Dairy products: Facts & fantasy


Jean-Yves Reginster

Public Health, Epidemiology and Health Economics, University of Liège, Belgium









Facts

- Dairy products and bone health
- Dairy products and sarcopenia









Dairy products and growth

Open randomized intervention trial 80 girls, 12 years Intervention: + 300 ml milk vs usual intake





- Greater increase of BMC and BMD
- No difference in height, weight, lean body mass, and fat mass

Cadogan J et al BMJ 1997







Dairy products and growth

The National Osteoporosis Foundation's position statement on peak bone mass development and lifestyle factors: A systematic review and implementation recommendations

"The evidence since 2000 builds on earlier evidence, with additional RCTs showing a benefit to bone owing to the inclusion of dairy products in the diet. Dairy products contain colloidal calcium phosphate protein complexes in the form of casein micelles that have the minerals and nutrients needed for bone growth."

Food source B	Bone-related function	Recommended servings ^a			Percentage of population with usual intakes below recommendations		
		Children	Males	Females	Children	Males	Females
Dairy (cups) ^b	Intakes correlated with linear growth, bone mass accrual, reduced fracture	2–3 years: 2 4–8 years: 2.5	14-18 years: 3	•	•	9–13 years: 8 14–18 years: 68 19–30 years: 80	•








Dairy products and BMD

The Postmenopausal Health Study: 66 women, 55-65 years, 30 months

- intervention (n=35): fortified dairy products (1200mg Ca + 300 IU vit D for 12 months, 1200mg Ca + 900 IU vit D for the next 18 months)
- no intervention (n=31)



*p<0.001







Dairy products and bone metabolism markers

The Postmenopausal Health Study: 101 women, 55-65 years, 12 months

- dairy intervention group (n=39): fortified dairy products (1200mg Ca + 300 IU vitD/d
- calcium supplemented group (n=26):1200 mg Ca/d
- control group (n = 36).

	Baseline	5 mo	5-mo change	12 mo	12-mo change	P^2
			%		%	
Serum IGF-1 (ng/mL)						0.019
Control group	$112.9 \pm 7.5^{\circ}$	117.3 ± 6.4 ^a	5.8 (-0.9, 12.1) ⁴	147.2 ± 9.5	28.2 (13.6, 42.8)	
Calcium-supplemented group	95.7 ± 13.6	95.2 ± 13.3^{a}	-0.5(-10.8, 9.8)	119.8 ± 17.1	27.6 (12.7, 42.4)	
Dairy intervention group	117.6 ± 7.3	132.8 ± 7.2^{b}	15.9 (7.2, 24.6)	159.2 ± 9.2	38.5 (28.7, 48.3)	
P (treatment effect)	0.380	0.034		0.140		
Serum 25(OH)D (ng/mL)						0.050
Control group	25.5 ± 1.5	22.3 ± 1.3	-12.2(-16.2, -8.2)	31.8 ± 1.8	24.4 (17.9, 30.8)	
Calcium-supplemented group	25.1 ± 2.6	20.5 ± 2.4	-16.2(-24.2, -8.3)	30.0 ± 3.3	20.2 (10.2, 30.1)	
Dairy intervention group	28.1 ± 1.4	25.7 ± 1.3	-8.3(-11.9, -4.8)	35.7 ± 1.8	30.1 (22.7, 37.6)	
P (treatment effect)	0.385	0.080		0.199		
Serum PTH (pg/mL)						0.035
Control group	35.6 ± 2.7	44.7 ± 2.9*	24.7 (13.6, 35.8)	42.3 ± 2.2	20.1 (11.3, 28.9)	
Calcium-supplemented group	35.8 ± 4.9	37.2 ± 5.2^{n}	6.8 (-9.5, 23.1)	38.2 ± 4.1	6.8 (-9.4, 22.9)	
Dairy intervention group	31.6 ± 2.6	32.2 ± 2.8^{b}	2.1 (-10.5, 14.7)	35.1 ± 2.2	11.1 (-3.0, 25.2)	
P (treatment effect)	0.545	0.010		0.142		
Serum osteocalcin (ng/mL)						0.563
Control group	4.50 ± 0.28	4.16 ± 0.28	-5.9(-15.4, 3.6)	2.99 ± 0.31	-29.0(-43.9, -14.2)	
Calcium-supplemented group	4.41 ± 0.50	4.21 ± 0.51	-1.0 (-23.1, 21.2)	3.52 ± 0.56	-17.1 (-40.0, 5.7)	
Dairy intervention group	4.55 ± 0.27	4.33 ± 0.28	-3.1 (-9.7, 3.4)	3.07 ± 0.30	-35.0 (-44.7, -25.3)	
P (treatment effect)	0.971					
Serum CTx (ng/mL)						0.047
Control group	0.36 ± 0.03	0.33 ± 0.02	-7.6 (-19.5, 11.9)	0.27 ± 0.02	-18.1 (-37.4, 1.2)	
Calcium-supplemented group	0.34 ± 0.05	0.34 ± 0.04	1.7 (-21.1, 24.6)	0.27 ± 0.04	-15.9 (-40.3, 8.5)	
Dairy intervention group	0.40 ± 0.02	0.32 ± 0.02	-19.1 (-25.7, -12.6)	0.30 ± 0.02	-23.1(-29.3, -16.9)	
P (treatment effect)	0.437	0.897		0.618		







Dietary patterns, bone geometry and hip fracture

Rotterdam Study: 4028 subjects >55 years

- basal dietary intake, BMD and bone geometry
- mean follow up 14,8 years

Pattern "Fruit, vegetables and dairy"

	cross sectional association (β CI)			
BMD	0,14 (0,12-017) *			
Section modulus (bending strength)	0.13 (0.11, 0.16) *			
Buckling ratio (instability)	-0.12 (-0.14, -0.09) *			
	adjusted HR (% CI)			
Fracture risk	0.90 (0.83, 0.96) *			
Hip fracture risk	0.85 (0.81, 0.89) *			









Dietary proteins, bone strength and microstructure

- 746 women, mean age: 65 years
- distal tibia





→ Beneficial effect of dairy protein intake on trabecular microstructure

Durosier-Izart C et al Am J Clin Nutr. 2017 doi: 10.3945/ajcn.116.134676







Dairy products and fracture

Epidemiological studies: inconsistent data

 Protective association of milk intake on the risk of hip fracture: results from the Framingham Original Cohort milk intake >7 servings/week → 40% hip fracture



Milk intake and risk of mortality and fractures in women and men: cohort studies

milk intake > 600 ml/d → / fracture

Michaëlsson K et al . 2014


thebmj







Dairy products and fracture



- Milk fracture risk in women (but not men)
- Very high milk intake (>600ml/d)
- Milk fortified with high dose of vitamin A
- Fermented milk and cheese fracture risk in men and women
- Not adjusted for baseline vit D and physical activit

Michaëlsson K et al . 2014

thebmj






Ca + vitamin D and risk of fracture

Calcium + vit D, but not vit D alone, is associated with a reduction in fracture risk

- Sub-analysis of USPSTF meta-analysis: 11 studies of calcium 500–1200 mg/d + vit D (300–1100 IU/d), or vit D alone (400–1370 IU/d) for the prevention of fractures
- 52,915 people, mostly postmenopausal women.













Ca + vitamin D and risk of total fractures

Meta-analysis from the National Osteoporosis Foundation

Total fracture: 15% reduced risk



Hip fracture: 30% reduced risk



Weaver CM et al Osteoporos Int 2016








Ca + vitamin D and risk of falls

- Meta-analysis 26 trials, 45,782 participants, majority elderly females;
 mean age 76; duration of supplementation 3–62 months.
- Subgroup analysis of 10 studies of vitamin D ± calcium supplementation at any dose.






Murad MH, et al. J Clin Endocrinol Metab 2011





Sarcopenia and fractures

Musculosleletal health: A recent awareness of the problem











Osteoporosis and sarcopenia


Bone and muscle: similar temporal patterns


















Sarcopenia and fractures

- Osteoporotic Fractures in Men study: 5544 men, 74 years, follow-up: 9 years
- Study of Osteoporotic Fractures in women: 1114 women, 77,6 years, follow up: 8 years

Age-adjusted incidence rate (per 1,000) of non-spine fractures











Protein and muscle

Protein is an anabolic stimulus










Dietary protein, muscle and bone

Pathways through which dietary protein influences muscle anabolism and bone growth







Rizzoli R et al. Maturitas; 2014






Resistance training + protein supplementation

Meta-analysis of 22 RCT

- resistance-type exercise training + protein supplementation (19 RCT with milk proteins) or placebo
- mean duration: 12 weeks



Mean fat free mass gain

- Younger: 0,8 kg
- Older: 0,5 kg








Soy versus whey protein in elderly

Myofibrillar protein fractional synthetic rate (%•h-1) for whey and soy (20 g and 40 g) groups

and a group who consumed no protein (0 g) at rest and following resistance exercise

(Ex)











Fantasy

- The acid-ash hypothesis is not supported by evidence
- Dairy products don't increase cancer risk
- Dairy products don't increase cardiovascular risk
- Dairy products don't make fat
- Lactose maldigestion does not mean lactose intolerance








The acid ash hypothesis is not supported by evidence

- Diet does not change systemic pH or cause or "acidification"
- Milk does not increase acid excretion










The acid ash hypothesis is not supported by evidence

- Diet does not change systemic pH or cause or "acidification"
- Milk does not increase acid excretion and higher urinary pH is less acidic

Change in urinary pH after ingestion of various liquids










The acid ash hypothesis is not supported by evidence

- Diet does not change systemic pH or cause or "acidification"
- Milk does not increase acid excretion and higher urinary pH is less acidic
- Acid excretion is not associated with lower calcium balance, that is: poorer calcium balance












Dairy products and prostate cancer



WCRF CUP 2014

	AND PROSTATE CANCER					
		DECREASES RISK	INCREASES RISK			
STRONG EVIDENCE	Convincing					
	Probable		Body fatness (advanced prostate cancer) ^{1,2} Adult attained height ²			
LIMITED EVIDENCE	Limited-suggestive		Dairy products Diets high in calcium Low plasma alphatocopherol concentrations Low plasma selenium concentrations			
	Limitod-no conclusion	Cereals (grains) and their products, dietary fibre, potatoes, non-starchy vegetables, truits, puises (legumes) processed meat, rod meat, poultry, fish, eggs, total fat, saturated fatly acids, monoursaturated fatly acids, polyunsaturated fatly acids, plant oils, sugar (sucrose), sugary foods and drinks, coffee, tea, alcoholic drinks, carbohydrate, protein, vitamin A, retinol, alpha carotene, lycopene, foliate, thiamin, riboflavin, niacin, vitamin C, vitamin E supplements, parma-tocopherol, multivitamins, selenium supplements, rinc, physical activity, energy expenditure, vegetarian diets, Seventh-day Adventist diets, individual dietary patterns, body fatness (non-advanced prostate cancer), birth weight, energy intake				
STRONG EVIDENCE	Substantial effect on risk unlikely	Beta-carotene ^{4,a}				

DIET NUTDITION DUVSION ACTIVITY

CUP Panel's conclusions (pages 15, 17)

For a higher consumption of dairy products, the evidence suggesting an increased risk of prostate cancer is limited.

For diets high in calcium, the evidence suggesting an increased risk of prostate cancer is limited.








Diary products and colon cancer

WCRF Continuous Update Project 2011



FOOD, NUTF CANCERS O	RITION, PHYSICAL OF THE COLON AND	ACTIVITY AND THE RECTUM 2011			
	DECREASES RISK	INCREASES RISK			
Convincing	Physical activity ^{1,2} Foods containing dietary fibre ³	Red meat ^{4,5} Processed meat ^{4,5} Alcoholic drinks (men) ⁷ Body fatness Abdominal fatness Adult attained height ⁸			
Probable	Garlic Milk ^a Calcium ¹⁰	Alcoholic drinks (women) ⁷			
Limited - suggestive	Non-starchy vegetables Fruits Foods containing vitamin D ^{3,12}	Foods containing iron ^{3,4} Cheese ¹³ Foods containing animal fats ³ Foods containing sugars13			
Limited - no conclusion	Fish; glycaemic index; folate; vitamin C; vitamin E; selenium; low fat; dietary pattern				
Substantial effect on risk unlikely	None identified				

Milk: "The evidence on milk from cohort studies is reasonably consistent, supported by stronger evidence from dietary calcium as a marker. There is evidence for plausible mechanisms.

Milk probably protects against colorectal cancer."

Cheese: "The evidence suggesting that cheese is a cause of colorectal cancer is limited."








Dairy products and cardiovascular diseases

Relation between milk (per 200 mL/d) and cardiovascular disease:

• dose-response meta-analyses of 4 prospective cohort studies (n = 13,518, no.of cases = 2283)

RR 0.94 (0.89-0.99)





Soedamah-Muthu SS et al., Am J Clin Nutr 2011



Dairy products and cardiovascular diseases

Relation between milk (per 200 mL/d) and all-cause mortality:

 dose-response meta-analyses of 8 prospective cohort studies

$$(n = 62,779, no. of cases = 23,949)$$

1.03)

author (ref)	year	country		RR	0.99	(0%95 <u>5</u> risk	% Weigh
Fortes (6)	2000	Italy (•	-		0.24 (0.07, 0.86)	0.09
Mann (11)	1997	UK		•		0.90 (0.81, 1.01)	7.93
Ness (3)	2001	UK		+		0.93 (0.89, 0.98)	16.68
Engberink (44)	2009	Netherlands		•		0.98 (0.94, 1.03)	16.96
Kahn (17)	1984	USA		•		0.99 (0.97, 1.02)	21.05
Paganini–Hill (18)	2007	USA		•		1.03 (1.00, 1.06)	20.54
Elwood (10)	2004	UK		-		1.03 (0.92, 1.16)	7.21
Knoops (16)	2006	Europe		-		1.10 (1.00, 1.21)	9.52
Overall				Ø		0.99 (0.95, 1.03)	100.00
(I—squared = 72.3%	p = 0.00	1)					
NOTE: Weights are	from ranc	dom effects analysis					
		0.1	relative ris	sk	2	4	










Dairy products and weight Observational studies

Relationships between changes in food consumption and weight change every 4 years (Nurses' and Heath Professionals US cohorts)



Intake of dairy is inversely associated with body fat in observational studies; there is no difference between high vs low-fat dairy







Lactose intolerance EFSA Scientific Opinion 2010

Lactose intolerance can be due to genetic non-persistence of lactase. Dietary lactose is not or incompletely split by intestinal lactase and residual lactose is fermented by the colonic microbiota leading to abdominal symptoms.

Lactose tolerance varies widely among individuals with lactose maldigestion. A single threshold of lactose for all lactose intolerant subjects then cannot be determined. Symptoms of lactose intolerance have been described after intake of less than 6 g of lactose in some subjects. The vast majority of subjects with lactose maldigestion will tolerate acute doses of up to 12 g lactose (250 ml of milk) as a single dose with no or minor symptoms. Higher doses may be tolerated if distributed throughout the day.

NB: Yogurts, hard cheeses, and reduced-lactose foods may be effective management approaches.







Dairy products as a source of key « bone » nutrients

100 ml of full fat milk:

• Protein: 3,3 g

• Calcium: 119 mg

Potassium: 151 mg

• Phosphorus: 93 mg

Magnesium: 12 mg









Bioavailability of dietary calcium

	Ca content (mg)	Ca absorption (%)	Ca absorbed (mg)
Milk : 250 ml	300	32	90
Cabbage : 550 g	300	32	90
Spinach : 150 g	300	5	15







