Association of Fish Consumption and Metabolic Syndrome Criteria in College Students

Introduction

Metabolic Syndrome (MetS) is a cluster of conditions which increases the risk of developing cardiovascular disease and diabetes.¹ MetS affects one-third of American adults, and 26%-40% of American college students meet at least one of the MetS criteria.^{2,3} Early detection of MetS criteria in young adults could lead to targeted interventions to lower the risk of developing MetS, diabetes, and cardiovascular disease in the future.¹

The American Heart Association (AHA) recommends consuming at least 2 servings of fish per week (one serving equals 3.5 ounces, cooked).⁴ Higher fish consumption may be associated with protective factors against MetS, but limited studies have investigated the association between fish consumption and MetS prevalence among college students.^{5,6}

Objective

This study aims to examine the association between fish consumption and MetS criteria prevalence in a sample of college-aged students (18-24).

Metabolic Syndrome

Defined based on the presence of \geq 3 criteria:

Waist circumference	Women: $\geq 88 \text{ cm}$
	Men: $\geq 102 \text{ cm}$
HDL-C	Women: < 50 mg/dL
	Men: $< 40 \text{ mg/dL}$
Blood pressure	Systolic: \geq 130 mmHg
	Diastolic: \geq 85 mmHg
Triglycerides	\geq 150 g/dL
Fasting blood glucose	\geq 100 mg/dL

Methods

Study Design:

This study is part of the College Health & Nutrition Assessment Survey, an ongoing study of the health status of college students (18-24 years old) at the University of New Hampshire (UNH IRB # 5524).

Participants:

Young adults were recruited from an introductory nutrition course at UNH between 2012-2018; all subjects provided informed consent to participate, and demographic information was self-reported via Wellness Questionnaire.

Measurements:

- Fish consumption was determined using the question "In the past 30 days, and on average, how many servings of fish per week did you consume?"
- Waist circumference (WC) was measured twice by trained technicians
- A finger-stick was used to obtain fasting blood samples and LDX Cholestech analyzed HDL-C, triglycerides (TGs), and fasting blood glucose (FBG)
- Systolic and diastolic blood pressure (SBP and DBP) were measured twice after a 5-minute rest using an automatic device; mean pressures were analyzed

Data Management & Analysis:

- Fish consumption was categorized into four frequency groups: 0, >0-<2, 2-3, or >3 servings/week
- Analyses was conducted using ANCOVA
- Covariates: gender, exercise, kilocalories (3-day average), and BMI

Mea

% G

% C

% R

Mea

% P1

Smo

% N

SE) Criteria (Mean Of Mets

#



Lily Vinocoor BS & Jesse Stabile Morrell PhD Department of Agriculture, Nutrition and Food Systems University of New Hampshire, Durham, NH

Subject Characteristics According to Level of Fish Consumption

h Consumption Groups	0 servings/week (N=917)	>0-<2 servings/week (N=905)	2-3 servings/week (N= 754)	>3 servings/week (N=272)
an Age (years, ± SE)	$18.7 \pm .03$	$19 \pm .04$	$19 \pm .04$	$19.1 \pm .07$
Gender				
Male/Female	26.4/73.6	27.3/72.7	36.5/63.5	48.9/51.1
Class				
Freshman	58.3	52.4	54.9	52.2
Sophomore	29.9	33.1	31.8	30.5
Upper classmen	11.8	14.5	13.3	17.3
Race				
White	94.0	95.2	92.0	90.5
an BMI (kg/m ² , \pm SE)	$23.5 \pm .12$	$23.5 \pm .13$	$23.6 \pm .13$	$24 \pm .22$
Physical activity				
Low active	23.7	19.8	16.9	16.3
Moderately active	45.6	45.8	43.6	37.8
High active	30.7	34.4	39.5	45.9
oking Status (% YES)	4.4	4.8	6.4	9.9
Major				
Nutrition	5.8	6.4	6.6	5.1
Allied health	20.0	16.8	16.6	17.6
Non-nutrition or allied health	74.3	76.8	76.8	77.2

Fish Consumption Differences in # of MetS Criteria 0.8 0.7 0.6 0.5 0.721 0.699 0.699 0.3 0.2 0.1 0 servings/week >0-<2 servings/week 2-3 servings/week Fish Consumption Groups

Adjusted for gender, exercise, kilocalories (3-day average), and BMI



- ≥ 1 criteria of MetS
- There were no differences between number of MetS
- groups for WC (p=.55), SBP (p=.43), DBP(p=.09), and TGs (p=.16)
- significantly higher FBG (all $p \le 0.04$)

Strengths & Limitations

Strengths:

• Large sample size (N=2,848) technicians and validated instruments

Limitations:

- servings/week

Given the observed modest benefit in selected MetS parameters with higher fish consumption, these findings support emphasizing fish as part of the dietary recommendations for young adults.

Acknowledgement

This research was supported in part by the New Hampshire Agriculture Experiment Station and the USDA National Institute of Food and Agriculture Hatch Project 1010738.

1) Mbugua SM, Kimani ST, Munyoki G. Metabolic syndrome and its components among university students in Kenya. BMC Public Health. 2017;17:909. 2) Saklayen MG. The Global Epidemic of the Metabolic Syndrome. *Curr Hypertens Rep.* 2018;20. 3) Kim Y-S, Xun P, Iribarren C, et al. Intake of fish and long-chain omega-3 polyunsaturated fatty acids and incidence of metabolic syndrome among American young adults: a 25-year follow-up study. *Eur J Nutr*. 2016;55:1707-1716. 4) Fish and Omega-3 Fatty Acids. www.heart.org. https://www.heart.org/en/healthy-living/healthy-eating/eatsmart/fats/fish-and-omega-3-fatty-acids. Accessed December 3, 2019. 5) Tørris C, Molin M, Cvancarova MS. Lean fish consumption is associated with lower risk of metabolic syndrome: a Norwegian cross sectional study. BMC Public Health. 2016;16:347. 6) Tørris C, Molin M, Cvancarova Småstuen M. Fish consumption and its possible preventive role on the development and prevalence of metabolic syndrome - a systematic review. *Diabetol Metab Syndr*. 2014;6:112

Results

• The prevalence of MetS was 3.4%; 49.4% of students met

• The majority consumed less than the AHA's recommendation of 2 servings of fish per week (64%), and 32.2% consumed 0 servings of fish/week

criteria according to fish consumption group • There were no differences according to fish consumption

• The 0 servings fish/week group had significantly lower HDL-C (all $p \le 0.02$) compared to the other groups and

• Anthropometric measurements were collected by trained

• Reporting bias; over- or underestimation of fish

• Unable to determine type of fish or fish preparation • Cross-sectional studies cannot determine cause and effect

Conclusion

References

