Associations between circulating metabolites and incidence of breast, prostate, lung and

colorectal cancers in the HUNT Study and UK Biobank

Marion Denos[1][*][§], Abhibhav Sharma[1][*], Bjørn Olav Åsvold[1,2], Alya G.A. Arham[1], George

Davey Smith[3], Nicholas J. Timpson[3], Mari Løset[1,4], Ben Michael Brumpton[1,5,6,#], Julia Debik[1,#],

Guro F. Giskeødegård[1,7,#]

[1] HUNT Center for Molecular and Clinical Epidemiology, Department of Public Health and Nursing,

Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim, Norway.

[2] Department of Endocrinology, Clinic of Medicine, St. Olavs Hospital, Trondheim, Norway.

[3] MRC Integrative Epidemiology Unit, University of Bristol, Bristol Medical School, University of

Bristol

[4] Department of Dermatology, Clinic of Orthopedy, Rheumatology and Dermatology, St. Olavs Hospital,

Trondheim University Hospital, Trondheim, Norway.

[5] HUNT Research Centre, Department of Public Health and Nursing, Norwegian University of Science

and Technology, Levanger, Norway.

[6] Clinic of Medicine, St. Olavs Hospital, Trondheim University Hospital, Trondheim, Norway.

[7] Department of Surgery, St. Olavs University Hospital, Trondheim, Norway

[*] Contributed equally [#] Shared last authorship

[§] **Corresponding author:** Marion Denos; Department of Public Health and Nursing, Norwegian

University of Science and Technology, Trondheim, Norway; marion.denos@ntnu.no

ORCID identifier: 0000-0003-4134-9156

Word count

Abstract: 281 words

Main text: 4140 words

Abstract

Background: Breast, prostate, lung and colorectal cancers are the most common cancers in both women and men globally. The role of circulating metabolites, including lipoprotein subfractions, in the development of these cancers remains unclear.

Objective: This prospective cohort study, including two large population-based cohorts, aimed to explore the associations between circulating metabolites and the incidence of breast, prostate, lung and colorectal cancers.

Methods: From the Trøndelag Health Study (HUNT) and the UK Biobank (UKBB), 132 lipoprotein subfractions and metabolites, quantified using nuclear magnetic resonance spectroscopy, were available for participants (n=16,877 in HUNT3, n=260,805 in UKBB). Cox regression was used to investigate the associations with incident cancers.

Results: During a mean follow-up time of 14 years, 549 women and 741 men developed breast (n= 283), prostate (n=452), lung (n=175) or colorectal (n=380) cancer in HUNT3, while 6679 women and 8248 men developed breast (n=4516), prostate (n=5576), lung (n=1985) or colorectal (n=2850) cancer in UKBB. In the UKBB, higher levels of several subfractions of lipoproteins including VLDL and LDL were associated with a slight decreased incidence of prostate and lung cancers (cholesterol in large LDL: HR per 1-SD increment 0.90, 95% CI 0.86-0.94 for lung cancer). Similar associations were observed between albumin, some fatty acids, and lung cancer. However, no clear associations were observed in HUNT3.

Conclusion: Several lipoprotein subfractions and circulating metabolites were associated with a reduced incidence of lung cancer, predominantly in UKBB. Although no conclusive evidence was found for a specific lipid or metabolite profile associated with the incidence of the most common cancers, the observed associations were generally consistent across cohorts. Our

47   results highlight promising directions for future research into metabolic biomarkers and their

48   potential role in cancer prevention.

Introduction

Globally around 20 million new cancer cases were reported in 2022, and predictions estimate this number to rise to 35 million by 2050 (1). Breast cancer (BC) is the most common cancer in women, while prostate cancer (PCa) ranks second in men (1). Lung cancer (LC) and colorectal cancers (CRC) are also among the most frequently diagnosed cancers in both sexes (1). Although several modifiable risk factors have been associated with cancer incidence, they only partially account for the observed rates. In BC, factors related to reproductive history and lifestyle have been identified, yet they only explain a small proportion of cases in high-income countries (2-7). For PCa, few lifestyle and environmental factors have been established; age, ethnicity, family history and genetic susceptibility are recognized contributors, while associations with smoking and body weight remain inconclusive (1, 3, 8-10). LC is primarily attributed to tobacco smoking, and is often diagnosed at an advanced stage, resulting in poor survival rates. This underscores the need for biomarkers that enable earlier detection (1, 11). CRC risk is associated with factors such as age, smoking, alcohol consumption and diet (12). However, its typically slow progression and lack of early symptoms pose challenges for timely diagnosis. While prostate-specific antigen is used as a diagnostic tool for PCa, it does not predict cancer risk. To date, no clinically established circulating risk markers exist for these four major cancer types.

Metabolomics captures the dynamic interaction between an individual and the surrounding environment, revealing insights closely related to the phenotype (13, 14). The metabolite profile thus reflects the biological condition, providing a snapshot of the organism's current state. Metabolites found in human biofluids may serve as biomarkers of current health and future disease risk, and previous studies have shown the potential of metabolomic biomarkers for disease risk (15-17). Altered cellular metabolism is a well-established hallmark of cancer (18). In particular, changes in the levels of specific lipids and small-molecular have been shown to

support anaerobic glycolysis, thereby meeting the elevated energy and biosynthetic demands of tumor growth (19, 20). However, the role of circulating metabolites and lipids in cancer risk remains inconclusive. Epidemiological studies have found a strong link between elevated blood lipid levels and a higher incidence and recurrence of PCa, while inhibiting lipid biosynthesis with statins has been shown to reduce mortality of BC, LC and colon cancer (21-23). Mass spectrometry (MS) and nuclear magnetic resonance (NMR) based case-control studies have reported varying results on associations between metabolic profiles of prediagnostic blood samples and incidence of BC, PCa, LC and CRC (24-37). Our previous case-control study, based on the second Trøndelag Health Study (HUNT2), found that high levels of very low-density lipoprotein (VLDL) subfractions in blood were associated with a reduced risk of BC in premenopausal women and revealed alterations in lipid metabolism many years before BC diagnosis (29). Recently, studies by Buergel et al. and Julkunen et al. utilized the initial release of UK Biobank metabolomics data from ~118,000 participants (38, 39). They reported no or weak associations between free circulating metabolite levels and incidence of BC, PCa or CRC while they identified several biomarkers for LC incidence (38, 39). Both studies did not account for reproductive factors as confounders in women, which might influence the associations. In contrast, other case-control studies with a prospective design have identified metabolite risk factors for PCa (32, 40, 41). Thus, studies exploring the association between metabolic biomarkers and risk of BC, PCa, LC and CRC have shown inconsistent results and require further investigation.

In this prospective cohort study, we aimed to investigate the associations between circulating lipoprotein subfractions and small-molecular metabolites and incidence of BC, PCa, LC and CRC using data from two large population-based cohorts for independent validation: The Trøndelag Health Study (HUNT) in Norway and the UK Biobank including Phase 1 and Phase 2 metabolomic data releases.

Methods

Study populations

HUNT3

The Trøndelag Health Study (HUNT) is a longitudinal population-based cohort study in Norway, including data from questionnaires, clinical measurements, and biological materials (42). The study enrolled participants aged ≥20 years in 4 health surveys: HUNT1 (1984-1986), HUNT2 (1995-1997), HUNT3 (2006-2008), and HUNT4 (2017-2019) (43). Of the 50,800 participants in HUNT3 (participation rate of 54.1%), a subset of 17,210 participants had serum metabolomics data quantified by NMR spectroscopy, generated by Nightingale Health (44). Each participant was followed up from the date of participation in HUNT3 until the date of first diagnosis of BC, PCa, LC or CRC, the date of death or emigration from Norway, or the end of the follow-up period in December 2023, whichever came first. Diagnoses of BC, PCa, LC and CRC were obtained from the Cancer Registry of Norway. Information on death was collected from the Norwegian Cause of Death Registry. Among the 17,210 participants, we excluded those with a prior diagnosis of the cancer under study (breast, prostate, lung, or colorectal) before inclusion into HUNT3, leaving on average 16,877 participants in the study population.

UK Biobank (UKBB)

UKBB is a large population-based prospective study of adults aged 40-69 years recruited in 2006-2010 (45). Among the 9.2 million individuals invited to the study, around 500,000 (5.5%) participated. A large range of health data, including questionnaires and blood samples, was collected in 22 assessment centers throughout the United Kingdom (UK) (45). Metabolic profiling of all participants' plasma samples is underway using the Nightingale Health NMR

platform, and here we used the second release of metabolomics data of 274,352 participants

(46). Participants were followed up from the participation date in UKBB to the date of first

diagnosis of BC, PCa, LC or CRC, the date of death or lost to follow-up, or the end of the

follow-up period in June 2022, whichever came first. UKBB linked data from the National

Cancer and Death Registries to its database. Among the 268,047 participants, we excluded those

with a prior diagnosis of the cancer under study (breast, prostate, lung, or colorectal) before

inclusion into UKBB, leaving on average 260,805 participants in the study population.

Metabolomics data

HUNT3

Metabolomics analysis of serum samples from 17,210 participants in HUNT3 was generated

by NMR spectroscopy using the Nightingale Health NMR biomarker platform (Supplementary

Table S1). The serum samples were non-fasting, with an average of 3 hours since the last meal.

The samples were analyzed in two batches. Batch 1 (n = 6201) was analyzed using a 600 MHz

Bruker AVANCE spectrometer, while batch 2 (n = 11009) was analyzed using one 500 MHz

spectrometer and one 600 MHz spectrometer. Batch 2 was adjusted for instrument effects using

repeated samples from 96 individuals that were measured at both instruments, by multiplying

samples analyzed on 500 MHz by a correction factor per variable, resulting in equal median

values for the repeated samples. Finally, batch 2 was adjusted towards batch 1 by multiplying

with a correction factor per variable that resulted in equal means in the two batches. This study

includes 132 metabolic variables quantified in absolute levels. The variables indicating ratios,

percentages and size based on diameters were excluded from the analysis. The metabolic

variables include lipoprotein subclasses, fatty acids, and small-molecular metabolites, such as

amino acids, ketone bodies, glycolysis metabolites, aromatic and branched chain amino acids.

Lipid concentrations and composition were measured for 14 lipoprotein subclasses, including

triglycerides, phospholipids, total cholesterol, cholesteryl esters, and free cholesterol, as well

as total lipid concentration for each subclass. The average biomarker detection rate was >99%

in the serum samples.

UKBB

Nightingale Health has performed metabolic profiling of plasma samples for all UKBB

participants. The plasma samples were non-fasting, with an average of 4 hours since the last

meal. Measurements took place in Finland, using 500 MHz NMR Bruker AVANCE

spectrometers in three different phases, as described elsewhere (39, 46). The first data release

covered metabolic variables from a random selection of 118,000, the second release, which we

used in the current study, added 157,000 samples, and the remaining were analyzed in the third

phase, which is not yet publicly available. Any observations with more than 10% missing

metabolite values or flagged with "Low protein" (indicating more severe sample dilution) were

removed before imputation. We conducted kNN imputation for data missing at random, and

quantile regression imputation of left-censored data (QRILC) for data missing not at random.

The same metabolic variables as described for HUNT3 were quantified in UKBB, of which 132

were included in this study.

Covariates

Weight and height were measured by health professionals during the clinical examination. Body

mass index (BMI) was calculated as weight divided by the squared value of height (kg/m^2) and

analyzed as a continuous variable. Information on sociodemographic (age, sex, marital status),

lifestyle (smoking status, alcohol consumption) and reproductive factors (age at menarche, age

at menopause, number of live births) was collected in questionnaires or through interviews in

both cohorts. Covariates were categorized as follows: smoking status (never, former, current),

alcohol consumption (never, 1-3, ≥4 times/month), and marital status (married, unmarried).

Women with unknown menopausal status were defined as premenopausal if they were below

51 years old at recruitment and as postmenopausal if aged 51 or above. The cut-off value of 51

years was chosen based on a large study of over 300,000 Norwegian women (47). The variable

IDs from both biobanks are provided in Supplementary Table S2.

Cancer ascertainment

Participants in HUNT3 was linked to the Cancer Registry of Norway using the 11-digit personal

identification number. The Cancer Registry of Norway provides accurate, close-to-complete

and timely data (48). In UKBB, participants were linked to the national cancer registry which

consolidates information from regional cancer centres and whose data are considered the gold

standard for ascertaining cancer outcomes in the UK (49, 50). Cancer diagnoses were classified

according to the Tenth Revision of the International Classification of Diseases (ICD10) as

follows: BC (C50), PCa (C61), LC (C33-C34) and CRC (C18-C20) (51).

Statistical analysis

Baseline characteristics of women and men in each cohort were described using mean and

standard deviation (SD) for continuous variables, and number of participants (%) for categorical

variables. Metabolomics data from UKBB were corrected for the NMR spectrometer used for

the measurements, following the procedure by Julkunen et al. (39). We fit a linear regression

model with log-transformed concentration as the outcome and spectrometer as the predictor.

Scaled residuals from this regression were used as predictors in the analyses. For each

metabolite, concentrations outside four interquartile ranges from the median were considered

outliers and excluded from the analyses.

Cox proportional hazard (PH) models were used to explore the potential associations of

metabolomics data with incidence of BC (in women), PCa (in men), LC and CRC, separately.

Analyses were sex specific for BC and PCa. Crude and adjusted hazard ratios (HR) with 95%

confidence intervals (CIs) were calculated with age as the time scale. The HRs were reported

per SD increment in the log-transformed metabolite concentrations. The models were adjusted

for potential confounders, including BMI, assessment center (for UKBB), smoking status, and

alcohol consumption. Additionally, analyses for BC were adjusted for age at menarche and

number of live births, while analyses for PCa were adjusted for marital status, and analyses for

LC and CRC were adjusted for sex. We also conducted stratified analyses based on women's

menopausal status for BC. P-values were corrected for multiple testing using the Benjamini-

Hochberg approach. To assess the robustness of the findings, we performed sensitivity analyses:

(1) we restricted the age at participation in HUNT3 from 40 to 69 years old to match the UKBB

age frame; (2) we excluded all participants with any type of cancer before baseline.

Partial least squares discriminant analysis (PLS-DA) was utilized to evaluate the comparability

of NMR data between the UKBB and HUNT3. PLS-DA was applied to metabolomic data from

each cohort to discriminate premenopausal and postmenopausal women. Five-fold cross-

validation was applied for model training. By examining the loadings of the most explanatory

latent variable, the study assessed the consistency of metabolic differences across the two

population cohorts. All statistical analyses were performed with R statistical software version

4.2.1 (R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria). Cox-PH analysis was

performed using the *survival* package in R (52). PLS-DA was performed using the *mixOmix*

package in R (53).

Results

Population characteristics

Table 1 outlines the characteristics of participants in the two cohorts separated by sex. The mean age of participants was around 52 years in HUNT3 and 56 years in UKBB. HUNT3 had a higher number of smokers, while UKBB participants had on average a more frequent alcohol consumption. Moreover, women in HUNT3 had an earlier age of menopause and a higher number of live births.

Among 16,877 participants in HUNT3, 283 women developed BC, 452 men developed PCa, 175 participants developed LC, and 380 participants developed CRC, during a follow-up time of 14 years. Among 260,805 participants in the UKBB, 4516 women developed BC, 5576 men developed PCa, 1985 participants developed LC, and 2850 participants developed CRC, over a 14-year follow-up period.

Lipoprotein and small molecule metabolite associations with cancer incidence

Hazard ratio plots from fully adjusted Cox regression models show the associations between metabolic variables and the incidences of BC (Figure 1), PCa (Figure 2), LC (Figure 3) and CRC (Figure 4).

No lipoprotein subfractions or circulating metabolites were associated with BC in UKBB or HUNT3 after adjusting for multiple testing (Figure 1). Hazard ratios and corresponding 95% CIs for age-adjusted and fully adjusted Cox models for BC are provided in Supplementary Data 1-2.

Several fatty acids and lipoprotein subfractions were associated with PCa in UKBB (Figure 2). Higher levels of total triglycerides in HDL were associated with a decreased PCa incidence in the UKBB cohort (HR per 1-SD increment 0.95, 95% CI 0.92-0.98). A similar trend was observed for LDL and VLDL subfractions. Fatty acids species, including monounsaturated fatty acids (MUFA) (HR 0.96, 95% CI 0.93-0.98) and total fatty acids (HR 0.96, 95% CI 0.93-0.98), were also associated with a decreased risk of PCa, while unsaturated fatty acids were associated

with an increased risk of PCa (HR = 1.05, 95% CI 1.02-1.08). There was no association between metabolic variables and PCa in HUNT3. Notably, the point estimates were in the opposite direction for some metabolic variables in HUNT3 compared to those observed in the UKBB. However, the 95% CIs were wide in HUNT3 due to its smaller sample size (Supplementary Data 1-2).

As presented in Figure 3, total cholesterol, total free cholesterol, and total phospholipids were inversely associated with LC incidence in the UKBB (total cholesterol: HR per 1-SD increment 0.93, 95% CI 0.88-0.97). These inverse associations were specifically evident in small and medium VLDL, all LDL and IDL particles. Apolipoprotein B (ApoB) was associated with a reduced LC risk (HR per 1-SD increment 0.92, 95% CI 0.88-0.96). Additionally, higher levels of fatty acids, including docosahexaenoic acid, linoleic acid, omega-3 and -6, and polyunsaturated fatty acids (PUFAs), were associated with a reduced risk of LC. Similarly, albumin level was inversely associated with LC as well as circulating levels of cellular membrane-based lipids, such as choline, phosphatidylcholine, and sphingomyelins. Conversely, glycolysis-related metabolites such as lactate and free circulating ketone bodies (acetone, beta-hydroxybutyrate) were positively associated with LC incidence, while acetate was negatively associated with LC. Notably, the inflammation marker glycoprotein acetylation (GlycA) was positively associated with LC incidence (HR per 1-SD increment 1.23, 95% CI 1.15-1.30). The results from HUNT3 were consistent with UKBB, although not statistically significant after multiple testing adjustment, likely due to the smaller sample size. Hazard ratios and CIs for age-adjusted and fully adjusted Cox models for LC are provided in Supplementary Data 1-2.

Higher level of albumin was associated with a reduced risk of CRC in the UKBB (HR per 1-SD increment 0.93, 95% CI 0.89-0.96) (Figure 4). Glycolysis-related metabolites such as glucose and free circulating ketone bodies (acetoacetate, acetone, beta-hydroxybutyrate) were positively associated with CRC incidence, although these associations were not statistically

significant after multiple testing correction. The inflammation marker GlycA was positively

associated with CRC incidence (HR per 1-SD increment 1.04, 95% CI 1.00-1.09), similarly to

its association with LC incidence. No lipoprotein subfractions or other metabolites were

associated with CRC in UKBB or HUNT3. Hazard ratios and CIs for age-adjusted and fully

adjusted Cox models for CRC are provided in Supplementary Data 1-2.

Sensitivity analysis

Given the previously reported differences in serum metabolomic profiles between

premenopausal and postmenopausal women (29), which were confirmed in our study

(Supplementary Figure S1), we conducted stratified analyses to investigate the associations of

metabolic variables with BC incidence in pre-diagnostic blood samples of premenopausal and

postmenopausal women separately. Several metabolic variables were inversely associated with

BCa in premenopausal women, but not in postmenopausal women, in UKBB. These included

total triglyceride levels, triglycerides and cholesterols in large VLDLs, cholesterol and

cholesteryl esters in LDL subfractions, all lipids in small HDL, in addition to several fatty acid

(Supplementary Figure S2, Supplementary Data 1-2). No clear associations were observed in

HUNT3.

Results remained similar when the analysis was performed in the age restricted HUNT3 cohort

(in both raw and adjusted models) (Supplementary Figures S3–6, Supplementary Data 1-2).

Moreover, the associations remained unchanged when participants with previous history of

cancer at baseline were excluded (Supplementary Data 3-4).

Table 1. Baseline characteristics of participants in HUNT3 and UK Biobank

	HUNT3		UK Biobank	
	Women	Men	Women	Men
Number of participants	9129	7748	139,684	121,121
Female breast cancer cases	283 (3.1)		4516 (3.2)	

Prostate cancer cases		452 (5.8)		5576 (4.6)
Lung cancer cases	91 (1.0)	84 (1.1)	950 (0.7)	1035 (0.8)
Colorectal cancer cases	175 (1.9)	205 (2.6)	1213 (0.8)	1637 (1.3)
Age at cancer diagnosis (yrs)	68.2 ± 12.2	71.8 ± 8.9	64.6 ± 8.2	67.9 ± 6.4
Age at participation (yrs)	51.8 ± 16.0	52.4 ± 15.4	56.3 ± 8.0	56.6 ± 8.2
Fasting time at blood collection (hours)	2.7 ± 2.1	2.9 ± 2.1	3.7 ± 2.3	3.9 ± 2.6
Body mass index (kg/m²)	26.8 ± 4.8	27.4 ± 3.7	27.1 ± 5.2	27.8 ± 4.2
Smoking status				
never	4006 (43.9)	3195 (41.2)	83,066 (59.5)	59,072 (48.8)
former	2566 (28.1)	2617 (33.8)	43,484 (31.1)	46,429 (38.3)
current	2293 (25.1)	1769 (22.8)	12,469 (8.9)	15,021 (12.4)
missing	264 (2.9)	167 (2.2)	545 (0.4)	489 (0.5)
Alcohol consumption (times/month)				
never	478 (5.2)	190 (2.5)	12,940 (9.3)	7605 (6.3)
1 - 3	5774 (63.2)	4027 (52.0)	39,050 (28.0)	19,556 (16.2)
≥4	2600 (28.5)	3413 (44.1)	87,439 (62.6)	93,692 (77.4)
missing	277 (3.0)	118 (1.5)	134 (0.1)	157 (0.1)
Age at menarche (yrs)	13.2 ± 1.4		12.5 ± 2.9	
Age at menopause (yrs)	48.6 ± 5.8		46.4 ± 13.4	
Number of live births (n)	2.5 ± 1.1		1.8 ± 1.2	
Marital status				
married	5233 (57.3)	4776 (61,7)	98,522 (70.5)	93,912 (77.5)
unmarried	3882 (42.5)	2956 (38.1)	41,162 (29.4)	27,209 (22.4)

287 Data are given as mean ± standard deviation or as number of individuals (%)

Breast Cancer

Figure 1. Hazard ratios (HR) of circulating metabolites in relation to breast cancer incidence were
assessed in HUNT3 (events = 283, n = 9129) and the UKBB (events = 4516, n = 139,684). The data are
presented as HRs per 1-SD increment with 95% confidence intervals (CIs), based on SD-scaled
concentrations. Cox proportional hazards regression models were adjusted for UKBB assessment center
(for UKBB), BMI, alcohol consumption, smoking status, menarche status, and number of live births,
with age used as the timescale. AA=Amino acids, AAA = Aromatic amino acids, ApoA1 =
Apolipoprotein A1, ApoB = Apolipoprotein B, bOHbutyrate = Beta-hydroxybutyrate, BCAA =
Branched-chain amino acids, CE = Cholesteryl esters, C = Cholesterol, DHA = Docosahexaenoic acid,
FC = Free cholesterol, GlycA = Glycoprotein Acetylation, HDL = High-density lipoprotein, LA =
Linoleic acid, LDL = Low-density lipoprotein, MUFA = Monounsaturated fatty acids, Phosphatidylc =
Phosphatidylcholine, Phosphoglyc = Phosphoglycerides, P = Phospholipids, PUFA = Polyunsaturated
fatty acids, SFA = Saturated fatty acids, TG = Triglycerides, Total FA = Total fatty acids, VLDL = Very
low-density lipoprotein, XXL = Extremely large, Ø = Diameter.

Prostate Cancer

Figure 2. Hazard ratios (HR) of circulating metabolites in relation to prostate cancer incidence were assessed in HUNT3 (events = 452, n = 7,748) and the UKBB (events = 5,576, n = 121,121). The data are presented as HRs per 1-SD increment with 95% confidence intervals (CIs), based on SD-scaled concentrations. Cox proportional hazards regression models were adjusted for UKBB assessment center (for UKBB), BMI, alcohol consumption, smoking status, marital status, with age used as the timescale. AA=Amino acids, AAA = Aromatic amino acids, ApoA1 = Apolipoprotein A1, ApoB = Apolipoprotein B, bOHbutyrate = Beta-hydroxybutyrate, BCAA = Branched-chain amino acids, CE = Cholesteryl esters, C = Cholesterol, Clinical_LDL_C, DHA = Docosahexaenoic acid, FC = Free cholesterol, GlycA = Glycoprotein Acetylation, HDL = High-density lipoprotein, LA = Linoleic acid, LDL = Low-density lipoprotein, MUFA = Monounsaturated fatty acids, Phosphatidylc = Phosphatidylcholine, Phosphoglyc = Phosphoglycerides, P = Phospholipids, PUFA = Polyunsaturated fatty acids, SFA = Saturated fatty acids, TG = Triglycerides, Total FA = Total fatty acids, VLDL = Very low-density lipoprotein, XXL = Extremely large, Ø = Diameter.

Lung Cancer

Figure 3. Hazard ratios (HR) of circulating metabolites in relation to lung cancer incidence were
assessed in HUNT3 (events = 175, n = 16,877) and the UKBB (events =1985, n = 260,805). The data
are presented as HRs per 1-SD increment with 95% confidence intervals (CIs), based on SD-scaled
concentrations. Cox proportional hazards regression models were adjusted for sex, UKBB assessment
center (for UKBB), BMI, alcohol consumption, smoking status, with age used as the timescale.
AA=Amino acids, AAA = Aromatic amino acids, ApoA1 = Apolipoprotein A1, ApoB = Apolipoprotein
B, bOHbutyrate = Beta-hydroxybutyrate, BCAA = Branched-chain amino acids, CE = Cholesteryl
esters, C = Cholesterol, Clinical_LDL_C, DHA = Docosahexaenoic acid, FC = Free cholesterol, GlycA
= Glycoprotein Acetylation, HDL = High-density lipoprotein, LA = Linoleic acid, LDL = Low-density
lipoprotein, MUFA = Monounsaturated fatty acids, Phosphatidylc = Phosphatidylcholine, Phosphoglyc
= Phosphoglycerides, P = Phospholipids, PUFA = Polyunsaturated fatty acids, SFA = Saturated fatty
acids, TG = Triglycerides, Total FA = Total fatty acids, VLDL = Very low-density lipoprotein, XXL =
Extremely large, Ø = Diameter.

Colorectal Cancer

Figure 4. Hazard ratios (HR) of circulating metabolites in relation to colorectal cancer incidence were assessed in HUNT3 (events = 380, n = 16,877) and the UKBB (events = 2850, n = 260,805). The data are presented as HRs per 1-SD increment with 95% confidence intervals (CIs), based on SD-scaled concentrations. Cox proportional hazards regression models were adjusted for sex, UKBB assessment center (for UKBB), BMI, alcohol consumption, smoking status, with age used as the timescale. AA=Amino acids, AAA = Aromatic amino acids, ApoA1 = Apolipoprotein A1, ApoB = Apolipoprotein B, bOHbutyrate = Beta-hydroxybutyrate, BCAA = Branched-chain amino acids, CE = Cholesteryl esters, C = Cholesterol, Clinical_LDL_C, DHA = Docosahexaenoic acid, FC = Free cholesterol, GlycA = Glycoprotein Acetylation, HDL = High-density lipoprotein, LA = Linoleic acid, LDL = Low-density lipoprotein, MUFA = Monounsaturated fatty acids, Phosphatidylc = Phosphatidylcholine, Phosphoglyc = Phosphoglycerides, P = Phospholipids, PUFA = Polyunsaturated fatty acids, SFA = Saturated fatty acids, TG = Triglycerides, Total FA = Total fatty acids, VLDL = Very low-density lipoprotein, XXL = Extremely large, Ø = Diameter.

Discussion

This prospective study explored the association between circulating metabolites, including lipoprotein subfractions and lipids, and the incidence of BC, PCa, LC or CRC, using data from two large cohorts: HUNT3 and the UKBB. Several metabolites were associated with cancer incidence in UKBB, particularly for LC. Higher levels of triglycerides were associated with a lower risk of PCa. In contrast, higher levels of most lipid concentrations in LDL and IDL subfractions, except triglycerides, were associated with lower risk of LC. No clear associations were observed for BC before analyses were stratified based on women's menopausal status, where several lipoprotein subfractions showed a protective association in premenopausal women. Higher levels of albumin were inversely associated with both LC and CRC, while the inflammation marker GlycA showed a positive association with both cancers. In addition, free circulating ketone bodies (acetone, beta-hydroxybutyrate) were positively associated with incidence of LC and CRC. Except for PCa, results from HUNT3 were generally consistent with UKBB, but with wider confidence intervals, likely due to smaller sample size.

Lipids, including fats, oils, phospholipids, sterols, and triglycerides, are essential for energy storage, membrane structure, and cellular signaling (26, 28, 54-58). Lipoproteins, transporters of lipids in the blood, are classified into five types—VLDL, IDL, LDL, HDL, and chylomicrons. While LDL carries triglycerides and cholesterol from the liver to tissues in the

endogenous pathway, HDL collects excess cholesterol from tissues and blood vessels and transports it back to the liver for removal (59). So far, few studies have investigated the role of lipoprotein subfractions in cancer risk. We found the level of several lipoprotein subfractions in the endogenous pathway to be inversely associated with LC. Inverse associations between LDL-cholesterol and lung cancer risk have been seen in other large prospective cohorts (60), and a Mendelian randomization study showed evidence for a causal effect of high levels of LDL-cholesterol on a reduced risk of LC (61). However, results are conflicting as a recent Mendelian randomization study reported no association between lipid subfractions and cancer risk (62). Furthermore, several prospective studies based on NMR reported inverse associations of free circulating lipids and fatty acids with long-term PCa risk (26, 55-58). In line with these studies, we observed negative associations between the levels of total lipids or total fatty acids and PCa risk in UKBB. Associations with fatty acid metabolites, which were also observed for LC incidence, may reflect dietary risk factors, or reflect metabolic shifts years before diagnosis, including increased β-oxidation (16, 63-65). We have previously reported inverse associations of lipid fractions in VLDL with BC incidence in premenopausal women (29), and this finding was replicated in premenopausal women in UKBB in the current study.

Positive associations of ketone bodies—acetoacetate, acetone, and β-hydroxybutyrate—were observed for all cancers in our study. Ketone bodies result mainly from fatty acid oxidation in the liver, and changes in ketone bodies may reflect metabolic reprogramming that both may promote or protect against cancer (66, 67).

Chronic low-grade inflammation is a well-known risk factor for cancer development, and tumor-promoting inflammation is one of the hallmarks of cancer (18). Blood levels of GlycA products are emerging as biomarkers for systemic inflammation (68-70). Our analyses indicated that elevated GlycA levels were associated with increased incidences of both LC and CRC. Similarly, low blood concentration of albumin may reflect inflammation (71), and albumin was

found to be inversely associated with incidence of LC, CRC and PCa. Surprisingly, neither GlycA nor albumin was associated with incidence of BC. Our results are not in agreement with a previous prospective case-cohort study in the EPIC cohort, which reported an inverse association between albumin levels and BC incidence, but not with PCa, LC, or CRC incidence (72). Thus, further studies are needed to determine the association between albumin and cancer risk.

Dietary factors may influence several circulating metabolite levels, including glycolysis metabolites, lipids, fatty acids, and glycerol-derived compounds which are all affected by dietary fat and carbohydrate intake (73-76). High-fat diets tend to elevate circulating lipid metabolites, whereas low-fat or calorie-restricted diets may reduce their availability. In this study, we did not account for dietary intake for two main reasons —a) due to the differences in the variables and questionnaires used to capture diet and lifestyle features between HUNT3 and UKBB and b) dietary questionnaires are predominantly self-reported, which may introduce a response bias. However, future investigations incorporating detailed dietary information are warranted.

As metabolite levels were measured in blood samples collected years before diagnosis in our study, the observed associations between metabolite concentrations and cancer incidence may reflect broader metabolic alterations that promote the development and growth of cancer cells. Comparing results from metabolomics studies poses certain challenges due to variations in population characteristics and analytical techniques (77). Metabolites in both cohorts were quantified by Nightingale Health; however, different blood sample types were used: EDTA-plasma in UKBB and serum in HUNT3, which may influence metabolite measurements. Nonetheless, replicating potential associations—both for individual metabolites and more broadly across metabolite classes—is crucial for reliable interpretation of findings. While metabolic associations in UKBB and HUNT3 were mainly showing the same trends for LC and

CRC, striking discrepancies were observed for PCa, suggesting potential cohort-specific differences in population characteristics, data collection methods, or underlying biological mechanisms.

The key strengths of this study include: 1) the utilization of two distinct and large population-based biobanks, 2) the use of NMR metabolomics, a highly robust method for quantifying metabolites and lipoproteins, and 3) a prospective design with extended follow-up. Additionally, we conducted a sensitivity analysis by excluding participants with any form of cancer prior to or at recruitment. The associations remained consistent, indicating no confounding influence from other malignancies on the observed relationships. The metabolic profiles for both UKBB and HUNT3 were measured in a non-fasting state, with only a one-hour difference in the average time since last meal, which likely had minimal impact, maintaining cohort comparability. However, differences in dietary habits between UKBB and HUNT3 could still pose a comparability issue. Previous studies have demonstrated that lipid levels exhibit minimal changes in response to typical food intake in the general population (73-76, 78), and that non-fasting lipid profiles could reliably predict an increased risk of cardiovascular events (79). However, some small-molecular metabolites are very sensitive to diet and may be affected by the time since last meal (80). Although HUNT3 mirrored the associations observed in UKBB for LC incidence, the lower number of cases in HUNT3 may have contributed to less precise results. The incidence of PCa in HUNT3 (5.9%) was higher than in UKBB (4.6%). This difference may explain the discrepancy in the direction of associations in the two cohorts, potentially due to varying baseline risk profiles or differing environmental and genetic factors influencing disease risk. Moreover, UKBB represents an older population, while HUNT3 encompasses a broader age range (18–100 years vs. 40–69 years). Additionally, the low participation rate in UKBB (5.5%) may have introduced selection bias, as participants tend to be healthier than non-participants (81). In contrast, HUNT3, with a

439 higher participation rate (54.1%), is considered more representative of the general population

440 (82).

Conclusion

This prospective metabolomic study examined the associations between blood metabolites and

the incidence of breast, prostate, lung and colorectal cancers in two large population biobanks.

The study highlights inverse associations between most lipids in LDL and IDL subfractions and

lung cancer incidence, predominantly observed in the UK Biobank. Similar associations were

observed for albumin and some fatty acids. Ketone bodies, including acetoacetate, acetone, and

β-hydroxybutyrate, as well as the inflammation-related metabolite glycoprotein acetylation,

showed positive associations with incidence of lung cancer. Although the direction of these

associations was generally consistent in the HUNT Study, none reached statistical significance,

likely due to the smaller sample size.

Supplementary material

454 Supplementary data is available on GitHub.

Competing interests

457 The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Ethics declarations

The UKBB study was approved by the Northwest Multi-Centre Research Ethics Committee (reference number

11/NW/0382). The use of UKBB data in the current study was approved by the Regional Committees for Medical

and Health Research Ethics (REK 427916). All participants signed an informed consent form. The UKBB database

was made in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki. The HUNT Study was approved by the Regional

Committee for Ethics in Medical Research (REK; reference number 468380). All participants signed informed
written consent on participation in HUNT, with linkage to previous HUNT surveys and specific registries in
accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki.

Acknowledgement

This research has been conducted using data from UK Biobank, a major biomedical database
(https://www.ukbiobank.ac.uk/), under application number 40135. The Trøndelag Health Study (The HUNT
Study) is a collaboration between HUNT Research Center (Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, NTNU,
Norwegian University of Science and Technology), Trøndelag County Council, Central Norway Regional Health
Authority, and the Norwegian Institute of Public Health.

Author contributions

MD, AS, BMB, JD and GFG designed the study. MD and AS performed the statistical analysis and drafted the
manuscript. This publication is the work of the authors. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Funding

The study was funded by the Norwegian Cancer Society (project number 221998-2021). Open access funding is
provided by the Norwegian University of Science and Technology - NTNU (including St. Olavs Hospital -
Trondheim University Hospital).

Data availability

The UK Biobank data are available to researchers, subject to successful registration and application process via
their website (https://www.ukbiobank.ac.uk/). Data from the HUNT Study used in research projects will, when
reasonably requested by others, be made available on request to the HUNT Data Access Committee. The HUNT
data access information describes the policy regarding data availability (https://www.ntnu.edu/hunt/data).

References

1.   Bray F, Laversanne M, Sung H, Ferlay J, Siegel RL, Soerjomataram I, et al. Global cancer

statistics 2022: GLOBOCAN estimates of incidence and mortality worldwide for 36 cancers in 185

countries. CA Cancer J Clin. 2024;74(3):229–63.

2.   Global cancer burden growing, amidst mounting need for services Lyon, France; Geneva,

Switzerland: World Health Organization (WHO); 2024 [Available from:

https://www.who.int/news/item/01-02-2024-global-cancer-burden-growing--amidst-mounting-need-

for-

services#:~:text=In%202022%2C%20there%20were%20an,women%20die%20from%20the%20disea

se.

3.   Cancer Registry of Norway. Norwegian Institute of Public Health. Cancer in Norway 2023 -

Cancer incidence, mortality, survival and prevalence in Norway. 2024.

4.   Nasjonalt handlingsprogram med retningslinjer for diagnostikk, behandling

og oppfølging av pasienter med brystkreft: Helsedirektoratet; 2024 [updated 12 Sep 2024; cited 2024.

Available from: https://www.helsebiblioteket.no/innhold/nasjonal-faglig-retningslinje/brystkreft-

handlingsprogram.

5.   Howell A, Anderson AS, Clarke RB, Duffy SW, Evans DG, Garcia-Closas M, et al. Risk

determination and prevention of breast cancer. Breast Cancer Res. 2014;16(5):446.

6.   Fabian CJ, Kimler BF, Hursting SD. Omega-3 fatty acids for breast cancer prevention and

survivorship. Breast Cancer Res. 2015;17(1):62.

7.   Huang J, Chan PS, Lok V, Chen X, Ding H, Jin Y, et al. Global incidence and mortality of

breast cancer: a trend analysis. Aging (Albany NY). 2021;13(4):5748–803.

8.   Rawla P. Epidemiology of Prostate Cancer. World J Oncol. 2019;10(2):63–89.

9.   Odedina FT, Akinremi TO, Chinegwundoh F, Roberts R, Yu D, Reams RR, et al. Prostate

cancer disparities in Black men of African descent: a comparative literature review of prostate cancer

burden among Black men in the United States, Caribbean, United Kingdom, and West Africa. Infect

Agent Cancer. 2009;4 Suppl 1(Suppl 1):S2.

10. Kimura T. East meets West: ethnic differences in prostate cancer epidemiology between East

Asians and Caucasians. Chin J Cancer. 2012;31(9):421–9.

11. Allemani C, Matsuda T, Di Carlo V, Harewood R, Matz M, Nikšić M, et al. Global

surveillance of trends in cancer survival 2000-14 (CONCORD-3): analysis of individual records for

37 513 025 patients diagnosed with one of 18 cancers from 322 population-based registries in 71

countries. Lancet. 2018;391(10125):1023–75.

12. Brenner H, Kloor M, Pox CP. Colorectal cancer. Lancet. 2014;383(9927):1490–502.

13. Baharum SN, Azizan KA. Metabolomics in Systems Biology. In: Aizat WM, Goh H-H,

Baharum SN, editors. Omics Applications for Systems Biology. Cham: Springer International

Publishing; 2018. p. 51–68.

14. Barrett JC, Esko T, Fischer K, Jostins-Dean L, Jousilahti P, Julkunen H, et al. Metabolomic

and genomic prediction of common diseases in 700,217 participants in three national biobanks. Nature

Communications. 2024;15(1):10092.

15. Armitage EG, Barbas C. Metabolomics in cancer biomarker discovery: Current trends and

future perspectives. Journal of Pharmaceutical and Biomedical Analysis. 2014;87:1–11.

16. Schmidt DR, Patel R, Kirsch DG, Lewis CA, Vander Heiden MG, Locasale JW. Metabolomics

in cancer research and emerging applications in clinical oncology. CA: A Cancer Journal for

Clinicians. 2021;71(4):333–58.

17. Mamas M, Dunn WB, Neyses L, Goodacre R. The role of metabolites and metabolomics in

clinically applicable biomarkers of disease. Archives of Toxicology. 2011;85(1):5–17.

18. Hanahan D. Hallmarks of Cancer: New Dimensions. Cancer Discov. 2022;12(1):31–46.

19. Koundouros N, Poulogiannis G. Reprogramming of fatty acid metabolism in cancer. British

Journal of Cancer. 2020;122(1):4–22.

20. Giallourou N, Urbaniak C, Puebla-Barragan S, Vorkas PA, Swann JR, Reid G. Characterizing

the breast cancer lipidome and its interaction with the tissue microbiota. Communications Biology.

2021;4(1):1229.

21. Pelton K, Freeman MR, Solomon KR. Cholesterol and prostate cancer. Curr Opin Pharmacol.

2012;12(6):751–9.

22. Shafique K, McLoone P, Qureshi K, Leung H, Hart C, Morrison DS. Cholesterol and the risk

of grade-specific prostate cancer incidence: evidence from two large prospective cohort studies with

up to 37 years' follow up. BMC Cancer. 2012;12:25.

23. Nielsen SF, Nordestgaard BG, Bojesen SE. Statin use and reduced cancer-related mortality. N

Engl J Med. 2012;367(19):1792–802.

24. Zeleznik OA, Balasubramanian R, Zhao Y, Frueh L, Jeanfavre S, Avila-Pacheco J, et al.

Circulating amino acids and amino acid-related metabolites and risk of breast cancer among

predominantly premenopausal women. NPJ Breast Cancer. 2021;7(1):54.

25. Lécuyer L, Dalle C, Lyan B, Demidem A, Rossary A, Vasson MP, et al. Plasma Metabolomic

Signatures Associated with Long-term Breast Cancer Risk in the SU.VI.MAX Prospective Cohort.

Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev. 2019;28(8):1300–7.

26. Kühn T, Floegel A, Sookthai D, Johnson T, Rolle-Kampczyk U, Otto W, et al. Higher plasma

levels of lysophosphatidylcholine 18:0 are related to a lower risk of common cancers in a prospective

metabolomics study. BMC Medicine. 2016;14(1):13.

27. His M, Viallon V, Dossus L, Gicquiau A, Achaintre D, Scalbert A, et al. Prospective analysis

of circulating metabolites and breast cancer in EPIC. BMC Medicine. 2019;17(1):178.

28. Lécuyer L, Victor Bala A, Deschasaux M, Bouchemal N, Nawfal Triba M, Vasson MP, et al.

NMR metabolomic signatures reveal predictive plasma metabolites associated with long-term risk of

developing breast cancer. Int J Epidemiol. 2018;47(2):484–94.

29. Debik J, Schäfer H, Andreassen T, Wang F, Fang F, Cannet C, et al. Lipoprotein and

metabolite associations to breast cancer risk in the HUNT2 study. Br J Cancer. 2022;127(8):1515–24.

30. Schmidt JA, Fensom GK, Rinaldi S, Scalbert A, Appleby PN, Achaintre D, et al. Patterns in

metabolite profile are associated with risk of more aggressive prostate cancer: A prospective study of

3,057 matched case-control sets from EPIC. Int J Cancer. 2020;146(3):720–30.

31. Lécuyer L, Victor Bala A, Demidem A, Rossary A, Bouchemal N, Triba MN, et al. NMR

metabolomic profiles associated with long-term risk of prostate cancer. Metabolomics. 2021;17(3):32.

32.   Schmidt JA, Fensom GK, Rinaldi S, Scalbert A, Appleby PN, Achaintre D, et al. Pre-

diagnostic metabolite concentrations and prostate cancer risk in 1077 cases and 1077 matched controls

in the European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition. BMC Med. 2017;15(1):122.

33.   His M, Viallon V, Dossus L, Gicquiau A, Achaintre D, Scalbert A, et al. Prospective analysis

of circulating metabolites and breast cancer in EPIC. BMC Med. 2019;17(1):178.

34.   Jobard E, Dossus L, Baglietto L, Fornili M, Lécuyer L, Mancini FR, et al. Investigation of

circulating metabolites associated with breast cancer risk by untargeted metabolomics: a case-control

study nested within the French E3N cohort. Br J Cancer. 2021;124(10):1734–43.

35.   Cross AJ, Moore SC, Boca S, Huang WY, Xiong X, Stolzenberg-Solomon R, et al. A

prospective study of serum metabolites and colorectal cancer risk. Cancer. 2014;120(19):3049–57.

36.   Vidman L, Zheng R, Bodén S, Ribbenstedt A, Gunter MJ, Palmqvist R, et al. Untargeted

plasma metabolomics and risk of colorectal cancer-an analysis nested within a large-scale prospective

cohort. Cancer Metab. 2023;11(1):17.

37.   Wikoff WR, Hanash S, DeFelice B, Miyamoto S, Barnett M, Zhao Y, et al. Diacetylspermine

Is a Novel Prediagnostic Serum Biomarker for Non-Small-Cell Lung Cancer and Has Additive

Performance With Pro-Surfactant Protein B. J Clin Oncol. 2015;33(33):3880–6.

38.   Buergel T, Steinfeldt J, Ruyoga G, Pietzner M, Bizzarri D, Vojinovic D, et al. Metabolomic

profiles predict individual multidisease outcomes. Nat Med. 2022;28(11):2309–20.

39.   Julkunen H, Cichońska A, Tiainen M, Koskela H, Nybo K, Mäkelä V, et al. Atlas of plasma

NMR biomarkers for health and disease in 118,461 individuals from the UK Biobank. Nat Commun.

2023;14(1):604.

40.   Huang J, Mondul AM, Weinstein SJ, Koutros S, Derkach A, Karoly E, et al. Serum

metabolomic profiling of prostate cancer risk in the prostate, lung, colorectal, and ovarian cancer

screening trial. Br J Cancer. 2016;115(9):1087–95.

41.   Kelly RS, Vander Heiden MG, Giovannucci E, Mucci LA. Metabolomic Biomarkers of

Prostate Cancer: Prediction, Diagnosis, Progression, Prognosis, and Recurrence. Cancer Epidemiol

Biomarkers Prev. 2016;25(6):887–906.

42.   Krokstad S, Langhammer A, Hveem K, Holmen TL, Midthjell K, Stene TR, et al. Cohort

Profile: the HUNT Study, Norway. Int J Epidemiol. 2013;42(4):968–77.

43.   Åsvold BO, Langhammer A, Rehn TA, Kjelvik G, Grøntvedt TV, Sørgjerd EP, et al. Cohort

Profile Update: The HUNT Study, Norway. Int J Epidemiol. 2023;52(1):e80–e91.

44.   Næss M, Kvaløy K, Sørgjerd EP, Sætermo KS, Norøy L, Røstad AH, et al. Data Resource

Profile: The HUNT Biobank. International Journal of Epidemiology. 2024;53(3).

45.   Sudlow C, Gallacher J, Allen N, Beral V, Burton P, Danesh J, et al. UK biobank: an open

access resource for identifying the causes of a wide range of complex diseases of middle and old age.

PLoS Med. 2015;12(3):e1001779.

46.   Nightingale Health. NMR metabolomics companion document (Phase 2 update) [21.11.2024].

Available from: https://biobank.ndph.ox.ac.uk/showcase/refer.cgi?id=130.

47.   Bjelland EK, Hofvind S, Byberg L, Eskild A. The relation of age at menarche with age at

natural menopause: a population study of 336 788 women in Norway. Hum Reprod. 2018;33(6):1149–

57.

48.   Larsen IK, Småstuen M, Johannesen TB, Langmark F, Parkin DM, Bray F, et al. Data quality

at the Cancer Registry of Norway: an overview of comparability, completeness, validity and

timeliness. Eur J Cancer. 2009;45(7):1218–31.

49.   Conroy MC, Lacey B, Bešević J, Omiyale W, Feng Q, Effingham M, et al. UK Biobank: a

globally important resource for cancer research. Br J Cancer. 2023;128(4):519–27.

50.   Møller H, Richards S, Hanchett N, Riaz SP, Lüchtenborg M, Holmberg L, et al. Completeness

of case ascertainment and survival time error in English cancer registries: impact on 1-year survival

estimates. Br J Cancer. 2011;105(1):170–6.

51.   World Health Organization. International classification of diseases for oncology (ICD-O). 3rd

ed: World Health Organization; 2013.

52.   Therneau TM. A Package for Survival Analysis in R. 2024.

53.   Rohart F, Gautier B, Singh A, Le Cao KA. mixOmics: An R package for 'omics feature

selection and multiple data integration. PLoS Computational Biology. 2017;13(11):e1005752.

54.   Bro R, Kamstrup-Nielsen MH, Engelsen SB, Savorani F, Rasmussen MA, Hansen L, et al.

Forecasting individual breast cancer risk using plasma metabolomics and biocontours. Metabolomics.

2015;11(5):1376–80.

55.   Schmidt JA, Fensom GK, Rinaldi S, Scalbert A, Appleby PN, Achaintre D, et al. Patterns in

metabolite profile are associated with risk of more aggressive prostate cancer: A prospective study of

3,057 matched case–control sets from EPIC. International Journal of Cancer. 2020;146(3):720–30.

56.   Schmidt JA, Fensom GK, Rinaldi S, Scalbert A, Appleby PN, Achaintre D, et al. Pre-

diagnostic metabolite concentrations and prostate cancer risk in 1077 cases and 1077 matched controls

in the European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition. BMC Medicine. 2017;15(1):122.

57.   Mondul AM, Moore SC, Weinstein SJ, Karoly ED, Sampson JN, Albanes D. Metabolomic

analysis of prostate cancer risk in a prospective cohort: The alpha-tocopherol, beta-carotene cancer

prevention (ATBC) study. International Journal of Cancer. 2015;137(9):2124–32.

58.   Mondul AM, Moore SC, Weinstein SJ, Männistö S, Sampson JN, Albanes D. 1-

stearoylglycerol is associated with risk of prostate cancer: results from serum metabolomic profiling.

Metabolomics. 2014;10(5):1036–41.

59.   Feingold KR. Introduction to lipids and lipoproteins. Endotext [internet]. 2024.

60.   Lyu Z, Li N, Wang G, Feng X, Chen S, Su K, et al. Independent and joint associations of

blood lipids and lipoproteins with lung cancer risk in Chinese males: A prospective cohort study. Int J

Cancer. 2019;144(12):2972–84.

61.   Carreras-Torres R, Johansson M, Haycock PC, Wade KH, Relton CL, Martin RM, et al.

Obesity, metabolic factors and risk of different histological types of lung cancer: A Mendelian

randomization study. PLoS One. 2017;12(6):e0177875.

62.   Carter P, Vithayathil M, Kar S, Potluri R, Mason AM, Larsson SC, et al. Predicting the effect

of statins on cancer risk using genetic variants from a Mendelian randomization study in the UK

Biobank. Elife. 2020;9.

63.   His M, Zelek L, Deschasaux M, Pouchieu C, Kesse-Guyot E, Hercberg S, et al. Prospective

associations between serum biomarkers of lipid metabolism and overall, breast and prostate cancer

risk. Eur J Epidemiol. 2014;29(2):119–32.

64.   Röhrig F, Schulze A. The multifaceted roles of fatty acid synthesis in cancer. Nat Rev Cancer.

2016;16(11):732–49.

65.   Günther UL. Metabolomics Biomarkers for Breast Cancer. Pathobiology. 2015;82(3-4):153–

65.

66.   Puchalska P, Crawford PA. Multi-dimensional Roles of Ketone Bodies in Fuel Metabolism,

Signaling, and Therapeutics. Cell Metab. 2017;25(2):262–84.

67.   Suresh VV, Sivaprakasam S, Bhutia YD, Prasad PD, Thangaraju M, Ganapathy V. Not Just an

Alternative Energy Source: Diverse Biological Functions of Ketone Bodies and Relevance of

HMGCS2 to Health and Disease. Biomolecules. 2025;15(4).

68.   Gruppen EG, Connelly MA, Vart P, Otvos JD, Bakker SJ, Dullaart RP. GlycA, a novel

proinflammatory glycoprotein biomarker, and high-sensitivity C-reactive protein are inversely

associated with sodium intake after controlling for adiposity: the Prevention of Renal and Vascular

End-Stage Disease study. Am J Clin Nutr. 2016;104(2):415–22.

69.   Chung CP, Ormseth MJ, Connelly MA, Oeser A, Solus JF, Otvos JD, et al. GlycA, a novel

marker of inflammation, is elevated in systemic lupus erythematosus. Lupus. 2016;25(3):296–300.

70.   Lawler PR, Akinkuolie AO, Chandler PD, Moorthy MV, Vandenburgh MJ, Schaumberg DA,

et al. Circulating N-Linked Glycoprotein Acetyls and Longitudinal Mortality Risk. Circulation

Research. 2016;118(7):1106–15.

71.   Sheinenzon A, Shehadeh M, Michelis R, Shaoul E, Ronen O. Serum albumin levels and

inflammation. International Journal of Biological Macromolecules. 2021;184:857–62.

72.   Kühn T, Sookthai D, Graf ME, Schübel R, Freisling H, Johnson T, et al. Albumin, bilirubin,

uric acid and cancer risk: results from a prospective population-based study. Br J Cancer.

2017;117(10):1572–9.

73.   Mensink RP, Katan MB. Effect of dietary fatty acids on serum lipids and lipoproteins. A meta-

analysis of 27 trials. Arteriosclerosis and Thrombosis: A Journal of Vascular Biology. 1992;12(8):911–

9.

74.   Ahrens E, Insull W, Blomstrand R, Hirsch J, Tsaltas T, Peterson M. THE INFLUENCE OF

DIETARY FATS ON SERUM-LIPID LEVELS IN MAN. The Lancet. 1957;269(6976):943–53.

75. Rasmussen OW, Thomsen C, Hansen KW, Vesterlund M, Winther E, Hermansen K. Effects on

Blood Pressure, Glucose, and Lipid Levels of High-Monounsaturated Fat Diet Compared With a High-

Carbohydrate Diet in NIDDM Subjects. Diabetes Care. 1993;16(12):1565–71.

76. Kinsell LW, Partridge J, Boling L, Margen S, Michaels G. Dietary modification of serum

cholesterol and phospholipid levels. J Clin Endocrinol Metab. 1952;12(7):909–13.

77. Yu Z, Kastenmüller G, He Y, Belcredi P, Möller G, Prehn C, et al. Differences between Human

Plasma and Serum Metabolite Profiles. PLOS ONE. 2011;6(7):e21230.

78. Schwingshackl L, Hoffmann G. Comparison of effects of long-term low-fat vs high-fat diets

on blood lipid levels in overweight or obese patients: a systematic review and meta-analysis. J Acad

Nutr Diet. 2013;113(12):1640–61.

79. Langsted A, Freiberg JJ, Nordestgaard BG. Fasting and nonfasting lipid levels: influence of

normal food intake on lipids, lipoproteins, apolipoproteins, and cardiovascular risk prediction.

Circulation. 2008;118(20):2047–56.

80. Giskeødegård GF, Andreassen T, Bertilsson H, Tessem MB, Bathen TF. The effect of sampling

procedures and day-to-day variations in metabolomics studies of biofluids. Anal Chim Acta.

2019;1081:93–102.

81. Fry A, Littlejohns TJ, Sudlow C, Doherty N, Adamska L, Sprosen T, et al. Comparison of

Sociodemographic and Health-Related Characteristics of UK Biobank Participants With Those of the

General Population. Am J Epidemiol. 2017;186(9):1026–34.

82. Langhammer A, Krokstad S, Romundstad P, Heggland J, Holmen J. The HUNT study:

participation is associated with survival and depends on socioeconomic status, diseases and symptoms.

BMC Med Res Methodol. 2012;12:143.