

**Advances in Nutrition** 

AN INTERNATIONAL REVIEW JOURNAL

journal homepage: https://advances.nutrition.org/

Review

# Tree Nut and Peanut Consumption and Risk of Cardiovascular Disease: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials



Advances in Nutritio



Lauren Houston<sup>1,2,3,\*</sup>, Yasmine C. Probst<sup>3,4</sup>, Mamatha Chandra Singh<sup>3,4</sup>, Elizabeth P. Neale<sup>3,4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The George Institute for Global Health, University of New South Wales, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia; <sup>2</sup> School of Medical Sciences, Faculty of Medicine, University of New South Wales, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia; <sup>3</sup> School of Medical, Indigenous and Health Sciences, Faculty of Science, Medicine and Health, University of Wollongong, Wollongong, New South Wales, Australia; <sup>4</sup> Illawarra Health and Medical Research Institute, University of Wollongong, New South Wales, Australia

# ABSTRACT

Cardiovascular disease (CVD) is the leading cause of death globally. Habitual consumption of tree nuts and peanuts is associated with cardioprotective benefits. Food-based dietary guidelines globally recommend nuts as a key component of a healthy diet. This systematic review and meta-analysis were conducted to examine the relationship between tree nut and peanut consumption and risk factors for CVD in randomized controlled trials (RCTs) (PROSPERO: CRD42022309156). MEDLINE, PubMed, CINAHL, and Cochrane Central databases were searched up to 26 September, 2021. All RCT studies that assessed the effects of tree nut or peanut consumption of any dose on CVD risk factors were included. Review Manager software was used to conduct a random effect meta-analysis for CVD outcomes from RCTs. Forest plots were generated for each outcome, between-study heterogeneity was estimated using the I<sup>2</sup> test statistic and funnel plots and Egger's test for outcomes with  $\geq$ 10 strata. The quality assessment used the Health Canada Quality Appraisal Tool, and the certainty of the evidence was assessed using grading of recommendations assessment, development, and evaluation (GRADE). A total of 153 articles describing 139 studies (81 parallel design and 58 cross-over design) were included in the systematic review, with 129 studies in the meta-analysis. The meta-analysis showed a significant decrease for low-density lipoprotein (LDL) cholesterol, total cholesterol (TC), triglycerides (TG), TC:highdensity lipoprotein (HDL) cholesterol, LDL cholesterol:HDL cholesterol, and apolipoprotein B (apoB) following nut consumption. However, the quality of evidence was "low" for only 18 intervention studies. The certainty of the body of evidence for TC:HDL cholesterol, LDL cholesterol:HDL cholesterol, and apoB were "moderate" because of inconsistency, for TG were "low," and for LDL cholesterol and TC were "very low" because of inconsistency and the likelihood of publication bias. The findings of this review provide evidence of a combined effect of tree nuts and peanuts on a range of biomarkers to create an overall CVD risk reduction.

Keywords: nuts, peanuts, CVD, cholesterol, lipids, apo, blood pressure, meta-analysis

# **Statements of Significance**

This is the first systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials to provide a comprehensive picture of whether all or some types of tree nuts and peanuts are preferential for improving CVD risk and if there is a dose response to the effect.

*Abbreviations*: ApoA-I, apolipoprotein A-I; ApoB, apolipoprotein B; BMI, body mass index; CAD, coronary artery disease; CHD, coronary heart disease; CI, confidence interval; CINAHL, cumulated index to nursing and allied health literature; CVD, cardiovascular disease; DBP, diastolic blood pressure; FDA, Food and Drug Administration; GRADE, grading of recommendations assessment, development, and evaluation; HDL, high-density lipoprotein; IV, inverse variance; LDL, low-density lipoprotein; MEDLINE, medical literature analysis and retrieval system online; MetS, metabolic syndrome; RCT, randomized controlled trial; SBP, systolic blood pressure; SD, standard deviation; SE, standard error; TC, total cholesterol; TG, triglycerides; T2DM, type 2 diabetes mellitus.

\* Corresponding author. *E-mail address:* houston@georgeinstitute.org.au (L. Houston).

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.advnut.2023.05.004

Received 4 December 2022; Received in revised form 27 April 2023; Accepted 3 May 2023; Available online 5 May 2023

2161-8313/© 2023 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Inc. on behalf of American Society for Nutrition. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (http:// creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

# Introduction

Cardiovascular disease (CVD) is the leading cause of death globally, accounting for 17.9 million lives lost each year (32% of all global deaths) [1]. The high prevalence and mortality rate of CVD is not unique to high-income countries but also to low- and middle-income countries. Low- and middle-income countries account for  $\sim$ 80% of all CVD deaths, with  $\sim$ 40% of these deaths defined as premature [2]. Contributing to an increased risk of CVD is the consumption of poor diets. As part of a healthy diet, food-based dietary guidelines globally recommend nuts as a key component, with a typical serving of 15-30 g/d [3,4]. Nuts are rich in fats, making them energy-dense, and concern regarding the impact of nuts on body weight has been reported in the literature [5–8]. A recent review has demonstrated that energy compensation may occur following a meal with nuts, which mitigates this concern [9]. However, nuts are considered to be good sources of unsaturated fatty acids, vitamin E, minerals (for example, magnesium and potassium), plant sterols, polyphenols, and dietary fibers [10]. Tree nuts are defined as dry fruits that contain a seed within the ovary wall that becomes hard at maturity. Tree nuts include almonds, Brazil nuts, cashews, chestnuts, hazelnuts, macadamias, pecans, pine nuts, pistachios, and walnuts. Although peanuts, also known as ground nuts, are botanically classified as a legume rather than a nut, they appear in cuisines in a similar way to that of tree nuts and have a similar nutrient composition. This review offers the advantage of including whole tree nuts, peanuts, and mixed nuts in dietary patterns.

Habitually consuming tree nuts and peanuts has been associated with cardioprotective benefits [11]. The effects of nuts have been shown via improvements to lipid profiles, glucose regulation, and antioxidant effects [12-14] and their ability to mediate inflammation, hyperglycemia, and oxidative stress [15]. In addition, a considerable amount of evidence has been reported from meta-analyses of prospective cohort studies that higher nut consumption is associated with lower CVD incidence and/or CVD mortality [16-21]. However, to date, only 1 meta-analysis of 61 randomized and nonrandomized controlled intervention trials has reported the effects of all tree nuts and dose response on CVD risk factors [22]. Since 2015, the consumption of all nuts has remained largely under investigation within randomized controlled trials (RCTs). Most meta-analyses of RCTs have focused on only 1 type of nut - almonds [23,24], cashews [25,26], peanuts [27], pistachios [28], and walnuts [29] on key CVD risk factors (for example, blood lipids, apolipoproteins, blood pressure, and inflammation). Therefore, the effect of combined tree nut and peanut consumption remains unclear. This review provides an opportunity to advance the understanding of whether all or some types of tree nuts and peanuts are preferential for improving CVD risk and if there is a dose response to the effect.

Despite the known health benefits associated with tree nut and peanut consumption and the promotion of nut intakes through dietary guidance messages, no health claim has been authorized globally for a cause-and-effect relationship between nuts and CVD. However, in 2012 the European Food Safety Authority panel substantiated a health claim related to 30 g/d of walnuts having an improvement in endothelium-dependent vasodilation [30]. Further, in 2014, Food Standards Australia New Zealand considered the relationship between walnuts and

endothelium-dependent vasodilation [31] not to be assessable because of the small number of studies and high risk of bias. More recently, the United States Food and Drug Administration (FDA) 2017 approved a qualified health claim for 1.5 oz (42.5 g/d) of macadamia nuts and reduced risk of coronary heart disease (CHD) [32]. The FDA has also approved qualified health claims for nuts (2003) [33] and walnuts (2004) [34]. However, these 2 health claims were approved based on supportive but not conclusive evidence that consuming nuts and walnuts may reduce risk of CHD. The above-mentioned regulatory applications were constructed from the available scientific literature at the time. Since these applications were assessed, new studies have become available. An update of the literature is warranted to determine if the findings from the observational evidence are also demonstrated in experimental studies of nut consumption on CVD outcomes. Therefore, we performed a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials (RCT) studies to quantify the relation between nut consumption and risk of CVD.

# Methods

This systematic review and meta-analysis are reported according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines [35] and checklist (Supplemental Table 1). The protocol was registered in PROS-PERO (the international prospective register of systematic reviews, registration no. CRD42022309156).

# Search strategy and study selection

A systematic search was undertaken in MEDLINE (EBSCO), PubMed, CINAHL (EBSCO), and Cochrane Central databases from inception to 26 September, 2021. The search strategy used a combination of keywords and Medical Subject Headings in addition to free-text search terms related to nuts and the cardiovascular outcomes of interest (that is, blood lipids, apolipoproteins, and blood pressure). Both MEDLINE and PubMed databases were searched to ensure that recent studies were identified [36,37]. An example of the detailed search strategy for the MEDLINE database is presented in Supplemental Table 2. Studies were restricted to those published in the English language only.

The records identified from the search strategy were imported to Covidence software (Covidence Systematic Review software; Veritas Health Innovation), and duplicates were removed. Records were screened by title and abstract by 1 reviewer (LH), and subsequent full-text candidate articles were assessed by 2 independent reviewers (LH and EPN). Where a study protocol was retrieved by the search (for example, a clinicaltrials.gov listing), a search was conducted to determine if a relevant article had been published from the study. Any discrepancies with full-text screening were resolved by the research team (LH, EPN, YCP) by discussion to consensus. Reference lists of the included articles were manually searched to identify additional articles.

In the case that the results from 1 study were reported in multiple articles, all articles were checked (LH, EPN, YCP) to avoid duplication of study populations in the analysis or oversight of new information on included outcomes. Where different information for included outcomes was reported across the articles, all relevant articles were included. Where the same outcomes from a single study were reported across multiple articles, decisions relating to article inclusion were based firstly on the length of the follow-up for the outcome and then on the total sample size, with articles including larger sample sizes prioritized.

# Study eligibility criteria

Studies were included if they: 1) were RCTs (parallel or crossover); 2) assessed the effects of tree nut or peanut consumption [whole tree nuts (almonds, Brazil nuts, cashew, chestnut, hazelnut, macadamia, pecan, pine nut, pistachio, or walnut), mixed nuts, peanuts, or their related products (for example, nut oils, nut powders, nut flours, and new genetic varieties of nuts)] of any dose on CVD risk factors [total cholesterol (TC), lowdensity lipoprotein (LDL) cholesterol, high-density lipoprotein (HDL) cholesterol, triglycerides (TG), apolipoprotein A-I (apoA-I), apolipoprotein B (apoB), systolic blood pressure (SBP), and diastolic blood pressure (DBP)]; 3) with a control or comparator group (an intervention with a lower amount of nuts or a usual diet without the addition of nuts); 4) in adults or children (>2 y of age) and healthy individuals or with chronic noncommunicable diseases such as diabetes, hyperlipidemia, or hypertension; 5) a study duration of  $\geq$ 3 wk; and 6) outcomes available as a change from baseline or at the end of the intervention as final values.

Studies were excluded if they were: 1) animal studies, observational studies, nonrandomized study design, reviews, commentaries, or clinical trials without a control group; 2) in children <2 y or acutely ill individuals; 3) targeting coconut and coconut products, as their nutrient profiles differ from the aforementioned "nuts" [38]; or 4) unable to isolate the effect of nut consumption on the health outcome.

#### Data extraction

Outcome data were extracted by the first researcher (LH) and confirmed by a second researcher (MCS). A third researcher (ES) also performed quality checking on a 10% random sample of the data extracted for inclusion in the meta-analysis using source data verification [39]. The following data were extracted from each study: study details, country, study design, type of nut, nut dose, study duration, sample size and loss to follow-up, participant details [age, sex, body mass index (BMI, in kg/m<sup>2</sup>), and health status], intervention, background diet, a method to measure health effect and method to measure food consumption, results, and quality appraisal.

Mean changes in relevant outcomes were extracted where possible, and in the case that these data were not available, mean final values were retrieved as recommended by the Cochrane Handbook [40]. Study authors were contacted for additional information if the published article did not provide sufficient information. Where a study involved >1 intervention group meeting the inclusion criteria, data for the 2 intervention groups were combined as recommended by the Cochrane Handbook [40], with the sample size divided across the 2 groups in the case of cross-over studies to avoid a unit-of-analysis error. In the case of the Prevention with Mediterranean Diet (PREDIMED) study [41], which included 2 intervention arms featuring a Mediterranean diet supplemented with either nuts or olive oil and a low-fat control arm, data from the arm receiving the Mediterranean diet with olive oil was treated as the comparator group, and included studies were required to compare the nut group with the olive oil group. This decision was made to ensure that the outcomes were not confounded by differences in the background diet of the 2 groups. Data were converted to common units, for example, mg/dL was converted to mmol/L by multiplying by 0.0259 for LDL cholesterol, HDL cholesterol, and TC and by multiplying by 0.0113 for TG. Standard deviations (SDs) were imputed from standard errors (SEs) or 95% confidence intervals (CIs) using formulas in the Cochrane Handbook [42]. Where studies reported medians and 25th and 75th percentiles, means and SDs were imputed using the formulas developed by Wan et al. [43]. Where imputation was not possible (for example, where geometric means were reported or where a median was reported with 95% CIs), the values were used in place of the means. Where studies did not report sufficient data to be included in the meta-analysis (for example, if they did not report either SDs, SEs, 95% CIs, or interquartile range), the results were reported descriptively.

#### Data synthesis and analysis

Review Manager software version 5.3 (RevMan; Copenhagen: The Nordic Cochrane Centre, the Cochrane Collaboration, 2014) was used to conduct the random-effects meta-analyses to determine the weighted mean differences (with 95% CIs) in change or final mean values for each measure. Forest plots were generated for each outcome. Cross-over studies were treated in the same way as parallel studies by comparing measurements from the intervention periods with the control periods. Although this approach results in a unit-of-analysis error, it is considered a conservative approach [40] and was therefore deemed appropriate.

The proportion of total variation attributable to betweenstudy heterogeneity was estimated using the I<sup>2</sup> test statistic [44] to provide an indication of the consistency of the results. An I<sup>2</sup> value of  $\geq$ 75% was deemed to indicate a high level of inconsistency, 50%–75% substantial inconsistency, 36%–60% moderate inconsistency, and 0%–35% low inconsistency; based on the recommendations by Higgins et al. [44] I<sup>2</sup> values were generated for each analysis. The presence of small study effects (which may be the result of publication bias) was explored via funnel plots, which were conducted for all outcomes with  $\geq$ 10 strata. Egger's test was then conducted in Stata IC software version 15.1 (StataCorp LLC) to test for funnel plot asymmetry.

Prespecified subgroup analyses were conducted based on study design, nut group, and nut dose ( $\leq$ 30 g/d, 31–60 g/d, >60 g/d, based on  $\sim$  30 g typically recommended as 1 serving of nuts in dietary guidelines globally [3]), study duration (<12 wk compared with  $\geq 12$  wk, aligning with the approaches used in previous meta-analyses of nut consumption [45-47]) and participant health status to explore differences in the magnitude of effects between subgroups. For the studies that reported nut dose as a percentage of energy intake, we multiplied the reported percentage by the reported mean energy intake of the trial participants to recalculate the dosage in grams per day. Subgroup analyses were conducted where there were  $\geq 10$  effect sizes per outcome in total [40], although the number of effect sizes per individual subgroup was not restricted. As part of the sub-analyses based on nut dose, sensitivity analyses were also conducted to explore the effect of whole nuts by removing individual studies that assessed the effect of nut oils, nut powders, and/or nut flours from the meta-analysis.

# Quality assessment

All included studies were assessed using the Health Canada Quality Appraisal Tool [48]. Quality assessment was completed by 1 researcher (EPN), and the presence or absence of a clearly stated hypothesis, statistical power, study duration, and the background diet was taken into account when evaluating the quality of each study.

The certainty of the body of evidence for interventions included in the meta-analyses was determined using the grading of recommendations assessment, development, and evaluation (GRADE) [49]. GRADE evaluates the study design, risk of bias, inconsistency, indirectness, imprecision, and other considerations such as publication bias. GRADEpro GDT software [GRADEpro Guideline Development Tool (software). McMaster University and Evidence Prime, 2022. Available from gradepro.org] was used to conduct the certainty of evidence appraisal.

# Results

A total of 56,965 articles were identified from the systematic search, including the review of relevant reference lists. After applying the exclusion criteria, 153 articles describing 139 studies were included in the systematic review and 129 studies in



FIGURE 1. PRISMA [35] flow diagram of study selection.

Abbreviations: CINAHL, Cumulated Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature; MEDLINE, Medical Literature Analysis and Retrieval System Online.

the meta-analysis. Ten studies (11 strata) [50–60] were excluded from the meta-analysis because of insufficient data reported; therefore, the results of the 11 strata are reported descriptively below for each study outcome. The process of study inclusion and exclusion is shown in Figure 1.

Characteristics of 139 included studies (81 parallel designs and 58 cross-over designs), including 9099 participants in the meta-analysis, are shown in Supplemental Table 3. Study duration ranged from 3–260 wk (or 5 y); only 8 [61–72] out of 139 studies (6%) had a duration of >1 y.) Studies were conducted in 25 countries across 6 continents. The mean participant age was 48.3 y, and 116 studies (83%) included both males and females. Studies included participants who were healthy [51,53,56,58, 73–105], had risk factors for chronic disease such as overweight [55,57,63,68,69,72,106–132], or obesity hypercholesterolemia/hyperlipidemia [59,60,71,133–160], prediabetes [61,161-164], at risk of CVD or had diagnosed CVD [52, 165–167], at risk of metabolic syndrome or met the criteria for metabolic syndrome [64,70,168-176], had type 2 diabetes mellitus [54,62,177-193], had diagnosed coronary artery disease [194-198], or included a mixture of health conditions [50, 65-67,199-202]. Included studies examined the effects of consumption of a range of tree nuts, including walnuts [52,56,59,60,

#### Advances in Nutrition 14 (2023) 1029-1049

62.63.68-70.75.76.81.83.84.86.96-98.102.104.111.116.119. 125,129,134,139,146,151,152,157-159,162,167,170,176,184, 186,187,192,202], almonds [50,51,53,57,58,61,72,80,85,89, 90.94.95,103,106,110,112-114, 117,118,120,131-133,143, 153,155,156,160,164,165,177,181–183,191,195,198], nistachios [54,87,121,126,138,141,142,144,145,149,154,161,169, 174,188-190], hazelnuts [55,105,128,136,150,178,201], mixed nuts [64-67,73,77,99,107,115,130,171,180,196,197], cashews [74,91,179,185], macadamias [78,79,82,127,140,147], pecans [92,93,123,137,166,194], Brazil nuts [122,168,199,200], and peanuts [71,88,100,101,108,109,124,148,163,175,193] as well as comparing 2 different types of nuts [135,172,173] (Table 1). Nuts were consumed in either prescribed doses, ranging from  $\sim 3$ [59] to 88 [124] g/d for nut oils, flour, and butter and for whole nuts from 8 [116] to 168 [85] g/d or were included to provide a proportion of dietary energy, for example, 10% [178,179] to 30% [100,101] of total energy (equating to  $\sim$ 21–76 g/d).

# Effect of nut consumption on study outcomes LDL cholesterol

A total of 126 strata from 122 studies explored the effect of nut consumption on LDL cholesterol. The meta-analysis showed that nut consumption was associated with a significant decrease

#### TABLE 1

Included studies and the type of nut analyzed (n = 139)

Type of nut	Number of studies <i>n</i>	Participants n	Female %	Mean age (y)	Mean duration (wk)	Mean nut dose (g/d)	Participant health status
Almond	36	2276	58	47	12	58	1 CVD or at CVD risk, 1 multiple health conditions, 2 CAD, 2 prediabetic, 4 T2DM, 6 hypercholesterolemia/hyperlipidemia, 8 healthy, and 12 overweight/obese
Brazil nut	4	216	69	49	11	14	1 MetS or at risk of MetS, 1 overweight/ obese, and 2 multiple health conditions
Cashew nut	4	394	59	54	7	37	2 healthy and 2 T2DM
hazelnut	7	393	56	41	8	37	1 healthy, 1 multiple health conditions, 1 T2DM, 2 hypercholesterolemia/ hyperlipidemia, and 2 overweight/obese
Macadamia	6	237	57	40	5	49	1 overweight/obese, 2 hypercholesterolemia/hyperlipidemia, and 3 healthy
Peanut	10	895	46	45	14	58	1 prediabetic, 1 MetS or at risk of MetS, 1 T2DM, 2 healthy, 2 hypercholesterolemia/ hyperlipidemia, and 3 overweight/obesity
Pecan	6	272	51	50	8	58	1 CAD, 1 CVD or at CVD risk, 1 hypercholesterolemia/hyperlipidemia, 1 overweight/obese, and 2 healthy
Pistachio	14	652	56	49	12	62	1 healthy, 1 prediabetic, 2 MetS or at risk of MetS, 2 overweight/obese, 3 T2DM, and 5 hypercholesterolemia/hyperlipidemia
Walnut	39	2824	52	52	16	38	1 prediabetic, 1 multiple health conditions, 2 CVD or CVD risk, 3 MetS or at risk of MetS, 5 T2DM, 7 overweight/obese, 9 hypercholesterolemia/hyperlipidemia, and 11 healthy
Mixed nuts	11	858	49	47	35	45	1 CAD, 1 multiple health conditions, 1 T2DM, 2 MetS, 3 healthy, and 3 overweight/obese
Different study arms compared different nuts (for example, group 1 consumed almonds, and group 2 consumed walnuts)	2	82	52.5	51	6	69	1 hypercholesterolemia/hyperlipidemia and 1 MetS or at risk of MetS
Total (all nuts)	139	9099	54	48	14	48	

Abbreviations: CAD, coronary artery disease; CVD, cardiovascular disease; MetS, metabolic syndrome; T2DM, type 2 diabetes mellitus.

#### TABLE 2

Change in outcomes following nut intervention compared to a control

Outcome	Number of strata	Number of studies	Number of participants	Effect estimate	Inconsistency (I <sup>2</sup> )%
LDL cholesterol, mmol/L	126	122	9487	-0.11 ( $-0.14$ , $-0.07$ ), $P < 0.00001$	80
HDL cholesterol, mmol/L	126	122	10,102	0.00 (-0.01, 0.02), P = 0.59	81
TC, mmol/L	126	122	9423	-0.13 ( $-0.18$ , $-0.09$ ), $P < 0.00001$	87
TG, mmol/L	122	118	9744	-0.06 ( $-0.08$ , $-0.03$ ), $P < 0.00001$	61
TG:HDL cholesterol	5	5	331	-0.12 (-0.40, 0.15), $P = 0.37$	0
TC:HDL cholesterol	51	49	3837	-0.15 ( $-0.24$ , $-0.07$ ), $P = 0.0003$	68
HDL cholesterol:LDL cholesterol	3	3	209	-0.06 ( $-0.23$ , $0.11$ ), $P = 0.46$	53
LDL cholesterol:HDL cholesterol	39	38	2539	-0.14 (-0.20, 0.08), $P < 0.00001$	75
ApoB, mg/dL	39	39	3069	-3.01 (-4.44, -1.58), $P < 0.00001$	44
ApoA-I, mg/dL	33	33	2259	-1.02 (-2.53, 0.49), $P = 0.19$	0
SBP, mmHg	71	70	6521	-0.05 ( $-0.83$ , $0.72$ ), $P = 0.89$	47
DBP, mmHg	67	66	6198	-0.10 ( $-0.53$ , $0.33$ ), $P = 0.65$	24

Abbreviations: ApoA-I, apolipprotein A-1; ApoB, apolipoprotein B; DBP, diastolic blood pressure; HDL, high density lipoprotein; LDL, low density lipoprotein; SBP, systolic blood pressure; TC, total cholesterol; TG, triglycerides.

in LDL cholesterol (Table 2 and Figure 2). Of the 126 strata, 35 explored the effect of walnut consumption, and 101 had a duration of  $\leq$ 3 mo. Eleven strata from 10 RCTs [50,52–60] were removed from the meta-analysis, of which 2 [56,60] reported a significant reduction in LDL cholesterol with the consumption of nuts. Subgroup analysis indicated significant differences, including those related to study design, nut type, and health status (Supplemental Table 4). Larger reductions in LDL cholesterol were found in cross-over studies, compared to studies with a parallel design, although the magnitude of effects in the different subgroups is not likely to be clinically significant. Regarding nut type and health status, it should be noted that the significance of the effects should be interpreted with caution because of the uneven distribution of studies in the subgroups. When studies assessing the effect of nut oils, nut powders, and/or nut flours were removed from the dose subgroup analysis, similar results were found in the overall analysis (Supplemental Table 5).

# ТС

A total of 126 strata from 122 studies explored the effect of nut consumption on TC. The meta-analysis showed that nut consumption was associated with a significant decrease in TC (Table 2 and Figure 3). Walnuts (n = 35) and almonds (n = 33) were the most common nut types in this analysis. Eleven strata from 10 RCTs [50,52–60] were removed from the meta-analysis, of which 3 [54,56,60] reported a significant reduction in TC with the consumption of nuts. Variation in the magnitude of the effect was observed for nut type, although these results should be interpreted with caution because of the uneven distribution of studies in the subgroups (Supplemental Table 6). For the nut dose, a significant dose response was found. Stronger effects were observed for >60 g/d; however, there was substantial heterogeneity that should be considered when interpreting results. Findings were similar when studies assessing the effect of nut oils, nut powders, and/or nut flours were removed (Supplemental Table 5).

# TG

A total of 122 strata from 118 studies explored the effect of nut consumption on TG. The meta-analysis showed that nut consumption was associated with a significant decrease in TG (Table 2 and Figure 4). Eleven strata from 10 RCTs [50,52–60] were removed from the meta-analysis, of which 3 [56,59,60] reported a significant reduction in TG with the consumption of nuts. Subgroup analysis indicated differences related to nut type (Supplemental Table 7). However, this significant effect should be interpreted with caution because of the uneven distribution of studies included in the subgroups. When studies assessing the effect of nut oils, nut powders, and/or nut flours were removed from the dose subgroup analysis, results were similar to the overall analysis (Supplemental Table 5).

#### TC to HDL cholesterol ratio

A total of 51 strata from 49 studies explored the effect of nut consumption on TC:HDL cholesterol. The meta-analysis showed that nut consumption was associated with a significant decrease in TC:HDL cholesterol (Table 2 and Figure 5). Six strata from 6 RCTs [53,54,56,57,60,105] were removed from the meta-analysis, of which 3 [53,54,60] reported a significant reduction in TC:HDL cholesterol with the consumption of nuts. The subgroup analyses indicated that a similar magnitude of the effect was found across the different subgroups (Supplemental Table 8). After removing studies assessing the effect of nut oils, nut powders, and/or nut flours from the dose subgroup analysis, results were similar to the overall analysis (Supplemental Table 5).

#### LDL cholesterol to HDL cholesterol ratio

A total of 39 strata from 38 studies explored the effect of nut consumption on LDL cholesterol:HDL cholesterol. The metaanalysis showed that nut consumption was associated with a significant decrease in LDL cholesterol:HDL cholesterol (Table 2 and Figure 6). Two strata from 2 RCTs were removed from the meta-analysis, of which both [53,54] reported a significant reduction in LDL cholesterol:HDL cholesterol with the consumption of nuts. Variation in the magnitude of the effect was observed for nut type, study duration, and health status (Supplemental Table 9). Although studies with a shorter duration (<12 wk) had a larger decrease in LDL cholesterol:HDL cholesterol:HDL cholesterol than found for studies of  $\geq$ 12 wk, the magnitude of the effects in the subgroups is not likely to be clinically significant.

Study or Subgroup	Exper Mean (mmol/L)	rimental SD [mmol/L]	Total	Co Mean [mmol/L]	ntrol SD [mmol/L]	Total	Weight	Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI [mmol/L	Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI [mmol/L]
1.1.1 All Abazarfard et al. (2014)	-0.303548	0.043771	50	-0.32893	0.035742	50	2.5%	0.03 [0.01, 0.04]	
Abbaspour et al. (2019) Agebratt et al. (2016)	2.44 2.2	0.94	24 15	2.44 2.43	0.84 0.69	24 15	0.3% 0.5%	0.00 [-0.50, 0.50] -0.23 [-0.64, 0.18]	
Alves et al. (2014) Baer et al. (2019)	0.0292 0.14245	0.7475 0.32761197	43 40	-0.3201 0.09065	0.7095 0.56610907	22 39	0.5% 1.2%	0.35 [-0.02, 0.72] 0.05 [-0.15, 0.26]	
Bamberger et al. (2017) Barbour et al. (2015)	3.60787 3.6	0.48090379 0.8	204 32	3.71924 3.5	0.48090379 0.8	204 29	2.1% 0.5%	-0.11 [-0.20, -0.02] 0.10 [-0.30, 0.50]	<u> </u>
Berryman et al. (2015) Bowen et al. (2019)	3.3411 3.3	0.53832139	48	3.4965	0.53832139	48	1.1%	-0.16 [-0.37, 0.06] -0.13 [-0.48, 0.22]	
Campos et al. (2020)	2.2533	0.34186982	68	2.48899	0.34186982	67	0.9%	-0.17 [-0.38, 0.04] -0.24 [-0.49, 0.02]	
Casas-Agustench et al. (2011)	-0.16576	0.50874593	25	-0.16835	0.62987592	42	0.3%	0.23 [-0.09, 0.55]	
Chen et al. (2015) Chen et al. (2017)	2.5382	0.63455	33	2.66511	0.75628	33	0.6%	-0.13 [-0.46, 0.21]	
Chisholm et al. (2020)	-0.68	0.46	16	-0.3498	0.63	16	0.8%	-0.13 [-0.42, 0.16] -0.16 [-0.54, 0.22]	<u> </u>
Coates et al. (2005) Coates et al. (2020)	2.94	0.79372539	63 14	3.19	0.80622578	65	0.4%	-0.25 [-0.53, 0.03]	
Costa et al. (2020)	-0.25641	1.77674	15	0.58793	1.12924	16	0.1%	-0.84 [-1.90, 0.21]	
Damasceno et al. (2011)	4.495	0.5373	18	5.06	0.4988	18	0.6%	-0.56 [-0.90, -0.23]	
de Souza et al. (2018) Deon et al. (2018)	3.372698	0.722092	24	3.19865	0.918932	22	0.4%	0.17 [-0.31, 0.65]	
Dhillon et al. (2016) Dhillon et al. (2018)	-0.020461	0.50951297	43	0.04144	1.6	43	0.3%	-0.06 [-0.56, 0.44] -0.11 [-0.14, -0.08]	
Dikariyanto et al. (2020) Din et al. (2011)	-0.09	0.50791967	53 30	0.15	0.49936334	48 30	1.2%	-0.24 [-0.44, -0.04] 0.16 [-0.05, 0.37]	
Dusanov et al. (2020) Eastman and Clavshulte (2005)	0 3.9627	0.5	42 8	-0.2 4.3771	0.4 1.6576	44 9	1.3%	0.20 [0.01, 0.39]	
Fatahi et al. (2019) Foster et al. (2012)	3.0782 -0.08029	0.3613	66 61	2.8568 -0.00259	0.4921 0.50984201	33 62	1.3% 1.3%	0.22 [0.03, 0.41] -0.08 [-0.26, 0.11]	
Ghanavati et al. (2021a)/Ghanavati et al. (2021b) Gozde et al. (2019)	-0.185444 4.05335	0.50064042 0.855218	35 20	-0.242424 4.060084	0.51722639 0.714581	32 17	1.0% 0.3%	0.06 [-0.19, 0.30] -0.01 [-0.51, 0.50]	_ <del></del>
Griel et al. (2008) Guarneiri et al. (2021)	3.14 3.4234	0.68585713 0.7083	24 34	3.44 3.8332	0.68585713	24 18	0.5%	-0.30 [-0.69, 0.09] -0.41 [-0.94, 0.12]	
Gulati et al. (2014) Hernández-Alonso et al. (2014)	2.55892 -0.1036	0.34188 0.45355776	33 49	2.78943 0.03108	0.34188 0.49999558	35 49	1.5% 1.3%	-0.23 [-0.39, -0.07] -0.13 [-0.32, 0.05]	-
Hiraoka-Yamamoto et al. (2004) Holligan (2014) / West (2012) / Gebauer (2008)	2.331 3.03	0.8729	71 28	2.4601 3.42	0.8907 0.2646	71 28	0.8% 1.1%	-0.13 [-0.42, 0.16] -0.39 [-0.61, -0.17]	
Holscher et al. (2018) Huguenin et al. (2015)	2.7972 2.935	0.71424856	18 91	3.0303 2.94396667	0.71424856 1.24865991	18 91	0.4% 0.6%	-0.23 [-0.70, 0.23] -0.01 [-0.35, 0.33]	
Hwang et al. (2019) Iwamoto et al. (2002)	2.928513 1.86	0.612017 0.56920998	43 40	3.075884 2.05	0.769489 0.56920998	41 40	0.8% 1.0%	-0.15 [+0.45, 0.15] -0.19 [+0.44, 0.06]	
Jamshed et al. (2015) Jenkins et al. (2002)	0.9054 4.0533	0.9009	79 27	1.3468 4.22	1.3592 0.6755	34 27	0.3% 0.6%	-0.44 [-0.94, 0.06] -0.17 [-0.51, 0.18]	
Jenkins et al. (2018) Johnston et al. (2017)	2.1663 -0.29785	0.8491 0.19425	71 6	2.37 0.01295	0.84 0.35483	32 6	0.6% 0.7%	-0.20 [-0.56, 0.15] -0.31 [-0.63, 0.01]	
Jung et al. (2017) Kamoun et al. (2021)	3.19 2.27	0.7	84 10	3.41 2.59	0.78	84 10	1.1% 0.2%	-0.22 [-0.44, 0.00] -0.32 [-0.94, 0.30]	
Kasliwal et al. (2015) Katz et al. (2012)	3.30484 0.01036	0.8806 0.59311	21 23	3.5483 -0.01036	0.67858 0.518	21 23	0.4% 0.7%	-0.24 [-0.72, 0.23] 0.02 [-0.30, 0.34]	
Kay et al. (2010) Kocyigit et al. (2006)	3.03 -0.05	0.1201 0.01	56 22	3.42 -0.03	0.11	28 22	2.4% 2.5%	-0.39 [-0.44, -0.34] -0.02 [-0.03, -0.01]	
Kris-Etherton et al. (1999) Kurlandsky and Stote (2006)	3.08 0.063	0.9169 0.1369	22 23	3.52 0.09	0.9381 0.15	22 12	0.3% 2.0%	-0.44 [-0.99, 0.11] -0.03 [-0.13, 0.07]	
Le et al. (2016) / Rock et al. (2016)_IR Le et al. (2016) / Rock et al. (2016)_IS	3.0821 2.7972	0.9193588 0.6216	35 36	3.1857 2.9267	0.86523058 0.61290587	31 35	0.4% 0.8%	-0.10 [+0.53, 0.33] -0.13 [+0.42, 0.16]	
Lee et al. (2014) Lee et al. (2017)	-0.03885 3.3072	0.398601 0.3983	30 31	0.04921 3.512	0.62937 0.4038	30 31	0.9% 1.2%	-0.09 [-0.35, 0.18] -0.20 [-0.40, -0.01]	
Li et al. (2010) Li et al. (2011) / Liu et al. (2013)	2.06941 3	1.48038382 0.89442719	27 20	1.88811 3.4	1.38565 0.4472136	25 20	0.1% 0.4%	0.18 [-0.60, 0.96] -0.40 [-0.84, 0.04]	
Liu et al. (2018) Lovejoy et al. (2002)_HF	2.598547 2.51	0.687386 0.54772256	57 30	2.362598 2.58	0.692307 0.54772256	28 30	0.7% 0.8%	0.24 [-0.08, 0.55] -0.07 [-0.35, 0.21]	
Lovejoy et al. (2002)_LF Ma et al. (2010)	2.53 -0.19943	0.54772256 0.259	30 12	2.53 0.20202	0.54772256 0.53354	30 12	0.8% 0.6%	0.00 [-0.28, 0.28] -0.40 [-0.74, -0.07]	
Madan et al. (2021) Mah et al. (2017)	-0.110593 -0.12432	0.643615 0.65244123	107 42	0.153587 0.03108	0.643615 0.41972334	112 42	1.4% 1.0%	-0.26 [-0.43, -0.09] -0.16 [-0.39, 0.08]	
Maranhao et al. (2011) McKay et al. (2018)	1.955 -0.031598	0.2777 0.30580607	8 11	2.58136667 -0.191919	0.49839275 0.38619453	9 15	0.5% 0.9%	-0.63 [-1.00, -0.25] 0.16 [-0.11, 0.43]	
Mohan et al. (2018) Morgan and Clayshulte (2000)	0.02331 2.46	0.65009 0.59	129 10	-0.0777 3.03	0.55944 0.57	140 9	1.6% 0.3%	0.10 [-0.04, 0.25] -0.57 [-1.09, -0.05]	
Morgan et al. (2002) Mukuddem-Petersen (2007) / Schutte et al. (2006)	3.9 0.15	0.6 0.8212	42 42	4 0.19	0.7 0.6428	42 22	0.8% 0.6%	-0.10 [-0.38, 0.18] -0.04 [-0.41, 0.33]	
Müllner et al. (2013)_insulin Müllner et al. (2013)_OAD	2.83 2.82	0.90490768 0.82812	18 29	3.05 2.79	0.88202885 0.78868571	16 29	0.2% 0.5%	-0.22 [-0.82, 0.38] 0.03 [-0.39, 0.45]	
Nestel et al. (1994) Njike et al. (2015)_HD	4.06 -0.376068	0.63 0.624449	34 26	4.05 -0.253561	0.64 0.411033	34 23	0.7% 0.8%	0.01 [-0.29, 0.31] -0.12 [-0.42, 0.17]	
Njike et al. (2015)_ID Nouran et al. (2009)	-0.320901 0.17612	0.461538 0.74226888	26 54	-0.306656 -0.00259	0.49469 0.66613874	26 54	0.9% 0.9%	-0.01 [-0.27, 0.25] 0.18 [-0.09, 0.44]	T-
Olmedilla-Alonso et al. (2008) Orem et al. (2013)	-0.19684 3.7555	0.33882479 0.6475	25 21	-0.08029 4.0922	0.51137445 0.58793	25 21	1.0% 0.5%	-0.12 [-0.36, 0.12] -0.34 [-0.71, 0.04]	
O'Byrne et al. (1997) Pelkman et al. (2004)	4.2994 3.48	0.4921 0.67549982	13 27	4.1699 3	0.518 0.7	12 25	0.5%	0.13 [-0.27, 0.53] 0.48 [0.11, 0.85]	
PREDIMED - Urpi-Sarda et L. (2021) Rajaram et al. (2001)	-0.25382 2.73	1.16607218	92 23	-0.40404 3.05	1.04495844	93 23	0.7%	0.15 [-0.17, 0.47] -0.32 [-0.63, -0.01]	
Rajaram et al. (2009) Rajaram et al. (2010) / Sabate et al. (2003)	2.77 3.5856	0.75	25 25	3.06	0.75	25 25	0.5%	-0.29 [-0.71, 0.13] -0.15 [-0.73, 0.42]	
Rock et al. (2017) Rock et al. (2020)	2.9008	0.88780727	47	2.9008 2.9008	0.91570328	50 44	0.6%	0.00 [-0.36, 0.36] -0.03 [-0.35, 0.30]	
Ros et al. (2004) Ruisinger et al. (2015)	4.33 2.47604	0.61901	20	4.64 2.70137	0.46	20	0.8%	-0.31 [-0.60, -0.02] -0.23 [-0.55, 0.10]	
Sabate et al. (1993) Sabate et al. (2005) / Torabian et al. (2010)	2.4346 3.29	0.4403	18	2.9008	0.4144 0.09	18 87	2.5%	-0.47 [-0.75, -0.19] -0.09 [-0.12, -0.06]	
Salas-Huetos et al. (2018) Sales (2008) / Akuamoah-Boateng (2007)	-0.121 2.3051	0.374	32	-0.0777 2.4087	0.41516136	50 32	1.6%	-0.04 [-0.19, 0.11] -0.10 [-0.46, 0.25]	- <u>+</u>
Sauder et al. (2021) Sauder et al. (2015) / Sauder et al. (2014)	3.2634	0.21908902	30	2.43	0.32863354	30	1.4%	-0.04 [-0.18, 0.10]	
Solá et al. (2017) Solá et al. (2012)	0.068	0.43970552	28	4.2217	0.9328855	15	1.1%	-0.39 [-1.08, 0.30] 0.07 [-0.16, 0.30]	
Somerset et al. (2013) Spaccarotella et al. (2008)	-0.1	0.59573484	32	0.03	0.59573484	32 21	0.2%	-0.13 [-0.41, 0.79] -0.13 [-0.49, 0.23]	
Sweazea et al. (2014) Tamizifor et al. (2005)	2.71	0.83	10	4.5066	0.76	11	0.2%	-0.85 [-1.50, -0.21] 0.19 [-0.49, 0.87]	
Tan et al. (2013)	2.3947	0.6866	110	2.173	0.562	27	1.0%	0.22 [-0.03, 0.47]	<del>_</del>
Tapsell et al. (2007) Tapsell et al. (2017)	2.4	0.6	18	2.5	0.8	17	0.4%	-0.10 [-0.57, 0.37]	
Tey et al. (2011) Tey et al. (2013)	-0.09	0.33941126	32	-0.06	0.37696154	29	1.4%	-0.03 [-0.21, 0.15]	
Tindall et al. (2019) Wang et al. (2012)	2.77907	0.66822	36	2.81274	0.66822	36	0.7%	-0.03 [-0.34, 0.28]	
Wang et al. (2021a) Wien et al. (2003)	3.59	0.91	113 32	3.54	0.91	111	1.0%	0.05 [-0.19, 0.29]	
Wien et al. (2010) Wien et al. (2014)	2.6936	0.72157132	25	3.0044	0.74898853	29	0.5%	-0.31 [-0.70, 0.08]	
Williams et al. (2019) Wu et al. (2010)	0.03	0.4792	24	0.02	0.4899	24	0.8%	0.01 [-0.26, 0.28]	+
Wu et al. (2014) Zambon et al. (2000)	-0.1813	0.49141795	40 25	-0.0518	0.32761197 3.13534687	40	1.3%	-0.13 [-0.31, 0.05] -0.29 [-1.58, 1.00]	
Zhao et al. (2004) / West et al. (2010) Zibaeenezhad et al. (2017)	3.3061	0.5388	23 45	3.74	0.6714	23 45	0.6%	-0.43 [-0.79, -0.08] -0.88 [-1.25, -0.52]	
Zibaeenezhad et al. (2019) Subtotal (95% CI)	3.394195	0.462056	42 4911	3.759385	0.765863	40 4576	0.8%	-0.37 [-0.64, -0.09] -0.11 [-0.14, -0.07]	+
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.01; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 609.76, df = 125 Test for overall effect: Z = 6.69 (P < $0.00001$ )	(P < 0.00001); l <sup>2</sup> =	80%				control.			
Total (95% CI)			4911			4576	100.0%	-0.11 [-0.14, -0.07]	+
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.01; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 609.76, df = 125 Test for overall effect: Z = $6.69$ (P < $0.00001$ )	(P < 0.00001); l <sup>2</sup> =	80%							-2 -1 0 1 2 Favours [experimental]
Test for subgroup differences: Not applicable									



Abbreviation: IV, inverse variance.

Study or Subgroup	Exper Mean (mmol/L1	rimental SD [mmol/L]	Total	Co Mean Immol/L1	ntrol SD (mmol/L)	Total	Weight	Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI Immol/L	Mean Difference
3.1.1 All	mean [mmean]	op (minoraj	Total	intern (nintern)	op (minorit)	Total	Trongine	Tri randoni, oo io or printona	
Abazarfard et al. (2014) Abbaspour et al. (2019)	-2.357418 4.14	0.875679	50 24	-1.42968	0.948976	50 24	0.8% 0.6%	-0.93 [-1.29, -0.57] 0.03 [-0.45, 0.51]	
Agebratt et al. (2016)	3.95	0.45	15	4.38	0.91	15	0.5%	-0.43 [-0.94, 0.08]	
Alves et al. (2014) Baer et al. (2019)	-0.1741	0.8733	43 40	-0.4084 0.1295	0.7289	22 39	0.7%	0.23 [-0.17, 0.64] 0.06 [-0.12, 0.25]	
Bamberger et al. (2017)	5.77829	0.59188159	204	5.93628	0.59188159	204	1.5%	-0.16 [-0.27, -0.04]	-
Barbour et al. (2015) Berryman et al. (2015)	5.2	0.8	32	5.1 5.4649	0.8	29 48	0.7%	0.10 [-0.30, 0.50] -0.13 [-0.17, -0.09]	-
Bowen et al. (2019)	5.43	1	39	5.62	0.84	35	0.7%	-0.19 [-0.61, 0.23]	
Campos et al. (2020)	4.1699	0.36323668	68	4.47034	0.36323668	67	1.2%	-0.32 [-0.55, -0.09] -0.30 [-0.58, -0.02]	
Carvalho et al. (2015)	-0.53095	1.58508	35	-0.19166	1.15255	42	0.4%	-0.34 [-0.97, 0.29]	
Chen et al. (2015)	3.80471	0.83916	21	3.84874	0.99197	24	0.5%	-0.04 [-0.58, 0.49]	
Chen et al. (2017) Chen et al. (2020)	4.63351	0.73556	33	4.67754	0.9324	33	0.7%	-0.04 [-0.45, 0.36]	
Chisholm et al. (1998)	5.99	0.45	16	6.11	0.75	16	0.6%	-0.12 [-0.55, 0.31]	
Chisholm et al. (2005) Costes et al. (2020)	5.44	0.08	28	5.18	0 88684835	28	0.8%	0.26 [-0.11, 0.63]	
Colquhoun et al. (1996)	5.25	0.92	14	5.24	0.9	14	0.3%	0.01 [-0.66, 0.68]	
Costa et al. (2020) Curb et al. (2000)	-0.08029	1.71458	15	0.61901	0.99974	16	0.2%	-0.70 [-1.70, 0.30]	
Damasceno et al. (2011)	6.49	0.7282	18	7.1867	0.8929	18	0.5%	-0.70 [-1.23, -0.16]	
Damavandi et al. (2013) de Souza et al. (2018)	4.010874 5.138042	0.95312	23 24	3.50686 4.883186	0.811706	25 22	0.5%	0.50 [0.00, 1.01] 0.25 [-0.35, 0.86]	
Deon et al. (2018)	5.4742	1.2047	42	5.2862	1.1629	18	0.3%	0.19 [-0.46, 0.84]	
Dhillon et al. (2018) Dhillon et al. (2018)	-0.062937 0.74592	0.08806	43	1.00492	0.09065	43	1.1%	-0.26 [-0.30, -0.22]	-
Dikariyanto et al. (2020) Dia et al. (2011)	-0.18	0.59861961	53	0.03	0.6026799	48	1.1%	-0.21 [-0.44, 0.02]	
Dusanov et al. (2020)	-0.2	0.5	42	-0.33	0.39	44	1.2%	0.30 [0.09, 0.51]	
Eastman and Clayshulte (2005)	6.0088	0.9065	8	6.6822	1.7353	9	0.1%	-0.67 [-1.97, 0.62]	
Foster et al. (2012)	0.09583	0.70799913	61	0.15022	0.63220409	62	1.1%	-0.05 [-0.29, 0.18]	-+-
Ghanavati et al. (2021a)/Ghanavati et al. (2021b) Gozde et al. (2019)	-0.36001	0.56925228	35	-0.43512 6.002584	0.67526779	32 17	0.9%	0.08 [-0.23, 0.38]	
Griel et al. (2008)	4.94	0.83282651	24	5.45	0.83282651	24	0.6%	-0.51 [-0.98, -0.04]	
Guarneiri et al. (2021) Gulati et al. (2014)	5.0505 4.51955	0.7637	34 33	5.3872 4.79409	1.238 0.48951	18 35	0.4%	-0.34 [-0.96, 0.29] -0.27 [-0.51, -0.04]	
Hernández-Alonso et al. (2014)	-0.096866	0.49233109	49	0.054649	0.58791185	49	1.2%	-0.15 [-0.37, 0.06]	
Hiraoka-Yamamoto et al. (2004) Holligan (2014) / West (2012) / Gebauer (2008)	4.3771 4.965	0.5213	28	4.4537	1.31/2 0.5292	28	0.7%	-0.08 [-0.47, 0.32] -0.46 [-0.73, -0.18]	
Holscher et al. (2018)	4.8433	0.7801792	18	5.0246	0.7801792	18	0.5%	-0.18 [-0.69, 0.33]	
Huguenin et al. (2015) Hwang et al. (2019)	4.617452	0.785806	43	4.847185	0.829059	41	0.5%	-0.04 [-0.53, 0.44] -0.23 [-0.58, 0.12]	
Iwamoto et al. (2002)	4.03	0.69570108	40	4.22	0.63245553	40	1.0%	-0.19 [-0.48, 0.10]	
Jenkins et al. (2002)	6.2293	0.7646	27	6.44	0.7794	27	0.7%	-0.21 [-0.62, 0.20]	
Jenkins et al. (2018)	3.9465	0.8422	71	4.2	1.0519	32	0.7%	-0.25 [-0.67, 0.16]	
Johnston et al. (2017)	-0.2849	0.27195	6	0.08547	0.40922	6	0.7%	-0.37 [-0.76, 0.02]	
Jung et al. (2017) Kemoun et al. (2021)	4.99	0.91	84	5.28	1.01	84	1.0%	-0.29 [-0.58, 0.00]	
Kasliwal et al. (2015)	5.01683	1.07485	21	5.41051	0.89096	21	0.4%	-0.39 [-0.99, 0.20]	
Katz et al. (2012) Kocyloit et al. (2006)	-0.01295	0.60088	23 22	0.00777	0.55944	23	0.8%	-0.02 [-0.36, 0.31] -0.45 [-0.49 -0.41]	-
Kris-Etherton et al. (1999)	4.875	1.0543	22	5.41	1.0788	22	0.4%	-0.54 [-1.17, 0.10]	
Kurlandsky and Stote (2006) Le et al. (2016) / Rock et al. (2016) IB	-0.0139 5.1282	0.1104	23 35	-0.01 5.18	0.21	12 31	1.5%	-0.00 [-0.13, 0.12] -0.05 [-0.55, 0.45]	
Le et al. (2016) / Rock et al. (2016)_IS	4.9987	0.9324	36	4.9728	0.777	35	0.7%	0.03 [-0.37, 0.42]	
Lee et al. (2014) Lee et al. (2017)	-0.226107 5.117	0.3885	30	0.04921 5.2991	0.64491 0.5191	30	1.0%	-0.28 [-0.54, -0.01] -0.18 [-0.44, 0.07]	
Li et al. (2010)	4.96244	1.00935261	27	4.74488	1.0619	25	0.4%	0.22 [-0.35, 0.78]	
Lietal. (2011) / Liu etal. (2013) Liu etal. (2018)	4.152547	0.89442719	57	4.026932	0.89442719	20	0.4%	0.13 [-0.21, 0.46]	
Lovejoy et al. (2002)_HF	4.46	0.76681158	30	4.52	0.76681158	30	0.7%	-0.06 [-0.45, 0.33]	
Ma et al. (2010)	-0.25123	0.37555	12	-0.11655	0.5957	12	0.7%	-0.13 [-0.53, 0.26]	
Madan et al. (2021) Mab et al. (2017)	-0.14763	0.637917	107	0.345765	2.453766	112	0.6%	-0.49 [-0.96, -0.02]	
Maranhao et al. (2011)	3.51376667	0.27770219	8	4.27781667	0.64564516	9	0.6%	-0.76 [-1.23, -0.30]	
McKay et al. (2018) Mohan et al. (2018)	-0.025382 0.08547	0.3547694 0.67081	11	-0.230251	0.44236828	15	0.9%	0.20 [-0.10, 0.51] 0.13 [-0.02, 0.29]	
Morgan and Clayshulte (2000)	4.22	0.83	10	5.02	0.54	9	0.4%	-0.80 [-1.42, -0.18]	
Morgan et al. (2002) Mukuddem-Petersen (2007) / Schutte et al. (2006)	0.02	0.7506	42	0.07	0.7443	42	0.9%	-0.20 [-0.50, 0.10] -0.05 [-0.44, 0.34]	
Müllner et al. (2013)_insulin	4.72	1.08588921	18	5.03	0.99462828	16	0.3%	-0.31 [-1.01, 0.39]	
Nestel et al. (1994)	4.74	0.85440952	29 34	4.78	0.88069904	29 34	0.6%	-0.05 [-0.37, 0.27]	
Njike et al. (2015)_HD	-0.324009	0.582491	26	-0.288526	0.564102	26	0.9%	-0.04 [-0.35, 0.28]	
Nouran et al. (2009)	0.17353	0.85646409	54	-0.243978	0.85646409	54	0.8%	0.26 [-0.06, 0.58]	<u>+</u>
Olmedilla-Alonso et al. (2008) Orem et al. (2013)	-0.27713	0.40470739	25	-0.09842	0.48000179	25	1.1%	-0.18 [-0.42, 0.07]	
O'Byrne et al. (1997)	6.2419	0.5698	13	6.1642	0.6216	12	0.6%	0.08 [-0.39, 0.55]	
Pelkman et al. (2004) PREDIMED - Urni-Sarda et L. (2021)	5.15 -0.32116	0.77942286	27 92	4.85	0.8	25	0.6%	0.30 [-0.13, 0.73] 0.20 [-0.17, 0.57]	
Rajaram et al. (2001)	4.47	0.7	23	4.78	0.75	23	0.7%	-0.31 [-0.73, 0.11]	
Rajaram et al. (2009) Rajaram et al. (2010) / Sabate et al. (2003)	4.87 5.2612	0.9	25 25	5.14 5.41	0.9	25 25	0.5%	-0.27 [-0.77, 0.23] -0.15 [-0.67, 0.37]	
Rock et al. (2017)	5.0246	1.06536872	47	5.0246	1.09884394	50	0.6%	0.00 [-0.43, 0.43]	
Rock et al. (2020) Ros et al. (2004)	5.0246	1.06536872	4/ 20	5.0246	0.85900582	44	0.7%	-0.29 [-0.67, 0.09]	
Ruisinger et al. (2015) Sebate et al. (1003)	4.28904	0.81067	20	4.58948	0.61383	26	0.6%	-0.30 [-0.73, 0.13]	
Sabate et al. (1993) Sabate et al. (2005) / Torabian et al. (2010)	5.41	0.09	87	4.7138	0.09	87	1.7%	-0.13 [-0.16, -0.10]	-
Salas-Huetos et al. (2018) Salas (2008) / Akuamosh Rostong (2007)	-0.10791667	0.40400478	56	-0.09496667	0.47447013	50	1.4%	-0.01 [-0.18, 0.16]	
Sapp et al. (2021)	4.9728	0.36628131	50	4.921	0.36628131	50	1.4%	0.05 [-0.09, 0.20]	+
Sauder et al. (2015) / Sauder et al. (2014) Sheridan et al. (2007)	6 1383	0.32863354	30 15	4.15 6 3714	0.32863354	30	1.4%	-0.15 [-0.32, 0.02]	
Solá et al. (2012)	0.0075	0.39586391	28	-0.087	0.39715337	28	1.2%	0.09 [-0.11, 0.30]	+
Somerset et al. (2013) Spaccarotella et al. (2008)	5.1 -0.18	1.07480231 0.54990908	32 21	4.74	1.69705628	32 21	0.3%	0.36 [-0.34, 1.06] -0.16 [-0.49, 0.17]	
Spiller et al. (1998)	5.7498	0.7252	18	6.8117	1.0878	12	0.3%	-1.06 [-1.76, -0.36]	
Sweazea et al. (2014) Tamizifar et al. (2005)	4.34 -0.1813	1.2 0.56744057	10 30	4.11 0.2331	0.88 0.56744057	11 30	0.2%	0.23 [-0.68, 1.14] -0.41 [-0.70, -0.13]	
Tan et al. (2013)	3.9329	0.7925	110	3.8125	0.6216	27	1.0%	0.12 [-0.16, 0.40]	+
Tapsell et al. (2004)	4.02	0.77	18	4.9	1.08	17	0.4%	-0.88 [-1.49, -0.27] 0.30 [-0.30, 0.90]	
Tapsell et al. (2017)	5.26666667	0.91010876	64	4.93333333	1.06742112	52	0.8%	0.33 [-0.03, 0.70]	
Tindall et al. (2019)	4.56099	0.3838788	36	4.57394	0.43081318	36	0.8%	-0.01 [-0.36, 0.34]	
Wang et al. (2012) Wang et al. (2021a)	-0.2764	0.831	56 113	-0.21	0.53	30	1.0%	-0.07 [-0.36, 0.22]	-
Wang et al. (2021b)	4.2217	1.08537998	56	4.3771	1.29355916	41	0.5%	-0.16 [-0.64, 0.33]	
Wien et al. (2003) Wien et al. (2010)	4.4807	1.1721002	32	5.1023	1.19027338	33 20	0.4%	-0.62 [-1.20, -0.05]	
Wien et al. (2014)	4.27	0.89714648	30	4.22	0.87036598	30	0.6%	0.05 [-0.40, 0.50]	
Williams et al. (2019) Wu et al. (2010)	0.03	0.486	24 94	0.16	0.4899	24 95	1.0%	-0.13 [-0.41, 0.15] 0.12 [-0.24, 0.48]	
Wu et al. (2014)	-0.2072	0.49141795	40	-0.0518	0.32761197	40	1.3%	-0.16 [-0.34, 0.03]	
Zampon et al. (2000) Zhao et al. (2004) / West et al. (2010)	6.52 4.9852	0.9 0.6341	25	6.81 5.59	0.79	24	0.6% 0.7%	-0.29 [-0.76, 0.18] -0.60 [-1.01, -0.20]	
Zibaeenezhad et al. (2017) Zibaeenezhad et al. (2019)	5.37943	1.02823	45	6.36622	1.10593	45	0.6%	-0.99 [-1.43, -0.55]	— <u> </u>
Subtotal (95% CI)	5.405071	0.746251	42 4861	0.002312	1.056/2	40	100.0%	-0.05 [-1.05, -0.25] -0.13 [-0.18, -0.09]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.03; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 960.05, df = 125 Test for overall effect: Z = 6.10 (P < 0.00001)	(P < 0.00001); l <sup>2</sup> =	87%							
I otal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0,03: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 960.05. df = 125	(P < 0.00001): l <sup>2</sup> =	87%	4861			4562	100.0%	-0.13 [-0.18, -0.09]	·····
Test for overall effect: Z = 6.10 (P < 0.00001)									-2 -1 0 1 2 Favours [experimental] Favours [control]
rest for subgroup differences: Not applicable									



Abbreviation: IV, inverse variance.

Study or Subgroup	Exper Mean [mmol/L]	rimental SD [mmol/I ]	Total	Co Mean Immol/I 1	ntrol SD [mmol/i ]	Total	Weight	Mean Difference	Mean Difference
4.1.1 All	wean [mmowL]	an funnon-f	Total	mean [mmovil]	an funnonri	Total	weight	W, Random, 55% CI [mmol/L]	
Abazarfard et al. (2014) Abbasarar et al. (2010)	-1.403234	0.715629	50	-0.681729	0.69947	50	0.6%	-0.72 [-1.00, -0.44]	
Agebratt et al. (2016)	0.8	0.33	15	0.84	0.38	15	0.7%	-0.04 [-0.29, 0.21]	+
Al Abdrabalnabi et al. (2020)	1.02943	0.42218381	319	1.01022	0.42357701	306	3.0%	0.02 [-0.05, 0.09]	
Baer et al. (2019)	-0.0339	0.32875039	40	0.215265	0.2963876	39	1.7%	-0.05 [-0.18, 0.09]	+
Bamberger et al. (2017) Barbour et al. (2015)	1.10853	0.35507182	204	1.21927	0.48418885	204	2.7%	-0.11 [-0.19, -0.03]	-
Berryman et al. (2015)	1.4803	0.0904	48	1.5481	0.0904	48	3.7%	-0.07 [-0.10, -0.03]	•
Bowen et al. (2019) Burne Whitmore et al. (2014)	1.7	0.21266964	39	1.92	0.96	35	0.2%	-0.22 [-0.73, 0.29]	
Campos et al. (2020)	1.4577	0.5876	68	1.59895	0.54579	67	1.1%	-0.14 [-0.33, 0.05]	
Carvalho et al. (2015)	-0.56048	2.23966	35	-0.000565	1.17633	42	0.1%	-0.56 [-1.38, 0.26]	
Chen et al. (2015)	1.40459	0.68591	21	1.48482	0.68026	24	0.3%	-0.08 [-0.48, 0.32]	
Chen et al. (2017) Chen et al. (2020)	1.84077	1.25543	33	1.59556	0.77179	33	0.2%	0.25 [-0.26, 0.75]	
Chisholm et al. (1998)	2	0.8	16	1.86	0.48	16	0.2%	0.14 [-0.32, 0.60]	
Chisholm et al. (2005)	1.25	0.56	28	1.21	0.48	28	0.6%	0.04 [-0.23, 0.31]	Ŧ
Colquhoun et al. (1996)	0.91	0.47023524	14	1.05	0.48373546	14	0.4%	-0.14 [-0.48, 0.20]	-+-
Costa et al. (2020) Curb et al. (2000)	0.77518	0.94468	15	-0.05085	0.05085	16	0.2%	0.83 [0.35, 1.30]	
Damasceno et al. (2011)	1.185	0.589	18	1.3633	0.8447	18	0.2%	-0.18 [-0.65, 0.30]	-+-
Damavandi et al. (2013)	1.456118	0.803204	23	1.404364	0.947279	25	0.2%	0.05 [-0.44, 0.55]	
Deon et al. (2018)	1.1747	1.585	42	1.0566	1.1545	18	0.3%	0.12 [-0.60, 0.84]	
Dhillon et al. (2016)	-0.20453	0.84472923	43	-0.085541	0.85213914	43	0.4%	-0.12 [-0.48, 0.24]	-†
Dikariyanto et al. (2018)	-0.076666667	0.09492	38 53	-0.1	0.1604901	35 48	3.5%	0.02 [-0.02, 0.07]	+
Din et al. (2011)	0.23	0.59	30	0.33	0.86	30	0.4%	-0.10 [-0.47, 0.27]	- <u>+</u> _
Eastman and Clayshulte (2005)	2.4973	1.9549	42	-0.1	0.8814	44 9	0.8%	0.20 [-0.03, 0.43]	
Foster et al. (2012)	-0.04633	0.56483726	61	-0.11639	0.49826722	62	1.1%	0.07 [-0.12, 0.26]	±.
Gnanavati et al. (2021a)/Ghanavati et al. (2021b) Gozde et al. (2019)	-0.44748 1.26673	0.603646	35 20	-0.37968 1.712967	0.5641562	32	0.5%	-0.07 [-0.37, 0.24] -0.45 [-1.07, 0.18]	
Griel et al. (2008)	1.55	0.73484692	24	1.59	0.73484692	24	0.3%	-0.04 [-0.46, 0.38]	
Guarnein et al. (2021) Hernández-Alonso et al. (2014)	1.4903 -0.056048	0.6865	34 49	1.7854 0.084411	0.9481 0.60348803	18 49	0.2%	-0.30 [-0.79, 0.20] -0.14 [-0.35, 0.071	
Hiraoka-Yamamoto et al. (2004)	0.6215	0.3809	71	0.7396	0.6629	71	1.2%	-0.12 [-0.30, 0.06]	<u> </u>
Holigan (2014) / West (2012) / Gebauer (2008) Holscher et al. (2018)	1.24 1.014747	0.5209	28 18	1.4 1.04412	0.5292	28 18	0.6% 0.7%	-0.16 [-0.44, 0.12] -0.03 [-0.29, 0.23]	7
Huguenin et al. (2015)	2.04906667	1.25129644	91	1.86073333	1.05551536	91	0.4%	0.19 [-0.15, 0.52]	
Hwang et al. (2019) Iwamoto et al. (2002)	1.330462	0.585114 0.63245553	43 40	1.527873 1 5	0.657999	41 40	0.6%	-0.20 [-0.46, 0.07] 0.00 [-0.28, 0.28]	7
Jamshed et al. (2015)	1.3443	1.3042	79	1.6385	1.6472	34	0.1%	-0.29 [-0.92, 0.33]	-+
Jenkins et al. (2002) Jenkins et al. (2018)	1.6111	0.5613	27	1.8	0.6235	27	0.5%	-0.19 [-0.51, 0.13]	-
Jia et al. (2006)	0.0119	0.0058	20	0.0131	0.0051	10	4.0%	-0.00 [-0.01, 0.00]	1
Johnston et al. (2017) Jung et al. (2017)	0.2034	0.43957	6	0.07119	0.32883	6 84	0.3%	0.13 [-0.31, 0.57]	<u>+</u>
Kamoun et al. (2021)	1.32	0.08	10	1.51	0.23	10	1.5%	-0.19 [-0.34, -0.04]	-
Kasliwal et al. (2015)	1.59104	0.71303	21	1.62155	0.72659	21	0.3%	-0.03 [-0.47, 0.40]	
Kocyigit et al. (2006)	-0.11	0.02	22	0.04005	0.09	22	3.6%	-0.12 [-0.16, -0.08]	
Kris-Etherton et al. (1999)	1.17	0.5036	22	1.29	0.5159	22	0.5%	-0.12 [-0.42, 0.18]	
Le et al. (2016) / Rock et al. (2016)_IR	1.3786	0.73368717	35	1.4577	0.65889756	34	0.4%	-0.08 [-0.41, 0.25]	+
Le et al. (2016) / Rock et al. (2016)_IS	0.9492	0.33425851	35	1.1187	0.59300781	34	0.8%	-0.17 [-0.40, 0.06]	
Lee et al. (2014) Lee et al. (2017)	-0.620031	0.4006	30	-0.201479	0.402	30	1.0%	0.01 [-0.19, 0.21]	+
Li et al. (2010)	0.99553	0.39927235	27	1.49273	0.9492	25	0.3%	-0.50 [-0.90, -0.10]	
Lietal. (2011) / Lietal. (2013) Lietal. (2018)	0.8136	0.89442719	20 57	0.643648	0.89442719	20	1.5%	-0.10 [-0.65, 0.45] 0.17 [0.02, 0.32]	-
Lovejoy et al. (2002)_HF	1.77	0.9859006	30	1.68	0.9859006	30	0.2%	0.09 [-0.41, 0.59]	
Lovejoy et al. (2002)_LF Ma et al. (2010)	-0.02147	0.9859006	30 12	2 0.09266	0.9859006	30 12	0.2%	0.10 [-0.40, 0.60] -0.11 [-0.53, 0.30]	
Madan et al. (2021)	-0.030962	0.394031	107	0.01921	0.359453	112	2.3%	-0.05 [-0.15, 0.05]	+
Mah et al. (2017) Maranhao et al. (2011)	0.08701	0.47321765 0.25241592	42	0.17741	0.43876885	42	1.0%	-0.09 [-0.29, 0.10] -0.47 [-0.99, 0.05]	
McKay et al. (2018)	0.002938	0.25784768	11	-0.032883	0.41007535	15	0.7%	0.04 [-0.22, 0.29]	+
Mohan et al. (2018) Morgan and Clayshulte (2000)	0.04859	0.57743	129	0.00452	0.70286	140	1.5%	0.04 [-0.11, 0.20]	
Morgan et al. (2002)	1.5	0.9	42	1.6	0.9	42	0.3%	-0.10 [-0.48, 0.28]	-
Mukuddem-Petersen (2007) / Schutte et al. (2006) Mülleer et al. (2013) insulin	-0.1	0.7315	42	0.11	0.609	22	0.4%	-0.21 [-0.55, 0.13]	
Müllner et al. (2013)_0AD	1.48	0.61780381	29	1.91	0.8288014	29	0.3%	-0.48 [-0.86, -0.10]	
Njike et al. (2015)_HD	0.051189	0.403297	26	0.051641	0.552457	26	0.7%	-0.00 [-0.26, 0.26]	±
Nouran et al. (2009)	-0.08362	0.8635921	54	-0.12882	1.06288259	54	0.4%	0.05 [-0.32, 0.41]	+-
Olmedilla-Alonso et al. (2008)	-0.071416	0.5926769	25	0.08362	0.6323712	25	0.4%	-0.16 [-0.49, 0.18]	
O'Byrne et al. (1997)	1.42/5666/	0.65582324	13	1.5594	0.8085492	12	0.3%	-0.25 [-0.78, 0.28]	
Pelkman et al. (2004)	1.21	0.67549982	27	1.61	0.65	25	0.4%	-0.40 [-0.76, -0.04]	
Rajaram et al. (2001)	-0.2034	0.92625613	92	-U.20453 1.29	0.87845786	93 23	0.7%	0.00 [-0.26, 0.26] -0.13 [-0.55, 0.29]	<u> </u>
Rajaram et al. (2009)	1.11	0.55	25	1.12	0.55	25	0.5%	-0.01 [-0.31, 0.29]	<u>+</u>
rajaram et al. (2010) / Sabate et al. (2003) Rock et al. (2017)	1.494 1.1639	0.9303	25 47	1.52	0.95 0.7191276	25 50	0.2%	-0.03 [-0.55, 0.50] -0.07 [-0.31, 0.171	
Rock et al. (2020)	1.3899	0.61975118	47	1.2656	0.29982288	44	1.0%	0.12 [-0.07, 0.32]	<u>+</u>
Ros et al. (2004) Ruisinger et al. (2015)	1.43 1.15373	0.77	20	1.32 1.2995	0.64	20 26	0.3% 0.6%	0.11 [-0.33, 0.55] -0.15 [-0.41, 0.12]	
Sabate et al. (1993)	1.1639	0.5085	18	1.2882	0.6667	18	0.3%	-0.12 [-0.51, 0.26]	-
Sabate et al. (2005) / Torabian et al. (2010) Salas-Huetos et al. (2018)	1.35 0.05273333	0.05	87 56	1.44	0.07	87 50	3.9% 2.3%	-0.09 [-0.11, -0.07] -0.03 [-0.13. 0 07]	1
Sales (2008) / Akuamoah-Boateng (2007)	0.7458	0.36273	32	0.7119	0.34239	32	1.2%	0.03 [-0.14, 0.21]	+
Sapp et al. (2021) Sauder et al. (2015) / Sauder et al. (2014)	1.1639	0.2397092	50 30	1.2543	0.31961226	50 30	2.1%	-0.09 [-0.20, 0.02]	
Sheridan et al. (2007)	1.4803	0.48141183	15	1.469	0.61270596	15	0.3%	0.01 [-0.38, 0.41]	+
Solà et al. (2012) Somerset et al. (2013)	-0.036	0.5596252	28	-0.102	0.5596252	28	0.5%	0.07 [-0.23, 0.36]	<b></b>
Spaccarotella et al. (2008)	1	4.5825757	21	1	4.5825757	21	0.0%	0.00 [-2.77, 2.77]	
Sweazea et al. (2014) Tamizifar et al. (2005)	-0.4859	0.67	10 30	-0.6102	1.27	11	0.1%	-0.55 [-1.41, 0.31] 0.12 [0.03, 0.22]	
Tan et al. (2013)	1.0797	0.5386	110	1.1108	0.5673	27	0.8%	-0.03 [-0.27, 0.21]	+
Tapsell et al. (2004) Tapsell et al. (2009)	1.7	0.68	16 18	2.13	0.71	20	0.2%	-0.43 [-0.89, 0.03] 0.30 [-0.39, 0.99]	
Tapsell et al. (2017)	1.2	0.53089678	64	1.266666667	0.53371056	52	1.1%	-0.07 [-0.26, 0.13]	+
Tey et al. (2013) Tindall et al. (2019)	1.3063	0.623	70	1.13	0.3041	37	1.2%	0.18 [0.00, 0.35]	1
Wang et al. (2021a)	1.51	0.73217841	113	1.52002	0.80630003	111	1.0%	-0.08 [-0.28, 0.12]	+
Wang et al. (2021b) Wien et al. (2003)	0.9605	0.40589499	56	0.9492	0.34730546	41	1.5%	0.01 [-0.14, 0.16]	
Wien et al. (2010)	1.0396	0.43800602	25	1.1978	0.53472891	29	0.7%	-0.16 [-0.42, 0.10]	-+
Wien et al. (2014) Williams et al. (2019)	1.36	0.69629279	30	1.54	0.77663426	30	0.4%	-0.18 [-0.55, 0.19]	<u> </u>
Wu et al. (2010)	-0.076666667	0.9583	24 94	-0.02	0.62481087	24 95	1.1%	-0.01 [-0.19, 0.18]	+
Wu et al. (2014) Zambon et al. (2000)	-0.113	0.35733738	40	-0.0226	0.2858699	40	1.6%	-0.09 [-0.23, 0.05]	-
Zhao et al. (2004) / West et al. (2010)	1.42	0.5154	25	1.51	0.6235	24	0.4%	-0.27 [-0.60, 0.06]	
Zibaeenezhad et al. (2017)	1.95603	0.35482	45	2.28034	0.54127	45	1.1%	-0.32 [-0.51, -0.14]	-
∠ibaeenezhad et al. (2019) Subtotal (95% CI)	2.480915	0.540818	42 5010	2.778444	0.963212	40 4734	0.4% 100.0%	-0.30 [-0.64, 0.04] -0.06 [-0.08, -0.03]	
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.00; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 311.55, df = 121	(P < 0.00001); l <sup>2</sup> =	61%							
rest for overall effect: ∠ = 4.82 (P < 0.00001)									
Total (95% CI)	·D - 0 00	0401	5010			4734	100.0%	-0.06 [-0.08, -0.03]	
Test for overall effect: Z = 4.82 (P < 0.0001)	(r < 0.00001); l <sup>a</sup> = 1	0176							
Test for subgroup differences: Not applicable									· uvours [experimental] Pavours [control]

**FIGURE 4.** Difference in TGs (mmol/L) between nut consumption and control. The diamond indicates a weighted mean difference with 95% CIs. Abbreviation: IV, inverse variance.

For nut type and health status, these results should be interpreted with caution because of the small and/or uneven distribution of studies included in the subgroups. When studies assessing the effect of nut oils, nut powders, and/or nut flours were removed from the dose subgroup analysis, similar results were found in the overall analysis (Supplemental Table 5).

	E	xperimental			Control			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
6.1.1 All									
Abazarfard et al. (2014)	-2.17	0.88	50	-1.43	0.98	50	2.2%	-0.74 [-1.11, -0.37]	
Alves et al. (2014)	0.1723	0.7721	43	0	0.6098	22	2.3%	0.17 [-0.17, 0.52]	
Berryman et al. (2015)	4.26	0.13	48	4.5	0.13	48	3.8%	-0.24 [-0.29, -0.19]	-
Bowen et al. (2019)	4.18	1.19	39	4.48	1.14	35	1.5%	-0.30 [-0.83, 0.23]	
Burns-Whitmore et al. (2014)	3.64	0.30981952	20	3.86	0.29913609	20	3.3%	-0.22 [-0.41, -0.03]	
Campos et al. (2020)	3.5	0.8	68	3.8	0.9	67	2.7%	-0.30 [-0.59, -0.01]	
Chisholm et al. (2005)	4.7	1.3	28	4.4	1.2	28	1.1%	0.30 [-0.36, 0.96]	
Coates et al. (2020)	3.58	0.95247047	63	3.67	0.96747093	65	2.4%	-0.09 [-0.42, 0.24]	<del></del>
Damavandi et al. (2019)	3.86	1	22	4.44	1.1	21	1.2%	-0.58 [-1.21, 0.05]	
de Souza et al. (2018)	4.28	0.88	24	4.51	3.9	22	0.2%	-0.23 [-1.90, 1.44]	
Dikariyanto et al. (2020)	-0.03	0.38093975	53	-0.04	0.37882736	48	3.5%	0.01 [-0.14, 0.16]	+
Din et al. (2011)	-0.05	0.62	30	-0.13	0.61	30	2.5%	0.08 [-0.23, 0.39]	
Foster et al. (2012)	-0.2	0.78102497	61	-0.1	0.78740079	62	2.7%	-0.10 [-0.38, 0.18]	
Ghanavati et al. (2021a)/Ghanavati et al. (2021b)	-0.48	0.72777657	35	-0.37	0.56859401	32	2.5%	-0.11 [-0.42, 0.20]	
Gozde et al. (2019)	4.5	1.43	20	5.13	1.33	17	0.7%	-0.63 [-1.52, 0.26]	
Griel et al. (2008)	4.6	1.17575508	24	4.89	1.17575508	24	1.1%	-0.29 [-0.96, 0.38]	
Guarneiri et al. (2021)	3.6912	0.6477	34	4.41	1.23	18	1.3%	-0.72 [-1.33, -0.11]	
Hernández-Alonso et al. (2014)	-0.19	0.64407521	49	-0.05	0.69629752	49	2.8%	-0.14 [-0.41, 0.13]	
Holligan (2014) / West (2012) / Gebauer (2008)	3.64	0.9968	28	3.98	1.0054	28	1.5%	-0.34 [-0.86, 0.18]	
Jamshed et al. (2015)	2.5519	2.5001	79	3.3	3.4986	34	0.4%	-0.75 [-2.05, 0.55]	
Jenkins et al. (2002)	4.6281	1.1977	27	4.89	1.2471	27	1.2%	-0.26 [-0.91, 0.39]	
Jenkins et al. (2018)	3.3634	0.9905	71	3.49	1.2519	32	1.7%	-0.13 [-0.62, 0.36]	
Jung et al. (2017)	4.15	1.09	84	4.26	1.03	84	2.5%	-0.11 [-0.43, 0.21]	-+-
Kasliwal et al. (2015)	5.3	1.1	21	4.9	0.8	21	1.3%	0.40 [-0.18, 0.98]	
Katz et al. (2012)	0.03	0.59	23	0.11	0.74	23	2.1%	-0.08 [-0.47, 0.31]	
Kocyigit et al. (2006)	-0.81	0.37	22	0.07	0.15	22	3.4%	-0.88 [-1.05, -0.71]	
Kris-Etherton et al. (1999)	4.15	1.3742	22	4.5	1.4071	22	0.8%	-0.35 [-1.17, 0.47]	
Lee et al. (2017)	4.8484	0.5498	31	5.1	0.5568	31	2.7%	-0.25 [-0.53, 0.02]	
Liu et al. (2018)	3.19	1.03	57	2.63	0.57	28	2.4%	0.56 [0.22, 0.90]	
Lovejoy et al. (2002) HF	4.1	0.54772256	30	4	0.54772256	30	2.7%	0.10 [-0.18, 0.38]	- <del></del>
Lovejoy et al. (2002) LF	4.2	0.54772256	30	4.2	0.54772256	30	2.7%	0.00 [-0.28, 0.28]	
Ma et al. (2010)	-0.2	0.4	12	-0.2	0.5	12	2.2%	0.00 [-0.36, 0.36]	
Mah et al. (2017)	4.3	1.28360668	42	4.6	1.92541002	42	1.0%	-0.30 [-1.00, 0.40]	
Mohan et al. (2018)	-0.2	1	129	-0.1	0.8	140	3.1%	-0.10 [-0.32, 0.12]	-+
Njike et al. (2015)_HD	-0.19	0.67	26	-0.22	0.82	26	2.0%	0.03 [-0.38, 0.44]	
Njike et al. (2015) ID	-0.29	0.74	26	-0.15	0.64	23	2.1%	-0.14 [-0.53, 0.25]	
Nouran et al. (2009)	-0.7	1.46969385	54	0.3	1.46969385	54	1.4%	-1.00 [-1.55, -0.45]	
O'Byrne et al. (1997)	5.2	1.1	13	5.32	0.94	12	0.9%	-0.12 [-0.92, 0.68]	
Pelkman et al. (2004)	4.69	0.98726896	27	4.4	0.95	25	1.5%	0.29 [-0.24, 0.82]	
PREDIMED - Urpi-Sarda et L. (2021)	0.1	1.46811169	92	-0.1	1.2300575	93	2.1%	0.20 [-0.19, 0.59]	<b></b>
Rajaram et al. (2009)	4.32	1.05	25	4.49	1.05	25	1.3%	-0.17 [-0.75, 0.41]	
Ros et al. (2004)	4.31	0.94	20	4.43	0.92	20	1.4%	-0.12 [-0.70, 0.46]	
Sauder et al. (2015) / Sauder et al. (2014)	4.06	0.43817805	30	4.37	0.43817805	30	3.1%	-0.31 [-0.53, -0.09]	
Sheridan et al. (2007)	4.4	1.00697567	15	4.8	1.20062484	15	0.9%	-0.40 [-1.19, 0.39]	
Tapsell et al. (2017)	3.6	1.13763595	64	3.67	0.91493239	52	2.2%	-0.07 [-0.44, 0.30]	
Tey et al. (2013)	4.0067	1.0984	70	3.86	1.0949	37	1.9%	0.15 [-0.29, 0.58]	
Tindall et al. (2019)	4.1	1.2	36	4.2	1.2	36	1.4%	-0.10 [-0.65, 0.45]	
Wien et al. (2010)	3.12	0.70255391	25	3.43	0.74925142	29	2.1%	-0.31 [-0.70, 0.08]	
Wien et al. (2014)	3.38	1.08460992	30	3.56	1.08460992	30	1.5%	-0.18 [-0.73, 0.37]	
Williams et al. (2019)	0.05	0.4818	24	0	0.4899	24	2.7%	0.05 [-0.22, 0.32]	- <del> </del>
Zhao et al. (2004) / West et al. (2010) Subtotal (95% CI)	4.5876	0.8724	23 2019	4.9	0.8632	23 1818	1.6% 100.0%	-0.31 [-0.81, 0.19] -0.15 [-0.24, -0.07]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.05; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 157.72, df = 50	(P < 0.00	001); l² = 68%							· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Test for overall effect: Z = 3.59 (P = 0.0003)									
Total (95% CI)	and the second	100000000 (1000 (2000000	2019			1818	100.0%	-0.15 [-0.24, -0.07]	▲
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.05; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 157.72, df = 50 Test for overall effect: Z = $3.59$ (P = $0.0003$ )	(P < 0.00	001); l² = 68%	•						-2 -1 0 1 2 Favours [experimental] Favours [control]

Test for subgroup differences: Not applicable

FIGURE 5. Difference in total cholesterol to HDL cholesterol ratio between nut consumption and control. The diamond indicates a weighted mean difference with 95% CIs.

Abbreviation: IV, inverse variance.

#### АроВ

A total of 39 strata from 39 studies explored the effect of nut consumption on apoB. The meta-analysis showed that nut consumption was associated with a significant decrease in apoB (Table 2 and Figure 7). One stratum from 1 RCT [57] was removed from the meta-analysis, though no significant finding in relation to apoB and the consumption of nuts was reported. Subgroup analysis indicated significant subgroup differences related to study design, nut type, and health status (Supplemental Table 10). Larger decreases in apoB were observed in cross-over studies, compared to parallel studies, although the magnitude of the effects in the different subgroups is not likely to be clinically significant. Other significant effects for nut type and health status should be interpreted with caution because of the small and/or uneven distribution of studies included in the subgroups. When studies assessing the effect of nut oils, nut powders, and/or nut flours were removed from the dose subgroup analysis, similar results were found in the overall analysis (Supplemental Table 5).

# HDL cholesterol, TG to HDL cholesterol ratio, HDL cholesterol to LDL cholesterol ratio, apoA-I, SBP, and DBP

The meta-analysis showed that consumption of nuts had no significant effect on HDL cholesterol and did not result in significant differences in TG:HDL cholesterol, HDL cholesterol:LDL cholesterol, apoA-I, SBP, and DBP (Table 2 and Supplemental Figures 1–6). In the case of the subgroup analyses, a similar magnitude of the effect was found across the different subgroups for apoA-I (Supplemental Table 11) and SBP (Supplemental Table 12). Although there were significant subgroup differences found for HDL cholesterol (Supplemental Table 13) and DBP (Supplemental Table 14) according to health status, these differences should be interpreted with caution because of the uneven distribution in the number of participants and studies included in the subgroups. Variation in the magnitude of the effect was also observed for DBP and study duration (Supplemental Table 14). Although a reduction in DBP was only observed in studies with a duration of 12 or more weeks, it should be noted that the magnitude of this reduction was small

	E	xperimental			Control			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
8.1.1 All									
Agebratt et al. (2016)	1.62	0.37	15	1.62	0.46	15	2.7%	0.00 [-0.30, 0.30]	
Alves et al. (2014)	0.2998	0.6868	43	-0.06	0.6098	22	2.4%	0.36 [0.03, 0.69]	
Barbour et al. (2015)	2.6	0.2	32	2.6	0.2	29	6.9%	0.00 [-0.10, 0.10]	+
Berryman et al. (2015)	2.69	0.09	48	2.88	0.09	48	8.3%	-0.19 [-0.23, -0.15]	-
Burns-Whitmore et al. (2014)	2.19	0.25640236	20	2.31	0.25640236	20	5.3%	-0.12 [-0.28, 0.04]	
Campos et al. (2020)	1.9	0.7	68	2.1	0.8	67	3.4%	-0.20 [-0.45, 0.05]	
Chen et al. (2017)	2.15	0.7	33	2.22	0.82	33	2.0%	-0.07 [-0.44, 0.30]	
Damasceno et al. (2011)	2.8167	0.7026	18	3.1667	0.724	18	1.4%	-0.35 [-0.82, 0.12]	<del></del>
Damavandi et al. (2019)	2.03	0.6	22	2.46	0.6	21	2.1%	-0.43 [-0.79, -0.07]	
de Souza et al. (2018)	2.72	0.74	24	2.88	1.28	22	0.9%	-0.16 [-0.77, 0.45]	
Ghanavati et al. (2021a)/Ghanavati et al. (2021b)	-0.2	0.43666594	35	-0.2	0.44378069	32	4.2%	0.00 [-0.21, 0.21]	
Gozde et al. (2019)	3	1 12	20	3 47	0.99	17	0.7%	-0.47 [-1.15, 0.21]	
Griel et al. (2008)	2 91	0.83282651	24	3.09	0.88181631	24	1.3%	-0.18[-0.67_0.31]	
Hernández-Alonso et al. (2014)	-0.15	0.59185289	49	-0.04	0.53963058	49	3.9%	-0 11 [-0 33 0 11]	<del></del>
Holligan (2014) / West (2012) / Gebauer (2008)	2 265	1 0451	28	2 55	1 0583	28	1.0%	-0.28 [-0.84, 0.27]	
Iwamoto et al. (2002)	1.31	0.56920998	40	1 46	0.63245553	40	3.2%	-0 15 [-0 41 0 11]	<del></del>
lamshed et al. (2015)	0.9115	0.6262	79	1 47	1 1662	34	1.7%	-0.56[-0.97 -0.14]	
Jenkins et al. (2002)	3 0478	0.0202	27	3.23	0.9353	27	1.7%	-0.18 [-0.70, 0.33]	
lenkins et al. (2018)	1 752	1 0164	71	1 97	1.28	32	1.2%	-0.22 [-0.72, 0.28]	
lung et al. (2017)	2.67	1.0104	84	2.76	0.78	84	3.6%	-0.09 [-0.33, 0.15]	<del></del>
Konvigit et al. (2006)	-0.24	0.04	22	0.01	0.70	22	8.4%	-0.25[-0.280.22]	•
Kris-Etherton et al. (1999)	27	1 3907	44	3	1 4071	22	0.6%	-0.30[-1.02_0.42]	
Lietal (2011)/Liuetal (2013)	2.1	0.89442719	20	33	0 89442719	20	1.0%	-0.30 [-0.85, 0.25]	
Loveiov et al. (2002) HE	23	0.54772256	30	23	0.54772256	30	3.0%	0.00[-0.28_0.28]	
Lovejov et al. (2002) LE	23	0.54772256	30	23	0.54772256	30	3.0%	0.00[-0.28, 0.28]	
Nouran et al. (2002)_El	-0.4	0.73484602	54	0.3	0.73484602	54	3.0%	-0.70[-0.20, 0.20]	
O'Byrne et al. (1997)	3.61	0.70404002	13	3 58	0.70404052	12	0.0%	0.03 [-0.56 0.62]	
Pelkman et al. (2004)	3.18	0.77942286	27	2 73	0.50	25	1.7%	0.45 [0.03 0.87]	
Rajaram et al. (2001)	2 37	0.77542200	23	2.70	0.70	23	1 / %	-0.44 [-0.01, 0.03]	
Rajaram et al. (2009)	2.51	0.7	25	2.01	0.0	25	1.4%	-0.20[-0.70, 0.30]	
Rajaram et al. (2003) Rajaram et al. (2010) / Sabate et al. (2003)	3 244	1 379	25	3.4	1.4	25	0.6%	-0.20 [-0.70, 0.50]	
Ros et al. (2004)	2 01	0.68	20	3.08	0.78	20	1.5%	-0.17[-0.62_0.28]	
Sabata at al. (2004)	2.01	0.00	10	2.00	0.70	10	1.070	-0.17 [-0.02, 0.20]	
Sabate et al. (1995) / Torabian et al. (2010)	2.2	0.1	97	2.5	0.0	97	9.3%	0.061.0.00 0.031	_
Sheridan et al. (2003) / Totablah et al. (2010)	2.00	0.06824584	15	2.77	1 00607567	15	0.3%	-0.40[-1.11_0.31]	
Spaccarotella et al. (2008)	0.04	0.68738635	21	0.15	0.68738635	21	1 7%	-0.40 [-1.11, 0.31]	
Wion et al. (2003)	2.04	1 13137095	27	27	1 14901252	22	1.0%	0.10[0.45_0.65]	
Wien et al. (2003)	1 77	0.80341476	30	1.83	0.816805	30	1.0%	0.10[-0.43, 0.05]	
Zamban at al. (2000)	2.4	0.00341470	25	1.03	0.010000	24	1.7 70	-0.00 [-0.47, 0.35]	
Subtotal (95% CI)	3.4		1341	5.7		1198	100.0%	-0.30 [-0.80, 0.20]	
Haterogeneity: $T_{CU}^2 = 0.01$ ; $Chi^2 = 150.52$ , $df = 28.4$	D < 0.00	001)-12 - 750/	1041			1150	100.070	-0.14[-0.20, -0.00]	•
Test for overall effect: $Z = 4.59 (P < 0.00001)$	F < 0.00	501), 1 75%							
Total (95% CI)			1341			1198	100.0%	-0.14 [-0.20, -0.08]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.01; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 150.52, df = 38 ( Test for overall effect: Z = $4.59$ (P < $0.00001$ ) Test for subgroup differences: Not applicable	P < 0.00	001); I² = 75%	,						-1 -1 -1 -1 -2 Favours [experimental] Favours [control]

FIGURE 6. Difference in LDL cholesterol to HDL cholesterol ratio between nut consumption and control. The diamond indicates a weighted mean difference with 95% CIs.

Abbreviation: IV, inverse variance.

and not likely to be clinically significant. Similar results to the original analysis were found when studies assessing the effect of nut oils, nut powders, and/or nut flours were removed from the dose subgroup analysis for HDL cholesterol, TG:HDL cholesterol, HDL cholesterol;LDL cholesterol, apoA-I, SBP, and DBP (Supplemental Table 5).

# Heterogeneity

Considerable heterogeneity ( $I^2 > 75\%$ ) was observed for LDL cholesterol, HDL cholesterol, and TC (see Table 2). In addition, substantial heterogeneity ( $I^2$ : 50%–75%) was observed for 4 measures (TG, TC:HDL cholesterol, LDL cholesterol:HDL cholesterol; HDL cholesterol), moderate heterogeneity ( $I^2$ : 36%–60%) for 2 measures (apoB and SBP), whereas low heterogeneity ( $I^2$ : 0%–35%) was observed for 3 measures (TG:HDL cholesterol, apoA-I, and DBP).

# Small study effects

Funnel plots were generated for outcomes with 10 or more strata (LDL cholesterol, HDL cholesterol, TC, TG, TC:HDL cholesterol, LDL cholesterol:HDL cholesterol, apoA-I, apoB, SBP, and DBP) (see Supplemental Figures 7–16). Egger's test outcomes indicated funnel plot asymmetry for LDL cholesterol (bias: -0.69; 95% CI: -1.10, -0.28; P = 0.001), HDL cholesterol (bias: 0.58; 95% CI: 0.07, 1.09; P = 0.027), TC (bias: -0.82; 95% CI: -1.33, -0.31; P = 0.002), TG (bias: -0.58; 95% CI: -0.86,

-0.30; P = 0.000), SBP (bias: -0.61; 95% CI: -1.11, -0.12; P = 0.016), and DBP (bias: -0.57; 95% CI: -0.99, -0.14; P = 0.010). These results indicate the presence of small study effects, which may be caused by publication bias. By comparison, funnel plot asymmetry was not detected for TC:HDL cholesterol (bias: 0.42; 95% CI: -0.33, 1.16; P = 0.266), LDL cholesterol:HDL cholesterol (bias: 0.35; 95% CI: -0.20, 0.90; P = 0.205), and apoA-I (bias: 0.42; 95% CI: -0.34, 1.19; P = 0.268).

#### Quality assessment

Quality assessment is presented for each study in Supplemental Table 3, with full quality assessment available in Supplemental Table 15. The quality of evidence was "low" for n = 18 intervention studies [50,51,53,55,58–60,77,78,82,85,90,100, 101,122,124,127,146,149,150].

The certainty of the body of evidence was assessed for studies included in meta-analyses using GRADE, with results presented in <u>Supplemental Table 16</u>. The certainty of the body of evidence for apoA-I was "high." The body of evidence for TC:HDL cholesterol, LDL cholesterol:HDL cholesterol, and apoB was downgraded to "moderate" because of inconsistency and for DBP because of the likelihood of publication bias. The certainty for TG and SBP was downgraded to "low" because of inconsistency and the likelihood of publication bias, and the certainty for TG:HDL cholesterol was downgraded to "low" because of

	Experimental Control							Mean Difference	Mean Difference		
Study or Subgroup	Mean [mg/dL]	SD [mg/dL]	Total	Mean [mg/dL]	SD [mg/dL]	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI [mg/dL]	IV, Random, 95% CI [mg/dL]		
9.1.1 All											
Baer et al. (2019)	4.3	8.85437745	40	2.8	8.7429972	39	5.6%	1.50 [-2.38, 5.38]	+-		
Bamberger et al. (2017)	103.4	12.85457117	204	108.8	12.85457117	204	7.4%	-5.40 [-7.89, -2.91]	-		
Berryman et al. (2015)	103	2	48	108	2	48	9.3%	-5.00 [-5.80, -4.20]	•		
Burns-Whitmore et al. (2014)	86	8.54674545	20	94	8.54675	20	4.1%	-8.00 [-13.30, -2.70]			
Carvalho et al. (2015)	-5.2	25.9	35	-5	23.4	42	1.4%	-0.20 [-11.32, 10.92]			
Chen et al. (2015)	71.9	19	21	67.1	19.8	24	1.4%	4.80 [-6.55, 16,15]			
Chen et al. (2017)	86.7	22.6	33	85.8	24.2	33	1.4%	0.90 [-10.40, 12.20]	<del></del>		
Chen et al. (2020)	9	33	77	9	30.5699	166	2.1%	0.00 [-8.72, 8.72]	<del></del>		
Chisholm et al. (1998)	87.22	24.51	16	92.16	21.37	16	0.7%	-4.94 [-20.87, 10.99]			
Chisholm et al. (2005)	101	34	28	99	32	28	0.6%	2.00 [-15.29, 19.29]			
de Souza et al. (2018)	53	34	24	58	38	22	0.4%	-5.00 [-25.91, 15.91]			
Dusanov et al. (2020)	0	20	42	0	20	44	2.2%	0.00 [-8.46, 8.46]			
Guarneiri et al. (2021)	95 1706	16 3005	34	103	23.2	18	1.2%	-7 83 [-19 87 4 21]			
Holligan (2014) / West (2012) / Gebauer (2008)	95.35	10.3953	28	100.5	10.583	28	4.0%	-5.15 [-10.64, 0.34]			
Hwang et al. (2019)	89.45	19 17	43	89.76	20.49	41	2.2%	-0.31 [-8.81 8 19]			
Iwamoto et al. (2002)	67.2	18 34121043	40	72.8	18 34121043	40	2.4%	-5.60 [-13.64.2.44]			
lenkins et al. (2002)	121 963	15 3196	27	127	15 5885	27	2.3%	-5 04 [-13 28 3 21]	+		
Jenkins et al. (2018)	76 1972	19 8615	71	78	22 222	32	2.0%	-1.80 [-10.78, 7.18]			
lung et al. (2017)	87.98	18.83	84	92.31	20.7	84	3.6%	-4 33 [-10 31 1 65]			
Kasliwal et al. (2015)	92.8	18.9	21	98.8	16.1	21	1.5%	-6.00 [-16.62, 4.62]			
Kris-Etherton et al. (1999)	92.0	22 8860	21	101	23 4521	21	1.0%	-6.00 [-10.02, 4.02]			
Los et al. (2017)	102.0	12 26262447	24	107.5	12 26262447	21	2 10/	4 60 [ 11 26 2 06]			
List al. (2011) / liv at al. (2012)	110.9	20.06999271	20	107.5	20.06999271	20	0.6%	22.00 [ 40.02 4.99]			
Orom et al. (2012)	110.0	23.00000371	20	133.7	25.00000371	20	1.6%	-22.30 [-40.32, -4.00]			
O'Burne et el. (1007)	112	25	12	120	10	10	0.70/	1 00 [ 17 65 15 65]			
Bolkman et al. (2004)	21 22	7 49245040	13	39	7.2	25	0.770 E E0/	-1.00 [-17.00, 10.00]	<u>_</u>		
Peinten et al. (2004)	31.32	1.40240545	27	29.1	1.2	20	1.00/	10.00[21.57, 5.01]			
Rajaram et al. (2001)	75	19	23	102	21	23	0.7%	-10.00 [-21.57, 1.57]			
Rajaram et al. (2009)	94	07.5044	20	103	30	20	0.7%	-9.00 [-25.65, 7.65]			
Rajaram et al. (2010) / Sabate et al. (2003)	90.430	27.5041	25	100.3	28	25	0.8%	-3.86 [-19.27, 11.54]			
Ros et al. (2004)	127	11 0107005	20	133	22	20	1.1%	-6.00 [-18.74, 6.74]			
Sapp et al. (2021)	98.1	11.3137085	50	92.5	11.3137085	50	5.0%	5.60 [1.17, 10.03]			
Sheridan et al. (2007)	119	21.3014084	15	124	23.23790008	15	0.7%	-5.00 [-20.95, 10.95]			
Sola et al. (2012)	3.9	10.31567194	28	3.4	10.5736	28	4.0%	0.50 [-4.97, 5.97]	[		
Tey et al. (2013)	86.0571	23.5531	70	86	24.3311	37	1.8%	0.06 [-9.53, 9.64]			
Williams et al. (2019)	-3	19.2738	24	4	19.5959	24	1.4%	-7.00 [-18.00, 4.00]	· _		
Wu et al. (2010)	-6	22.25975445	94	-/	0.22377844	95	4.9%	1.00 [-3.50, 5.50]			
Wu et al. (2014)	-5	8.22192192	40	-0.2	6.95701085	40	6.3%	-4.80 [-8.14, -1.46]			
Zambon et al. (2000)	144	22	25	152	21	24	1.2%	-8.00 [-20.04, 4.04]			
Zhao et al. (2004) / West et al. (2010) Subtotal (95% CI)	101	14.38749457	23 1532	111	14.38749457	23 1537	2.3% 100.0%	-10.00 [-18.32, -1.68] -3.01 [-4.44, -1.58]			
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 5.54; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 67.38, df = 38 Test for overall effect: Z = 4.13 (P < 0.0001)	(P = 0.002); I <sup>2</sup> = 4	44%									
Total (95% CI)			1532			1537	100.0%	-3.01 [-4.44, -1.58]	•		
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 5.54; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 67.38, df = 38 Test for overall effect: Z = 4.13 (P < $0.0001$ ) Test for subgroup differences: Not applicable	(P = 0.002); I <sup>2</sup> = 4	44%							-50 -25 0 25 50 Favours [experimental] Favours [control]		

FIGURE 7. Difference in apoB (mg/dL) between nut consumption and control. The diamond indicates a weighted mean difference with 95% CIs. Abbreviation: IV, inverse variance.

imprecision and the likelihood of publication bias. Certainty for LDL cholesterol, HDL cholesterol, TC, was downgraded to "very low" because of the inconsistency and likelihood of publication bias, and HDL cholesterol:LDL cholesterol because of inconsistency, imprecision, and the likelihood of publication bias.

# Discussion

This systematic review and meta-analysis showed favorable effects of tree nut and peanut consumption on lowering LDL cholesterol, TC, TG, TC:HDL cholesterol, LDL cholesterol:HDL cholesterol, and apoB from RCTs including 9099 participants. These findings align with a review conducted in 2015, which explored the effects of all tree nuts on CVD risk factors [22]. The present meta-analysis builds on these findings with the addition of studies published since the 2015 review [22] and focuses solely on RCTs. It also includes studies investigating other nut forms, including nut oils [55,59,71,88,100,101,124,147, 158-160,168,186,187,202,203], nut butter [88,124], and nut flour [199] and adolescents (aged 13 y or older) [136]. Subgroup analyses found differences across the types of nuts for outcomes, LDL cholesterol, TC, TG, LDL cholesterol:HDL cholesterol, and apoB. Having fewer studies within the Brazil nut, cashew nut, hazelnut, macadamia, and pecan subgroups may have played a role in the significant effects observed. A dose response and stronger effects were also observed for >60 g/d for TC. Despite the nut dose response, a reduction in LDL cholesterol, TC, TG, TC:HDL cholesterol, LDL cholesterol:HDL cholesterol, and apoB, and an increase in HDL were found in <30 g/d of nuts. Taken together, this meta-analysis provides a timely effect of tree nut and peanut intake on overall CVD risk reduction, including dose-response relations.

The scientific evidence indicates that the consumption of nuts is beneficial to positive changes in many biomarkers of CVD. Although biomarkers were assessed in this review, the population effect for LDL cholesterol, HDL cholesterol, TC, and TG was based on >4500 interventions and >4500 control participants, and SBP and DBP were based on >3000 interventions and >3000 control participants. This substantial population size for high-quality study designs indicates significant reductions in LDL cholesterol, TC, and TG and no change in HDL cholesterol. Despite the heterogeneity, this combined effect suggests that nuts do not simply display positive changes to 1 biomarker of CVD risk but a range of biomarkers to create an overall risk reduction. Although the findings of the SBP and DBP studies indicated a nonsignificant reduction, there was less heterogeneity which is of clinical relevance. The effects on HDL cholesterol were also not indicative of risk reduction, though the metaanalysis suggested no change, which is also a favorable outcome. Both blood lipids and blood pressure are major risk factors for CVD and are included in the Framingham risk equation [204], used globally by clinicians. Therefore, this review provides evidence of a causal link between nut intake and lower CVD risk.

In this review, we observed that there were significant differences in outcomes (LDL cholesterol, TC, TG, LDL cholesterol:HDL cholesterol, and apoB) across different types of nuts. Consideration is needed when interpreting the findings of this review as it is unclear whether all or some types of nuts are preferential for improving CVD risk. This review suggests stronger evidence for almonds and walnuts because of the greater number of studies (n > 30), and therefore more studies are needed for other nut types.

Our findings suggest a dose response was observed for tree nut and peanut consumption of >60 g/d for TC. Similar findings were reported in a recent meta-analysis of RCTs and non-RCTs in this field [22], which showed the relationship between tree nut intake and TC and LDL cholesterol was nonlinear, with stronger effects at >60 g/d. However, the scientific evidence suggests that consumers typically do not meet recommended serving sizes of 15-30 g. In Australia, for example, nut intake was estimated at an average of 4.61 g/d, with only 5.6% of the population consuming the recommended daily amount of nuts [205]. Public health messaging needs to support reasons for consumers to increase their intake of nuts. However, nuts, as a food group because of their high-fat content, have been related to consumer concerns about weight gain, a risk factor for CVD. While this review did not look at body weight, a recent meta-analysis of 106 RCTs and 6 prospective cohorts showed that higher nut intake was associated with reductions in body weight and body fat [206]. Establishing health messages about the regular consumption of nuts to reduce CVD risk may shift consumer opinion and add to the acknowledgment of core foods for positive lifestyle change related to CVD risk.

Consideration should be given when interpreting findings from this review, which included only RCTs when compared to real-life consumer settings, as they are substantially different. RCTs aiming to explore the influence of specific foods must consider many methodological challenges, including the design of the dietary intervention and control arms to avoid increases in total energy intake, which could skew results [207]. Although a dose response was reported for TC, several studies incorporated nuts as a proportion of a participant's total energy, resulting in substantial variation between individual nut doses. Whether the energy value of nuts was adjusted for in the total diet may also influence the results. We did not consider in our subgroup analysis whether the energy provided by nuts was accounted for by dietary modeling or advice to substitute other foods or nuts, though there is evidence suggesting that energy-restricted diets are effective in improving the blood lipid profile [208] and blood pressure [209]. This highlights the importance of total energy intake and should be considered in future meta-analyses. Further, energy-restricted diet studies that were designed for weight loss were included in this analysis. As weight loss is a significant contributor to improving CVD risk factors, it is challenging to determine whether the effects observed from this review were from nuts alone or if further benefits were obtained from the additional weight loss. The design of the control arm may have also impacted our results; for example, Agebratt et al. [73] compared nut intake with a control intervention (that is, fruit), which may have potentially influenced the control effects. A previous meta-analysis has highlighted the potential impact of control groups on underestimating intervention effects in weight-loss RCTs [210]. Thus, RCTs that aim to explore the influence of specific foods should carefully design the dietary intervention and control arms to avoid a total energy increase to skew results. Despite these challenges, the most recent meta-analyses of prospective cohort studies in this field [21] have shown an inverse association between nut consumption and CVD incidence and mortality. Taken together, this review provides the most recent evidence that the findings from RCTs conducted in highly controlled conditions support the findings from observational studies that reflect free-living populations.

This review has several strengths and limitations. A notable strength was that the processes followed current guidelines in review conduct, reporting, and analysis. The review is grounded in the evidence with findings aligned to previous reviews of observational studies and 1 review of randomized and nonrandomized trials. We considered a range of outcomes associated with CVD, including blood lipids, apolpoproteins, and blood pressure. In a recent review by the authors, the effects of nuts and inflammation (c-reactive protein, adiponectin, tumor necrosis factor alpha, interleukin-6, intercellular adhesion molecule 1, and vascular cell adhesion molecule 1) reported nonsignificant changes because of a lack of consistent available evidence, and as a result, such variables were not included in this review [211]. However, we recognize that the outcomes explored in this review are not interchangeable with disease endpoints such as CVD mortality and morbidity. The range of population groups addressed in the included studies of this review may be considered both a strength and a limitation. The populations included some groups who had existing risk factors for CVD, such as overweight and type 2 diabetes mellitus, whereas others were considered "healthy" populations. Because of the existing comorbidities, the effect size of some studies may appear greater than if all studies targeted a healthy population. For cross-over trials, there were no additional exclusion criteria applied, which meant studies using this design were not required to meet a "sufficient" wash-out period for inclusion in this review. This may have resulted in potential carryover effects, though the potential impact on the results was considered in the quality appraisal. These above-mentioned points need to be considered when interpreting the findings.

The heterogeneity of the evidence included can also be considered a limitation. Variation existed because of study design and duration, participant health status, nut type, and dose, although these factors were explored in subgroup analyses. In particular, relatively few studies in some nut types (Brazil nut, cashew nut, hazelnut, macadamia, and pecan) limit the statistical power to detect a potential interaction that needs to be considered in relation to the whole body of evidence. Of the different tree nut types, all tree nuts except chestnuts were addressed in the body of evidence that was reviewed. The lower fat profile of chestnuts suggests that they could mechanistically work differently from other nut types [212]. In addition, pine nuts were only included in 1 study as part of mixed nuts consumed by participants [171]. Thought should be given to the variability of nuts as a food group, as there are a number of methodological challenges relating to the study of dietary patterns and CVD. One major challenge is related to the way food groups are formed and the limitations of the different food composition databases used to analyze the outcomes, especially if energy is adjusted [213]. Background diets also varied between studies, with some prescribing dietary guidelines, whereas others advised participants to follow their habitual diet, which may have varied considerably between individuals. For 1 study, the PREDIMED study [65-67], we considered the olive oil arm to be the control arm when compared with the other Mediterranean diet arms. The authors acknowledge that olive oil provides unsaturated fats and has been associated with lipid-lowering properties. This comparison, however, eliminates the confounding nature of the overall Mediterranean

diet, allowing for the comparison between nut and olive oil consumption. Similarly, 1 study [176] also included seeds in their control diet. Although linseeds have a similar nutrient profile to nuts, a meta-analysis reported particular doses and participant characteristics to influence the lipid-lowering effect [214]. Analysis of funnel plots suggested the results for LDL cholesterol, HDL cholesterol, TC, TG, SBP, and DBP may have been influenced by small study effects, which may be caused by publication bias. This resulted in downgrading the quality of evidence for these outcomes. Finally, although we were unable to explore the distribution of the published data included in this meta-analysis, several studies reported median values rather than means, which may suggest that some of the data was skewed and may have impacted our analyses.

In conclusion, this systematic review and meta-analysis of the effects of tree nut and peanut consumption on improving risk of CVD finds evidence of significantly favorable effects on LDL cholesterol, TC, TG, TC:HDL cholesterol, LDL cholesterol:HDL cholesterol, and apoB. The nonsignificant differences in SBP and DBP suggest a lack of consistent evidence for the effects of tree nuts and peanuts on blood pressure. The results should also be interpreted with caution because of the large variation in the included studies. The findings of this review provide further insight into the combined effect that tree nuts and peanuts do not simply display positive changes to 1 biomarker of CVD risk but a range of biomarkers to create an overall risk reduction. The findings of this review also build on previous observational and intervention meta-analyses, which have shown an inverse association between nut consumption and risk of CVD. Although stronger effects are observed for tree nut and peanut consumption of >60 g/d for LDL cholesterol and TC, most dietary guidelines recommend the consumption of 15-30 g as a serving size. Importantly, this review shows a reduction in LDL cholesterol, TC, TG, TC:HDL cholesterol, LDL cholesterol:HDL cholesterol, and apoB, and an increase in HDL with the consumption of  $\leq$  30 g/d of nuts, supporting dietary guidelines. As consumers are not currently meeting these recommendations, public health messaging is needed to support reasons for consumers to increase their intake of nuts, which also have favorable effects on risk of CVD.

# Acknowledgments

We thank Dr. Vivienne Guan for her contribution to the scoping review, which set the foundations for this systematic review. We also thank Ms. Elizabeth Sherry for her help with quality checking (source data verification).

The authors' responsibilities were as follows—LH: designed and conducted the research, performed the literature search, wrote the initial draft, and had primary responsibility for final content; LH, EPN, and YCP: performed data screening; LH and MCS: performed data extraction; EPN: performed quality assessment; and all authors: read and approved the final manuscript.

# Data availability

The data used in this review are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

# Funding

This research was funded by the Australian Nut Industry Council Ltd, which did not provide any input into the design, collection, analysis, interpretation of the data, or manuscript writing.

# Author disclosures

EPN has previously received funding from the International Nut and Dried Fruit Council. In addition, EPN and YCP have previously received funding from the California Walnut Commission. LH and MCS, no conflicts of interest.

### Appendix A. Supplementary data

Supplementary data to this article can be found online at https://doi.org/10.1016/j.advnut.2023.05.004.

### References

- [1] Cardiovascular diseases (CVDs) key facts [Internet], World Health Organization (2021) [cited 21 April, 2022]. Available from: https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/cardiovasculardiseases-(cvds.
- [2] S. Anand, C. Bradshaw, D. Prabhakaran, Prevention and management of CVD in LMICs: why do ethnicity, culture, and context matter? BMC Med 18 (1) (2020) 7, https://doi.org/10.1186/s12916-019-1480-9.
- [3] E.P. Neale, L.C. Tapsell, Nuts in Healthy dietary Patterns and Dietary Guidelines, in: C. Alasalvar, J. Salas-Salvado, E. Ros, J. Sabate (Eds.), Health Benefits of Nuts and Dried Fruits, Taylor & Francis Group, Boca Raton, FL, 2020.
- [4] A. Herforth, M. Arimond, C. Álvarez-Sánchez, J. Coates, K. Christianson, E. Muehlhoff, A global review of food-based dietary guidelines, Adv. Nutr. 10 (4) (2019) 590–605, https://doi.org/ 10.1093/advances/nmy130.
- [5] R.C. Brown, A.R. Gray, L.C. Yong, A. Chisholm, S.L. Leong, S.L. Tey, A comparison of perceptions of nuts between the general public, dietitians, general practitioners, and nurses, PeerJ 6 (2018), e5500, https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.5500.
- [6] L.C. Yong, A.R. Gray, A. Chisholm, S.L. Leong, S.L. Tey, R.C. Brown, Barriers to and facilitators and perceptions of nut consumption among the general population in New Zealand, Public Health Nutr 20 (17) (2017) 3166–3182, https://doi.org/10.1017/S1368980017002464.
- [7] R. Pawlak, S. Colby, J. Herring, Beliefs, benefits, barriers, attitude, intake and knowledge about peanuts and tree nuts among WIC participants in eastern North Carolina, Nutr. Res. Pract. 3 (3) (2009) 220–225, https://doi.org/10.4162/nrp.2009.3.3.220.
- [8] R. Pawlak, H. London, S. Colby, E. WallBassett, N. Sira, Perception of nut intake among individuals with or at risk for heart disease and/or diabetes, J. Behav. Health. 1 (3) (2012) 185–188, https://doi.org/ 10.5455/jbh.20120501060143.
- [9] C.J. Nikodijevic, Y.C. Probst, S.Y. Tan, E.P. Neale, The effects of tree nut and peanut consumption on energy compensation and energy expenditure: a systematic review and meta-analysis, Adv. Nutr. 14 (1) (2023) 77–98.
- [10] Y.C. Probst, V.X. Guan, K. Kent, Dietary phytochemical intake from foods and health outcomes: a systematic review protocol and preliminary scoping, BMJ Open 7 (2) (2017), e013337, https:// doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2016-013337.
- [11] E. Bitok, J. Sabaté, Nuts and cardiovascular disease, Prog. Cardiovasc. Dis. 61 (1) (2018) 33–37, https://doi.org/10.1016/ j.pcad.2018.05.003.
- [12] J. Sabaté, K. Oda, E. Ros, Nut consumption and blood lipid levels: a pooled analysis of 25 intervention trials, Arch. Intern. Med. 170 (9) (2010) 821–827, https://doi.org/10.1001/archinternmed.2010.79.
- [13] D.J. Jenkins, C.W. Kendall, A.R. Josse, S. Salvatore, F. Brighenti, L.S. Augustin, et al., Almonds decrease postprandial glycemia, insulinemia, and oxidative damage in healthy individuals, J. Nutr. 136 (12) (2006) 2987–2992, https://doi.org/10.1093/jn/136.12.2987.

- [14] S.M. Downs, J. Fanzo, Is a cardio-protective diet sustainable? A review of the synergies and tensions between foods that promote the health of the heart and the planet, Curr. Nutr. Rep. 4 (4) (2015) 313–322, https://doi.org/10.1007/s13668-015-0142-6.
- [15] R.G.M. De Souza, R.M. Schincaglia, G.D. Pimentel, J.F. Mota, Nuts and human health outcomes: a systematic review, Nutrients 9 (12) (2017) 1311, https://doi.org/10.3390/nu9121311.
- [16] A.J. Mayhew, R.J. de Souza, D. Meyre, S.S. Anand, A. Mente, A systematic review and meta-analysis of nut consumption and incident risk of CVD and all-cause mortality, Br. J. Nutr. 115 (2) (2016) 212–225, https://doi.org/10.1017/S0007114515004316.
- [17] D. Aune, N. Keum, E. Giovannucci, L.T. Fadnes, P. Boffetta, D.C. Greenwood, et al., Nut consumption and risk of cardiovascular disease, total cancer, all-cause and cause-specific mortality: a systematic review and dose-response meta-analysis of prospective studies, BMC Med 14 (1) (2016) 207, https://doi.org/10.1186/s12916-016-0730-3.
- [18] C. Luo, Y. Zhang, Y. Ding, Z. Shan, S. Chen, M. Yu, et al., Nut consumption and risk of type 2 diabetes, cardiovascular disease, and all-cause mortality: a systematic review and meta-analysis, Am. J. Clin. Nutr. 100 (1) (2014) 256–269, https://doi.org/10.3945/ ajcn.113.076109.
- [19] D. Zhou, H. Yu, F. He, K.H. Reilly, J. Zhang, S. Li, et al., Nut consumption in relation to cardiovascular disease risk and type 2 diabetes: a systematic review and meta-analysis of prospective studies, Am. J. Clin. Nutr. 100 (1) (2014) 270–277, https://doi.org/10.3945/ ajcn.113.079152.
- [20] G. Grosso, J. Yang, S. Marventano, A. Micek, F. Galvano, S.N. Kales, Nut consumption on all-cause, cardiovascular, and cancer mortality risk: a systematic review and meta-analysis of epidemiologic studies, Am. J. Clin. Nutr. 101 (4) (2015) 783–793, https://doi.org/10.3945/ ajcn.114.099515.
- [21] N. Becerra-Tomás, I. Paz-Graniel, C.W.C. Kendall, H. Kahleova, D. Rahelić, J.L. Sievenpiper, et al., Nut consumption and incidence of cardiovascular diseases and cardiovascular disease mortality: a metaanalysis of prospective cohort studies, Nutr. Rev. 77 (10) (2019) 691–709, https://doi.org/10.1093/nutrit/nuz042.
- [22] L.C. Del Gobbo, M.C. Falk, R. Feldman, K. Lewis, D. Mozaffarian, Effects of tree nuts on blood lipids, apolipoproteins, and blood pressure: systematic review, meta-analysis, and dose-response of 61 controlled intervention trials, Am. J. Clin. Nutr. 102 (6) (2015) 1347–1356, https://doi.org/10.3945/ajcn.115.110965.
- [23] O.J. Phung, S.S. Makanji, C.M. White, C.I. Coleman, Almonds have a neutral effect on serum lipid profiles: a meta-analysis of randomized trials, J. Am. Diet. Assoc. 109 (5) (2009) 865–873, https://doi.org/ 10.1016/j.jada.2009.02.014.
- [24] M.A. Lee-Bravatti, J. Wang, E.E. Avendano, L. King, E.J. Johnson, G. Raman, Almond consumption and risk factors for cardiovascular disease: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials, Adv. Nutr. 10 (6) (2019) 1076–1088, https:// doi.org/10.1093/advances/nmz043.
- [25] M. Jalali, M. Karamizadeh, G.A. Ferns, M. Zare, S.P. Moosavian, M. Akbarzadeh, The effects of cashew nut intake on lipid profile and blood pressure: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials, Complement, Ther. Med. 50 (2020) 102387, https:// doi.org/10.1016/j.ctim.2020.102387.
- [26] N. Mohammadifard, F. Haghighatdoost, M. Mansourian, R. Hassannejhad, M. Sadeghi, H. Roohafza, et al., Long-term association of nut consumption and cardiometabolic risk factors, Nutr. Metab. Cardiovasc. Dis. 29 (9) (2019) 972–982, https://doi.org/ 10.1016/j.numecd.2019.04.014.
- [27] B. Jafari Azad, E. Daneshzad, L. Azadbakht, Peanut and cardiovascular disease risk factors: a systematic review and meta-analysis, Crit. Rev. Food Sci. Nutr. 60 (7) (2020) 1123–1140, https://doi.org/10.1080/ 10408398.2018.1558395.
- [28] A. Hadi, O. Asbaghi, M. Kazemi, H.K. Haghighian, A. Pantovic, E. Ghaedi, et al., Consumption of pistachio nuts positively affects lipid profiles: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials, Crit. Rev. Food Sci. Nutr. (2021) 1–14, https:// doi.org/10.1080/10408398.2021.2018569.
- [29] D.K. Banel, F.B. Hu, Effects of walnut consumption on blood lipids and other cardiovascular risk factors: a meta-analysis and systematic review, Am. J. Clin. Nutr. 90 (1) (2009) 56–63, https://doi.org/ 10.3945/ajcn.2009.27457.
- [30] EFSA Panel on Dietetic Products, Nutrition and Allergies (NDA), Scientific opinion on the substantiation of health claims related to walnuts and maintenance of normal blood LDL-cholesterol

concentrations (ID 1156, 1158) and improvement of endotheliumdependent vasodilation (ID 1155, 1157) pursuant to Article 13(1) of Regulation (EC) No 1924/2006, EFSA J 9 (4) (2011) 2074.

- [31] Food Standards Australia and New Zealand (FSANZ), Systematic Review of the Evidence for a Relationship Between Walnuts and Endothelium-Dependent Vasodilation, FSANZ, 2014.
- [32] United States Food and Drug Administration (FDA), Petition for a Qualified Health Claim for Macadamia Nuts and Reduced Risk of Coronary Heart Disease, 2016 (Docket No. FDA-2015-Q-4850).
- [33] United States Food and Drug Administration (FDA), Qualified Health Claims: Letter of Enforcement Discretion –Nuts and Coronary Heart Disease, Docket No 02P-0505), 2003.
- [34] United States Food and Drug Administration (FDA), Qualified Health Claims: Letter of Enforcement Discretion –Walnuts and Coronary Heart Disease, 2004. Docket No 02P-0292).
- [35] M.J. Page, J.E. McKenzie, P.M. Bossuyt, I. Boutron, T.C. Hoffmann, C.D. Mulrow, et al., The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews, BMJ 372 (2021) n71, https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71.
- [36] L. Rosen, R. Suhami, The art and science of study identification: a comparative analysis of two systematic reviews, BMC Med. Res. Methodol. 16 (1) (2016) 24, https://doi.org/10.1186/s12874-016-0118-2.
- [37] W.M. Bramer, M.L. Rethlefsen, J. Kleijnen, O.H. Franco, Optimal database combinations for literature searches in systematic reviews: a prospective exploratory study, Syst. Rev. 6 (1) (2017) 245, https:// doi.org/10.1186/s13643-017-0644-y.
- [38] R.C. Brown, S.L. Tey, A.R. Gray, A. Chisholm, C. Smith, E. Fleming, et al., Association of nut consumption with cardiometabolic risk factors in the 2008/2009 New Zealand Adult Nutrition Survey, Nutrients 7 (9) (2015) 7523–7542, https://doi.org/10.3390/ nu7095351.
- [39] L. Houston, Y. Probst, A. Humphries, Measuring data quality through a source data verification audit in a clinical research setting, Stud. Health Technol. Inform. 214 (2015) 107–113.
- [40] J.P. Higgins, J. Thomas, J. Chandler, M. Cumpston, T. Li, M.J. Page, et al., Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions, John Wiley & Sons, 2019.
- [41] R. Estruch, E. Ros, J. Salas-Salvadó, M.I. Covas, D. Corella, F. Arós, et al., Primary prevention of cardiovascular disease with a Mediterranean diet, N. Engl. J. Med. 368 (14) (2013) 1279–1290, https://doi.org/ 10.1056/NEJMoa1200303.
- [42] J.P.T. Higgins, J. Thomas, J. Chandler, M. Cumpston, T. Li, M.J. Page, et al., Section 6-5-2-4. Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions version 6.2 (updated February 2021), in: Transformations and Skewed Data, 2021. Cochrane.
- [43] X. Wan, W. Wang, J. Liu, T. Tong, Estimating the sample mean and standard deviation from the sample size, median, range and/or interquartile range, BMC Med. Res. Methodol. 14 (1) (2014) 135, https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2288-14-135.
- [44] J.P. Higgins, S.G. Thompson, J.J. Deeks, D.G. Altman, Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses, BMJ 327 (7414) (2003) 557–560, https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.327.7414.557.
- [45] E. Viguiliouk, C.W. Kendall, S. Blanco Mejia, A.I. Cozma, V. Ha, A. Mirrahimi, et al., Effect of tree nuts on glycemic control in diabetes: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled dietary trials, PLOS ONE 9 (7) (2014), e103376, https://doi.org/ 10.1371/journal.pone.0103376.
- [46] S. Blanco Mejia, C.W.C. Kendall, E. Viguiliouk, L.S. Augustin, V. Ha, A.I. Cozma, et al., Effect of tree nuts on metabolic syndrome criteria: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials, BMJ Open 4 (7) (2014), e004660, https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2013-004660.
- [47] E.P. Neale, V. Guan, L.C. Tapsell, Y.C. Probst, Effect of walnut consumption on markers of blood glucose control: a systematic review and meta-analysis, Br. J. Nutr. 124 (7) (2020) 641–653, https:// doi.org/10.1017/S0007114520001415.
- [48] Health Canada, Guidance Document for Preparing a Submission for Food Health Claims, Bureau of Nutritional Sciences FD, Health Products and Food Branch, 2009.
- [49] G.H. Guyatt, A.D. Oxman, G.E. Vist, R. Kunz, Y. Falck-Ytter, P. Alonso-Coello, et al., GRADE: an emerging consensus on rating quality of evidence and strength of recommendations, BMJ 336 (7650) (2008) 924–926, https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.39489.470347.AD.
- [50] K. Choudhury, J. Clark, H.R. Griffiths, An almond-enriched diet increases plasma  $\alpha$ -tocopherol and improves vascular function but

does not affect oxidative stress markers or lipid levels, Free Radic. Res. 48 (5) (2014) 599–606, https://doi.org/10.3109/10715762.2014.896458.

- [51] G.E. Fraser, H.W. Bennett, K.B. Jaceldo, J. Sabaté, Effect on body weight of a free 76 kilojoule (320 calorie) daily supplement of almonds for six months, J. Am. Coll. Nutr. 21 (3) (2002) 275–283, https://doi.org/10.1080/07315724.2002.10719221.
- [52] R.R. Holt, S.J. Yim, G.C. Shearer, R.M. Hackman, D. Djurica, J.W. Newman, et al., Effects of short-term walnut consumption on human microvascular function and its relationship to plasma epoxide content, J. Nutr. Biochem. 26 (12) (2015) 1458–1466, https:// doi.org/10.1016/j.jnutbio.2015.07.012.
- [53] K. Jaceldo-Siegl, J. Sabaté, M. Batech, G.E. Fraser, Influence of body mass index and serum lipids on the cholesterol-lowering effects of almonds in free-living individuals, Nutr. Metab. Cardiovasc. Dis. 21 (suppl 1) (2011) S7–S13, https://doi.org/10.1016/ i.numecd.2011.03.007.
- [54] A. Khorramirad, S. Heidari, M. Parham, S.A. Jang, M. Hozoori, Pistachio nut effects on the blood lipid profile in patients with type II diabetes mellitus: a single-blind randomized crossover controlled clinical trial, Iran, Heart J 22 (3) (2021) 23–32.
- [55] R.P.A. Lima, R.A.F. do Nascimento, R.C.P. Luna, D.C. Persuhn, A.S. da Silva, M. da Conceição Rodrigues Gonçalves, et al., Effect of a diet containing folate and hazelnut oil capsule on the methylation level of the ADRB3 gene, lipid profile and oxidative stress in overweight or obese women, Clin. Epigenet. 9 (2017) 110, https://doi.org/10.1186/ s13148-017-0407-6.
- [56] D.L. McKay, C.Y. Chen, K.J. Yeum, N.R. Matthan, A.H. Lichtenstein, J.B. Blumberg, Chronic and acute effects of walnuts on antioxidant capacity and nutritional status in humans: a randomized, cross-over pilot study, Nutr. J. 9 (2010) 21, https://doi.org/10.1186/1475-2891-9-21.
- [57] O.M. Palacios, K.C. Maki, D. Xiao, M.L. Wilcox, M.R. Dicklin, M. Kramer, et al., Effects of consuming almonds on insulin sensitivity and other cardiometabolic health markers in adults with prediabetes, J. Am. Coll. Nutr. 39 (5) (2020) 397–406, https://doi.org/10.1080/ 07315724.2019.1660929.
- [58] S. Zaveri, S. Drummond, The effect of including a conventional snack (cereal bar) and a nonconventional snack (almonds) on hunger, eating frequency, dietary intake and body weight, J. Hum. Nutr. Diet. 22 (5) (2009) 461–468, https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-277X.2009.00983.x.
- [59] M.J. Zibaeenezhad, M. Rezaiezadeh, A. Mowla, S.M. Ayatollahi, M.R. Panjehshahin, Antihypertriglyceridemic effect of walnut oil, Angiology 54 (4) (2003) 411–414, https://doi.org/10.1177/ 000331970305400404.
- [60] M.J. Zibaeenezhad, S.J. Shamsnia, M. Khorasani, Walnut consumption in hyperlipidemic patients, Angiology 56 (5) (2005) 581–583, https:// doi.org/10.1177/000331970505600509.
- [61] J. Madan, S. Desai, P. Moitra, S. Salis, S. Agashe, R. Battalwar, et al., Effect of almond consumption on metabolic risk factors–glucose metabolism, hyperinsulinemia, selected markers of inflammation: a randomized controlled trial in adolescents and young adults, Front. Nutr. 8 (363) (2021) 668622, https://doi.org/10.3389/ fnut.2021.668622.
- [62] L.C. Tapsell, M.J. Batterham, G. Teuss, S.Y. Tan, S. Dalton, C.J. Quick, et al., Long-term effects of increased dietary polyunsaturated fat from walnuts on metabolic parameters in type II diabetes, Eur. J. Clin. Nutr. 63 (8) (2009) 1008–1015, https://doi.org/10.1038/ejcn.2009.19.
- [63] L.C. Tapsell, M. Lonergan, M.J. Batterham, E.P. Neale, A. Martin, R. Thorne, et al., Effect of interdisciplinary care on weight loss: a randomised controlled trial, BMJ Open 7 (7) (2017), e014533, https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2016-014533.
- [64] P. Casas-Agustench, P. López-Uriarte, M. Bulló, E. Ros, J.J. Cabré-Vila, J. Salas-Salvadó, Effects of one serving of mixed nuts on serum lipids, insulin resistance and inflammatory markers in patients with the metabolic syndrome, Nutr. Metab. Cardiovasc. Dis. 21 (2) (2011) 126–135, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.numecd.2009.08.005.
- [65] M. Urpi-Sarda, R. Casas, G. Chiva-Blanch, E.S. Romero-Mamani, P. Valderas-Martínez, J. Salas-Salvadó, et al., The Mediterranean diet pattern and its main components are associated with lower plasma concentrations of tumor necrosis factor receptor 60 in patients at high risk for cardiovascular disease, J. Nutr. 142 (6) (2012) 1019–1025, https://doi.org/10.3945/jn.111.148726.
- [66] R. Casas, M. Urpi-Sardà, E. Sacanella, S. Arranz, D. Corella, O. Castañer, et al., Anti-inflammatory effects of the Mediterranean diet

in the early and late stages of atheroma plaque development, Mediators Inflamm (2017) 3674390, https://doi.org/10.1155/2017/ 3674390, 2017.

- [67] M. Urpi-Sarda, R. Casas, E. Sacanella, D. Corella, C. Andrés-Lacueva, R. Llorach, et al., The 3-year effect of the Mediterranean diet intervention on inflammatory biomarkers related to cardiovascular disease, Biomedicines 9 (8) (2021), https://doi.org/10.3390/ biomedicines9080862.
- [68] T. Le, S.W. Flatt, L. Natarajan, B. Pakiz, E.L. Quintana, D.D. Heath, et al., Effects of diet composition and insulin resistance status on plasma lipid levels in a weight loss intervention in women, J. Am. Heart Assoc. 5 (1) (2016), https://doi.org/10.1161/JAHA.115.002771.
- [69] C.L. Rock, S.W. Flatt, B. Pakiz, E.L. Quintana, D.D. Heath, B.K. Rana, et al., Effects of diet composition on weight loss, metabolic factors and biomarkers in a 1-year weight loss intervention in obese women examined by baseline insulin resistance status, Metabolism 65 (11) (2016) 1605–1613, https://doi.org/10.1016/ j.metabol.2016.07.008.
- [70] A. Al Abdrabalnabi, S. Rajaram, E. Bitok, K. Oda, W.L. Beeson, A. Kaur, et al., Effects of supplementing the usual diet with a daily dose of walnuts for two years on metabolic syndrome and its components in an elderly cohort, Nutrients 12 (2) (2020) 451, https://doi.org/ 10.3390/nu12020451.
- [71] C.G. Chen, P. Wang, Z.Q. Zhang, Y.B. Ye, S.Y. Zhuo, Q. Zhou, et al., Effects of plant oils with different fatty acid composition on cardiovascular risk factors in moderately hypercholesteremic Chinese adults: a randomized, double-blinded, parallel-designed trial, Food Funct 11 (8) (2020) 7164–7174, https://doi.org/10.1039/d0fo00875c.
- [72] G.D. Foster, K.L. Shantz, S.S. Vander Veur, T.L. Oliver, M.R. Lent, A. Virus, et al., A randomized trial of the effects of an almondenriched, hypocaloric diet in the treatment of obesity, Am. J. Clin. Nutr. 96 (2) (2012) 249–254, https://doi.org/10.3945/ ajcn.112.037895.
- [73] C. Agebratt, E. Ström, T. Romu, O. Dahlqvist-Leinhard, M. Borga, P. Leandersson, et al., A randomized study of the effects of additional fruit and nuts consumption on hepatic fat content, cardiovascular risk factors and basal metabolic rate, PLOS ONE 11 (1) (2016), e0147149, https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0147149.
- [74] D.J. Baer, J.A. Novotny, Consumption of cashew nuts does not influence blood lipids or other markers of cardiovascular disease in humans: a randomized controlled trial, Am. J. Clin. Nutr. 109 (2) (2019) 269–275, https://doi.org/10.1093/ajcn/nqy242.
- [75] C. Bamberger, A. Rossmeier, K. Lechner, L. Wu, E. Waldmann, R.G. Stark, et al., A walnut-enriched diet reduces lipids in healthy Caucasian subjects, independent of recommended macronutrient replacement and time point of consumption: a prospective, randomized, controlled trial, Nutrients 9 (10) (2017), https://doi.org/ 10.3390/nu9101097.
- [76] B. Burns-Whitmore, E. Haddad, J. Sabaté, S. Rajaram, Effects of supplementing n-3 fatty acid enriched eggs and walnuts on cardiovascular disease risk markers in healthy free-living lacto-ovovegetarians: a randomized, crossover, free-living intervention study, Nutr. J. 13 (2014) 29, https://doi.org/10.1186/1475-2891-13-29.
- [77] A. Chisholm, K. Mc Auley, J. Mann, S. Williams, M. Skeaff, Cholesterol lowering effects of nuts compared with a Canola oil enriched cereal of similar fat composition, Nutr. Metab. Cardiovasc. Dis. 15 (4) (2005) 284–292, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.numecd.2005.01.006.
- [78] D.M. Colquhoun, J.A. Humphries, D. Moores, S.M. Somerset, Effects of a macadamia nut enriched diet on serum lipids and lipoproteins compared to a low fat diet, Food Australia 48 (5) (1996) 216–221.
- [79] J.D. Curb, G. Wergowske, J.C. Dobbs, R.D. Abbott, B. Huang, Serum lipid effects of a high-monounsaturated fat diet based on macadamia nuts, Arch. Intern. Med. 160 (8) (2000) 1154–1158, https://doi.org/ 10.1001/archinte.160.8.1154.
- [80] J. Dhillon, M. Thorwald, N. De La Cruz, E. Vu, S.A. Asghar, Q. Kuse, et al., Glucoregulatory and cardiometabolic profiles of almond vs. cracker snacking for 8 weeks in young adults: a randomized controlled trial, Nutrients 10 (8) (2018), https://doi.org/10.3390/nu10080960.
- [81] J.N. Din, S.M. Aftab, A.W. Jubb, F.H. Carnegy, K. Lyall, J. Sarma, et al., Effect of moderate walnut consumption on lipid profile, arterial stiffness and platelet activation in humans, Eur. J. Clin. Nutr. 65 (2) (2011) 234–239, https://doi.org/10.1038/ejcn.2010.233.
- [82] J. Hiraoka-Yamamoto, K. Ikeda, H. Negishi, M. Mori, A. Hirose, S. Sawada, et al., Serum lipid effects of a monounsaturated (palmitoleic) fatty acid-rich diet based on macadamia nuts in healthy, young Japanese women, Clin. Exp. Pharmacol. Physiol. 31

#### L. Houston et al.

(suppl 2) (2004) S37–S38, https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1440-1681.2004.04121.x.

- [83] H.D. Holscher, H.M. Guetterman, K.S. Swanson, R. An, N.R. Matthan, A.H. Lichtenstein, et al., Walnut consumption alters the gastrointestinal microbiota, microbially derived secondary bile acids, and health markers in healthy adults: a randomized controlled trial, J. Nutr. 148 (6) (2018) 861–867, https://doi.org/10.1093/jn/ nxy004.
- [84] M. Iwamoto, K. Imaizumi, M. Sato, Y. Hirooka, K. Sakai, A. Takeshita, et al., Serum lipid profiles in Japanese women and men during consumption of walnuts, Eur. J. Clin. Nutr. 56 (7) (2002) 629–637, https://doi.org/10.1038/sj.ejcn.1601400.
- [85] X. Jia, N. Li, W. Zhang, X. Zhang, K. Lapsley, G. Huang, et al., A pilot study on the effects of almond consumption on DNA damage and oxidative stress in smokers, Nutr. Cancer. 54 (2) (2006) 179–183, https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327914nc5402\_4.
- [86] A. Kamoun, O. Hammouda, M. Turki, R. Maaloul, M. Chtourou, M. Bouaziz, et al., Moderate walnut consumption improved lipid profile, steroid hormones and inflammation in trained elderly men: a pilot study with a randomized controlled trial, Biol. Sport. 38 (2) (2021) 245–252, https://doi.org/10.5114/ biolsport.2020.97676.
- [87] A. Kocyigit, A.A. Koylu, H. Keles, Effects of pistachio nuts consumption on plasma lipid profile and oxidative status in healthy volunteers, Nutr. Metab. Cardiovasc. Dis. 16 (3) (2006) 202–209, https://doi.org/ 10.1016/j.numecd.2005.08.004.
- [88] P.M. Kris-Etherton, T.A. Pearson, Y. Wan, R.L. Hargrove, K. Moriarty, V. Fishell, et al., High-monounsaturated fatty acid diets lower both plasma cholesterol and triacylglycerol concentrations, Am. J. Clin. Nutr. 70 (6) (1999) 1009–1015, https://doi.org/10.1093/ajcn/ 70.6.1009.
- [89] S.B. Kurlandsky, K.S. Stote, Cardioprotective effects of chocolate and almond consumption in healthy women, Nutr. Res. 26 (10) (2006) 509–516, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nutres.2006.08.007.
- [90] Y. Liu, H.J. Hwang, H.S. Kim, H. Park, Time and intervention effects of daily almond intake on the changes of lipid profile and body composition among free-living healthy adults, J. Med. Food. 21 (4) (2018) 340–347, https://doi.org/10.1089/jmf.2017.3976.
- [91] E. Mah, J.A. Schulz, V.N. Kaden, A.L. Lawless, J. Rotor, L.B. Mantilla, et al., Cashew consumption reduces total and LDL cholesterol: a randomized, crossover, controlled-feeding trial, Am. J. Clin. Nutr. 105 (5) (2017) 1070–1078, https://doi.org/10.3945/ajcn.116.150037.
- [92] W.A. Morgan, B.J. Clayshulte, Pecans lower low-density lipoprotein cholesterol in people with normal lipid levels, J. Am. Diet Assoc. 100 (3) (2000) 312–318, https://doi.org/10.1016/S0002-8223(00)00097-3.
- [93] S. Rajaram, K. Burke, B. Connell, T. Myint, J. Sabaté, A monounsaturated fatty acid-rich pecan-enriched diet favorably alters the serum lipid profile of healthy men and women, J. Nutr. 131 (9) (2001) 2275–2279, https://doi.org/10.1093/jn/ 131.9.2275.
- [94] S. Rajaram, K.M. Connell, J. Sabaté, Effect of almond-enriched highmonounsaturated fat diet on selected markers of inflammation: a randomised, controlled, crossover study, Br. J. Nutr. 103 (6) (2010) 907–912, https://doi.org/10.1017/S0007114509992480.
- [95] J. Sabaté, E. Haddad, J.S. Tanzman, P. Jambazian, S. Rajaram, Serum lipid response to the graduated enrichment of a Step I diet with almonds: a randomized feeding trial, Am. J. Clin. Nutr. 77 (6) (2003) 1379–1384, https://doi.org/10.1093/ajcn/77.6.1379.
- [96] J. Sabaté, Z. Cordero-Macintyre, G. Siapco, S. Torabian, E. Haddad, Does regular walnut consumption lead to weight gain? Br. J. Nutr. 94 (5) (2005) 859–864, https://doi.org/10.1079/bjn20051567.
- [97] J. Sabaté, G.E. Fraser, K. Burke, S.F. Knutsen, H. Bennett, K.D. Lindsted, Effects of walnuts on serum lipid levels and blood pressure in normal men, N. Engl. J. Med. 328 (9) (1993) 603–607, https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJM199303043280902.
- [98] S. Torabian, E. Haddad, Z. Cordero-MacIntyre, J. Tanzman, M.L. Fernandez, J. Sabate, Long-term walnut supplementation without dietary advice induces favorable serum lipid changes in free-living individuals, Eur. J. Clin. Nutr. 64 (3) (2010) 274–279, https://doi.org/ 10.1038/ejcn.2009.152.
- [99] A. Salas-Huetos, R. Moraleda, S. Giardina, E. Anton, J. Blanco, J. Salas-Salvado, et al., Effect of nut consumption on semen quality and functionality in healthy males: a randomized controlled trial, Am. J. Clin. Nutr. 108 (5) (2018) 953–962, https://doi.org/10.1093/ajcn/ nqy181.

#### Advances in Nutrition 14 (2023) 1029-1049

- [100] L. Akuamoah-Boateng, S.S. Iyer, R.L. Sales, P. Lokko, A. Lartey, J.B.R. Monteiro, et al., Effect of peanut oil consumption on energy balance, J. Appl. Res. 2 (2007) 185.
- [101] R.L. Sales, S.B. Coehlo, N.M.B. Costa, J. Bressan, S. Iyer, L.A. Boateng, et al., The effects of peanut oil on lipid profile of normolipidemic adults: a three-country collaborative study, J. Appl. Res. 8 (2) (2008) 216–225.
- [102] K.J. Spaccarotella, P.M. Kris-Etherton, W.L. Stone, D.M. Bagshaw, V.K. Fishell, S.G. West, et al., The effect of walnut intake on factors related to prostate and vascular health in older men, Nutr. J. 7 (2008) 13, https://doi.org/10.1186/1475-2891-7-13.
- [103] S.Y. Tan, R.D. Mattes, Appetitive, dietary and health effects of almonds consumed with meals or as snacks: a randomized, controlled trial, Eur. J. Clin. Nutr. 67 (11) (2013) 1205–1214, https://doi.org/10.1038/ ejcn.2013.184.
- [104] L. Wu, K. Piotrowski, T. Rau, E. Waldmann, U.C. Broedl,
  H. Demmelmair, et al., Walnut-enriched diet reduces fasting non-HDLcholesterol and apolipoprotein B in healthy Caucasian subjects: a randomized controlled cross-over clinical trial, Metabolism 63 (3) (2014) 382–391, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.metabol.2013.11.005.
- [105] S.L. Tey, R. Brown, A. Gray, A. Chisholm, C. Delahunty, Nuts improve diet quality compared to other energy-dense snacks while maintaining body weight, J. Nutr. Metab. 2011 (2011) 357350, https://doi.org/ 10.1155/2011/357350.
- [106] Z. Abazarfard, M. Salehi, S. Keshavarzi, The effect of almonds on anthropometric measurements and lipid profile in overweight and obese females in a weight reduction program: a randomized controlled clinical trial, J. Res. Med. Sci. 19 (5) (2014) 457–464.
- [107] N. Abbaspour, T. Roberts, S. Hooshmand, M. Kern, M.Y. Hong, Mixed nut consumption may improve cardiovascular disease risk factors in overweight and obese adults, Nutrients 11 (7) (2019), https://doi.org/ 10.3390/nu11071488.
- [108] R.D. Moreira Alves, A.P. Boroni Moreira, V.S. Macedo, J. Bressan, R. de Cássia Gonçalves Alfenas, R. Mattes, et al., High-oleic peanuts: new perspective to attenuate glucose homeostasis disruption and inflammation related obesity, Obesity (Silver Spring). 22 (9) (2014) 1981–1988, https://doi.org/10.1002/oby.20825.
- [109] J.A. Barbour, P.R. Howe, J.D. Buckley, J. Bryan, A.M. Coates, Effect of 12 weeks high oleic peanut consumption on cardio-metabolic risk factors and body composition, Nutrients 7 (9) (2015) 7381–7398, https://doi.org/10.3390/nu7095343.
- [110] J. Bowen, N.D. Luscombe-Marsh, W. Stonehouse, C. Tran, G.B. Rogers, N. Johnson, et al., Effects of almond consumption on metabolic function and liver fat in overweight and obese adults with elevated fasting blood glucose: a randomised controlled trial, Clin. Nutr. ESPEN. 30 (2019) 10–18, https://doi.org/10.1016/ j.clnesp.2018.12.088.
- [111] A. Canales, J. Benedí, M. Nus, J. Librelotto, J.M. Sánchez-Montero, F.J. Sánchez-Muniz, Effect of walnut-enriched restructured meat in the antioxidant status of overweight/obese senior subjects with at least one extra CHD-risk factor, J. Am. Coll. Nutr. 26 (3) (2007) 225–232, https://doi.org/10.1080/07315724.2007.10719605.
- [112] A.M. Coates, S. Morgillo, C. Yandell, A. Scholey, J.D. Buckley, K.A. Dyer, et al., Effect of a 12-week almond-enriched diet on biomarkers of cognitive performance, mood, and cardiometabolic health in older overweight adults, Nutrients 12 (4) (2020), https:// doi.org/10.3390/nu12041180.
- [113] R.G.M. de Souza, A.C. Gomes, I.A. de Castro, J.F. Mota, A baru almond-enriched diet reduces abdominal adiposity and improves highdensity lipoprotein concentrations: a randomized, placebo-controlled trial, Nutrition 55-56 (2018) 154–160, https://doi.org/10.1016/ j.nut.2018.06.001.
- [114] J. Dhillon, S.Y. Tan, R.D. Mattes, Almond consumption during energy restriction lowers truncal fat and blood pressure in compliant overweight or obese adults, J. Nutr. 146 (12) (2016) 2513–2519, https://doi.org/10.3945/jn.116.238444.
- [115] S. Dusanov, M. Svendsen, J. Ruzzin, H. Kiviranta, H.L. Gulseth, T.O. Klemsdal, et al., Effect of fatty fish or nut consumption on concentrations of persistent organic pollutants in overweight or obese men and women: a randomized controlled clinical trial, Nutr. Metab. Cardiovasc. Dis. 30 (3) (2020) 448–458, https://doi.org/10.1016/ j.numecd.2019.11.006.
- [116] S. Fatahi, F. Haghighatdoost, B. Larijani, L. Azadbakht, Effect of weight reduction diets containing fish, walnut or fish plus walnut on cardiovascular risk factors in overweight and obese women, Arch. Iran. Med. 22 (10) (2019) 574–583.

- [117] C.S. Johnston, K.L. Sweazea, E. Schwab, E.A. McElaney, Almond ingestion contributes to improved cardiovascular health in sedentary older adults participating in a walking intervention: a pilot study, J. Funct. Foods. 39 (2017) 58–62, https://doi.org/10.1016/ j.jff.2017.10.010.
- [118] H. Jung, C.Y.O. Chen, J.B. Blumberg, H.-K. Kwak, The effect of almonds on vitamin E status and cardiovascular risk factors in Korean adults: a randomized clinical trial, Eur. J. Nutr. 57 (2018) 2069–2079, https://doi.org/10.1007/s00394-017-1480-5.
- [119] D.L. Katz, A. Davidhi, Y. Ma, Y. Kavak, L. Bifulco, V.Y. Njike, Effects of walnuts on endothelial function in overweight adults with visceral obesity: a randomized, controlled, crossover trial, J. Am. Coll. Nutr. 31 (6) (2012) 415–423, https://doi.org/10.1080/ 07315724.2012.10720468.
- [120] Y. Lee, C.E. Berryman, S.G. West, C.O. Chen, J.B. Blumberg, K.G. Lapsley, et al., Effects of dark chocolate and almonds on cardiovascular risk factors in overweight and obese individuals: a randomized controlled-feeding trial, J. Am. Heart Assoc. 6 (12) (2017), https://doi.org/10.1161/JAHA.116.005162.
- [121] Z. Li, R. Song, C. Nguyen, A. Zerlin, H. Karp, K. Naowamondhol, et al., Pistachio nuts reduce triglycerides and body weight by comparison to refined carbohydrate snack in obese subjects on a 12-week weight loss program, J. Am. Coll. Nutr. 29 (3) (2010) 198–203, https://doi.org/ 10.1080/07315724.2010.10719834.
- [122] P.A. Maranhão, L.G. Kraemer-Aguiar, C.L. de Oliveira, M.C. Kuschnir, Y.R. Vieira, M.G. Souza, et al., Brazil nuts intake improves lipid profile, oxidative stress and microvascular function in obese adolescents: a randomized controlled trial, Nutr. Metab. (Lond). 8 (1) (2011) 32, https://doi.org/10.1186/1743-7075-8-32.
- [123] D.L. McKay, M. Eliasziw, C.-Y.O. Chen, J.B. Blumberg, A pecan-rich diet improves cardiometabolic risk factors in overweight and obese adults: a randomized controlled trial, Nutrients 10 (3) (2018), https:// doi.org/10.3390/nu10030339.
- [124] C.L. Pelkman, V.K. Fishell, D.H. Maddox, T.A. Pearson, D.T. Mauger, P.M. Kris-Etherton, Effects of moderate-fat (from monounsaturated fat) and low-fat weight-loss diets on the serum lipid profile in overweight and obese men and women, Am. J. Clin. Nutr. 79 (2) (2004) 204–212, https://doi.org/10.1093/ajcn/ 79.2.204.
- [125] C.L. Rock, S.W. Flatt, H.S. Barkai, B. Pakiz, D.D. Heath, Walnut consumption in a weight reduction intervention: effects on body weight, biological measures, blood pressure and satiety, Nutr. J. 16 (1) (2017) 76, https://doi.org/10.1186/s12937-017-0304-z.
- [126] C.L. Rock, E. Zunshine, H.T. Nguyen, A.O. Perez, C. Zoumas, B. Pakiz, et al., Effects of pistachio consumption in a behavioral weight loss intervention on weight change, cardiometabolic factors, and dietary intake, Nutrients 12 (7) (2020), https://doi.org/10.3390/ nu12072155.
- [127] S. Somerset, L. Graham, K. Markwell, D. Colquhoun, Isoenergetic replacement of dietary saturated with monounsaturated fat via macadamia nuts can affect coronary risk in overweight subjects, e-SPEN J. 12 (1) (2013) 143–144.
- [128] S.L. Tey, A.R. Gray, A.W. Chisholm, C.M. Delahunty, R.C. Brown, The dose of hazelnuts influences acceptance and diet quality but not inflammatory markers and body composition in overweight and obese individuals, J. Nutr. 143 (8) (2013) 1254–1262, https://doi.org/ 10.3945/jn.113.174714.
- [129] A.M. Tindall, K.S. Petersen, A.C. Skulas-Ray, C.K. Richter, D.N. Proctor, P.M. Kris-Etherton, Replacing saturated fat with walnuts or vegetable oils improves central blood pressure and serum lipids in adults at risk for cardiovascular disease: a randomized controlledfeeding trial, J. Am. Heart Assoc. 8 (9) (2019), e011512, https:// doi.org/10.1161/JAHA.118.011512.
- [130] J. Wang, S. Wang, S.M. Henning, T. Qin, Y. Pan, J. Yang, et al., Mixed tree nut snacks compared to refined carbohydrate snacks resulted in weight loss and increased satiety during both weight loss and weight maintenance: a 24-week randomized controlled trial, Nutrients 13 (5) (2021) 1512, https://doi.org/10.3390/ nu13051512.
- [131] M.A. Wien, J.M. Sabaté, D.N. Iklé, S.E. Cole, F.R. Kandeel, Almonds vs complex carbohydrates in a weight reduction program, Int. J. Obes. Relat. Metab. Disord. 27 (11) (2003) 1365–1372, https://doi.org/ 10.1038/sj.ijo.0802411.
- [132] P.T. Williams, N. Bergeron, S. Chiu, R.M. Krauss, A randomized, controlled trial on the effects of almonds on lipoprotein response to a

higher carbohydrate, lower fat diet in men and women with abdominal adiposity, Lipids Health Dis 18 (1) (2019) 83, https://doi.org/10.1186/s12944-019-1025-4.

- [133] C.E. Berryman, S.G. West, J.A. Fleming, P.L. Bordi, P.M. Kris-Etherton, Effects of daily almond consumption on cardiometabolic risk and abdominal adiposity in healthy adults with elevated LDL-cholesterol: a randomized controlled trial, J. Am. Heart Assoc. 4 (1) (2015), e000993, https://doi.org/10.1161/JAHA.114.000993.
- [134] A. Chisholm, J. Mann, M. Skeaff, C. Frampton, W. Sutherland, A. Duncan, et al., A diet rich in walnuts favourably influences plasma fatty acid profile in moderately hyperlipidaemic subjects, Eur. J. Clin. Nutr. 52 (1) (1998) 12–16, https://doi.org/10.1038/sj.ejcn.1600507.
- [135] N.R. Damasceno, A. Pérez-Heras, M. Serra, M. Cofán, A. Sala-Vila, J. Salas-Salvadó, et al., Crossover study of diets enriched with virgin olive oil, walnuts or almonds. Effects on lipids and other cardiovascular risk markers, Nutr. Metab. Cardiovasc. Dis. 21 (suppl 1) (2011) S14–S20, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.numecd.2010.12.006.
- [136] V. Deon, C. Del Bo, F. Guaraldi, F. Abello, S. Belviso, M. Porrini, et al., Effect of hazelnut on serum lipid profile and fatty acid composition of erythrocyte phospholipids in children and adolescents with primary hyperlipidemia: a randomized controlled trial, Clin. Nutr. 37 (4) (2018) 1193–1201, https://doi.org/10.1016/ j.clnu.2017.05.022.
- [137] W.A. Eastman, B.J. Clayshulte, Pecan effects on serum lipoproteins and dietary intakes of hyperlipidemic individuals consuming selfselected diets, Fam. Con. Sci. Res. J. 33 (3) (2005) 197–207.
- [138] S.K. Gebauer, S.G. West, C.D. Kay, P. Alaupovic, D. Bagshaw, P.M. Kris-Etherton, Effects of pistachios on cardiovascular disease risk factors and potential mechanisms of action: a dose-response study, Am. J. Clin. Nutr. 88 (3) (2008) 651–659, https://doi.org/10.1093/ ajcn/88.3.651.
- [139] O. Gozde, S.M. Mercanligil, S. Kabaran, S. Ogmen, Effects of walnutenriched diet on blood lipids and glucose profiles in hyperlipidemic subjects: a randomized controlled trial, Prog. Nutr. 21 (4) (2019) 825–835, https://doi.org/10.23751/pn.v21i4.7852.
- [140] A.E. Griel, Y. Cao, D.D. Bagshaw, A.M. Cifelli, B. Holub, P.M. Kris-Etherton, A macadamia nut-rich diet reduces total and LDL-cholesterol in mildly hypercholesterolemic men and women, J. Nutr. 138 (4) (2008) 761–767, https://doi.org/10.1093/jn/138.4.761.
- [141] S.D. Holligan, S.G. West, S.K. Gebauer, C.D. Kay, P.M. Kris-Etherton, A moderate-fat diet containing pistachios improves emerging markers of cardiometabolic syndrome in healthy adults with elevated LDL levels, Br. J. Nutr. 112 (5) (2014) 744–752, https://doi.org/10.1017/ S0007114514001561.
- [142] S.G. West, S.K. Gebauer, C.D. Kay, D.M. Bagshaw, D.M. Savastano, C. Diefenbach, et al., Diets containing pistachios reduce systolic blood pressure and peripheral vascular responses to stress in adults with dyslipidemia, Hypertension 60 (1) (2012) 58–63, https://doi.org/ 10.1161/HYPERTENSIONAHA.111.182147.
- [143] D.J. Jenkins, C.W. Kendall, A. Marchie, T.L. Parker, P.W. Connelly, W. Qian, et al., Dose response of almonds on coronary heart disease risk factors: blood lipids, oxidized low-density lipoproteins, lipoprotein(a), homocysteine, and pulmonary nitric oxide: a randomized, controlled, crossover trial, Circulation 106 (11) (2002) 1327–1332, https://doi.org/10.1161/01.cir.0000028421.91733.20.
- [144] R.R. Kasliwal, M. Bansal, R. Mehrotra, K.P. Yeptho, N. Trehan, Effect of pistachio nut consumption on endothelial function and arterial stiffness, Nutrition 31 (5) (2015) 678–685, https://doi.org/10.1016/ j.nut.2014.10.019.
- [145] C.D. Kay, S.K. Gebauer, S.G. West, P.M. Kris-Etherton, Pistachios increase serum antioxidants and lower serum oxidized-LDL in hypercholesterolemic adults, J. Nutr. 140 (6) (2010) 1093–1098, https://doi.org/10.3945/jn.109.117366.
- [146] J.M. Morgan, K. Horton, D. Reese, C. Carey, K. Walker, D.M. Capuzzi, Effects of walnut consumption as part of a low-fat, low-cholesterol diet on serum cardiovascular risk factors, Int. J. Vitam. Nutr. Res. 72 (5) (2002) 341–347, https://doi.org/10.1024/0300-9831.72.5.341.
- [147] P. Nestel, P. Clifton, M. Noakes, Effects of increasing dietary palmitoleic acid compared with palmitic and oleic acids on plasma lipids of hypercholesterolemic men, J. Lipid. Res. 35 (4) (1994) 656–662, https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-2275(20)41179-4.
- [148] M. Ghadimi Nouran, M. Kimiagar, A. Abadi, M. Mirzazadeh, G. Harrison, Peanut consumption and cardiovascular risk, Public Health Nutr 13 (10) (2010) 1581–1586, https://doi.org/10.1017/ S1368980009992837.

- [149] D.J. O'Byrne, D.A. Knauft, R.B. Shireman, Low fat-monounsaturated rich diets containing high-oleic peanuts improve serum lipoprotein profiles, Lipids 32 (7) (1997) 687–695, https://doi.org/10.1007/ s11745-997-0088-y.
- [150] A. Orem, F.B. Yucesan, C. Orem, B. Akcan, B.V. Kural, C. Alasalvar, et al., Hazelnut-enriched diet improves cardiovascular risk biomarkers beyond a lipid-lowering effect in hypercholesterolemic subjects, J. Clin. Lipidol. 7 (2) (2013) 123–131, https://doi.org/10.1016/ j.jacl.2012.10.005.
- [151] S. Rajaram, E.H. Haddad, A. Mejia, J. Sabaté, Walnuts and fatty fish influence different serum lipid fractions in normal to mildly hyperlipidemic individuals: a randomized controlled study, Am. J. Clin. Nutr. 89 (5) (2009) 1657S–1663S, https://doi.org/10.3945/ ajcn.2009.26736S.
- [152] E. Ros, I. Núñez, A. Pérez-Heras, M. Serra, R. Gilabert, E. Casals, et al., A walnut diet improves endothelial function in hypercholesterolemic subjects: a randomized crossover trial, Circulation 109 (13) (2004) 1609–1614, https://doi.org/10.1161/01.CIR.0000124477.91474.FF.
- [153] J.F. Ruisinger, C.A. Gibson, J.M. Backes, B.K. Smith, D.K. Sullivan, P.M. Moriarty, et al., Statins and almonds to lower lipoproteins (the STALL Study), J. Clin. Lipidol. 9 (1) (2015) 58–64, https://doi.org/ 10.1016/j.jacl.2014.10.001.
- [154] M.J. Sheridan, J.N. Cooper, M. Erario, C.E. Cheifetz, Pistachio nut consumption and serum lipid levels, J. Am. Coll. Nutr. 26 (2) (2007) 141–148, https://doi.org/10.1080/07315724.2007.10719595.
- [155] G.A. Spiller, D.A. Jenkins, O. Bosello, J.E. Gates, L.N. Cragen, B. Bruce, Nuts and plasma lipids: an almond-based diet lowers LDL-C while preserving HDL-C, J. Am. Coll. Nutr. 17 (3) (1998) 285–290, https:// doi.org/10.1080/07315724.1998.10718761.
- [156] B. Tamizifar, M. Rismankarzadeh, A.A. Vosoughi, M. Rafieeyan, A. Aminzade, A low-dose almond-based diet decreases LDL-C while preserving, HDL-C 8 (1) (2005) 45–51.
- [157] D. Zambón, J. Sabaté, S. Muñoz, B. Campero B, E. Casals, M. Merlos, et al., Substituting walnuts for monounsaturated fat improves the serum lipid profile of hypercholesterolemic men and women. A randomized crossover trial, Ann. Intern. Med. 132 (7) (2000) 538–546, https:// doi.org/10.7326/0003-4819-132-7-200004040-00005.
- [158] G. Zhao, T.D. Etherton, K.R. Martin, S.G. West, P.J. Gillies, P.M. Kris-Etherton, Dietary alpha-linolenic acid reduces inflammatory and lipid cardiovascular risk factors in hypercholesterolemic men and women, J. Nutr. 134 (11) (2004) 2991–2997, https://doi.org/10.1093/jn/134.11.2991.
- [159] S.G. West, A.L. Krick, L.C. Klein, G. Zhao, T.F. Wojtowicz, M. McGuiness, et al., Effects of diets high in walnuts and flax oil on hemodynamic responses to stress and vascular endothelial function, J. Am. Coll. Nutr. 29 (6) (2010) 595–603, https://doi.org/10.1080/ 07315724.2010.10719898.
- [160] M.J. Zibaeenezhad, P. Ostovan, S.H. Mosavat, M. Zamirian, A. Attar, Almond oil for patients with hyperlipidemia: a randomized open-label controlled clinical trial, Complement, Ther. Med. 42 (2019) 33–36, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ctim.2018.10.013.
- [161] P. Hernández-Alonso, J. Salas-Salvadó, M. Baldrich-Mora, M. Juanola-Falgarona, M. Bulló, Beneficial effect of pistachio consumption on glucose metabolism, insulin resistance, inflammation, and related metabolic risk markers: a randomized clinical trial, Diabetes Care 37 (11) (2014) 3098–3105, https://doi.org/10.2337/dc14-1431.
- [162] V.Y. Njike, R. Ayettey, P. Petraro, J.A. Treu, D.L. Katz, Walnut ingestion in adults at risk for diabetes: effects on body composition, diet quality, and cardiac risk measures, BMJ Open Diabetes Res. Care. 3 (1) (2015), e000115, https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjdrc-2015-000115.
- [163] P.A. Sapp, P.M. Kris-Etherton, K.S. Petersen, Peanuts or an isocaloric lower fat, higher carbohydrate nighttime snack have similar effects on fasting glucose in adults with elevated fasting glucose concentrations: a 6-week randomized crossover trial, J. Nutr. 152 (1) (2022) 153–162, https://doi.org/10.1093/jn/nxab347.
- [164] M. Wien, D. Bleich, M. Raghuwanshi, S. Gould-Forgerite, J. Gomes, L. Monahan-Couch, et al., Almond consumption and cardiovascular risk factors in adults with prediabetes, J. Am. Coll. Nutr. 29 (3) (2010) 189–197, https://doi.org/10.1080/ 07315724.2010.10719833.
- [165] V. Dikariyanto, L. Smith, L. Francis, M. Robertson, E. Kusaslan, M. O'Callaghan-Latham, et al., Snacking on whole almonds for 6 weeks improves endothelial function and lowers LDL cholesterol but does not affect liver fat and other cardiometabolic risk factors in

healthy adults: the ATTIS study, a randomized controlled trial, Am. J. Clin. Nutr. 111 (6) (2020) 1178–1189, https://doi.org/10.1093/ajcn/nqaa100.

- [166] L.L. Guarneiri, C.M. Paton, J.A. Cooper, Pecan-enriched diets alter cholesterol profiles and triglycerides in adults at risk for cardiovascular disease in a randomized, controlled trial, J. Nutr. 151 (10) (2021) 3091–3101, https://doi.org/10.1093/jn/nxab248.
- [167] B. Olmedilla-Alonso, F. Granado-Lorencio, C. Herrero-Barbudo, I. Blanco-Navarro, S. Blázquez-García, B. Pérez-Sacristán, Consumption of restructured meat products with added walnuts has a cholesterol-lowering effect in subjects at high cardiovascular risk: a randomised, crossover, placebo-controlled study, J. Am. Coll. Nutr. 27 (2) (2008) 342–348, https://doi.org/10.1080/ 07315724.2008.10719710.
- [168] E.S.L.M. Costa, M.L. Pereira de Melo, F.V. Faro Reis, M.C. Monteiro, S.M. Dos Santos, B.A. Quadros Gomes, et al., Comparison of the effects of Brazil nut oil and soybean oil on the cardiometabolic parameters of patients with metabolic syndrome: a randomized trial, Nutrients 12 (1) (2019), https://doi.org/10.3390/nu12010046.
- [169] S. Gulati, A. Misra, R.M. Pandey, S.P. Bhatt, S. Saluja, Effects of pistachio nuts on body composition, metabolic, inflammatory and oxidative stress parameters in Asian Indians with metabolic syndrome: a 24-wk, randomized control trial, Nutrition 30 (2) (2014) 192–197, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nut.2013.08.005.
- [170] H.J. Hwang, Y. Liu, H.S. Kim, H. Lee, Y. Lim, H. Park, Daily walnut intake improves metabolic syndrome status and increases circulating adiponectin levels: randomized controlled crossover trial, Nutr. Res. Pract. 13 (2) (2019) 105–114, https://doi.org/10.4162/ nrp.2019.13.2.105.
- [171] Y.J. Lee, G.E. Nam, J.A. Seo, T. Yoon, I. Seo, J.H. Lee, et al., Nut consumption has favorable effects on lipid profiles of Korean women with metabolic syndrome, Nutr. Res. 34 (9) (2014) 814–820, https:// doi.org/10.1016/j.nutres.2014.08.011.
- [172] J. Mukuddem-Petersen, W. Stonehouse Oosthuizen, J.C. Jerling, S.M. Hanekom, Z. White, Effects of a high walnut and high cashew nut diet on selected markers of the metabolic syndrome: a controlled feeding trial, Br. J. Nutr. 97 (6) (2007) 1144–1153, https://doi.org/ 10.1017/S0007114507682944.
- [173] A.E. Schutte, J.M. Van Rooyen, H.W. Huisman, J. Mukuddem-Petersen, W. Oosthuizen, S.M. Hanekom, et al., Modulation of baroreflex sensitivity by walnuts versus cashew nuts in subjects with metabolic syndrome, Am. J. Hypertens. 19 (6) (2006) 629–636, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amjhyper.2005.12.014.
- [174] X. Wang, Z. Li, Y. Liu, X. Lv, W. Yang, Effects of pistachios on body weight in Chinese subjects with metabolic syndrome, Nutr. J. 11 (2012) 20, https://doi.org/10.1186/1475-2891-11-20.
- [175] D. Wang, L. Sun, X. Liu, Z. Niu, S. Chen, L. Tang, et al., Replacing white rice bars with peanuts as snacks in the habitual diet improves metabolic syndrome risk among Chinese adults: a randomized controlled trial, Am. J. Clin. Nutr. 113 (1) (2021) 28–35, https:// doi.org/10.1093/ajcn/nqaa307.
- [176] H. Wu, A. Pan, Z. Yu, Q. Qi, L. Lu, G. Zhang, et al., Lifestyle counseling and supplementation with flaxseed or walnuts influence the management of metabolic syndrome, J. Nutr. 140 (11) (2010) 1937–1942, https://doi.org/10.3945/jn.110.126300.
- [177] C.M. Chen, J.F. Liu, S.C. Li, C.L. Huang, A.T. Hsirh, S.F. Weng, et al., Almonds ameliorate glycemic control in Chinese patients with better controlled type 2 diabetes: a randomized, crossover, controlled feeding trial, Nutr. Metab. (Lond). 14 (1) (2017) 51, https://doi.org/ 10.1186/s12986-017-0205-3.
- [178] R.D. Damavandi, S. Eghtesadi, F. Shidfar, I. Heydari, A.R. Foroushani, Effects of hazelnuts consumption on fasting blood sugar and lipoproteins in patients with type 2 diabetes, J. Res. Med. Sci. 18 (4) (2013) 314–321.
- [179] R.D. Damavandi, S.N. Mousavi, F. Shidfar, V. Mohammadi, A. Rajab, S. Hosseini, et al., Effects of daily consumption of cashews on oxidative stress and atherogenic indices in patients with type 2 diabetes: a randomized, controlled-feeding trial, Int. J. Endocrinol. Metab. 17 (1) (2019), e70744, https://doi.org/10.5812/ijem.70744.
- [180] D.J.A. Jenkins, C.W.C. Kendall, B. Lamarche, M.S. Banach, K. Srichaikul, E. Vidgen, et al., Nuts as a replacement for carbohydrates in the diabetic diet: a reanalysis of a randomised controlled trial, Diabetologia 61 (8) (2018) 1734–1747, https:// doi.org/10.1007/s00125-018-4628-9.

- [181] S.C. Li, Y.H. Liu, J.F. Liu, W.H. Chang, C.M. Chen, C.Y. Chen, Almond consumption improved glycemic control and lipid profiles in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus, Metabolism 60 (4) (2011) 474–479, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.metabol.2010.04.009.
- [182] J.F. Liu, Y.H. Liu, C.M. Chen, W.H. Chang, C.Y. Chen, The effect of almonds on inflammation and oxidative stress in Chinese patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus: a randomized crossover controlled feeding trial, Eur. J. Nutr. 52 (3) (2013) 927–935, https://doi.org/10.1007/ s00394-012-0400-y.
- [183] J.C. Lovejoy, M.M. Most, M. Lefevre, F.L. Greenway, J.C. Rood, Effect of diets enriched in almonds on insulin action and serum lipids in adults with normal glucose tolerance or type 2 diabetes, Am. J. Clin. Nutr. 76 (5) (2002) 1000–1006, https://doi.org/10.1093/ajcn/ 76.5.1000.
- [184] Y. Ma, V.Y. Njike, J. Millet, S. Dutta, K. Doughty, J.A. Treu, et al., Effects of walnut consumption on endothelial function in type 2 diabetic subjects: a randomized controlled crossover trial, Diabetes Care 33 (2) (2010) 227–232, https://doi.org/10.2337/ dc09-1156.
- [185] V. Mohan, R. Gayathri, L.M. Jaacks, N. Lakshmipriya, R.M. Anjana, D. Spiegelman, et al., Cashew nut consumption increases HDL cholesterol and reduces systolic blood pressure in Asian indians with Type 2 diabetes: a 12-week randomized controlled trial, J. Nutr. 148 (1) (2018) 63–69, https://doi.org/10.1093/jn/nxx001.
- [186] E. Müllner, E. Plasser, H. Brath, W. Waldschütz, E. Forster, M. Kundi, et al., Impact of polyunsaturated vegetable oils on adiponectin levels, glycaemia and blood lipids in individuals with type 2 diabetes: a randomised, double-blind intervention study, J. Hum. Nutr. Diet. 27 (5) (2014) 468–478, https://doi.org/10.1111/jhn.12168.
- [187] M.J.Z. Zibaeenezhad, K. Aghasadeghi, H. Hakimi, H. Yarmohammadi, F. Nikaein, The effect of walnut oil consumption on blood sugar in patients with diabetes mellitus type 2, Int. J. Endocrinol. Metab. 14 (3) (2016), e34889, https://doi.org/10.5812/ijem.34889.
- [188] M. Parham, S. Heidari, A. Khorramirad, M. Hozoori, F. Hosseinzadeh, L. Bakhtyari, et al., Effects of pistachio nut supplementation on blood glucose in patients with type 2 diabetes: a randomized crossover trial, Rev. Diabet. Stud. 11 (2) (2014) 190–196, https://doi.org/10.1900/ RDS.2014.11.190.
- [189] K.A. Sauder, C.E. McCrea, J.S. Ulbrecht, P.M. Kris-Etherton, S.G. West, Effects of pistachios on the lipid/lipoprotein profile, glycemic control, inflammation, and endothelial function in type 2 diabetes: a randomized trial, Metabolism 64 (11) (2015) 1521–1529, https:// doi.org/10.1016/j.metabol.2015.07.021.
- [190] K.A. Sauder, C.E. McCrea, J.S. Ulbrecht, P.M. Kris-Etherton, S.G. West, Pistachio nut consumption modifies systemic hemodynamics, increases heart rate variability, and reduces ambulatory blood pressure in well-controlled type 2 diabetes: a randomized trial, J. Am. Heart Assoc. 3 (4) (2014), https://doi.org/10.1161/ JAHA.114.000873.
- [191] K.L. Sweazea, C.S. Johnston, K.D. Ricklefs, K.N. Petersen, Almond supplementation in the absence of dietary advice significantly reduces C-reactive protein in subjects with type 2 diabetes, J. Funct. Foods 10 (2014) 252–259, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jff.2014.06.024.
- [192] L.C. Tapsell, L.J. Gillen, C.S. Patch, M. Batterham, A. Owen, M. Baré, et al., Including walnuts in a low-fat/modified-fat diet improves HDL cholesterol-to-total cholesterol ratios in patients with type 2 diabetes, Diabetes Care 27 (12) (2004) 2777–2783, https://doi.org/10.2337/ diacare.27.12.2777.
- [193] M. Wien, K. Oda, J. Sabaté, A randomized controlled trial to evaluate the effect of incorporating peanuts into an American Diabetes Association meal plan on the nutrient profile of the total diet and cardiometabolic parameters of adults with type 2 diabetes, Nutr. J. 13 (2014) 10, https://doi.org/10.1186/1475-2891-13-10.
- [194] V.P. Campos, V.L. Portal, M.M. Markoski, A.S. Quadros, Â.C. Bersch-Ferreira, J. Garavaglia, et al., Effects of a healthy diet enriched or not with pecan nuts or extra-virgin olive oil on the lipid profile of patients with stable coronary artery disease: a randomised clinical trial, J. Hum. Nutr. Diet. 33 (3) (2020) 439–450, https://doi.org/10.1111/ jhn.12727.
- [195] C.Y. Chen, M. Holbrook, M.A. Duess, M.M. Dohadwala, N.M. Hamburg, B.F. Asztalos, et al., Effect of almond consumption on vascular function in patients with coronary artery disease: a randomized, controlled, cross-over trial, Nutr. J. 14 (2015) 61, https://doi.org/10.1186/s12937-015-0049-5.

- [196] M. Ghanavati, S. Alipour Parsa, J. Nasrollahzadeh, A calorierestricted diet with nuts favourably raises plasma high-density lipoprotein-cholesterol in overweight and obese patients with stable coronary heart disease: a randomised controlled trial, Int. J. Clin. Pract. 75 (9) (2021), e14431, https://doi.org/10.1111/ ijcp.14431.
- [197] M. Ghanavati, S.M. Hosseinabadi, S.A. Parsa, M. Safi, H. Emamat, J. Nasrollahzadeh, Effect of a nut-enriched low-calorie diet on body weight and selected markers of inflammation in overweight and obese stable coronary artery disease patients: a randomized controlled study, Eur. J. Clin. Nutr. 75 (7) (2021) 1099–1108, https://doi.org/10.1038/ s41430-020-00819-9.
- [198] H. Jamshed, F.A. Sultan, R. Iqbal, A.H. Gilani, Dietary almonds increase serum HDL cholesterol in coronary artery disease patients in a randomized controlled trial, J. Nutr. 145 (10) (2015) 2287–2292, https://doi.org/10.3945/jn.114.207944.
- [199] R.F. Carvalho, G.V. Huguenin, R.R. Luiz, A.S. Moreira, G.M. Oliveira, G. Rosa, Intake of partially defatted Brazil nut flour reduces serum cholesterol in hypercholesterolemic patients—a randomized controlled trial, Nutr. J. 14 (2015) 59, https://doi.org/10.1186/ s12937-015-0036-x.
- [200] G.V. Huguenin, A.S. Moreira, T.D. Siant'Pierre, R.A. Gonçalves, G. Rosa, G.M. Oliveira, et al., Effects of dietary supplementation with brazil nuts on microvascular endothelial function in hypertensive and dyslipidemic patients: a randomized crossover placebo-controlled trial, Microcirculation 22 (8) (2015) 687–699, https://doi.org/ 10.1111/micc.12225.
- [201] R. Solà, R.M. Valls, G. Godàs, G. Perez-Busquets, J. Ribalta, J. Girona, et al., Cocoa, hazelnuts, sterols and soluble fiber cream reduces lipids and inflammation biomarkers in hypertensive patients: a randomized controlled trial, PLOS ONE 7 (2) (2012), e31103, https://doi.org/ 10.1371/journal.pone.0031103.
- [202] M.J. Zibaeenezhad, P. Farhadi, A. Attar, A. Mosleh, F. Amirmoezi, A. Azimi, Effects of walnut oil on lipid profiles in hyperlipidemic type 2 diabetic patients: a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial, Nutr. Diabetes. 7 (4) (2017) e259, https://doi.org/10.1038/ nutd.2017.8.
- [203] F. Kaseb, M. Rashidi, M. Afkhami-Ardekani, H. Fallahzadeh, Effect of olive, almond and walnut oil on cardiovascular risk factors in type 2 diabetic patients, Int. J. Diabetes Dev. Ctries. 33 (2) (2013) 115–119, https://doi.org/10.1007/s13410-012-0108-9.
- [204] P.W. Wilson, R.B. D'Agostino, D. Levy, A.M. Belanger, H. Silbershatz, W.B. Kannel, Prediction of coronary heart disease using risk factor categories, Circulation 97 (18) (1998) 1837–1847, https://doi.org/ 10.1161/01.cir.97.18.1837.
- [205] C.J. Nikodijevic, Y.C. Probst, M.J. Batterham, L.C. Tapsell, E.P. Neale, Nut consumption in a representative survey of Australians: a secondary analysis of the 2011–2012 National Nutrition and Physical Activity Survey, Public Health Nutr 23 (18) (2020) 3368–3378, https://doi.org/10.1017/S1368980019004117.
- [206] S.K. Nishi, E. Viguiliouk, S. Blanco Mejia, C.W.C. Kendall, R.P. Bazinet, A.J. Hanley, et al., Are fatty nuts a weighty concern? A systematic review and meta-analysis and dose-response meta-regression of prospective cohorts and randomized controlled trials, Obes. Rev. 22 (11) (2021), e13330, https://doi.org/10.1111/obr.13330.
- [207] J.R. Hébert, E.A. Frongillo, S.A. Adams, G.M. Turner-McGrievy, T.G. Hurley, D.R. Miller, et al., Perspective: randomized controlled trials are not a panacea for diet-related research, Adv. Nutr. 7 (3) (2016) 423–432, https://doi.org/10.3945/an.115.011023.
- [208] H. Meng, L. Zhu, H. Kord-Varkaneh, H. O Santos, G.M. Tinsley, P. Fu, Effects of intermittent fasting and energy-restricted diets on lipid profile: a systematic review and meta-analysis, Nutrition 77 (2020) 110801, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nut.2020.110801.
- [209] M. Bes-Rastrollo, N.M. Wedick, M.A. Martinez-Gonzalez, T.Y. Li, L. Sampson, F.B. Hu, Prospective study of nut consumption, longterm weight change, and obesity risk in women, Am. J. Clin. Nutr. 89 (6) (2009) 1913–1919, https://doi.org/10.3945/ajcn.2008.27276.
- [210] J.A. Dawson, K.A. Kaiser, O. Affuso, G.R. Cutter, D.B. Allison, Rigorous control conditions diminish treatment effects in weight lossrandomized controlled trials, Int. J. Obes. (Lond). 40 (6) (2016) 895–898, https://doi.org/10.1038/ijo.2015.212.
- [211] E.P. Neale, L.C. Tapsell, V. Guan, M.J. Batterham, The effect of nut consumption on markers of inflammation and endothelial function: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials,

BMJ Open 7 (11) (2017), e016863, https://doi.org/10.1136/ bmjopen-2017-016863.

- [212] E. Ros, Health benefits of nut consumption, Nutrients 2 (7) (2010) 652–682, https://doi.org/10.3390/nu2070652.
- [213] L.C. Tapsell, E.P. Neale, Y. Probst, Dietary patterns and cardiovascular disease: insights and challenges for considering food groups and nutrient sources, Curr. Atheroscler. Rep. 21 (3) (2019) 9, https:// doi.org/10.1007/s11883-019-0770-1.
- [214] C. Yang, H. Xia, M. Wan, Y. Lu, D. Xu, X. Yang, et al., Comparisons of the effects of different flaxseed products consumption on lipid profiles, inflammatory cytokines and anthropometric indices in patients with dyslipidemia related diseases: systematic review and a doseresponse meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials, Nutr. Metab. (Lond). 18 (1) (2021) 91, https://doi.org/10.1186/s12986-021-00619-3.