

STROBE Statement—checklist of items that should be included in reports of observational studies for manuscript *Meat intake and cancer risk: prospective analyses in UK Biobank*

	<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Page No., Section/Subsection(if applicable) /Paragraph (if applicable)</b>	<b>Relevant text from manuscript</b>
<b>Title and abstract</b>	1	(a) Indicate the study’s design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	P.1, Title	“prospective analyses in UK Biobank”
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	P.2, Abstract/Methods and Findings	
<b>Introduction</b>				
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	P.4, Introduction/Paragraph 1, 2	
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	P.4, Introduction/Paragraph 3	“The aim of the present study was to systematically investigate the associations between intakes of total, red and processed meat (both separately and combined) and poultry and cancer across 20 common cancer sites in a large British cohort. “
<b>Methods</b>				
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	P.1, Title	“prospective analyses in UK Biobank”
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	P.4-5, Methods/Study population; P.7, Methods/Statistical analysis /Paragraph 2	“The UK Biobank..”; “The person-years of follow-up were calculated from baseline assessment until the first registration of malignant cancer, date of death due to

---

				cancer if not diagnosed previously, date of death, loss of follow-up or end of follow-up (31 March 2016 for England and Wales, 31 October 2015 for Scotland), whichever came first.”
Participants	6	<p>(a) <i>Cohort study</i>—Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up</p> <p><i>Case-control study</i>—Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of case ascertainment and control selection. Give the rationale for the choice of cases and controls</p> <p><i>Cross-sectional study</i>—Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants</p>	P.6, Methods/Statistical analysis/Paragraph 1	<p>“Of 502,536 participants, 27,177 were excluded due to a cancer diagnosis at baseline (excluding non-melanoma skin cancer ICD-10: C44). Additionally, 334 participants were excluded in whom genetic sex differed from reported gender and two participants with zero person years of follow-up, resulting in a maximal study sample of 475,023 participants. “; “The person-years of follow-up were calculated from baseline assessment until the first registration of malignant cancer, date of death due to cancer if not diagnosed previously, date of death, loss of follow-up or end of follow-up (31 March 2016 for England and Wales, 31 October 2015 for Scotland), whichever came first.”</p>

---

		<p>(b) <i>Cohort study</i>—For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of exposed and unexposed</p> <p><i>Case-control study</i>—For matched studies, give matching criteria and the number of controls per case</p>		
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	P.5-6, Methods/Exposure assessment; P.6, Methods/Outcome assessment; P.6-8., Methods/Statistical analysis/Paragraph 3, 4	
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	P.5-6, Methods/Exposure assessment; P.6, Methods/Outcome assessment; P.6-7., Methods/Statistical analysis/Paragraph 2; Supporting information/S1 Text	
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	P.7-8, Methods/Statistical analysis/Paragraph 3, 4	Paragraph 3 lists adjustments for confounding; “We conducted three sensitivity analyses: (1) we repeated all analyses excluding the first 2 years of follow-up, to examine whether the overall results might be influenced by reverse causality; (2) we repeated analyses including only those reporting never having smoked at baseline, to reduce residual confounding by smoking;”

Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	P.6, Methods/Statistical analysis/Paragraph 1	<p>“Of 502,536 participants, 27,177 were excluded due to a cancer diagnosis at baseline (excluding non-melanoma skin cancer ICD-10: C44). Additionally, 334 participants were excluded in whom genetic sex differed from reported gender and two participants with zero person years of follow-up, resulting in a maximal study sample of 475,023 participants.”</p>
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	P.5, Methods/Exposure assessment; P.6-8, Methods/Statistical analysis/Paragraph 2, 3; Supporting information/S1 Text; Supporting information/S2 Text	<p>“Meat intakes were categorised into three or four groups depending on distribution and restricted by the answer categories as follows: red meat 0 to &lt;1, 1 to &lt;2, 2 to &lt;4 and ≥ 4 times/week; processed meat 0 to &lt;1 time/week, 1 to &lt;2 times a week and ≥ 2 times/week; poultry 0 to &lt;1, 1 to &lt;2 and ≥ 2 times/week; red and processed meat 0 to 1, &gt;1 to &lt;3, 3 to &lt;5 and ≥ 5 times/week; total meat 3, 3 to &lt;5, 5 to &lt;7 and ≥7 times/week. “; “Meat intakes were included in the</p>

				<p>regression models categorically using the lowest intake category as reference, and continuously as a trend in risk expressing the hazard ratios (HR) in increments of 100 g/day for total meat intake, 70 g/day for red and processed meat, 50 g/day for red meat, 20 g/day for processed meat and 30 g/day for poultry (for more details see S1 Text).” Handling of covariates described in statistical analysis/Paragraph 3 and S2 Text.</p>
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	P.6-8, Methods/Statistical analysis/Paragraph 2, 3, 5	
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	P.6-8, Methods/Statistical analysis/Paragraph 4	<p>“We conducted three sensitivity analyses: (1) we repeated all analyses excluding the first 2 years of follow-up, to examine whether the overall results might be influenced by reverse causality; (2) we repeated analyses including only those reporting never having smoked at baseline, to reduce residual confounding by smoking; (3) we compared models with and without an</p>

interaction term by sex using likelihood-ratio tests, based on earlier findings of sex differences in the associations between meat intake and cancer risk in this cohort [19].  
“

(c) Explain how missing data were addressed

P.6, Methods/Statistical analysis/Paragraph 1

“Participants who reported ‘prefer not to answer’ or who did not know their meat intake were considered to have missing meat intake and were excluded from the respective analyses (for total meat 1.5%, red and processed meat 1.4%, red meat 1.3%, processed meat 0.4%, and poultry 0.3%). Missing data for the main covariates was minimal with 73.5% having no missing data and 94.5% having one or fewer covariates missing; therefore a ‘missing’ category was created for each covariate.”

(d) *Cohort study*—If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed  
*Case-control study*—If applicable, explain how matching of cases and controls was addressed  
*Cross-sectional study*—If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy

P.6-7, Methods/Statistical analysis/Paragraph 2

“The person-years of follow-up were calculated from baseline assessment until the first registration of malignant cancer, date of death due to cancer if not diagnosed previously, date of death, loss

of follow-up or end of follow-up (31 March 2016 for England and Wales, 31 October 2015 for Scotland), whichever came first.”

(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses

**Results**

Participants	13* (a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed	P11, Results/Figs 1; P14, Results/Figs 2; P15, Results/Figs 3; P17, Results/Figs 4; P19, Results/Figs 5	Each figure title points out sample size included in analyses, footnotes point out where this size differs. E.g.” Fig 1. Association of total meat intake and cancer incidence by cancer site (per 100 g/day higher intake; n = 467,420)*”; “‡ Analyses restricted to never smokers (n = 256,009).”
	(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	P.6, Methods/Statistical analysis/Paragraph 1	“Of 502,536 participants, 27,177 were excluded due to a cancer diagnosis at baseline (excluding non-melanoma skin cancer ICD-10: C44). Additionally, 334 participants were excluded in whom genetic sex differed from reported gender and two participants with zero person years of follow-up, resulting in a maximal study sample of 475,023 participants.

				Participants who reported ‘prefer not to answer’ or who did not know their meat intake were considered to have missing meat intake and were excluded from the respective analyses (for total meat 1.5%, red and processed meat 1.4%, red meat 1.3%, processed meat 0.4%, and poultry 0.3%).”
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram		
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders	P.8, Results/Descriptive/Paragraph 1; P.9-10, Results/Table 1; Supporting information/S1-S3 Table	
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	P.9-10, Results/Table 1; Supporting information/S1 Table	Presents number of missing data in ‘unknown’ category
		(c) <i>Cohort study</i> —Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount)		
Outcome data	15*	<i>Cohort study</i> —Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time	P8, Results/Descriptive/Paragraph 1; P11, Results/Figs 1; P14, Results/Figs 2; P15, Results/Figs 3; P17, Results/Figs 4; P19, Results/Figs 5	“During a mean follow-up of 6.9 (SD 1.3, maximum 10.1) years, a total of 28,955 participants (6.1%) were newly diagnosed with any type of malignant cancer (excluding non-melanoma skin cancer ICD-10: C44).”
		<i>Case-control study</i> —Report numbers in each exposure category, or summary measures of exposure		



<i>Cross-sectional study</i> —Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures				
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included	P10-20 Results/Main findings; P11, Results/Figs 1; P14, Results/Figs 2; P15, Results/Figs 3; P17, Results/Figs 4; Supporting information/Tables S4-S8	Results section and figures show adjusted results. Supplementary tables also show the minimally adjusted findings.
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	P10-20 Results/Main findings; Supporting information/Tables S4-S8	Categories described in text as well as shown in supplementary tables.
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period		
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	P.20-21, Results/Sensitivity analyses; Supporting information/Figs S1-S5; Supporting information/Table S9	
<b>Discussion</b>				
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	P.21, Discussion/Paragraph 1	“In this large British prospective study of 461,986 participants investigating the association between meat intake and common cancer sites, total, red and processed meat intakes were positively associated with risks of colorectal cancer. Additionally, red meat intake was positively associated with breast cancer and prostate

				cancer, while poultry intake was positively associated with the risk for cancers of the lymphatic and hematopoietic tissues.”
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias	P.24-25, Discussion/Strengths and limitations/Paragraph 2	“Nevertheless, limitations need to be considered in the interpretation of our results....”
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	P.21-24, Discussion/Paragraphs 2-6	
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	P.24, Discussion/Strengths and limitations/ Paragraph 2	“This study was not representative of the UK population, therefore selection bias might still have some impact on the findings, but exposure-disease relationships are likely to be generalizable because they have been shown to not require representativeness [13, 52].”
<b>Other information</b>				
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	Submitted in system	“This research is supported by the Wellcome Trust, Our Planet Our Health (Livestock, Environment and People - LEAP) (205212/Z/16/Z <a href="https://www.wellcome.ac.uk/">https://www.wellcome.ac.uk/</a> ), by Cancer Research UK (C8211/A19170 <a href="https://www.cancerresearchuk">https://www.cancerresearchuk</a> ).

---

org/); and the UK Medical Research Council (MR/M012190/1 <https://mrc.ukri.org/>). The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.”

---

\*Give information separately for cases and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies.

**Note:** An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at [www.strobe-statement.org](http://www.strobe-statement.org).