82.
- 312 13. Vermeer IT, Pachen DM, Dallinga JW, et al. Volatile N-nitrosamine formation after intake of
313 nitrate at the ADI level in combination with an amine-rich diet. *Environ Health Perspect.* 1998;
314 106(8):459–63.
- 315 14. Mirvish SS, Haorah J, Zhou L, et al. N-nitroso compounds in the gastrointestinal tract of rats
316 and in the feces of mice with induced colitis or fed hot dogs or beef. *Carcinogenesis.* 2003;
317 24(3):595–603.
- 318 15. Kazerouni N, Sinha R, Hsu CH, et al. Analysis of 200 food items for benzo[a]pyrene and
319 estimation of its intake in an epidemiologic study. *Food Chem Toxicol* 2001;39:423–36.
- 320 16. Knize MG, Sinha R, Salmon CP, et al. Formation of heterocyclic amine mutagens/carcinogens
321 during cooking of muscle meat. *J Muscle Foods* 1996;7:271–79.
- 322 17. Ito N, Hasegawa R, Sano M, et al. A new colon and mammary carcinogen in cooked food, 2-
323 amino-1-methyl-6-phenylimidazo[4,5-b]pyridine (PhIP). *Carcinogenesis* 1991;12:1503–06.
- 324 18. Shirai T, Tamano S, Sano M, et al. Carcinogenicity of 20-amino-1-methyl-6-phenylimidazo[4,5b]
325 pyridine (PhIP) in rats: dose response studies. In: Adamson R, Gustafsson JA, Ito N et al. (eds).
326 *Heterocyclic Amines in Cooked Foods: Possible Human Carcinogens.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton
327 Scientific Publication,1995.
- 328 19. El-Bayoumy K, Chae YH, Upadhyaya P, et al. Comparative tumorigenicity of benzo[a]pyrene,
329 1-nitropyrene and 2-amino-1-methyl-6-phenylimidazo[4,5-b]pyridine administered by gavage to
330 female CD rats. *Carcinogenesis* 1995;16:431–34.
- 331 20. Zheng W, Sang-Ah L. Well-done meat intake, heterocyclic amine exposure, and cancer risk.
332 *Nutr Cancer* 2009;61:437–46.
- 333 21. Mordukhovich I, Rossner P, Terry M, et al. Associations between polycyclic aromatic
334 hydrocarbon-related exposures and p53 mutations in breast tumors. *Environ Health Perspect*
335 2009;118:511–18.
- 336 22. Bonner MR, Han D, Nie J, et al. Breast cancer risk and exposure in early life to polycyclic
337 aromatic hydrocarbons using total suspended particulates as a proxy measure. *Cancer Epidemiol*
338 *Biomarkers Prev* 2005;14:53–60.
- 339 23. Gammon MD, Santella RM, Neugut AI, et al. Environmental toxins and breast cancer on Long

- 340 Island. I. Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon DNA adducts. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev*
341 2002;11:677–85.
- 342 24. Rundle A, Tang D, Hibshoosh H, et al. The relationship between genetic damage from polycyclic
343 aromatic hydrocarbons in breast tissue and breast cancer. *Carcinogenesis* 2000;21:1281–89.
- 344 25. Sinha R, Gustafson DR, Kulldorff M, et al. 2-amino-1-methyl-6-phenylimidazo[4,5-b]pyridine,
345 a carcinogen in high-temperature-cooked meat, and breast cancer risk. *J Natl Cancer Inst*
346 2000;92:1352–54.
- 347 26. Steck S, Gaudet M, Eng S, et al. Cooked meat and risk of breast cancer—lifetime versus recent
348 dietary intake. *Epidemiology* 2007;18:373–82.
- 349 27. Egeberg R, Olsen A, Autrup H, et al. Meat consumption, N-acetyl transferase 1 and 2
350 polymorphism and risk of breast cancer in Danish postmenopausal women. *Eur J Cancer Prev*
351 2008;17:39–47.
- 352 28. Lew JQ, Freedman ND, Leitzmann MF, et al. Alcohol and risk of breast cancer by histologic
353 type and hormone receptor status in postmenopausal women: the NIH-AARP Diet and Health Study.
354 *Am J Epidemiol.* 2009; 170:308–17.
- 355 29. Chen WY, Rosner B, Hankinson SE, et al. Moderate alcohol consumption during adult life,
356 drinking patterns, and breast cancer risk. *JAMA.* 2011; 306:1884–90.
- 357 30. Allen NE, Beral V, Casabonne D, et al. Moderate alcohol intake and cancer incidence in women.
358 *J Natl Cancer Inst.* 2009; 101:296–305.
- 359 31. Fernandez SV. Estrogen, alcohol consumption, and breast cancer. *Alcoholism, Clinical and*
360 *Experimental Research.* 2011; 35(3):389–391.
- 361 32. Gill J. The effects of moderate alcohol consumption on female hormone levels and reproductive
362 function. *Alcohol and Alcoholism.* 2000; 35(5):417–423.
- 363 33. Key TJ, Appleby PN, Reeves GK, et al. The endogenous hormones and breast cancer
364 collaborative group. Circulating sex hormones and breast cancer risk factors in postmenopausal
365 women: Reanalysis of 13 studies. *Br J Cancer.* 2011; 105(5):709–722.
- 366 34. Suzuki R, Orsini N, Mignone L, et al. Alcohol intake and risk of breast cancer defined by
367 estrogen and progesterone receptor status--a meta-analysis of epidemiological studies. *Int J Cancer.*
368 2008; 122(8):1832–1841.

- 369 35. Ristow H, Seyfarth A, Lochmann ER. Chromosomal damages by ethanol and acetaldehyde in
370 *saccharomyces cerevisiae* as studied by pulsed field gel electrophoresis. *Mutation Research*. 1995;
371 326(2):165–170.
- 372 36. Dumitrescu RG, Shields PG. The etiology of alcohol-induced breast cancer. *Alcohol*. 2005;
373 35(3):213–225.
- 374 37. Antoniou A, Pharoah PDP, Narod S, et al. Average risks of breast and ovarian cancer associated
375 with BRCA1 or BRCA2 mutations detected in case series unselected for family history: a combined
376 analysis of 22 studies. *Am J Hum Genet*. 2003;72(5):1117–1130.
- 377 38. Chen S, Parmigiani G. Meta-analysis of BRCA1 and BRCA2 penetrance. *J Clin Oncol*.
378 2007;25(11):1329–1333.
- 379 39. Holm, J., Li, J., Darabi, H., et al. (2016). Associations of breast cancer risk prediction tools with
380 tumor characteristics and metastasis. *J. Clin. Oncol*. 34, 251–258.
- 381 40. Li, J., Holm, J., Bergh, J., et al. (2015). Breast cancer genetic risk profile is differentially
382 associated with interval and screen-detected breast cancers. *Ann. Oncol*. 26, 517–522.
- 383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390



Supplementary figure1. Flowchart of the study