

A Systematic Review and Dose-Response Meta-Analysis of the Association Between Nitrate & Nitrite intake and Gastroesophageal Cancer Risk: A Study Protocol

Mohammadreza Ghasemi^{1,2}, Mohammad Bahrami koutenaei¹, Alireza Ghasemi³, Reza Alizadeh-navaei¹, Mahmood Moosazadeh^{1,*}

¹Gastrointestinal Cancer Research Center, Non-communicable Disease Institute, Mazandaran University of Medical Sciences, Sari, Iran

²School of medicine, Shahid Beheshti University of Medical Science, Tehran, Iran

³Student Research Committee, Alborz University of Medical Sciences, Karaj, Iran

* Corresponding Author: Mahmood Moosazadeh; Gastrointestinal Cancer Research Center, Mazandaran University of Medical Sciences, Sari, Iran Email: mmoosazadeh1351@gmail.com, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5452-514X>

Abstract

Objectives: The global burden of cancer underscores the necessity for evidence-based strategies to identify and manage risk factors. Nitrate and nitrite are inherent byproducts resulting from microbial-mediated nitrogen oxidation in plants, soil, or water. Fruits, vegetables, and combinations thereof are integral constituents of a nutritious diet. Despite the potential carcinogenicity of N-nitroso compounds (NOCs), certain epidemiological investigations have reported a lack of correlation between the dietary intake of nitrate, nitrite, and NOCs and the occurrence of cancer in human subjects.

Methods: PubMed/MEDLINE, Embase, WoS (Clarivate Analytics), Proquest, Scopus, and Google Scholar as electronic databases will be precisely searched for observational studies that assessed the relationship between nitrate/nitrite levels and gastric/esophageal cancer. In this study, an assessment will be conducted on studies spanning January 1, 1980, to October 30, 2023. The inclusion criteria will not restrict language. Discrepancies among the reviewers at various stages of the study, including screening, selection, quality assessment, and data extraction, will be resolved through consensus. In instances where disagreements persist unresolved, a third reviewer will decide. The combination method will be employed based on methodological similarities in the chosen articles, utilizing either the Random Effect Model or the Fixed Effect Model. Additionally, forest plots will be generated for the included articles. Statistical heterogeneity will be evaluated using the I² statistic and the Q-statistic test. Furthermore, funnel plots will be employed to assess non-significant study effects and potential reporting bias. Eggers and Beggs tests will be executed, and the identification of publication bias will rely on significant findings ($P < 0.05$).

Conclusion: The findings of this study should be of benefit to governments and researchers in maintaining safe levels of nitrate and nitrite in drinking water as well as preventing Gastroesophageal cancers.

Keywords: Nitrate¹, Nitrite², Gastric cancer³, Esophageal cancer⁴, Dose-response⁵.

1. Background

Gastric cancer (GC) manifests as a markedly aggressive and rapidly proliferating cancers. A considerable number of patients with gastric cancer exhibit partial metastasis at the time of diagnosis. Despite a decrease in the incidence of gastric cancer (GC) in recent decades, it maintains its position as the fifth most prevalent cancer, following lung, breast, colorectal, and prostate cancers. Additionally, it stands as the third leading cause of cancer-related mortality globally, surpassed only by lung and colorectal cancers.(1)

Esophageal cancer poses a significant global health challenge. As per projections derived from the GLOBOCAN project, there were 572,034 newly diagnosed cases of esophageal cancer in 2018, accounting for 3.2% of all newly reported cancer cases worldwide. Additionally, 508,585 deaths were attributed to esophageal cancer in the same year.(2,3)

Given the escalating global burden of cancer, there is an escalating need for evidence-based approaches to identifying and managing risk factors associated with cancer development. While the precise causes of cancer remain incompletely understood, a multitude of factors, both non-modifiable (such as gender, age, and genetic factors) and modifiable (including diet and lifestyle factors), have been identified as contributors to increased risk. Notably, one-third of cancer-related deaths can be attributed to behavioral and dietary risks. In recent years, emerging evidence has instigated a paradigm shift in our comprehension of the impact of dietary nitrate and nitrite on human health, particularly concerning cancer risk.

Nitrate and nitrite are inherent byproducts resulting from the microbial-mediated oxidation of nitrogen in plants, soil, or water. Nitrate, being the predominant nitrogen source in soils, plays a crucial role in the production of amino acids in plants. It serves as a pivotal nutrient orchestrating optimal plant growth and developmental processes.(4)

Traditionally, elevated consumption of nitrate and nitrite was perceived as potentially harmful food additives and classified as likely human carcinogens, particularly in situations facilitating endogenous nitrosation and subsequent N-nitroso compound (NOC) formation. Presently, it is acknowledged that nitrate, nitrite, and nitrosamine naturally exist in fruits and vegetables, integral components of a healthful diet. This acknowledgment stems from compelling evidence supporting their substantial health benefits, particularly in the context of cancer prevention.(5–7)

The conversion of nitrogen compounds to nitrosamine has been linked to the increased risk of gastrointestinal cancer. Conversely, endogenously produced nitric oxide (NO) from naturally occurring nitrate in plants is implicated in blood pressure regulation, thereby contributing to enhanced cardiovascular health. The intake of inorganic nitrate positively influences endothelial function, leading to a significant reduction in cardiovascular disease (CVD) risk factors, including decreased platelet aggregation and arterial rigidity.(8–10)

Fruits, vegetables, and combinations thereof are recognized as integral constituents of a nutritious diet. The naturally occurring nitrate and nitrite found in these food sources are believed to confer advantageous effects in terms of cancer prevention and contribute to vascular and metabolic well-being. The nitrite–NO pathway has been demonstrated to exhibit antihypertensive properties. Consequently, despite the substantial consumption of nitrate from vegetable sources, its intake is unlikely to be deemed problematic.(11)

Despite the potential carcinogenicity of N-nitroso compounds (NOCs), certain epidemiological investigations have reported a lack of correlation between the dietary intake of nitrate, nitrite, and

NOCs and the occurrence of cancer in human subjects. Overall, epidemiologic studies that have examined associations between nitrate, nitrite, and NOC compounds and various types of cancer in humans have returned mixed and, in some cases, complex results.(12–14)

In this study, this systematic review aims to evaluate the association and clarify the relationship between dietary consumption of nitrate and nitrite and risk of gastric or esophageal cancer in humans. Furthermore, our objective is to elucidate the dose-response pattern of the relationship between nitrate/nitrite and gastric/esophageal cancer.

2.Objectives

2.1 Primary Objective

The main objective of this study is to examine the association between dietary nitrate intake levels and the gastric cancer.

2.2 Secondary Objectives

1. Assessing the relationship between levels of dietary nitrite intake and gastric cancer.
2. Assessing the relationship between levels of dietary nitrate intake and esophageal cancer.
3. Assessing the relationship between levels of dietary nitrite intake and esophageal cancer.
4. Assessing potential heterogeneity and finding its sources.

3.Methods

This systematic review and meta-analysis's research protocol adhere to the guidelines outlined in the Cochrane Handbook, and it has been duly registered under the PROSPERO registration number CRD42023398071. The methodology for study selection will be articulated in accordance with the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 guidelines.(15,16)

3.1 Patient and Public Involvement

No patients will be involved.

3.2 Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

3.2.1 Study Types

This study will include observational designs, including cross-sectional, case-control, and cohort studies, which investigate the association between nitrate and nitrite exposure and gastroesophageal cancer. Notably, case reports, case series, clinical trial studies, review articles, and protocol papers will be excluded.

3.2.2 Types of Participants

People of all ages, with diagnosis of gastric or esophageal cancer will be the Participants of this study. There will be no specific restrictions on age or sex. In vitro and in vivo studies will be excluded

116 3.3 Exposure

117 Included studies will have at least two levels of nitrate or nitrite exposure in diet. There is no limit to
118 the units of reported nitrate or nitrite.

119 3.4 Control

120 Controls will refer to participants with gastric or esophageal cancer and normal levels of nitrate or
121 nitrite in their diet.

122 3.5 Outcomes

123 The occurrence of gastric or esophageal cancer is the outcome of this study, which is considered a
124 categorical variable. The effect size is the odds ratio (OR), which is defined as the odds of the
125 occurrence of gastric or esophageal cancer in people with high levels of nitrate or nitrite in diet
126 compared to people who received normal levels of nitrate or nitrite.

127 3.6 Search Strategy Components

128 To attain a comprehensive search, the study will employ the PECO (Patient, Exposure,
129 Comparison/Control, and Outcome) framework to formulate search terms pertaining to the exposure
130 (nitrate or nitrite) and outcome (gastric or esophageal cancer) elements. The identified key search
131 terms are delineated in Table 1, with appropriate formatting tailored to each database. Thesaurus
132 systems incorporating Medical Subject Headings (MeSH) and Emtree, along with insights from
133 experts, will be utilized to acquire equivalent terms for the components.

Table 1. Search Strategies Used in PubMed/MEDLINE

Search terms	
1	(Nitrate*[tiab] OR “nitrate content”[tiab] OR “nitrate ion”[tiab] OR “nitrate medium”[tiab] OR “nitrate salt”[tiab] OR “nitric acid salt”[tiab] OR “water nitrate”[tiab] OR Nitrates[tiab] OR Nitrite*[tiab] OR “nitrite ion”[tiab] OR nitrites[tiab] OR “nitrous acid salt”[tiab] OR Nitrites[tiab])
2	(“Stomach Neoplasms”[tiab] OR (“Neoplasm”[tiab] AND “Stomach”[tiab]) OR “Stomach Neoplasm”[tiab] OR (“Neoplasms”[tiab] AND “Stomach”[tiab]) OR “Gastric Neoplasms”[tiab] OR “Gastric Neoplasm”[tiab] OR (“Neoplasm”[tiab] AND “Gastric”[tiab]) OR (“Neoplasms”[tiab] AND “Gastric”[tiab]) OR “Cancer of Stomach”[tiab] OR “Stomach Cancers”[tiab] OR “Gastric Cancer”[tiab] OR (“Cancer”[tiab] AND “Gastric”[tiab]) OR (“Cancers”[tiab] AND “Gastric”[tiab]) OR “Gastric Cancers”[tiab] OR “Stomach Cancer”[tiab] OR (“Cancer”[tiab] AND “Stomach”[tiab]) OR (“Cancers”[tiab] AND “Stomach”[tiab]) OR “Cancer of the Stomach”[tiab] OR (“Gastric Cancer”[tiab] AND “Familial Diffuse”[tiab]) OR “stomach cancer”[tiab] OR “cancer of the cardia”[tiab] OR “cancer of the gastric antrum”[tiab] OR “cancer of the gastric body”[tiab] OR “cancer of the gastric cardia”[tiab] OR “cancer of the gastric fundus”[tiab] OR “cancer[tiab] AND stomach”[tiab] OR “cardia cancer”[tiab] OR “gastric antral cancer”[tiab] OR “gastric antrum cancer”[tiab] OR “gastric body

cancer"[tiab] OR "gastric cancer"[tiab] OR "gastric cardia cancer"[tiab] OR "gastric cardiac cancer"[tiab] OR "gastric malignancies"[tiab] OR "gastric malignancy"[tiab] OR "malignancies of the stomach"[tiab] OR "malignancy of the stomach"[tiab] OR "malignant gastric neoplasm"[tiab] OR "malignant gastric tumor"[tiab] OR "malignant neoplasm of the stomach"[tiab] OR "malignant neoplasms of the stomach"[tiab] OR "malignant tumor of the stomach"[tiab] OR "malignant tumors of the stomach"[tiab] OR "malignant tumour of the stomach"[tiab] OR "malignant tumours of the stomach"[tiab] OR "pyloric cancer"[tiab] OR "stomach malignancies"[tiab] OR "stomach malignancy"[tiab] OR "Esophageal Neoplasms"[tiab] OR "Esophageal Neoplasm"[tiab] OR ("Neoplasm"[tiab] AND "Esophageal"[tiab]) OR "Esophagus Neoplasm"[tiab] OR "Esophagus Neoplasms"[tiab] OR ("Neoplasm"[tiab] AND "Esophagus"[tiab]) OR ("Neoplasms"[tiab] AND "Esophageal"[tiab]) OR "Cancer of Esophagus"[tiab] OR "Cancer of the Esophagus"[tiab] OR "Esophagus Cancer"[tiab] OR ("Cancer"[tiab] AND "Esophagus"[tiab]) OR ("Cancers"[tiab] AND "Esophagus"[tiab]) OR "Esophagus Cancers"[tiab] OR "Esophageal Cancer"[tiab] OR ("Cancer"[tiab] AND "Esophageal"[tiab]) OR ("Cancers"[tiab] AND "Esophageal"[tiab]) OR "Esophageal Cancers"[tiab] OR "Oesophageal Squamous Cell Carcinoma"[tiab] OR "Esophageal Squamous Cell Carcinoma"[tiab] OR "esophagus cancer"[tiab] OR "cancer of the abdominal esophagus"[tiab] OR "cancer of the cervical esophagus"[tiab] OR "cancer of the cervical oesophagus"[tiab] OR "cancer of the esophagus"[tiab] OR "cancer of the oesophagus"[tiab] OR "cancer of the thoracic esophagus"[tiab] OR "cancer of the thoracic oesophagus"[tiab] OR ("cancer[tiab] AND esophagus"[tiab]) OR "carcinogenesis in the esophagus"[tiab] OR "esophageal cancer"[tiab] OR "esophageal carcinogenesis"[tiab] OR "esophageal malignancies"[tiab] OR "esophageal malignancy"[tiab] OR "malignancies of the esophagus"[tiab] OR "malignancies of the oesophagus"[tiab] OR "malignancy of the esophagus"[tiab] OR "malignancy of the oesophagus"[tiab] OR "malignant esophageal disease"[tiab] OR "malignant esophageal tumor"[tiab] OR "malignant neoplasm of the esophagus"[tiab] OR "malignant neoplasm of the oesophagus"[tiab] OR "malignant oesophageal disease"[tiab] OR "malignant tumor of the esophagus"[tiab] OR "oesophageal cancer"[tiab] OR "oesophageal carcinogenesis"[tiab] OR "oesophageal malignancies"[tiab] OR "oesophageal malignancy"[tiab] OR "oesophagus cancer"[tiab])

3 1 AND 2

134

135 3.7 Electronic Database Search

136 Systematic searches will be executed using electronic databases, including PubMed/MEDLINE,
137 Embase (Embase.com), Scopus, WoS (Clarivate Analytics), Google Scholar, and ProQuest.

138 3.8 Grey literature

139 Theses related to the subject will be identified through the electronic databases of Scopus and
140 ProQuest. Additionally, electronic databases will be employed to locate conference papers and
141 proceedings.

142 3.9 Publication date

143 This study will encompass all relevant research studies published within the timeframe from January
144 1, 1980, to October 30, 2023.

145

146 3.10 Publication language

147 In the present study, there would not be any language limitations. Any studies written in a language
148 other than English, which are ultimately chosen for inclusion, must undergo an initial translation
149 using Google Translate. Subsequently, they will be rechecked by an official translator.

150 3.11 Constructing the Search Syntax

151 As delineated in Table 1, the elements designated as 'Exposure (nitrate/nitrite)' and 'Outcome
152 (Gastric/Esophageal cancer)' will be targeted for the identification of pertinent studies. The execution
153 of a comprehensive search is anticipated to yield the maximal number of observational studies within
154 electronic databases. The formulated search syntax is designed to be adaptable for application to
155 various electronic databases. The detailed search syntax tailored for PubMed is outlined in Table 1.
156 Subsequently, all searches conducted across diverse databases will be consolidated within Endnote
157 software.

158 3.12 Study Screening and Selection

159 The search protocol will be implemented, adhering to the specified syntax tailored to each electronic
160 database. One of the authors (MG) will undertake the evaluation of titles and abstracts in accordance
161 with a predetermined checklist, according to the established inclusion criteria during the screening
162 stage. Articles related to the subject of the study will be identified and extracted. studies failing to
163 meet any of the inclusion criteria will be excluded at this stage. Papers lacking sufficient information
164 on one or more inclusion criteria will be temporarily considered, with the final decision based on a
165 comprehensive examination of the complete texts.

166 In the subsequent selection phase, two contributors (AG and MB) will meticulously assess the full
167 texts of the studies identified during the screening stage, independently determining the conclusive
168 selection of studies. Any discord arising during these phases will be resolved through consensus. In
169 instances where consensus cannot be reached, an expert's opinion (MM) will be sought for
170 resolution.

171 3.13 Risk of bias Assessment

172 The evaluation of the methodological quality of studies will be conducted utilizing the Joanna Briggs
173 Institute critical appraisal for cohort and case-controls (JBI checklist) (17). The comprehensive risk
174 of bias in each included study will be categorized as "high," "low," or "unclear."

175 This evaluation process will be independently performed by two authors (MG and AG). In the event
176 of disagreements, resolution will be sought through consensus, and should consensus prove elusive,
177 the perspective of a third expert (MM) will be solicited to arbitrate the matter.

178 3.14 Data extraction

179 Two authors, MG and MB, will complete the data extraction form for all the eligible papers,
180 independently. Any disagreement in their assessments will be discussed to achieve a consensus, or
181 alternatively, the viewpoint of a third expert (MM) will be sought for resolution.

182 The data extraction form will encompass the following information: the first author's name,
183 publication year, study country, study design, study duration, sample size, number of cases, quality
184 scores of papers, cancer type, outcome type (occurrence/mortality), nitrate dose, nitrite, point
185 estimate of odds ratio (OR) for each level of exposure, upper bound of the confidence interval of OR
186 for each level of exposure, and lower bound of the confidence interval of OR for each level of
187 exposure.

188 In instances where the included studies have incomplete data, efforts will be made to contact the
189 authors for data retrieval. A paper will be excluded after three unsuccessful attempts to elicit a
190 response from the study authors.

191 3.15 Data Synthesis and Analysis

192 Brief details pertaining to each study included in the analysis will be presented in a table. This table
193 will encompass essential information such as the first author's name, study country, study design,
194 number of cases, nitrate/nitrite categories, reported odds ratio (OR) with 95% confidence interval
195 (CI), and the specific cancer sites (stomach or esophageal).

196 3.16 Statistical Analysis

197 Stata V.14 software (StataCorp, USA) will be applied for the statistical analysis in this study.

198 3.17 Assessment of heterogeneity

199 To assess the statistical heterogeneity within the included studies, the I² statistic and Q-statistic tests,
200 along with their corresponding 95% Confidence Intervals (CIs), will be employed. Heterogeneity
201 values categorized as 0%-40%, 30%-60%, 50%-90%, and 75%-100% will be interpreted as 'perhaps
202 not important,' 'moderate heterogeneity,' 'substantial heterogeneity,' and 'considerable heterogeneity,'
203 respectively. Regarding the Q-test, a significance level of $P < 0.05$ will be deemed statistically
204 significant.

205 3.18 Assessment of Publication Bias

206 Conducting a comprehensive search at the initiation of the study constitutes the primary strategy to
207 avoid publication bias. Additionally, funnel plots will be constructed to assess non-significant study
208 effects and potential reporting bias. Egger's test and Begg's test will be conducted, and the
209 identification of significant results ($P < 0.05$) may indicate the presence of publication bias.
210 Subsequently, the non-parametric 'trim and fill' method will be implemented to rectify this form of
211 bias.

212 3.19 Missing Data

213 Regarding probable missing data of the final papers, efforts will be made to obtain contact
214 information for the corresponding authors in order to establish communication and acquire the
215 missing data. Failure to establish contact with the authors will result in the exclusion of their studies.

216 4. Conclusions

217 The present systematic review and meta-analysis will assess the dose-response relationship between
 218 nitrate/nitrite and gastrointestinal cancer. Researchers and governments are expected to benefit from
 219 the results of this study since they will be able to use the findings of the study to control levels of
 220 nitrate/nitrite in dietary products and prevent gastric or esophageal cancer. The results of this study
 221 will be reported in publications and presentations at conferences.

222 5. Strengths and Limitations of this study

- 223 • This study will examine the association between nitrate/nitrite and gastric/esophageal cancer in a
 224 dose-response manner.
- 225 • The reporting of data will adhere to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and
 226 Meta-Analysing Protocols.
- 227 • The study employs a comprehensive search strategy based on thesaurus systems, including Emtree
 228 and MeSH. It conducts searches across prominent databases such as Scopus, MEDLINE/PubMed,
 229 WOS, Embase, Google Scholar, and ProQuest, spanning an extensive time frame.
- 230 • Potential methodological biases in the primary studies included may introduce uncertainty into the
 231 findings of the present study.

232 6. Acknowledgments

233 The authors wish to acknowledge the Gastrointestinal Cancer Research Center, Mazandaran
 234 University of Medical Sciences for their support, which has been invaluable in the completion of
 235 this research.

236 **Conflict of Interest:** The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

237 **Ethical Approval:** Since patient information will be sourced from previously published papers, there
 238 is no requirement for seeking ethical approval. Any deviations from the established protocol will be
 239 thoroughly documented in the final report.

240 **Funding/Support:** This research did not receive any specific grant from any funding agency in the
 241 commercial, public, or not-for-profit sectors.

242 References

- 243 1. Bray F, Ferlay J, Soerjomataram I, Siegel RL, Torre LA, Jemal A. Global cancer statistics
 244 2018: GLOBOCAN estimates of incidence and mortality worldwide for 36 cancers in 185
 245 countries. *CA Cancer J Clin* [Internet]. 2018 Nov;68(6):394–424. Available from:
 246 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30207593>
- 247 2. Thrift AP. Global burden and epidemiology of Barrett oesophagus and oesophageal cancer.
 248 *Nat Rev Gastroenterol Hepatol*. 2021;18(6):432–43.
- 249 3. Organization WH. Cancer Today: Data visualization tools for exploring the global cancer
 250 burden in 2020. 2020; Available from: <https://gco.iarc.fr/today/home>

- 251 4. Raddatz N, Morales de los Ríos L, Lindahl M, Quintero FJ, Pardo JM. Coordinated Transport
252 of Nitrate, Potassium, and Sodium. *Front Plant Sci* [Internet]. 2020 Mar 6;11. Available from:
253 <https://www.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fpls.2020.00247/full>
- 254 5. Jones RR, Weyer PJ, DellaValle CT, Inoue-Choi M, Anderson KE, Cantor KP, et al. Nitrate
255 from Drinking Water and Diet and Bladder Cancer Among Postmenopausal Women in Iowa.
256 *Environ Health Perspect* [Internet]. 2016 Nov;124(11):1751–8. Available from:
257 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27258851>
- 258 6. Bradbury KE, Appleby PN, Key TJ. Fruit, vegetable, and fiber intake in relation to cancer risk:
259 findings from the European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition (EPIC). *Am J*
260 *Clin Nutr* [Internet]. 2014 Jul;100 Suppl:394S–8S. Available from:
261 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24920034>
- 262 7. Gonzalez CA, Lujan-Barroso L, Bueno-de-Mesquita HB, Jenab M, Duell EJ, Agudo A, et al.
263 Fruit and vegetable intake and the risk of gastric adenocarcinoma: A reanalysis of the
264 european prospective investigation into cancer and nutrition (EPIC-EURGAST) study after a
265 longer follow-up. *Int J Cancer* [Internet]. 2012 Dec 15;131(12):2910–9. Available from:
266 <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/ijc.27565>
- 267 8. van den Brand AD, Beukers M, Niekerk M, van Donkersgoed G, van der Aa M, van de Ven B,
268 et al. Assessment of the combined nitrate and nitrite exposure from food and drinking water:
269 application of uncertainty around the nitrate to nitrite conversion factor. *Food Addit Contam*
270 *Part A Chem Anal Control Expo Risk Assess* [Internet]. 2020 Apr;37(4):568–82. Available
271 from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/31944907>
- 272 9. Keller RM, Beaver L, Prater MC, Hord NG. Dietary Nitrate and Nitrite Concentrations in
273 Food Patterns and Dietary Supplements. *Nutr Today* [Internet]. 2020 Sep;55(5):218–26.
274 Available from: <https://journals.lww.com/10.1097/NT.0000000000000253>
- 275 10. Karwowska M, Kononiuk A. Nitrates/Nitrites in Food—Risk for Nitrosative Stress and
276 Benefits. *Antioxidants* [Internet]. 2020 Mar 16;9(3):241. Available from:
277 <https://www.mdpi.com/2076-3921/9/3/241>
- 278 11. Salehzadeh H, Maleki A, Rezaee R, Shahmoradi B, Ponnet K. The nitrate content of fresh and
279 cooked vegetables and their health-related risks. Sharma RR, editor. *PLoS One* [Internet].
280 2020 Jan 9;15(1):e0227551. Available from: <https://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0227551>
- 281 12. Bryan NS, Alexander DD, Coughlin JR, Milkowski AL, Boffetta P. Ingested nitrate and nitrite
282 and stomach cancer risk: An updated review. *Food Chem Toxicol* [Internet]. 2012
283 Oct;50(10):3646–65. Available from:
284 <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0278691512005406>
- 285 13. Espejo-Herrera N, Cantor KP, Malats N, Silverman DT, Tardón A, García-Closas R, et al.
286 Nitrate in drinking water and bladder cancer risk in Spain. *Environ Res* [Internet]. 2015
287 Feb;137:299–307. Available from:
288 <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0013935114003983>
- 289 14. Lundberg JO, Weitzberg E, Gladwin MT. The nitrate–nitrite–nitric oxide pathway in
290 physiology and therapeutics. *Nat Rev Drug Discov* [Internet]. 2008 Feb;7(2):156–67.

- 291 Available from: <https://www.nature.com/articles/nrd2466>
- 292 15. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG. Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic
293 Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. PLoS Med [Internet]. 2009 Jul
294 21;6(7):e1000097. Available from: <https://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1000097>
- 295 16. Stroup DF. Meta-analysis of Observational Studies in Epidemiology<SUBTITLE>A Proposal
296 for Reporting</SUBTITLE>. JAMA [Internet]. 2000 Apr 19;283(15):2008. Available from:
297 <http://jama.jamanetwork.com/article.aspx?doi=10.1001/jama.283.15.2008>
- 298 17. Moola S, Munn Z, Tufanaru C, Aromataris E, Sears K, Sfetcu R, Currie M, Qureshi R, Mattis
299 P, Lisy K MP-F. Chapter 7: Systematic reviews of etiology and risk. Joanna Briggs Inst Rev
300 Manual [Internet]. 2017; Available from: <https://reviewersmanual.joannabriggs.org/>
- 301