CANCER EPIDEMIOLOGY

SHORT REPORT



Causal association of childhood obesity with cancer risk in adulthood: A Mendelian randomization study

| Xuexian Fang ^{1,2} Xinhui Wang ³ Zijun Song ³ | Dan Han⁴ Xiangju Yin⁵ | I |
|--|--|---|
| Bingqing Liu ⁶ Luyi Chen ⁷ Ronghua Zhang ⁴ | Fuzhi Lian ¹ Xinbing Sui ² | |

¹Department of Nutrition and Toxicology, School of Public Health, Faculty of Medicine, Hangzhou Normal University, Hangzhou, China

²College of Pharmacy, Faculty of Medicine, Hangzhou Normal University, Hangzhou, China

³School of Public Health, Institute of Translational Medicine, Zhejiang University School of Medicine, Hangzhou, China

⁴Department of Nutrition and Food Safety, Zhejiang Provincial Center for Disease Control and Prevention, Hangzhou, China

⁵Institute of Resources and Environment, Henan Polytechnic University, Jiaozuo, China

⁶Department of Women's Healthcare, Women's Hospital, Zhejiang University School of Medicine, Hangzhou, China

⁷Department of Gastroenterology, Sir Run Run Shaw Hospital, Zhejiang University School of Medicine, Hangzhou, China

Correspondence

Xuexian Fang and Fuzhi Lian, Department of Nutrition and Toxicology, School of Public Health, Hangzhou Normal University, 2318 Yuhangtang Road, Hangzhou 311121, China. Email: xfang@hznu.edu.cn (X. F.) and fuzhi. lian@hznu.edu.cn (F. L.)

Xinbing Sui, College of Pharmacy, Hangzhou Normal University, 2318 Yuhangtang Road, Hangzhou 311121, China. Email: hzzju@zju.edu.cn

Funding information

China Postdoctoral Science Foundation, Grant/ Award Number: 2020T130583; National Natural Science Foundation of China, Grant/ Award Number: 31900835; Natural Science Foundation of Henan Province of China, Grant/Award Number: 202300410169

Abstract

In observational studies of children and adolescents, higher body weight has been associated with distinct disease outcomes, including cancer, in adulthood. Therefore, we performed a two-sample Mendelian randomization (MR) study to evaluate the causal effect of childhood obesity on long-term cancer risk. Single-nucleotide polymorphisms associated with higher childhood body mass index (BMI) from large-scale genome-wide association studies were used as genetic instruments. Summary-level data for 24 site-specific cancers were obtained from UK Biobank. We found that a 1-SD increase in childhood BMI (kg/m²) was significantly associated with a 60% increase in risk of pancreatic cancer (odds ratio [OR]: 1.60; 95% confidence interval [CI]: 1.12-2.28; P < 0.01) and a 47% increase in risk of esophageal cancer (OR: 1.47; 95% CI: 1.09-1.97; P < 0.01) in adults. In contrast, there was an inverse association of genetic predisposition to childhood obesity with throat (OR: 0.46; 95% CI: 0.27-0.79; P < 0.01) and breast cancer (OR: 0.77; 95% CI: 0.64-0.94; P < 0.01) in adult life. For the other 20 cancers studied, no statistically significant association was observed. Our MR analyses found causal effects of childhood obesity on several cancers. Maintaining a healthy weight should be emphasized during childhood and adolescence to prevent cancer risk later in life.

KEYWORDS

cancer, childhood obesity, gene, Mendelian randomization

What's new?

Higher body weight during childhood has been associated with various diseases later in life, but it's not known whether being overweight as a kid is the cause. Here, the authors used

Abbreviations: BMI, body mass index; CI, confidence interval; EGG, early growth genetics; GWAS, genome-wide association studies; IVW, inverse variance weighted; MR, Mendelian randomization; OR, odds ratio; SD, standard deviation; SNP, single-nucleotide polymorphism.

Mendelian randomization analysis to look at the relationship between genetic predisposition to childhood obesity and adult cancer risk loci. For 20 cancers, they found no association. They determined that higher childhood BMI was associated with higher risk of pancreatic and esophageal cancer, and lower risk of throat and breast cancer. However, childhood BMI is also associated with adult BMI, so it's not entirely clear when the cancer-promoting effect happens.

1 | INTRODUCTION

1422

Obesity has emerged to a global epidemic and accounts for the increasing burden of major chronic diseases, such as cardiovascular disease, diabetes and cancer.^{1,2} It is more worrisome that children and adolescents are becoming overweight at progressively younger ages.³ According to the estimation based on the Global Burden of Disease study, 107.7 million children were obese worldwide and the overall prevalence of obesity was 5.0% among children in 2015.⁴

Observational studies have suggested that higher body weight during childhood is associated with increased morbidity and mortality in adult life due to metabolic disorders.⁵ One important consequence of these disorders is the high cancer risk.⁶ However, observational studies are unable to fully account for residual confounding, thus the causality of the association remains poorly understood.

By using genetic variants as instruments, Mendelian randomization (MR) analysis is a method to assess the potential causality between exposure and outcome.⁷ Previously, MR analysis has investigated the causal association between childhood BMI with breast cancer.^{8,9} Here, we conducted a two-sample MR study to systematically examine the causal effects of childhood obesity on risk of 24 site-specific cancers.

2 | METHODS

For unbiased detection of causal effects, the genetic variants used as genetic variants in this MR analysis must satisfy three key assumptions: (a) the used genetic variants should be robustly associated with childhood BMI, (b) the used should not be associated with any confounders and (c) the genetic variants should influence the outcome (cancer risk in adulthood) only through childhood BMI, rather than alternative pathways. The second and third assumptions are collectively known as independence from pleiotropy.¹⁰

In the present MR study, childhood obesity was evaluated for body mass index (BMI) using genome-wide significant single-nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) from previous genome-wide association studies (GWAS) by the early growth genetics (EGG) consortium.¹¹ The large GWAS included 47 541 children from 33 individual studies, and identified 15 loci associated with childhood obesity ($P < 5 \times 10^{-8}$).

| Types of | Case/Control | | | MR estimates | | _ | _ |
|------------------------------|--------------|----------|----------|---------------------|-------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| cancer | п | | | OR (95% CI) | Р | P _{heterogeneity} | P _{pleiotropy} |
| Pancreatic cancer | 1060/400294 | | _ | 1.60 (1.12, 2.28) | <0.01 | 0.85 | 0.82 |
| Gallbladder/bile duct cancer | 323/400294 | | | 1.55 (0.74, 3.22) | 0.24 | 0.64 | 0.79 |
| Multiple myoloma | 1005/414840 | + | | 1.50 (0.97, 2.30) | 0.07 | 0.58 | 0.36 |
| Esophageal cancer | 1068/400294 | | | 1.47 (1.09, 1.97) | 0.01 | 0.96 | 0.43 |
| Testicular cancer | 332/400294 | | | — 1.42 (0.53, 3.75) | 0.49 | 0.09 | 0.24 |
| Endometrial cancer | 1765/198791 | - | | 1.34 (0.94, 1.91) | 0.11 | 0.40 | 0.87 |
| Leukemia | 2555/414840 | _ | | 1.17 (0.87, 1.58) | 0.29 | 0.40 | 0.23 |
| Thyroid cancer | 518/418625 | | | 1.17 (0.64, 2.15) | 0.60 | 0.64 | 0.56 |
| Malignant melanomas | 3658/402691 | | | 1.17 (0.91, 1.49) | 0.22 | 0.41 | 0.49 |
| Colorectal cancer | 6375/401350 | _ | | 1.11 (0.93, 1.32) | 0.25 | 0.55 | 0.18 |
| Bone cancer | 200/419977 | | | 1.09 (0.36, 3.27) | 0.89 | 0.33 | 0.91 |
| Lung cancer | 3755/416654 | _ | | 1.05 (0.84, 1.33) | 0.65 | 0.55 | 0.44 |
| Kidney cancer | 1468/415431 | | | 1.05 (0.74, 1.50) | 0.77 | 0.57 | 0.75 |
| Mouth cancer | 875/418011 | | | 1.04 (0.71, 1.52) | 0.84 | 0.87 | 0.45 |
| Ovarian cancer | 1301/207089 | | | 1.02 (0.66, 1.59) | 0.92 | 0.28 | 0.41 |
| Prostate cancer | 8639/176489 | | — | 1.00 (0.80, 1.25) | 0.98 | 0.02 | 0.67 |
| Non-Hodgkin's lymphoma | 2552/414840 | | ⊢ | 0.99 (0.78, 1.25) | 0.92 | 0.82 | 0.51 |
| Stomach cancer | 852/400294 | | | 0.92 (0.51, 1.65) | 0.77 | 0.13 | 0.98 |
| Brain cancer | 748/418389 | | | 0.91 (0.52, 1.59) | 0.75 | 0.35 | 0.08 |
| Liver cancer | 271/400294 | _ | | 0.80 (0.35, 1.84) | 0.60 | 0.64 | 0.42 |
| Bladder cancer | 3269/415431 | | | 0.80 (0.62, 1.03) | 0.09 | 0.46 | 0.39 |
| Breast cancer | 15249/416252 | | | 0.77 (0.64, 0.94) | <0.01 | <0.01 | 0.40 |
| Cervical cancer | 345/198725 | | | 0.68 (0.37, 1.22) | 0.19 | 0.89 | 0.97 |
| Throat cancer | 871/418011 | - | | 0.46 (0.27, 0.79) | <0.01 | 0.26 | 0.85 |
| | | 0.5 1 | 1 2 | | | | |

FIGURE 1 Associations between childhood body mass index (BMI) and 24 site-specific cancers. All estimations were based on the randomeffects inverse variance weighted method and were standardized to a 1-SD decrease in childhood BMI due to genetic variants

TABLE 1 Sensitivity analyses of the associations between childhood BMI and site-specific cancers

| | OR (95% CI) | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------|------------------|--------------------|--|
| Types of cancer | Weighted median | Simple median | MR-Egger | |
| Mouth cancer | 1.09 (0.59-2.02) | 1.07 (0.53-2.14) | 2.16 (0.33-14.17) | |
| Throat cancer | 0.47 (0.22-0.99) | 0.46 (0.21-0.99) | 0.57 (0.07-4.88) | |
| Esophageal cancer | 1.23 (0.70-2.16) | 1.40 (0.80-2.44) | 2.89 (0.53-15.68) | |
| Stomach cancer | 0.62 (0.31-1.24) | 0.93 (0.45-1.90) | 0.94 (0.09-9.98) | |
| Colorectal cancer | 1.11 (0.86-1.42) | 1.13 (0.86-1.49) | 1.82 (0.89-3.69) | |
| Liver cancer | 0.91 (0.26-3.20) | 0.73 (0.21-2.59) | 3.34 (0.10-112.09) | |
| Pancreatic cancer | 1.53 (0.83-2.83) | 1.75 (0.92-3.34) | 1.95 (0.35-10.95) | |
| Gallbladder/bile duct cancer | 1.44 (0.45-4.62) | 1.20 (0.35-4.12) | 1.02 (0.05-22.74) | |
| Lung cancer | 1.02 (0.74-1.41) | 1.03 (0.73-1.43) | 0.74 (0.29-1.86) | |
| Bone cancer | 0.95 (0.20-4.49) | 0.72 (0.16-3.34) | 0.84 (0.01-68.64) | |
| Malignant melanomas | 1.11 (0.80-1.53) | 1.14 (0.81-1.59) | 0.84 (0.33-2.17) | |
| Breast cancer | 0.86 (0.71-1.03) | 0.83 (0.68-0.99) | 0.94 (0.44-1.99) | |
| Cervical cancer | 0.63 (0.21-1.90) | 0.63 (0.21-1.90) | 0.71 (0.03-14.80) | |
| Endometrial cancer | 1.41 (0.89-2.23) | 1.51 (0.93-2.46) | 1.50 (0.36-6.23) | |
| Ovarian cancer | 1.25 (0.68-2.29) | 1.26 (0.68-2.36) | 1.99 (0.36-11.03) | |
| Prostate cancer | 0.95 (0.73-1.22) | 0.95 (0.72-1.25) | 1.21 (0.49-2.96) | |
| Testicular cancer | 1.83 (0.55-6.12) | 1.45 (0.42-5.03) | 1.82 (0.05-72.77) | |
| Kidney cancer | 1.06 (0.64-1.75) | 1.12 (0.66-1.91) | 0.84 (0.20-3.54) | |
| Bladder cancer | 0.79 (0.56-1.12) | 0.82 (0.57-1.19) | 0.52 (0.19-1.39) | |
| Brain cancer | 0.74 (0.37-1.49) | 0.79 (0.36-1.72) | 0.14 (0.02-1.07) | |
| Thyroid cancer | 1.42 (0.58-3.47) | 1.19 (0.46-3.07) | 1.82 (0.14-23.70) | |
| Non-Hodgkin's lymphoma | 1.05 (0.71-1.57) | 1.11 (0.74-1.67) | 0.68 (0.22-2.07) | |
| Multiple myoloma | 1.90 (1.01-3.56) | 1.62 (0.82-3.20) | 0.66 (0.11-3.88) | |
| Leukemia | 1.17 (0.78-1.75) | 1.13 (0.73-1.75) | 0.59 (0.19-1.78) | |

Note: Results were standardized to a 1-SD decrease in childhood BMI due to genetic variants.

Abbreviations: BMI, body mass index; CI, confidence interval; OR, odds ratio.

The first-stage *F* statistic was used to evaluate the strength of each instrument. The following equation was used: $F = (R^2/k)/([1 - R^2]/[n - k - 1])$, where R^2 is the proportion of the variability accounted for by the SNP, *k* is the number of instruments used in the model and *n* is the sample size.¹² To minimize weak instrument bias, only SNPs with an *F* statistic >10 were included in subsequent analyses.

Summary-level data for 24 site-specific cancers were obtained from the Pan-ancestry genetic analysis of the UK Biobank.¹³ The UK-based prospective cohort study was approved by the North West Multicentre Research Ethics Committee, and recruited 488 377 genotyped adults aged 40 to 69 years. In the current analyses, we confided the study samples to European-descent participants, in order to control the bias introduced by population stratification. Cases were obtained until 31 March 2017 and cancer diagnoses were based on the national registries (International Classification of Diseases, 10th revision code).

For MR estimation, we used the inverse variance weighted (IVW) method to assess the combined causal associations. Due to heterogeneity among the causal estimates of different variants, a random effects model would be more appropriate than a fixed-effects model.¹⁴ Because a simple instrumental variable analysis alone may

not be relied on to give a causal conclusion, we used simple median, weighted median and MR-Egger methods as sensitivity analyses to explore the robustness of our findings.¹⁵ Briefly, the median-based methods give a consistent estimate of the causal effect when over 50% of the genetic variants are valid instruments, while MR-Egger regression can detect violations of standard instrumental variable assumptions.

To explore the direct effect of adult BMI, we performed a multivariable MR analysis.¹⁶ Publicly available summarized data regarding the genetic association of instruments with adult BMI were acquired from the Genetic Investigation of Anthropometric Traits.¹⁷

We considered the associations significant if the directions of the estimates by three methods were consistent and the main IVW MR reached a threshold of P < 0.05. Odds ratios (ORs) with 95% confidence intervals (CIs) of cancers are per one standard deviation (SD) increase in genetically predicted childhood BMI in all analyses. The SD of childhood BMI corresponds to 2.45 kg/m² based on the EGG study. Power calculations were based on a method designed by Burgess (https://sb452.shinyapps.io/power),¹⁸ and results from these analyses were displayed in Supplementary Table 1. To assess the heterogeneity and pleiotropy, we used *P*-values from Cochran's *Q* test

and MR-Egger regression, respectively. All analyses were performed using Stata 15.0 and R 4.0.2 software.

3 | RESULTS

Characteristics of the 15 childhood BMI-associated SNPs used as instruments were presented in Supplementary Table 2.¹⁹ *F* statistics for these SNPs ranged from 37 to 109, which making significant bias from the use of weak instruments is unlikely. There was also no evidence of pleiotropy observed by MR-Egger regression in all analyses (Figure 1).

Pooled MR estimates for the effect of childhood obesity on risk of different cancers were shown in Figure 1. And 1-SD unit increase in genetically predicted childhood BMI was associated with a 60.0% increase in pancreatic cancer risk (OR: 1.60; 95% Cl: 1.12-2.28; P < 0.01), as well as a 46.5% increase in esophageal cancer risk (OR: 1.47; 95% Cl: 1.09-1.97; P < 0.01). MR analysis also showed significant inverse associations between higher childhood BMI and risk of throat cancer (OR: 0.46; 95% Cl: 0.27-0.79; P < 0.01) and breast cancer (OR: 0.77; 95% Cl: 0.64-0.94; P < 0.01). No association was found in the other 20 cancers (Figure 1). We detected significant heterogeneity only in the analyses of prostate cancer (P = 0.02) and breast cancer (P < 0.01). Sensitivity analyses using simple median- or weighted median-based methods showed similar patterns of the effect for childhood obesity on cancer risk, supporting the consistency and robustness of our findings (Table 1).

In addition, we also showed that a 1-SD increase in childhood BMI was associated with a 0.62-SD increase in adult BMI (OR: 1.87; 95% CI: 1.60-2.18; $P = 1.17 \times 10^{-15}$) (Supplementary Table 3). When considering adult BMI using multivariable MR method, although the directions of the causal links were consistent with univariable MR results, no significant associations between childhood BMI and those cancers were found (Supplementary Table 4). These results suggested that the effect of childhood BMI on cancer is not independent of adult BMI and long-term weight loss intervention might alleviate the unfavorable influence of childhood obesity on cancer risk.

4 | DISCUSSION

In this MR study, we systematically evaluated the causality between childhood obesity and cancer risk in adult life, and found that higher childhood BMI was associated with higher risk of pancreatic and esophageal cancer, and lower risk of throat and breast cancer. Compared to two previously published MR studies only involving cancers of breast, colorectum, lung, ovary and prostate,^{8,9} the similar inverse association was found between childhood obesity and breast cancer risk in later life. However, the associations between childhood obesity and lower risks of throat and breast cancer remain poorly understood, but sex hormones such as estrogen may play a role.²⁰

Our findings were consistent with results from the cohort studies that have demonstrated a pathogenetic impact of higher childhood BMI on pancreatic and esophageal cancer risk.^{21,22} Mechanically, the detrimental effects of childhood obesity in relation to certain site-specific cancers might be driven by increased secretion of proinflammatory cytokines.²³ Using mice carrying a pancreas-specific oncogenic Kras mutation, Chang et al suggested that dysregulated autophagy, in addition to inflammation, may contribute to obesityinduced pancreatic cancer development.²⁴ Additionally, previous studies have demonstrated that obese individuals are more likely to have gastroesophageal reflux disease (GERD), a well-established risk factor for esophageal cancer.²⁵ Thus, interaction between childhood obesity and GERD may increase the risk of developing esophageal cancer.

Since the relationship between obesity and cancer is increasingly recognized, the benefit of weight loss on cancer risk also has got attention.²⁶ For instance, Parker and Folsom found an 11% lower incidence of any cancer in women who experienced intentional weight loss (more than 20 pounds) since age 18 years.²⁷ However, most of these studies are limited to adult populations, and the impact of weight loss in children and adolescents is less well defined. Thus, there is a need for further investigation evaluating the anti-cancer effect of intentional weight loss in overweight and obese children.

Key strengths of the study are primarily attributed to the MR design, which overcomes the limitations of observational studies. In addition, inclusion of multiple instrumental variables allows us to examine and adjust pleiotropy. Another strength is that the consistency between different MR approaches suggests the robustness of our findings.

However, our study also has several limitations. First, the statistical power was low in several analyses due to limited case number. Second, potential pleiotropy could not be completely ruled out, although no evidence was found by the MR-Egger method. Third, our analyses only included individuals of European origin, thus we may not be unable to generalize these estimates to other populations.

Finally, childhood obesity is significantly associated with increased adult levels of BMI, hip circumference-adjusted BMI and waist circumference-adjusted BMI.¹⁹ Observation from cohort studies also suggested that adult BMI is positively associated with esophageal adenocarcinoma and pancreas cancer.²⁰ Therefore, it is difficult to specify when the cancer-promoting effect happens. Although other anthropometric measures, such as waist circumference, were reported to be associated with cancer risk,²⁸ we cannot assess the causal effect because of unavailability of genetic data.

In summary, our current results provide important evidence supporting an effect of childhood obesity on cancer and imply a substantial public health impact of childhood BMI modification. Normalization of body weight should be emphasized during childhood and adolescence to prevent cancer risk later in life.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors acknowledge the participants and investigators of the UK Biobank and EGG consortium. This study was supported by research grants from the National Natural Science Foundation of China (31900835 to X.F.), the China Postdoctoral Science Foundation (2020T130583 to X.F.) and the Natural Science Foundation of Henan Province of China (202300410169 to X.Y.). The funders had no role in the design and conduct of the study; collection, management,

analysis and interpretation of the data; preparation, review or approval of the manuscript; and decision to submit the manuscript for publication.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declared no potential conflicts of interest.

ETHICS STATEMENT

Studies included in the consortia were approved by the institutional review board of Hangzhou Normal University and all participants provided written informed consent.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

The UK Biobank data are available through the Pan-UKB team (https://pan.ukbb.broadinstitute.org). EGG data are available through online application (http://www.egg-consortium.org). Summary-level data used for the study will be made available upon reasonable request to authors.

ORCID

Xuexian Fang () https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5414-9888

REFERENCES

- Collaboration NCDRF. Worldwide trends in body-mass index, underweight, overweight, and obesity from 1975 to 2016: a pooled analysis of 2416 population-based measurement studies in 128.9 million children, adolescents, and adults. *Lancet*. 2017;390:2627-2642.
- Prospective Studies C, Whitlock G, Lewington S, et al. Body-mass index and cause-specific mortality in 900 000 adults: collaborative analyses of 57 prospective studies. *Lancet*. 2009;373:1083-1096.
- Daniels SR, Jacobson MS, McCrindle BW, et al. American Heart Association Childhood Obesity Research Summit: executive summary. *Circulation*. 2009;119:2114-2123.
- Collaborators GBDO, Afshin A, Forouzanfar MH, et al. Health effects of overweight and obesity in 195 countries over 25 years. N Engl J Med. 2017;377:13-27.
- Kelsey MM, Zaepfel A, Bjornstad P, Nadeau KJ. Age-related consequences of childhood obesity. *Gerontology*. 2014;60:222-228.
- Lauby-Secretan B, Scoccianti C, Loomis D, et al. Body fatness and cancer-viewpoint of the IARC working group. N Engl J Med. 2016; 375:794-798.
- Lawlor DA, Harbord RM, Sterne JA, et al. Mendelian randomization: using genes as instruments for making causal inferences in epidemiology. *Stat Med.* 2008;27:1133-1163.
- Gao C, Patel CJ, Michailidou K, et al. Mendelian randomization study of adiposity-related traits and risk of breast, ovarian, prostate, lung and colorectal cancer. *Int J Epidemiol*. 2016;45:896-908.
- Richardson TG, Sanderson E, Elsworth B, et al. Use of genetic variation to separate the effects of early and later life adiposity on disease risk: mendelian randomisation study. *BMJ*. 2020;369:m1203.
- 10. Emdin CA, Khera AV, Kathiresan S. Mendelian randomization. Jama. 2017;318:1925-1926.
- Felix JF, Bradfield JP, Monnereau C, et al. Genome-wide association analysis identifies three new susceptibility loci for childhood body mass index. *Hum Mol Genet*. 2016;25:389-403.
- 12. Palmer TM, Lawlor DA, Harbord RM, et al. Using multiple genetic variants as instrumental variables for modifiable risk factors. *Stat Methods Med Res*. 2012;21:223-242.

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

@uicc

ПC

- Burgess S, Bowden J, Fall T, Ingelsson E, Thompson SG. Sensitivity analyses for robust causal inference from Mendelian randomization analyses with multiple genetic variants. *Epidemiology*. 2017;28:30-42.
- Burgess S, Butterworth A, Thompson SG. Mendelian randomization analysis with multiple genetic variants using summarized data. *Genet Epidemiol.* 2013;37:658-665.
- Sanderson E, Davey Smith G, Windmeijer F, Bowden J. An examination of multivariable Mendelian randomization in the single-sample and two-sample summary data settings. *Int J Epidemiol.* 2019;48:713-727.
- Locke AE, Kahali B, Berndt SI, et al. Genetic studies of body mass index yield new insights for obesity biology. *Nature*. 2015;518:197-206.
- Burgess S. Sample size and power calculations in Mendelian randomization with a single instrumental variable and a binary outcome. *Int J Epidemiol.* 2014;43:922-929.
- Geng T, Smith CE, Li C, Huang T. Childhood BMI and adult type 2 diabetes, coronary artery diseases, chronic kidney disease, and cardiometabolic traits: a Mendelian randomization analysis. *Diabetes Care*. 2018;41:1089-1096.
- Fang X, Wei J, He X, et al. Quantitative association between body mass index and the risk of cancer: a global meta-analysis of prospective cohort studies. *Int J Cancer.* 2018;143:1595-1603.
- Levi Z, Kark JD, Afek A, et al. Measured body mass index in adolescence and the incidence of pancreatic cancer in a cohort of 720,000 Jewish men. *Cancer Causes Control.* 2012;23:371-378.
- Levi Z, Kark JD, Shamiss A, et al. Body mass index and socioeconomic status measured in adolescence, country of origin, and the incidence of gastroesophageal adenocarcinoma in a cohort of 1 million men. *Cancer*. 2013;119:4086-4093.
- Weihe P, Spielmann J, Kielstein H, Henning-Klusmann J, Weihrauch-Blüher S. Childhood obesity and cancer risk in adulthood. *Curr Obes Rep.* 2020;9:204-212.
- Chang HH, Moro A, Takakura K, et al. Incidence of pancreatic cancer is dramatically increased by a high fat, high calorie diet in KrasG12D mice. *PLoS One*. 2017;12:e0184455.
- Schlottmann F, Dreifuss NH, Patti MG. Obesity and esophageal cancer: GERD, Barrett s esophagus, and molecular carcinogenic pathways. Expert Rev Gastroenterol Hepatol. 2020;14:425-433.
- Birks S, Peeters A, Backholer K, O'Brien P, Brown W. A systematic review of the impact of weight loss on cancer incidence and mortality. *Obes Rev.* 2012;13:868-891.
- Parker ED, Folsom AR. Intentional weight loss and incidence of obesity-related cancers: the Iowa Women's Health Study. Int J Obes Relat Metab Disord. 2003;27:1447-1452.
- Recalde M, Davila-Batista V, Diaz Y, et al. Body mass index and waist circumference in relation to the risk of 26 types of cancer: a prospective cohort study of 3.5 million adults in Spain. *BMC Med.* 2021; 19:10.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Additional supporting information may be found online in the Supporting Information section at the end of this article.

How to cite this article: Fang X, Wang X, Song Z, et al. Causal association of childhood obesity with cancer risk in adulthood: A Mendelian randomization study. *Int. J. Cancer*. 2021;149(7): 1421–1425. https://doi.org/10.1002/ijc.33691