|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Supplemental Table 1.** Association of honey with NAFLD in the TCLSIH Study, excluding participants with significant alcohol intake (n=21,311) | | | | |
| Logistic regression models | Consumption frequency of honey | | | *P* for trend a |
| ≤1 time/week | 2-6 times/week | ≥1 times/day |
| No. of participants | 16,855 | 2,937 | 1,519 | - |
| No. of NAFLD | 5,416 | 691 | 406 | - |
| Model 1 | 1.00 (reference) | 0.81 (0.72, 0.90) b | 1.03 (0.89, 1.19) | 0.13 |
| Model 2 | 1.00 (reference) | 0.85 (0.76, 0.95) | 1.10 (0.94, 1.27) | 0.75 |
| Model 3 | 1.00 (reference) | 0.84 (0.75, 0.95) | 1.09 (0.94, 1.26) | 0.66 |
| NAFLD, non-alcoholic fatty liver disease; TCLSIH, Tianjin Chronic Low-grade Systemic Inflammation and Health. | | | | |
| a Obtained by using logistic regression analysis. | | | | |
| b Data are odds ratio (95% confidence interval). | | | | |
| Model 1 was adjusted for age, sex, and body mass index. | | | | |
| Model 2 was adjusted for age, sex, body mass index, smoking status, alcohol intake, education level, occupation, household income, physical activity, family history of disease (including cardiovascular disease, hypertension, hyperlipidemia, and diabetes), hypertension, hyperlipidemia, diabetes, and total energy intake. | | | | |
| Model 3 was adjusted for the same variables as in model 2 and further for three main dietary pattern scores (honey intake was not included in the calculation). | | | | |
| Significant alcohol intake: >210 g/week for men or >140 g/week for women. | | | | |