

Dietary and metabolic factors contributing to Barrett's esophagus: a univariate and multivariate Mendelian randomization study

Zijie Li^{1,2#}, Weitao Zhuang^{1,3#}, Junhan Wu^{1,2}, Haijie Xu^{2,4}, Yong Tang¹, Guibin Qiao^{1,2}

Affiliations

¹ Department of Thoracic Surgery, Guangdong Provincial People's Hospital (Guangdong Academy of Medical Sciences), Southern Medical University, Guangzhou 510080, China

² Shantou University Medical College, Shantou 515041, China

³ Department of Medical Oncology, State Key Laboratory of Oncology in South China, Collaborative Innovation Center for Cancer Medicine, Sun Yat-sen University Cancer Center, Guangzhou 510060, China

⁴ Department of Thoracic Surgery, The First Affiliated Hospital of Shantou University Medical College, Shantou 515041, China

These authors contributed equally to this work

Corresponding to

Guibin Qiao, MD, PhD

Department of Thoracic Surgery, Guangdong Provincial People's Hospital (Guangdong Academy of Medical Sciences), Southern Medical University, Guangzhou 510080, China

E-mail address: guibinqiao@126.com

1 **Abstract**

2 **Background:** Dietary and metabolic factors have been associated with the risk of
3 Barrett's esophagus (BE) in observational epidemiological studies. However, the
4 aforementioned associations may be influenced by confounding bias. The present
5 study aimed to evaluate these causal relationships through univariate and multivariate
6 Mendelian randomization (MR) analysis.

7 **Methods:** Genetic instruments associated with dietary and metabolic factors were
8 obtained in the large-scale genome-wide association studies (GWAS), respectively.
9 Summary data for BE were available from a GWAS of 13,358 cases and 43,071
10 controls of European descent. Univariable MR analysis was initially performed to
11 estimate the causal relationship between exposures and BE. The inverse-variance
12 weighted (IVW) method was adopted as the primary MR analysis. Multivariate MR
13 analysis was further conducted to evaluate the independent effects of exposures on
14 BE.

15 **Results:** In univariate MR analysis, BE was causally associated with higher body
16 mass index (odds ratio (OR) = 2.575, 95% confidence interval (CI): 2.301-2.880, P =
17 7.369E-61), larger waist circumference (OR = 2.028, 95% CI: 1.648-2.496, P =
18 2.482E-11), and smoking per day (OR = 1.241, 95% CI: 1.085-1.419, P = 0.002).
19 Dried fruit intake showed a protective effect on BE (OR = 0.228, 95% CI:
20 0.135-0.384, P = 2.783E-08), whereas alcohol drinking, coffee intake, tea intake, fresh
21 fruit intake, and type 2 diabetes mellitus were not associated with BE (P = 0.351, P =
22 0.458, P = 0.125, P = 0.847, P = 0.413, respectively). No pleiotropy was found in the
23 sensitivity analysis. The relationships of obesity, smoking, and dried fruit intake with
24 BE risk remained strong after adjustment.

25 **Conclusions:** Our study provided MR evidence supporting obesity and smoking were
26 independent risk factors for BE. Conversely, dried fruit intake was a protective factor
27 for BE.

28

29 **Abstract word:** 281

30

31 **Keywords:** Barrett's esophagus; Mendelian randomization; Obesity; Smoking;

32 Alcohol drinking; Dried fruit intake.

33

34 **Short title:** Contributing factors to Barrett's esophagus

35 **Background**

36 Barrett's esophagus (BE) is characterized by a metaplastic change in the distal
37 esophagus from normal squamous to a specialized columnar epithelium¹. The
38 prevalence of BE is approximately 1-2% in the population worldwide and is higher in
39 patients with gastroesophageal reflux disease (GERD). BE is a well-known precursor
40 lesion for esophageal adenocarcinoma (EAC), and the process of carcinogenesis has
41 been found to be a sequential progression from metaplasia to dysplasia to cancer².
42 Patients with BE have a 10 to 55-fold increased risk of developing EAC compared to
43 the general population¹. Therefore, primary prevention of BE is of particular
44 significance.

45 Numerous observational epidemiological studies have revealed several potential
46 influencing factors for BE, including obesity³, type 2 diabetes mellitus (T2DM)⁴,
47 smoking⁵, alcohol drinking^{6,7}, coffee and tea intake⁸, and fruit intake⁹. However, the
48 findings regarding the effects of these dietary and metabolic factors on BE from
49 previous studies are inconsistent even opposite to each other, which make the
50 identification of truly protective and risk factors for BE extremely difficult. For
51 example, previous studies have shown an association between smoking or excessive
52 alcohol drinking and the presence of BE^{5,6}, whereas several other case-control studies
53 did not find any relationship between smoking and alcohol drinking and the risk of
54 BE^{10,11}. For coffee and tea intake, an Italian study showed that tea intake could reduce
55 the risk of BE while coffee might do the opposite⁸. Nevertheless, another study in the
56 United States did not find any correlation between coffee intake and the risk of BE¹².
57 In summary, these controversial results have reflected the unignorable limitations of
58 observational epidemiological studies, such as confounding factors and reverse
59 causality, rendering causal inference as a difficult task using classic study
60 methodology¹³.

61 Since dietary habits and metabolism status are the few potentially modifiable risk
62 factors for BE, it is of great importance to identify their causal relationships using a
63 more robust methodology, in order to achieve a comprehensive understanding and

64 timely intervention for disease prevention. Mendelian randomization (MR) analysis
65 provides an effective alternative analysis method to assess the effect on outcome
66 using single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) as proxies for exposure, reducing the
67 impact of unmeasured confounding and reverse causality¹⁴. Furthermore, multivariate
68 MR can incorporate genetic variation for multiple exposures into the same model for
69 analysis, rendering it as an effective tool to explore the causal effect of dietary and
70 metabolic factors on broad health-related outcomes^{15,16}. The interaction between
71 exposures is eliminated so that the independent effects of individual exposures on the
72 outcome can be estimated simultaneously¹⁷.

73 The present study aimed to explore the potential causal relationship between dietary
74 and metabolic factors and the risk of BE through univariate and multivariate MR
75 analysis.

76

77 **Method**

78 **Study design**

79 This study was reported according to the strengthening the reporting of observational
80 studies in epidemiology using mendelian randomization (STROBE-MR)¹⁸, and the
81 study design overview was shown in Figure 1. MR analysis is based on three
82 assumptions: (1) instrumental variables (IVs) are closely associated with exposures;
83 (2) IVs should not be affected by confounders; and (3) IVs only affect BE through
84 exposures¹⁹. The relationships between exposures and BE were initially explored by
85 univariate MR analysis. Suitable variables were further included in the same model
86 and multivariate MR analysis was utilized to verify the independent effect of each
87 exposure on BE. The present study was based on summary-level data that had been
88 made publicly available, and ethical approval had been obtained in all original studies.

89 **Data sources**

90 The genetic IVs of exposures were obtained from the summary statistics of published
91 genome-wide association studies (GWAS), which were restricted to
92 European-ancestry individuals to eliminate population stratification bias²⁰⁻²³. The data

93 sources of GWAS data were represented in Supplemental Table 1. Summary datasets
94 for body mass index (BMI) and waist circumference were obtained from the Genetic
95 Investigation of ANthropometric Traits (GIANT) consortium²⁰. Summary data of
96 T2DM were extracted from the large-scale GWAS including 655,666 participants²¹.
97 Genetic instruments of smoking per day and alcohol drinking per week were extracted
98 from the GWAS and Sequencing Consortium of Alcohol and Nicotine use (GSCAN)
99 consortium²². Summary statistics relating to coffee, tea, and fruit were obtained from
100 the Medical Research Council-Integrative Epidemiology Unit (MRC-IEU) consortium.
101 The GWAS summary statistics for BE were obtained from the large-scale published
102 GWAS in the European population, which included 13,358 cases and 43,071
103 controls²³.

104 **Selection of IVs**

105 A series of quality control steps were performed to select eligible SNPs from the
106 GWAS summary data of exposures. All SNPs achieving genome-wide significance (P
107 $< 5 \times 10^{-8}$) were screened as IVs. Meanwhile, the linkage disequilibrium (LD) among
108 the SNPs was estimated using 1000 Genomes European panel as the reference
109 population²⁴. SNPs in high LD (clumping r^2 cutoff = 0.001 and clumping windows =
110 10,000 kb) were excluded to guarantee the independence of IVs. Furthermore, the
111 proxy SNP correlated ($r^2 > 0.8$) with the variant of interest was selected when there
112 was no SNP associated with the exposure in the outcome dataset. The exposure SNPs
113 and outcome SNPs were harmonized to maintain concordance of effect alleles, while
114 the palindromic SNPs were further excluded. MR Pleiotropy Residual Sum and
115 Outlier (MR-PRESSO) test was applied to detect and remove outlier SNPs to correct
116 for widespread horizontal pleiotropy and generate estimates without outliers²⁵. The R^2
117 of each SNP was calculated by the following equation: $2 \times \text{Beta}^2 \times \text{EAF} \times (1 - \text{EAF})$,
118 which was used to represent the proportion of variance in an exposure factor
119 explained by the IVs²⁶. F-statistics of each SNP were calculated by the following
120 equation: $R^2 \times (N - k - 1) \div (1 - R^2)$. The correlation between the IVs and exposure
121 was considered sufficiently strong when F-statistics > 10 , and SNPs with F-statistics $<$

122 10 were removed from MR analysis²⁷. The final selected SNPs were utilized as the
123 eligible genetic IVs for subsequent MR analysis.

124 **Statistical Analyses**

125 In this study, the inverse variance weighted (IVW) method was performed as the
126 primary analysis method to estimate the causal relationship between genetic
127 susceptibility to each exposure and the risk of BE²⁴. MR Egger, weighted median,
128 simple mode, and weighted mode were considered as complementary methods to infer
129 causality. This causal relationship was considered indicative if the estimates from the
130 IVW method were statistically significant and no conflicting results were found in the
131 other complementary methods. The heterogeneity between SNPs was assessed by
132 Cochran's Q statistic, and the IVs were deemed to have no heterogeneity when P
133 ≥ 0.05 ²⁸. The random-effects IVW model was used to estimate MR effects if
134 significant heterogeneity existed, which was less susceptible to the bias of weaker
135 SNPs-exposure associations²⁹. Otherwise, the fixed-effects IVW method was
136 considered as the primary result. The MR-Egger regression intercept was used to
137 assess the horizontal pleiotropy of IVs, with a P value < 0.05 suggesting
138 pleiotropy³⁰. In addition, leave-one-out analysis was performed to assess whether the
139 presence of any outliers would bias the overall MR estimate. The funnel plot and
140 scatter plot were used to visualize the robustness of the results. The asymmetry of the
141 funnel plot indicated the presence of horizontal polymorphism²⁴. To further eliminate
142 interaction effects between different exposures, we further performed multivariate
143 MR analysis to adjust for exposures. The Bonferroni method was performed to correct
144 for multiple testing in the study. The association with two-sided P -values < 0.006 ($\alpha =$
145 $0.05/9$) was deemed statistically significant, and P -values between 0.006 and 0.05
146 were regarded as suggestive evidence of association. Moreover, other statistical tests
147 were two-sided and the statistical significance was set at P -values < 0.05 . The odds
148 ratio (OR) was reported per standard deviation increase in the exposure trait. All
149 statistical analyses were conducted using the TwoSampleMR (v0.5.6), Mendelian
150 Randomization (v0.6.0), and MRPRESSO (v1.0) packages in R software (v4.0.0).

151 The forestploter (v0.1.5) package was employed in drawing forest plot.

152

153 **Result**

154 **Univariable MR analysis**

155 After a series of selections of eligible IVs and the exclusion of potentially pleiotropic
156 SNPs, the SNPs closely associated with exposures were applied as IVs (Supplemental
157 Table 2-10). The F-statistic for each SNP was greater than 10 (from 10.2 to 3813.5),
158 indicating all the IVs selected in the MR analysis were of sufficient validity.
159 Univariable MR analysis indicated that the genetic susceptibility of smoking per day,
160 BMI, waist circumference, and dried fruit intake were causally related to the risk of
161 developing BE (Figure 2). The number of smoking per day was causally related to the
162 risk of BE (OR = 1.241, 95% confidence interval (CI): 1.085-1.419, P = 0.002)
163 (Figure 2), and other complementary methods remained in a consistent direction,
164 though not statistically significant (Supplemental Table 11). MR-PRESSO did not
165 detect any influential outliers. In the analysis of the relationship between BMI and BE,
166 the IVW method supported that higher BMI was a risk factor for BE (OR = 2.575, 95%
167 CI: 2.301-2.880, P = 7.369E-61). Likewise, there was a causal relationship between
168 larger waist circumference and the risk of developing BE after the removal of outliers
169 (OR = 2.028, 95% CI: 1.648-2.496, P = 2.482E-11). In the analysis of the relationship
170 between fruit intake and BE, it was worth noting that dried fruit intake was a
171 protective factor for BE (OR = 0.228, 95%CI: 0.135-0.384, P = 2.783E-08).
172 Nevertheless, there was no evidence to support the association between fresh fruit
173 intake and BE (P = 0.847). In addition, alcohol drinking per week, coffee intake, tea
174 intake, and T2DM were not significantly associated with the risk of BE (P = 0.351, P
175 = 0.458, P = 0.125, P = 0.413, respectively). Figure 3 showed the scatter plots of the
176 causal effect estimates of each exposure on the risk of BE, and the forest maps
177 indicated the effect of each SNP for exposures on BE and their whole estimates
178 (Supplemental Figure 1).

179 **Sensitivity analysis**

180 The results of the sensitivity analysis were presented in Table 1. There was
181 heterogeneity in the causal estimation of alcohol drinking per week, fresh fruit intake,
182 BMI, waist circumference, and T2DM on BE in Cochran's Q test ($P < 0.05$). The
183 MR-Egger intercept analyses showed no evidence of directional pleiotropy in all
184 analyses. The leave-one-out test suggested that the potential relationships between
185 exposures and risk of BE were not driven by any single SNPs (Supplemental Figure
186 2). The funnel plots showed the symmetrical distribution of points that represented the
187 causal association effect of each SNP, indicating the associations were less affected by
188 potential bias (Supplemental Figure 3).

189 **Multivariable MR analysis**

190 After adjusting for the potential interactions of variables using multivariate MR
191 analysis, the direct effects of the exposure on BE were explored and the results were
192 shown in Figure 4. In the first multivariate MR model, the causal effect of smoking on
193 BE remained essentially consistent after adjusting for alcohol drinking and BMI (OR
194 = 1.239, 95%: 1.070-1.435, $P = 0.004$). The effect of obesity on BE was slightly
195 reduced after adjusting for smoking and alcohol drinking (OR = 2.452, 95% CI:
196 2.154-2.792, $P = 8.918E-42$). There remained no significant association between
197 alcohol drinking and BE ($P = 0.541$). In the second multivariate MR model, the
198 protective effect of dried fruit intake on BE was slightly reduced after adjusting for
199 obesity and fresh fruit intake (OR = 0.355, 95% CI: 0.194-0.649, $P = 7.742E-04$).

200

201 **Discussion**

202 Compared to previous observational epidemiological studies, MR studies provide
203 genetic proof of potential causality, which avoid the effects of confounding bias and
204 reverse causation. The present MR study supported that the independent causal
205 associations of genetic predisposition to smoking, higher BMI, and larger waist
206 circumference with the risk of developing BE. Remarkably, dried fruit intake played a
207 protective role in BE. However, the MR results demonstrated that alcohol drinking per
208 week, coffee intake, tea intake, fresh fruit intake, and T2DM were not causally related

209 to BE.

210 Smoking has been consistently shown to be an independent risk factor for BE in
211 various observational studies, which supported our MR finding. A large-scale study
212 covering data from five case-control studies found that smokers had 1.7 times the risk
213 of developing BE compared to never smokers⁵. Another meta-analysis, which
214 included 62 studies with more than 250,157 participants and 22,608 cases, showed
215 that the risk of BE could be effectively reduced by interventions for smoking and the
216 sensitivity analysis for this result was statistically robust³¹. In addition, there was also
217 evidence that smoking primarily contributed to the progression of BE to EAC rather
218 than increasing the risk of Barrett's esophagus itself^{1,32}. Nevertheless, the exact
219 mechanism of smoking on BE remains unclear. Previous studies have suggested that it
220 could be a combination of multiple impacts³³, including esophageal exposure to
221 N-nitrosamines and genotoxic effects of myosmine³⁴, persistent inflammatory
222 irritation of smoking that promoted cell proliferation³⁵, as well as the impaired
223 defense mechanism of the esophagus which resulted in GERD³⁶.

224 Our MR study was consistent with the findings of previous observational studies that
225 obesity was an independent risk factor for BE. A meta-analysis including 119,273
226 subjects found that abdominal obesity was significantly associated with the risk of
227 BE³⁷, which mutually confirmed the causal relationship between larger waist
228 circumference and the risk of BE in the current study. Another case-control study
229 using abdominal CT further elucidated that visceral abdominal fat was more strongly
230 associated with BE rather than subcutaneous fat³. Several potential mechanisms have
231 been proposed to explain the association, and central obesity may impact BE through
232 both mechanical and metabolic effects³⁸. On one hand, central obesity may
233 mechanically disrupt the gastroesophageal junction reflux barrier, leading to an
234 increase in gastroesophageal reflux and hence the development of BE. On the other
235 hand, the visceral abdominal fat compartment mediates the metabolic effect, which
236 releases adipokines and leads to a systemic inflammatory state. Notably, the sleeve
237 gastrectomy in obese patients could alter the anatomy of the His angle, divide the

238 gastric sling fibers and create a narrow stomach in a sleeve fashion, which increases
239 intra-gastric pressure and possibly leads to the aggravation of GERD and BE³⁹.

240 In terms of fruit intake, numerous previous studies have shown that fruit intake can
241 reduce the risk of BE^{9,40}. Notably, our study supported that dried fruit was a protective
242 factor for BE, rather than fresh fruit, which might be a novel finding. For fresh fruit, it
243 is widely believed that the intake of fresh fruit can reduce the risk of cancer⁴¹. Besides,
244 a multicenter case-control study involving 1285 individuals also suggested that the
245 decrease in BE risk was associated with a higher frequency of fresh fruit intake⁹.

246 However, there was still no causal relationship observed between fresh fruit intake
247 and BE in univariate and multivariate MR analysis, which might require larger MR
248 studies as well as better-designed prospective studies to further validate the issue. For
249 dried fruit, traditional dried fruit is formed from fruits such as prunes and grapes by
250 removing water, which is a great source of many micronutrients⁴². Nevertheless, few
251 studies have focused on the association between dried fruits and the risk of BE.

252 Previous studies have suggested that dried fruit had a protective effect on various
253 health-related outcomes such as cardiovascular disease and gastrointestinal
254 disorders^{42,43}. A previous MR study has also demonstrated that dried fruit reduced the
255 risk of various cancers such as lung cancer and pancreatic cancer, suggesting a
256 beneficial effect of dried fruit in disease prevention⁴⁴. However, the potential
257 mechanism of the effect of dried fruit on BE needs to be further explored in
258 subsequent studies.

259 In respect to alcohol drinking and tea intake, most previous studies suggested that
260 there was no association between alcohol or tea drinking and BE^{10,12}, which was
261 consistent with the results of the current MR study. However, a few studies have
262 indicated that both wine drinking and tea intake could reduce the risk of BE^{8,45}. The
263 possible explanations for the inconsistent results of these observational and the
264 current MR study are as follows: for alcohol drinking, on the one hand, the
265 epidemiological studies may be biased by confounding factors, such as different
266 lifestyles and habits between drinkers and non-drinkers. On the other hand, wine is

267 different from other alcoholic beverages in that moderate consumption of wine might
268 provide a protective effect⁴⁵, while the current MR study did not subdivide the types
269 of alcohol consumed, which might be related to the uncorrelated results. For tea intake,
270 epidemiological studies are likewise biased by confounding factors. Green tea is rich
271 in polyphenols, and catechins are specific polyphenolic compounds that exert
272 anticancer effects by improving the redox state, inhibiting inflammation, and
273 modulating immunity^{46,47}. However, summary statistics of tea intake used in the MR
274 analysis included both green and other categories, which could present uncorrelated
275 results. Therefore, further studies are necessary to determine the causal effects of
276 different subtypes of alcohol and tea on BE.

277 Our MR study found no causal relationship between coffee and BE, while the findings
278 of observational studies regarding the effect of coffee on BE were various. Most
279 studies have concluded that coffee was not associated with BE or had a hazardous
280 effect on BE^{8,12}. However, these observational studies are susceptible to confounding
281 factors, and the effect mechanism of various coffee components on BE has not been
282 validated by relevant studies. Notably, dewaxed coffee showed easier digestion and
283 better tolerance, and provided relief for GERD in a recent randomized pilot study⁴⁸,
284 which might further mitigate the risk of developing BE. Coffee as a common
285 beverage has been shown to play an important role in health-related outcomes such as
286 chronic disease and cancer⁴⁹. For example, chlorogenic acid, the main phenolic
287 component of coffee, is a powerful antioxidant and anti-inflammatory agent that plays
288 a key role in reducing the risk of many gastrointestinal diseases and cancers⁵⁰.
289 Therefore, it is highly necessary to identify the specific effects and mechanisms of
290 coffee components on BE.

291 MR evidence did not support the causal relationship between T2DM and the risk of
292 BE, though observational studies have reported T2DM was a risk factor for BE⁴.
293 Previous studies found that insulin and insulin growth factor 1 were upregulated in BE,
294 which might mediate the development of BE⁵¹. However, larger sample MR studies as
295 well as experimental studies are needed to validate it in the future.

296 Our study had several strengths. It was the first application of the univariate and
297 multivariate MR analysis to estimate the causal relationship between various
298 potentially modifiable exposures and BE risk, which minimized potential confounding
299 and reverse causality. The inclusion of summary data based on individuals of
300 European ancestry greatly mitigated the effect of population stratification.

301 There were several limitations to the present study. First, the specific subtypes of
302 partial exposures remained to be further explored, such as different types of alcohol
303 drinking and tea, and different types of coffee processing affecting its components,
304 which might have different effects on BE. In addition, there were significant
305 heterogeneities in genetic instruments for BMI and T2DM, etc., which might be
306 attributed to the number of participants and SNPs. Given that the included datasets
307 were from participants of European ancestry, it might limit the generalization of the
308 conclusions to non-European populations. The conclusions will be more valid by
309 including data from a larger sample of various ethnicities.

310

311 **Conclusion**

312 In summary, our findings provided genetic support that smoking, obesity, and larger
313 waist circumference were risk factors for BE, while dried fruit intake was a protective
314 factor for BE. There was no evidence to support that alcohol drinking, coffee intake,
315 tea intake, fresh fruit intake, and T2DM were associated with the risk of developing
316 BE.

317

318 **Acknowledgments**

319 The authors acknowledged Jue-Sheng Ong et al. for their contribution, as well as the
320 effort of the GIANT consortium, GSCAN consortium, and MRC-IEU consortium in
321 providing high-quality GWAS data for researchers.

322

323 **Funding**

324 This study was funded by a grant from the Science and Technology Program of

325 Guangzhou, China (202206010103); and the Natural Science Foundation of
326 Guangdong Province (2022A1515012469).

327

328 **Author Contributions**

329 Guibin Qiao and Yong Tang designed and supervised the study; Zijie Li and Weitao
330 Zhuang carried out the statistical analyses; Zijie Li, Weitao Zhuang, Junhan Wu and
331 Haijie Xu conducted the study; Zijie Li, Weitao Zhuang, Junhan Wu and Haijie Xu
332 contributed to writing the manuscript; All authors had read and approved the final
333 version of the manuscript.

334

335 **Data Availability Statement**

336 All data used in the present study were obtained from publicly available GWAS
337 summary statistics, and the datasets presented in this study can be found in online
338 repositories.

339

340 **Abbreviations**

341 BE = Barrett's esophagus

342 GERD = gastroesophageal reflux disease

343 EAC = esophageal adenocarcinoma

344 T2DM = type 2 diabetes mellitus

345 MR = Mendelian randomization

346 SNPs = single nucleotide polymorphisms

347 IVs = instrumental variables

348 GWAS = genome-wide association study

349 BMI = body mass index

350 GIANT = Genetic Investigation of Anthropometric Traits

351 GSCAN = GWAS and Sequencing Consortium of Alcohol and Nicotine use

352 MRC-IEU = Medical Research Council-Integrative Epidemiology Unit

353 LD = linkage disequilibrium

354 MR-PRESSO = MR Pleiotropy RESidual Sum and Outlier

355 IVW = inverse variance weighted

356 OR = odds ratio

357 CI = confidence interval

358

359 **References:**

- 360 1. Thrift AP. Global burden and epidemiology of Barrett oesophagus and
361 oesophageal cancer. *Nat Rev Gastroenterol Hepatol*. 2021;18(6):432-443.
- 362 2. Eluri S, Shaheen NJ. Barrett's esophagus: diagnosis and management.
363 *Gastrointest Endosc*. 2017;85(5):889-903.
- 364 3. El-Serag HB, Hashmi A, Garcia J, et al. Visceral abdominal obesity measured
365 by CT scan is associated with an increased risk of Barrett's oesophagus: a
366 case-control study. *Gut*. 2014;63(2):220-229.
- 367 4. Iyer PG, Borah BJ, Heien HC, Das A, Cooper GS, Chak A. Association of
368 Barrett's esophagus with type II Diabetes Mellitus: results from a large
369 population-based case-control study. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol*.
370 2013;11(9):1108-1114.e1105.
- 371 5. Cook MB, Shaheen NJ, Anderson LA, et al. Cigarette smoking increases risk
372 of Barrett's esophagus: an analysis of the Barrett's and Esophageal
373 Adenocarcinoma Consortium. *Gastroenterology*. 2012;142(4):744-753.
- 374 6. Matsuzaki J, Suzuki H, Kobayakawa M, et al. Association of Visceral Fat Area,
375 Smoking, and Alcohol Consumption with Reflux Esophagitis and Barrett's
376 Esophagus in Japan. *PLoS One*. 2015;10(7):e0133865.
- 377 7. Conio M, Filiberti R, Bianchi S, et al. Risk factors for Barrett's esophagus: a
378 case-control study. *Int J Cancer*. 2002;97(2):225-229.
- 379 8. Filiberti RA, Fontana V, De Ceglie A, et al. Association between coffee or tea
380 drinking and Barrett's esophagus or esophagitis: an Italian study. *Eur J Clin
381 Nutr*. 2017;71(8):980-986.
- 382 9. Filiberti RA, Fontana V, De Ceglie A, et al. Dietary Habits and Risk of
383 Esophagitis and Barrett's Esophagus: A Multicenter Italian Case-Control Study.
384 *Dig Dis Sci*. 2021;66(10):3448-3460.
- 385 10. Thrift AP, Cook MB, Vaughan TL, et al. Alcohol and the risk of Barrett's
386 esophagus: a pooled analysis from the International BEACON Consortium.
387 *Am J Gastroenterol*. 2014;109(10):1586-1594.

- 388 11. Thrift AP, Kramer JR, Richardson PA, El-Serag HB. No significant effects of
389 smoking or alcohol consumption on risk of Barrett's esophagus. *Dig Dis Sci.*
390 2014;59(1):108-116.
- 391 12. Sajja KC, El-Serag HB, Thrift AP. Coffee or Tea, Hot or Cold, Are Not
392 Associated With Risk of Barrett's Esophagus. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol.*
393 2016;14(5):769-772.
- 394 13. Fewell Z, Davey Smith G, Sterne JA. The impact of residual and unmeasured
395 confounding in epidemiologic studies: a simulation study. *Am J Epidemiol.*
396 2007;166(6):646-655.
- 397 14. Smith GD, Ebrahim S. 'Mendelian randomization': can genetic epidemiology
398 contribute to understanding environmental determinants of disease? *Int J*
399 *Epidemiol.* 2003;32(1):1-22.
- 400 15. Yuan S, Gill D, Giovannucci EL, Larsson SC. Obesity, Type 2 Diabetes,
401 Lifestyle Factors, and Risk of Gallstone Disease: A Mendelian Randomization
402 Investigation. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol.* 2022;20(3):e529-e537.
- 403 16. Wang YB, Yang L, Deng YQ, et al. Causal relationship between obesity,
404 lifestyle factors and risk of benign prostatic hyperplasia: a univariable and
405 multivariable Mendelian randomization study. *J Transl Med.* 2022;20(1):495.
- 406 17. Sanderson E, Davey Smith G, Windmeijer F, Bowden J. An examination of
407 multivariable Mendelian randomization in the single-sample and two-sample
408 summary data settings. *Int J Epidemiol.* 2019;48(3):713-727.
- 409 18. Skrivankova VW, Richmond RC, Woolf BAR, et al. Strengthening the
410 reporting of observational studies in epidemiology using mendelian
411 randomisation (STROBE-MR): explanation and elaboration. *Bmj.*
412 2021;375:n2233.
- 413 19. Emdin CA, Khera AV, Kathiresan S. Mendelian Randomization. *Jama.*
414 2017;318(19):1925-1926.
- 415 20. Yengo L, Sidorenko J, Kemper KE, et al. Meta-analysis of genome-wide
416 association studies for height and body mass index in ~700000 individuals of

- 417 European ancestry. *Hum Mol Genet.* 2018;27(20):3641-3649.
- 418 21. Xue A, Wu Y, Zhu Z, et al. Genome-wide association analyses identify 143
419 risk variants and putative regulatory mechanisms for type 2 diabetes. *Nat*
420 *Commun.* 2018;9(1):2941.
- 421 22. Liu M, Jiang Y, Wedow R, et al. Association studies of up to 1.2 million
422 individuals yield new insights into the genetic etiology of tobacco and alcohol
423 use. *Nat Genet.* 2019;51(2):237-244.
- 424 23. Ong JS, An J, Han X, et al. Multitrait genetic association analysis identifies 50
425 new risk loci for gastro-oesophageal reflux, seven new loci for Barrett's
426 oesophagus and provides insights into clinical heterogeneity in reflux
427 diagnosis. *Gut.* 2022;71(6):1053-1061.
- 428 24. Hemani G, Zheng J, Elsworth B, et al. The MR-Base platform supports
429 systematic causal inference across the human phenome. *Elife.* 2018;7.
- 430 25. Verbanck M, Chen CY, Neale B, Do R. Detection of widespread horizontal
431 pleiotropy in causal relationships inferred from Mendelian randomization
432 between complex traits and diseases. *Nat Genet.* 2018;50(5):693-698.
- 433 26. Park JH, Wacholder S, Gail MH, et al. Estimation of effect size distribution
434 from genome-wide association studies and implications for future discoveries.
435 *Nat Genet.* 2010;42(7):570-575.
- 436 27. Burgess S, Thompson SG. Avoiding bias from weak instruments in Mendelian
437 randomization studies. *Int J Epidemiol.* 2011;40(3):755-764.
- 438 28. Haycock PC, Burgess S, Wade KH, Bowden J, Relton C, Davey Smith G. Best
439 (but oft-forgotten) practices: the design, analysis, and interpretation of
440 Mendelian randomization studies. *Am J Clin Nutr.* 2016;103(4):965-978.
- 441 29. Bowden J, Del Greco MF, Minelli C, Davey Smith G, Sheehan N, Thompson J.
442 A framework for the investigation of pleiotropy in two-sample summary data
443 Mendelian randomization. *Stat Med.* 2017;36(11):1783-1802.
- 444 30. Bowden J, Davey Smith G, Burgess S. Mendelian randomization with invalid
445 instruments: effect estimation and bias detection through Egger regression. *Int*

- 446 *J Epidemiol.* 2015;44(2):512-525.
- 447 31. Zhao Z, Yin Z, Zhang C. Lifestyle interventions can reduce the risk of
448 Barrett's esophagus: a systematic review and meta-analysis of 62 studies
449 involving 250,157 participants. *Cancer Med.* 2021;10(15):5297-5320.
- 450 32. Coleman HG, Bhat S, Johnston BT, McManus D, Gavin AT, Murray LJ.
451 Tobacco smoking increases the risk of high-grade dysplasia and cancer among
452 patients with Barrett's esophagus. *Gastroenterology.* 2012;142(2):233-240.
- 453 33. Hardikar S, Onstad L, Blount PL, Odze RD, Reid BJ, Vaughan TL. The role of
454 tobacco, alcohol, and obesity in neoplastic progression to esophageal
455 adenocarcinoma: a prospective study of Barrett's esophagus. *PLoS One.*
456 2013;8(1):e52192.
- 457 34. Vogt S, Fuchs K, Richter E. Genotoxic effects of myosmine in a human
458 esophageal adenocarcinoma cell line. *Toxicology.* 2006;222(1-2):71-79.
- 459 35. Reid BJ, Li X, Galipeau PC, Vaughan TL. Barrett's oesophagus and
460 oesophageal adenocarcinoma: time for a new synthesis. *Nat Rev Cancer.*
461 2010;10(2):87-101.
- 462 36. Smit CF, Copper MP, van Leeuwen JA, Schoots IG, Stanojic LD. Effect of
463 cigarette smoking on gastropharyngeal and gastroesophageal reflux. *Ann Otol*
464 *Rhinol Laryngol.* 2001;110(2):190-193.
- 465 37. Di J, Cheng Y, Chang D, Liu Y. A Meta-Analysis of the Impact of Obesity,
466 Metabolic Syndrome, Insulin Resistance, and Microbiome on the Diagnosis of
467 Barrett's Esophagus. *Dig Dis.* 2020;38(3):165-177.
- 468 38. Chandar AK, Iyer PG. Role of Obesity in the Pathogenesis and Progression of
469 Barrett's Esophagus. *Gastroenterol Clin North Am.* 2015;44(2):249-264.
- 470 39. Schlottmann F, Dreifuss NH, Patti MG. Obesity and esophageal cancer:
471 GERD, Barrett's esophagus, and molecular carcinogenic pathways. *Expert*
472 *Rev Gastroenterol Hepatol.* 2020;14(6):425-433.
- 473 40. Wang SE, Hodge A, Dashti SG, et al. Diet and risk of Barrett's oesophagus:
474 Melbourne collaborative cohort study. *Br J Nutr.* 2022;129(7):1-10.

- 475 41. Aune D, Giovannucci E, Boffetta P, et al. Fruit and vegetable intake and the
476 risk of cardiovascular disease, total cancer and all-cause mortality-a systematic
477 review and dose-response meta-analysis of prospective studies. *Int J*
478 *Epidemiol.* 2017;46(3):1029-1056.
- 479 42. Sadler MJ, Gibson S, Whelan K, Ha MA, Lovegrove J, Higgs J. Dried fruit
480 and public health - what does the evidence tell us? *Int J Food Sci Nutr.*
481 2019;70(6):675-687.
- 482 43. Zeng Y, Cao S, Yang H. Causal associations between dried fruit intake and
483 cardiovascular disease: A Mendelian randomization study. *Front Cardiovasc*
484 *Med.* 2023;10:1080252.
- 485 44. Jin C, Li R, Deng T, et al. Association between dried fruit intake and
486 pan-cancers incidence risk: A two-sample Mendelian randomization study.
487 *Front Nutr.* 2022;9:899137.
- 488 45. Filiberti RA, Fontana V, De Ceglie A, et al. Alcohol consumption pattern and
489 risk of Barrett's oesophagus and erosive oesophagitis: an Italian case-control
490 study. *Br J Nutr.* 2017;117(8):1151-1161.
- 491 46. Khan N, Mukhtar H. Tea Polyphenols in Promotion of Human Health.
492 *Nutrients.* 2018;11(1).
- 493 47. Shirakami Y, Shimizu M. Possible Mechanisms of Green Tea and Its
494 Constituents against Cancer. *Molecules.* 2018;23(9).
- 495 48. Polese B, Izzo L, Mancino N, et al. Effect of Dewaxed Coffee on
496 Gastroesophageal Symptoms in Patients with GERD: A Randomized Pilot
497 Study. *Nutrients.* 2022;14(12).
- 498 49. Wang P, Song M, Eliassen AH, et al. Optimal dietary patterns for prevention of
499 chronic disease. *Nat Med.* 2023.
- 500 50. Tajik N, Tajik M, Mack I, Enck P. The potential effects of chlorogenic acid,
501 the main phenolic components in coffee, on health: a comprehensive review of
502 the literature. *Eur J Nutr.* 2017;56(7):2215-2244.
- 503 51. Greer KB, Thompson CL, Brenner L, et al. Association of insulin and

504 insulin-like growth factors with Barrett's oesophagus. *Gut*.
505 2012;61(5):665-672.
506

507 **Table**

508 **Table 1.** Heterogeneity and horizontal pleiotropy analyses between exposures and risk
 509 of Barrett's esophagus.

Exposure	Heterogeneity test						Pleiotropy test		
	Inverse variance weighted			MR Egger			MR Egger intercept		
	Q-statistics	Q_df	P	Q-statistics	Q_df	P	Estimate	SE	P
Smoking per day	24.36	13	0.028	20.41	12	0.060	0.015	0.010	0.154
Alcohol drinking per week	28.96	17	0.035	28.34	16	0.029	-0.010	0.017	0.563
Coffee intake	36.55	27	0.104	36.28	26	0.087	-0.003	0.008	0.662
Tea intake	38.47	30	0.138	38.17	29	0.119	0.004	0.008	0.634
Fresh fruit intake	76.17	40	4.958E-04	75.75	39	3.816E-04	-0.006	0.013	0.660
Dried fruit intake	40.11	28	0.065	39.06	27	0.063	0.018	0.021	0.402
BMI	696.78	480	3.279E-10	691.51	479	6.268E-10	0.005	0.003	0.057
Waist circumference	58.91	42	0.043	58.50	41	0.037	0.004	0.008	0.592
T2DM	176.58	102	6.575E-06	178.82	103	5.332E-06	0.006	0.005	0.258

510 BMI, body mass index; T2DM, type 2 diabetes mellitus.

511

512 **Figure Legend**

513 **Figure 1.** Study design overview. SNPs, single nucleotide polymorphisms; LD,
 514 linkage disequilibrium; BMI, body mass index; T2DM, type 2 diabetes mellitus; MR,
 515 Mendelian randomization; IVW, inverse variance weighted.

516 **Figure 2.** Univariable Mendelian randomization estimated the association between
 517 exposures and Barrett's esophagus. SNPs, Single nucleotide polymorphisms; OR,
 518 odds ratio; CI, confidence interval; IVW, inverse variance weighted; BMI, body mass
 519 index; BMI, body mass index; T2DM, type 2 diabetes mellitus.

520 **Figure 3.** Scatter plots for the association between exposures and Barrett's esophagus.
 521 (A) Smoking per day; (B) Alcohol drinking per week; (C) Coffee intake; (D) Tea
 522 intake; (E) Fresh fruit intake; (F) Dried fruit intake; (G) BMI; (H) Waist
 523 circumference; (I) T2DM. SNPs, Single nucleotide polymorphisms; BE, Barrett's
 524 esophagus; BMI, body mass index; T2DM, type 2 diabetes mellitus; IVW, inverse
 525 variance weighted.

526 **Figure 4.** Multivariable Mendelian randomization estimated the association between

527 exposures and Barrett's esophagus. SNPs, Single nucleotide polymorphisms; OR,
528 odds ratio; CI, confidence interval; BMI, body mass index; IVW, inverse variance
529 weighted.

530

531 **Supplemental Material**

532 **Supplemental Table 1.** Basic information on the GWAS data applied in this study.

533 **Supplemental Table 2.** The genetic instruments of smoking per day used in this
534 study.

535 **Supplemental Table 3.** The genetic instruments of alcohol drinking per week used in
536 this study.

537 **Supplemental Table 4.** The genetic instruments of coffee intake used in this study.

538 **Supplemental Table 5.** The genetic instruments of tea intake used in this study.

539 **Supplemental Table 6.** The genetic instruments of fresh fruit intake used in this
540 study.

541 **Supplemental Table 7.** The genetic instruments of dried fruit intake used in this
542 study.

543 **Supplemental Table 8.** The genetic instruments of body mass index used in this
544 study.

545 **Supplemental Table 9.** The genetic instruments of waist circumference used in this
546 study.


547 **Supplemental Table 10.** The genetic instruments of type 2 diabetes mellitus used in
548 this study.


549 **Supplemental Table 11.** Detail of the results of univariate Mendelian randomization.


550 **Supplemental Figure 1.** Forest plots for the causal effects of dietary and metabolic
551 factors on Barrett's esophagus. (A) Smoking per day; (B) Alcohol drinking per week;
552 (C) Coffee intake; (D) Tea intake; (E) Fresh fruit intake; (F) Dried fruit intake; (G)
553 BMI; (H) Waist circumference; (I) T2DM. SNPs, Single nucleotide polymorphisms;
554 BE, Barrett's esophagus; BMI, body mass index; T2DM, type 2 diabetes mellitus;
555 IVW, inverse variance weighted.

556 **Supplemental Figure 2.** Leave-one-out test plots for the causal effects of dietary and
557 metabolic factors on Barrett's esophagus. (A) Smoking per day; (B) Alcohol drinking
558 per week; (C) Coffee intake; (D) Tea intake; (E) Fresh fruit intake; (F) Dried fruit
559 intake; (G) BMI; (H) Waist circumference; (I) T2DM. SNPs, Single nucleotide
560 polymorphisms; BE, Barrett's esophagus; BMI, body mass index; T2DM, type 2
561 diabetes mellitus; IVW, inverse variance weighted.

562 **Supplemental Figure 3.** Funnel plots for individual causal effects of dietary and
563 metabolic factors on Barrett's esophagus. (A) Smoking per day; (B) Alcohol drinking
564 per week; (C) Coffee intake; (D) Tea intake; (E) Fresh fruit intake; (F) Dried fruit
565 intake; (G) BMI; (H) Waist circumference; (I) T2DM. BE, Barrett's esophagus; BMI,
566 body mass index; T2DM, type 2 diabetes mellitus.
567







/ IVW
 / MR Egger
 / Simple mode
 / Weighted median
 / Weighted mode

