

Diet and Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis

Natalia Morozova,*† Marc G. Weisskopf,†‡ Marjorie L. McCullough,§ Cassandra L. Munger,*
Eugenia E. Calle,† Michael J. Thun,§ and Alberto Ascherio*†¶

Background: Several dietary factors have been associated with risk of amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (ALS) in case-control studies, but no prospective studies have investigated diet and ALS.

Methods: We prospectively assessed the association of selected foods and beverages with ALS mortality among participants of the Cancer Prevention Study II, a cohort of over 1 million men and women enrolled in 1982. Habitual diet was assessed with a 44-item food frequency questionnaire. Participant follow-up was conducted from 1989 through 2002 for ALS mortality.

Results: During the follow-up period, 862 cohort participants died of ALS. The strongest finding was an inverse association between chicken consumption and risk of ALS (P for trend = 0.0006). We also observed an increased risk of ALS among study participants with a high consumption of brown rice/whole wheat/barley (P for trend = 0.006) and decaffeinated coffee (P for trend = 0.01), and a decreased risk of ALS for high consumption of tea (P for trend = 0.02) and French fries (P for trend = 0.02); however, none of these latter associations remained significant after adjusting for multiple comparisons.

Conclusions: Overall, these results do not provide convincing evidence that the investigated food items are related to ALS mortality. The association observed between chicken consumption and ALS mortality should be assessed in other studies.

(*Epidemiology* 2008;19: 324–337)

The majority of amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (ALS) cases are sporadic, with familial cases accounting for only about 10% of all ALS cases.¹ Occupational exposure to neurotoxins,^{1,2} cigarette smoking,^{1,3,4} and dietary factors⁵ are

possible risk factors for ALS, but none of these is well established.⁶ Comprehensive case-control studies of diet and ALS have reported several associations with diet, including decreased risk associated with dietary intake of fiber,⁵ magnesium,⁷ and lycopene,⁷ polyunsaturated fatty acids,⁸ and vitamin E,⁸ and an increase in risk associated with dietary intake of fat and glutamate.⁵ The limitations of case-control studies in assessing relationships between diet and chronic disease are, however, well known.⁹ To date, no case-control studies have looked at foods or food groups; only individual nutrients have been studied in relation to ALS. Studies of nutrients are easiest to interpret biologically. Studies of foods and food groups, such as this one, however, are more practical because they enable exploratory analyses of disease for which few specific dietary hypotheses have been developed.⁹

We examined prospectively the relation between diet and risk of ALS among participants in the Cancer Prevention Study II cohort, comprising nearly 1.2 million men and women. We have previously reported an inverse association between use of vitamin E supplements and ALS mortality among participants of this cohort.¹⁰ Here we present the results of a comprehensive analysis of foods and beverages.

METHODS

Study Population

The Cancer Prevention Study II is a prospective study that began in 1982 when 77,000 American Cancer Society volunteers recruited 508,334 men and 676,288 women from 50 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico.¹¹ Eligible households had to have at least 1 member over the age of 45 years; all members over the age of 30 were invited to participate. Participants completed a 4-page questionnaire on diet, smoking history, alcohol intake, physical activity, height, weight, medical history, and other factors.

Participants were not given an opportunity specifically to report a history of ALS at baseline. Consequently, we excluded 65,836 participants who reported “any other serious disease” in their baseline 1982 questionnaire because they may have had ALS at baseline. We also excluded from food and food-group analyses those individuals who left all of 28 food questions blank or indicated consuming fewer than 5 of the 28 items listed on the questionnaire. From the beverage analysis, we excluded those who left the entire beverage

Submitted 17 April 2007; accepted 11 November 2007; posted 5 February 2008. From the Departments of *Nutrition, †Epidemiology, and ‡Environmental Health, Harvard School of Public Health, Boston, Massachusetts; §Epidemiology and Surveillance Research, American Cancer Society, Atlanta, Georgia; and ¶Channing Laboratory, Department of Medicine, Brigham and Women’s Hospital, and Harvard Medical School, Boston, Massachusetts.

Supported by NIDDK T32-DK07703 (Training Grant in Academic Nutrition, to N.M.) and by NIH/NINDS R01 NS045893.

Supplemental material for this article is available with the online version of the journal at www.epidem.com; click on “Article Plus.”

Correspondence: Natalia Morozova, Harvard School of Public Health, Department of Nutrition, 655 Huntington Avenue, Boston, MA 02215. E-mail: nmorozov@hsph.harvard.edu.

Copyright © 2008 by Lippincott Williams & Wilkins

ISSN: 1044-3983/08/1902-0324

DOI: 10.1097/EDE.0b013e3181632c5d

section blank and those who reported more than 10 servings of 2 or more beverages per day. Otherwise, blank values for a beverage were considered as zero consumption. We intended to exclude all participants who left the entire fried foods section blank, but after all other exclusions, there were no such participants in the analysis.

Case Ascertainment

The National Death Index was used to determine the vital status of the study participants through December 31, 2002.¹² We were able to obtain death certificates or codes for the cause of death for over 98% of known deaths. The International Classification of Diseases, 9th¹³ or 10th¹⁴ revision (ICD-9 or ICD-10), as appropriate, was used to code the underlying and contributing cause of death.¹⁵ We excluded follow-up time before January 1, 1989 because deaths from ALS were not coded separately before that date.³

For follow-up from January 1989 through the end of 1998, we considered as eligible cases all individuals who had ICD-9 code 335.20 (motor neuron disease) listed as either the underlying or contributing cause of death. For this segment of follow-up, we had 183 death certificates coded 335.2 available to us for review (108 for men and 75 for women); 164 (90%) were specified as ALS (ICD-9 code 335.20); 13 (7.1%) were specified only as motor neuron disease (ICD-9 code 335.2); 3 (1.6%) were illegible; 2 (1.1%) were specified as bulbar palsy; and 1 (0.6%), as progressive muscular dystrophy. Thus, only a small number of death certificates with ICD-9 code 335.2 did not have a diagnosis of ALS. Likewise, for follow-up from January 1999 through December 2002, ICD-10 code G12.2 (motor neuron disease) was used to identify the cases.

Assessment of Exposure and Other Covariates

The dietary questionnaire used in this study has been described previously.¹⁶ Participants were asked to report how many days per week they consumed each of the 34 foods listed on the questionnaire. For the present study, foods were grouped in a manner analogous to that used in prior work on this cohort.¹⁶ Food groups considered in the analyses included vegetables only, citrus fruits/juices, vegetables and citrus fruits, high fiber grains, low fiber grains, fatty meats, dairy, other fats, and fried foods. To construct food groups, aggregate measures were obtained by summing the contributions from the individual foods, treating all foods equivalently. Participants were also asked how many times per day they consumed 10 beverages at the time of the study and in the past. Therefore, in addition to considering beverage consumption at the time of the study, we also estimated the relative risk of ALS comparing individuals with consistently high (more than 1 serving/d both in the past and at the time of the study) versus those with consistently low (less than 1 serving/d both in the past and at the time of the study) consumption of individual beverages. Components of each

food group and the beverages are listed in eTable 1 (available with the online version of this article).

Participants were instructed to write "1/2" if they consumed foods less than once a week, but at least twice a month, and if they consumed beverages less than once a day, but at least 3 times a week. Unless all items were left blank, we assumed that blanks in the questionnaire represented nonconsumption, as there were no instructions to include a zero for nonconsumption.

Statistical Analysis

Follow-up of the study participants lasted from January 1, 1989 to the date of death or December 31, 2002, whichever came first.

We analyzed foods individually as well as grouped in the categories described above. Within strata of individual foods and beverages, we combined data from men and women, adjusting for sex. To examine possible differences in results between men and women, we repeated all analyses among men and women separately and verified that there were no significant differences (at the 95% confidence level) between the combined and sex-specific results. For food groups, to avoid an uneven distribution by sex across quintiles, we first created sex-specific consumption quintiles. All food group results were then pooled across sex. We performed tests of heterogeneity for the *P* for trend for each food group. With the exception of pooling, which was done using Stata 9.0 (StataCorp, College Station, TX), SAS version 8.2 (SAS Institute, Cary, NC) was used for all analyses.

For each individual food, we created categories of consumption based on distribution of intakes, collapsing categories until no group had fewer than 10 cases. We calculated relative risks (RRs) of ALS, adjusted for age (in 5-year age groups), by dividing ALS mortality rates among study participants in each consumption category by the corresponding mortality rate in the reference category (lowest consumption category), using Mantel-Haenszel weights. We estimated multivariate RRs and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) using Cox proportional hazards regression, adjusted for age, smoking (never, past, current),³ and vitamin E¹⁰ [categorized into nonusers, occasional users (<15 times per month), regular users (≥ 15 times per month) for less than 10 years, regular users for 10 years or longer, and missing or incomplete data]. The Cox models were stratified by age in single years to obtain a better adjustment.

We also considered the possibility that body mass index (BMI) or education could confound the diet-ALS association. Neither of these variables, however, was related to ALS mortality. In men, the RR for BMI comparing persons with BMI ranging from 24.7 to 27.8 kg/m² and from 27.8 to 31.3 kg/m² to those with a reference BMI (20.7–24.7 kg/m²) was 0.97 (95% CI = 0.79–1.20) and 0.99 (0.76–1.29), respectively. In women, these relative risks were 0.78 (0.60–1.04) and 0.95 (0.68–1.32) for the BMI categories above. Likewise, for education, the RR comparing those with some

college or more education to a reference category comprising those with high school diploma or less education was, in men, 1.08 (0.86–1.36) and, in women, 1.13 (0.89–1.45). The associations reported in this manuscript did not materially change when BMI or education were added to the models. Thus, we did not include BMI or education in our final models.

After exclusions, our dietary analyses included 891,920 participants (383,683 men and 508,237 women); 96,475 participants were excluded because they left all of 28 food questions blank or indicated consuming less than 5 of the 28 items listed on the questionnaire. Our beverage analysis included 956,918 participants; 28,201 respondents were excluded because they left the entire beverage section blank; and 3276 participants were excluded for having reported consumption of more than 10 servings per day of 2 or more beverages. This latter exclusion was because we thought it unlikely that a person would consume more than 10 servings per day of one beverage. We were concerned that respondents may have misinterpreted our beverage question and thus reported beverage consumption in days per week, as was the timeframe for foods, whereas for beverages the question on beverages asked about times per day.

In analysis of beverages, we partitioned beverage consumption into the following categories: 0, <1, 1, 2, 3, and 4 or more cups/d. For beverages, the tests for trend were based on these 6 categories.

Because of the exploratory nature of the study and the multiple analyses conducted, significant associations could easily arise by chance. To assist in the interpretation of the data, in addition to the unadjusted *P* values (defined as significant if <0.05), we have also reported whether associations were significant after Bonferroni correction (based on a total of 44 comparisons, and thus significant if $P < 0.001$).

RESULTS

The mean age of study participants in 1989 was 63.5 years for men and 63.0 years for women. During the follow-up period, we documented 862 ALS deaths among participants included in the dietary analyses (474 deaths among men and 388 deaths among women).

As expected, consumption of healthy foods such as citrus fruits and vegetables and whole fiber grains was associated with a higher education and a lower prevalence of smoking. More than 75% of men and 68% of women in the top quintile of fruit and vegetable consumption had completed college as compared with only 48% of men and 40% of women in the lowest consumption quintile. Only 14% of men and 16% of women in the highest fruit and vegetable consumption quintile were current smokers as compared with 28% of men and 25% of women in the bottom quintile. Opposite associations were found for fried foods and fatty

meats. For example, 27% of men and 21% of women in the highest quintile of fried food consumption were smokers as compared with only 13% of men and 18% of women in the bottom quintile. Major changes in diet in the past 10 years were reported more often by individuals in the top quintile of consumption of healthy foods (40% of men and 50% of women in the highest vegetable consumption quintile reported such changes as compared with only 23% of men and 31% of women in the bottom quintile), and by those in the bottom quintile of fried foods (49% of men and 53% of women) and fatty meats (42% of men and 51% of women), a result consistent with improvement in diet over time among participants of this cohort. These results are presented in eTable 2.

Overall, intakes of dairy, dairy and eggs, fatty meats, low fat meats, fried foods, high fiber grains, low fiber grains, other fats, vegetables, and citrus fruit were not associated with risk of ALS (Table 1). The tests for heterogeneity by sex were not significant for any of the food groups; therefore, we also present results combining men and women.

Results from our analysis of individual foods are presented in Table 2. High intake of brown rice/whole wheat/barley was associated with an increased risk of ALS (*P* for trend = 0.006), whereas high consumption of chicken (*P* for trend = 0.0006) and French fries (*P* for trend = 0.02) was associated with a decreased risk. Only the association with chicken remained significant after adjusting for multiple comparisons.

Our beverage analysis was based on 932 ALS cases. The number of cases in the beverage analysis was different from that in the food analysis because of nonoverlapping exclusions in the 2 analyses, as described above. Among beverages (Table 3), high consumption of tea was associated with a decreased risk of ALS (*P* for trend = 0.02). In contrast, consumption of decaffeinated coffee was associated with an increased risk of ALS (*P* for trend = 0.01).

In combined analyses of past and current beverage consumption, individuals who reported consistently high wine consumption had a higher risk of ALS than those reporting a consistently low consumption (RR = 2.06; 95% CI = 1.20–3.45); no similar evidence for an association, however, was found for consumption of liquor (1.30; 0.85–1.98). None of the nonalcoholic beverages was related to ALS mortality in these analyses.

Because the accuracy of ALS diagnosis may decline with age, we repeated the analyses censoring participants who were more than 65 years old in 1989. For foods and food groups, the analysis included 514,675 subjects, of whom 393 were ALS cases. The main change in results after the exclusion of these older subjects was the disappearance of the positive trend associated in the overall cohort with the consumption of brown rice/whole wheat/barley (*P* for trend = 0.31) and French fries (*P* for trend = 0.54). In contrast, the

TABLE 1. Relative Risk of ALS Death According to Consumption of Various Food Groups by Quantities

Foods	Men					Women				
	Quantile Range (times/wk)	No. Persons	No. Cases	No. Person-Years	RR (95% CI)*	Quantile Range (times/wk)	No. Persons	No. Cases	No. Person-Years	RR (95% CI)*
Dairy										
Q1†	0–2.50	75,654	81	895,550	1.00	0–2.0	100,175	71	1,261,347	1.00
Q2	2.75–5.25	73,477	93	901,039	1.17 (0.87–1.58)	2.25–4.75	102,852	78	1,339,072	1.11 (0.80–1.53)
Q3	5.50–8.75	73,371	95	902,604	1.20 (0.89–1.62)	5.0–7.25	95,402	71	1,249,133	1.10 (0.79–1.53)
Q4	9.0–14.75	83,593	104	1,030,563	1.18 (0.88–1.57)	7.50–11.75	105,227	89	1,368,795	1.26 (0.92–1.73)
Q5	15.0–91.0	77,588	101	948,588	1.27 (0.95–1.70)	12.0–89.0	104,581	79	1,351,131	1.14 (0.83–1.58)
<i>P</i> for trend					0.18					0.38
<i>P</i> for heterogeneity										0.11
Dairy and Eggs										0.94
Q1†	0–4.25	73,149	99	872,267	1.00	0–3.75	93,678	74	1,180,435	1.00
Q2	4.5–7.75	72,506	75	890,261	0.76 (0.56–1.03)	4.0–6.75	98,838	73	1,284,624	0.96 (0.70–1.33)
Q3	8.0–11.75	82,395	98	1,010,949	0.88 (0.67–1.17)	7.0–9.75	103,537	68	1,348,452	0.86 (0.62–1.20)
Q4	12.0–17.75	78,568	109	964,269	1.04 (0.79–1.36)	10.0–14.50	109,762	95	1,433,316	1.15 (0.85–1.57)
Q5	18.0–98.0	77,068	93	940,600	0.93 (0.70–1.24)	14.75–92.0	102,422	78	1,322,653	1.04 (0.75–1.43)
<i>P</i> for trend					0.66					0.45
<i>P</i> for heterogeneity										0.42
Fatty Meats										0.73
Q1†	0–3.75	59,964	85	711,822	1.00	0–3.25	99,030	76	1,245,711	1.00
Q2	4.0–5.75	71,894	102	872,891	1.03 (0.77–1.37)	3.5–4.75	76,641	59	984,573	1.03 (0.73–1.44)
Q3	6.0–7.75	81,307	101	997,220	0.93 (0.70–1.25)	5.0–6.75	120,934	99	1,573,233	1.12 (0.83–1.52)
Q4	8.0–10.75	88,615	108	1,091,675	0.94 (0.70–1.25)	7.0–8.75	96,369	71	1,261,021	1.05 (0.76–1.45)
Q5	11.0–56.0	81,903	78	1,004,738	0.75 (0.55–1.03)	9.0–56.0	115,263	83	1,504,942	1.04 (0.76–1.43)
<i>P</i> for trend					0.05					0.83
<i>P</i> for heterogeneity										0.16
Low Fat Meats										0.15
Q1†	0	27,657	36	325,050	1.00	0–0.75	33,456	25	416,581	1.00
Q2	0.25–0.75	116,505	150	1,426,844	0.97 (0.67–1.39)	1.0–1.50	135,529	96	1,759,126	0.96 (0.62–1.50)
Q3	1.0–2.75	77,580	114	949,597	1.08 (0.74–1.57)	2.0–2.50	125,232	97	1,630,370	1.04 (0.67–1.61)
Q4	3.0–6.75	78,240	84	958,577	0.78 (0.53–1.15)	3.0–3.50	84,890	75	1,099,440	1.17 (0.75–1.85)
Q5	7.0–21.0	83,701	90	1,018,278	0.76 (0.52–1.12)	4.0–14.0	129,130	95	1,663,962	0.95 (0.61–1.48)
<i>P</i> for trend					0.02					0.92
<i>P</i> for heterogeneity										0.11
Fried Foods										0.08
Q1†	0–1.75	64,708	96	766,794	1.00	0–0.75	92,665	74	1,165,756	1.00
Q2	2–3.75	75,992	113	929,828	1.03 (0.78–1.35)	1.0–2.25	102,591	74	1,328,224	0.94 (0.68–1.30)
Q3	4–5.75	73,381	83	903,043	0.80 (0.60–1.08)	2.5–3.75	84,742	73	1,104,711	1.15 (0.83–1.59)
Q4	6–9.25	92,766	101	1,139,566	0.80 (0.60–1.06)	4.0–6.75	125,378	99	1,632,494	1.08 (0.79–1.46)
Q5	9.5–42.0	76,836	81	939,115	0.80 (0.59–1.08)	7.0–42.0	102,861	68	1,338,294	0.92 (0.68–1.29)
<i>P</i> for trend					0.06					0.78
<i>P</i> for heterogeneity										0.09
										0.38

(Continued)

TABLE 1. (Continued)

Foods	Men					Women					Pooled RR (95%CI)
	Quantile Range (times/wk)	No. Persons	No. Cases	No. Person-Years	RR (95% CI)*	Quantile Range (times/wk)	No. Persons	No. Cases	No. Person-Years	RR (95% CI)*	
High Fiber Grains											
Q1†	0	92,293	103	1,120,989	1.00	0	1,10,207	67	1,410,529	1.00	1.00
Q2	0.25–0.75	34,965	46	420,520	1.16 (0.82–1.64)	0.25–0.75	53,353	39	684,156	1.20 (0.81–1.78)	1.18 (0.91–1.53)
Q3	1.0–2.75	86,422	96	1,065,674	0.97 (0.73–1.28)	1.0–3.25	1,41,333	103	1,842,124	1.22 (0.90–1.66)	1.08 (0.88–1.33)
Q4	3.00–6.75	91,300	116	1,122,311	1.04 (0.79–1.35)	3.50–6.75	93,958	79	1,226,387	1.37 (0.99–1.90)	1.16 (0.95–1.43)
Q5	7.0–21.0	78,703	113	948,852	1.10 (0.84–1.45)	7.0–21.0	1,09,386	100	1,406,283	1.44 (1.05–1.97)	1.24 (1.01–1.52)
P for trend					0.51					0.03	0.05
P for heterogeneity											0.25
Low Fiber Grains											
Q1†	0–1.75	60,678	80	718,652	1.00	0–1.25	84,155	72	1,064,351	1.00	1.00
Q2	2.0–4.75	75,364	107	931,321	1.09 (0.82–1.46)	1.5–3.75	1,00,310	70	1,306,101	0.85 (0.61–1.18)	0.98 (0.79–1.22)
Q3	5.0–7.25	81,030	86	998,163	0.82 (0.60–1.11)	4.0–6.75	1,10,104	83	1,440,668	0.94 (0.69–1.29)	0.88 (0.70–1.09)
Q4	7.5–9.25	83,626	98	1,018,779	0.91 (0.67–1.22)	7.0–8.50	98,922	72	1,274,685	0.89 (0.64–1.24)	0.90 (0.72–1.13)
Q5	9.5–21.0	82,985	103	1,011,430	0.94 (0.70–1.26)	9.0–21.0	1,14,746	91	1,483,675	1.00 (0.73–1.36)	0.97 (0.78–1.20)
P for trend					0.33					0.79	0.58
P for heterogeneity											0.4
Other Fats											
Q1†	0–1.75	66,266	91	785,979	1.00	0–1.25	90,186	64	1,131,774	1.00	1.00
Q2	2.0–4.75	72,226	93	891,733	0.97 (0.72–1.29)	1.5–4.75	1,01,626	73	1,327,049	1.08 (0.77–1.51)	1.02 (0.82–1.27)
Q3	5–7.25	81,349	95	986,119	0.86 (0.64–1.14)	5.0–7.25	1,08,117	84	1,384,448	1.13 (0.82–1.57)	0.97 (0.78–1.20)
Q4	7.5–8.75	65,750	85	797,089	0.91 (0.68–1.22)	7.5–8.75	98,418	83	1,276,990	1.19 (0.86–1.66)	1.02 (0.82–1.27)
Q5	9.0–28.0	98,092	110	1,217,426	0.84 (0.64–1.11)	9.0–28.0	1,09,890	84	1,449,218	1.18 (0.85–1.63)	0.97 (0.78–1.19)
P for trend					0.18					0.26	0.8
P for heterogeneity											0.08
Vegetables											
Q1†	0–5.25	73,919	90	869,553	1.00	0–6.25	1,01,204	58	1,268,324	1.00	1.00
Q2	5.5–8.75	74,637	77	912,462	0.83 (0.61–1.12)	6.5–9.75	94,401	76	1,222,007	1.44 (1.02–2.03)	1.06 (0.84–1.33)
Q3	9.0–11.75	78,127	95	962,193	0.94 (0.70–1.25)	10.0–12.75	97,531	76	1,270,355	1.37 (0.97–1.93)	1.10 (0.88–1.37)
Q4	12.0–14.75	67,088	90	827,562	1.00 (0.75–1.35)	13.0–16.25	1,08,418	88	1,414,265	1.38 (0.99–1.93)	1.15 (0.92–1.44)
Q5	15.0–35.0	89,912	122	1,106,575	0.99 (0.75–1.30)	16.5–35.0	1,06,683	90	1,394,528	1.41 (1.01–1.97)	1.14 (0.92–1.41)
P for trend					0.64					0.09	0.13
P for heterogeneity											0.37
Vegetables and Citrus Fruit											
Q1†	0–7.75	73,206	88	866,226	1.00	0–8.75	92,754	53	1,167,137	1.00	1.00
Q2	8.0–12.25	77,785	80	951,511	0.83 (0.61–1.12)	9–13.75	98,477	74	1,274,161	1.35 (0.95–1.92)	1.02 (0.81–1.29)
Q3	12.5–15.75	66,548	73	818,265	0.85 (0.62–1.16)	14–17.75	1,04,089	84	1,353,332	1.41 (1.00–1.99)	1.07 (0.85–1.35)
Q4	16.0–20.25	85,706	117	1,055,122	1.01 (0.76–1.34)	18–21.75	97,521	83	1,271,905	1.44 (1.01–2.03)	1.16 (0.93–1.45)
Q5	20.5–42.0	80,438	116	987,221	1.03 (0.78–1.36)	22.0–42.0	1,15,396	94	1,502,944	1.34 (0.96–1.89)	1.15 (0.92–1.42)
P for trend					0.43					0.12	0.1
P for heterogeneity											0.53

*Adjusted for age (one year categories), vitamin E use, and smoking (never, past, current).

†Reference category.

TABLE 2. Relative Risk of ALS According to Consumption of Individual Foods

Food Servings/wk	No. Persons	No. Cases	No. Person-Years	RR (95% CI)*	RR (95% CI) [†]
Tomato					
<1 [‡]	266,552	220	2,317,306	1.00	1.00
2 to 3	274,377	267	2,430,450	1.17 (0.98–1.40)	1.16 (0.97–1.38)
4 to 5	224,903	258	1,995,934	1.34 (1.12–1.61)	1.35 (1.13–1.62)
6 or more	126,088	117	1,107,934	1.04 (0.83–1.30)	1.07 (0.86–1.34)
<i>P</i> for trend					0.17
Cabbage					
Never [‡]	170,101	151	1,464,381	1.00	1.00
<2	445,540	449	3,936,794	1.13 (0.94–1.36)	1.16 (0.96–1.40)
2 to 3	205,900	206	1,825,642	1.10 (0.89–1.36)	1.16 (0.94–1.43)
4 or more	70,379	56	624,807	0.87 (0.64–1.18)	0.95 (0.70–1.29)
<i>P</i> for trend					0.87
Green leafy vegetables					
<1 [‡]	159,973	140	1,364,420	1.00	1.00
2 to 3	170,089	156	1,493,820	1.07 (0.85–1.35)	1.06 (0.84–1.33)
4 to 5	232,863	224	2,071,195	1.09 (0.88–1.35)	1.09 (0.88–1.35)
6 or more	328,995	342	2,922,189	1.13 (0.93–1.38)	1.15 (0.94–1.40)
<i>P</i> for trend					0.16
Carrots					
Never [‡]	145,048	117	1,246,569	1.00	1.00
<1	440,322	442	3,891,218	1.22 (1.00–1.50)	1.26 (1.03–1.55)
2 to 3	207,891	198	1,835,147	1.11 (0.88–1.40)	1.17 (0.93–1.48)
4 or more	98,659	105	878,690	1.25 (0.96–1.62)	1.34 (1.03–1.75)
<i>P</i> for trend					0.18
Squash/corn					
Never [‡]	155,612	147	1,336,446	1.00	1.00
<1	497,520	500	4,404,222	1.08 (0.90–1.29)	1.09 (0.90–1.31)
2 to 3	200,507	178	1,773,226	0.96 (0.77–1.19)	0.97 (0.78–1.20)
4 or more	38,281	37	337,730	1.03 (0.72–1.48)	1.07 (0.75–1.54)
<i>P</i> for trend					0.70
Potatoes					
Never [‡]	59,730	52	518,018	1.00	1.00
<1	237,258	236	2,089,383	1.16 (0.86–1.56)	1.15 (0.85–1.55)
2 to 3	318,982	305	2,825,933	1.13 (0.85–1.52)	1.08 (0.81–1.45)
4 to 5	204,654	203	1,803,150	1.15 (0.85–1.57)	1.10 (0.81–1.49)
6 or more	71,296	66	615,138	1.08 (0.75–1.55)	0.98 (0.68–1.41)
<i>P</i> for trend					0.52
Raw vegetables					
Never [‡]	150,620	119	1,272,786	1.00	1.00
<1	223,196	234	1,959,091	1.34 (1.07–1.67)	1.40 (1.12–1.74)
2 to 3	182,502	168	1,622,342	1.17 (0.93–1.48)	1.23 (0.97–1.56)
4 to 5	143,664	143	1,285,073	1.23 (0.96–1.56)	1.34 (1.05–1.72)
6 or more	191,938	198	1,712,331	1.22 (0.97–1.53)	1.36 (1.08–1.72)
<i>P</i> for trend					0.11
Citrus fruit					
Never [‡]	110,824	104	953,178	1.00	1.00
<1	154,826	131	1,359,507	0.92 (0.71–1.19)	0.93 (0.72–1.21)
2 to 3	120,226	105	1,072,122	0.94 (0.72–1.24)	0.97 (0.74–1.27)
4 to 5	120,686	109	1,079,170	0.97 (0.74–1.27)	0.99 (0.75–1.30)
6 or more	385,358	413	3,387,647	1.08 (0.87–1.34)	1.12 (0.90–1.39)
<i>P</i> for trend					0.06

(Continued)

TABLE 2. (Continued)

Food Servings/wk	No. Persons	No. Cases	No. Person-Years	RR (95% CI)*	RR (95% CI)†
Brown rice/whole wheat/barley					
Never‡	441,905	384	3,848,651	1.00	1.00
<1	212,858	214	1,891,619	1.15 (0.98–1.36)	1.17 (0.99–1.38)
2 to 3	91,291	86	816,415	1.08 (0.85–1.36)	1.09 (0.86–1.38)
4 to 5	61,532	84	551,749	1.53 (1.21–1.94)	1.56 (1.23–1.98)
6 or more	84,334	94	743,189	1.20 (0.96–1.51)	1.22 (0.97–1.53)
P for trend					0.006
Bran/corn muffins					
Never‡	561,179	537	4,923,607	1.00	1.00
<1	255,898	253	2,271,638	1.04 (0.89–1.20)	1.06 (0.91–1.23)
2 to 3	47,196	46	414,793	1.00 (0.74–1.35)	1.02 (0.75–1.37)
4 to 5	27,647	26	241,585	0.93 (0.63–1.39)	0.94 (0.63–1.39)
P for trend					0.98
Oatmeal/shredded wheat/bran cereals					
Never‡	364,084	326	3,204,503	1.00	1.00
<1	222,100	231	1,968,443	1.15 (0.97–1.36)	1.16 (0.98–1.38)
2 to 3	138,130	126	1,219,038	0.96 (0.78–1.18)	0.96 (0.78–1.19)
4 to 5	83,340	88	734,480	1.07 (0.84–1.36)	1.08 (0.85–1.37)
6 or more	84,266	91	725,158	1.07 (0.84–1.35)	1.06 (0.83–1.34)
P for trend					0.84
Bread/rolls/biscuits					
Never‡	156,087	179	1,357,787	1.00	1.00
<1	210,247	196	1,855,677	0.85 (0.69–1.04)	0.84 (0.68–1.03)
2 to 3	149,260	137	1,332,354	0.86 (0.69–1.08)	0.84 (0.67–1.05)
4 to 5	122,855	109	1,095,594	0.84 (0.66–1.07)	0.82 (0.64–1.04)
6 or more	253,471	241	2,210,210	0.89 (0.74–1.09)	0.83 (0.69–1.01)
P for trend					0.19
Spaghetti/macaroni/white rice					
Never‡	122,698	107	1,049,248	1.00	1.00
<1	515,696	536	4,543,286	1.24 (1.01–1.53)	1.25 (1.01–1.54)
2 to 3	203,138	178	1,808,703	1.10 (0.86–1.41)	1.13 (0.89–1.44)
4 or more	50,388	41	450,386	1.10 (0.76–1.59)	1.10 (0.77–1.58)
P for trend					0.94
Cold (dry) cereals					
Never‡	370,657	336	3,259,574	1.00	1.00
<1	201,304	182	1,782,099	1.00 (0.84–1.20)	1.01 (0.84–1.21)
2 to 3	147,856	143	1,306,612	1.03 (0.84–1.25)	1.02 (0.84–1.24)
4 to 5	89,647	104	791,535	1.21 (0.97–1.51)	1.17 (0.94–1.46)
6 or more	82,456	97	711,803	1.18 (0.94–1.49)	1.12 (0.89–1.41)
P for trend					0.16
Beef					
Never‡	19,782	19	169,945	1.00	1.00
<1	233,136	234	2,016,705	1.02 (0.64–1.64)	0.97 (0.61–1.54)
2 to 3	412,217	395	3,638,530	0.99 (0.63–1.58)	0.94 (0.59–1.48)
4 to 5	194,439	187	1,738,060	1.08 (0.68–1.74)	0.97 (0.60–1.56)
6 or more	32,346	27	288,383	0.88 (0.49–1.60)	0.82 (0.45–1.48)
P for trend					0.68
Pork					
Never‡	196,827	186	1,710,966	1.00	1.00
<1	566,512	573	5,015,605	1.12 (0.95–1.32)	1.10 (0.93–1.30)
2 to 3	105,932	87	928,205	0.93 (0.72–1.20)	0.89 (0.69–1.15)
4 or more	22,649	16	196,847	0.78 (0.47–1.30)	0.71 (0.43–1.18)
P for trend					0.12

(Continued)

TABLE 2. (Continued)

Food Servings/wk	No. Persons	No. Cases	No. Person-Years	RR (95% CI)*	RR (95% CI)†
Ham					
Never‡	285,851	262	2,505,555	1.00	1.00
<1	544,944	549	4,814,607	1.12 (0.97–1.30)	1.11 (0.95–1.28)
2 or more	61,125	51	531,462	0.93 (0.69–1.26)	0.89 (0.66–1.20)
P for trend					0.98
Liver					
Never‡	549,673	529	4,855,355	1.00	1.00
Ever	342,247	333	2,996,268	0.98 (0.85–1.12)	0.99 (0.87–1.14)
P for trend					0.92
Bacon					
Never‡	359,519	349	3,149,696	1.00	1.00
<1	360,953	349	3,209,643	1.04 (0.89–1.20)	1.03 (0.89–1.20)
2 to 3	122,022	120	1,067,225	1.04 (0.84–1.28)	1.04 (0.84–1.28)
4 or more	49,426	44	425,060	0.92 (0.67–1.25)	0.92 (0.67–1.26)
P for trend					0.29
Sausage					
Never‡	314,001	306	2,740,286	1.00	1.00
<1	502,794	506	4,456,475	1.09 (0.94–1.25)	1.06 (0.91–1.22)
2 or more	75,125	50	654,862	0.74 (0.55–0.99)	0.69 (0.51–0.94)
P for trend					0.12
Smoked meat					
Never‡	589,793	549	5,179,577	1.00	1.00
<1	257,118	265	2,279,110	1.11 (0.96–1.29)	1.11 (0.96–1.28)
2 or more	45,009	48	392,937	1.14 (0.85–1.53)	1.09 (0.81–1.46)
P for trend					0.24
Fried hamburgers or beef					
Never‡	268,760	254	2,340,909	1.00	1.00
<1	396,127	392	3,505,374	1.09 (0.93–1.27)	1.08 (0.92–1.27)
2 to 3	190,717	190	1,684,223	1.13 (0.93–1.37)	1.15 (0.95–1.38)
4 or more	36,316	26	321,118	0.86 (0.57–1.29)	0.87 (0.58–1.31)
P for trend					0.60
Fried eggs					
Never‡	338,577	297	2,972,769	1.00	1.00
<1	326,146	356	2,895,068	1.28 (1.09–1.49)	1.28 (1.10–1.49)
2 to 3	157,788	144	1,384,259	1.07 (0.88–1.30)	1.07 (0.88–1.31)
4 to 5	39,391	36	343,975	1.08 (0.76–1.53)	1.09 (0.77–1.54)
6 or more	30,018	29	255,553	1.10 (0.75–1.61)	1.11 (0.76–1.63)
P for trend					0.33
Fried chicken					
Never‡	353,262	351	3,090,418	1.00	1.00
<1	413,429	403	3,667,198	1.02 (0.88–1.17)	1.02 (0.88–1.17)
2 or more	125,229	108	1,094,008	0.89 (0.72–1.11)	0.90 (0.73–1.12)
P for trend					0.18
Butter					
Never‡	569,547	545	4,985,818	1.00	1.00
<1	112,504	11	997,741	1.08 (0.88–1.32)	1.08 (0.88–1.33)
2 to 3	48,429	46	433,784	1.07 (0.79–1.45)	1.05 (0.78–1.42)
4 to 5	40,631	38	365,650	1.09 (0.78–1.51)	1.07 (0.77–1.48)
6 or more	120,809	122	1,068,632	1.10 (0.91–1.34)	1.10 (0.91–1.34)
P for trend					0.32
Cheese					
<1‡	316,736	289	2,739,608	1.00	1.00
2 to 3	288,998	303	2,560,203	1.16 (0.99–1.37)	1.18 (1.00–1.39)

(Continued)

TABLE 2. (Continued)

Food Servings/wk	No. Persons	No. Cases	No. Person-Years	RR (95% CI)*	RR (95% CI)†
4 to 5	193,218	189	1,725,981	1.11 (0.92–1.33)	1.14 (0.95–1.37)
6 or more	92,968	81	825,831	0.98 (0.77–1.26)	1.01 (0.79–1.30)
<i>P</i> for trend					0.69
Ice cream					
Never‡	183,799	158	1,598,351	1.00	1.00
<1	375,825	378	3,325,841	1.17 (0.97–1.41)	1.15 (0.96–1.39)
2 to 3	208,142	190	1,840,479	1.04 (0.84–1.29)	0.98 (0.79–1.21)
4 to 5	89,928	94	792,237	1.17 (0.91–1.51)	1.08 (0.84–1.40)
6 or more	34,226	42	294,716	1.38 (0.98–1.94)	1.23 (0.87–1.73)
<i>P</i> for trend					0.77
Chocolate					
Never‡	345,808	332	2,979,484	1.00	1.00
<1	352,158	350	3,136,100	1.06 (0.91–1.23)	1.07 (0.92–1.24)
2 to 3	129,176	118	1,156,962	0.99 (0.80–1.23)	1.00 (0.81–1.23)
4 or more	64,778	62	579,077	1.07 (0.82–1.41)	1.08 (0.83–1.42)
<i>P</i> for trend					0.69
Margarine					
Never‡	184,305	168	1,617,332	1.00	1.00
<1	116,499	116	1,014,986	1.09 (0.86–1.38)	1.11 (0.88–1.41)
2 to 3	86,206	84	769,955	1.11 (0.85–1.44)	1.11 (0.85–1.44)
4 to 5	103,363	94	926,364	1.03 (0.80–1.33)	1.03 (0.80–1.33)
6 or more	401,547	400	3,522,985	1.05 (0.88–1.26)	1.06 (0.89–1.27)
<i>P</i> for trend					0.81
French fries					
Never‡	435,237	454	3,792,399	1.00	1.00
<1	358,964	332	3,191,572	0.97 (0.84–1.11)	0.96 (0.84–1.11)
2 or more	97,719	76	867,653	0.86 (0.67–1.11)	0.89 (0.70–1.14)
<i>P</i> for trend					0.02
Other fried foods					
Never‡	580,501	574	5,078,567	1.00	1.00
<1	194,478	185	1,734,236	1.00 (0.84–1.17)	0.99 (0.84–1.17)
2 to 3	91,720	86	814,598	1.01 (0.80–1.26)	1.02 (0.81–1.28)
4 or more	25,221	17	224,222	0.75 (0.46–1.22)	0.77 (0.47–1.24)
<i>P</i> for trend					0.26
Chicken					
Never‡	28,623	33	244,919	1.00	1.00
<1	460,236	488	4,054,162	0.91 (0.64–1.30)	0.94 (0.66–1.34)
2 to 3	349,570	308	3,082,028	0.76 (0.53–1.08)	0.79 (0.55–1.13)
4 or more	53,491	33	470,514	0.52 (0.32–0.85)	0.58 (0.36–0.94)
<i>P</i> for trend					0.0006
Fish					
Never‡	135,950	130	1,180,120	1.00	1.00
<1	579,483	554	5,116,423	0.98 (0.81–1.18)	0.97 (0.80–1.18)
2 to 3	152,977	156	1,347,115	0.98 (0.78–1.24)	1.01 (0.80–1.28)
4 or more	23,510	22	207,966	0.92 (0.59–1.45)	0.97 (0.62–1.53)
<i>P</i> for trend					0.89
Eggs					
<1‡	364,563	365	3,196,299	1.00	1.00
2 to 3	334,447	323	2,961,705	0.97 (0.83–1.12)	0.98 (0.84–1.14)
4 to 5	120,040	110	1,064,071	0.94 (0.76–1.16)	0.94 (0.76–1.17)
6 or more	72,870	64	629,548	0.87 (0.67–1.14)	0.83 (0.64–1.09)
<i>P</i> for trend					0.18

*Adjusted for age (5-year categories).

†Adjusted for age (1-year categories), smoking (never, past, current), and vitamin E use.

‡Reference category.

TABLE 3. Relative Risk of ALS According to Current Beverage Consumption

Beverage	No. Persons	No. Cases	No. Person-Years	RR (95% CI)*	RR (95% CI) [†]
Tea					
0 cups [‡]	466,914	495	5,827,186	1.00	1.00
Seasonal/occasional	12,316	7	146,560	0.54 (0.25–1.13)	0.58 (0.28–1.23)
3–6 cups/wk	160,535	156	2,044,525	0.90 (0.75–1.07)	0.95 (0.80–1.14)
1 cup/d	137,151	132	1,729,783	0.90 (0.74–1.09)	0.93 (0.77–1.13)
2 cups/d	96,045	87	1,219,526	0.85 (0.68–1.07)	0.89 (0.71–1.12)
3 cups/d	37,820	29	483,540	0.73 (0.50–1.07)	0.78 (0.54–1.13)
4 or more cups/d	46,137	32	585,285	0.68 (0.48–0.97)	0.71 (0.49–1.01)
<i>P</i> for trend					0.02
Diet soda or diet iced tea					
0 cups	669,351	671	8,321,550	1.00	1.00
Seasonal/occasional	8047	5	97,572	0.61 (0.25–1.48)	0.70 (0.29–1.68)
3–6 cups/wk	113,940	115	1,474,518	1.01 (0.83–1.24)	1.11 (0.91–1.36)
1 cup/d	84,109	77	1,091,402	0.97 (0.77–1.23)	1.04 (0.82–1.32)
2 cups/d	44,172	34	571,380	0.84 (0.59–1.19)	0.91 (0.64–1.29)
3 cups/d	16,842	16	217,585	1.06 (0.65–1.75)	1.16 (0.70–1.90)
4 or more cups/d	20,457	20	262,399	1.09 (0.70–1.70)	1.17 (0.75–1.83)
<i>P</i> for trend					0.62
Nondiet colas					
0 cups	738,708	724	9,225,297	1.00	1.00
Seasonal/occasional	7557	11	92,796	1.50 (0.83–2.73)	1.61 (0.89–2.92)
3–6 cups/wk	117,046	114	1,513,285	1.07 (0.87–1.30)	1.04 (0.85–1.27)
1 cup/d	55,482	49	714,968	1.03 (0.77–1.37)	0.96 (0.72–1.29)
2 cups/d	21,469	23	276,572	1.30 (0.86–1.97)	1.23 (0.81–1.86)
3 cups/d	7535	7	97,054	1.15 (0.55–2.43)	1.10 (0.52–2.32)
4 or more cups/d	9121	10	116,434	1.38 (0.74–2.58)	1.31 (0.70–2.46)
<i>P</i> for trend					0.33
Other nondiet soft drinks					
0 cups	835,993	816	10,495,992	1.00	1.00
Seasonal/occasional	6697	7	81,434	1.04 (0.49–2.18)	1.12 (0.53–2.36)
3–6 cups/wk	72,529	68	931,883	0.96 (0.75–1.23)	0.97 (0.76–1.24)
1 cup/d	25,112	25	319,281	1.07 (0.72–1.59)	1.03 (0.69–1.53)
2 cups/d	9084	12	114,326	1.44 (0.82–2.55)	1.39 (0.79–2.47)
3 cups/d	3249	5	41,061	1.70 (0.70–4.09)	1.65 (0.69–3.98)
4 or more cups/d	4254	5	52,429	1.33 (0.55–3.20)	1.29 (0.54–3.11)
<i>P</i> for trend					0.18
Milk					
0 cups	570,585	576	7,207,486	1.00	1.00
Seasonal/occasional	7332	8	86,880	1.10 (0.55–2.22)	1.14 (0.56–2.28)
3–6 cups/wk	142,063	105	1,802,196	0.75 (0.61–0.93)	0.74 (0.60–0.91)
1 cup/d	144,431	145	1,806,030	1.02 (0.85–1.22)	0.96 (0.80–1.15)
2 cups/d	60,153	68	738,788	1.16 (0.90–1.49)	1.07 (0.83–1.38)
3 cups/d	17,086	23	210,812	1.42 (0.94–2.16)	1.30 (0.85–1.97)
4 or more cups/d	15,268	13	184,215	0.90 (0.52–1.56)	0.80 (0.46–1.39)
<i>P</i> for trend					0.99
Coffee					
0 cups	348,531	347	4,319,863	1.00	1.00
Seasonal/occasional	10,711	12	129,620	1.20 (0.67–2.13)	1.16 (0.65–2.07)
3–6 cups/wk	50,992	33	641,756	0.64 (0.45–0.92)	0.64 (0.45–0.91)
1 cup/d	102,500	97	1,278,665	0.93 (0.74–1.17)	0.91 (0.73–1.14)
2 cups/d	151,305	127	1,917,171	0.82 (0.67–1.01)	0.80 (0.65–0.98)
3 cups/d	110,903	120	1,420,351	1.09 (0.89–1.35)	1.05 (0.85–1.29)
4 or more cups/d	181,976	202	2,328,978	1.16 (0.98–1.39)	1.09 (0.91–1.31)
<i>P</i> for trend					0.28

(Continued)

TABLE 3. (Continued)

Beverage	No. Persons	No. Cases	No. Person-Years	RR (95% CI)*	RR (95% CI)†
Decaffeinated coffee					
0 cups	621,323	594	7,849,364	1.00	1.00
Seasonal/occasional	7737	7	89,773	0.94 (0.44–1.97)	1.00 (0.47–2.11)
3–6 cups/wk	59,050	60	745,701	1.01 (0.77–1.32)	1.07 (0.82–1.39)
1 cup/d	91,357	81	1,134,012	0.86 (0.68–1.08)	0.89 (0.71–1.12)
2 cups/d	81,205	71	1,014,425	0.86 (0.67–1.10)	0.88 (0.69–1.13)
3 cups/d	42,469	46	531,216	1.07 (0.79–1.45)	1.09 (0.81–1.47)
4 or more cups/d	53,777	79	671,914	1.49 (1.18–1.89)	1.48 (1.17–1.88)
<i>P</i> for trend					0.01
Beer					
0 cups	739,346	722	9,289,226	1.00	1.00
Seasonal/occasional	11,703	15	143,077	1.34 (0.80–2.23)	1.27 (0.76–2.12)
3–6 cups/wk	112,507	103	1,435,483	0.96 (0.78–1.18)	0.82 (0.67–1.02)
1 cup/d	37,348	44	473,168	1.25 (0.92–1.69)	1.02 (0.75–1.38)
2 cups/d	25,066	24	313,851	1.05 (0.70–1.58)	0.84 (0.56–1.27)
3 cups/d	11,843	13	148,105	1.22 (0.71–2.12)	0.97 (0.56–1.69)
4 or more cups/d	19,105	17	233,495	1.03 (0.64–1.66)	0.80 (0.49–1.30)
<i>P</i> for trend					0.30
Wine					
0 cups	718,784	666	8,957,406	1.00	1.00
Seasonal/occasional	14,640	13	181,617	0.93 (0.54–1.61)	1.01 (0.58–1.75)
3–6 cups/wk	139,944	165	1,817,383	1.26 (1.07–1.50)	1.30 (1.09–1.54)
1 cup/d	44,244	46	572,661	1.11 (0.82–1.49)	1.12 (0.83–1.51)
2 cups/d	23,814	29	307,884	1.32 (0.91–1.91)	1.36 (0.93–1.97)
3 cups/d	6578	9	85,074	1.50 (0.78–2.90)	1.52 (0.79–2.94)
4 or more cups/d	8914	10	114,381	1.21 (0.65–2.26)	1.24 (0.66–2.32)
<i>P</i> for trend					0.07
Liquor					
0 cups	705,039	652	8,872,153	1.00	1.00
Seasonal/occasional	16,027	19	198,289	1.23 (0.78–1.95)	1.27 (0.80–2.01)
3–6 cups/wk	123,244	131	1,575,138	1.12 (0.93–1.36)	1.06 (0.88–1.28)
1 cup/d	45,878	55	574,153	1.24 (0.94–1.63)	1.13 (0.86–1.49)
2 cups/d	38,363	36	474,229	0.95 (0.68–1.33)	0.87 (0.62–1.22)
3 cups/d	13,538	25	164,955	1.94 (1.30–2.90)	1.73 (1.16–2.59)
4 or more cups/d	14,829	20	177,489	1.45 (0.93–2.26)	1.28 (0.82–2.00)
<i>P</i> for trend					0.10

*Adjusted for age (5-year categories).

†Adjusted for age (1-year categories), smoking (never, past, current), Vitamin E use, and gender (male, female).

‡Reference category.

inverse trend for chicken (P for trend = 0.0007) remained strong. A marginally significant positive trend with the consumption of tomatoes (P for trend = 0.03) was also present in this subgroup. In the beverage analysis, excluding participants over 65 years old at baseline resulted in 544,473 participants and 422 ALS cases. The decreased risk associated with consumption of tea (P for trend = 0.005) and the increased risk associated with consumption of decaffeinated coffee (P for trend = 0.03) remained marginally significant. As in the main analysis, only the association with chicken was significant after we applied the Bonferroni correction.

Contrary to a prior observation of an association between high fat consumption and increased risk of ALS,⁵ fatty

meat, dairy, and other sources of fat were not associated with risk of ALS in our study.

DISCUSSION

To our knowledge, this is the first prospective study of diet and ALS. Other exposures, such as military service,¹⁷ occupation,¹⁸ smoking,³ and vitamin E consumption,¹⁰ have been studied with relation to ALS in the Cancer Prevention Study II cohort, but this is the first analysis of foods and food groups as potential risk factors for ALS in this cohort. We found an inverse association between frequency of chicken consumption and ALS mortality. Consumption of tea and French fries was also associated with decreased ALS mortal-

ity, whereas consumption of brown rice/whole wheat/barley and decaffeinated coffee were associated with increased risk. However, only the association with chicken consumption was significant at a level <0.001 , the level that corrects for multiple comparisons.

The most important factor that constrains the interpretation of our findings is that our dietary questionnaire assessed only a limited number of foods. Thus, we could not provide accurate estimates of nutrient intakes to directly refute or support those of other studies. For the same reason, we also could not adjust for total caloric intake when examining the individual food item/group associations. Further, although the questionnaire adopted in this study has not been directly validated, the instrument replicates known associations of diet and colon cancer.¹⁶

The hypotheses generated by previous studies on diet and ALS include potential adverse effects of glutamate and high fat intake, and possible protective effects of high fiber, omega-3 fatty acids, and vitamin E. Although these hypotheses cannot be directly assessed in our study, we examined whether intake of foods rich in these nutrients was related to risk of ALS. Glutamate is the primary excitatory neurotransmitter in the brain. According to the "glutamate hypothesis," overexcitation of glutamate receptors leads to an elevation of intracellular calcium, which can cause the selective neuron death characteristic of ALS.^{19,20} Glutamate is found in most foods that contain protein, but is particularly high in tomatoes, mushrooms, milk, and cheese.⁵ It is unknown whether dietary glutamate affects neurotransmission. In most areas of the brain, glutamate does not normally cross the blood-brain barrier.²¹ However, there exist areas of the brain called the "circumventricular organs" that are vulnerable to large fluctuations in plasma glutamate.²¹ In a population-based case-control study in western Washington State, Nelson et al⁵ reported a dose-response association of glutamate with risk of ALS. Subjects in the highest quartile of glutamate or fat intake had approximately a 3-fold higher risk of ALS compared with those in the bottom quartile. In our study, we did not see significant associations with meats, vegetables, or dairy products, which are the primary sources of glutamate; in fact, some protein sources (eg, chicken) were strongly inversely related to risk. In the same case-control study, high fat intake was found to be associated with an increased risk of ALS, whereas high fiber intake was associated with a reduced risk.⁵ In our cohort, we did not find an association between intake of fatty or high fiber foods and ALS. In contrast, brown rice/whole wheat/barley was associated with higher risk, but this finding may have been due to chance; it did not remain significant after adjustment for multiple comparisons.

In a separate case-control study, dietary polyunsaturated fatty acids and vitamin E intake were found to be associated with a reduced risk of ALS⁸; the risk was 50% to 60% lower comparing highest with lowest tertiles of intake.

The 2 nutrients appeared to be acting synergistically, and the interaction between them was statistically significant. Omega 3 polyunsaturated fatty acids (eicosapentanoic acid, docosahexanoic acid, and alpha-linolenic acid) are known to have anti-inflammatory properties,²² whereas vitamin E could be beneficial because of its antioxidant effects.²³ Results of several studies suggest that oxidative damage may increase the risk of ALS mortality^{10,24–26} and that antioxidants may be protective.⁵ We did not observe a decreased risk of ALS for any of the foods that are high in omega 3 polyunsaturated fatty acids (fish, green leafy vegetables). We also did not see a decreased risk of ALS in foods potentially high in vitamin E (mainly green leafy vegetables, of which some are high in this vitamin, as intake of nuts or vegetable oils was not measured in this study). However, as previously reported,¹⁰ regular use of vitamin E supplements was strongly associated with a decreased risk of ALS in this cohort.

Previous studies have not reported specific associations between individual foods or beverages and risk of ALS. We observed an association between high tea consumption and decreased risk of ALS. Ho et al²⁷ reported that treatment of ALS model mice with epigallocatechin gallate, a constituent of green tea, significantly prolonged the symptom onset and lifespan. In humans, Kuriyama et al²⁸ reported an inverse association between higher consumption of green tea and cognitive impairment. Consumption of vegetables and citrus fruit, however, which are the primary sources of dietary antioxidants such as carotenoids and flavonoids, was not associated with a reduction in ALS risk.

A case-control study by Nelson et al,⁴ looked at alcohol intake in relation to risk of ALS, but found no association. We did not find any relation between ALS and consumption of beer, wine, or liquor.

The strong inverse association between chicken consumption and ALS mortality was not expected a priori. The remaining associations were not statistically robust or supported by a biologic hypothesis, and most likely were due to chance.

There are 2 important limitations of this study. One is that we used ALS mortality as an end point because we did not have data on ALS incidence. Although this may introduce some misclassification of outcome, mortality is considered a reasonable proxy, for incidence, due to the highly fatal prognosis of ALS, and bias from this source is probably modest. Several authors^{29–31} have pointed out the limitations of using death certificate data to ascertain ALS, such as regional variability and the inability of some clinicians to distinguish ALS from other neurologic disorders. However, death certificates remain a valuable tool for large epidemiologic studies of ALS, and are widely used.^{17,32–35} Also, although the questionnaire used in this study has not been validated using an independent method of dietary assessment, a subset comprising 184,194 participants completed a more

detailed and validated food frequency questionnaire in 1992. The correlations between the food intakes reported in 1982 (used in this study) and the corresponding intakes in 1992 were as follows—in men: carrots 0.31, high fiber grains 0.16, chicken 0.19, fried chicken 0.32, and tomatoes 0.30; correlations in women: carrots 0.30, high fiber grains 0.15, chicken 0.18, fried chicken 0.35, and tomatoes 0.30. Tea and coffee were not included in the 1992 questionnaire, but for liquor, a beverage recorded in both questionnaires, the correlation coefficient was 0.53 in men and 0.52 in women.

The other, more important, limitation is that not all foods were included in the dietary questionnaire, and we were thus unable to accurately estimate nutrient intakes. A nutrient analysis would have been very useful for comparing our results with previous work on diet and ALS^{5,7} and to address specific hypotheses based on experimental findings and biologic mechanisms. Although studies of nutrients contribute most directly to our knowledge of biologic processes, studies that focus on foods and food groups give an opportunity to explore the data when a specific hypothesis has not been formulated.⁹ Additionally, foods are inherently more than just their nutrient composition, as exemplified by the difference in the physiologic effects of milk and yogurt.⁹ Additionally, studies of foods rather than specific nutrients are more practical, as they can be linked directly to dietary recommendations.⁹ Finally, as in all observational studies, confounding by unmeasured factors is a possibility. These limitations are in part compensated for by the unique strength of a prospective design, which minimizes the possibility of recall and selection bias. Both recall and selection bias may have affected the results of previous investigations, which relied on a case-control design with retrospective assessment of dietary habits.

In summary, in this large prospective study, we did not find convincing evidence that the investigated food items are related to ALS mortality. Although the results suggested a possible protective effect of high chicken consumption, studies in other populations are needed to determine whether this association is reproducible.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Eilis O'Reilly, Al Wing, and Roshni Patel for their statistical and programming help.

REFERENCES

- Armon C. Environmental risk factors for amyotrophic lateral sclerosis. *Neuroepidemiology*. 2001;20:2–6.
- Nelson LM. Epidemiology of ALS. *Clin Neurosci*. 1995;3:327–331.
- Weisskopf MG, McCullough ML, Calle EE, et al. Prospective study of cigarette smoking and amyotrophic lateral sclerosis. *Am J Epidemiol*. 2004;160:26–33.
- Nelson LM, McGuire V, Longstreth WT, et al. Population-based case-control study of amyotrophic lateral sclerosis in western Washington State. I. Cigarette smoking and alcohol consumption. *Am J Epidemiol*. 2000;151:156–163.
- Nelson LM, Matkin C, Longstreth WT Jr, et al. Population-based case-control study of amyotrophic lateral sclerosis in western Washington State. II. *Diet*. *Am J Epidemiol*. 2000;151:164–173.
- Milonas I. Amyotrophic lateral sclerosis: an introduction. *J Neurol*. 1998;245(Suppl 2):S1–S3.
- Longnecker MP, Kamel F, Umbach DM, et al. Dietary intake of calcium, magnesium and antioxidants in relation to risk of amyotrophic lateral sclerosis. *Neuroepidemiology*. 2000;19:210–216.
- Veldink JH, Kalmijn S, Groeneveld G-J, et al. Intake of polyunsaturated fatty acids and vitamin E reduces the risk of developing ALS. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*. 2007;78:367–371.
- Willett W. *Nutritional Epidemiology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 1998.
- Ascherio A, Weisskopf MG, O'Reilly EJ, et al. Vitamin E intake and risk of amyotrophic lateral sclerosis. *Ann Neurol*. 2005;57:104–110.
- Thun MJ, Calle EE, Rodriguez C, et al. Epidemiological research at the American Cancer Society. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev*. 2000;9:861–868.
- Calle EE, Terrell DD. Utility of the National Death Index for ascertainment of mortality among cancer prevention study II participants. *Am J Epidemiol*. 1993;137:235–241.
- World Health Organization. International Classification of Diseases. Ninth Revision. Manual of the International Statistical Classification of Disease, Injuries, and Causes of Death. Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organization, 1977.
- World Health Organization. *International Statistical Classification of Diseases and Related Health Problems. Tenth Revision*. Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organization; 1992.
- World Health Organization. *International Classification of Diseases for Oncology*. 2nd ed. Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organization; 1990.
- Thun MJ, Calle EE, Namboodiri MM, et al. Risk factors for fatal colon cancer in a large prospective study. *J Natl Cancer Inst*. 1992;84:1491–500.
- Weisskopf MG, O'Reilly EJ, McCullough ML, et al. Prospective study of military service and mortality from ALS. *Neurology*. 2005;64:32–37.
- Weisskopf MG, McCullough ML, Morozova N, et al. Prospective study of occupation and amyotrophic lateral sclerosis mortality. *Am J Epidemiol*. 2005;162:1146–1152.
- Shaw PJ, Ince PG. Glutamate, excitotoxicity and amyotrophic lateral sclerosis. *J Neurol*. 1997;244(Suppl 2):S3–S14.
- Iwasaki Y, Ikeda K, Kinoshita M. Molecular and cellular mechanism of glutamate receptors in relation to amyotrophic lateral sclerosis. *Curr Drug Targets CNS Neurol Disord*. 2002;1:511–518.
- Smith QR. Transport of glutamate and other amino acids at the blood-brain barrier. *J Nutr*. 2000;130:1016–1022.
- Din JN, Newby DE, Flapan AD. Omega 3 fatty acids and cardiovascular disease—fishing for a natural treatment. *BMJ*. 2004;328(7430):30–35.
- Hampton T. Vitamin E derivative packs anticancer punch. *JAMA*. 2006;296:32.
- Cookson MR, Shaw PJ. Oxidative stress and motor neurone disease. *Brain Pathol*. 1999;9:165–186.
- Gurney ME, Cutting FB, Zhai P, et al. Benefit of vitamin E, riluzole, and gabapentin in a transgenic model of familial amyotrophic lateral sclerosis. *Ann Neurol*. 1996;39:147–157.
- Ferrante RJ, Browne SE, Shinobu LA, et al. Evidence of increased oxidative damage in both sporadic and familial amyotrophic lateral sclerosis. *J Neurochem*. 1997;69:2064–2074.
- Koh S-H, Lee SM, Kim HY, et al. The effect of epigallocatechin gallate on suppressing disease progression of ALS model mice. *Neurosci Lett*. 2006;395:103–107.
- Kuriyama S, Hozawa A, Ohmori K, et al. Green tea consumption and cognitive function: a cross-sectional study from the Tsurugaya Project 1. *Am J Clin Nutr*. 2006;83:355–361.
- Chio A, Magnani C, Oddenino E, et al. Accuracy of death certificate diagnosis of amyotrophic lateral sclerosis. *J Epidemiol Community Health*. 1992;46:517–518.
- Hoffman PM, Brody JA. The reliability of death certificate reporting for amyotrophic lateral sclerosis. *J Chronic Dis*. 1971;24:5–8.
- Hoffman PM, Brody JA. The accuracy of mortality statistics in clinically

- proven amyotrophic lateral sclerosis. *Trans Am Neurol Assoc.* 1970;95: 261–263.
32. Chio A. Mortality trends in ALS: an increasingly intricate puzzle. *Lancet Neurol.* 2005;4:453–454.
33. Seljeseth YM, Vollset SE, Tysnes OB. Increasing mortality from amyotrophic lateral sclerosis in Norway? *Neurology.* 2000;55:1262–1266.
34. Jokelainen M. The epidemiology of amyotrophic lateral sclerosis in Finland. A study based on the death certificates of 421 patients. *J Neurol Sci.* 1976;29:55–63.
35. Maasilta P, Jokelainen M, Loytonen M, et al. Mortality from amyotrophic lateral sclerosis in Finland, 1986–1995. *Acta Neurol Scand.* 2001; 104:232–235.