

1 **Dietary Intake Is Associated With the Prevalence of Uterine Leiomyoma in Korean**  
2 **Women: A Retrospective Cohort Study**

3 Min-Jeong Kim, M.D.,<sup>1</sup> Sunmie Kim, M.D. Ph.D.,<sup>2\*</sup>□ Jin Ju Kim, M.D. Ph.D.,<sup>2</sup> Young Sun  
4 Kim, M.D. Ph.D.,<sup>3</sup> Ji Hyun Song, M.D. Ph.D.,<sup>3</sup> Jung Eun Lee, Sc.D.,<sup>4,5</sup> Jiyoung Youn, M.S.,<sup>4</sup>  
5 Sun Young Yang, M.D. Ph.D.,<sup>3\*</sup>□

6 <sup>1</sup>Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Division of Gynecology Oncology, CHA Hospital  
7 Ilsan Medical Center, Goyang-si, Gyonggi-do, Republic of Korea

8 <sup>2</sup>Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Seoul National University College of Medicine,  
9 Seoul National University Hospital Healthcare System Gangnam Center, Seoul, Republic of  
10 Korea

11 <sup>3</sup>Department of Internal Medicine and Healthcare Research Institute, Seoul National  
12 University Hospital, Healthcare System Gangnam Center, Seoul, Republic of Korea

13 <sup>4</sup>Department of Food and Nutrition, College of Human Ecology, Seoul National University,  
14 Seoul, Korea

15 <sup>5</sup>Research Institute of Human Ecology, Seoul National University, Seoul, Korea

16 **\*Corresponding Authors**

17 □These corresponding authors contributed equally to this work

18 Sunmie Kim, M.D. Ph.D.

19 Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Seoul National University College of Medicine,  
20 Seoul National University Hospital Healthcare System Gangnam Center, 39FL., Gangnam  
21 Finance Center 152, Taeheranro, Gangnam-gu, Seoul, 06236, South Korea

22 Telephone: + 82-2-2112-5636

23 Fax: + 82-02-2112-5794

**NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.**

24 E-mail: [smkimmd@snu.ac.kr](mailto:smkimmd@snu.ac.kr)

25 Sun Young Yang, M.D. Ph.D.

26 Department of Internal Medicine, Division of Gastroenterology, Healthcare Research Institute,

27 Seoul National University Hospital Healthcare System Gangnam Center, 39FL., Gangnam

28 Finance Center 152, Taeheranro, Gangnam-gu, Seoul, 06236, South Korea

29 Telephone: + 82-2-2112-5491

30 Fax: + 82-02-2112-5794

31 E-mail: [syyang@snuh.org](mailto:syyang@snuh.org)

32 Abstract word count: 303

33 Manuscript word count: 3477

34 **Running title**

35 Dietary intake and Uterine leiomyoma

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

## 47 Abstract

48 **Objective:** Uterine leiomyoma (UL), the most prevalent benign gynecologic tumor among  
49 reproductive-aged women, lacks sufficient research on the potential association between dietary intake  
50 and its occurrence in Korean women. Addressing this research gap, this study aims to evaluate the  
51 potential link between dietary intake and the prevalence of UL in Korean women.

52 **Methods:** In this cross-sectional study, a cohort of 672 women, aged 25 to 65, were enrolled, with 383  
53 (57%) being premenopausal. Dietary intake was assessed using a validated food frequency  
54 questionnaire (FFQ), and UL presence was determined through ultrasonography. The analysis focused  
55 exclusively on items within ten categories, including vegetables/fruit, vegetables, fruits, red meat,  
56 processed meat, poultry, fish, dairy product, milk, and alcohol. Multiple logistic regression models  
57 were employed to explore the relationship between dietary intake and the prevalence of UL,  
58 calculating odds ratios (ORs) and 95 % confidence intervals (CIs) while adjusting for confounding  
59 factors.

60 **Results:** Within the total cohort, 219 (32.6%) women were diagnosed with UL. High intakes of fish  
61 and poultry showed an association with higher UL prevalence. Odds ratios (95% CIs) for the upper  
62 quartiles compared to the lower quartiles were 1.70 (1.02-2.84; p trend = 0.049) for fish intake and 1.85  
63 (1.09 -3.14; p trend = 0.07) for poultry intake. Conversely, an inverse relationship emerged between  
64 dairy product intake and UL prevalence, with an odds ratio of 0.59 (95% CI 0.36–0.98; p trend = 0.06).  
65 Stratifying the analysis by menopausal status revealed a parallel pattern, with heightened UL prevalence  
66 with fish intake and reduced prevalence with dairy product intake. However, the link between poultry  
67 intake and UL prevalence was primarily observed among postmenopausal women. Among  
68 premenopausal women, elevated vegetable intake was linked to a decreased UL prevalence (OR 0.47,  
69 95% CI 0.22-1.01 for top vs. bottom quartiles; p trend = 0.01).

70 **Conclusion:** We found that high consumption of fish and poultry, coupled with low intake of dairy  
71 products, correlated with an elevated prevalence of UL. Furthermore, vegetable intake exhibited an  
72 inverse relationship with UL prevalence, particularly among premenopausal women.

73 **Key words:** Uterine leiomyoma, dietary intake, menopausal status, fish, dairy, vegetable

74

75

76

77

78

79

80

81

82

83

84

85

86

87

88

89

90

91

92

93

## 94 **Introduction**

95 Uterine leiomyoma (UL) is the most common benign gynecologic tumor, affecting  
96 approximately 25% of women of reproductive age, with peak prevalence occurring at age 50 and a  
97 lifetime risk of up to 70% [1-3]. While the pathophysiological mechanisms underlying the development  
98 of ULs at the cellular and molecular level have not been fully elucidated, they appear to be sex-hormone  
99 (estrogen and progesterone) dependent diseases, typically appearing after menarche, growing during  
100 reproductive ages, and regressing along with declining reproductive hormone levels after menopause  
101 [4-7]. Other known associated factors include age, ethnicity (with 2-3 times higher incidence in black  
102 women than in other races), genetics, number of pregnancies (more common in women who have had  
103 fewer pregnancies or deliveries), obesity, lack of physical exercise, and some dietary factors [8, 9].

104 As data on the relationship between dietary factors and malignant diseases such as breast or  
105 endometrial cancer, which are presumed to be estrogen dependent, have been reported mostly in terms  
106 of the potential of chemoprevention and long-term prognosis [10-13], the role of dietary nutrition as a  
107 factor that can be modified in the development and growth of UL has become a topic of interest, as  
108 dietary intake may alter either endocrine function or molecular biologic milieu [14].

109 According to previous studies, dietary patterns or some nutrients have shown significant  
110 associations with ULs. While the consumption of fruits and vegetables has shown a protective effect  
111 against ULs, findings have been inconsistent for other foods such as dairy, meat, or fish [8, 15-17].  
112 Meanwhile, studies that have reported the association between nutritional intake analysis and the  
113 prevalence of UL in Korean women are limited. This study aimed to investigate the association between  
114 dietary intake and prevalence of UL stratified by menopausal status among Korean women who  
115 underwent both analysis of food intake and pelvic ultrasound exam from a previous cross-sectional  
116 study of our institute.

## 117 **Materials and Methods**

### 118 ***Study design and participants***

119 This study retrospectively used a prospectively collected cohort from our previous study [18].  
120 Participants who underwent health checkups, including colonoscopy and dietary intake assessment,  
121 using a semi-quantitative food-frequency questionnaire (FFQ) at the Seoul National University Hospital  
122 Gangnam Center in Seoul, Korea, between May and December 2011, were registered. Among them,  
123 only women participants who also had pelvic ultrasonography during the study period were enrolled.  
124 Individuals who had already undergone hysterectomy or who did not take the pelvic ultrasound  
125 examination were excluded. A total of 672 women were finally included in this study. This study was  
126 approved and has been granted an exemption from the requirement for additional consent procedures  
127 by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of this institution. This exemption is based on the fact that the  
128 study involves the analysis of medical records from women who underwent pelvic ultrasound  
129 examinations among the participants of a previously conducted study at our institute [18]. To ensure  
130 the protection of personal information of the subjects included in this study, participants' names were  
131 anonymized, and participant identification codes and medical record numbers were encrypted. Access  
132 to the data of the study participants was conducted for one year, from June 2015 to May 2016.

133 Postmenopausal status was defined as the absence of menstruation for at least 1 year. Women  
134 in peri-menopausal status (irregular cycles of more than  $\geq 7$  days differences or missed two or more  
135 cycles of menstruation within 12 months) were classified as premenopausal women [19].

### 136 ***Clinical and laboratory assessment***

137 Baseline characteristics, such as medication use (e.g., antidiabetic, antihypertensive, or lipid-  
138 lowering agents), underlying diseases (diabetes, hypertension, and dyslipidemia), smoking history,  
139 amount of physical activity, alcohol consumption, and reproductive characteristics (age at menarche,  
140 parity, age at first delivery, and menopausal status) were recorded during a medical interview using a  
141 structured questionnaire before a routine gynecologic examination. Anthropometric parameters (body

142 mass index (BMI), waist circumference (WC), and blood pressure (BP)), and biochemical results  
143 (fasting plasma glucose, triglycerides, low-density lipoprotein (LDL)-cholesterol, and high-density  
144 lipoprotein (HDL)-cholesterol) were retrospectively reviewed for each individual, as previously  
145 described.

### 146 *Assessment of uterine leiomyoma*

147 ULs were assessed through ultrasound examination using GE LOGIQ®9 (GE healthcare,  
148 General Electric Co., UK) equipment. The examination was performed by one of the three  
149 gynecologists who were obstetrics and gynecology specialists (M-J Kim, JJ Kim, and S Kim) with more  
150 than eight years of experience. The presence of UL was assessed only by intracavitary (mostly  
151 transvaginal, some transrectal) pelvic ultrasound examination, and cases with UL were defined as  
152 having one or more nodules of typical leiomyoma with  $\geq 10$ mm in length.

### 153 *Assessment of Dietary intake*

154 Dietary intake data were assessed prior to the examination on the same day using a validated  
155 106-item Food Frequency Questionnaire (FFQ) [20] with assistance from a registered dietician.  
156 Participants reported their usual frequency of consumption of various foods and typical portion sizes  
157 for the year preceding the interview date. Each food item had 9 options for frequency (ranging from  
158 “never or less than once per month” to “3 times per day”) and three options for portion size (“small”,  
159 “medium”, or “large”). Fruit and vegetable intake included all raw, cooked, canned, frozen or dried  
160 forms of fruits and most edible vegetables. For the analysis, we examined the food consumption and  
161 total energy intake. Only items corresponding to the ten categories (vegetables/fruit, vegetables, fruits,  
162 red meat, processed meat (grouped into tertiles, two categories in postmenopausal women), poultry,  
163 fish, dairy product, milk, and alcohol (grouped into tertiles)) were included in the analyses and the  
164 amount of food intake was divided into quartiles.

### 165 *Assessment of risk factors*

166 Metabolic syndrome (MetS) was defined according to the harmonized definition proposed by

167 the International Diabetes Federation/American Heart Association/National Heart, Lung, and Blood  
168 Institute [21]. A patient was diagnosed with MetS if they met three or more of the following criteria:  
169 abdominal obesity (waist circumference  $\geq 85$  cm for Korean women as proposed by the Korean Society  
170 for the Study of Obesity [22]), high triglycerides (TG) ( $\geq 150$  mg/dL), low HDL-cholesterol ( $< 50$   
171 mg/dL), high fasting glucose ( $\geq 100$  mg/dL) or treatment for diabetes, and increased blood pressure ( $\geq$   
172 130/85 mmHg) or treatment for hypertension.

173 Current smokers were defined as those who had been smoking at least one cigarette per day  
174 during the previous 12 months, while past-smokers were considered those who discontinued smoking  
175 for at least 12 months before inclusion in the study. “Ever smokers” refers to respondents who are  
176 current or past smokers.

177 Physical activity (PA) was measured by the modified Korean version of the PA questionnaire  
178 from the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey [23]. PA was quantified using metabolic  
179 equivalent (MET)-minutes per week.

## 180 ***Statistical analysis***

181 Numerical variables were expressed as mean  $\pm$  standard deviation, and categorical variables  
182 were presented as numbers and percentages. If the parameters were not normally distributed,  $\log_{10}$   
183 transformation was used for analysis. The relationship between each dietary intake and UL was  
184 evaluated using binary logistic regression analyses. As ULs usually shrink after menopause due to a  
185 drastic drop in serum estrogen levels, the data were analyzed separately for two groups based on their  
186 menopausal status (premenopausal, including peri-menopausal, vs. postmenopausal). The median value  
187 of each tertile or quartile was included in the models as a continuous variable for trend testing. Odds  
188 ratios (ORs) and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) were calculated to evaluate the associations using  
189 multiple logistic regression models. In Model 1, we adjusted for confounding variables including age  
190 (years, continuous), BMI ( $\text{kg}/\text{m}^2$ ,  $<18.5$ ,  $18.5\text{--}23$ ,  $23\text{--}25$ ,  $25\leq$ ), total energy intake (kcal/d, quintile),  
191 and LDL-cholesterol (mg/dL, continuous). In Model 2, we further adjusted for all clinically relevant  
192 parameters, including menopausal status (premenopausal vs. postmenopausal), age at menarche (years



193 old,  $\leq 11$ ,  $11 <$ ), age at first delivery combined with parity (nulliparity, years old,  $< 25$ ,  $25 \leq$ ), alcohol  
194 intake (g/d, continuous), smoking status (never, or ever) and physical activity (MET-min/week, tertile).  
195 All analyses were performed using SAS 9.3 (SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC, USA). We used 2-sided  
196 statistical tests, and  $p$ -values less than 0.05 were considered statistically significant.

## 197 Results

### 198 *Baseline characteristics and prevalence of UL*

199 A total of 672 women were included in the study, with 383 (57%) being premenopausal and  
200 the age range being 25–65 years old (mean age 50.1 years). Of these, 219 (32.6%) were diagnosed with  
201 UL, with no significant difference in prevalence between pre- and postmenopausal women (34.5% vs.  
202 30.1%, respectively;  $p = 0.23$ ). Compared to women without UL, those with UL were older ( $51.0 \pm 7.4$   
203 vs.  $49.7 \pm 9.5$  years,  $p = 0.01$ ), had a higher BMI ( $22.4 \pm 3.2$  vs.  $21.9 \pm 2.8$  kg/m<sup>2</sup>,  $p = 0.03$ ), and higher  
204 LDL-cholesterol levels ( $128.2 \pm 31.3$  vs.  $122.3 \pm 32.4$  mg/dL,  $p = 0.01$ ). There were no significant  
205 differences in terms of reproductive, lifestyle, comorbidities, or laboratory parameters between the two  
206 groups (Table 1).

207 **Table 1. Baseline characteristics of participants with and without uterine leiomyoma**

Variables	Women without UL (n=453)	Women with UL (n=219)	<i>p</i> - value
Age, years old	49.7 ± 9.5	51.0 ± 7.4	0.01
Body mass index, kg/m <sup>2</sup> †	21.9 ± 2.8	22.4 ± 3.2	0.03
Abdominal circumference, cm†	80.0 ± 7.9	80.2 ± 9.7	0.73
SBP, mmHg†	111.2 ± 13.4	112.7 ± 12.4	0.12
DBP, mmHg†	69.8 ± 9.8	71.3 ± 9.5	0.07
Early menarche, n (%)†			0.20
Menarche at ≤11 years old	7 (1.6)	6 (3.2)	
Menarche at >11 years old	436 (98.4)	183 (96.8)	
Menopausal status			0.23
Premenopausal	251 (55.4)	132 (60.3)	
Postmenopausal	202 (44.6)	87 (39.7)	
Number of live births, n (%)			0.37
0	32 (7.1)	22 (10.1)	

1	51 (11.3)	28 (12.8)	
2	280 (61.8)	134 (61.2)	
≥3	90 (19.9)	35 (16.0)	
Age at first birth (years old), n (%)			0.14
<25	76 (19.1)	42 (24.6)	
≥25	322 (80.9)	129 (75.4)	
Smoking status, n (%) <sup>†</sup>			0.12
Never smoker	397 (90.9)	192 (92.3)	
Past smoker	18 (4.1)	12 (5.8)	
Current smoker	22 (5.0)	14 (1.9)	
Alcohol intake (g/d) <sup>†</sup>	6.1 (16.5)	4.3 (10.3)	0.63
Physical activity (MET-minute/week)	1142.5 ± 2567.1	1031.8 ± 1908.5	0.93
Hypertension, n (%) <sup>†</sup>	83 (19.1)	50 (23.6)	0.18
Diabetes mellitus, n (%) <sup>†</sup>	68 (15.9)	31 (14.8)	0.72
Dyslipidemia, n (%) <sup>†</sup>	138 (31.8)	57 (27.0)	0.21
Metabolic syndrome, n (%) <sup>†</sup>	52 (12.2)	21 (10.0)	0.41
Glucose ,g/dL <sup>†</sup>	89.9 ± 15.6	90.4 ± 14.4	0.57
Triglyceride, mg/dL <sup>†</sup>	75.5 ± 42.9	75.0 ± 38.0	0.65
HDL-cholesterol,mg/dL <sup>†</sup>	57.0 ± 10.9	57.4 ± 10.6	0.62
LDL-cholesterol, mg/dL <sup>†</sup>	122.3 ± 32.4	128.2 ± 31.3	0.01
25OH-D, ng/mL <sup>†</sup>	22.2 ± 7.3	22.2 ± 7.5	0.85

208 \*Abbreviations; UL, uterine leiomyoma; SBP, systolic blood pressure; DBP, diastolic blood pressure; HDL,  
 209 high-density lipoprotein; LDL, low density lipoprotein; MET, metabolic equivalent; 25OH-D, 25-hydroxyvitamin  
 210 D

211 <sup>†</sup>The total number of participants was different because of missing values.

212 Data are shown as mean ± standard deviation or numbers (percentages)

213 ***Association between dietary intake and prevalence of UL in the entire***  
214 ***population***

215 Table 2 shows the associations between dietary intake and the prevalence of UL in all  
216 participants, as analyzed through age-adjusted and two-stage multiple logistic regression models.  
217 Among all participants, higher fish intake showed an increased association with the prevalence of UL  
218 (Q4 vs. Q1: OR<sub>2</sub> 1.70, 95 % CI 1.02-2.84; *p* trend = 0.049). Higher poultry intake in Q2 and Q4 was  
219 associated with an increased prevalence of UL compared to Q1 (Q2 vs. Q1: OR<sub>2</sub> 1.81, 95% CI 1.05-  
220 3.12; Q4 vs. Q1: OR<sub>2</sub> 1.85, 95% CI 1.09-3.14), although the dose-response trend was not statistically  
221 significant (*p* for trend = 0.07).

222 On the other hand, higher intake of dairy products in Q3 and Q4 exhibited a significant inverse  
223 association with the prevalence of UL compared to Q1 (Q3 vs. Q1: OR<sub>2</sub> 0.59, 95% CI 0.36-0.96; Q4  
224 vs. Q1: OR<sub>2</sub> 0.59, 95% CI 0.36-0.98), but the dose-response relationship was not statistically significant  
225 (*p* trend = 0.06). The Q3 intake of milk showed a significant inverse association compared to Q1 (Q3  
226 vs. Q1: OR<sub>2</sub> 0.56, 95% CI 0.36-0.87).

227 **Table 2. Odds ratios (ORs) and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) of the risk of uterine leiomyoma**  
228 **according to quartiles of intake of each food group in all participants**

229

230

231

232

Food intake	Median, g/d	Women with UL (n=219)	Women without UL (n=453)	Age-adjusted OR (95% CI)	<i>p</i> *	Multivariable adjusted OR <sub>1</sub> (95% CI)	<i>p</i> *	Multivariable adjusted OR <sub>2</sub> (95% CI)	<i>p</i> *
<b>Vegetables and fruit</b>									
Q1	73.10	56 (25.6)	112 (24.7)	1.00	0.68	1.00	0.75	1.00	0.81
Q2	189.00	61 (27.9)	107 (23.6)	1.14 (0.73 -1.79)		1.16 (0.73 -1.85)		1.15 (0.71 -1.86)	
Q3	357.75	47 (21.5)	121 (26.7)	0.81 (0.51 -1.29)		0.85 (0.52 -1.39)		0.82 (0.49 -1.37)	
Q4	728.12	55 (25.1)	113 (24.9)	0.98 (0.62 -1.54)		0.99 (0.60 -1.65)		1.00 (0.59 -1.69)	
<b>Vegetables</b>									
Q1	36.96	50 (22.8)	118 (26.1)	1.00	0.94	1.00	0.79	1.00	0.56
Q2	82.57	56 (25.6)	112 (24.7)	1.19 (0.75 -1.88)		1.22 (0.76 -1.96)		1.35 (0.83 -2.20)	
Q3	129.72	59 (26.9)	109 (24.1)	1.26 (0.08 -2.00)		1.35 (0.83 -2.19)		1.48 (0.90 -2.43)	
Q4	239.64	54 (24.7)	114 (25.2)	1.06 (0.67 -1.70)		1.13 (0.68 -1.89)		1.26 (0.74 -2.13)	
<b>Fruit</b>									
Q1	0	67 (30.6)	131 (28.9)	1.00	0.45	1.00	0.46	1.00	0.39
Q2	76.83	53 (24.2)	85 (18.8)	1.25 (0.80 -1.98)		1.25 (0.79 -1.98)		1.19 (0.74 -1.91)	
Q3	230.57	46 (21.0)	122 (26.9)	0.77 (0.49 -1.21)		0.80 (0.05 -1.27)		0.75 (0.46 -1.22)	
Q4	532.79	53 (24.2)	115 (25.4)	0.94 (0.60 -1.46)		0.92 (0.58 -1.46)		0.87 (0.54 -1.41)	
<b>Red meat</b>									
Q1	5.83	59 (26.9)	109 (24.1)	1.00	0.40	1.00	0.30	1.00	0.19
Q2	18.33	55 (25.1)	118 (26.1)	0.90 (0.57 -1.42)		0.92 (0.58 -1.46)		0.93 (0.58 -1.49)	
Q3	35.24	45 (20.6)	118 (26.1)	0.78 (0.48 -1.25)		0.80 (0.49 -1.31)		0.78 (0.47 -1.30)	
Q4	78.13	60 (27.4)	108 (23.8)	1.15 (0.72 -1.82)		1.23 (0.74 -2.04)		1.31 (0.78 -2.23)	
<b>Processed meat</b>									
T1	0	125 (57.1)	281 (62.0)	1.00	0.11	1.00	0.12	1.00	0.15
T2	0.67	27 (12.3)	42 (9.3)	1.58 (0.93 -2.70)		1.64 (0.95 -2.82)		1.47 (0.84 -2.58)	
T3	3.33	67 (30.6)	130 (28.7)	1.43 (0.96 -2.14)		1.44 (0.94 -2.19)		1.41 (0.91 -2.17)	

Poultry									
Q1	0	45 (20.6)	116 (25.6)	1.00	0.06	1.00	0.08	1.00	0.07
Q2	1.25	41 (18.7)	71 (15.7)	1.51 (0.90 -2.53)		1.52 (0.90 -2.56)		<b>1.81 (1.05 -3.12)</b>	
Q3	2.50	66 (30.1)	146 (32.2)	1.30 (0.82 -2.07)		1.34 (0.83 -2.15)		1.51 (0.92 -2.49)	
Q4	6.25	67 (30.6)	120 (26.5)	<b>1.68 (1.04 -2.72)</b>		<b>1.69 (1.02 -2.81)</b>		<b>1.85 (1.09 -3.14)</b>	
Fish									
Q1	3.67	46 (21.0)	122 (26.9)	1.00	0.07	1.00	0.06	1.00	<b>0.049</b>
Q2	10.92	53 (24.2)	115 (25.4)	1.22 (0.76 -1.95)		1.28 (0.79 -2.08)		1.29 (0.78 -2.12)	
Q3	19.55	57 (26.0)	111 (24.5)	1.37 (0.86 -2.19)		1.46 (0.90 -2.35)		1.52 (0.92 -2.50)	
Q4	41.02	63 (28.8)	105 (23.2)	1.54 (0.97 -2.45)		<b>1.65 (1.00 -2.69)</b>		<b>1.70 (1.02 -2.84)</b>	
Dairy product									
Q1	1.67	67 (30.6)	100 (22.1)	1.00	0.07	1.00	0.09	1.00	0.06
Q2	47.86	54 (24.7)	115 (25.4)	0.73 (0.46 -1.14)		0.74 (0.47 -1.18)		0.73 (0.45 -1.17)	
Q3	120.00	48 (21.9)	120 (26.5)	<b>0.61 (0.39 -0.96)</b>		<b>0.61 (0.38 -0.97)</b>		<b>0.59 (0.36 -0.96)</b>	
Q4	256.43	50 (22.8)	118 (26.1)	0.64 (0.40 -1.00)		0.64 (0.39 -1.04)		<b>0.59 (0.36 -0.98)</b>	
Milk consumption									
Q1	0	76 (34.7)	123 (27.2)	1.00	0.17	1.00	0.20	1.00	0.09
Q2	16.67	44 (20.1)	76 (16.8)	0.97 (0.61 -1.55)		0.95 (0.59 -1.53)		0.95 (0.58 -1.55)	
Q3	50.00	60 (27.4)	164 (36.2)	<b>0.61 (0.40 -0.92)</b>		<b>0.60 (0.39 -0.91)</b>		<b>0.56 (0.36 -0.87)</b>	
Q4	200.00	39 (17.8)	90 (19.9)	0.71 (0.44 -1.13)		0.70 (0.43 -1.15)		0.62 (0.37 -1.03)	
Ethanol									
		203	433						
T1	0	100 (49.0)	216 (49.9)	1.00	0.72	1.00	0.78	1.00	0.78
T2	0.87	41 (20.1)	68 (15.7)	1.39 (0.87 -2.20)		1.34 (0.84 -2.13)		1.38 (0.85 -2.24)	
T3	8.16	63 (30.9)	149 (34.4)	1.00 (0.68 -1.49)		1.01 (0.68 -1.51)		1.14 (0.71 -1.83)	

234 Multivariable adjusted OR<sub>1</sub> was adjusted for age, BMI (kg/m<sup>2</sup>, <18.5, 18.5–23, 23–25, 25≤), total energy intake (kcal/d, quintile), and LDL-cholesterol (mg/dL,  
235 continuous)

236 Multivariable adjusted OR<sub>2</sub> was adjusted for age, BMI (kg/m<sup>2</sup>, <18.5, 18.5–23, 23–25, 25≤), total energy intake (kcal/d, quintile), and LDL-cholesterol (mg/dL,  
237 continuous), early menarche (years old , ≤11, 11<), menopausal state (premenopausal, postmenopausal), parity and age at first delivery (nulliparity, years old , <25, 25≤),  
238 alcohol intake (g/d, continuous), smoking (never, ever), physical activity (MET-minute per week, tertile)

239 *\*p value for the test of trend of odds*

240 Each of the cut-off values (g/d) were 121.9, 271.2, and 491.5 for vegetables and fruit intake; 60.8, 105.2, and 165.7 for vegetables intake; 0, 151.7, and 333.4 for fruit  
241 intake; 12.1, 25.0, and 47.5 for red meat intake; 0 and 0.7 for processed meat intake; 0, 1.3, and 3.5 for poultry intake; 7.1, 15.0, and 27.6 for fish intake; 22.1, 77.4, and  
242 168.3 for dairy intake; 0, 33.4, and 100.0 for milk intake; and 0 and 1.95 for ethanol intake.

243

244 *Association between dietary intake and the prevalence of UL in*  
245 *subgroups according to menopausal status*

246 A subgroup analysis was conducted for pre- and postmenopausal women (Table 3, Figure 1). In  
247 premenopausal women, vegetable intake was significantly inversely association with the UL prevalence  
248 in a dose-dependent manner ( $p$  trend = 0.01), although no single quartile intake of vegetables reached  
249 statistical significance compared with the lowest quartile (Q4 vs. Q1; OR<sub>2</sub> 0.47, 95% CI 0.22-1.01).  
250 Intake of red meat (Q2 vs. Q1: OR<sub>2</sub> 0.47, 95% CI 0.24-0.91) and dairy products (Q3 vs. Q1: OR<sub>2</sub> 0.46,  
251 95% CI 0.23-0.93) showed an inverse association with UL prevalence. The intake of fish was  
252 significantly association with increased prevalence of UL (Q3 vs. Q1: OR<sub>2</sub> 2.83, 95% CI 1.38-5.78).  
253 In postmenopausal women, higher fish intake was significantly associated with higher UL prevalence  
254 ( $p$  trend = 0.02), although no statistically significant association was demonstrated in each quartile  
255 group. Intake of processed meat (top vs. bottom: OR<sub>2</sub> 2.33, 95% CI 1.21-4.49) and poultry (Q2 vs. Q1:  
256 OR<sub>2</sub> 2.17, 95% CI 1.04-4.51) showed a significant association with an increased UL prevalence.

257

258 **Table 3. Odds ratios (ORs) and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) of the risk of uterine leiomyoma**  
259 **according to quartiles of intake of each food group in pre- and postmenopausal women**

260

261

262

263

264



	Premenopausal women						Postmenopausal women					
	Age-adjusted OR		Multivariable		Multivariable		Age-adjusted OR		Multivariable		Multivariable	
	(95% CI)	<i>p</i> *	adjusted OR <sub>1</sub> (95% CI)	<i>p</i> *	adjusted OR <sub>2</sub> (95% CI)	<i>p</i> *	(95% CI)	<i>p</i> *	adjusted OR <sub>1</sub> (95% CI)	<i>p</i> *	adjusted OR <sub>2</sub> (95% CI)	<i>p</i> *
Vegetables and fruit		<b>0.04</b>		0.15		0.19		0.10		0.26		0.34
Q1	1.00		1.00		1.00		1.00		1.00		1.00	
Q2	0.83 (0.45 -1.52)		0.85 (0.46 -1.57)		0.8 (0.42 -1.52)		1.78 (0.84 -3.78)		1.79 (0.81 -3.95)		1.67 (0.74 -3.78)	
Q3	<b>0.45 (0.24 -0.86)</b>		0.51 (0.26 -1.01)		0.51 (0.25 -1.02)		1.73 (0.82 -3.68)		1.77 (0.78 -4.01)		1.74 (0.75 -4.03)	
Q4	0.55 (0.29 -1.02)		0.62 (0.31 -1.21)		0.62 (0.31 -1.25)		<b>2.14 (1.02 -4.51)</b>		2.00 (0.85 -4.66)		1.85 (0.77 -4.40)	
Vegetables		<b>&lt;0.01</b>		<b>0.02</b>		<b>0.01</b>		<b>0.01</b>		<b>0.04</b>		0.05
Q1	1.00		1.00		1.00		1.00		1.00		1.00	
Q2	1.58 (0.85 -2.95)		1.63 (0.85 -3.12)		1.72 (0.87 -3.37)		1.06 (0.49 -2.32)		1.16 (0.52 -2.61)		1.12 (0.49 -2.54)	
Q3	0.94 (0.50 -1.76)		1.04 (0.54 -2.02)		1.14 (0.57 -2.26)		1.79 (0.85 -3.75)		1.93 (0.86 -4.35)		1.82 (0.80 -4.15)	
Q4	<b>0.47 (0.24 -0.91)</b>		0.52 (0.25 -1.08)		0.47 (0.22 -1.01)		<b>2.34 (1.13 -4.86)</b>		2.23 (0.99 -5.00)		2.11 (0.93 -4.78)	
Fruit		0.10		0.26		0.27		0.94		0.79		0.64
Q1	1.00		1.00		1.00		1.00		1.00		1.00	
Q2	1.12 (0.61 -2.05)		1.04 (0.56 -1.96)		0.98 (0.51 -1.89)		1.39 (0.66 -2.96)		1.36 (0.63 -2.96)		1.34 (0.60 -2.98)	
Q3	0.63 (0.34 -1.19)		0.68 (0.36 -1.30)		0.67 (0.34 -1.31)		1.34 (0.69 -2.60)		1.36 (0.68 -2.70)		1.33 (0.66 -2.70)	
Q4	0.67 (0.36 -1.23)		0.74 (0.39 -1.42)		0.72 (0.37 -1.41)		1.11 (0.56 -2.19)		0.96 (0.47 -1.98)		0.90 (0.43 -1.88)	
Red meat		0.98		0.43		0.30		0.18		0.54		0.49
Q1	1.00		1.00		1.00		1.00		1.00		1.00	
Q2	0.55 (0.30 -1.02)		<b>0.50 (0.27 -0.95)</b>		<b>0.47 (0.24 -0.91)</b>		0.88 (0.42 -1.85)		0.82 (0.38 -1.77)		0.80 (0.36 -1.75)	
Q3	0.55 (0.29 -1.04)		0.60 (0.31 -1.18)		0.64 (0.32 -1.27)		1.38 (0.67 -2.86)		1.28 (0.59 -2.77)		1.35 (0.61 -2.97)	
Q4	0.82 (0.44 -1.54)		1.03 (0.52 -2.02)		1.09 (0.54 -2.22)		1.49 (0.73 -3.07)		1.20 (0.53 -2.70)		1.23 (0.53 -2.85)	
Processed meat		0.29		0.23		0.22						
T1	1.00		1.00		1.00		1.00		1.00		1.00	

T2	1.04 (0.57 -1.91)		1.17 (0.62 -2.18)		1.27 (0.66 -2.44)		<b>2.33 (1.28 -4.25)</b>		<b>2.12 (1.13 -3.95)</b>		<b>2.33 (1.21 -4.49)</b>
T3	1.32 (0.78 -2.23)		1.42 (0.82 -2.47)		1.47 (0.83 -2.61)						
Poultry		0.91		0.74		0.67		0.91		0.15	0.18
Q1	1.00		1.00		1.00		1.00		1.00		1.00
Q2	1.14 (0.63 -2.09)		1.25 (0.67 -2.32)		1.36 (0.71 -2.60)		<b>2.18 (1.08 -4.41)</b>		<b>2.16 (1.06 -4.42)</b>		<b>2.17 (1.04 -4.51)</b>
Q3	1.02 (0.58 -1.81)		1.11 (0.61 -2.04)		1.15 (0.61 -2.18)		1.45 (0.68 -3.08)		1.40 (0.65 -3.04)		1.47 (0.67 -3.27)
Q4	0.98 (0.48 -2.00)		1.20 (0.55 -2.59)		1.27 (0.57 -2.84)		<b>2.48 (1.21 -5.09)</b>		2.08 (0.96 -4.50)		2.06 (0.92 -4.61)
Fish		0.68		0.84		0.81		<0.0		<b>0.02</b>	<b>0.02</b>
							1				
Q1	1.00		1.00		1.00		1.00		1.00		1.00
Q2	1.19 (0.63 -2.27)		1.50 (0.76 -2.96)		1.72 (0.85 -3.47)		0.93 (0.44 -1.96)		0.90 (0.42 -1.95)		0.85 (0.38 -1.87)
Q3	<b>1.94 (1.03 -3.66)</b>		<b>2.65 (1.33 -5.26)</b>		<b>2.83 (1.38 -5.78)</b>		0.82 (0.38 -1.76)		0.82 (0.37 -1.81)		0.76 (0.34 -1.70)
Q4	0.92 (0.48 -1.79)		1.26 (0.62 -2.55)		1.35 (0.65 -2.81)		<b>2.35 (1.17 -4.73)</b>		2.11 (0.98 -4.54)		2.09 (0.96 -4.57)
Dairy product		0.14		0.49		0.47		0.86		0.45	0.30
Q1	1.00		1.00		1.00		1.00		1.00		1.00
Q2	0.69 (0.38 -1.27)		0.74 (0.40 -1.37)		0.72 (0.38 -1.37)		0.71 (0.34 -1.45)		0.68 (0.32 -1.43)		0.69 (0.33 -1.47)
Q3	0.53 (0.28 -1.00)		0.57 (0.30 -1.10)		<b>0.46 (0.23 -0.93)</b>		0.93 (0.47 -1.88)		0.85 (0.41 -1.77)		0.85 (0.40 -1.78)
Q4	0.60 (0.32 -1.11)		0.75 (0.39 -1.46)		0.74 (0.37 -1.47)		0.83 (0.41 -1.68)		0.67 (0.31 -1.42)		0.60 (0.27 -1.32)
Milk		0.14		0.39		0.38		0.54		0.28	0.15
Q1	1.00		1.00		1.00		1.00		1.00		1.00
Q2	0.96 (0.51 -1.83)		0.98 (0.51 -1.89)		0.99 (0.51 -1.95)		0.99 (0.47 -2.07)		1.04 (0.49 -2.20)		1.01 (0.47 -2.16)
Q3	0.59 (0.33 -1.03)		0.62 (0.35 -1.11)		0.57 (0.31 -1.04)		0.67 (0.35 -1.28)		0.62 (0.32 -1.21)		0.59 (0.30 -1.17)
Q4	0.60 (0.31 -1.17)		0.72 (0.36 -1.47)		0.70 (0.34 -1.46)		0.86 (0.42 -1.74)		0.72 (0.34 -1.51)		0.62 (0.28 -1.34)
Alcohol		0.92		0.72		0.57		0.74		0.79	0.95
T1	1.00		1.00		1.00		1.00		1.00		1.00
T2	1.53 (0.87 -2.70)		1.46 (0.82 -2.61)		1.68 (0.91 -3.09)		1.60 (0.54 -4.78)		1.91 (0.61 -5.95)		2.15 (0.68 -6.83)

T3                      1.17 (0.68 -2.01)                      1.23 (0.70 -2.16)                      1.41 (0.68 -2.95)                      0.94 (0.53 -1.67)                      0.97 (0.54 -1.75)                      1.03 (0.53 -2.01)

265                      Q, quartile; T, tertile

266                      Multivariable adjusted OR<sub>1</sub> was adjusted for age, BMI (kg/m<sup>2</sup>, <18.5, 18.5–23, 23–25, 25≤), total energy intake (kcal/d, quintile), and LDL-cholesterol (mg/dL,  
267 continuous)

268                      Multivariable adjusted OR<sub>2</sub> was adjusted for age, BMI (kg/m<sup>2</sup>, <18.5, 18.5–23, 23–25, 25≤), total energy intake (kcal/d, quintile), and LDL-cholesterol (mg/dL,  
269 continuous), early menarche (years old , ≤11, 11<), menopausal state (premenopause, postmenopause), parity and age at first delivery (nulliparity, years old , <25, 25≤),  
270 alcohol intake (g/d, continuous), smoking (never, ever), physical activity (MET-minute per week, tertile)

271                      \**p* value for the test of trend of odds

272                      Each of the cut-off values (g/d) among premenopausal women were 123.8, 281.2, and 474.2 for vegetables and fruit intake; 55.2, 91.5, and 153.4 for vegetables intake;  
273 0, 171.4, and 356.5 for fruit intake; 14.2, 31.3, and 55.7 for red meat intake; 0 and 1.4 for processed meat intake; 1.3, 2.6, and 6.3 for poultry intake; 6.9, 14.1, and 25.4 for  
274 fish intake; 25.5, 72.9, and 161.7 for dairy intake; 0, 33.4, and 100.1 for milk intake; and 0 and 3.8 for ethanol intake.

275                      Each of the cut-off values (g/d) among postmenopausal women were 118.7, 255.5, and 520.4 for vegetables and fruit intake; 67.6, 118.0, and 191.1 for vegetables  
276 intake; 0, 120.0, and 304.0 for fruit intake; 8.4, 18.8, and 37.0 for red meat intake; 0 for processed meat intake; 0, 1.26, and 3.2 for poultry intake; 7.3, 16.3, and 29.7 for  
277 fish intake; 20.1, 85.0, and 175.4 for dairy intake; 0, 21.5, and 100.1 for milk intake; and 0 and 0.8 for ethanol intake.

278

279                      **Figure 1. Association between dietary intake and the prevalence of UL in subgroups according to menopausal status.**

## 280 *Discussion*

### 281 *Principal findings of our study and results of the other studies*

282 The key findings of our study are as follows:

- 283 1) Among all participants, 219 (32.6%) were diagnosed with UL: 132 out of 383 (34.5%) pre-  
284 menopausal women and 87 out of 289 (30.1%) postmenopausal women. No statistically significant  
285 differences was observed in the prevalence of UL between pre- and postmenopausal women ( $p = 0.23$ ).
- 286 2) Elevated fish and poultry consumption were associated with a higher prevalence of UL, with odds  
287 ratios (95% confidence intervals) comparing the top vs. bottom quartiles of 1.70 (1.02-2.84;  $p$  trend =  
288 0.049) for fish intake and 1.85 (1.09 -3.14;  $p$  trend = 0.07) for poultry intake. Conversely, a higher  
289 intake of dairy products displayed an inverse association with UL prevalence (OR 0.59, 95% CI 0.36–  
290 0.98;  $p$  trend = 0.06).
- 291 3) Upon analyzing pre- and post-menopausal women separately, a similar pattern emerged with  
292 increased prevalence associated with fish intake and decreased prevalence linked to dairy product intake.  
293 However, the association between poultry intake and UL prevalence was mainly evident among  
294 postmenopausal women. Among premenopausal women, a higher vegetable intake was associated with  
295 a lower prevalence of UL (OR 0.47, 95% CI 0.22 -1.01 for top vs. bottom quartiles;  $p$  trend = 0.01).

296 Our study observed a 33 % prevalence of UL. Although not statistically significant,  
297 premenopausal women exhibited a slightly higher UL prevalence than postmenopausal women (35 %  
298 vs. 30 %). Approximately 50% of ULs are asymptomatic and can be accurately diagnosed through  
299 ultrasound [1, 24]. We employed rigorous diagnostic criteria for identifying ULs. As a result, ULs were  
300 confirmed in about one-third of the total population, a figure comparable to a prior Korean study where  
301 ULs were detected in 37.5% of individuals undergoing pelvic ultrasonography as part of health check-  
302 ups, regardless of symptom presence [25].

303 We observed a significant association between fish consumption and UL in premenopausal women  
304 (Q3 vs. Q1: OR 2.83, 95% CI 1.38-5.78) and a dose-dependent association in postmenopausal women

305 (Q4 vs. Q1: OR2 2.09, 95% CI 0.96-4.57;  $p$  trend = 0.02). Contrasting findings exist in the literature,  
306 with an Italian case-control study reporting an inverse association [26], while Chinese and Japanese  
307 studies found no significant differences [27, 28]. A US cohort study demonstrated a 1.2-fold increased  
308 prevalence of UL in women who consumed sport fish from the Great Lakes for a decade, suggesting a  
309 potential risk elevation due to polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) exposure from fish consumption [29].  
310 However, a recent prospective cohort study investigating the relationship between PCBs and UL found  
311 no significant correlation [30]. Most previous studies have predominantly analyzed fish consumption  
312 in terms of dietary fat [15]. For instance, a prospective study involving 1,171 premenopausal African-  
313 American women in the US indicated that intakes of total fat, saturated fat, monounsaturated fat,  
314 polyunsaturated fat, and trans-fat were not appreciably associated with UL incidence. Interestingly, the  
315 consumption of marine  $\omega$ -3 polyunsaturated fatty acid, specifically docosahexaenoic acid, was linked  
316 to a 49% higher UL incidence (Q4 vs. Q1: HR 1.49, 95% CI 1.04, 2.14,  $p$  trend = 0.01) [31].  
317 Nevertheless, based solely on the results of this study, it is challenging to estimate the nutritional  
318 components of fish contributing to the association between fish consumption and UL. This point applies  
319 to all the associations between food groups included in this study and UL, and it has been reiterated as  
320 a limitation of this research.

321 Vegetable intake demonstrated a significant protective association with the prevalence of UL  
322 in premenopausal women. The odds ratio of the highest quartile of vegetable intake compared to the  
323 bottom quartile was 0.47 (95% CI 0.22–1.01), with a significant dose-dependent relationship ( $p$  trend  
324 = 0.01). These findings align with previous research, such as the Black Women’s Health Study,  
325 indicating reduced risk of UL development with higher fruit and vegetable consumption (four or more  
326 servings of fruits or vegetables daily, IRR = 0.90, 95% CI 0.82–0.98) [32]. In a case-control study  
327 involving 273 women, of whom 94% were of Han Chinese ethnicity, a negative correlation was found  
328 between vegetable and fruit intake and UL (OR 0.5, 95% CI 0.3–0.9) in premenopausal women [27].  
329 Furthermore, other investigations have indicated that women with UL consume green vegetables and  
330 fruits less frequently than women without UL [26, 33]. These protective associations are attributed to

331 mechanisms such as decreased bioavailable estrogen and growth factors [34, 35], or elevated levels of  
332 phytochemicals with anti-inflammatory properties [36, 37]. However, this study did not observe a  
333 protective effect of fruit consumption. The odds ratios for combined vegetable and fruit intake, as well  
334 as fruit intake alone, were 0.62 (95% CI 0.31–1.25) and 0.72 (95% CI 0.37–1.41) for the highest quartile  
335 over the lowest quartile, respectively. This finding aligns with a case-control study involving 843 Italian  
336 women, which indicated that vegetables were more protective than fruits against UL prevalence (OR  
337 0.5, 95% CI 0.4–0.6 for green vegetables, OR 0.8, 95% CI 0.6–1.0 for fruit consumption) [26].

338 We observed a protective association between dairy consumption and UL prevalence (Q4 vs.  
339 Q1: OR<sub>2</sub> 0.59, 95% CI 0.36–0.98 for all participants; Q3 vs. Q1: OR<sub>2</sub> 0.46, 95% CI 0.23–0.93 for  
340 premenopausal women). These findings align with a previous study that reported a protective effect of  
341 frequent consumption of milk and low-fat dairy products, as well as a modest protective effect for yogurt  
342 consumption, against the occurrence of UL. However, no significant associations were found for butter,  
343 cheese, and ice cream among African American women [38]. On the contrary, an Italian study presented  
344 contrasting results, finding no association between milk and cheese intake and the risk of UL [26].  
345 Additionally, a Chinese prospective cohort study demonstrated an increased risk when analyzing  
346 combined milk and soymilk consumption [39]. Dairy products are complex compounds with  
347 composition variations influenced by regional disparities in livestock production environments.  
348 Furthermore, reports suggest that dairy products might contain estrogenic compounds that could be  
349 absorbed and affect the menstrual cycle [40, 41]. As a result, diverse research findings have emerged  
350 concerning the link between dairy consumption and the risk of UL. In a substantial prospective cohort  
351 study spanning 18 years, no distinct associations emerged between overall dairy consumption and the  
352 risk of UL. Nevertheless, the study did establish that yogurt intake and dietary calcium were associated  
353 with a reduced risk of UL development [42].

354 Regarding the connection between meat consumption and UL, we observed a protective  
355 association with certain levels of red meat intake in premenopausal women (Q2 vs. Q1: OR<sub>2</sub> 0.47, 95%  
356 CI 0.24–0.91). On the other hand, we identified an increased association between processed meat (higher

357 vs. lower: OR<sub>2</sub> 2.33, 95% CI 1.21-4.49) and poultry (Q2 vs. Q1: OR<sub>2</sub> 2.17, 95% CI 1.04-4.51)  
358 consumption and UL prevalence in postmenopausal women. This aligns with findings from an Italian  
359 case-control study, which demonstrated that significant consumption of meats such as beef or ham was  
360 associated with an elevated risk of UL [26]. However, this risk was found to be insignificant in the  
361 Chinese population [27]. To classify meats, we categorized them into red meat, processed meat, and  
362 poultry. Processed meat and poultry intake exhibited an association with increased UL prevalence  
363 exclusively in postmenopausal women, whereas red meat intake indicated a lower UL prevalence solely  
364 in premenopausal women. Interpreting these associations is limited by the relatively low absolute  
365 amount of meat intake within this population. Nonetheless, it appears that processed meat, rather than  
366 red meat, may contain specific metabolites that could stimulate proliferative activities in UL cells [43,  
367 44].

368 A notable finding in our study was the variation in the association between dietary patterns  
369 and UL prevalence based on menopausal status. Numerous studies have reported differing dietary  
370 impacts on hormone-related conditions contingent on menopausal status. For instance, an investigation  
371 into the impact of a diabetes risk reduction diet on endometrial cancer revealed inverse associations  
372 exclusively among postmenopausal women, without such effects seen in premenopausal women [45].  
373 Similarly, a study exploring the link between urinary isoflavone and urinary estrogen levels after  
374 isoflavone intake identified a positive correlation solely in postmenopausal women. Cumulative  
375 evidence from epidemiological and metabolomics research suggests that the postmenopausal state can  
376 influence a specific set of metabolites in response to a particular diet, distinct from the premenopausal  
377 state [46, 47]. The potential anti-proliferative effect of a diet might be more profound in the high  
378 estrogenic environment of premenopausal women. Conversely, the impact of certain dietary  
379 components, such as estrogenic compounds in fatty fish or processed meat, could be more significant  
380 in the hypoestrogenic context of postmenopausal women. Consequently, considering the influence of  
381 menopausal status is imperative when investigating the relationship between dietary intake and health  
382 outcomes.

## 383 ***Strengths and limitations***

384 To the best of our knowledge, this is the first Korean study to investigate the association  
385 between dietary factors and UL, employing a validated Food Frequency Questionnaire (FFQ) known  
386 for its commendable reproducibility and validity [20]. All UL cases and non-cases underwent diagnosis  
387 through pelvic ultrasound examination, considered the most sensitive and clinically effective diagnostic  
388 tool for UL. Notably, the assessment of dietary intake data coincided with clinical factors, with the  
389 analysis accounting for menopausal status and other relevant confounding factors. However, several  
390 limitations must be acknowledged. Firstly, inevitable information discrepancies may arise from data  
391 gathered through self-reported food intake questionnaires. Secondly, the cross-sectional nature of the  
392 study curtails the ability to infer causal relationships, raising the possibility that those already diagnosed  
393 with UL may exhibit specific dietary patterns. Furthermore, the study may be subject to potential bias  
394 toward individuals of medium to high socioeconomic status who willingly invested USD \$500–1300  
395 for private health assessments, influencing the findings due to their increased health awareness and  
396 motivation towards adopting healthier lifestyles. Thirdly, the single-center design warrants caution in  
397 generalizing these findings to the entirety of Korean women. Fourthly, the study did not delve into the  
398 impact of nutrients derived from foods on dietary intake analyses. Absent were data on the concentration  
399 of associated metabolites, blood markers of inflammation, and reproductive or growth hormones,  
400 presumed to mediate these associations. Lastly, this study excluded women who had undergone  
401 hysterectomy due to UL-related symptoms, inadvertently excluding severe or symptomatic cases.

## 402 ***Conclusions***

403 In our study involving Korean women who underwent pelvic ultrasonography, we found that high  
404 consumption of fish and poultry, coupled with low intake of dairy products, correlated with an elevated  
405 prevalence of UL. Furthermore, vegetable intake exhibited an inverse relationship with UL prevalence,  
406 particularly among premenopausal women. These results suggest that dietary interventions offer  
407 promise as a potential preventive strategy for UL, with a specific focus on premenopausal women who



408 are disproportionately affected by this prevalent and consequential gynecological condition.

## 409 **References**

- 410 1. Baird DD, Dunson DB, Hill MC, Cousins D, Schectman JM. High cumulative incidence  
411 of uterine leiomyoma in black and white women: ultrasound evidence. *Am J Obstet Gynecol.*  
412 2003;188(1):100–7. doi: 10.1067/mob.2003.99. PubMed PMID: 12548202.
- 413 2. Stewart EA, Cookson CL, Gandolfo RA, Schulze–Rath R. Epidemiology of uterine  
414 fibroids: a systematic review. *Bjog.* 2017;124(10):1501–12. Epub 20170513. doi:  
415 10.1111/1471-0528.14640. PubMed PMID: 28296146.
- 416 3. Wise LA, Laughlin–Tommaso SK. Epidemiology of Uterine Fibroids: From Menarche  
417 to Menopause. *Clin Obstet Gynecol.* 2016;59(1):2–24. doi: 10.1097/grf.0000000000000164.  
418 PubMed PMID: 26744813; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC4733579.
- 419 4. Bulun SE. Uterine fibroids. *N Engl J Med.* 2013;369(14):1344–55. doi:  
420 10.1056/NEJMra1209993. PubMed PMID: 24088094.
- 421 5. Bulun SE, Moravek MB, Yin P, Ono M, Coon JSt, Dyson MT, et al. Uterine Leiomyoma  
422 Stem Cells: Linking Progesterone to Growth. *Semin Reprod Med.* 2015;33(5):357–65. Epub  
423 20150806. doi: 10.1055/s-0035-1558451. PubMed PMID: 26251118.
- 424 6. Hunter DS, Hodges LC, Eagon PK, Vonier PM, Fuchs–Young R, Bergerson JS, et al.  
425 Influence of exogenous estrogen receptor ligands on uterine leiomyoma: evidence from an in  
426 vitro/in vivo animal model for uterine fibroids. *Environ Health Perspect.* 2000;108 Suppl 5:829–  
427 34. doi: 10.1289/ehp.00108s5829. PubMed PMID: 11035990.
- 428 7. Marsh EE, Bulun SE. Steroid hormones and leiomyomas. *Obstet Gynecol Clin North*  
429 *Am.* 2006;33(1):59–67. doi: 10.1016/j.ogc.2005.12.001. PubMed PMID: 16504806.
- 430 8. Afrin S, AlAshqar A, El Sabeh M, Miyashita–Ishiwata M, Reschke L, Brennan JT, et al.  
431 Diet and Nutrition in Gynecological Disorders: A Focus on Clinical Studies. *Nutrients.*  
432 2021;13(6). Epub 20210521. doi: 10.3390/nu13061747. PubMed PMID: 34063835; PubMed  
433 Central PMCID: PMC8224039.
- 434 9. Pavone D, Clemenza S, Sorbi F, Fambrini M, Petraglia F. Epidemiology and Risk  
435 Factors of Uterine Fibroids. *Best Pract Res Clin Obstet Gynaecol.* 2018;46:3–11. Epub  
436 20171001. doi: 10.1016/j.bpobgyn.2017.09.004. PubMed PMID: 29054502.
- 437 10. Bradbury KE, Appleby PN, Key TJ. Fruit, vegetable, and fiber intake in relation to  
438 cancer risk: findings from the European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition  
439 (EPIC). *Am J Clin Nutr.* 2014;100 Suppl 1:394s–8s. Epub 20140611. doi:  
440 10.3945/ajcn.113.071357. PubMed PMID: 24920034.
- 441 11. Friberg E, Wallin A, Wolk A. Sucrose, high–sugar foods, and risk of endometrial  
442 cancer--a population–based cohort study. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev.*  
443 2011;20(9):1831–7. Epub 20110715. doi: 10.1158/1055-9965.Epi-11-0402. PubMed PMID:  
444 21765006.
- 445 12. Masala G, Assedi M, Bendinelli B, Ermini I, Sieri S, Grioni S, et al. Fruit and vegetables  
446 consumption and breast cancer risk: the EPIC Italy study. *Breast Cancer Res Treat.*  
447 2012;132(3):1127–36. Epub 20120104. doi: 10.1007/s10549-011-1939-7. PubMed PMID:  
448 22215387.
- 449 13. Rieck G, Fiander A. The effect of lifestyle factors on gynaecological cancer. *Best Pract*  
450 *Res Clin Obstet Gynaecol.* 2006;20(2):227–51. doi: 10.1016/j.bpobgyn.2005.10.010. PubMed  
451 PMID: 16543119.
- 452 14. Islam MS, Segars JH, Castellucci M, Ciarmela P. Dietary phytochemicals for possible  
453 preventive and therapeutic option of uterine fibroids: Signaling pathways as target. *Pharmacol*  
454 *Rep.* 2017;69(1):57–70. Epub 20161020. doi: 10.1016/j.pharep.2016.10.013. PubMed PMID:

455 27898339.

456 15. Ciebiera M, Esfandyari S, Siblini H, Prince L, Elkafas H, Wojtyła C, et al. Nutrition in  
457 Gynecological Diseases: Current Perspectives. *Nutrients*. 2021;13(4). Epub 20210402. doi:  
458 10.3390/nu13041178. PubMed PMID: 33918317; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPCMC8065992.

459 16. Parazzini F, Di Martino M, Candiani M, Viganò P. Dietary components and uterine  
460 leiomyomas: a review of published data. *Nutr Cancer*. 2015;67(4):569–79. Epub 20150331. doi:  
461 10.1080/01635581.2015.1015746. PubMed PMID: 25826470.

462 17. Tinelli A, Vinciguerra M, Malvasi A, Andjić M, Babović I, Sparić R. Uterine Fibroids  
463 and Diet. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2021;18(3). Epub 20210125. doi:  
464 10.3390/ijerph18031066. PubMed PMID: 33504114; PubMed Central PMCID:  
465 PMPCMC7908561.

466 18. Yang SY, Kim YS, Lee JE, Seol J, Song JH, Chung GE, et al. Dietary protein and fat  
467 intake in relation to risk of colorectal adenoma in Korean. *Medicine (Baltimore)*.  
468 2016;95(49):e5453. doi: 10.1097/md.0000000000005453. PubMed PMID: 27930524; PubMed  
469 Central PMCID: PMPCMC5265996.

470 19. Harlow SD, Gass M, Hall JE, Lobo R, Maki P, Rebar RW, et al. Executive summary of  
471 the Stages of Reproductive Aging Workshop + 10: addressing the unfinished agenda of staging  
472 reproductive aging. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab*. 2012;97(4):1159–68. Epub 20120216. doi:  
473 10.1210/jc.2011-3362. PubMed PMID: 22344196; PubMed Central PMCID: PMPCMC3319184.

474 20. Ahn Y, Kwon E, Shim JE, Park MK, Joo Y, Kimm K, et al. Validation and reproducibility  
475 of food frequency questionnaire for Korean genome epidemiologic study. *Eur J Clin Nutr*.  
476 2007;61(12):1435–41. Epub 20070207. doi: 10.1038/sj.ejcn.1602657. PubMed PMID:  
477 17299477.

478 21. Alberti KG, Eckel RH, Grundy SM, Zimmet PZ, Cleeman JI, Donato KA, et al.  
479 Harmonizing the metabolic syndrome: a joint interim statement of the International Diabetes  
480 Federation Task Force on Epidemiology and Prevention; National Heart, Lung, and Blood  
481 Institute; American Heart Association; World Heart Federation; International Atherosclerosis  
482 Society; and International Association for the Study of Obesity. *Circulation*.  
483 2009;120(16):1640–5. Epub 20091005. doi: 10.1161/circulationaha.109.192644. PubMed PMID:  
484 19805654.

485 22. Lee SY, Park HS, Kim DJ, Han JH, Kim SM, Cho GJ, et al. Appropriate waist  
486 circumference cutoff points for central obesity in Korean adults. *Diabetes Res Clin Pract*.  
487 2007;75(1):72–80. Epub 20060602. doi: 10.1016/j.diabres.2006.04.013. PubMed PMID:  
488 16735075.

489 23. Chun MY. Validity and reliability of korean version of international physical activity  
490 questionnaire short form in the elderly. *Korean J Fam Med*. 2012;33(3):144–51. Epub 20120524.  
491 doi: 10.4082/kjfm.2012.33.3.144. PubMed PMID: 22787536; PubMed Central PMCID:  
492 PMPCMC3391639.

493 24. Foth D, Röhl FW, Friedrich C, Tytkoski H, Rabe T, Römer T, et al. Symptoms of uterine  
494 myomas: data of an epidemiological study in Germany. *Arch Gynecol Obstet*. 2017;295(2):415–  
495 26. Epub 20161121. doi: 10.1007/s00404-016-4239-y. PubMed PMID: 27873052.

496 25. Kim MH, Park YR, Lim DJ, Yoon KH, Kang MI, Cha BY, et al. The relationship between  
497 thyroid nodules and uterine fibroids. *Endocr J*. 2010;57(7):615–21. Epub 20100513. doi:  
498 10.1507/endocrj.k10e-024. PubMed PMID: 20467159.

499 26. Chiaffarino F, Parazzini F, La Vecchia C, Chatenoud L, Di Cintio E, Marsico S. Diet and  
500 uterine myomas. *Obstet Gynecol*. 1999;94(3):395–8. doi: 10.1016/s0029-7844(99)00305-1.  
501 PubMed PMID: 10472866.

502 27. He Y, Zeng Q, Dong S, Qin L, Li G, Wang P. Associations between uterine fibroids and  
503 lifestyles including diet, physical activity and stress: a case-control study in China. *Asia Pac J*  
504 *Clin Nutr*. 2013;22(1):109–17. doi: 10.6133/apjcn.2013.22.1.07. PubMed PMID: 23353618.

- 505 28. Nagata C, Nakamura K, Oba S, Hayashi M, Takeda N, Yasuda K. Association of intakes  
506 of fat, dietary fibre, soya isoflavones and alcohol with uterine fibroids in Japanese women. *Br*  
507 *J Nutr.* 2009;101(10):1427–31. doi: 10.1017/s0007114508083566. PubMed PMID: 19459228.
- 508 29. Lambertino A, Turyk M, Anderson H, Freels S, Persky V. Uterine leiomyomata in a  
509 cohort of Great Lakes sport fish consumers. *Environ Res.* 2011;111(4):565–72. Epub 20110209.  
510 doi: 10.1016/j.envres.2011.01.006. PubMed PMID: 21310402; PubMed Central PMCID:  
511 PMCPMC3111144.
- 512 30. Wesselink AK, Claus Henn B, Fruh V, Orta OR, Weuve J, Hauser R, et al. A Prospective  
513 Ultrasound Study of Plasma Polychlorinated Biphenyl Concentrations and Incidence of Uterine  
514 Leiomyomata. *Epidemiology.* 2021;32(2):259–67. doi: 10.1097/ede.0000000000001320.  
515 PubMed PMID: 33427764; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC8862183.
- 516 31. Brasky TM, Bethea TN, Wesselink AK, Wegienka GR, Baird DD, Wise LA. Dietary Fat  
517 Intake and Risk of Uterine Leiomyomata: A Prospective Ultrasound Study. *Am J Epidemiol.*  
518 2020;189(12):1538–46. doi: 10.1093/aje/kwaa097. PubMed PMID: 32556077; PubMed Central  
519 PMCID: PMCPMC7857646.
- 520 32. Wise LA, Radin RG, Palmer JR, Kumanyika SK, Boggs DA, Rosenberg L. Intake of fruit,  
521 vegetables, and carotenoids in relation to risk of uterine leiomyomata. *Am J Clin Nutr.*  
522 2011;94(6):1620–31. Epub 20111109. doi: 10.3945/ajcn.111.016600. PubMed PMID: 22071705;  
523 PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC3252555.
- 524 33. Shen Y, Wu Y, Lu Q, Ren M. Vegetarian diet and reduced uterine fibroids risk: A case-  
525 control study in Nanjing, China. *J Obstet Gynaecol Res.* 2016;42(1):87–94. Epub 20151012.  
526 doi: 10.1111/jog.12834. PubMed PMID: 26458740.
- 527 34. Allen NE, Appleby PN, Davey GK, Kaaks R, Rinaldi S, Key TJ. The associations of diet  
528 with serum insulin-like growth factor I and its main binding proteins in 292 women meat-eaters,  
529 vegetarians, and vegans. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev.* 2002;11(11):1441–8. PubMed  
530 PMID: 12433724.
- 531 35. Barnard ND, Scialli AR, Hurlock D, Bertron P. Diet and sex-hormone binding globulin,  
532 dysmenorrhea, and premenstrual symptoms. *Obstet Gynecol.* 2000;95(2):245–50. doi:  
533 10.1016/s0029-7844(99)00525-6. PubMed PMID: 10674588.
- 534 36. Armstrong BK, Brown JB, Clarke HT, Crooke DK, Hähnel R, Masarei JR, et al. Diet and  
535 reproductive hormones: a study of vegetarian and nonvegetarian postmenopausal women. *J*  
536 *Natl Cancer Inst.* 1981;67(4):761–7. PubMed PMID: 6944545.
- 537 37. Islam MS, Akhtar MM, Ciavattini A, Giannubilo SR, Protic O, Janjusevic M, et al. Use  
538 of dietary phytochemicals to target inflammation, fibrosis, proliferation, and angiogenesis in  
539 uterine tissues: promising options for prevention and treatment of uterine fibroids? *Mol Nutr*  
540 *Food Res.* 2014;58(8):1667–84. Epub 20140630. doi: 10.1002/mnfr.201400134. PubMed PMID:  
541 24976593; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC4152895.
- 542 38. Wise LA, Radin RG, Palmer JR, Kumanyika SK, Rosenberg L. A prospective study of  
543 dairy intake and risk of uterine leiomyomata. *Am J Epidemiol.* 2010;171(2):221–32. Epub  
544 20091202. doi: 10.1093/aje/kwp355. PubMed PMID: 19955473; PubMed Central PMCID:  
545 PMCPMC2800240.
- 546 39. Gao M, Wang H. Frequent milk and soybean consumption are high risks for uterine  
547 leiomyoma: A prospective cohort study. *Medicine (Baltimore).* 2018;97(41):e12009. doi:  
548 10.1097/md.00000000000012009. PubMed PMID: 30313022; PubMed Central PMCID:  
549 PMCPMC6203589.
- 550 40. Kim K, Wactawski-Wende J, Michels KA, Plowden TC, Chaljub EN, Sjaarda LA, et al.  
551 Dairy Food Intake Is Associated with Reproductive Hormones and Sporadic Anovulation among  
552 Healthy Premenopausal Women. *J Nutr.* 2017;147(2):218–26. Epub 20161123. doi:  
553 10.3945/jn.116.241521. PubMed PMID: 27881593; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC5265695.
- 554 41. Maruyama K, Oshima T, Ohyama K. Exposure to exogenous estrogen through intake

555 of commercial milk produced from pregnant cows. *Pediatr Int.* 2010;52(1):33–8. Epub  
556 20090522. doi: 10.1111/j.1442–200X.2009.02890.x. PubMed PMID: 19496976.

557 42. Orta OR, Terry KL, Missmer SA, Harris HR. Dairy and related nutrient intake and risk  
558 of uterine leiomyoma: a prospective cohort study. *Hum Reprod.* 2020;35(2):453–63. doi:  
559 10.1093/humrep/dez278. PubMed PMID: 32086510; PubMed Central PMCID:  
560 PMCPMC8489562.

561 43. Chajès V, Thiébaud AC, Rotival M, Gauthier E, Maillard V, Boutron–Ruault MC, et al.  
562 Association between serum trans–monounsaturated fatty acids and breast cancer risk in the  
563 E3N–EPIC Study. *Am J Epidemiol.* 2008;167(11):1312–20. Epub 20080404. doi:  
564 10.1093/aje/kwn069. PubMed PMID: 18390841; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC2679982.

565 44. Turesky RJ. Mechanistic Evidence for Red Meat and Processed Meat Intake and Cancer  
566 Risk: A Follow–up on the International Agency for Research on Cancer Evaluation of 2015.  
567 *Chimia (Aarau).* 2018;72(10):718–24. doi: 10.2533/chimia.2018.718. PubMed PMID: 30376922;  
568 PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC6294997.

569 45. Esposito G, Bravi F, Serraino D, Parazzini F, Crispo A, Augustin LSA, et al. Diabetes  
570 Risk Reduction Diet and Endometrial Cancer Risk. *Nutrients.* 2021;13(8). Epub 20210730. doi:  
571 10.3390/nu13082630. PubMed PMID: 34444790; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC8399314.

572 46. Stark KD, Park EJ, Holub BJ. Fatty acid composition of serum phospholipid of  
573 premenopausal women and postmenopausal women receiving and not receiving hormone  
574 replacement therapy. *Menopause.* 2003;10(5):448–55. doi:  
575 10.1097/01.Gme.0000059861.93639.1a. PubMed PMID: 14501607.

576 47. Verri Hernandez V, Dordevic N, Hantikainen EM, Sigurdsson BB, Smáráson SV,  
577 García–Larsen V, et al. Age, Sex, Body Mass Index, Diet and Menopause Related Metabolites  
578 in a Large Homogeneous Alpine Cohort. *Metabolites.* 2022;12(3). Epub 20220224. doi:  
579 10.3390/metabo12030205. PubMed PMID: 35323648; PubMed Central PMCID:  
580 PMCPMC8955763.

581


582

## 583 **Supporting data**

584 **Supplementary Table 1. Median values of the tertiles or quartiles of each dietary group in all,**  
585 **pre-, and postmenopausal women.**

586

587



(A) Premenopausal women

(B) Postmenopausal women

Fig.1