

Coffee consumption and risk of breast cancer: a Mendelian Randomization study

Merete Ellingjord-Dale¹, Nikos Papadimitriou², Michalis Katsoulis³, Chew Yee¹, Niki Dimou², Dipender Gill¹, Dagfinn Aune^{1,4,5}, Jue-Sheng Ong^{6,7}, Stuart MacGregor⁶, Benjamin Elsworth⁷, Sarah J Lewis^{7,8}, Richard M Martin⁷⁻⁹, Elio Riboli¹, Konstantinos K Tsilidis^{1,10}

¹Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, School of Public Health, Imperial College London, London, UK

²Section of Nutrition and Metabolism, International Agency for Research on Cancer, Lyon, France

³Institute of Health Informatics Research, Faculty of Population Health Sciences, University College London, London, UK.

⁵Department of Nutrition, Bjørknes University College, Oslo, Norway

⁶Department of Endocrinology, Morbid Obesity and Preventive Medicine, Oslo University Hospital, Oslo, Norway

⁶Statistical Genetics, Department of Genetics and Computational Biology, QIMR Berghofer Medical Research Institute, Brisbane, QLD, Australia

⁷MRC Integrative Epidemiology Unit, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK

⁸Department of Population Health Sciences, Bristol Medical School, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK

⁹National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Bristol Biomedical Research Centre, University Hospitals Bristol NHS Foundation Trust and the University of Bristol, Bristol, UK

¹⁰Department of Hygiene and Epidemiology, School of Medicine, University of Ioannina, Ioannina, Greece

Corresponding author: Merete Ellingjord-Dale (email: m.ellingjord-dale@imperial.ac.uk)

Abstract

Background:

Observational studies have reported either null or weak protective associations for coffee consumption and risk of breast cancer.

Methods:

We conducted a two-sample Mendelian randomization randomization (MR) analysis to evaluate the relationship between coffee consumption and breast cancer risk using 33 single-nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) associated with coffee consumption from a genome-wide association (GWA) study on 212,119 female UK Biobank participants of White British ancestry. Risk estimates for breast cancer were retrieved from publicly available GWA summary statistics from the Breast Cancer Association Consortium (BCAC) on 122,977 cases (of which 69,501 were estrogen receptor (ER)-positive, 21,468 ER-negative) and 105,974 controls of European ancestry. Random-effects inverse variance weighted (IVW) MR analyses were performed along with several sensitivity analyses to assess the impact of potential MR assumption violations.

Results:

One cup per day increase in genetically predicted coffee consumption in women was not associated with risk of total (IVW random-effects; odds ratio (OR): 0.91, 95% confidence intervals (CI): 0.80-1.02, P: 0.12, P for instrument heterogeneity: 7.17e-13), ER-positive (OR=0.90, 95% CI: 0.79-1.02, P: 0.09) and ER-negative breast cancer (OR: 0.88, 95% CI: 0.75-1.03, P: 0.12). Null associations were also found in the sensitivity analyses using MR-

Egger (total breast cancer; OR: 1.00, 95% CI: 0.80-1.25), weighted median (OR: 0.97, 95% CI: 0.89-1.05) and weighted mode (OR: 1.00, CI: 0.93-1.07).

Conclusions:

The results of this large MR study do not support an association of genetically predicted coffee consumption on breast cancer risk, but we cannot rule out existence of a weak inverse association.

Keywords:

Coffee consumption, breast cancer risk, Mendelian Randomizaton

Background

Coffee contains biochemical compounds such as caffeine, polyphenols and diterpens that may protect against breast cancer risk through their anticarcinogenic properties (1-3) or through their favorable alterations of levels of estradiol and SHBG (4-8). Several observational studies have investigated the association between coffee consumption and breast cancer risk, but findings have been inconsistent with the majority of studies reporting null associations (9-25) and other studies reporting protective associations (26-30). A recent meta-analysis including 21 prospective cohort studies reported a weak protective association for highest versus lowest category of coffee consumption with overall (RR=0.96, 95% CI=0.93-1.00) and postmenopausal (RR=0.92, 95% CI=0.88-0.98) breast cancer (31). However, observational studies may be confounded by other dietary or lifestyle factors. Further, there are no clinical trials on the effect of coffee consumption on breast cancer risk, and it is still unclear whether an association exists and if so, whether it is causal.

Several genome-wide association studies (GWAS) on coffee or caffeine consumption have been previously published (32-37). One of these GWAS was a meta-analysis conducted by the Coffee and Caffeine Genetics Consortium in 2015 incorporating summary statistics from 28 population-based studies of European ancestry, and reported six loci associated with coffee consumption that were involved either in the pharmacokinetics (cytochrome P4501A1 (CYP1A1)/cytochrome P4501A2 (CYP1A2), aryl hydrocarbon receptor (AHR)) or pharmacodynamics of caffeine (brain-derived neurotrophic factor (BDNF) and solute carrier family 6 member 4 (SLC6A4)) (35). A more recent and larger GWAS was conducted among individuals (179,954 males and 212,119 females) of white British ancestry in the UK

Biobank (UKB) cohort (37), and identified 35 genetic variants strongly associated with coffee intake.

Mendelian randomization (MR) is a method that uses genetic variation arising from meiosis as a natural experiment, to investigate the potential causal relationship between an exposure and an outcome (38, 39). MR estimates are less susceptible to bias from potential reverse causality and confounding compared to estimates from observational studies, because genetic variants are randomly distributed at conception (40, 41). A recent MR study assessed the potential causal association between coffee consumption and risk of several cancers, including breast cancer, and concluded that coffee consumption is unlikely to be associated with overall breast cancer susceptibility (37). However, the latter study did not report associations by breast cancer subtypes. In the current MR study, we investigated the relationship between genetically predicted coffee consumption and risk of breast cancer overall as well as breast cancer subtypes incorporating several MR methods to assess the impact of potential MR assumption violations.

Methods

Genetic data on coffee consumption

We used 35 single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) that were associated with coffee consumption at genome-wide significance ($p < 5e-8$) level in the combined population of men and women in UKB(37), but their beta estimates (SNP-coffee) were derived from analyses only among the female population (Supplementary table 1). In a sensitivity analysis, we combined beta estimates (SNP-coffee) for both men and women to increase statistical power. The UKB is a population-based cohort study of more than 500,000 participants aged 38 to 73

years, who enrolled in the study between 2006 and 2010 from across the UK (42). Coffee consumption was measured via self-administered questionnaires and was defined as cups of decaffeinated coffee, instant coffee, ground coffee and any other type of coffee (UKB Data field ID: 1508) consumed per day (37). Briefly, the UKB participants were genotyped using Affymetrix UK Biobank Axiom array and imputed against the UK10K, 1000 Genomes Phase 3 and Haplotype Reference Consortium panels (37). The GWAS was conducted using the BOLT-LMM software (43) to model the genetic association accounting for cryptic relatedness in the UKB sample. SNPs were clumped at $r^2 < 0.01$ using a 10-mb window (37).

Genetic data on breast cancer

Out of the 35 genome-wide significant SNPs (37), we extracted 33 SNPs from the publicly available breast cancer GWAS from the Breast Cancer Association Consortium (BCAC). BCAC has data on 122,977 breast cancer cases and 105,974 controls of European ancestry (<http://bcac.ccg.e-medical.cam.ac.uk/bcacdata/oncoarray/gwas-icogs-and-oncoarray-summary-results/>). BCAC was initiated in 2005 and is an international collaboration that studies genetic susceptibility to breast cancer. The breast cancer GWAS was performed in females of European ancestry from 68 studies collaborating in BCAC, the Discovery, Biology and Risk of Inherited Variants in Breast Cancer Consortium (DRIVE; 61,282 cases and 45,494 controls), the Illumina iSelect genotyping Collaborative Oncological Gene-Environment Study (iCOGS; 46,785 cases and 42,892 controls), and 11 other breast cancer GWAS (14,910 cases and 17,588 controls) (44). Genotyping in the BCAC and DRIVE studies was done using OncoArray1, whereas iCOGS used Illumina iSelect array (<http://ccg.e-medical.cam.ac.uk/research/consortia/icogs/>). Using the 1000 Genomes Project (Phase 3) reference panel, genotypes were imputed for approximately 21M variants (44). All

studies were approved by relevant institutional review boards, and all participants provided written informed consent.

Statistical power

Statistical power calculations were conducted using the online mRnd calculator (available at <http://cnsgenomics.com/shiny/mRnd/>). Using an estimated 1% variance of coffee consumption explained by the instruments (37), the study had 80% power to detect associations of 0.89, 0.87 and 0.80 per one cup of coffee per day and risk of overall, ER-positive and ER-negative breast cancer, respectively.

Statistical analysis

Main MR analysis

We conducted a two-sample MR using summary association data for 33 coffee-associated SNPs. We ran both fixed- and random-effects inverse-variance weighted (IVW) models, but the random-effects IVW model was considered the main analysis due to the large number of SNPs and the substantive observed heterogeneity (45, 46). The IVW MR approach combines individual MR estimates across SNPs to derive an overall weighted estimate of the potential causal effect. We calculated the MR-derived odds ratio (OR) of breast cancer risk for a one cup per day increase in genetically predicted coffee consumption.

Sensitivity analyses

The IVW MR approach assumes that all genetic variants must satisfy the instrumental variable assumptions, namely the genetic variants must be: 1) associated with coffee consumption, 2) not associated with confounders of the association between coffee

consumption and breast cancer, and 3) only associated with breast cancer via their association with coffee consumption (45, 47, 48). We tested for potential violation of the first MR assumption by measuring the strength of the genetic instruments using F-statistics. The F-statistic is the ratio of the mean square of the model to the mean square of error (49). The Cochran's Q test and the I^2 statistic were used to quantify the heterogeneity in effect sizes between the genetic instruments (50), which may indicate horizontal pleiotropy that could violate the third MR assumption. To further test and attempt to correct for potential violation of the second and third MR assumptions, we used several approaches such as the MR-Egger regression (51), the weighted median (52) and mode (53) methods, and the MR pleiotropy residual sum and outlier test (MR-PRESSO) (54).

MR-Egger

The MR-Egger is an adaption of Egger regression, which allows for directional pleiotropy by introducing an intercept in the weighted regression model. Values away from zero for the intercept term are an indication of horizontal pleiotropy (51). The MR-Egger approach provides unbiased results in the presence of pleiotropic instruments assuming that the magnitude of pleiotropic effects is independent of the size of the SNP-coffee consumption effects, which is called the Instrument Strength Independent of Direct Effects (InSIDE) assumption (51).

Weighted median

We used the weighted median method that orders the MR estimates obtained using each instrument weighted for the inverse of their variance. Selecting the median result provides a single MR estimate with confidence intervals estimated using a parametric bootstrap method (52). The weighted median does not require that the size of any pleiotropic effects on the

instruments are uncorrelated to their effects on the intermediate phenotype, but assumes that at least half of the instruments are valid (55).

Weighted mode

The mode based causal estimate consistently estimates the true causal effect when the largest group of instruments with consistent MR estimates is valid (53).

MR-PRESSO

We used the MR-PRESSO outlier test to identify outlier SNPs, which could have pleiotropic effects (54). This method regresses SNP-outcome on SNP-exposure and uses square of residuals to identify outliers.

To further determine whether pleiotropy could have influenced our results, we collected information on published associations of the genetic instruments for coffee consumption with other phenotypes from the Phenoscanner webpage (56). Genetic instruments associated at genome-wide significance with potentially important confounders of the coffee and breast cancer association, namely BMI (57-61), age at menarche (62, 63), alcohol (64-68), smoking (67, 69-71) and age at menopause (72) were iteratively excluded from the analyses.

In addition, we repeated the analysis after excluding SNPs that had p-values in their associations with coffee consumption among women larger than 1e-05 to avoid weak instrument bias. We also used beta estimates from a previous GWAS as an alternative instrument of eight SNPs (rs1260326, rs1481012, rs17685, rs7800944, rs6265, rs9902453, rs2472297 and rs4410790) associated with coffee consumption (35) to ensure that our results

were robust against different choices of instrument selection and because these eight SNPs are linked to caffeine metabolism and may reflect less likelihood for pleiotropic actions. All the analyses were performed using the MR robust package in Stata (73) and the Mendelian randomization package in R (74).

Results

The associations between the genetic instruments with coffee consumption and breast cancer are shown in Supplementary Table 2. One variant (rs17817964 in *FTO*) was strongly associated with overall ($P=4.67E-20$), ER-positive ($P=2.48E-13$) and ER-negative breast cancer ($P=1.56E-09$).

Main MR analyses

The fixed-effects IVW method yielded inverse associations for genetically predicted coffee intake and risk of total, ER-positive and ER-negative breast cancer (Figures 1-3 and Supplementary Table 1), but there was substantial heterogeneity in the individual SNPs instrumenting coffee and risk of disease (Cochran's Q test P -value= 10^{-5} - 10^{-13} , $I^2=57$ - 74% , Supplementary Figures 1-6). Therefore, the random-effects IVW model was preferentially adopted for the main analysis, where the association between coffee consumption (per cup of coffee per day) and total ($OR=0.91$, 95% CI= 0.80-1.02, $P=0.12$), ER-positive ($OR=0.90$, 95% CI=0.79-1.02, $P=0.09$) and ER-negative breast cancer ($OR=0.88$, 95% CI=0.75-1.03, $P=0.12$) resulted in wider confidence intervals overlapping the null (Figures 1-3 and Supplementary Table 1).

Figure 1. Association between 1 cup/day increase of coffee consumption and breast cancer risk overall. MR-analyses are derived using fixed effect IVW, random effect IVW, MR-Egger, weighted median and mode.

Figure 2. Association between 1 cup/day increase of coffee consumption and risk of ER-positive breast cancer. MR-analyses are derived using fixed effect IVW, random effect IVW, MR-Egger, weighted median and mode.

Figure 3. Association between 1 cup/day increase of coffee consumption and risk of ER-negative breast cancer. MR-analyses are derived using fixed effect IVW, random effect IVW, MR-Egger, weighted median and mode.

MR-Egger

Results based on the MR-Egger regression did not show any association for genetically predicted coffee consumption and risk of total breast cancer or subtypes (Figures 1, 2, 3, Supplementary Table 1).

Weighted median and mode

Similarly, results from the weighted median analysis showed little evidence of an association per one cup of coffee per day and overall ($OR=0.97$, 95% CI=0.89-1.05, $P=0.45$, Figure 1), ER-positive ($OR=0.94$, 95% CI=0.86-1.04, $P=0.24$, Figure 2) and ER-negative breast cancer ($OR=1.02$, 95% CI=0.90-1.17, $P=0.72$, Figure 3). The weighted mode model also yielded little evidence for an association (Overall breast cancer; $OR=1.00$, 95% CI=0.93-1.07, Figure 1, 2, 3 and Supplementary Table 1).

MR-PRESSO

The MR-PRESSO outlier test detected six SNPs as potential outliers for total breast cancer (i.e. rs13387939, rs17817964, rs34060476, rs2472297, rs2521501 and rs539515), three SNPs

for ER-positive breast cancer (i.e. rs17817964, rs2472297 and rs2521501) and three SNPs for ER-negative breast cancer (i.e. rs13387939, rs3810291 and rs17817964). After excluding these SNPs outliers, there was an inverse association between genetically predicted coffee intake (per one cup of coffee per day) and risk of overall (OR=0.90, 95% CI=0.83-0.98, P=0.03) and ER-positive breast cancer (OR=0.87, 95% CI=0.78-0.97, P=0.02), but no association for ER-negative breast cancer (OR=0.97, 95% CI=0.87-1.08, P=0.62, Supplementary Table 1). However, the rs2472297 is located between *CYP1A1* and *CYP1A2* and is involved in the pharmacokinetics of caffeine, and has the strongest association with coffee consumption amongst all genetic instruments (P< 1e-168). Many of the other outlying SNPs had genome-wide significant associations with age at menarche (rs17817964, rs13387939, rs539515 and rs3810291), body mass index (rs17817964, rs13387939, rs2472297, rs539515 and rs3810291) and alcohol intake (rs17817964 and rs34060476, Supplementary Table 3).

Sensitivity analyses

We performed several sensitivity analyses and there was little evidence of any association between genetically predicted coffee consumption and breast cancer risk (Supplementary Table 1). We performed MR-analyses after excluding genetic instruments known to be associated at genome-wide significance with 1) body mass index (i.e. rs4357572, rs539515, rs62106258, rs13387939, rs142219, rs2465054, rs4410790, rs2472297, rs17817964, rs66723169 and rs3810291), 2) age at menarche (i.e. rs539515, rs62106258, rs13387939, rs2236955, rs17817964 and rs381029), 3) alcohol consumption (i.e. rs1260326, rs34060476, rs17817964 and rs66723169), 4) smoking (i.e. rs56113850), and 5) age at menopause (i.e. rs1260326) (Supplementary Tables 1 and 3). When we reran the analyses after excluding 13 genetic instruments (i.e. rs117968677, rs1260326, rs1422191, rs16966903, rs2236955,

rs2465054, rs2667773, rs34190000, rs3810291, rs395815, rs4092465, rs55754437 and rs62064918) with p-values with coffee consumption among women larger than 10^{-5} , the results remained largely the same (Overall; OR=0.90, 95% CI 0.77-1.06, ER-positive; OR=0.99, 95% CI 0.77-1.05 and ER-negative; OR=0.88, 95% CI 0.72-1.07, Supplementary Table 1). In another sensitivity analysis, we used as genetic instruments eight SNPs (i.e. rs1260326, rs1481012, rs17685, rs7800944, rs6265, rs9902453, rs4410790 and rs2472297) from a GWAS for coffee consumption among consumers conducted by the Coffee and Caffeine Genetics Consortium (35), and there was again no evidence of an association (Overall; OR= 1.10, 95% CI 0.97-1.24, ER-positive; OR=1.07, 95% CI 0.96-1.21 and ER-negative; OR=1.16, 95% CI 0.97-1.38). To increase statistical power, we used the 33 genetic instruments from UK Biobank but with beta estimates (SNP-coffee) from females and males combined, but the results remained largely the same (Overall; OR=0.92, 95% CI 0.82-1.04, P=0.20, ER-positive; OR=0.92, 95% CI 0.81-1.04, P=0.16, ER-negative; OR=0.90, 95% CI 0.77-1.05, P=0.17, Supplementary Table 1).

Discussion

In this comprehensive MR analysis of coffee consumption with risk of breast cancer, we observed that in the majority of analyses genetically predicted consumption of coffee was not associated with overall, ER-positive and ER-negative breast cancer. In line with our results, a recent large MR-study on the association between coffee consumption and risk of being diagnosed with or dying from cancer overall and by anatomical subsite reported no evidence for an association with risk of breast cancer (37). Compared to the previous study, our study added results by ER-status and presented detailed sensitivity analyses to fully assess potential violations of MR assumptions.

Coffee is among the most commonly consumed beverages worldwide, and its drinking provides exposure to a range of biologically active compounds (75). Higher coffee consumption has been associated with decreased risk of all-cause, cardiovascular and cancer mortality among non-smokers (76). Several observational studies have investigated the association between coffee consumption and risk of breast cancer development, but findings have been inconsistent (31, 77, 78). The most recent meta-analysis synthesized evidence from 21 prospective cohort studies (31), and reported a weak inverse association between coffee consumption and risk of total (OR higher vs. lower=0.96, 95% CI=0.93-1.00) and postmenopausal breast cancer (OR=0.92, 95% CI=0.88-0.98). Null associations were reported by estrogen or progesterone receptor status (31). When a dose-response meta-analysis was conducted among 13 prospective studies (31), the association per one cup of coffee per day was nominally significant (OR for postmenopausal disease=0.97, 95% CI=0.95-1.00), which was consistent with the finding of the current MR study (OR=0.90, 95% CI 0.79-1.02). In agreement, the World Cancer Research Fund Third Expert Report graded the evidence of coffee consumption and breast cancer risk as limited-no conclusion (79).

MR studies can be useful in nutritional epidemiology, as they are less susceptible to biases that are commonly present in traditional observational literature (80), namely exposure measurement error, residual confounding and reverse causation. MR estimates warrant a causal interpretation only if the assumptions of the instrumental variable approach hold. Though it is not possible to prove the validity of the assumptions in entirety, we performed several sensitivity analyses to detect potential violations and derived estimates that are

potentially robust against violations of these assumptions. The majority of the sensitivity analyses supported our main analysis finding.

Several limitations should be considered when interpreting our findings. Our MR-analysis had appropriate statistical power to detect an OR of 0.89 per cup of coffee per day and risk of overall breast cancer. Observational studies have detected smaller associations of coffee consumption and breast cancer risk than this (31). We were unable to rule out the possibility that coffee consumption may have a weaker association that we were not powered to detect. A weakness of using summary level data in two-sample MR is that stratified analyses by covariates of interest (e.g. smoking, alcohol, obesity, physical activity) are not possible which would have allowed us to investigate potential interactions between risk factors, but previous observational studies have in general not identified interactions with these variables (31). Although our genetic instruments are robustly associated with coffee consumption, coffee consumption itself is a heterogeneous phenotype that may potentially limit the generalizability of our findings on specific coffee type or preparation procedure. In addition, we are currently unable to isolate and classify genetic variants into caffeine and non-caffeine aspects of coffee given that the genetic loci heavily overlap, and future research into the biological mechanisms of the genetic instruments is warranted when more data becomes available; until then, a potential role of micronutrients attained through coffee consumption on reduction of breast cancer risk cannot be ruled out.

Conclusions

In summary, the results of this large MR study do not support an association of genetically predicted coffee consumption on breast cancer risk, but we cannot rule out existence of a weak inverse association.

Abbreviations

BMI: body mass index, BCAC: the Breast Cancer Association Consortium, CI: Confidence interval, ER: estrogen receptor, GWA: Genome-wide association, IVW: Inverse variance weighted, MR: Mendelian randomization, OR: Odds ratio, SNP: single-nucleotide polymorphism, UKB: UK Biobank

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate

Not applicable, as only publicly available summary association data were used.

Consent for publication

Not applicable, as only publicly available summary association data were used.

Availability of data and materials

All data generated or analysed during this study are included in this published article (and its supplementary information files).

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interest.

Authors' contributions

KKT designed the study. MED, NP, JSO, SM and BE collected the data. MED, CY did the statistical analyses. MED and KKT drafted the manuscript. ER, JSO, BE, CY, DA, DG, MK, ND, NP, SJL, SM and RMM critically reviewed the manuscript for important intellectual contents. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Funding

This work was supported by the World Cancer Research Fund International Regular Grant Programme (WCRF 2014/1180 to Konstantinos K. Tsilidis). RMM was supported by a Cancer Research UK (C18281/A19169) programme grant (the Integrative Cancer Epidemiology Programme) and is part of the Medical Research Council Integrative Epidemiology Unit at the University of Bristol supported by the Medical Research Council (MC_UU_12013/1, MC_UU_12013/2, and MC_UU_12013/3) and the University of Bristol. RMM is also supported by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Bristol Biomedical Research Centre which is funded by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) and is a partnership between University Hospitals Bristol NHS Foundation Trust and the University of Bristol.

Acknowledgements

This work was conducted using the UK Biobank Resource (application number 25331). The breast cancer genome-wide association analyses were supported by the Government of Canada through Genome Canada and the Canadian Institutes of Health Research, the 'Ministère de l'Économie, de la Science et de l'Innovation du Québec' through Genome Québec and grant PSR-SIIRI-701, The National Institutes of Health (U19 CA148065,

X01HG007492), Cancer Research UK (C1287/A10118, C1287/A16563, C1287/A10710) and The European Union (HEALTH-F2-2009-223175 and H2020 633784 and 634935).

Disclaimer: Where authors are identified as personnel of the International Agency for Research on Cancer / World Health Organization, the authors alone are responsible for the views expressed in this article and they do not necessarily represent the decisions, policy or views of the International Agency for Research on Cancer / World Health Organization.

References

1. Nkondjock A. Coffee consumption and the risk of cancer: an overview. *Cancer Lett.* 2009;277(2):121-5.
2. Cavin C, Holzhaeuser D, Scharf G, Constable A, Huber WW, Schilter B. Cafestol and kahweol, two coffee specific diterpenes with anticarcinogenic activity. *Food Chem Toxicol.* 2002;40(8):1155-63.
3. Grosso G, Godos J, Lamuela-Raventos R, Ray S, Micek A, Pajak A, et al. A comprehensive meta-analysis on dietary flavonoid and lignan intake and cancer risk: Level of evidence and limitations. *Mol Nutr Food Res.* 2017;61(4).
4. Woolcott CG, Shvetsov YB, Stanczyk FZ, Wilkens LR, White KK, Caberto C, et al. Plasma sex hormone concentrations and breast cancer risk in an ethnically diverse population of postmenopausal women: the Multiethnic Cohort Study. *Endocr Relat Cancer.* 2010;17(1):125-34.
5. Kotsopoulos J, Eliassen AH, Missmer SA, Hankinson SE, Tworoger SS. Relationship between caffeine intake and plasma sex hormone concentrations in premenopausal and postmenopausal women. *Cancer-Am Cancer Soc.* 2009;115(12):2765-74.
6. Fung TT, Schulze MB, Hu FB, Hankinson SE, Holmes MD. A dietary pattern derived to correlate with estrogens and risk of postmenopausal breast cancer. *Breast Cancer Res Treat.* 2012;132(3):1157-62.
7. Sisti JS, Hankinson SE, Caporaso NE, Gu F, Tamimi RM, Rosner B, et al. Caffeine, coffee, and tea intake and urinary estrogens and estrogen metabolites in premenopausal women. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev.* 2015;24(8):1174-83.
8. Nagata C, Kabuto M, Shimizu H. Association of coffee, green tea, and caffeine intakes with serum concentrations of estradiol and sex hormone-binding globulin in premenopausal Japanese women. *Nutr Cancer.* 1998;30(1):21-4.
9. Folsom AR, McKenzie DR, Bisgard KM, Kushi LH, Sellers TA. No association between caffeine intake and postmenopausal breast cancer incidence in the Iowa Women's Health Study. *Am J Epidemiol.* 1993;138(6):380-3.
10. Boggs DA, Palmer JR, Stampfer MJ, Spiegelman D, Adams-Campbell LL, Rosenberg L. Tea and coffee intake in relation to risk of breast cancer in the Black Women's Health Study. *Cancer Causes Control.* 2010;21(11):1941-8.
11. Larsson SC, Bergkvist L, Wolk A. Coffee and black tea consumption and risk of breast cancer by estrogen and progesterone receptor status in a Swedish cohort. *Cancer Causes Control.* 2009;20(10):2039-44.
12. Gierach GL, Freedman ND, Andaya A, Hollenbeck AR, Park Y, Schatzkin A, et al. Coffee intake and breast cancer risk in the NIH-AARP diet and health study cohort. *Int J Cancer.* 2012;131(2):452-60.
13. Fagherazzi G, Touillaud MS, Boutron-Ruault MC, Clavel-Chapelon F, Romieu I. No association between coffee, tea or caffeine consumption and breast cancer risk in a prospective cohort study. *Public Health Nutr.* 2011;14(7):1315-20.
14. McLaughlin CC, Mahoney MC, Nasca PC, Metzger BB, Baptiste MS, Field NA. Breast cancer and methylxanthine consumption. *Cancer Causes Control.* 1992;3(2):175-8.
15. Bhoo-Pathy N, Peeters PHM, Uiterwaal CSPM, Bueno-De-Mesquita HB, Bulgiba AM, Bech BH, et al. Coffee and tea consumption and risk of pre- and postmenopausal breast cancer in the European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition (EPIC) cohort study. *Breast Cancer Research.* 2015;17.
16. Michels KB, Holmberg L, Bergkvist L, Wolk A. Coffee, tea, and caffeine consumption and breast cancer incidence in a cohort of Swedish women. *Ann Epidemiol.* 2002;12(1):21-6.
17. Ganmaa D, Willett WC, Li TY, Feskanich D, van Dam RM, Lopez-Garcia E, et al. Coffee, tea, caffeine and risk of breast cancer: a 22-year follow-up. *Int J Cancer.* 2008;122(9):2071-6.

18. Bhoo Pathy N, Peeters P, van Gils C, Beulens JW, van der Graaf Y, Bueno-de-Mesquita B, et al. Coffee and tea intake and risk of breast cancer. *Breast Cancer Res Treat.* 2010;121(2):461-7.
19. Vatten LJ, Solvoll K, Loken EB. Coffee consumption and the risk of breast cancer. A prospective study of 14,593 Norwegian women. *Br J Cancer.* 1990;62(2):267-70.
20. Lubin J, Ron E, Wax Y, Modan B. Coffee and methylxanthines and breast cancer: a case-control study. *J Natl Cancer Inst.* 1985;74(3):569-73.
21. Ewertz M, Gill C. Dietary factors and breast-cancer risk in Denmark. *Int J Cancer.* 1990;46(5):779-84.
22. Mannisto S, Pietinen P, Virtanen M, Kataja V, Uusitupa M. Diet and the risk of breast cancer in a case-control study: does the threat of disease have an influence on recall bias? *J Clin Epidemiol.* 1999;52(5):429-39.
23. Hirvonen T, Mennen LI, de Bree A, Castetbon K, Galan P, Bertrais S, et al. Consumption of antioxidant-rich beverages and risk for breast cancer in French women. *Ann Epidemiol.* 2006;16(7):503-8.
24. Rosenberg L, Miller DR, Helmrich SP, Kaufman DW, Schottenfeld D, Stolley PD, et al. Breast cancer and the consumption of coffee. *Am J Epidemiol.* 1985;122(3):391-9.
25. La Vecchia C, Talamini R, Decarli A, Franceschi S, Parazzini F, Tognoni G. Coffee consumption and the risk of breast cancer. *Surgery.* 1986;100(3):477-81.
26. Nilsson LM, Johansson I, Lenner P, Lindahl B, Van Guelpen B. Consumption of filtered and boiled coffee and the risk of incident cancer: a prospective cohort study. *Cancer Causes Control.* 2010;21(10):1533-44.
27. Baker JA, Beehler GP, Sawant AC, Jayaprakash V, McCann SE, Moysich KB. Consumption of coffee, but not black tea, is associated with decreased risk of premenopausal breast cancer. *J Nutr.* 2006;136(1):166-71.
28. Li J, Seibold P, Chang-Claude J, Flesch-Janys D, Liu J, Czene K, et al. Coffee consumption modifies risk of estrogen-receptor negative breast cancer. *Breast Cancer Res.* 2011;13(3):R49.
29. Oh JK, Sandin S, Strom P, Lof M, Adami HO, Weiderpass E. Prospective study of breast cancer in relation to coffee, tea and caffeine in Sweden. *Int J Cancer.* 2015;137(8):1979-89.
30. Lukic M, Licaj I, Lund E, Skeie G, Weiderpass E, Braaten T. Coffee consumption and the risk of cancer in the Norwegian Women and Cancer (NOWAC) Study. *Eur J Epidemiol.* 2016;31(9):905-16.
31. Lafranconi A, Micek A, De Paoli P, Bimonte S, Rossi P, Quagliariello V, et al. Coffee Intake Decreases Risk of Postmenopausal Breast Cancer: A Dose-Response Meta-Analysis on Prospective Cohort Studies. *Nutrients.* 2018;10(2).
32. Sulem P, Gudbjartsson DF, Geller F, Prokopenko I, Feenstra B, Aben KKH, et al. Sequence variants at CYP1A1-CYP1A2 and AHR associate with coffee consumption. *Hum Mol Genet.* 2011;20(10):2071-7.
33. Cornelis MC, Monda KL, Yu K, Paynter N, Azzato EM, Bennett SN, et al. Genome-Wide Meta-Analysis Identifies Regions on 7p21 (AHR) and 15q24 (CYP1A2) As Determinants of Habitual Caffeine Consumption. *Plos Genet.* 2011;7(4).
34. Amin N, Byrne E, Johnson J, Chenevix-Trench G, Walter S, Nolte IM, et al. Genome-wide association analysis of coffee drinking suggests association with CYP1A1/CYP1A2 and NRCAM. *Mol Psychiatr.* 2012;17(11):1116-29.
35. Cornelis MC, Byrne EM, Esko T, Nalls MA, Ganna A, Paynter N, et al. Genome-wide meta-analysis identifies six novel loci associated with habitual coffee consumption. *Mol Psychiatr.* 2015;20(5):647-56.
36. Pirastu N, Kooyman M, Robino A, van der Spek A, Navarini L, Amin N, et al. Non-additive genome-wide association scan reveals a new gene associated with habitual coffee consumption. *Sci Rep-Uk.* 2016;6.
37. Ong JS, Law MH, An JY, Han XK, Gharahkhani P, Whiteman DC, et al. Association between coffee consumption and overall risk of being diagnosed with or dying from cancer among > 300 000

UKBiobank participants in a large-scale Mendelian randomization study. *Int J Epidemiol.* 2019;48(5):1447-56.

38. Davey Smith G, Hemani G. Mendelian randomization: genetic anchors for causal inference in epidemiological studies. *Hum Mol Genet.* 2014;23:R89-R98.

39. Davies NM, Holmes MV, Davey Smith G. Reading Mendelian randomisation studies: a guide, glossary, and checklist for clinicians. *BMJ.* 2018;362:k601.

40. Palmer TM, Sterne JA, Harbord RM, Lawlor DA, Sheehan NA, Meng S, et al. Instrumental variable estimation of causal risk ratios and causal odds ratios in Mendelian randomization analyses. *Am J Epidemiol.* 2011;173(12):1392-403.

41. Verduijn M, Siegerink B, Jager KJ, Zoccali C, Dekker FW. Mendelian randomization: use of genetics to enable causal inference in observational studies. *Nephrol Dial Transplant.* 2010;25(5):1394-8.

42. Sudlow C, Gallacher J, Allen N, Beral V, Burton P, Danesh J, et al. UK biobank: an open access resource for identifying the causes of a wide range of complex diseases of middle and old age. *PLoS Med.* 2015;12(3):e1001779.

43. Loh PR, Tucker G, Bulik-Sullivan BK, Vilhjalmsson BJ, Finucane HK, Salem RM, et al. Efficient Bayesian mixed-model analysis increases association power in large cohorts. *Nat Genet.* 2015;47(3):284-90.

44. Michailidou K, Lindstrom S, Dennis J, Beesley J, Hui S, Kar S, et al. Association analysis identifies 65 new breast cancer risk loci. *Nature.* 2017;551(7678):92-4.

45. Burgess S TS. *Mendelian Randomization: Methods for Using Genetic Variants in Causal Estimation.* 1st Edition ed. New York: Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press; 2015 6 March 2015.

46. Burgess S, Butterworth A, Thompson SG. Mendelian randomization analysis with multiple genetic variants using summarized data. *Genet Epidemiol.* 2013;37(7):658-65.

47. Didelez V, Sheehan N. Mendelian randomization as an instrumental variable approach to causal inference. *Stat Methods Med Res.* 2007;16(4):309-30.

48. Greenland S. An introduction to instrumental variables for epidemiologists. *Int J Epidemiol.* 2018;47(1):358.

49. Pierce BL, Ahsan H, Vanderweele TJ. Power and instrument strength requirements for Mendelian randomization studies using multiple genetic variants. *Int J Epidemiol.* 2011;40(3):740-52.

50. Greco MF, Minelli C, Sheehan NA, Thompson JR. Detecting pleiotropy in Mendelian randomisation studies with summary data and a continuous outcome. *Stat Med.* 2015;34(21):2926-40.

51. Bowden J, Davey Smith G, Burgess S. Mendelian randomization with invalid instruments: effect estimation and bias detection through Egger regression. *Int J Epidemiol.* 2015;44(2):512-25.

52. Bowden J, Davey Smith G, Haycock PC, Burgess S. Consistent Estimation in Mendelian Randomization with Some Invalid Instruments Using a Weighted Median Estimator. *Genet Epidemiol.* 2016;40(4):304-14.

53. Hartwig FP, Davey Smith G, Bowden J. Robust inference in summary data Mendelian randomization via the zero modal pleiotropy assumption. *Int J Epidemiol.* 2017;46(6):1985-98.

54. Verbanck M, Chen CY, Neale B, Do R. Detection of widespread horizontal pleiotropy in causal relationships inferred from Mendelian randomization between complex traits and diseases. *Nat Genet.* 2018;50(5):693-8.

55. Bowden J, Del Greco MF, Minelli C, Davey Smith G, Sheehan NA, Thompson JR. Assessing the suitability of summary data for two-sample Mendelian randomization analyses using MR-Egger regression: the role of the I^2 statistic. *Int J Epidemiol.* 2016;45(6):1961-74.

56. Phenoscanner. [Available from: <http://www.phenoscanner.medschl.cam.ac.uk>].

57. Heard-Costa NL, Zillikens MC, Monda KL, Johansson A, Harris TB, Fu M, et al. NRXN3 Is a Novel Locus for Waist Circumference: A Genome-Wide Association Study from the CHARGE Consortium. *Plos Genet.* 2009;5(6).

58. Speliotes EK, Willer CJ, Berndt SI, Monda KL, Thorleifsson G, Jackson AU, et al. Association analyses of 249,796 individuals reveal 18 new loci associated with body mass index. *Nat Genet.* 2010;42(11):937-48.

59. Paternoster L, Evans DM, Nohr EA, Holst C, Gaborieau V, Brennan P, et al. Genome-wide population-based association study of extremely overweight young adults--the GOYA study. *PLoS One.* 2011;6(9):e24303.

60. Yang J, Loos RJF, Powell JE, Medland SE, Speliotes EK, Chasman DI, et al. FTO genotype is associated with phenotypic variability of body mass index. *Nature.* 2012;490(7419):267-+.

61. Guo Y, Lanktree MB, Taylor KC, Hakonarson H, Lange LA, Keating BJ, et al. Gene-centric meta-analyses of 108 912 individuals confirm known body mass index loci and reveal three novel signals. *Hum Mol Genet.* 2013;22(1):184-201.

62. Perry JRB, Day F, Elks CE, Sulem P, Thompson DJ, Ferreira T, et al. Parent-of-origin-specific allelic associations among 106 genomic loci for age at menarche. *Nature.* 2014;514(7520):92-+.

63. Kichaev G, Bhatia G, Loh PR, Gazal S, Burch K, Freund MK, et al. Leveraging Polygenic Functional Enrichment to Improve GWAS Power. *Am J Hum Genet.* 2019;104(1):65-75.

64. Clarke TK, Adams MJ, Davies G, Howard DM, Hall LS, Padmanabhan S, et al. Genome-wide association study of alcohol consumption and genetic overlap with other health-related traits in UK Biobank (N=112 117). *Mol Psychiatry.* 2017;22(10):1376-84.

65. Evangelou E, Gao H, Chu C, Ntritsos G, Blakeley P, Butts AR, et al. New alcohol-related genes suggest shared genetic mechanisms with neuropsychiatric disorders. *Nat Hum Behav.* 2019;3(9):950-61.

66. Zhong VW, Kuang A, Danning RD, Kraft P, van Dam RM, Chasman DI, et al. A genome-wide association study of bitter and sweet beverage consumption. *Hum Mol Genet.* 2019;28(14):2449-57.

67. Liu M, Jiang Y, Wedow R, Li Y, Brazel DM, Chen F, et al. Association studies of up to 1.2 million individuals yield new insights into the genetic etiology of tobacco and alcohol use. *Nat Genet.* 2019;51(2):237-44.

68. Karlsson Linner R, Biroli P, Kong E, Meddens SFW, Wedow R, Fontana MA, et al. Genome-wide association analyses of risk tolerance and risky behaviors in over 1 million individuals identify hundreds of loci and shared genetic influences. *Nat Genet.* 2019;51(2):245-57.

69. Brazel DM, Jiang Y, Hughey JM, Turcot V, Zhan X, Gong J, et al. Exome Chip Meta-analysis Fine Maps Causal Variants and Elucidates the Genetic Architecture of Rare Coding Variants in Smoking and Alcohol Use. *Biol Psychiatry.* 2019;85(11):946-55.

70. Patel YM, Park SL, Han Y, Wilkens LR, Bickeboller H, Rosenberger A, et al. Novel Association of Genetic Markers Affecting CYP2A6 Activity and Lung Cancer Risk. *Cancer Res.* 2016;76(19):5768-76.

71. McKay JD, Hung RJ, Han Y, Zong X, Carreras-Torres R, Christiani DC, et al. Large-scale association analysis identifies new lung cancer susceptibility loci and heterogeneity in genetic susceptibility across histological subtypes. *Nat Genet.* 2017;49(7):1126-32.

72. Day FR, Ruth KS, Thompson DJ, Lunetta KL, Pervjakova N, Chasman DI, et al. Large-scale genomic analyses link reproductive aging to hypothalamic signaling, breast cancer susceptibility and BRCA1-mediated DNA repair. *Nat Genet.* 2015;47(11):1294-303.

73. Spiller W DN, Palmer T. Software Application Profile: mrrobust - A tool for performing two-sample summary Mendelian randomization analyses. *bioRxiv*, published online 25th May 2017.

74. Yavorska OO, Burgess S. MendelianRandomization: an R package for performing Mendelian randomization analyses using summarized data. *Int J Epidemiol.* 2017;46(6):1734-9.

75. Gomez-Ruiz JA, Leake DS, Ames JM. In vitro antioxidant activity of coffee compounds and their metabolites. *J Agr Food Chem.* 2007;55(17):6962-9.

76. Grossi G, Micek A, Godos J, Sciacca S, Pajak A, Martinez-Gonzalez MA, et al. Coffee consumption and risk of all-cause, cardiovascular, and cancer mortality in smokers and non-smokers: a dose-response meta-analysis. *Eur J Epidemiol.* 2016;31(12):1191-205.

77. Li XJ, Ren ZJ, Qin JW, Zhao JH, Tang JH, Ji MH, et al. Coffee consumption and risk of breast cancer: an up-to-date meta-analysis. *PLoS One*. 2013;8(1):e52681.
78. Jiang W, Wu Y, Jiang X. Coffee and caffeine intake and breast cancer risk: an updated dose-response meta-analysis of 37 published studies. *Gynecol Oncol*. 2013;129(3):620-9.
79. Report TWCRFTE. Diet, nutrition, physical activity and breast cancer. <https://www.wcrf.org/sites/default/files/Breast-cancer-report.pdf>. 2017.
80. Schatzkin A, Abnet CC, Cross AJ, Gunter M, Pfeiffer R, Gail M, et al. Mendelian Randomization: How It Can-and Cannot-Help Confirm Causal Relations between Nutrition and Cancer. *Cancer Prev Res*. 2009;2(2):104-13.

Figure 1. Association between 1 cup/day increase of coffee consumption and breast cancer risk overall. MR-analyses are derived using fixed effect IVW, random effect IVW, MR-Egger, weighted median and mode.




Figure 2. Association between 1 cup/day increase of coffee consumption and risk of ER-positive breast cancer. MR-analyses are derived using fixed effect IVW, random effect IVW, MR-Egger, weighted median and mode.




Figure 3. Association between 1 cup/day increase of coffee consumption and risk of ER-negative breast cancer. MR-analyses are derived using fixed effect IVW, random effect IVW, MR-Egger, weighted median and mode.

