

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

Table S1. Search terms used in databases.

MEDLINE (via PubMed)
((("european prospective investigation into cancer" OR "EPIC study") AND ("cancer" OR "tumor" OR "tumour" OR "myelo*" OR "leukaemia" OR "leukemia" OR "neoplasm*" OR "lympho*" OR "carcinoma" OR "sarcoma") AND ("diet" OR "intake" OR "nutrients" OR "physical activity" OR "exercise" OR "BMI" OR "alcohol") AND ("mortality" OR "survival"))))
Scopus
TITLE-ABS-KEY (("european prospective investigation into cancer" OR "EPIC study") AND ("cancer" OR "tumor" OR "tumour" OR "myelo*" OR "leukaemia" OR "leukemia" OR "neoplasm*" OR "lympho*" OR "carcinoma" OR "sarcoma") AND ("diet" OR "intake" OR "nutrients" OR "physical activity" OR "exercise" OR "BMI" OR "alcohol") AND ("mortality" OR "survival"))
Web of Science
((("european prospective investigation into cancer" OR "EPIC study")) AND TEMA: (("cancer" OR "tumor" OR "tumour" OR "myelo*" OR "leukaemia" OR "leukemia" OR "neoplasm*" OR "lympho*" OR "carcinoma" OR "sarcoma")) AND TEMA: (("diet" OR "intake" OR "nutrients" OR "physical activity" OR "exercise" OR "BMI" OR "alcohol")) AND TEMA: (("mortality" OR "survival"))

Table S2. Joanna Briggs Institute Critical Appraisal Tool for Cohort Studies.

	Yes	No	Unclear	Not applicable
1. Were the two groups similar and recruited from the same population?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Were the exposures measured similarly to assign people to both exposed and unexposed groups?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Was the exposure measured in a valid and reliable way?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Were confounding factors identified?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Were strategies to deal with confounding factors stated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Were the groups/participants free of the outcome at the start of the study (or at the moment of exposure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Were the outcomes measured in a valid and reliable way?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Was the follow up time reported and sufficient to be long enough for outcomes to occur?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Was follow up complete, and if not, were the reasons to loss to follow up described and explored?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. Were strategies to address incomplete follow up utilized?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. Was appropriate statistical analysis used?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Table S3. Quality assessment of included articles.

Study	Item 1	Item 2	Item 3	Item 4	Item 5	Item 6	Item 7	Item 8	Item 9	Item 10	Item 11	Quality Category
Aasheim 2015 [60]	N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓	High
Agudo 2017 [63]	N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓	High
Appleby 2016 [43]	N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓	High
Bamia 2010 [70]	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓	High
Bergmann 2013 [66]	N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓	High
Buckland 2011 [41]	N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓	High
Buckland 2012 [58]	N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓	High
Burger 2012 [36]	N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓	High
Chuang 2012 [37]	N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓	High
Deschaseaux 2020 [64]	N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓	High
Engeset 2015 [39]	N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓	High
Fedirko 2012 [50]	N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓	High
Ferrari 2014 [65]	N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓	High
González 2021 [76]	N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓	High
Heath 2021 [68]	N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓	High
Huerta 2016 [47]	N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓	High
Kyrø 2015 [56]	N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓	High
Lassale 2016 [42]	N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓	High
Li 2011 [57]	N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓	High
Li 2012 [55]	N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓	High
Leenders 2013 [34]	N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓	High
Mok 2019 [45]	N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓	High
Mullee 2019 [67]	N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓	High
Muller 2014 [51]	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓	High
Mulligan 2018 [74]	N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓	High
Myint 2019 [54]	N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓	High
Nimptsch 2010 [52]	N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓	High
Nöthlings 2008 [33]	N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓	High
Pala 2019 [40]	N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓	High
Perez-Cornago 2017 [35]	N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓	High
Perez-Cornago 2020 [75]	N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓	High
Pischon 2008 [69]	N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓	High
Rohrmann 2013 [61]	N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓	High

Romaguera 2015 [49]	N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓	High
Sahlqvist 2013 [46]	N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓	High
Sawada 2017 [71]	N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓	High
Segovia-Siapco 2018 [44]	N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓	High
Sluik 2011 [72]	N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓	High
Sluik 2012 [77]	N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓	High
Vergnaud 2013 [48]	N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓	High
Ward 2016 [38]	N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓	High
Wijndaele 2011 [73]	N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓	High
Zamora-Ros 2013 [59]	N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓	High
Zamora-Ros 2019 [62]	N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓	High
Zwakenberg 2017 [53]	N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓	High
Criterion Score %	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	N/A	100	

Note that the criterion score is calculated by dividing the number of studies meeting one criterion by the total number of studies. ✓: meet the methodological quality criterion; ✖: not meet the methodological quality criterion.; ?: unclear; N/A: not applicable.