

Title of Paper: Dietary risk factors for monoclonal gammopathy of undetermined significance in a racially diverse population

Running Title: Diet and MGUS: and NHANES case-control study

Authors: Janine M. Joseph, MS, MBA¹; Jens Hillengass, MD, PhD²; Li Tang, PhD¹; Alexander M. Lesokhin, MD³; Ola Landgren, MD, PhD⁴; Saad Z. Usmani, MD³; Kirsten B. Moysich, PhD¹; Susan E. McCann, PhD¹†; Urvi A. Shah, MD³

- 1) Department of Cancer Prevention and Control, Roswell Park Comprehensive Cancer Center, Buffalo, NY, USA.
- 2) Myeloma Section, Department of Medicine, Roswell Park Comprehensive Cancer Center, Buffalo, NY, USA.
- 3) Myeloma Service, Department of Medicine, Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center, New York, NY, USA.
- 4) Myeloma Service, Department of Medicine, Sylvester Comprehensive Cancer Center at the University of Miami, Miami, FL, USA.

† Deceased author

Corresponding Authors:

Janine M. Joseph, MS, MBA
Pre-Doctoral Trainee
Department of Cancer Prevention and Control
Roswell Park Comprehensive Cancer Center
Elm & Carlton Streets
Buffalo, New York 14263
Email: janine.joseph@roswellpark.org
Office: 716-845-8937
Fax: 716-845-8487

Urvi A. Shah, MD
Myeloma Service, Department of Medicine
Assistant Attending
Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center
530 East 74th Street
New York, New York 10021
Email: shahu@mskcc.org
Office: 646-608-3713
Fax: 929-321-7405

Word Count: 3,003 (manuscript), 244 (abstract) **Tables:** 3 **Figures:** 1 **References:** 52

Key Points

Consumption of whole-grain bread, oats, and rice ($P<0.05$) and fruits and vegetables ($P=0.02$) was associated with reduced risk of MGUS.

Intake of sugar- ($P=0.04$) or artificially ($P=0.03$) sweetened soft drinks was associated with increased risk of MGUS.

Abstract

Monoclonal gammopathy of undetermined significance (MGUS) – a precursor of multiple myeloma – is associated with shorter lifespan and cardiac, renal, neurologic, and immune-related comorbidities. There is little known about modifiable risk factors for this condition. To determine if risk of MGUS is associated with dietary factors in a racially diverse population, we conducted a United States population-based case-control study from the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (1988-2004), which included 373 individuals with MGUS and 1,406 matched controls. Diet was characterized by one 24-hour dietary recall, with gram intake of individual foods and beverages aggregated into groups. Unconditional multivariable logistic regressions were used to model associations between intake of several food groups and MGUS, with odds ratios (OR) and 95% confidence intervals (95% CI) reported for the highest relative to the lowest quantile of intake. Daily gram intake of several food and beverage groups were significantly associated with MGUS. MGUS was inversely associated with whole-grain bread, oats, and rice (OR 0.70; 95% CI 0.48-1.00; $P<0.05$), fruits (excluding juice) and vegetables (OR 0.69; 95% CI 0.52-0.93; $P=0.02$), vegetables (OR 0.75; 95% CI 0.56-0.99; $P<0.05$), tomatoes (OR 0.72; 95% CI 0.51-1.00; $P<0.05$), and cruciferous vegetables (OR 0.44; 95% CI 0.26-0.74; $P<0.01$). Direct associations were observed for sugar-sweetened beverages (OR 1.34; 95% CI 1.00-1.78; $P<0.05$), sugar-sweetened soft drinks (OR 1.41; 95% CI 1.01-1.96; $P=0.04$), and artificially sweetened soft drinks (OR 1.55; 95% CI 1.04-2.33; $P=0.03$). Our study shows that diet is potentially a modifiable risk factor for MGUS.

Introduction

Monoclonal gammopathy of undetermined significance (MGUS) is characterized by elevated abnormal serum proteins produced by clonal plasma cells. Although usually benign, MGUS progresses to multiple myeloma (MM) or a related disorder at a rate of approximately 1% per year¹. Additionally, there is evidence that MGUS is associated with shorter lifespan^{1,2} and cardiac, renal, neurologic, and immune-related comorbidities³. An estimated 3.0-3.6% of White and 5.9-8.4% of Black individuals have MGUS⁴.

Risk factors for MGUS include older age⁴, male sex⁴, Black race⁴, family history⁴, chronic antigenic stimulation⁵, infections and inflammatory conditions⁶, certain pesticides^{4,7}, other chemicals⁵, diabetes⁸ and obesity⁹. Obesity more than doubles the risk of progression from MGUS to MM¹⁰.

There are limited data on the association between diet and MGUS. In a population-based case-control study from Iceland, intake of fruit during adolescence and whole-wheat bread during middle age were inversely associated with MGUS¹¹. There is, however, evidence that diet is associated with MM risk or survival¹², including diets with higher inflammatory or insulinemic potential¹³, vegetarian or vegan diets (inversely)¹⁴, and several foods or dietary compounds¹⁵⁻¹⁸.

There is an unmet need to identify additional risk factors related to MGUS that are potentially amenable to intervention, as most risk factors for MGUS are non-modifiable or not easily modifiable. Given that most MM cases are preceded by MGUS and dietary risk factors have been associated with MM, studying the evidence for dietary risk factors for MGUS is warranted.

Methods

Study Population

The National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES) program is administered by the National Center for Health Statistics within the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. The goal of the program is to assess the health and nutritional status of the United States population. To obtain reliable estimates of subgroups, certain populations, such as older persons, African Americans, Mexican Americans, and low-income persons are oversampled. Further details are available on the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention website¹⁹.

Study Sample

Data from this population-based, case-control study were obtained from four releases of NHANES (NHANES III, 1999-2000, 2001-2002, 2003-2004), which included 77,772 individuals²⁰. The overall dataset was restricted to 25,095 individuals whose sera were included in the surplus sera studies of MGUS released in 2012 for participants ≥ 50 years of age from NHANES III (n=6,557), 1999-2000 (n=1,864), 2001-2002 (n=2,130), and 2003-2004 (n=2,164), and in 2015 for participants < 50 years of age from NHANES III (n=12,380) (Figure 1), as described previously^{21, 22}.

Case and Control Definitions

Potential cases (n=433) were defined as individuals with MGUS by established criteria²³⁻²⁶. Potential controls (n=24,662) were individuals whose sera did not meet criteria for MGUS. We excluded individuals younger than age 18 (1 case and 2,939 controls), missing matching characteristics (9 cases and 278 controls), missing 24-hour dietary recall (DR), or implausible total energy intake (< 500 or > 3500 kilocalories per day [kcal/d]²⁷) (50 cases and 2,627 controls), leaving a total of 373 cases and 18,818 possible controls. Controls were frequency matched at a rate of four controls to one case on five criteria: NHANES release, sex, race/ethnicity, age at interview (five-year categories), and body mass index (BMI) category (< 18.5 , 18.5-24.9, 25.0-29.9, and ≥ 30.0 kg/m²) (Figure 1).

Descriptive Characteristics and Dietary Measures

Descriptive characteristics were available through NHANES interview questionnaires done prior to MGUS ascertainment²⁸. BMI was obtained by physical examination. Individuals with MGUS were risk stratified based on International Myeloma Working Group criteria (non-IgG-type MGUS, M protein concentration >1.5 g/dL, and/or abnormal serum free light chain ratio) into low-risk MGUS (LRMGUS, zero risk factors) and intermediate/high-risk MGUS (IHRMGUS, one or more risk factors)²⁹.

Dietary practices were assessed with a DR that captured food and beverage intake for 24 hours through midnight prior to the interview. Based on the DR, NHANES provides individual estimates of total energy intake (kcal/d), macronutrients (g/d), and micronutrients. Additionally, the DR provided detail on individual foods consumed, classified by their eight-digit food code assigned by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA). The first digit identifies the food group, as described in the USDA Food and Nutrient Database for Dietary Studies documentation³⁰: (1) milk and milk products; (2) meat, poultry, fish, and mixtures; (3) eggs; (4) legumes, nuts, and seeds; (5) grain products; (6) fruits; (7) vegetables; (8) fats, oils, and salad dressings; and (9) sugars, sweets, and beverages. We divided (6) fruits into (6a) fruits (excluding juices) and (6b) fruit juices, and we created a combined “fruits (excluding juice) and vegetables” group.

Subsequent digits of the USDA food code allow for foods to be assigned to ever more specific groups. We created 12 more custom food groups based on the second or third digit or, in a few instances, by selection of individual foods based on their eight-digit code. These custom groups provided insights into the drivers of an association for a primary food group or because of prior associations with MGUS or cancer (Supplementary Table S1). For each primary and custom

food group, we calculated each participant's total g/d consumed. Consumption of each food group (g/d) was divided into tertiles (T) or, for highly skewed distributions, quantiles (Q), based on the distribution in the controls. Where more than 90% of the controls had no intake, the sample was divided into "None" or "Any" consumption.

The Healthy Eating Index (HEI), a measure of diet quality used to assess how well a set of foods aligns with the Dietary Guidelines for Americans, was available for NHANES III and calculated from DR data. Additionally, NHANES III administered an extensive FFQ which was included as supplementary analyses for this study. This queried monthly intake of 60 items. Each item was mapped to 11 primary and 10 custom FFQ food groups, which largely aligned with the USDA-based DR food groups described above (Supplementary Tables S2 and S3). Monthly consumption (times/month) was assigned into tertiles or quantiles, based on the distribution in controls.

Statistical Methods

Key demographic and health-related characteristics of cases and controls were compared using Student's t-tests for differences in means or chi-squared tests for differences in proportion.

Due to the frequency-match between cases and controls, i.e., not unique matching, unconditional multivariable logistic regression analyses were used to model the association between MGUS, LRMGUS, and IHRMGUS and daily intake of primary and custom food groups, with odds ratios (OR) and 95% confidence intervals (CI) as the measures of association. Firth's corrections were applied to logistic regressions with referent groups representing $\geq 70\%$ of the controls. Total daily energy intake (kcal), age in years, sex, race/ethnicity, and continuous BMI, were included as covariates in all multivariable models. Variables associated with socioeconomic status (education and family income) were not included in the final models because they did not substantially impact the modeled measures of association. P-values for

food groups with more than two quantiles of intake are stated as p for trend (P_{trend}) between quantile midpoints.

As secondary analyses, the association between MGUS, LRMGUS, and IHRMGUS and monthly intake of primary and custom FFQ food groups for 1,079 NHANES III participants was examined and modeled similar to the primary analyses.

In all models, a value of $P \leq 0.05$ was considered significant. All analyses were performed using SAS 9.4 for Windows (SAS Institute, Cary, NC).

Data Availability

Original datasets are publicly available from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. The datasets generated during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

Results

Participant Characteristics

There are 1,779 total participants – 373 MGUS cases and 1,406 matched controls – included in the analysis. The mean age at interview is 67.3 years. The participants are predominantly overweight/obese (69.7%), from the NHANES III cycle (61.0%), male (57.6%), non-Hispanic White (55.0%), with no college education (69.5%), married (61.0%; data not shown), have a family income above \$20,000/year (52.1%) and are not current smokers (82.8%). The study was racially diverse, with 45.0% minorities, including 27.2% non-Hispanic Blacks and 16.0% Mexican Americans. There are no statistically significant differences in these characteristics between cases and controls (Table 1).

Diet and MGUS Association

Food Groups (Dietary Recall)

Participants report eating 1,730 kcal/d on average. Participants from NHANES III have a mean HEI score of 64, indicating an average diet that needs improvement by USDA Center for Nutrition Policy and Promotion standards³¹. This HEI score is roughly comparable to the United States national average in 1994 among individuals aged 51 and over – 64.0 for males and 67.1 for females³². There are no significant differences in total energy, HEI, or macronutrient intake between cases and controls (data not shown).

Multivariable models of the association between daily food intake and MGUS, LRMGUS, and IHRMGUS as defined by USDA primary (Table 2) and custom food groups (Table 3) are shown. Daily intakes of certain plant-based foods are inversely associated with MGUS. Intake of whole-wheat bread, whole oats, and brown rice shows an inverse association with MGUS (Q2 OR 0.70; 95% CI 0.48-1.00; $P<0.05$) and LRMGUS (Q2 OR 0.51; 95% CI 0.28-0.93; $P=0.03$). Intake of fruits (excluding juice) and vegetables shows a dose-dependent ($P_{trend} 0.02$) inverse association with MGUS (T3 OR 0.69; 95% CI 0.52-0.93; $P=0.02$). Taken alone, intake of fruits (excluding juice) is inversely associated with LRMGUS (Q3 OR 0.62; 95% CI 0.38-0.99; $P<0.05$). Intake of vegetables is inversely associated with MGUS (T3 OR 0.75; 95% CI 0.56-0.99; $P<0.05$). Intake of tomatoes shows an inverse association with MGUS (Q2 OR 0.72; 95% CI 0.51-1.00; $P<0.05$). Intake of cruciferous vegetables shows an inverse association with both MGUS (Q2 OR 0.44; 95% CI 0.26-0.74; $P<0.01$) and IHRMGUS (Q2 OR 0.22; 95% CI 0.09-0.57; $P<0.01$).

Daily gram intake of sugars, sweets, and beverages is associated with MGUS (T3 OR 1.39; 95% CI 1.02-1.89; $P=0.04$) and LRMGUS (T3 OR 1.68; 95% CI 1.08-2.60; $P=0.02$). This overall association is attributed to sugar- and artificially sweetened soft drinks, as described below, with no associations seen for the other major contributors to this primary USDA food group, such as desserts, candy, coffee, or alcoholic beverages (data not shown).

Intake of sugar-sweetened beverages is associated with both MGUS (Q2 OR 1.34; 95% CI 1.00-1.78; $P<0.05$) and LRMGUS (Q2 OR 1.68; 95% CI 1.13-2.49; $P=0.01$) but not with IHRMGUS. Intake of soft drinks, which includes both sugar-sweetened and artificially sweetened, is associated with MGUS (Q2 OR 1.43; 95% CI 1.06-1.92; $P=0.02$) and LRMGUS (Q2 OR 1.68; 95% CI 1.11-2.53; $P=0.01$). Similarly, intake of soft drinks (sugar-sweetened) is associated with MGUS (Q2 OR 1.41; 95% CI 1.01-1.96; $P=0.04$). There are even more pronounced associations between intake of soft drinks (artificially sweetened) and MGUS (Q2 OR 1.55; 95% CI 1.04-2.33; $P=0.03$) and LRMGUS (Q2 OR 2.13; 95% CI 1.28-3.56; $P<0.01$). Similarly, daily intake of cola (regular and diet) is associated with MGUS (Q2 OR 1.59; 95% CI 1.14-2.22; $P<0.01$) and LRMGUS (Q2 OR 1.77; 95% CI 1.13-2.78; $P=0.01$) but not IHRMGUS. Lastly, any daily intake of any tea (sugar-sweetened) is associated with LRMGUS (OR 1.88; 95% CI 1.07-3.28; $P=0.03$). By comparison, tea (unsweetened) exhibits non-significant inverse associations for MGUS, LRMGUS, and IHRMGUS, suggesting that added sugar is relevant to MGUS.

Among animal products, there is a suggestive dose-dependent ($P_{\text{trend}}=0.08$) positive association between consumption of milk and milk products and IHRMGUS (T3 OR 1.53, 95% CI 0.99-2.36; $P=0.05$). Processed meat intake at intermediate levels is associated with LRMGUS (Q1 OR 1.78; 95% CI 1.19-2.67; $P<0.01$), but there is a non-significant association at the highest level (Q2 OR 1.31; 95% CI 0.82-2.08; $P=0.26$).

Usual Intake (Food Frequency Questionnaire)

Our secondary analyses of the association in NHANES III between usual monthly frequency of intake of 60 items aggregated into primary (Supplementary Table S4) and custom (Supplementary Table S5) food groups and MGUS, LRMGUS, and IHRMGUS provides support for some of the associations seen in the primary analysis of daily intake. There are dose-dependent associations between fruit juice and MGUS and IHRMGUS, and between meat,

poultry, seafood, stews and MGUS. There is also an association between soft drinks (artificially sweetened) and MGUS and a borderline association with LRMGUS. Lastly, monthly intake of tea is inversely related to LRMGUS.

Discussion

In the current study, there are associations between MGUS and daily intake of certain food groups, suggesting that lower diet quality is associated with MGUS. Notably, low daily intake of whole-wheat bread, whole oats, and brown rice, fruits (excluding juices) and vegetables, tomatoes, and cruciferous vegetables, and high daily intake of sugars, sweets, and beverages, specifically sugar- and artificially sweetened beverages are associated with MGUS. Most findings are consistent with the American Institute of Cancer Research and World Cancer Research Fund cancer prevention recommendations that recommend eating a diet rich in whole grains, vegetables, fruits, and beans and limiting consumption of sugar-sweetened drinks, fast and processed foods, and red and processed meat.

The association between MGUS and high daily intake of sugar- and artificially sweetened beverages could be due to multiple underlying mechanisms. They are a concentrated source of calories without other nutrients, such as fiber, to mitigate these effects and thus contribute to obesity, which is linked with MGUS⁹. Obesity can promote systemic inflammation and lower production of adiponectin³³, an adipokine with anti-inflammatory, insulin-sensitizing, and anti-tumor effects, including in MM cells³⁴. High intake of sugar is linked to chronic inflammation³⁵ which can facilitate tumorigenesis³⁶. Sugar intake can also lead to increased insulin and insulin-like growth factor 1 (IGF-1), a potent mitogen in myeloma cells³⁷. Soft drinks include phosphoric acid, which may dysregulate the calcium/phosphorus balance, leading to decreased bone density and fractures³⁸ and possibly tumorigenesis³⁹. Sugary drinks and/or fruit juices have been previously associated with risk of overall, breast, biliary tract, colorectal, prostate, thyroid, skin, and pancreatic cancers^{40, 41}.

On the contrary, intakes of whole grains, fruits, and vegetables show inverse associations with risk of MGUS, LRMGUS, and/or IHRMGUS, with a particularly strong inverse association between cruciferous vegetables and IHRMGUS. This is consistent with large epidemiologic studies that have shown a reduced cancer risk associated with intake of fruits and vegetables, especially cruciferous and green-yellow vegetables⁴², and whole grains⁴³. Plant-based foods reduce cancer risk through multiple mechanisms. They are a rich source of dietary flavonoids and fiber, which decrease levels of insulin, IGF-1, and inflammation⁴⁴. Dietary flavonoids and fiber also have beneficial effects on the immune system and microbiome, through increased levels of butyrate producers^{44, 45}. Higher stool butyrate producers and butyrate concentrations have been associated with sustained minimal residual disease negativity in MM patients⁴⁶. Cruciferous vegetables (a group of vegetables from the *Brassica* genus of plants⁴⁷) are unique dietary sources of glucosinolates, which hydrolyze *in vivo* to isothiocyanates (e.g. sulforaphane) and indoles, with known anti-cancer properties⁴⁸. Tomatoes are a major source of carotenoids such as lycopene and beta-carotene that have anti-cancer properties⁴⁹ and are a good source of vitamin C⁵⁰. Thus, it is important to differentiate refined carbohydrates, such as those found in sugary drinks, from complex carbohydrates, such as found in whole grains, as they have opposite associations with MGUS risk and risk of other cancers.

The direct association between MGUS and intake of processed meat is consistent with its classification by the International Agency for Research on Cancer as a group 1 carcinogen, although this classification was based on associations with colorectal and gastric cancer⁵¹.

Associations between dietary intake and MGUS differ by risk of progression, with no food groups or nutrients significant in both LRMGUS and IHRMGUS, possibly due to the small subgroup sample sizes. Most notably, the associations between sugar- and artificially sweetened beverages and LRMGUS, the most marked associations observed in this study, are null in IHRMGUS, suggesting that there could be etiologic differences between LRMGUS and

IHRMGUS; the etiology of IHRMGUS could be overwhelmed by genetics or environmental exposure, obscuring associations between diet and the condition.

Strengths of the study include the comprehensive dietary assessment, employing both quantitative (DR) and non-quantitative (FFQ) tools, capturing dietary practices in a racially diverse cohort that included minority populations. The large number of subjects without MGUS allowed us to match on multiple characteristics associated with MGUS. Blood samples were randomly evaluated for MGUS without any pre-existing suspicion of MGUS, resulting in an unbiased method used to ascertain case-control status. All participants were subject to the dietary evaluations prior to their blood being tested for MGUS, reducing the risk of recall bias.

A weakness is that certain food groups combine heterogeneous foods and beverages with possibly different physiologic effects. This may have obscured associations that would have been more apparent if it were possible to analyze intake of individual food items in relation to MGUS, although that would be problematic from a statistical power standpoint. Additionally, the representation by both solid foods and beverages in certain categories complicates the interpretation, as the total gram weight consumption of the category is largely driven by intake of beverages, which tend to be consumed in larger quantities (by gram weight) and are highly variable from person to person.

Another limitation is that the assessment tools (DR and FFQ) provide a snapshot of a person's diet which might not be connected to the biologically relevant exposure window. Longer-term dietary data, such as those used in the Iceland study¹¹, would benefit future analyses.

Additionally, this study did not assess overall dietary patterns in relation to MGUS and can be addressed in future studies. Furthermore, the study population had a low-quality diet overall, with the majority of the population being below the recommended daily allowances of many micronutrients studied. This limited distribution made it difficult to detect an association between healthful dietary intakes and MGUS.

Conclusion

This is the most comprehensive study of dietary risk factors in MGUS in a racially diverse United States population. This study provides evidence to support that diet may be a risk factor for MGUS. Given the case-control study design, it is not possible to determine a causal relationship between diet and MGUS. Future studies should focus on dietary patterns and examine dietary composition at multiple timepoints throughout life to interrogate the biologically relevant exposure window. There is also a need to examine whether the observed associations differ by race, sex, or obesity status – established risk factors for MGUS^{4, 9} –and by physical activity – an emerging risk factor for several cancers, including MM⁵². Nevertheless, the current study provides insight into how diet, a modifiable risk factor, could be related to MGUS, a condition for which very little is known regarding risk-reduction strategies.

Acknowledgements:

This study is funded in part through the NIH/NCI Cancer Center Support Grant at Memorial Sloan Kettering P30 CA008748. U.A. Shah received research and salary support from the NCI MSK Paul Calabresi Career Development Award for Clinical Oncology K12 CA184746 and American Society of Hematology Scholar Award. She also received research funding from the Paula and Rodger Riney Foundation and HealthTree Foundation. J.M. Joseph is partially supported by the Roswell Park Alliance Foundation. The authors would like to acknowledge Jeanne A. Joseph for her careful editing of the manuscript.

Author Contributions:

J.M.J., S.M. and U.A.S. designed the study and initiated this work; J.M.J. developed the statistical analysis plans and analyzed the data; J.M.J. and U.A.S. wrote the manuscript; and all authors made substantial contributions to design of the study, interpretation of results, revised the article critically and gave final approval of the manuscript to be submitted.

Disclosure of Conflicts of Interest:

JH serves on the advisory boards of Adaptive, Amgen, Axxess Networks, Bristol Myers Squibb, GlaxoSmithKline, Janssen Biotech, Oncopeptides, ONCOtracker, Sanofi, and Skyline; has given talks at Amgen, BeiGene, Beijing Medical Award Foundation, Curio Science, and Janssen Biotech; and serves on the data and safety monitoring board of Janssen Biotech. UAS reports grants from NIH/NCI Cancer Center Support Grant P30CA008748, MSK Paul Calabresi Career Development Award for Clinical Oncology K12CA184746, Paula and Rodger Riney Foundation, Allen Foundation Inc, Parker Institute for Cancer Immunotherapy at MSK, HealthTree

Foundation, and International Myeloma Society as well as non-financial support from American Society of Hematology Clinical Research Training Institute, TREC Training Workshop R25CA203650 (PI: Melinda Irwin). UAS also reports research funding support from Celgene/BMS and Janssen to the institution, nonfinancial research support from Plantable, Sabinsa pharmaceuticals, and M&M labs to the institution; personal fees from ACCC, MashUp MD, Janssen Biotech, Sanofi, BMS, MJH LifeSciences, Intellisphere, Phillips Gilmore Oncology Communications, RedMedEd and i3Health outside the submitted work. SEM is deceased. JMJ, LT, KBM, AML, OL, and SZU declare no potential competing interests.

REFERENCES

1. Kyle RA, Larson DR, Therneau TM, et al. Long-Term Follow-up of Monoclonal Gammopathy of Undetermined Significance. *N Engl J Med*. 2018;378(3):241-9.
2. Ji M, Huber JH, Schoen MW, et al. Mortality in the US Populations With Monoclonal Gammopathy of Undetermined Significance. *JAMA Oncol*. 2023.
3. Kristinsson SY, Björkholm M, Andersson TM, et al. Patterns of survival and causes of death following a diagnosis of monoclonal gammopathy of undetermined significance: a population-based study. *Haematologica*. 2009;94(12):1714-20.
4. Wadhera RK, Rajkumar SV. Prevalence of monoclonal gammopathy of undetermined significance: a systematic review. *Mayo Clin Proc*. 2010;85(10):933-42.
5. Pasqualetti P, Collacciani A, Casale R. Risk of monoclonal gammopathy of undetermined significance: a case-referent study. *Am J Hematol*. 1996;52(3):217-20.
6. Brown LM, Gridley G, Check D, Landgren O. Risk of multiple myeloma and monoclonal gammopathy of undetermined significance among white and black male United States veterans with prior autoimmune, infectious, inflammatory, and allergic disorders. *Blood*. 2008;111(7):3388-94.
7. Hofmann JN, Beane Freeman LE, Murata K, et al. Lifetime Pesticide Use and Monoclonal Gammopathy of Undetermined Significance in a Prospective Cohort of Male Farmers. *Environ Health Perspect*. 2021;129(1):17003.
8. Shah UA, Rögnvaldsson S, Derkach A, et al. Diabetes mellitus and risk of plasma cell and lymphoproliferative disorders in 94,579 cases and 368,348 matched controls. *Haematologica*. 2022;107(1):284-6.
9. Landgren O, Rajkumar SV, Pfeiffer RM, et al. Obesity is associated with an increased risk of monoclonal gammopathy of undetermined significance among black and white women. *Blood*. 2010;116(7):1056-9.

10. Thordardottir M, Lindqvist EK, Lund SH, et al. Obesity and risk of monoclonal gammopathy of undetermined significance and progression to multiple myeloma: a population-based study. *Blood Adv.* 2017;1(24):2186-92.
11. Thordardottir M, Lindqvist EK, Lund SH, et al. Dietary intake is associated with risk of multiple myeloma and its precursor disease. *PLoS One.* 2018;13(11):e0206047.
12. Shah UA, Parikh R, Castro F, Bellone M, Lesokhin AM. Dietary and microbiome evidence in multiple myeloma and other plasma cell disorders. *Leukemia.* 2023;37(5):964-80.
13. Lee DH, Fung TT, Tabung FK, et al. Prediagnosis dietary pattern and survival in patients with multiple myeloma. *Int J Cancer.* 2020;147(7):1823-30.
14. Key TJ, Appleby PN, Crowe FL, Bradbury KE, Schmidt JA, Travis RC. Cancer in British vegetarians: updated analyses of 4998 incident cancers in a cohort of 32,491 meat eaters, 8612 fish eaters, 18,298 vegetarians, and 2246 vegans. *Am J Clin Nutr.* 2014;100 Suppl 1(1):378s-85s.
15. Brown LM, Gridley G, Pottern LM, et al. Diet and nutrition as risk factors for multiple myeloma among blacks and whites in the United States. *Cancer Causes Control.* 2001;12(2):117-25.
16. Caini S, Masala G, Gnagnarella P, et al. Food of animal origin and risk of non-Hodgkin lymphoma and multiple myeloma: A review of the literature and meta-analysis. *Crit Rev Oncol Hematol.* 2016;100:16-24.
17. Hosgood HD, 3rd, Baris D, Zahm SH, Zheng T, Cross AJ. Diet and risk of multiple myeloma in Connecticut women. *Cancer Causes Control.* 2007;18(10):1065-76.
18. Lee DH, Fung TT, Tabung FK, et al. Dietary Pattern and Risk of Multiple Myeloma in Two Large Prospective US Cohort Studies. *JNCI Cancer Spectr.* 2019;3(2):pkz025.
19. National Center for Health Statistics. NHANES Questionnaires, Datasets, and Related Documentation [Available from: <https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/nhanes/>].

20. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS). National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey Data. Hyattsville, MD: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; 1988-2004 <https://wwwn.cdc.gov/nchs/nhanes/Default.aspx>.
21. Landgren O, Graubard BI, Katzmann JA, et al. Racial disparities in the prevalence of monoclonal gammopathies: a population-based study of 12,482 persons from the National Health and Nutritional Examination Survey. *Leukemia*. 2014;28(7):1537-42.
22. Landgren O, Graubard BI, Kumar S, et al. Prevalence of myeloma precursor state monoclonal gammopathy of undetermined significance in 12372 individuals 10-49 years old: a population-based study from the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey. *Blood Cancer J*. 2017;7(10):e618.
23. Criteria for the classification of monoclonal gammopathies, multiple myeloma and related disorders: a report of the International Myeloma Working Group. *Br J Haematol*. 2003;121(5):749-57.
24. Kyle RA. Monoclonal gammopathy of undetermined significance. Natural history in 241 cases. *Am J Med*. 1978;64(5):814-26.
25. Kyle RA, Therneau TM, Rajkumar SV, et al. A long-term study of prognosis in monoclonal gammopathy of undetermined significance. *N Engl J Med*. 2002;346(8):564-9.
26. Kyle RA, Therneau TM, Rajkumar SV, et al. Prevalence of monoclonal gammopathy of undetermined significance. *N Engl J Med*. 2006;354(13):1362-9.
27. Rhee JJ, Sampson L, Cho E, Hughes MD, Hu FB, Willett WC. Comparison of methods to account for implausible reporting of energy intake in epidemiologic studies. *Am J Epidemiol*. 2015;181(4):225-33.
28. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS). National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey Questionnaire. Hyattsville, MD: U.S.

Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; 1988-2004 <https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/nhanes/Default.aspx>.

29. Kyle RA, Durie BG, Rajkumar SV, et al. Monoclonal gammopathy of undetermined significance (MGUS) and smoldering (asymptomatic) multiple myeloma: IMWG consensus perspectives risk factors for progression and guidelines for monitoring and management. *Leukemia*. 2010;24(6):1121-7.

30. U.S. Department of Agriculture Agricultural Research Service. The USDA Food and Nutrient Database for Dietary Studies, 1.0 - Documentation and User Guide Beltsville, Maryland: U.S. Department of Agriculture Agricultural Research Service, Beltsville Human Nutrition Research Center, Food Surveys Research Group; 2004 [Available from: <http://www.ars.usda.gov/nea/bhnrc/fsrg>].

31. Basiotis PP, Carlson, A., Gerrior, S.A., Juan, W.Y., Lino, M. The Healthy Eating Index: 1999-2000. US Department of Agriculture, Center for Nutrition Policy and Promotion CNPP-12. 2002.

32. Kennedy E, Bowman SA, Lino M, Gerrior SA, Basiotis PP. Diet Quality of Americans: Healthy Eating Index. *America's Eating Habits: Changes and Consequences*. Agriculture Information Bulletin No. 750: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service, Food and Rural Economics Division; 1999.

33. Ellulu MS, Patimah I, Khaza'ai H, Rahmat A, Abed Y. Obesity and inflammation: the linking mechanism and the complications. *Arch Med Sci*. 2017;13(4):851-63.

34. Dalamaga M, Diakopoulos KN, Mantzoros CS. The role of adiponectin in cancer: a review of current evidence. *Endocr Rev*. 2012;33(4):547-94.

35. Ma X, Nan F, Liang H, et al. Excessive intake of sugar: An accomplice of inflammation. *Front Immunol*. 2022;13:988481.

36. Tabung FK, Smith-Warner SA, Chavarro JE, et al. Development and Validation of an Empirical Dietary Inflammatory Index. *J Nutr*. 2016;146(8):1560-70.

37. Sprynski AC, Hose D, Caillot L, et al. The role of IGF-1 as a major growth factor for myeloma cell lines and the prognostic relevance of the expression of its receptor. *Blood*. 2009;113(19):4614-26.
38. Chen L, Liu R, Zhao Y, Shi Z. High Consumption of Soft Drinks Is Associated with an Increased Risk of Fracture: A 7-Year Follow-Up Study. *Nutrients*. 2020;12(2).
39. Brown RB, Razzaque MS. Phosphate toxicity and tumorigenesis. *Biochim Biophys Acta Rev Cancer*. 2018;1869(2):303-9.
40. Davis EW, McCann SE, Joseph JM, Yeary KHK, Fountzilas C, Moysich KB. Sugar Sweetened and Artificially Sweetened Beverage Consumption and Pancreatic Cancer: A Retrospective Study. *Nutrients*. 2023;15(2).
41. Pan B, Lai H, Ma N, et al. Association of soft drinks and 100% fruit juice consumption with risk of cancer: a systematic review and dose-response meta-analysis of prospective cohort studies. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act*. 2023;20(1):58.
42. Aune D, Giovannucci E, Boffetta P, et al. Fruit and vegetable intake and the risk of cardiovascular disease, total cancer and all-cause mortality-a systematic review and dose-response meta-analysis of prospective studies. *Int J Epidemiol*. 2017;46(3):1029-56.
43. Aune D, Keum N, Giovannucci E, et al. Whole grain consumption and risk of cardiovascular disease, cancer, and all cause and cause specific mortality: systematic review and dose-response meta-analysis of prospective studies. *Bmj*. 2016;353:i2716.
44. Shah UA, Iyengar NM. Plant-Based and Ketogenic Diets As Diverging Paths to Address Cancer: A Review. *JAMA Oncol*. 2022;8(8):1201-8.
45. Baky MH, Elshahed M, Wessjohann L, Farag MA. Interactions between dietary flavonoids and the gut microbiome: a comprehensive review. *Br J Nutr*. 2022;128(4):577-91.
46. Shah UA, Maclachlan KH, Derkach A, et al. Sustained Minimal Residual Disease Negativity in Multiple Myeloma is Associated with Stool Butyrate and Healthier Plant-Based Diets. *Clin Cancer Res*. 2022;28(23):5149-55.

47. National Cancer Institute. Cruciferous Vegetables and Cancer Prevention [Available from: <https://www.cancer.gov/about-cancer/causes-prevention/risk/diet/cruciferous-vegetables-fact-sheet>].
48. Li YZ, Yang ZY, Gong TT, et al. Cruciferous vegetable consumption and multiple health outcomes: an umbrella review of 41 systematic reviews and meta-analyses of 303 observational studies. *Food Funct.* 2022;13(8):4247-59.
49. Kelkel M, Schumacher M, Dicato M, Diederich M. Antioxidant and anti-proliferative properties of lycopene. *Free Radic Res.* 2011;45(8):925-40.
50. Mellidou I, Koukounaras A, Kostas S, Patelou E, Kanellis AK. Regulation of Vitamin C Accumulation for Improved Tomato Fruit Quality and Alleviation of Abiotic Stress. *Genes (Basel).* 2021;12(5).
51. Bouvard V, Loomis D, Guyton KZ, et al. Carcinogenicity of consumption of red and processed meat. *Lancet Oncol.* 2015;16(16):1599-600.
52. Moore SC, Lee IM, Weiderpass E, et al. Association of Leisure-Time Physical Activity With Risk of 26 Types of Cancer in 1.44 Million Adults. *JAMA Intern Med.* 2016;176(6):816-25.

Table 1. Descriptive characteristics of 1,779 participants in the case-control study of dietary characteristics and monoclonal gammopathy of undetermined significance (MGUS) in the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES)			
	MGUS (n = 373)	Non-MGUS¹ (n = 1,406)	p-value²
	Mean (SD)		
Age at interview (years)	67.6 (14.0)	67.2 (14.3)	0.59
	n (%)†		
BMI (kg/m ²)			
Underweight (<18.5)	9 (2.4)	17 (1.2)	0.39
Normal weight (18.5-24.99)	106 (28.4)	407 (29.0)	
Overweight (25.0-29.99)	151 (40.5)	579 (41.2)	
Obese (≥30.0)	107 (28.7)	403 (28.7)	
NHANES Cycle			
NHANES III	222 (59.5)	857 (61.0)	0.96
NHANES 1999-2000	38 (10.2)	141 (10.0)	
NHANES 2001-2002	54 (14.5)	191 (13.6)	
NHANES 2003-2004	59 (15.8)	217 (15.4)	
Sex			
Male	213 (57.1)	812 (57.8)	0.82
Female	160 (42.9)	594 (42.3)	
Race/Ethnicity			
Non-Hispanic White	197 (52.8)	781 (55.6)	0.13
Non-Hispanic Black	105 (28.2)	379 (27.0)	
Mexican American	59 (15.8)	225 (16.0)	
Other Hispanic	2 (0.5)	1 (0.1)	
Other or Multiracial	10 (2.7)	20 (1.4)	
Education			
<9 th grade	90 (24.1)	388 (27.6)	0.28
Some high school	78 (20.9)	245 (17.4)	
High school	98 (26.3)	340 (24.2)	
Some college (incl. Associate's)	54 (14.5)	241 (17.1)	
Bachelor or above	50 (13.4)	186 (13.2)	
Family income			
<\$20,000/year	164 (44.0)	652 (46.6)	0.48
>=\$20,000/year	199 (53.4)	728 (52.0)	
Smoking Status			
Never	161 (43.2)	612 (43.5)	0.66
Former	142 (38.1)	556 (39.5)	
Current	70 (18.8)	236 (16.8)	

†Total categorical values may not sum to 100% due to missing data and rounding. MGUS=monoclonal gammopathy of undetermined significance; SD = standard deviation; N = number; ¹Controls and cases matched at a rate of four controls to one case on five criteria: NHANES release, sex, race/ethnicity, five-year age category, and BMI category. ²Tested by Student's t-test for difference in mean or chi-squared test of differences in proportion.

Table 2. Association between daily food intake, estimated from 24-hour dietary recall data, by primary USDA food group, and overall, low-risk, and intermediate/high-risk MGUS in 1,779 participants in the case-control study of dietary characteristics and monoclonal gammopathy of undetermined significance (MGUS) in the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES)

	n (%)				OR (95% CI) ^{1,2,3}		
	MGUS	LRMGUS	IHRMGUS	Non-MGUS	MGUS	LRMGUS	IHRMGUS
Primary USDA Food Group							
Milk and milk products (g/d)							
T1 (0.0-45.0)	121 (32.4)	59 (37.3)	48 (26.7)	469 (33.4)	ref.	ref.	ref.
T2 (45.4-244)	117 (31.4)	43 (27.2)	64 (35.6)	473 (33.6)	0.99 (0.74-1.33)	0.73 (0.48-1.13)	1.38 (0.91-2.09)
T3 (245.0-1850.0)	135 (36.2)	56 (35.4)	68 (37.8)	464 (33.0)	1.21 (0.89-1.65)	1.01 (0.66-1.55)	1.53 (0.99-2.36)
Meat, poultry, fish and mixtures (g/d)							
T1 (0.0-86.3)	135 (36.2)	58 (36.7)	63 (35.0)	469 (33.4)	ref.	ref.	ref.
T2 (86.8-199.9)	109 (29.2)	52 (32.9)	46 (25.6)	469 (33.4)	0.83 (0.62-1.10)	0.90 (0.60-1.34)	0.77 (0.51-1.15)
T3 (200.0-2410.0)	129 (34.6)	48 (30.4)	71 (39.4)	468 (33.3)	1.01 (0.76-1.36)	0.84 (0.55-1.29)	1.22 (0.83-1.80)
Eggs (g/d)							
None	265 (71.1)	113 (71.5)	127 (70.6)	1005 (71.5)	ref.	ref.	ref.
Q1 (1.0-75.0)	58 (15.6)	24 (15.2)	30 (16.7)	200 (14.2)	1.07 (0.77-1.49)	1.09 (0.68-1.74)	1.13 (0.74-1.75)
Q2 (76.0-976.0)	50 (13.4)	21 (13.3)	23 (12.8)	201 (14.3)	0.95 (0.68-1.35)	0.95 (0.58-1.57)	0.92 (0.57-1.48)
Dry beans, peas, other legumes, nuts, & seeds (g/d)							
None	260 (69.7)	110 (69.6)	126 (70.0)	999 (71.1)	ref.	ref.	ref.
Q1 (1.0-63.3)	59 (15.8)	28 (17.7)	26 (14.4)	203 (14.4)	1.14 (0.82-1.57)	1.29 (0.83-2.02)	1.01 (0.64-1.60)
Q2 (64.0-758.0)	54 (14.5)	20 (12.7)	28 (15.6)	204 (14.5)	1.04 (0.74-1.47)	0.92 (0.55-1.54)	1.09 (0.69-1.72)
Grain products (g/d)							
T1 (0.0-133.0)	138 (37.0)	57 (36.1)	68 (37.8)	466 (33.1)	ref.	ref.	ref.
T2 (134.0-289.6)	120 (32.2)	52 (32.9)	56 (31.1)	472 (33.6)	0.87 (0.65-1.15)	0.92 (0.61-1.38)	0.80 (0.54-1.18)
T3 (290.0-1932.0)	115 (30.8)	49 (31.0)	56 (31.1)	468 (33.3)	0.83 (0.61-1.12)	0.89 (0.58-1.38)	0.76 (0.51-1.15)
Fruits (excluding juice) and vegetables (g/d)							
T1 (0.0-159.0)	146 (39.1)	62 (39.2)	68 (37.8)	470 (33.4)	ref.**	ref.	ref.
T2 (159.7-367.1)	126 (33.8)	55 (34.8)	61 (33.9)	468 (33.3)	0.88 (0.67-1.16)	0.90 (0.61-1.33)	0.91 (0.62-1.33)
T3 (368.0-2420.0)	101 (27.1)	41 (26.0)	51 (28.3)	468 (33.3)	0.69 (0.52-0.93)	0.67 (0.44-1.03)	0.73 (0.49-1.10)
Fruits (excluding juice) (g/d)							
None	185 (49.6)	80 (50.6)	86 (47.8)	678 (48.2)	ref.	ref.	ref.
None	110 (29.5)	52 (32.9)	51 (28.3)	364 (25.9)	1.09 (0.83-1.43)	1.21 (0.83-1.77)	1.05 (0.72-1.54)
None	78 (20.9)	26 (16.5)	43 (23.9)	364 (25.9)		0.62 (0.38-0.99)	0.90 (0.60-1.35)

Q1 (2.0-155.5) Q2 (156.0-1998.0)					0.78 (0.58-1.06)		
Vegetables (g/d)							
T1 (0.0-81.0)	144 (38.6)	56 (35.4)	72 (40.0)	468 (33.3)	ref.	ref.	ref.
T2 (82.0-253.0)	122 (32.7)	57 (36.1)	54 (30.0)	470 (33.4)	0.84 (0.64-1.12)	1.02 (0.69-1.52)	0.73 (0.50-1.07)
T3 (253.1-1928.0)	107 (28.7)	45 (28.5)	54 (30.0)	468 (33.3)	0.75 (0.56-0.99)	0.82 (0.54-1.25)	0.73 (0.49-1.08)
Fruit juice and nectar (g/d)							
None	256 (68.6)	110 (69.6)	119 (66.1)	950 (67.6)	ref.	ref.	ref.
Q1 (1.0-202.3)	62 (16.6)	27 (17.1)	31 (17.2)	229 (16.3)	1.00 (0.73-1.38)	1.04 (0.66-1.65)	1.05 (0.68-1.63)
Q2 (203.1-1365.0)	55 (14.8)	21 (13.3)	20 (16.7)	227 (16.2)	0.89 (0.64-1.23)	0.81 (0.50-1.33)	1.00 (0.65-1.55)
Fats, oils, and salad dressings (g/d)							
None	147 (39.4)	54 (34.2)	74 (41.1)	580 (41.3)	ref.	ref.	ref.
Q1 (0.8-13.8)	106 (28.4)	52 (32.9)	48 (26.7)	403 (28.7)	1.08 (0.81-1.44)	1.43 (0.94-2.17)	0.97 (0.65-1.45)
Q2 (14.0-247.7)	120 (32.2)	52 (32.9)	58 (32.2)	423 (30.1)	1.21 (0.91-1.62)	1.42 (0.93-2.17)	1.14 (0.77-1.69)
Sugars, sweets, and beverages (g/d)							
T1 (0.0-540.0)	122 (32.7)	45 (28.5)	62 (34.4)	468 (33.3)	ref.**	ref.**	ref.
T2 (541.0-997.0)	112 (30.0)	46 (29.1)	57 (31.7)	469 (33.4)	0.99 (0.74-1.33)	1.05 (0.68-1.63)	1.03 (0.69-1.52)
T3 (998.0-12752.8)	139 (37.3)	67 (42.4)	61 (33.9)	469 (33.4)	1.39 (1.02-1.89)	1.68 (1.08-2.60)	1.26 (0.83-1.94)
<p>MGUS=monoclonal gammopathy of undetermined significance; LRMGUS=low-risk MGUS; IHRMGUS=intermediate/high-risk MGUS; OR=odds ratio; CI=confidence interval; n=number; d=day; kcal=kilocalories; g=gram of total food weight of dietary recall categories; T=tertile; Q=quantile, used when tertiles are not practical. ¹ Adjusted for age, sex, race, body mass index, and total daily energy intake. ² Odds of MGUS, LRMGUS, and IHRMGUS all relative to controls (non-MGUS). ³ Significance of overall category based on p-for-trend. **p for trend < 0.05. Bold text indicates statistical significance.</p>							

Table 3. Association between daily food intake, estimated from 24-hour dietary recall data, by select custom food groups, and overall, low-risk, and intermediate/high-risk MGUS in 1,779 participants in the case-control study of dietary characteristics and monoclonal gammopathy of undetermined significance (MGUS) in the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES)

	n (%)				OR (95% CI) ^{1,2,3}		
	MGUS	LRMGUS	IHRMGUS	Non-MGUS	MGUS	LRMGUS	IHRMGUS
Custom Food Group							
Processed meat (g/d)							
None	245 (65.7)	95 (60.1)	126 (70.0)	979 (69.6)	ref.	ref.	ref.
Q1 (4-46)	71 (19.0)	37 (23.4)	29 (16.1)	216 (15.4)	1.33 (0.98-1.80)	1.78 (1.19-2.67)	1.06 (0.69-1.62)
Q2 (47.7-382)	57 (15.3)	26 (16.5)	25 (13.9)	211 (15.0)	1.12 (0.80-1.56)	1.31 (0.82-2.08)	0.97 (0.61-1.53)
Whole-wheat bread, whole oats, brown rice (g/d)							
None	285 (76.4)	125 (79.1)	130 (72.2)	1045 (74.3)	ref.	ref. **	ref.
Q1 (7-51.9)	50 (13.4)	21 (13.3)	28 (15.6)	155 (11.0)	1.18 (0.83-1.67)	1.17 (0.71-1.91)	1.42 (0.91-2.22)
Q2 (52-847.1)	38 (10.2)	120 (7.6)	22 (12.2)	206 (14.7)	0.70 (0.48-1.00)	0.51 (0.28-0.93)	0.87 (0.54-1.40)
Tomatoes (g/d)							
None	242 (64.9)	101 (63.9)	115 (63.9)	863 (61.4)	ref.**	ref.	ref.
Q1 (1-46)	78 (20.9)	38 (24.1)	36 (20.0)	275 (19.6)	1.03 (0.77-1.39)	1.18 (0.79-1.76)	1.05 (0.70-1.58)
Q2 (47-568)	53 (14.2)	19 (12.0)	29 (16.1)	268 (19.1)	0.72 (0.51-1.00)	0.61 (0.36-1.02)	0.83 (0.53-1.29)
Cruciferous vegetables (g/d)							
None	307 (82.3)	129 (81.7)	150 (83.3)	1126 (80.1)	ref. **	ref.	ref. **
Q1 (0.6-112.5)	49 (13.1)	17 (10.8)	26 (14.4)	139 (9.9)	1.30 (0.91-1.84)	1.06 (0.63-1.81)	1.43 (0.90-2.25)
Q2 (113-856)	17 (4.6)	12 (7.6)	4 (2.2)	141 (10.0)	0.44 (0.26-0.74)	0.77 (0.42-1.41)	0.22 (0.09-0.57)
Sugar-sweetened foods and beverages (g/d)							
T1 (0-55)	120 (32.2)	43 (27.2)	66 (36.7)	467 (33.2)	ref.	ref.**	ref.
T2 (56-336.8)	113 (30.3)	48 (30.4)	52 (28.9)	470 (33.4)	0.96 (0.72-1.29)	1.15 (0.74-1.78)	0.78 (0.52-1.16)
T3 (337.7-2319)	140 (37.5)	67 (42.4)	62 (34.4)	469 (33.4)	1.26 (0.94-1.68)	1.65 (1.08-2.53)	1.01 (0.68-1.50)
Sugar-sweetened beverages (g/d)							
None	209 (56.0)	83 (52.5)	104 (57.8)	801 (57.0)	ref.	ref. **	ref.
Q1 (46.9-369.6)	63 (16.9)	23 (14.6)	33 (18.3)	293 (20.8)	0.82 (0.59-1.12)	0.76 (0.47-1.24)	0.86 (0.56-1.31)
Q2 (370-2280)	101 (27.1)	52 (32.9)	43 (23.9)	312 (22.2)	1.34 (1.00-1.78)	1.68 (1.13-2.49)	1.20 (0.80-1.79)
Soft drinks (g/d)							
None	211 (56.6)	82 (51.9)	108 (60.0)	825 (58.7)	ref. **	ref. **	ref.
Q1 (8-368)	65 (17.4)	29 (18.4)	29 (16.1)	285 (20.3)	0.92 (0.68-1.26)	1.03 (0.66-1.61)	0.83 (0.54-1.28)
Q2 (370-2280)	97 (26.0)	47 (29.8)	43 (23.9)	296 (21.1)	1.43 (1.06-1.92)	1.68 (1.11-2.53)	1.28 (0.85-1.92)

Q2 (369-3840)								
Soft drinks (sugar-sweetened) (g/d)								
None	268 (71.9)	112 (70.9)	130 (72.2)	1013 (72.1)	ref.	ref.	ref.	
Q1 (15.4-369)	39 (10.5)	14 (8.9)	20 (11.1)	200 (14.2)	0.74 (0.51-1.07)	0.64 (0.37-1.13)	0.81 (0.49-1.33)	
Q2 (370-1860)	66 (17.7)	32 (20.3)	30 (16.7)	193 (13.7)	1.41 (1.01-1.96)	1.53 (0.98-2.39)	1.42 (0.90-2.23)	
Soft drinks (artificially sweetened) (g/d)								
None	317 (85.0)	128 (81.0)	159 (88.3)	1211 (86.1)	ref.	ref. **	ref.	
Q1 (8-355)	18 (4.8)	8 (5.1)	8 (4.4)	91 (6.5)	0.80 (0.48-1.34)	0.90 (0.43-1.85)	0.73 (0.35-1.51)	
Q2 (360-2028.9)	38 (10.2)	22 (13.9)	13 (7.2)	104 (7.4)	1.55 (1.04-2.33)	2.13 (1.28-3.56)	1.09 (0.60-2.01)	
Cola (g/d)								
None	267 (71.6)	109 (69.0)	133 (73.9)	1045 (74.3)	ref. **	ref. **	ref.	
Q1 (15.5-369)	41 (11.0)	17 (10.8)	19 (10.6)	180 (12.8)	0.92 (0.64-1.33)	0.93 (0.55-1.58)	0.87 (0.53-1.45)	
Q2 (372-2028.9)	65 (17.4)	32 (20.3)	28 (15.6)	181 (12.9)	1.59 (1.14-2.22)	1.77 (1.13-2.78)	1.47 (0.92-2.33)	
Tea (sugar-sweetened) (g/d)								
None	346 (92.8)	142 (89.9)	170 (94.4)	1325 (94.2)	ref.	ref. **	ref.	
Any (118.4-1894.4)	27 (7.2)	16 (10.1)	10 (5.6)	81 (5.8)	1.31 (0.84-2.06)	1.88 (1.07-3.28)	1.03 (0.53-2.00)	
Tea (unsweetened) (g/d)								
None	316 (84.7)	133 (84.2)	155 (86.1)	1133 (80.6)	ref.	ref.	ref.	
Q1 (59-338)	26 (7.0)	12 (7.6)	9 (5.0)	131 (9.3)	0.70 (0.45-1.09)	0.80 (0.43-1.47)	0.51 (0.26-1.01)	
Q2 (355.2-3552)	31 (8.3)	13 (8.2)	16 (8.9)	142 (10.1)	0.81 (0.54-1.22)	0.80 (0.44-1.45)	0.87 (0.51-1.50)	

* Intake estimated by 24-hour recall. MGUS=monoclonal gammopathy of undetermined significance; LRMGUS=low-risk MGUS; IHRMGUS=intermediate/high-risk MGUS; OR=odds ratio; CI=confidence interval; n=number; d=day; kcal=kilocalories; g=gram of total food weight of dietary recall categories; T=tertile; Q=quantile, used when tertiles are not practical. ¹ Adjusted for age, sex, race, body mass index, and total daily energy intake. ² Odds of MGUS, LRMGUS, and IHRMGUS all relative to non-MGUS. ³ Firth correction applied to logistic regressions with referent groups representing ≥70% of the control group. **p for trend < 0.05. **Bold text** indicates statistical significance.

Figure Legend:

Figure 1. Flow chart of participants included in the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES) case-control study of dietary characteristics and monoclonal gammopathy of undetermined significance (MGUS)

