Check for updates

OPEN ACCESS

EDITED BY Georgios D. Panos, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece

REVIEWED BY Martha Neuringer, Oregon Health and Science University, United States Neetu Kushwah, Boston Children's Hospital and Harvard Medical School, United States

*CORRESPONDENCE Pengcheng Hu Mpcyanke@126.com Ming He 18883851143@163.com

[†]These authors have contributed equally to this work and share first authorship

RECEIVED 29 May 2024 ACCEPTED 13 August 2024 PUBLISHED 04 September 2024

CITATION

Li K, Liu J, Li X, Liu X, Hu P and He M (2024) Association of EPA and DHA with age-related macular degeneration: a cross-sectional study from NHANES. *Front. Med.* 11:1440479. doi: 10.3389/fmed.2024.1440479

COPYRIGHT

© 2024 Li, Liu, Li, Liu, Hu and He. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.

Association of EPA and DHA with age-related macular degeneration: a cross-sectional study from NHANES

Kewei Li^{1†}, Jialing Liu^{2†}, Xuhui Li³, Xiaozhu Liu⁴, Pengcheng Hu^{3*} and Ming He^{3*}

¹Department of Ophthalmology, the First Affiliated Hospital of Chongqing Medical University, Chongqing, China, ²Department of Phase I Clinical Trial Center, the Second Affiliated Hospital of Chongqing Medical University, Chongqing, China, ³Department of Ophthalmology, the Second Affiliated Hospital of Chongqing Medical University, Chongqing, China, ⁴Emergency and Critical Care Medical Center, Beijing Shijitan Hospital, Capital Medical University, Beijing, China

Purpose: This cross-sectional study conducted in the general US population investigated the association between dietary intake of eicosapentaenoic acid (EPA) and docosahexaenoic acid (DHA) and the prevalence of AMD.

Methods: Data from the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES) were utilized, including 4,842 participants aged 40 years and older. Dietary EPA and DHA intake data were collected through two 24-h dietary recall interviews and adjusted for weight. AMD was determined by a standardized grading system based on the presence of key features of AMD in color photographs of the macula. Multivariate logistic regression and restricted cubic spline models evaluated the associations between dietary EPA and DHA intake and AMD. Subgroup analysis and interaction analysis explored the influence of covariates.

Results: A total of 4,842 participants were included. In the multivariate-adjusted model 2, the odds ratios (ORs) with 95% confidence intervals (CIs) for AMD were 0.86 (0.75, 0.99) and 0.88 (0.80, 0.97) per unit increase in dietary EPA and DHA intake, respectively. Interaction testing revealed significant effect modification by age, education, and BMI on the EPA-AMD association, indicating these factors significantly impacted this inverse relationship (*p*-interaction < 0.05). Similarly, age, education, BMI, and cataract surgery history modified the inverse DHA-AMD association (*p*-interaction < 0.05). Dose-response analyses demonstrated a negative correlation between dietary EPA and DHA intake with AMD prevalence (*p*-nonlinearity = 0.184 and 0.548, respectively).

Conclusion: Our findings suggested that higher dietary EPA and DHA intake could be associated with lower AMD risk in older US adults. Age, education level, BMI, and history of cataract surgery may influence this inverse association.

KEYWORDS

age-related macular degeneration, eicosapentaenoic acid (EPA), docosahexaenoic acid (DHA), dose-response, NHANES

1 Introduction

Age-related macular degeneration (AMD) is a disease that damages the macular region of the retina. It can be neovascular (also known as wet or exudative) or non-neovascular (known as atrophic, dry, or non-exudative). Both result in the loss of central visual acuity, leading to severe and permanent visual impairment and irreversible blindness (1, 2). In 2020, AMD ranked as the fourth leading cause of blindness worldwide and the third most common cause of moderate and severe vision impairment (MSVI). Moreover, AMD represents the primary cause of severe vision loss among individuals over 50 years of age in high-income nations (3). Age-related macular degeneration is estimated to be present in 8.69% of the world's population. The projected number of people with this disease in 2020 is 196 million; This prevalence is expected to increase to 288 million in 2040 (4).

N-3 polyunsaturated fatty acids are a class of essential polyunsaturated fatty acids that are crucial for human health. They include alpha-linolenic acid (ALA), eicosapentaenoic acid (EPA), and docosahexaenoic acid (DHA). ALA, the principal dietary omega-3 fatty acid, serves as a precursor to EPA, which in turn is the precursor for DHA. Docosahexaenoic acid (DHA), a long-chain omega-3 (n-3) polyunsaturated fatty acid, is a predominant lipid constituent of the membranes of the outer segment of retinal photoreceptors, and possesses antiinflammatory and anti-angiogenic properties (5). It affects both the survival and development of neurons and retinal vascular cells (6, 7). EPA inhibits eicosanoids derived from arachidonic acid (AA), which have been implicated in retinal neovascular abnormalities, increased vascular permeability, and inflammatory processes (8, 9). EPA also enhances cellular antioxidant capacity by optimizing mitochondrial function and biogenesis, thus highlighting the potential of EPA supplementation to mitigate oxidative damage associated with chronic diseases (10). Studies in adult humans demonstrate that the conversion of α -Linolenic acid (ALA) to EPA and DHA is generally poor. Therefore, we need to eat foods that provide adequate amounts of EPA and DHA, including fish and fish oil products (11).

Clinical studies of the effects of omega-3 fatty acids on AMD have been inconsistent. Several studies showed that a higher intake of n-3 fatty acids was associated with a lower risk of AMD progression (12, 13). For example, Agron et al. (14) found that higher dietary intake of long-chain polyunsaturated fatty acids, such as DHA and EPA, was associated with a reduced risk of advanced age-related macular degeneration (AMD), particularly for the geographic atrophy (GA) subtype. However, other studies have different results. A prospective cohort study found that for patients with unilateral exudative AMD, 3 years of oral DHAenriched supplementation had the same effect on the incidence of choroidal neovascularization (CNV) in the second eye as placebo (15). The Age-Related Eye Disease Study 2 (AREDS2) Randomized Clinical Trial showed that DHA+EPA did not further reduce the risk of progression to advanced AMD (16). A Cochrane review showed that omega-3 fatty acids supplementation in people with AMD for periods of up to 5 years did not reduce the risk of progression to advanced AMD. Therefore, currently available evidence does not support increasing dietary intake of omega-3 fatty acids for the explicit purpose of preventing or slowing the progression of AMD (17).

Because of the inconsistency of the above results, we conducted this cross-sectional study using data from NHANES 2005–2008 to explore the associations between EPA and DHA intake with the risk of AMD, and to explore the corresponding doseresponse relationships.

2 Materials and methods

2.1 Study design and data source

We examined this association utilizing data from the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES) 2005–2008 for the US population. NHANES employs a complex, multistage probability sampling design to target a nationally representative sample of non-institutionalized civilians, implemented by the National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS). Appropriate weighting schemes were utilized throughout the analysis to provide optimal prevalence estimates for the US population. Data collection was performed via in-person interviews, telephone interviews, mobile medical examinations, and laboratory testing. The National Center for Health Statistics Ethics Review Board approved the study protocol (2005–2006), and informed consent was obtained from all participants for ongoing research through at-home interviews and examinations.

In NHANES 2005–2008, there were a total of 20,497 individuals, and our analyses were limited to 7,081 individuals over 40 years of age that had reliable 24-h dietary data. Among them, the individuals without complete AMD diagnosis and EPA or DHA data (n = 2,085), and with missing data on education, alcohol use, diabetes, hypertension, smoking, BMI, cataract surgery, and glaucoma (n = 139) were also excluded. Additionally, individuals with extreme total dietary energy intake were excluded from the study (males: < 500 or > 8,000 kcal/day, females: < 500 or > 5,000 kcal/day) (n = 15). Finally, we included a total of 4,842 participants in this cross-sectional study (Figure 1). We included the worse eye of each patient in our analysis.

2.2 Definition of AMD and ophthalmic examination

The main outcome was the presence of AMD diagnosed by NHANES on fundus photography. Two 45° non-mydriatic digital retinal images of each eye were obtained using fundus photography from an ophthalmic digital imaging system in participants 40 years and older. The first image was centered on the macula and the second on the optic nerve. The classification of age-related macular degeneration (AMD) was determined based on the condition of the worse eye. The grading team included nine experienced graders. The graders viewed each retinal image with a highresolution monitor, using the EyeQLite image processing software and database, and referenced the written protocol and the digital photographic standards to evaluate retinal abnormalities (18). Early AMD was characterized by the presence or absence of drusen and/or pigmentary abnormalities, while late AMD was indicated



by signs of exudative AMD and/or geographic atrophy (18). All images were graded by at least two individuals; When the first two inspectors failed to reach a consensus regarding a diagnosis, a third assessor examined the eye photographs.

2.3 Dietary intake of EPA and DHA

Dietary intake of DHA and EPA was assessed utilizing two 24-h dietary recalls. The primary recall was performed in person at the Mobile Examination Center (MEC), while the secondary recall was conducted via telephone interview 3 to 10 days subsequently. Participants reported foods and beverages consumed in the 24 h preceding the interview (midnight to midnight), and their reported food intake was used to calculate energy and nutrients. Comprehensive dietary interview procedures are accessible per NHANES dietary interviewer guideline manuals (19). DHA and EPA intake were estimated based on a detailed 2day dietary recall from the participants, which was then analyzed using the United States Department of Agriculture's Food and Nutrient Database for Dietary Studies, 3.0 (FNDDS 3.0). This database facilitated the calculation of nutrient intake from various food items consumed by the subjects, allowing for an accurate estimation of their DHA and EPA consumption (20). These intake values were then normalized by body weight (mg/kg/day) and partitioned into quartiles.

2.4 Covariates

Age, gender, race, and educational level were collected in demographic data. The poverty income ratio (PIR) was calculated by dividing the total income of a household by the poverty threshold for that household size, multiplied by the square root of the number of people in the household. A ratio of 1.0 or higher indicates that the household's income is at or above the poverty level, while a ratio below 1.0 signifies that the household's income is below the poverty threshold. Smoking status was obtained from cigarette use in the questionnaire and classified into 3 levels. The 3 levels were defined as never (smoked < 100 cigarettes in a lifetime), former (smoked \geq 100 cigarettes in life and smoke not at all now), and now (have smoked \geq 100 consumption was categorized into five levels based on questionnaire data: never

10.3389/fmed.2024.1440479

drinking (< 12 lifetime alcoholic drinks), former drinking (≥ 12 drinks/year but none in the past year), heavy drinking (≥ 4 and \geq 3 drinks/day for men and women or binge drinking > 4 days/month), moderate drinking (\geq 3 and \geq 2 drinks/day for men and women or binge drinking 1-4 days/month), and mild drinking (below moderate drinking criteria). Body mass index (BMI) was acquired from body measures in the examination data, which were calculated as weight in kilograms divided by height in meters squared. Hypertension was defined by any of the following criteria: (1) self-reported physician diagnosis on the questionnaire; (2) use of antihypertensive medication; or (3) systolic blood pressure \geq 140 mmHg or diastolic blood pressure \geq 90 mmHg. Hyperlipidemia was defined as meeting one or more of the following: (1) serum total cholesterol $\geq 200 \text{ mg/dL}$ [5.18 mmol/L]; (2) triglycerides \geq 150 mg/dL; (3) HDL cholesterol < 40 mg/dL [1.04 mmol/L] in men and < 50 mg/dL [1.30 mmol/L] in women; (4) LDL cholesterol \geq 130 mg/dL [3.37 mmol/L]; or (5) use of cholesterol-lowering medication. Diabetes was defined by the presence of one or more of the following: (1) fasting plasma glucose \geq 7.0 mmol/L; (2) random or 2-h OGTT plasma glucose ≥ 11.1 mmol/L; (3) glycated hemoglobin > 6.5%; (4) use of anti-diabetic medication; or (5) selfreported physician diagnosis. Cardiovascular diseases (CVD) were defined as meeting the following conditions:(1) coronary heart disease; (2) congestive heart failure; (3) heart attack; (4) stroke; (5) angina. Comorbid eye conditions include a self-reported history of cataract operation and glaucoma.

2.5 Statistical analysis

Per NHANES analytical guidelines, novel sample weights were derived by halving the original weights when amalgamating two cycles (NHANES 2005-2008) for this analysis. Crude weights were obtained from the two-day dietary sample weights. Continuous variables were conveyed as weighted mean \pm standard error (SE). Categorical variables were conveyed as weighted percentages (95% confidence interval). The Student's t-test for survey data and Rao-Scott chi-square test were utilized to juxtapose means of continuous variables and percentages of categorical variables between the AMD and non-AMD groups, respectively. Associations between dietary DHA and EPA and weighted odds ratios (95% confidence intervals) for AMD were calculated by multivariate logistic regression, which was adjusted by relevant variables. Model 1 was adjusted for age, sex, and race. Model 2 was adjusted for age, sex, race, education level, poverty income ratio, smoking status, alcohol intake, BMI, diabetes, hypertension, CVD, hyperlipidemia, cataract operation, and history of glaucoma. To probe the EPA/DHA-AMD relationship across subpopulations, subgroup analysis was undertaken. For each categorical variable, we conducted separate analyses to explore the relationship between EPA or DHA intake and AMD. For the continuous variable of age, we divided it into two subgroups for analysis: 40-64 years old and 65 years old or above. This categorization was based on the distribution characteristics of our data and clinical relevance, facilitating the analysis and interpretation. Interaction analyses were performed by including multiplicative interaction terms in our statistical models. We assessed whether the effect of EPA or DHA intake on AMD risk was modified by other variables. Specifically, we tested for significant interactions by including cross-product terms of EPA or DHA with other covariates in the model and evaluated the significance of the coefficients associated with these terms. We considered interactions to be statistically significant if the p < 0.05. Additionally, dose-response relationships were scrutinized employing logistic regression modeling with restricted cubic spline (RCS) in the definitive analysis model. Nonlinear *p*-values were derived. A *p*-value for nonlinearity below 0.05 signifies the presence of a statistically significant nonlinear association in the logistic regression model with RCS. All statistical analyses were performed using the R language. A two-tailed P < 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

3 Results

Demographics of the study participants, encompassing 383 subjects with AMD and 4,459 without AMD, are depicted in Table 1. The prevalence of AMD was 7.91% (383/4,842). The mean age was 68.86 ± 0.94 and 55.91 ± 0.36 years in each group, respectively. There were substantial variations between the groups in terms of age, race, poverty income ratio (PIR), Smoking, alcohol intake, diabetes, hypertension, CVD, Hyperlipidemia, Cataract operation, and History of glaucoma (P < 0.05). Furthermore, DHA and EPA intake in non-AMD participants was significantly higher than in AMD participants (P < 0.05).

Weighted odds ratios (ORs) with 95% confidence intervals (95% CIs) of AMD based on EPA and DHA are shown in Tables 2, 3, respectively. In the unadjusted model, both were significantly associated with AMD (OR: 0.84, 95% CI: 0.76, 0.94; OR: 0.85, 95% CI: 0.78, 0.93) (p < 0.05), respectively. In Model 1, after adjusting for age, gender, and race, EPA and DHA intakes were still inversely associated with the risk of AMD. After further adjusting for education level, poverty income ratio, smoking status, alcohol intake, BMI, diabetes, hypertension, CVD, hyperlipidemia, cataract operation, and history of glaucoma in Model 2, the ORs with 95% CIs of AMD were 0.86 (0.75, 0.99) and 0.88 (0.80, 0.97) for EPA and DHA, respectively. The trend analysis for EPA intake demonstrates a significant protective effect against AMD, with a statistically significant trend (P for trend < 0.05). In contrast, for DHA intake, the trend analysis in model 2 does not show a significant relationship with the risk of AMD. This lack of significance suggests that the protective effect of DHA may not be as consistent or as strong as that of EPA.

The results of our subgroup analysis revealed that there were inconsistent relationships between dietary EPA and DHA with AMD (Tables 4, 5). Regarding the relationship between dietary EPA and AMD, stratified subgroups showing statistically significant associations included participants aged 40–64 years, some college or above, BMI ≥ 30 (kg/m2), without diabetes, CVD, hyperlipidemia, cataract operation, and history of glaucoma connection. A significant association of dietary DHA with AMD was observed in participants aged 40–64, Female, Non-Hispanic White, some college or above, BMI ≥ 30 (kg/m2), former drinking, hyperlipidemia, without diabetes and CVD, without history of glaucoma and cataract operation (all p < 0.05). Interaction analysis uncovered significant disparities based on age, education level,

TABLE 1 Characteristics of the participants: a cross-sectional study using data from NHANES 2005–2008 (N = 4,842).

Characteristic	All participants $(N = 4,842)$	Without AMD (<i>n</i> = 4,459)	With AMD (<i>n</i> = 383)	<i>P</i> -value
Mean age (\pm SE), year	56.77 ± 0.39	55.91 ± 0.36	68.86 ± 0.94	< 0.001
Age group				< 0.001
40-64	73.79 (65.77, 81.82)	76.81 (74.74, 78.88)	31.27 (24.80, 37.75)	
≥ 65	26.21 (22.63, 29.78)	23.19 (21.12, 25.26)	68.73 (62.25, 75.20)	
Sex				0.532
Female	54.31 (48.75, 59.88)	54.17 (52.50, 55.84)	56.30 (50.15, 62.45)	
Male	45.69 (40.26, 51.11)	45.83 (44.16, 47.50)	43.70 (37.55, 49.85)	
Race/ethnicity				< 0.001
Non-Hispanic White	78.60 (67.32, 89.88)	77.86 (73.83, 81.88)	89.03 (85.87, 92.19)	
Non-Hispanic Black	9.38 (7.64, 11.12)	9.78 (7.29, 12.27)	3.73 (2.39, 5.07)	
Mexican American	5.14 (3.96, 6.31)	5.25 (3.91, 6.58)	3.55 (2.00, 5.11)	
Other Race	6.89 (5.06, 8.71)	7.11 (5.28, 8.94)	3.69 (1.12, 6.25)	
Education				0.239
Less than high school	16.42 (13.85, 18.99)	16.10 (14.05, 18.16)	20.90 (14.11, 27.69)	
High school graduate/GED	26.65 (22.98, 30.32)	26.63 (24.30, 28.96)	27.00 (20.92, 33.08)	
Some colleges or above	56.93 (49.83, 64.02)	57.27 (53.51, 61.03)	52.10 (44.46, 59.74)	
Poverty income ratio (PIR)				< 0.001
< 1	8.33 (7.06, 9.61)	8.36 (7.15, 9.58)	7.91 (4.79, 11.03)	
1–3	32.01 (27.25, 36.78)	31.07 (27.40, 34.74)	45.31 (38.50, 52.13)	
> 3	54.18 (46.44, 61.92)	55.32 (50.93, 59.71)	38.03 (30.89, 45.17)	
Unknown	5.47 (4.26, 6.68)	5.24 (4.07, 6.41)	8.75 (4.65, 12.84)	
Smoking status				< 0.001
Never	48.32 (42.32, 54.32)	48.93 (46.37, 51.48)	39.80 (33.95, 45.65)	
Former	31.39 (27.86, 34.91)	30.50 (28.05, 32.95)	43.88 (37.84, 49.93)	
Now	20.29 (17.00, 23.58)	20.57 (18.28, 22.87)	16.32 (11.02, 21.62)	
Alcohol intake				0.047
Never	10.77 (9.15, 12.38)	10.40 (8.66, 12.14)	15.90 (12.16, 19.63)	
Former	21.93 (18.94, 24.91)	21.68 (19.40, 23.95)	25.47 (21.14, 29.80)	
Mild	40.07 (34.78, 45.37)	40.33 (37.73, 42.93)	36.47 (29.08, 43.85)	
Moderate	15.24 (13.01, 17.48)	15.37 (13.95, 16.79)	13.42 (9.40, 17.44)	
Heavy	11.99 (10.06, 13.92)	12.22 (11.08, 13.37)	8.74 (4.05, 13.43)	
BMI (kg/m ²) (%)				0.191
< 18.5	1.17 (0.75, 1.60)	1.22 (0.79, 1.65)	0.48 (-0.08, 1.04)	
18.5–30	62.26 (55.25, 69.27)	61.96 (59.27, 64.65)	66.50 (60.30, 72.70)	
≥ 30	36.57 (31.89, 41.24)	36.82 (34.15, 39.49)	33.02 (26.86, 39.19)	
Diabetes				0.047
No	83.71 (74.32, 93.10)	84.06 (82.24, 85.88)	78.85 (72.90, 84.80)	
Yes	16.29 (13.98, 18.59)	15.94 (14.12, 17.76)	21.15 (15.20, 27.10)	
Hypertension				< 0.001
No	50.32 (44.05, 56.60)	51.50 (48.74, 54.25)	33.78 (26.74, 40.81)	
Yes	49.68 (44.07, 55.29)	48.50 (45.75, 51.26)	66.22 (59.19, 73.26)	
CVD				< 0.001

(Continued)

TABLE 1 (Continued)

Characteristic	All participants (N = 4,842)	Without AMD (n = 4,459)	With AMD (<i>n</i> = 383)	<i>P</i> -value
No	88.24 (78.87, 97.61)	89.28 (88.08, 90.48)	73.66 (67.83, 79.49)	
Yes	11.76 (9.90, 13.61)	10.72 (9.52, 11.92)	26.34 (20.51, 32.17)	
Hyperlipidemia				0.018
No	19.26 (17.58, 20.94)	19.67 (17.98, 21.36)	13.48 (9.48, 17.47)	
Yes	80.74 (71.18, 90.30)	80.33 (78.64, 82.02)	86.52 (82.53, 90.52)	
Cataract operation				< 0.001
No	90.65 (81.07, 100.22)	92.28 (91.46, 93.10)	67.59 (61.72, 73.45)	
Yes	9.35 (7.93, 10.78)	7.72 (6.90, 8.54)	32.41 (26.55, 38.28)	
History of glaucoma				< 0.001
No	95.05 (85.02, 105.08)	95.54 (94.71, 96.38)	88.07 (83.90, 92.25)	
Yes	4.95 (3.95, 5.95)	4.46 (3.62, 5.29)	11.93 (7.75, 16.10)	
Eicosapentaenoic (mg/kg/day)	0.67 ± 0.06	0.69 ± 0.06	0.37 ± 0.05	< 0.001
Docosahexaenoic (mg/kg/day)	1.21 ± 0.10	1.24 ± 0.11	0.70 ± 0.07	< 0.001

Continuous variables were expressed as weighted mean \pm standard error (SE). Categorical variables were expressed as weighted percentages (95% confidence interval). *P*-values were weighted by dietary two-day sample weight. AMD, age-related macular degeneration; CVD, cardiovascular disease; BMI, body mass index.

and BMI regarding the association between dietary EPA and AMD, indicating these variables substantially impacted this inverse relationship (*p*-interaction < 0.05). Additionally, age, education status, BMI, and cataract surgery history modulated the negative correlation between dietary DHA and AMD (*p*-interaction < 0.05).

The dose-response relationship between EPA and DHA intake with AMD prevalence is exhibited in Figures 2, 3. A negative correlation association was evident between EPA intake and AMD prevalence (nonlinearity p = 0.184). AMD prevalence declined with rising EPA intake; no discernible threshold or inflection point was apparent. Moreover, the DHA-AMD prevalence dose-response relationship was similar (nonlinearity p = 0.548), implying that AMD risk decreased with escalating dietary DHA.

4 Discussion

In this cross-sectional study of nationally representative US adults, we investigated the associations between dietary DHA and EPA with the risk of AMD among older adults in the United States. we found that dietary intakes of DHA and EPA were associated with a lower prevalence rate of AMD. We also found that age, education, BMI, and history of cataract operation may influence this negative association. The dose-response relationship revealed that there were negative associations of dietary DHA and EPA with the prevalence of AMD.

Our results support previous studies that have found an inverse correlation between DHA and EPA and AMD risk. A multicenter, prospective cohort study indicated a significant correlation between elevated DHA levels as well as increased combined DHA+EPA levels and decreased risk of early AMD. However, EPA levels alone did not exhibit a significant association with AMD (21). A randomized controlled study found that serum EPA was significantly associated with a lower risk of neovascular AMD (OR = 0.41; 95% CI 0.22–0.77; p = 0.005). Analysis of red blood

TABLE 2 Weighted odds ratios (95% confidence intervals) of AMD with adjusted dietary eicosapentaenoic intake (mg/Kg/day).

	Crude	Model 1	Model 2
Eicosapentaenoic (mg/kg/day)	0.84 (0.76, 0.94)	0.85 (0.76, 0.96)	0.86 (0.75, 0.99)
Quintiles of eicc	sapentaenoic		
Q1 (N = 1,203) (0- 0.034 mg/Kg/day)	Ref	Ref	Ref
Q2 (N = 1,223) (0.034– 0.099 mg/Kg/day)	0.92 (0.58, 1.45)	0.87 (0.55, 1.38)	0.91 (0.51, 1.63)
Q3 (N = 1,206) (0.099– 0.318 mg/Kg/day)	0.66 (0.43, 1.00)	0.76 (0.49, 1.17)	0.79 (0.44, 1.43)
Q4 (<i>N</i> = 1,210) (0.318– 22.991 mg/Kg/day)	0.55 (0.38, 0.81)	0.59 (0.40, 0.87)	0.62 (0.38, 1.00)
<i>P</i> for trend	0.002	0.008	0.035

Crude: non-adjusted model; Model 1 adjusted for age, sex, race; Model 2 adjusted for age, sex, race, education level, poverty income ratio, smoking status, alcohol intake, BMI, diabetes, hypertension, CVD, hyperlipidemia, cataract operation, and history of glaucoma.

cell membranes (RBCM) revealed that EPA and EPA+DHA were significantly associated with a lower risk of neovascular AMD (OR = 0.25; 95% CI 0.13–0.47; p < 0.0001 and OR = 0.52; 95% CI 0.29–0.94; p = 0.03, respectively) (22). Augood et al. (12) found that eating oily fish at least once a week compared to less than once a week was associated with a halving of the odds of NV-AMD (OR 0.47; 95% CI 0.33–0.68; p = 0.002) (12). Reynolds et al. (23) also indicated that an increase in self-reported dietary intake of omega-3 fatty acids (DHA and EPA) was significantly associated with a reduced risk of AMD progression (23).

In contrast, the results of several studies were not entirely consistent. In a randomized, double-blind, and comparative study,

	Crude	Model 1	Model 2
Docosahexaenoic (mg/kg/day)	0.85 (0.78, 0.93)	0.87 (0.80, 0.95)	0.88 (0.80, 0.97)
Quintiles of doc	osahexaenoic		
Q1 (<i>N</i> = 1,212) (0– 0.166 mg/Kg/day)	Ref	Ref	Ref
Q2 (N = 1,205) (0.166– 0.399 mg/Kg/day)	0.84 (0.51, 1.38)	0.91 (0.54, 1.53)	0.91 (0.44, 1.85)
Q3 (N = 1,214) (0.399– 0.993 mg/Kg/day)	0.68 (0.40, 1.14)	0.83 (0.47, 1.48)	0.86 (0.40, 1.84)
Q4 (N = 1,211) (0.993, 44.629 mg/Kg/day)	0.53 (0.35, 0.79)	0.63 (0.41, 0.99)	0.65 (0.36, 1.18)
<i>P</i> for trend	0.006	0.078	0.142

TABLE 3 Weighted odds ratios (95% confidence intervals) of AMD with adjusted dietary docosahexaenoic intake (mg/Kg/day).

Crude: non-adjusted model; Model 1 adjusted for age, sex, and race; Model 2 adjusted for age, sex, race, education level, poverty income ratio, smoking status, alcohol intake, BMI, diabetes, hypertension, CVD, hyperlipidemia, cataract operation, and history of glaucoma.

the patients were randomized to be allocated either 840 mg/day DHA and 270 mg/day EPA from fish oil capsules or placebo (olive oil capsules) for a 3-year duration. Time to onset and incidence of CNV in the study eye exhibited no significant differences between the DHA supplementation group compared to placebo (15). The Age-Related Eye Disease Study 2 (AREDS2) found that DHA+EPA did not further reduce the risk of progression to advanced AMD (24). A review also found that omega-3 fatty acids supplementation in people with AMD for periods of up to five years does not reduce the risk of progression to advanced AMD or the development of moderate to severe visual loss (17). However, there are several potential explanations for the negative result between omega-3 fatty acids supplementation and AMD. Firstly, the relatively low doses of DHA (350 or 840 mg) and EPA (650 or 270 mg) used in those trials may cause the results. A total of 1,027 patients were randomized to be allocated either approximately 1.6 g/day of long-chain omega-3 fatty acids (930 mg EPA and 660 mg DHA) or corn oil placebo as an adjunct to standard therapy. Following 2 years of follow-up, no significant differences were evident between the supplemented and control cohorts for the primary composite cardiovascular endpoint (25). However, a meta-regression analysis demonstrated that each 1 g/day increment in EPA+DHA intake conferred a 5.8% decrease in CVD risk. For myocardial infarction (MI) specifically, the risk reduction exhibited a dose-dependent relationship, with each supplemental 1 g/day of EPA+DHA conferring a significant 9% lowering of risk (25). Our study also found that the higher the dietary DHA and EPA, the lower the incidence of AMD, and it is a quantity-dependent relationship. Second, in AREDS2, participants were taking the AREDS1 formula; therefore, the effect of adding dietary DHA+EPA may have been masked by the base formula and an additional benefit could not be detected. Another additional explanation for the failure of omega-3 in these studies was that the follow-up time was short, and age is the most important influencing factor of AMD (2), so a long follow-up time can better observe the effect of DHA and EPA in the diet.

TABLE 4	Subgroup analysis and interaction test for the association			
between dietary eicosapentaenoic intake (mg/Kg/day) and AMD.				

Model 2OR 95% CIρp for interactionAge group0.31 0.29.0.970.0410.00540-640.53 0.29.0.970.04122 650.95 0.81, 1.000.04310.557Female0.83 0.09, 1.000.0520.014Male0.89 0.73, 1.080.0140.210Kac/ethnicity0.87 0.75, 1.000.0530.151Non-Hispanic0.91 0.52, 1.570.06750.018Mexican0.95 0.77, 1.190.7350.018Mexican0.95 0.77, 1.190.7350.018Education0.90 0.82, 1.220.0000.018Education1.00 0.82, 1.220.0000.018Igh school0.00 0.82, 1.220.00210.018Ighs chool0.00 0.82, 1.220.00210.021Igh school0.00 0.82, 1.220.00730.021Igh school0.02 0.55, 0.940.02130.272Some colleges or above0.72 0.55, 0.940.02350.014Igh school0.83 0.67, 1.030.0730.021Istin (FIR)0.62 0.37, 1.040.0730.021Istin (FIR)0.0210.0730.073Istin (FIR)0.0210.0730.073Istin (FIR)0.0210.0730.074Istin (FIR)0.023, 0.0210.0740.074Istin (FIR)0.023, 0.020.0740.074Istin (FIR)0.0203, 0.020.0740.074Istin (Istin (Istin (Istin (Istin (Istin (Istin (Istin (Istin (Ist	-	•		
40-640.53 (0.29, 0.97)0.04140-640.53 (0.29, 0.97)0.041≥ 650.95 (0.81, 1.10)0.431Sex0.83 (0.69, 1.00)0.052Fenale0.83 (0.69, 1.00)0.052Male0.89 (0.73, 1.08)0.013Kac/ethnicity0.91 (0.52, 1.57)0.053Non-Hispanic0.91 (0.52, 1.57)0.0675Back0.91 (0.52, 1.57)0.0735Mercian0.95 (0.77, 1.19)0.144Education10.004, 2.11)0.144Education10.004, 2.11)0.018Less than high school0.55 (0.63, 1.13)0.0218Jense than high school0.72 (0.55, 0.94)0.021Some colleges of sobove0.72 (0.55, 0.94)0.0213Fatio (PIR)0.72 (0.55, 0.94)0.0235Some colleges of sobove0.72 (0.57, 0.14)0.073Some colleges of sobove0.72 (0.57, 0.14)0.0213India (MER)0.0210.072Some colleges of sobove0.02 (0.71, 1.16)0.0235Verer0.83 (0.67, 1.03)0.073India (MER)0.0730.074Newen0.92 (0.73, 1.14)0.0366India (MER)0.07490.041Never0.92 (0.68, 1.23)0.0749Never0.92 (0.68, 1.23)0.0749Never0.92 (0.68, 1.24)0.0366Never0.92 (0.68, 1.24)0.0372Never0.90 (0.71, 1.15)0.0372Never0.90 (0.71, 1.15)0.0374 <t< th=""><th>Model 2</th><th>OR 95% CI</th><th>p</th><th></th></t<>	Model 2	OR 95% CI	p	
≥ 650.95 (0.81, 1.10)0.0.4310.057Sex0.83 (0.69, 1.00)0.0520.557Female0.89 (0.73, 1.08)0.0520.210Male0.89 (0.73, 1.08)0.0530.210Rac/ethnicity0.97 (0.75, 1.00)0.0530.194Non-Hispanic0.91 (0.52, 1.57)0.06750.018Black0.91 (0.52, 1.57)0.0730.018Merican0.95 (0.77, 1.19)0.01440.018Education10.004, 2.11)0.1440.018Education0.95 (0.63, 1.13)0.2180.018Less than high school0.72 (0.55, 0.94)0.0210.018Some colleges of sobove0.72 (0.55, 0.94)0.0210.0172Some colleges of sobove0.72 (0.57, 0.14)0.02350.021Some colleges of sobove0.72 (0.55, 0.94)0.0210.072Some colleges of sobove0.72 (0.57, 0.94)0.02350.021Some colleges of sobove0.92 (0.63, 1.20)0.0730.021Some colleges of sobove0.92 (0.71, 1.04)0.03720.021Some colleges of sobove0.92 (0.71, 1.04)0.0360.074Some colleges of sobove0.92 (0.71, 1.14)0.03660.0749Some colleges of sobove0.92 (0.71, 1.14)0.03640.0414Some colleges of sobove0.92 (0.71, 1.14)0.03660.0749Never0.92 (0.68, 1.23)0.05310.1541Never0.92 (0.68, 1.24)0.03640.0414	Age group			0.005
SexImageImageImageImageImageFemale0.83 (0.69, 1.00)0.052ImageMale0.89 (0.73, 1.08)0.11940.210Rac/ethnicity0.87 (0.75, 1.00)0.053ImageNon-Hispanic0.91 (0.52, 1.57)0.675ImageBlack0.91 (0.52, 1.57)0.675ImageMexican0.95 (0.77, 1.19)0.735ImageMexican0.95 (0.77, 1.19)0.735ImageCher Race0.30 (0.04, 2.11)0.144ImageEducation1.00 (0.82, 1.22)1.000ImageIgaduate/GED0.72 (0.55, 0.94)0.021ImageSome colleges or abover0.72 (0.55, 0.94)0.021ImageSome colleges or abover0.72 (0.57, 0.94)0.023ImageImage1.19 (0.87, 1.63)0.021ImageImage0.83 (0.67, 1.02)0.073ImageImage0.83 (0.67, 1.03)0.073ImageImage0.83 (0.67, 1.03)0.073ImageImage0.92 (0.31, 1.44)0.336ImageImage0.92 (0.81, 1.37)ImageImageImage0.92 (0.68, 1.23)0.037ImageImage0.92 (0.68, 1.23)0.037ImageImage0.92 (0.68, 1.23)ImageImageImage0.92 (0.68, 1.23)ImageImageImage0.92 (0.68, 1.23)ImageImageImage0.92 (0.68, 1.23)ImageImageImage<	40-64	0.53 (0.29, 0.97)	0.041	
Female0.83 (0.69, 1.00)0.052 (0.52)Male0.89 (0.73, 1.08)0.194Rac/ethnicity0.87 (0.75, 1.00)0.053Non-Hispanic0.91 (0.52, 1.57)0.675Black0.91 (0.52, 1.57)0.675Mexican0.95 (0.77, 1.19)0.735Merican0.95 (0.77, 1.19)0.735Cher Race0.30 (0.04, 2.11)0.144Education0.85 (0.63, 1.13)0.218Igstacharbigh0.85 (0.63, 1.13)0.0218Jraduate/GED1.00 (0.82, 1.22)1.000Graduate/GED0.72 (0.55, 0.94)0.0211Powerly income0.72 (0.55, 0.94)0.0213I-30.87 (0.69, 1.08)0.0178Powerly income0.83 (0.67, 1.02)0.0730Some colleges or0.87 (0.69, 1.08)0.0178I-30.83 (0.67, 1.02)0.073Somking status0.62 (0.37, 1.04)0.0372Now0.92 (0.73, 1.14)0.386Former0.92 (0.73, 1.14)0.386Now0.92 (0.74, 1.03)0.0678Now0.70 (0.47, 1.03)0.068Former0.92 (0.68, 1.23)0.0511Mider0.70 (0.47, 1.03)0.068Haay0.92 (0.68, 1.23)0.018Moderate0.92 (0.81, 1.27)0.230Solide (Mighral)0.92 (0.81, 1.27)0.230Solide (Mighral)0.92 (0.81, 1.27)0.230Solide (Mighral)0.92 (0.81, 1.27)0.231Solide (Mighral)0.92 (0.81, 1.27)0.018 <t< td=""><td>≥ 65</td><td>0.95 (0.81, 1.10)</td><td>0.431</td><td></td></t<>	≥ 65	0.95 (0.81, 1.10)	0.431	
Male0.89 (0.73, 1.08)0.1194Race/ethnicity0.87 (0.75, 1.00)0.053Non-Hispanic0.91 (0.52, 1.57)0.053Non-Hispanic0.91 (0.52, 1.57)0.675Back0.95 (0.77, 1.19)0.735Merican0.95 (0.77, 1.19)0.735Other Race0.30 (0.04, 2.11)0.144Education0.85 (0.63, 1.13)0.218Itigh school0.85 (0.63, 1.13)0.021graduate/GED0.72 (0.55, 0.94)0.021Some colleges or above0.72 (0.55, 0.94)0.021Some colleges or above0.72 (0.55, 0.94)0.0231-30.87 (0.69, 1.08)0.1781-30.87 (0.69, 1.08)0.1781-30.87 (0.69, 1.08)0.01731-30.83 (0.67, 1.02)0.07310known0.62 (0.37, 1.04)0.03610known0.62 (0.37, 1.04)0.036Never0.92 (0.73, 1.14)0.386Now0.78 (0.41, 1.47)0.390Now0.92 (0.68, 1.23)0.618Now0.92 (0.68, 1.23)0.618Never0.90 (0.71, 1.15)0.353Mild0.91 (0.75, 1.11)0.307Heavy0.92 (0.81, 1.05)0.168Miderate0.92 (0.81, 1.05)0.168Simoking status0.92 (0.81, 1.27)0.230Now0.92 (0.81, 1.27)0.2300.174Marce0.92 (0.81, 1.27)0.2300.168Mild0.91 (0.75, 1.11)0.3530.168Simoking	Sex			0.557
Race/ethnicityInterfact of the sector of the se	Female	0.83 (0.69, 1.00)	0.052	
Non-Hispanic White0.87 (0.75, 1.00)0.053INon-Hispanic Black0.91 (0.52, 1.57)0.675IMexican American0.95 (0.77, 1.19)0.735IOther Race0.30 (0.04, 2.11)0.144IEducationI0.144IEducation1.00 (0.82, 1.22)1.0000.018Igh school graduate/GED1.00 (0.82, 1.22)1.000ISome colleges or above0.72 (0.55, 0.94)0.021ISome colleges or above0.72 (0.55, 0.94)0.021I1-30.87 (0.69, 1.08)0.178I1-30.87 (0.69, 1.08)0.073I1-30.83 (0.67, 1.02)0.073I1-40.92 (0.73, 1.14)0.386I1-50.83 (0.67, 1.03)0.076I10known0.62 (0.37, 1.06)II10known0.62 (0.37, 1.06)0.073I10known0.63 (0.67, 1.03)0.076I10known0.63 (0.67, 1.03)0.076I10known0.62 (0.37, 1.14)0.386I10known0.78 (0.41, 1.47)0.390I10ker0.90 (0.71, 1.15)0.068I10ker0.90 (0.71, 1.15)0.037I10ker0.90 (0.71, 1.15)0.331I10ker0.90 (0.71, 1.15)0.331I10ker0.90 (0.71, 1.15)0.353I10ker0.90 (0.71, 1.15)0.168I10ker0.92 (Male	0.89 (0.73, 1.08)	0.194	
WhiteImage: set of the set of	Race/ethnicity			0.210
BlackImage: set of the set of	*	0.87 (0.75, 1.00)	0.053	
AmericanImage: American of the section of	*	0.91 (0.52, 1.57)	0.675	
EducationInterfact (1)Interfact (1)Education $0.85 (0.63, 1.13)$ 0.218 0.018 Less than high school $0.85 (0.63, 1.13)$ 0.218 0.018 High school graduate/GED $1.00 (0.82, 1.22)$ 1.000 0.021 Some colleges or above $0.72 (0.55, 0.94)$ 0.021 0.372 Poverty income ratio (PIR) $1.19 (0.87, 1.63)$ 0.235 0.372 < 1 $1.19 (0.87, 1.63)$ 0.235 0.372 < 1 $0.87 (0.69, 1.08)$ 0.178 0.678 > 3 $0.83 (0.67, 1.02)$ 0.073 0.678 Unknown $0.62 (0.37, 1.06)$ 0.073 0.678 Never $0.92 (0.73, 1.14)$ 0.386 0.749 Now $0.78 (0.41, 1.47)$ 0.390 0.749 Never $0.92 (0.68, 1.23)$ 0.531 0.749 Never $0.92 (0.68, 1.23)$ 0.678 0.009 Mild $0.91 (0.75, 1.11)$ 0.307 0.009 Mild $0.91 (0.75, 1.11)$ 0.353 0.009 Moderate $0.99 (0.71, 1.15)$ 0.353 0.009 BMI (kg/m ²) (%) $0.92 (0.81, 1.05)$ 0.168 0.009 $> 18.5-30$ $0.92 (0.81, 1.05)$ 0.011 0.541 No $0.84 (0.74, 0.96)$ 0.019 0.541 No $0.84 (0.74, 0.96)$ 0.019 0.541		0.95 (0.77, 1.19)	0.735	
Less than high school $0.85 (0.63, 1.13)$ 0.218 0.218 High school graduate/GED $1.00 (0.82, 1.22)$ 1.000 Some colleges or above $0.72 (0.55, 0.94)$ 0.021 Poverty income ratio (PIR) $0.72 (0.55, 0.94)$ 0.021 < 1 $0.72 (0.55, 0.94)$ 0.021 < 1 $0.72 (0.55, 0.94)$ 0.021 < 1 $0.72 (0.55, 0.94)$ 0.021 < 1 $0.72 (0.55, 0.94)$ 0.021 < 1 $0.72 (0.55, 0.94)$ 0.021 < 1 $0.72 (0.55, 0.94)$ 0.021 < 1 $0.72 (0.55, 0.94)$ 0.021 < 1 $0.72 (0.55, 0.94)$ 0.021 < 1 0.178 0.372 < 1 $0.87 (0.69, 1.08)$ 0.235 $1-3$ $0.87 (0.69, 1.08)$ 0.073 $< 0.83 (0.67, 1.02)$ 0.073 0.678 Never $0.92 (0.73, 1.14)$ 0.386 Now $0.78 (0.41, 1.47)$ 0.390 Never $0.92 (0.68, 1.23)$ 0.531 Now $0.92 (0.68, 1.23)$ 0.068 Mild $0.91 (0.75, 1.11)$ 0.353 Moderate $0.92 (0.81, 1.05)$ 0.168 $> 18.5 - 30$ $0.92 (0.81, 1.05)$ 0.168 $> 18.5 - 30$ $0.52 (0.33, 0.82)$ 0.011 $> 19abetes$ $0.94 (0.74, 0.96)$ 0.019 $> 19abetes$ $0.96 (0.51, 1.42)$ 0.816	Other Race	0.30 (0.04, 2.11)	0.144	
school Image: school<	Education			0.018
graduate/GED Image: colleges or above 0.72 (0.55, 0.94) 0.021 Some colleges or above 0.72 (0.55, 0.94) 0.021 0.372 Poverty income ratio (PIR) Image: colleges or above 0.372 <1	-	0.85 (0.63, 1.13)	0.218	
above Image: state		1.00 (0.82, 1.22)	1.000	
ratio (PIR)Image: definition of the section of the sect	-	0.72 (0.55, 0.94)	0.021	
1-30.87 (0.69, 1.08)0.178> 30.83 (0.67, 1.02)0.073Unknown0.62 (0.37, 1.06)0.073Smoking status0.62 (0.37, 1.06)0.073Never0.92 (0.73, 1.14)0.386Former0.83 (0.67, 1.03)0.076Now0.78 (0.41, 1.47)0.390Alcohol intake0.749Never0.92 (0.68, 1.23)0.531Former0.70 (0.47, 1.03)0.068Mild0.91 (0.75, 1.11)0.307Moderate0.90 (0.71, 1.15)0.353Heavy0.72 (0.41, 1.27)0.230BMI (kg/m²) (%)0.92 (0.81, 1.05)0.168 \geq 300.52 (0.33, 0.82)0.011Diabetes0.96 (0.65, 1.42)0.816	-			0.372
> 30.83 (0.67, 1.02)0.073Unknown0.62 (0.37, 1.06)0.073Smoking status0.62 (0.37, 1.06)0.073Smoking status0.62 (0.37, 1.06)0.073Never0.92 (0.73, 1.14)0.386Former0.83 (0.67, 1.03)0.076Now0.78 (0.41, 1.47)0.390Alcohol intake0.78 (0.41, 1.47)0.390Never0.92 (0.68, 1.23)0.531Former0.70 (0.47, 1.03)0.068Mild0.91 (0.75, 1.11)0.307Moderate0.90 (0.71, 1.15)0.353Heavy0.72 (0.41, 1.27)0.230BMI (kg/m²) (%)0.92 (0.81, 1.05)0.168 ≥ 30 0.52 (0.33, 0.82)0.011Diabetes0.96 (0.65, 1.42)0.816	< 1	1.19 (0.87, 1.63)	0.235	
Unknown0.62 (0.37, 1.06)0.073Smoking status0.62 (0.37, 1.14)0.073Never0.92 (0.73, 1.14)0.386Former0.83 (0.67, 1.03)0.076Now0.78 (0.41, 1.47)0.390Alcohol intake0.78 (0.41, 1.47)Never0.92 (0.68, 1.23)0.531Former0.70 (0.47, 1.03)0.068Mild0.91 (0.75, 1.11)0.307Moderate0.90 (0.71, 1.15)0.353Heavy0.72 (0.41, 1.27)0.230BMI (kg/m²) (%)0.92 (0.81, 1.05)0.168≥ 300.52 (0.33, 0.82)0.011Diabetes0.94 (0.74, 0.96)0.019Yes0.96 (0.65, 1.42)0.816	1-3	0.87 (0.69, 1.08)	0.178	
Smoking status0.678Never $0.92 (0.73, 1.14)$ 0.386 Former $0.83 (0.67, 1.03)$ 0.076 Now $0.78 (0.41, 1.47)$ 0.390 Alcohol intake $0.78 (0.41, 1.47)$ 0.390 Never $0.92 (0.68, 1.23)$ 0.531 Former $0.70 (0.47, 1.03)$ 0.068 Mild $0.91 (0.75, 1.11)$ 0.307 Moderate $0.90 (0.71, 1.15)$ 0.353 Heavy $0.72 (0.41, 1.27)$ 0.230 BMI (kg/m²) (%) $0.92 (0.81, 1.05)$ 0.168 ≥ 30 $0.52 (0.33, 0.82)$ 0.011 Diabetes $0.96 (0.65, 1.42)$ 0.816	> 3	0.83 (0.67, 1.02)	0.073	
Never $0.92 (0.73, 1.14)$ 0.386 Former $0.83 (0.67, 1.03)$ 0.076 Now $0.78 (0.41, 1.47)$ 0.390 Alcohol intake $0.78 (0.41, 1.47)$ 0.390 Alcohol intake $0.78 (0.41, 1.47)$ 0.390 Never $0.92 (0.68, 1.23)$ 0.531 Former $0.70 (0.47, 1.03)$ 0.068 Mild $0.91 (0.75, 1.11)$ 0.307 Moderate $0.90 (0.71, 1.15)$ 0.353 Heavy $0.72 (0.41, 1.27)$ 0.230 BMI (kg/m ²) $0.92 (0.81, 1.05)$ 0.168 ≥ 30 $0.52 (0.33, 0.82)$ 0.011 Diabetes $0.96 (0.65, 1.42)$ 0.816	Unknown	0.62 (0.37, 1.06)	0.073	
Former $0.83 (0.67, 1.03)$ 0.076 Now $0.78 (0.41, 1.47)$ 0.390 Alcohol intake $0.78 (0.41, 1.47)$ 0.390 Never $0.92 (0.68, 1.23)$ 0.531 Former $0.70 (0.47, 1.03)$ 0.068 Mild $0.91 (0.75, 1.11)$ 0.307 Moderate $0.90 (0.71, 1.15)$ 0.353 Heavy $0.72 (0.41, 1.27)$ 0.230 BMI (kg/m ²) (%) $0.92 (0.81, 1.05)$ 0.168 ≥ 30 $0.52 (0.33, 0.82)$ 0.011 Diabetes $0.96 (0.65, 1.42)$ 0.816	Smoking status			0.678
Now 0.78 (0.41, 1.47) 0.390 Alcohol intake 0.78 (0.41, 1.47) 0.390 Alcohol intake 0.78 (0.41, 1.47) 0.390 Never 0.92 (0.68, 1.23) 0.531 Former 0.70 (0.47, 1.03) 0.068 Mild 0.91 (0.75, 1.11) 0.307 Moderate 0.90 (0.71, 1.15) 0.353 Heavy 0.72 (0.41, 1.27) 0.230 BMI (kg/m ²) 0.92 (0.81, 1.05) 0.168 ≥ 30 0.52 (0.33, 0.82) 0.011 Diabetes 0.94 (0.74, 0.96) 0.019 Yes 0.96 (0.65, 1.42) 0.816	Never	0.92 (0.73, 1.14)	0.386	
Alcohol intake0.749Alcohol intake0.749Never0.92 (0.68, 1.23)0.531Former0.70 (0.47, 1.03)0.068Mild0.91 (0.75, 1.11)0.307Moderate0.90 (0.71, 1.15)0.353Heavy0.72 (0.41, 1.27)0.230BMI (kg/m²) (%)0.92 (0.81, 1.05)0.168 ≥ 30 0.52 (0.33, 0.82)0.011Diabetes0.96 (0.65, 1.42)0.816	Former	0.83 (0.67, 1.03)	0.076	
Never $0.92 (0.68, 1.23)$ 0.531 Former $0.70 (0.47, 1.03)$ 0.068 Mild $0.91 (0.75, 1.11)$ 0.307 Moderate $0.90 (0.71, 1.15)$ 0.353 Heavy $0.72 (0.41, 1.27)$ 0.230 BMI (kg/m ²) $0.92 (0.81, 1.05)$ 0.168 $2 30$ $0.52 (0.33, 0.82)$ 0.011 Diabetes $0.96 (0.65, 1.42)$ 0.816	Now	0.78 (0.41, 1.47)	0.390	
Former $0.70 (0.47, 1.03)$ 0.068 Mild $0.91 (0.75, 1.11)$ 0.307 Moderate $0.90 (0.71, 1.15)$ 0.353 Heavy $0.72 (0.41, 1.27)$ 0.230 BMI (kg/m²) (%) $0.92 (0.81, 1.05)$ 0.168 $2 30$ $0.92 (0.81, 1.05)$ 0.0168 Diabetes $0.52 (0.33, 0.82)$ 0.011 No $0.84 (0.74, 0.96)$ 0.019 Yes $0.96 (0.65, 1.42)$ 0.816	Alcohol intake			0.749
Mild $0.91 (0.75, 1.11)$ 0.307 Moderate $0.90 (0.71, 1.15)$ 0.353 Heavy $0.72 (0.41, 1.27)$ 0.230 BMI (kg/m ²) (%) $0.92 (0.41, 1.27)$ 0.230 18.5-30 $0.92 (0.81, 1.05)$ 0.168 ≥ 30 $0.52 (0.33, 0.82)$ 0.011 Diabetes $0.84 (0.74, 0.96)$ 0.019 Yes $0.96 (0.65, 1.42)$ 0.816	Never	0.92 (0.68, 1.23)	0.531	
Moderate 0.90 (0.71, 1.15) 0.353 Heavy 0.72 (0.41, 1.27) 0.230 BMI (kg/m ²) (%) 0.92 (0.41, 1.27) 0.230 18.5-30 0.92 (0.81, 1.05) 0.168 ≥ 30 0.52 (0.33, 0.82) 0.011 Diabetes 0.541 0.541 No 0.84 (0.74, 0.96) 0.019 Yes 0.96 (0.65, 1.42) 0.816	Former	0.70 (0.47, 1.03)	0.068	
Heavy 0.72 (0.41, 1.27) 0.230 BMI (kg/m²) (%) 0.009 0.009 18.5-30 0.92 (0.81, 1.05) 0.168 ≥ 30 0.52 (0.33, 0.82) 0.011 Diabetes 0.84 (0.74, 0.96) 0.019 Yes 0.96 (0.65, 1.42) 0.816	Mild	0.91 (0.75, 1.11)	0.307	
BMI (kg/m ²) 0.009 $(\%)$ 0.92 (0.81, 1.05) 0.168 \geq 30 0.52 (0.33, 0.82) 0.011 Diabetes 0.541 No 0.84 (0.74, 0.96) 0.019 Yes 0.96 (0.65, 1.42) 0.816	Moderate	0.90 (0.71, 1.15)	0.353	
(%) Image: Constraint of the state of the	Heavy	0.72 (0.41, 1.27)	0.230	
≥ 30 0.52 (0.33, 0.82) 0.011 Diabetes 0.541 No 0.84 (0.74, 0.96) 0.019 Yes 0.96 (0.65, 1.42) 0.816	e			0.009
Diabetes 0.541 No 0.84 (0.74, 0.96) 0.019 Yes 0.96 (0.65, 1.42) 0.816	18.5–30	0.92 (0.81, 1.05)	0.168	
No 0.84 (0.74, 0.96) 0.019 Yes 0.96 (0.65, 1.42) 0.816	≥ 30	0.52 (0.33, 0.82)	0.011	
Yes 0.96 (0.65, 1.42) 0.816	Diabetes			0.541
	No	0.84 (0.74, 0.96)	0.019	
Hypertension 0.105	Yes	0.96 (0.65, 1.42)	0.816	
	Hypertension			0.105

(Continued)

TABLE 4 (Continued)

Model 2	OR 95% CI	p	<i>p</i> for interaction
No	0.91 (0.78, 1.08)	0.231	
Yes	0.78 (0.58, 1.03)	0.074	
CVD			0.091
No	0.79 (0.65, 0.98)	0.033	
Yes	1.02 (0.80, 1.29)	0.880	
Hyperlipidemia			0.141
No	0.68 (0.48, 0.97)	0.037	
Yes	0.88 (0.77, 1.00)	0.052	
Cataract operation			0.056
No	0.82 (0.67, 0.99)	0.043	
Yes	1.04 (0.85, 1.28)	0.651	
History of glaucoma			0.453
No	0.86 (0.75, 0.99)	0.043	
Yes	0.75 (0.43, 1.32)	0.261	

Model 2 was a fully adjusted model, and the stratified variables in the subgroup analysis were not adjusted.

EPA and DHA are both long-chain omega-3 fatty acids. The body's ability to synthesize them from the precursor ALA is not efficient, so their direct intake through the diet may be necessary to obtain health benefits (26). The retina is one of the tissues with the highest lipid content in the human body. The major omega-3 fatty acid, DHA, is a major structural component of the retinal photoreceptor membranes and the vascular tissue of the retina (8). DHA and EPA have been reported to have suppressive effects against oxidative stress and inflammation (27). However, the precise mechanisms underlying the association between EPA and DHA intake and reduced AMD risk remain incompletely elucidated. Nonetheless, various potential mechanisms have been proposed. EPA and DHA intake may attenuate the production of inflammatory cytokines and eicosanoids (8). DHA can also negatively modulate vascular cell adhesion molecule 1 (VCAM-1) expression induced by tumor necrosis factor α (TNF-α) via dampening of nuclear factor-κB (NFκB) signaling and activator protein-1 (AP-1) activation, thereby exerting anti-inflammatory properties (28). EPA application substantially reduced the expression of intercellular adhesion molecule 1 (ICAM-1) and monocyte chemotactic protein 1 (MCP-1) in endothelial cells and the expression of VEGF and interleukin-6 (IL-6) in macrophages, effects which have anti-inflammatory and anti-angiogenic properties (29), and it is known that inflammatory effects play an important role in the occurrence and development of AMD (27). A key target in modulating lipid metabolism is the peroxisome proliferator-activated receptor (PPAR), which has been demonstrated to augment macrophage phagocytosis of apoptotic cells, promote M2 macrophage polarization, decrease matrix metalloproteinase (MMP) 2 and MMP9, and suppress choroidal neovascularization (CNV) (30, 31). Both DHA and EPA are ligands of PPAR isoforms (32). Previous studies also demonstrated that omega-3 (DHA and EPA) supplementation can TABLE 5 Subgroup analysis and interaction test for the association between dietary docosahexaenoic intake (mg/Kg/day) and AMD.

Model 2OR 95% Clρp for interactionAge group40-640.71 (0.51, 0.98)0.042≥ 650.94 (0.83, 1.06)≥ 650.94 (0.83, 1.06)Sex </th <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th>				
40-64 $0.71 (0.51, 0.98)$ 0.042 ≥ 65 $0.94 (0.83, 1.06)$ 0.235 Sex I 0.235 Sex $0.85 (0.74, 0.98)$ 0.030 Male $0.91 (0.79, 1.04)$ 0.145 Race/ethnicity I 0.385 Non-Hispanic White $0.92 (0.64, 1.31)$ 0.026 Non-Hispanic Black $0.92 (0.64, 1.31)$ 0.678 Mexican American $0.96 (0.81, 1.13)$ 0.678 Other Race $0.61 (0.30, 1.27)$ 0.123 Education $0.97 (0.84, 1.13)$ 0.695 If gh school graduate/GED $0.97 (0.84, 1.13)$ 0.695 Some college or above $0.79 (0.68, 0.92)$ 0.008 Poverty income ratio (PIR) $0.86 (0.72, 1.03)$ 0.057 I-3 $0.86 (0.72, 1.03)$ 0.007 Now $0.83 (0.62, 1.11)$ 0.075 Now $0.92 (0.79, 1.07)$ 0.259 Now $0.92 (0.79, 1.07)$ 0.259 Now $0.76 (0.46, 1.25)$ 0.240 Now $0.91 (0.74, 1.12)$ 0.353 Now $0.91 (0.74, 1.12)$ 0.353 Now $0.92 (0.50, 0.39)$ 0.018 Never $0.92 (0.76, 1.13)$ 0.399 Now $0.92 (0.76, 1.13)$ 0.394	Model 2	OR 95% CI	p	
≥ 65 0.94 (0.83, 1.06) 0.235 Sex 0.94 (0.83, 1.06) 0.235 Sex 0.85 (0.74, 0.98) 0.030 Male 0.91 (0.79, 1.04) 0.0145 Race/ethnicity 0.91 (0.79, 1.04) 0.0145 Nan-Hispanic 0.88 (0.79, 0.98) 0.026 Non-Hispanic 0.92 (0.64, 1.31) 0.568	Age group			0.032
Sex Image of the section o	40-64	0.71 (0.51, 0.98)	0.042	
Female0.85 (0.74, 0.98)0.0300Male0.91 (0.79, 1.04)0.145Mace/ethnicityI0.385Race/ethnicity0.88 (0.79, 0.98)0.026Non-Hispanic White0.92 (0.64, 1.31)0.568Image of the second seco	≥ 65	0.94 (0.83, 1.06)	0.235	
Male0.91 (0.79, 1.04)0.145Race/ethnicity0.88 (0.79, 0.98)0.026Non-Hispanic White0.92 (0.64, 1.31)0.568Non-Hispanic Black0.92 (0.64, 1.31)0.568Mexican American0.96 (0.81, 1.13)0.678Other Race0.61 (0.30, 1.27)0.123Education0.86 (0.68, 1.07)0.152Issthan high school0.97 (0.84, 1.13)0.695Igraduate/GED0.97 (0.84, 1.13)0.695Some college or above0.79 (0.68, 0.92)0.008Some college or ratio (PIR)0.79 (0.68, 0.92)0.0081-30.86 (0.72, 1.03)0.0900.655Sonking status0.83 (0.62, 1.11)0.062Unknown0.83 (0.62, 1.11)0.170Smoking status0.92 (0.79, 1.07)0.259Never0.92 (0.79, 1.02)0.018Now0.76 (0.46, 1.25)0.018Never0.91 (0.74, 1.12)0.353Mild0.92 (0.76, 1.13)0.399Mild0.92 (0.76, 1.13)0.399Heavy0.84 (0.64, 1.11)0.193	Sex			0.448
Race/ethnicity Image: Control of the section of the sect	Female	0.85 (0.74, 0.98)	0.030	
Non-Hispanic White0.88 (0.79, 0.98)0.026Non-Hispanic Black0.92 (0.64, 1.31)0.568Mexican American0.96 (0.81, 1.13)0.678Other Race0.61 (0.30, 1.27)0.123EducationI0.026Education0.86 (0.68, 1.07)0.152Itigh school graduate/GED0.97 (0.84, 1.13)0.695Some college or above0.79 (0.68, 0.92)0.008Some college or above0.79 (0.68, 0.92)0.008Poverty income ratio (PIR)0.79 (0.68, 0.92)0.0081-30.86 (0.72, 1.03)0.0900.83 (0.62, 1.11)0.062Jonkown0.83 (0.62, 1.11)0.062Vunknown0.83 (0.62, 1.11)0.0170Smoking status0.92 (0.79, 1.07)0.259Now0.76 (0.46, 1.25)0.240Now0.91 (0.74, 1.12)0.353Never0.92 (0.56, 0.93)0.018Midd0.92 (0.76, 1.13)0.399Heavy0.84 (0.64, 1.11)0.193	Male	0.91 (0.79, 1.04)	0.145	
WhiteImage: state of the state o	Race/ethnicity			0.385
BlackImage: set of the set of	-	0.88 (0.79, 0.98)	0.026	
American Interferent Interferent Other Race 0.61 (0.30, 1.27) 0.123 0.026 Education Interferent 0.026 Less than high school 0.86 (0.68, 1.07) 0.152 Interferent High school 0.97 (0.84, 1.13) 0.695 Interferent Some college or above 0.79 (0.68, 0.92) 0.008 Interferent Poverty income ratio (PIR) Interferent 0.655 Interferent <1-3	-	0.92 (0.64, 1.31)	0.568	
Education 0.026 Less than high school 0.86 (0.68, 1.07) 0.152 High school graduate/GED 0.97 (0.84, 1.13) 0.695 Some college or above 0.79 (0.68, 0.92) 0.008 Poverty income ratio (PIR) 0.655 0.655 1-3 0.86 (0.72, 1.03) 0.090 > 3 0.87 (0.75, 1.01) 0.062 Unknown 0.83 (0.62, 1.11) 0.170 Smoking status 0.92 (0.79, 1.07) 0.259 Former 0.86 (0.73, 1.02) 0.075 Never 0.92 (0.79, 1.07) 0.259 Former 0.86 (0.73, 1.02) 0.075 Never 0.91 (0.74, 1.12) 0.353 Never 0.91 (0.74, 1.12) 0.353 Former 0.72 (0.56, 0.93) 0.018 Mild 0.92 (0.76, 1.13) 0.399 Heavy 0.84 (0.64, 1.11) 0.193		0.96 (0.81, 1.13)	0.678	
Less than high school 0.86 (0.68, 1.07) 0.152 High school graduate/GED 0.97 (0.84, 1.13) 0.695 Some college or above 0.79 (0.68, 0.92) 0.008 Poverty income ratio (PIR) 0.111 (0.87, 1.42) 0.0354 1.11 (0.87, 1.42) 0.354 1-3 0.86 (0.72, 1.03) 0.090 > 3 0.87 (0.75, 1.01) 0.062 Unknown 0.83 (0.62, 1.11) 0.170 Smoking status 0.86 (0.73, 1.02) 0.075 Never 0.92 (0.79, 1.07) 0.259 Former 0.86 (0.73, 1.02) 0.075 Now 0.76 (0.46, 1.25) 0.240 Never 0.91 (0.74, 1.12) 0.353 Former 0.92 (0.80, 1.05) 0.202 Mid 0.92 (0.76, 1.13) 0.399 Mid 0.92 (0.76, 1.13) 0.399 Heavy 0.84 (0.64, 1.11) 0.193	Other Race	0.61 (0.30, 1.27)	0.123	
school Image: school </td <td>Education</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>0.026</td>	Education			0.026
graduate/GED Image: Constant of the section of the secti	-	0.86 (0.68, 1.07)	0.152	
above Image: Constraint of Pire Poverty income ratio (PIR) Image: Constraint of Pire Poverty income ratio (PIR) Omega (Omega (Port)) Omega (Omega (Port)) Omega (Port) Omega (Port) </td <td>-</td> <td>0.97 (0.84, 1.13)</td> <td>0.695</td> <td></td>	-	0.97 (0.84, 1.13)	0.695	
ratio (PIR) Image: mathematical symbols < 1	-	0.79 (0.68, 0.92)	0.008	
1-3 0.86 (0.72, 1.03) 0.090 > 3 0.87 (0.75, 1.01) 0.062 Unknown 0.83 (0.62, 1.11) 0.170 Smoking status 0.92 (0.79, 1.07) 0.259 Never 0.92 (0.79, 1.07) 0.075 Now 0.76 (0.46, 1.25) 0.075 Now 0.76 (0.46, 1.25) 0.240 Alcohol intake 0.91 (0.74, 1.12) 0.353 Former 0.91 (0.74, 1.12) 0.353 Mild 0.92 (0.80, 1.05) 0.202 Moderate 0.92 (0.76, 1.13) 0.399 Heavy 0.84 (0.64, 1.11) 0.193 BMI (kg/m ²) Image: Mark and the state s				0.655
> 3 0.87 (0.75, 1.01) 0.062 Unknown 0.83 (0.62, 1.11) 0.170 Smoking status 0.557 Never 0.92 (0.79, 1.07) 0.259 Former 0.86 (0.73, 1.02) 0.075 Now 0.76 (0.46, 1.25) 0.240 Alcohol intake 0.91 (0.74, 1.12) 0.353 Former 0.91 (0.74, 1.12) 0.353 Former 0.92 (0.80, 1.05) 0.202 Mild 0.92 (0.80, 1.05) 0.202 Heavy 0.84 (0.64, 1.11) 0.193 BMI (kg/m ²) Image: Market	< 1	1.11 (0.87, 1.42)	0.354	
Unknown 0.83 (0.62, 1.11) 0.170 Smoking status 0.557 Never 0.92 (0.79, 1.07) 0.259 Former 0.86 (0.73, 1.02) 0.075 Now 0.76 (0.46, 1.25) 0.240 Alcohol intake 0.91 (0.74, 1.12) 0.353 Former 0.91 (0.74, 1.12) 0.353 Former 0.92 (0.80, 1.05) 0.202 Mild 0.92 (0.80, 1.05) 0.202 Moderate 0.92 (0.76, 1.13) 0.399 Heavy 0.84 (0.64, 1.11) 0.193 BMI (kg/m ²) Image: Marcine and the second	1-3	0.86 (0.72, 1.03)	0.090	
Smoking status 0.527 Never 0.92 (0.79, 1.07) 0.259 Former 0.86 (0.73, 1.02) 0.075 Now 0.76 (0.46, 1.25) 0.240 Alcohol intake 0.91 (0.74, 1.12) 0.353 Never 0.91 (0.74, 1.12) 0.353 Former 0.72 (0.56, 0.93) 0.018 Mild 0.92 (0.80, 1.05) 0.202 Moderate 0.92 (0.76, 1.13) 0.399 Heavy 0.84 (0.64, 1.11) 0.193 BMI (kg/m ²) Image: March and	> 3	0.87 (0.75, 1.01)	0.062	
Never 0.92 (0.79, 1.07) 0.259 Former 0.86 (0.73, 1.02) 0.075 Now 0.76 (0.46, 1.25) 0.240 Alcohol intake 0.91 (0.74, 1.12) 0.353 Never 0.91 (0.74, 1.12) 0.353 Former 0.72 (0.56, 0.93) 0.018 Mild 0.92 (0.80, 1.05) 0.202 Moderate 0.92 (0.76, 1.13) 0.399 Heavy 0.84 (0.64, 1.11) 0.193 BMI (kg/m ²) Image: March 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10,	Unknown	0.83 (0.62, 1.11)	0.170	
Former 0.86 (0.73, 1.02) 0.075 Now 0.76 (0.46, 1.25) 0.240 Alcohol intake 0.808 Never 0.91 (0.74, 1.12) 0.353 Former 0.72 (0.56, 0.93) 0.018 Mild 0.92 (0.80, 1.05) 0.202 Moderate 0.92 (0.76, 1.13) 0.399 Heavy 0.84 (0.64, 1.11) 0.193 BMI (kg/m ²) Image: March and	Smoking status			0.557
Now 0.76 (0.46, 1.25) 0.240 Alcohol intake 0.808 Never 0.91 (0.74, 1.12) 0.353 Former 0.72 (0.56, 0.93) 0.018 Mild 0.92 (0.80, 1.05) 0.202 Moderate 0.92 (0.76, 1.13) 0.399 Heavy 0.84 (0.64, 1.11) 0.193 BMI (kg/m ²) Image: March and	Never	0.92 (0.79, 1.07)	0.259	
Alcohol intake 0.808 Never 0.91 (0.74, 1.12) 0.353 Former 0.72 (0.56, 0.93) 0.018 Mild 0.92 (0.80, 1.05) 0.202 Moderate 0.92 (0.76, 1.13) 0.399 Heavy 0.84 (0.64, 1.11) 0.193 BMI (kg/m ²) Image: March and the second and the	Former	0.86 (0.73, 1.02)	0.075	
Never 0.91 (0.74, 1.12) 0.353 Former 0.72 (0.56, 0.93) 0.018 Mild 0.92 (0.80, 1.05) 0.202 Moderate 0.92 (0.76, 1.13) 0.399 Heavy 0.84 (0.64, 1.11) 0.193 BMI (kg/m ²) Image: Marcine State Stat	Now	0.76 (0.46, 1.25)	0.240	
Former 0.72 (0.56, 0.93) 0.018 Mild 0.92 (0.80, 1.05) 0.202 Moderate 0.92 (0.76, 1.13) 0.399 Heavy 0.84 (0.64, 1.11) 0.193 BMI (kg/m ²) 0.042	Alcohol intake			0.808
Mild 0.92 (0.80, 1.05) 0.202 Moderate 0.92 (0.76, 1.13) 0.399 Heavy 0.84 (0.64, 1.11) 0.193 BMI (kg/m²) 0.042	Never	0.91 (0.74, 1.12)	0.353	
Moderate 0.92 (0.76, 1.13) 0.399 Heavy 0.84 (0.64, 1.11) 0.193 BMI (kg/m ²) 0.042	Former	0.72 (0.56, 0.93)	0.018	
Heavy 0.84 (0.64, 1.11) 0.193 BMI (kg/m ²) 0.042	Mild	0.92 (0.80, 1.05)	0.202	
BMI (kg/m ²) 0.042	Moderate	0.92 (0.76, 1.13)	0.399	
	Heavy	0.84 (0.64, 1.11)	0.193	
				0.042
18.5–30 0.92 (0.84, 1.02) 0.088	18.5-30	0.92 (0.84, 1.02)	0.088	
≥ 30 0.66 (0.45, 0.95) 0.030	≥ 30	0.66 (0.45, 0.95)	0.030	
Diabetes 0.565	Diabetes			0.565
No 0.86 (0.78, 0.95) 0.010	No	0.86 (0.78, 0.95)	0.010	
Yes 0.95 (0.70, 1.30) 0.726	Yes	0.95 (0.70, 1.30)	0.726	
Hypertension 0.167	Hypertension			0.167

(Continued)

Model 2	OR 95% CI	p	<i>p</i> for interaction
No	0.90 (0.80, 1.02)	0.092	
Yes	0.83 (0.68, 1.00)	0.052	
CVD			0.119
No	0.83 (0.72, 0.96)	0.022	
Yes	1.00 (0.83, 1.20)	0.986	
Hyperlipidemia			0.401
No	0.76 (0.58, 1.00)	0.050	
Yes	0.89 (0.80, 0.98)	0.026	
Cataract operation			0.030
No	0.83 (0.72, 0.96)	0.021	
Yes	1.04 (0.89, 1.21)	0.561	
History of glaucoma			0.570
No	0.88 (0.79, 0.98)	0.023	
Yes	0.83 (0.56, 1.24)	0.300	

TABLE 5 (Continued)

Model 2 was a fully adjusted model, and the stratified variables in the subgroup analysis were not adjusted.



decrease vitreal VEGF levels in patients with wet AMD (33), and significantly improve plasma antioxidant capacity (34).

In addition, we also found that age, education, BMI, and history of cataract operation can influence the prevalence of AMD, which had also been reported in previous studies (35–37). The intricate role of aging in the pathogenic mechanisms underlying AMD remains incompletely elucidated, potentially attributable to oxidative stress, amyloid beta accumulation, circadian rhythm dysfunction, metabolic aging, and cellular senescence impacting photoreceptors, microglia, RPE cells, Bruch's membrane, and the choroid (36). A Korean study also suggested that increased



education was a unique risk factor for AMD (38). The Age-Related Eye Disease Study (AREDS) found that greater body mass was associated with a higher risk of AMD (39). One possible explanation is that excessive caloric intake increased the risk of developing AMD, as it could have led to increased oxidative stress that damages the retina (40). One putative hypothesis for the heightened AMD prevalence following cataract surgery entails greater retinal exposure to blue light; photochemical reactions within the oxygen-replete outer retinal milieu engender cytotoxic reactive oxygen species (ROS). These ROS induce oxidative stress, a recognized contributor to AMD pathogenesis (41), while the exact mechanism remains to be further explored.

This study has several strengths, including a substantial nationally representative sample, comprehensive subgroup, interaction analyses, and augmented statistical power and result reliability conferred by the ample sample size. Furthermore, numerous potential confounders were adjusted for, encompassing health status along with socioeconomic and lifestyle variables. Additionally, dose-response relationships between dietary EPA/DHA intake and AMD risk were examined, reinforcing the conclusion that higher EPA/DHA consumption correlates with reduced AMD prevalence.

Certain limitations to this study must be acknowledged. Foremost, as with other observational studies, causal inferences regarding the relationship between DHA/EPA intake and AMD prevalence cannot be established. At the same time, the subgroup analyses are exploratory and hypothesis-generating. Regarding the positive covariates in the results, they need to be approached with caution and further research is required for validation. Second, we did not assess the associations of DHA and EPA levels in serum and red-blood-cell membranes (RBCM) with AMD, while RBCM EPA and EPA+DHA, as biomarkers of the dietary status of n-3 fatty acids, were strongly associated with AMD and can represent an objective biomarker (22). Third, dietary data was collected via 24-h dietary recalls, a survey method often hampered by inaccurate conscious or unconscious recording and underreporting, potentially subject to recall bias. Lastly, we were unable to obtain the dietary supplement intake of DHA and EPA in NHANES, which was an important source of DHA and EPA.

5 Conclusion

In conclusion, our investigation revealed a negative correlation between the prevalence of AMD and dietary EPA and DHA in the older adult population of the United States. These findings imply that dietary EPA and DHA intake may exhibit an inverse correlation with AMD risk among older adults in the US. Age, education level, BMI, and cataract surgery history appear to impact this negative association. Additional large-scale prospective cohort studies alongside further biological experiments are warranted to validate these results and elucidate the precise underlying mechanisms.

Data availability statement

Publicly available datasets were analyzed in this study. This data can be found here: https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/nhanes/index.htm.

Ethics statement

The studies involving humans were approved by the National Center for Health Statistics Research Ethics Review Board. The studies were conducted in accordance with the local legislation and institutional requirements. The participants provided their written informed consent to participate in this study.

Author contributions

KL: Conceptualization, Data curation, Formal analysis, Methodology, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing. JL: Data curation, Formal analysis, Methodology, Validation,

References

1. Mitchell P, Liew G, Gopinath B, Wong T. Age-related macular degeneration. Lancet. (2018) 392:1147-59. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(18)31550-2

2. Guymer R, Campbell T. Age-related macular degeneration. Lancet. (2023) 401:1459-72. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(22)02609-5

3. Bernasconi A, Wiest M, Lavie C, Milani R, Laukkanen J. Effect of omega-3 dosage on cardiovascular outcomes: An updated meta-analysis and meta-regression of interventional trials. *Mayo Clin Proc.* (2021) 96:304–13. doi: 10.1016/j.mayocp.2020. 08.034

4. Wong W, Su X, Li X, Cheung C, Klein R, Cheng C, et al. Global prevalence of age-related macular degeneration and disease burden projection for 2020 and 2040: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet Glob Health*. (2014) 2:e106–16. doi: 10.1016/S2214-109X(13)70145-1

5. Yum H, Na H, Surh Y. Anti-inflammatory effects of docosahexaenoic acid: Implications for its cancer chemopreventive potential. *Semin Cancer Biol.* (2016) 40-41:141-59. doi: 10.1016/j.semcancer.2016.08.004

6. Politi L, Rotstein N, Carri N. Effects of docosahexaenoic acid on retinal development: Cellular and molecular aspects. *Lipids*. (2001) 36:927–35. doi: 10.1007/s11745-001-0803-8

Writing – original draft. XuL: Data curation, Formal analysis, Methodology, Validation, Writing – review & editing. XiL: Data curation, Formal analysis, Methodology, Validation, Writing – original draft. PH: Conceptualization, Data curation, Investigation, Project administration, Supervision, Writing – review & editing. MH: Conceptualization, Data curation, Investigation, Project administration, Supervision, Writing – review & editing.

Funding

The authors declare that no financial support was received for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Acknowledgments

We thank the staff of the National Centers for Health Statistics of the Centers for Disease Control for designing, collecting, managing NHANES data, and releasing data available to the public.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Publisher's note

All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.

 Bazan N. Cell survival matters: Docosahexaenoic acid signaling, neuroprotection and photoreceptors. *Trends Neurosci.* (2006) 29:263–71. doi: 10.1016/j.tins.2006.03.005

8. SanGiovanni J, Chew E. The role of omega-3 long-chain polyunsaturated fatty acids in health and disease of the retina. *Prog Retin Eye Res.* (2005) 24:87–138. doi: 10.1016/j.preteyeres.2004.06.002

9. Ren J, Ren A, Deng X, Huang Z, Jiang Z, Li Z, et al. Long-chain polyunsaturated fatty acids and their metabolites regulate inflammation in age-related macular degeneration. *J Inflamm Res.* (2022) 15:865–80. doi: 10.2147/JIR.S347231

10. Xiao B, Li Y, Lin Y, Lin J, Zhang L, Wu D, et al. Eicosapentaenoic acid (EPA) exhibits antioxidant activity via mitochondrial modulation. *Food Chem.* (2022) 373:131389. doi: 10.1016/j.foodchem.2021.131389

11. Shahidi F, Ambigaipalan P. Omega-3 polyunsaturated fatty acids and their health benefits. *Annu Rev Food Sci Technol.* (2018) 9:345–81. doi: 10.1146/annurev-food-111317-095850

12. Augood C, Chakravarthy U, Young I, Vioque J, de Jong P, Bentham G, et al. Oily fish consumption, dietary docosahexaenoic acid and eicosapentaenoic acid intakes, and associations with neovascular age-related macular degeneration. *Am J Clin Nutr.* (2008) 88:398–406. doi: 10.1093/ajcn/88.2.398

degeneration. *Ophthalmology*. (2017) 124:634–43. doi: 10.1016/j.ophtha.2016.12.033 14. Agron E, Mares J, Clemons T, Swaroop A, Chew E, Keenan T, et al. Dietary nutrient intake and progression to late age-related macular degeneration in the agerelated eye disease studies 1 and 2. *Ophthalmology*. (2021) 128:425–42. doi: 10.1016/j. ophtha.2020.08.018

15. Souied E, Delcourt C, Querques G, Bassols A, Merle B, Zourdani A, et al. Oral docosahexaenoic acid in the prevention of exudative age-related macular degeneration: The nutritional AMD treatment 2 study. *Ophthalmology.* (2013) 120:1619–31. doi: 10.1016/j.ophtha.2013.01.005

16. Chew E, Clemons T, Agron E, Domalpally A, Keenan T, Vitale S, et al. Long-term outcomes of adding lutein/zeaxanthin and omega-3 fatty acids to the AREDS supplements on age-related macular degeneration progression: AREDS2 report 28. *JAMA Ophthalmol.* (2022) 140:692–8. doi: 10.1001/jamaophthalmol.2022. 1640

17. Lawrenson J, Evans J. Omega 3 fatty acids for preventing or slowing the progression of age-related macular degeneration. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* (2015) 2015:CD010015. doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD010015.pub3

18. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. *NHANES*. (2008). Available online at: https://wwwn.cdc.gov/Nchs/Nhanes/2005-2006/OPXRET_D.htm#OPDUARM (accessed February 11, 2024).

19. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. *NHANES*. (2005). Available online at: https://wwwn.cdc.gov/nchs/nhanes/continuousnhanes/manuals.aspx?BeginYear= 2005 (accessed February 09, 2024).

20. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. *NHANES*. (2008). Available online at: https://wwwn.cdc.gov/Nchs/Nhanes/2005-2006/DR1TOT_D.htm#Component_Description (accessed February 13, 2024).

21. Karger A, Guan W, Nomura S, Weir N, Klein B, Burke G, et al. ASSOCIATION OF PLASMA omega-3 FATTY ACIDS WITH EARLY AGE-RELATED MACULAR DEGENERATION IN THE MULTI-ETHNIC STUDY OF ATHEROSCLEROSIS. *Retina.* (2022) 42:1384–91. doi: 10.1097/IAE.00000000003465

22. Merle B, Benlian P, Puche N, Bassols A, Delcourt C, Souied E, et al. Circulating omega-3 fatty acids and neovascular age-related macular degeneration. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci.* (2014) 55:2010–9. doi: 10.1167/iovs.14-13916

23. Reynolds R, Rosner B, Seddon J. Dietary omega-3 fatty acids, other fat intake, genetic susceptibility, and progression to incident geographic atrophy. *Ophthalmology.* (2013) 120:1020–8. doi: 10.1016/j.ophtha.2012.10.020

24. Age-Related Eye Disease Study 2 Research Group. Lutein + zeaxanthin and omega-3 fatty acids for age-related macular degeneration: The age-related eye disease study 2 (AREDS2) randomized clinical trial. *JAMA*. (2013) 309:2005–15. doi: 10.1001/ iama.2013.4997

25. Kalstad A, Myhre P, Laake K, Tveit S, Schmidt E, Smith P, et al. Effects of n-3 fatty acid supplements in elderly patients after myocardial infarction: A randomized, controlled trial. *Circulation*. (2021) 143:528–39. doi: 10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA. 120.052209

26. Baker E, Miles E, Burdge G, Yaqoob P, Calder P. Metabolism and functional effects of plant-derived omega-3 fatty acids in humans. *Prog Lipid Res.* (2016) 64:30–56. doi: 10.1016/j.plipres.2016.07.002

27. Suzumura A, Terao R, Kaneko H. Protective effects and molecular signaling of n-3 fatty acids on oxidative stress and inflammation in retinal diseases. *Antioxidants* (*Basel*). (2020) 9:920. doi: 10.3390/antiox9100920

28. Wang T, Chen C, Lee T, Chao H, Wu W, Hsieh S, et al. Docosahexaenoic acid attenuates VCAM-1 expression and NF-kappaB activation in TNF-alpha-treated human aortic endothelial cells. *J Nutr Biochem.* (2011) 22:187–94. doi: 10.1016/j. jnutbio.2010.01.007

29. Koto T, Nagai N, Mochimaru H, Kurihara T, Izumi-Nagai K, Satofuka S, et al. Eicosapentaenoic acid is anti-inflammatory in preventing choroidal neovascularization in mice. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci.* (2007) 48:4328–34. doi: 10.1167/ iovs.06-1148

30. SanGiovanni J, Chen J, Sapieha P, Aderman C, Stahl A, Clemons T, et al. DNA sequence variants in PPARGC1A, a gene encoding a coactivator of the omega-3 LCPUFA sensing PPAR-RXR transcription complex, are associated with NV AMD and AMD-associated loci in genes of complement and VEGF signaling pathways. *PLoS One.* (2013) 8:e53155. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0053155

31. Fu Z, Liegl R, Wang Z, Gong Y, Liu C, Sun Y, et al. Adiponectin mediates dietary omega-3 long-chain polyunsaturated fatty acid protection against choroidal neovascularization in mice. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci.* (2017) 58:3862–70. doi: 10.1167/ iovs.17-21796

32. Moran E, Ding L, Wang Z, Cheng R, Chen Q, Moore R, et al. Protective and antioxidant effects of PPARalpha in the ischemic retina. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci.* (2014) 55:4568–76. doi: 10.1167/iovs.13-13127

33. Rezende F, Lapalme E, Qian C, Smith L, SanGiovanni J, Sapieha P. Omega-3 supplementation combined with anti-vascular endothelial growth factor lowers vitreal levels of vascular endothelial growth factor in wet age-related macular degeneration. *Am J Ophthalmol.* (2014) 158:1071–8. doi: 10.1016/j.ajo.2014.07.036

34. Arnold C, Winter L, Frohlich K, Jentsch S, Dawczynski J, Jahreis G, et al. Macular xanthophylls and omega-3 long-chain polyunsaturated fatty acids in age-related macular degeneration: A randomized trial. *JAMA Ophthalmol.* (2013) 131:564–72. doi: 10.1001/jamaophthalmol.2013.2851

35. Pugazhendhi A, Hubbell M, Jairam P, Ambati B. Neovascular macular degeneration: A review of etiology, risk factors, and recent advances in research and therapy. *Int J Mol Sci.* (2021) 22:1170. doi: 10.3390/ijms22031170

36. Blasiak J, Sobczuk P, Pawlowska E, Kaarniranta K. Interplay between aging and other factors of the pathogenesis of age-related macular degeneration. *Ageing Res Rev.* (2022) 81:101735. doi: 10.1016/j.arr.2022.101735

37. Wang Y, Zhong Y, Zhang L, Wu Q, Tham Y, Rim T, et al. Global incidence, progression, and risk factors of age-related macular degeneration and projection of disease statistics in 30 years: A modeling study. *Gerontology*. (2022) 68:721–35. doi: 10.1159/000518822

38. Woo S, Ahn J, Morrison M, Ahn S, Lee J, Kim K, et al. Analysis of genetic and environmental risk factors and their interactions in korean patients with agerelated macular degeneration. *PLoS One.* (2015) 10:e0132771. doi: 10.1371/journal. pone.0132771

 Clemons T, Milton R, Klein R, Seddon J, Ferris F III, Age-Related Eye Disease Study Research Group. Risk factors for the incidence of advanced age-related macular degeneration in the age-related eye disease study (AREDS) AREDS report no. 19. Ophthalmology. (2005) 112:533–9. doi: 10.1016/j.ophtha.2004.10.047

40. Hirvela H, Luukinen H, Laara E, Sc L, Laatikainen L. Risk factors of agerelated maculopathy in a population 70 years of age or older. *Ophthalmology.* (1996) 103:871-7. doi: 10.1016/s0161-6420(96)30593-9

41. Margrain T, Boulton M, Marshall J, Sliney D. Do blue light filters confer protection against age-related macular degeneration? *Prog Retin Eye Res.* (2004) 23:523–31. doi: 10.1016/j.preteyeres.2004.05.001