

1 **Title Page**

2

3 **Title: Pre-Diagnosis Dietary Patterns and Risk of Multiple Myeloma in the NIH-AARP Diet and**
4 **Health Study**

5

6 Authors: Francesca Castro^{a*}, Richa Parikh^{b*}, Jelyn C. Eustaquio^c, Andriy Derkach^d, Janine M.
7 Joseph^e, Alexander M. Lesokhin^{a,f}, Saad Z. Usmani^{a,f}, Urvi A. Shah^{a,f}

8

9 ^aMyeloma Service, Department of Medicine, Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center

10 ^bDepartment of Hematology/Oncology, Karmanos Cancer Institute, Wayne State University,
11 Detroit, MI

12 ^cJacobs School of Medicine and Biomedical Science, University at Buffalo

13 ^dDepartment of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center

14 ^eDepartment of Cancer Prevention and Control, Roswell Park Comprehensive Cancer Center

15 ^fDepartment of Medicine, Weill Cornell Medical College

16

17 *These authors contributed equally to this work

18 Corresponding Author:

19 Urvi A. Shah, MD

20 530 E 74th St,

21 New York, NY 10021.

22 Phone: 646-608-3713

23 Email address: shahu@mskcc.org

24

25 **Competing Interests**

26 U.A. Shah reports research funding support from Celgene/BMS, Janssen, Plantable, Sabinsa

27 pharmaceuticals, VeggieDoctor and M and M labs to the institution, non-financial research

28 support; personal fees from ACCC, MashUp MD, Janssen Biotech, Sanofi, BMS, MJH

29 LifeSciences, Intellisphere, Phillips Gilmore Oncology Communications, i3 Health and RedMedEd

30 outside the submitted work. A.M. Lesokhin reports grants from Bristol Myers Squibb and

31 Genentech; grants, personal fees, and non-financial support from Pfizer; and grants and

32 personal fees from Janssen outside the submitted work. A.M. Lesokhin has a patent for

33 US20150037346A1 licensed and with royalties paid from Serametrix, Inc. S. Z. Usmani reports

34 grants/personal fees from Amgen, Celgene, Sanofi, Seattle Genetics, Janssen, Takeda,

35 SkylineDx, Netherlands; Merck, and GSK; grant funding from Bristol Myers Squibb and

36 Pharmacyclics; and personal fees from AbbVie, MundiPharma, Gilead, Genentech, and

37 Oncopeptides. No disclosures were reported by the other authors.

38

39

40 **Keywords**

41 Multiple Myeloma, Diet, Dietary Pattern, Nutrition, Plasma cell disorders

42

43

44

45 **Abstract**

46 **Background:** Despite patient interest in knowing whether diet is linked to multiple myeloma
47 (MM), there is limited research on dietary patterns and MM risk. Two studies have assessed
48 this risk, albeit with a small number of MM cases. The EPIC-Oxford cohort and Oxford
49 Vegetarian study (65 MM cases) showed that fish eaters, vegetarians and vegans had
50 significantly reduced MM risk compared to meat eaters. The Nurses' Health Study and Health
51 Professionals Follow-up Study (478 MM cases) showed a significantly increased MM risk in men
52 with Empirical Dietary Inflammatory Pattern.

53 **Methods:** The NIH-AARP Diet and Health study is a prospective cohort of 567,169 persons who
54 completed a food frequency questionnaire in 1995-1996 and were followed until December
55 2011. Healthy Eating Index-2015 (HEI-2015), Healthy Diet Score (HDS), alternate Mediterranean
56 Diet (aMED) and healthful Plant-based Diet Index (hPDI) scores were calculated using *a*
57 *priori* defined methods and grouped into quartiles, with higher scores reflecting healthier
58 eating patterns. We prospectively evaluated the association between pre-diagnosis dietary
59 patterns and MM incidence in this cohort. Hazard ratios (HR) and 95% confidence intervals
60 (95%CI) were estimated using multivariate Cox proportional hazards models adjusted for age at
61 study entry, sex, race, body mass index, education, and total energy intake (by residual
62 method). Sensitivity analysis was conducted to assess reverse causality by excluding MM cases
63 diagnosed within one year of follow-up.

64 **Results:** Among 392,589 participants (after exclusions), a total of 1,366 MM cases (59% males;
65 92% non-Hispanic whites) were identified during the follow-up period. Analysis revealed a
66 significant association between hPDI scores and reduced MM risk (highest vs lowest quartile,

67 HR 0.85; 95%CI 0.73-1.0; p=0.043) (Table). In sensitivity analysis (1,302 MM cases), the
68 association was no longer significant (HR 0.87; 95%CI 0.74-1.03; p 0.09) but trended in the same
69 direction. This may be due to small sample size, given MM is a rare disease. HEI-2015, HDS and
70 aMED scores were not associated with MM risk.

71 **Conclusions:** A healthful plant-based diet was associated with reduced MM risk in the NIH-
72 AARP cohort. These results will help oncologists and patients make informed choices about
73 their diet. To our knowledge, this is the largest epidemiologic study to date assessing pre-
74 diagnosis dietary patterns and MM risk.

75

76

77

78

79

80

81

82

83

84

85

86

87

88

89 **Manuscript**

90 The incidence of multiple myeloma (MM), the second most common hematologic malignancy,
91 is rising globally [1]. Therefore, research efforts focused on identifying risk factors to reduce risk
92 of MM are essential. Several risk factors have been identified, some that are non-modifiable
93 (older age, male sex, African American race) and others that are modifiable (obesity, dietary
94 patterns, diabetes mellitus). Additionally, amongst 421 patients with plasma cell disorders, 82%
95 had questions about their diet and 57% reported their questions were not addressed by their
96 oncologists. Among those who received dietary guidance from their oncologists, 94%
97 attempted to follow it [2].

98

99 Despite this, there is limited data on dietary patterns and MM risk with few MM cases in each
100 study. The EPIC-Oxford cohort and Oxford Vegetarian study (65 MM cases) showed vegetarians
101 and vegans had 77% lower relative risk to develop MM than meat eaters [Relative risk (RR)
102 0.23, 95% confidence interval (95%CI) 0.09-0.59] [3]. The Nurses' Health Study and Health
103 Professionals Follow-up Study (478 MM cases) showed the Empirical Dietary Inflammatory
104 Pattern had a 16% increased MM risk in men [Hazard Ratio (HR) 1.16, 95%CI 0.96-1.24] [4].

105

106 Therefore, we evaluated the association between pre-diagnosis dietary patterns and MM risk in
107 the NIH-AARP Diet and Health Study, a large population-based, prospective cohort study. To
108 our knowledge, this is also the largest epidemiologic study on diet and MM risk to date with 1
109 366 MM cases.

110

111 In 1995-1996, a food frequency questionnaire was mailed to 3.5 million American Association
112 of Retired Persons (AARP) members who were aged 50–71 years, residents of six US states
113 (California, Florida, Louisiana, New Jersey, North Carolina, and Pennsylvania) or two
114 metropolitan areas (Atlanta and Detroit) [5]. A total of 566 398 satisfactorily completed
115 questionnaires were returned between October 1995 and February 1997. Records were
116 excluded from our analysis if they were completed in duplicate (n=179), questionnaire was
117 completed by a proxy respondent (n=15 760) or proxy variable was not available or unknown
118 (56 134), or if the participant died or moved out of the study area before returning the
119 questionnaire (n=582), withdrew from the study (n=1), had a history of cancer as determined
120 by self-report or confirmed from registry data (n=77 805), had a cancer diagnosis date prior to
121 enrollment (n=1 564) and or had implausible energy intake (<800 or >4200 kcal/d for men and
122 <600 or >3500 kcal/d for women) (n=20 967). After these exclusions, our final baseline cohort
123 included 392 589 participants.

124
125 Study participants were followed from the date the questionnaire was received until first
126 cancer diagnosis or until participant moved out of study area or died or follow-up period ended
127 on December 31, 2011. Incident MM cases were identified through linkage to state cancer
128 registries. Case ascertainment has been estimated to be about 90% complete [6]. MM cases
129 were defined per International Classification of Diseases for Oncology, Third Edition code (ICD-
130 O-3).

131

132 In this analysis, we used four dietary indices – Healthy Eating Index-2015 (HEI-2015), Healthy
133 Diet Score (HDS), alternate Mediterranean Diet (aMED), and healthful Plant-based Diet Index
134 (hPDI), to assess diet quality. Many of these scores have been inversely associated with cancer
135 risk and cancer mortality. However, these pre-diagnosis scores have not been evaluated for
136 MM risk. Using MyPyramid Equivalents Database and other variables, we were able to calculate
137 each component and index scores for aMED and hPDI, while the HEI-2015 and HDS scores were
138 previously calculated and provided in the database. These scores were grouped into quartiles.
139 Higher scores imply higher adherence and a healthier diet.

140

141 The HEI-2015 is a measure of diet quality and overall alignment with the U.S. Dietary Guidelines
142 for Americans and uses an energy-adjusted density approach for calorie adjustment [7]. There
143 are nine adequacy components including total fruits, whole fruits, total vegetables, greens and
144 beans, whole grains, dairy, total protein foods, seafood and plant proteins, and fatty acids.
145 There are four moderation components including refined grains, sodium, added sugars, and
146 saturated fats. The HEI score ranges from 0-100.

147

148 The HDS was adapted from the Healthy Diet Indicator which was based on World Health
149 Organization recommendations [8]. It comprises of 12 components, saturated fatty acids,
150 polyunsaturated fatty acids, protein, total carbohydrates, dietary fiber, fruit and vegetables,
151 pulses and nuts, total non-milk extrinsic sugars, cholesterol, fish, red meat and meat products
152 and calcium. Participants scored 0 or 1 based on their intake of each of these 12 items. The
153 highest score is 11 [8].

154

155 The aMED score [9] was adapted from the traditional Mediterranean diet score [10] to assesses
156 the conformity with the Mediterranean dietary pattern. The traditional Mediterranean Diet
157 score was based on intake of nine components - vegetables, legumes, fruit and nuts, dairy,
158 cereals, meat and meat products, fish, alcohol and the ratio of monounsaturated to saturated
159 fat [10]. Intakes above the median received 1 point, all other intakes received 0 points. Meat
160 and dairy product consumption less than median received 1 point. The aMED score excluded
161 potato products from the vegetable group, separated fruit and nuts into 2 groups, eliminated
162 the dairy group, included whole-grain products only, included only red and processed meats for
163 the meat group and assigned alcohol intake between 5 and 15g/d for 1 point [9]. Scores ranged
164 from 0 to 9.

165

166 The overall plant-based diet index (PDI) and hPDI were developed by splitting 18 dietary
167 components into three groups: healthful plant foods (vegetables, whole grains, fruits, legumes,
168 nuts, vegetable oils, tea/coffee), unhealthful plant foods (fruit juices, refined grains, potatoes,
169 sugar sweetened beverages, sweets/desserts), and animal foods [11]. We utilized the hPDI, in
170 which the highest score was given to the highest quintile of intake for each healthful food
171 group available, and the lowest score given to the highest quintile of intake for unhealthful
172 plant foods and animal foods available.

173

174 HR and 95%CI for MM risk in highest versus lowest quartiles of dietary index scores were
175 estimated using multivariate Cox proportional hazards models with person-years as the

176 underlying time metric. The models were adjusted for age at study entry, sex, race (non-
177 Hispanic Whites, non-Hispanic Blacks, other minority), body mass index (BMI) (<18.5, 18.5-24.9,
178 25-29.9, 30-34.9, ≥ 35), and education (less than high school, high school, post-high school
179 training/college and unknown). Dietary variables were energy adjusted by residual method.
180 Sensitivity analysis was conducted to assess reverse causality by excluding MM cases diagnosed
181 within one year of follow-up.

182

183 Among 392,589 participants, 58.6% were males, 92.1% were non-Hispanic Whites, 34.4% had a
184 normal BMI and 5.4% completed less than high school (Table 1). A total of 1 366 MM cases
185 were identified during median follow-up period of 15.6 years. Multivariate analysis revealed a
186 statistically significant inverse association between hPDI scores and MM risk (Q4 vs Q1, HR
187 0.85, 95%CI 0.73-1.0, $p=0.043$) (Table 2). There was no significant association between HEI-2015
188 ($p=0.206$), HDS ($p=0.454$), aMED ($p=0.594$) scores and MM risk. In a sensitivity analysis (1 302
189 MM cases), hPDI was associated with similar reduced MM risk statistical significance was not
190 achieved (HR 0.87, 95%CI 0.74-1.03, $p=0.09$).

191

192 In this large prospective analysis of the NIH-AARP Diet and Health Study, we found that higher
193 hPDI scores were associated with a reduced MM risk. HEI-2015, HDS and aMED scores were not
194 significantly associated with MM risk. Our findings confirm the observations from the EPIC-
195 Oxford and Oxford-Vegetarian study [3]. The Nurses' Health Study and Health Professionals
196 Follow-up Study cohorts demonstrated 15-24% lower MM-specific mortality for presumed
197 healthy pre-diagnosis plant-based dietary patterns [Alternate HEI (AHEI-2010), aMED, dietary

198 approaches to stop hypertension (DASH and Prudent)] [HR range 0.76-0.85 per 1-standard
199 deviation (SD) increase in scores] and a 16-24% higher MM-specific mortality in unhealthy pre-
200 diagnosis dietary patterns (Western and inflammatory/insulinemic dietary patterns) (HR range
201 1.16-1.24, per 1-SD increase in scores) [12]. These findings also suggest that healthy pre-
202 diagnosis dietary habits may reduce risk of death once MM develops.

203

204 Plant-based diets are rich in fiber and phytochemicals and are associated with reduced cancer
205 risk and improved survival in cancer through multiple mechanisms such as improved BMI,
206 decreased inflammation, decreased insulin levels, decreased insulin-like growth factor 1 and
207 improved stool microbiome [13]. As the role of gut dysbiosis is being increasingly recognized in
208 the pathogenesis of MM, diet, the largest driver of microbiome composition can no longer be
209 ignored [14]. Preliminary results of a pilot nutrition-based intervention study (NUTRIVENTION)
210 in individuals with precursor plasma cell disorders and BMI ≥ 25 (NCT04920084) show that a
211 plant-based diet is feasible and leads to improvement in biomarkers associated with
212 progression to MM such as insulin resistance and gut microbiome composition [15]. A larger
213 randomized study of a plant-based diet is currently enrolling (NCT05640843) [16].

214

215 The strengths of this study include the large sample size of MM cases and prospective nature of
216 the study. A limitation of this study is the predominantly White population despite a higher MM
217 incidence in Blacks. Further studies are warranted to better understand the underlying
218 molecular and biological mechanisms.

219

220 In conclusion, the findings of this largest dietary epidemiologic study in MM are highly
221 suggestive of a reduced MM risk with a healthful plant-based diet. These observations will help
222 oncologists guide patients to make informed healthy dietary choices.

223

224

225 **Acknowledgements**

226 The authors would like to thank the NIH AARP Diet and Health Study Team and Participants.

227 This research was supported [in part] by the Intramural Research Program of the NIH, National

228 Cancer Institute. Cancer incidence data from the Atlanta metropolitan area were collected by

229 the Georgia Center for Cancer Statistics, Department of Epidemiology, Rollins School of Public

230 Health, Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia. Cancer incidence data from California were

231 collected by the California Cancer Registry, California Department of Public Health's Cancer

232 Surveillance and Research Branch, Sacramento, California. Cancer incidence data from the

233 Detroit metropolitan area were collected by the Michigan Cancer Surveillance Program,

234 Community Health Administration, Lansing, Michigan. The Florida cancer incidence data used in

235 this report were collected by the Florida Cancer Data System (Miami, Florida) under contract

236 with the Florida Department of Health, Tallahassee, Florida. The views expressed herein are

237 solely those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the FCDC or FDOH. Cancer

238 incidence data from Louisiana were collected by the Louisiana Tumor Registry, Louisiana State

239 University Health Sciences Center School of Public Health, New Orleans, Louisiana. Cancer

240 incidence data from New Jersey were collected by the New Jersey State Cancer Registry, The

241 Rutgers Cancer Institute of New Jersey, New Brunswick, New Jersey. Cancer incidence data

242 from North Carolina were collected by the North Carolina Central Cancer Registry, Raleigh,
243 North Carolina. Cancer incidence data from Pennsylvania were supplied by the Division of
244 Health Statistics and Research, Pennsylvania Department of Health, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.
245 The Pennsylvania Department of Health specifically disclaims responsibility for any analyses,
246 interpretations or conclusions. Cancer incidence data from Arizona were collected by the
247 Arizona Cancer Registry, Division of Public Health Services, Arizona Department of Health
248 Services, Phoenix, Arizona. Cancer incidence data from Texas were collected by the Texas
249 Cancer Registry, Cancer Epidemiology and Surveillance Branch, Texas Department of State
250 Health Services, Austin, Texas. Cancer incidence data from Nevada were collected by the
251 Nevada Central Cancer Registry, Division of Public and Behavioral Health, State of Nevada
252 Department of Health and Human Services, Carson City, Nevada. We are indebted to the
253 participants in the NIH-AARP Diet and Health Study for their outstanding cooperation. We wish
254 to acknowledge Dr. Arthur Schatzkin who was instrumental in conceiving and establishing the
255 NIH-AARP Diet and Health Study. We also thank former and current study leaders at the
256 National Cancer Institute and AARP, including Louise A. Brinton, Laurence S. Freedman, Albert
257 R. Hollenbeck, Victor Kipnis, Michael F. Leitzmann, Linda M. Liao, Charles E. Matthews, Yikyung
258 Park, Rashmi Sinha, Amy F. Subar and Mary H. Ward. Additionally, we are thankful to Sigurd
259 Hermansen and Kerry Grace Morrissey from Westat for study outcomes ascertainment and
260 management and Leslie Carroll and her team at Information Management Services for data
261 support and analysis.
262

263 This study was funded by the Center for Hematologic Malignancies at MSKCC and in part
264 through the NIH/NCI Cancer Center Support Grant P30 CA008748. Urvi A. Shah has received the
265 American Society of Hematology Scholar Award, the NCI MSK Paul Calabresi K12 Career
266 Development Award for Clinical Oncology K12CA184746, the MSK Parker Institute of Cancer
267 Immunotherapy CDA and the International Myeloma Society CDA as well as additional funding
268 support from HealthTree Foundation, the Allen Foundation Inc, the Paula and Rodger Riney
269 Foundation, the Willow Foundation and the David Drelich, MD, CFP, Irrevocable Trust. U. A.
270 Shah also received non-financial support from American Society of Hematology Clinical
271 Research Training Institute and TREC Training Workshop R25CA203650 (PI: Melinda Irwin). A.M.
272 Lesokhin received research support from NIH/NCI Cancer Center Support Grant P30CA008748,
273 NCI 1R01CA249981-01, Sawiris Family Fund, and Paula and Rodger Riney Foundation.

274

275

276 **Author Contributions**

277 Concept and design: RP, FC, AD, UAS. Acquiring data: RP, FC, AD, UAS. Analyzing data: RP, FC,
278 AD, JE, JMJ, UAS. Drafting the manuscript: RP, FC, JE, UAS. Critical revision of the manuscript:
279 FC, RP, JMJ, AML, SZU, UAS. Approving the final version of the paper: FC, RP, JE, AD, JMJ, AML,
280 SZU and UAS. Submission: RP and UAS. RP and FC contributed equally to this work. All authors
281 agreed to be accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions related to the
282 accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved.

283

284

285 **Data Availability**

286 The data that support the findings of this study are available from the NIH-AARP Diet and
287 Health Study, but restrictions apply to the availability of these data, which were used under
288 license for the current study, and so are not publicly available. Data are however available from
289 the authors upon reasonable request and with permission of the NIH-AARP Diet and Health
290 Study team.

291

292

293

294

295

296

297

298

299

300

301

302

303

304

305

306

307 References

- 308 1. Huang, J., et al., *The epidemiological landscape of multiple myeloma: a global cancer*
309 *registry estimate of disease burden, risk factors, and temporal trends*. *Lancet Haematol*,
310 2022. **9**(9): p. e670-e677.
- 311 2. Malik, M.A., et al., *Nutrition perceptions, needs and practices among patients with*
312 *plasma cell disorders*. *Blood Cancer J*, 2022. **12**(4): p. 70.
- 313 3. Key, T.J., et al., *Cancer in British vegetarians: updated analyses of 4998 incident cancers*
314 *in a cohort of 32,491 meat eaters, 8612 fish eaters, 18,298 vegetarians, and 2246*
315 *vegans*. *Am J Clin Nutr*, 2014. **100 Suppl 1**(1): p. 378s-85s.
- 316 4. Lee, D.H., et al., *Dietary Pattern and Risk of Multiple Myeloma in Two Large Prospective*
317 *US Cohort Studies*. *JNCI Cancer Spectr*, 2019. **3**(2): p. pkz025.
- 318 5. Schatzkin, A., et al., *Design and serendipity in establishing a large cohort with wide*
319 *dietary intake distributions : the National Institutes of Health-American Association of*
320 *Retired Persons Diet and Health Study*. *Am J Epidemiol*, 2001. **154**(12): p. 1119-25.
- 321 6. Michaud, D., et al., *Comparison of cancer registry case ascertainment with SEER*
322 *estimates and self-reporting in a subst of the NIH-AARP Diet and Health Study*. *J Registry*
323 *Manag*, 2005. **32**: p. 70-75.
- 324 7. Krebs-Smith, S.M., et al., *Update of the Healthy Eating Index: HEI-2015*. *J Acad Nutr Diet*,
325 2018. **118**(9): p. 1591-1602.
- 326 8. Maynard, M., et al., *Selecting a healthy diet score: lessons from a study of diet and*
327 *health in early old age (the Boyd Orr cohort)*. *Public Health Nutr*, 2005. **8**(3): p. 321-6.

- 328 9. Fung, T.T., et al., *Diet-quality scores and plasma concentrations of markers of*
329 *inflammation and endothelial dysfunction*. Am J Clin Nutr, 2005. **82**(1): p. 163-73.
- 330 10. Trichopoulou, A., et al., *Adherence to a Mediterranean diet and survival in a Greek*
331 *population*. N Engl J Med, 2003. **348**(26): p. 2599-608.
- 332 11. Satija, A., et al., *Plant-Based Dietary Patterns and Incidence of Type 2 Diabetes in US*
333 *Men and Women: Results from Three Prospective Cohort Studies*. PLoS Med, 2016. **13**(6):
334 p. e1002039.
- 335 12. Lee, D.H., et al., *Prediagnosis dietary pattern and survival in patients with multiple*
336 *myeloma*. Int J Cancer, 2020. **147**(7): p. 1823-1830.
- 337 13. Shah, U.A. and N.M. Iyengar, *Plant-Based and Ketogenic Diets As Diverging Paths to*
338 *Address Cancer: A Review*. JAMA Oncol, 2022. **8**(8): p. 1201-1208.
- 339 14. Shah, U.A., et al., *Dietary and microbiome evidence in multiple myeloma and other*
340 *plasma cell disorders*. Leukemia, 2023.
- 341 15. Shah, U.A., et al., *A Pilot Plant Based Dietary Intervention in MGUS and SMM Patients*
342 *with Elevated BMI Is Feasible and Associated with Improvements in Metabolic and*
343 *Microbiome Biomarkers of Progression*. Blood, 2022. **140**(Supplement 1): p. 5066-5069.
- 344 16. Shah, U.A., et al., *A Randomized Placebo Controlled Study of a Plant-Based Dietary*
345 *Versus Supplement Versus Placebo Intervention in Patients with Monoclonal*
346 *Gammopathy of Undetermined Significance (MGUS) and Smoldering Multiple Myeloma*
347 *(SMM) - the Nutrition Prevention (NUTRIVENTION-3) Study*. Blood, 2022.
348 **140**(Supplement 1): p. 5052-5055.
- 349

Table 1: Baseline characteristics of study cohort		
	Overall (N= 392,589)	Multiple Myeloma (N=1366)
Age at Entry		
>60	229,032 (58%)	952 (70%)
45-60	163,557 (42%)	414 (30%)
Sex		
Male	230,130 (59%)	961 (70%)
Female	162,459 (41%)	405 (30%)
Race		
Non-Hispanic White	361,486 (92%)	1,216 (89%)
Non-Hispanic Black	13,714 (4%)	94 (7%)
Hispanic/Asian/Pacific Islander/American Indian/Alaskan Native/Unknown	17,389 (4%)	56 (4%)
Body Mass Index		
<18.5	3,935 (1%)	11 (1%)
18.5-25	134,997 (34%)	420 (31%)
25-30	16,3455 (42%)	609 (45%)
30-35	59,669 (15%)	227 (17%)
>35	23,645 (6%)	75 (5%)
Education		
Less than high school	21,231 (5%)	74 (5%)
Completed high school	75,189 (19%)	248 (18%)
Post-high school training/ College/Postgraduate	286,512 (73%)	1,019 (75%)
Unknown	9,657 (3%)	25 (2%)

350

351

352

Table 2: Cox multivariate analysis for dietary pattern scores in quartiles and MM risk					
Dietary Score	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	p-value
HEI-2015	1	1.15 (0.99, 1.34)	1.01 (0.87, 1.18)	1.01 (0.87, 1.19)	0.2055
HDS	1	0.95 (0.81, 1.10)	0.88 (0.76, 1.03)	0.92 (0.79, 1.07)	0.4537
aMED	1	1.02 (0.89, 1.18)	1.0 (0.87, 1.16)	0.92 (0.79, 1.07)	0.5942
hPDI	1	1.02 (0.88, 1.17)	1.05 (0.9, 1.23)	0.85 (0.73, 1.00)	0.0429*
Hazard Ratio (95% confidence interval)					
*Statistically significant					
MM: Multiple myeloma; HEI-2015: Healthy Eating Index-2015; HDS: Healthy Diet Score; aMED: alternate Mediterranean Diet; hPDI: healthful Plant-based Diet Index; Q: Quartile.					

353