# Role of Antioxidants in Cancer Prevention: A Meta-Analysis of Past Research

**Krittitapa Dutta[1], Dr. Dinesh Tyagi[2]**
Research Scholar, Department of Food & Nutrition, CCSU, Meerut[1]
Professor, Department of Food & Nutrition, CCSU, Meerut[2]

***ABSTRACT***

*Cancer remains one of the leading causes of mortality worldwide, prompting extensive research into preventive strategies. Antioxidants have emerged as molecules of significant interest due to their ability to neutralize reactive oxygen species (ROS) and mitigate oxidative stress, a key contributor to carcinogenesis. This review paper presents a comprehensive meta-analysis of past research examining the role of antioxidants in cancer prevention. Through systematic examination of epidemiological studies, clinical trials, and mechanistic investigations, we evaluate the efficacy of dietary and supplemental antioxidants including vitamins C and E, carotenoids, polyphenols, and selenium in reducing cancer risk. The analysis reveals complex and sometimes paradoxical relationships between antioxidant intake and cancer outcomes, with evidence suggesting protective effects in certain populations and cancer types, while other studies demonstrate null or potentially harmful effects, particularly with high-dose supplementation. The review synthesizes findings from observational studies indicating inverse associations between dietary antioxidant consumption and cancer incidence, contrasted with randomized controlled trials showing limited preventive benefits. We critically analyze methodological considerations, dose-response relationships, bioavailability issues, and the influence of oxidative stress levels on antioxidant efficacy. This comprehensive analysis provides insights into future research directions and clinical implications for antioxidant use in cancer prevention strategies.*

***Keywords:*** *antioxidants, cancer prevention, oxidative stress, reactive oxygen species, dietary supplementation, chemoprevention, meta-analysis*

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Cancer constitutes a major global health burden, with the World Health Organization reporting approximately 10 million cancer-related deaths annually (Sung et al., 2021). The multifactorial nature of cancer development involves genetic mutations, environmental exposures, lifestyle factors, and cellular oxidative damage. Oxidative stress, characterized by an imbalance between ROS production and antioxidant defense mechanisms, has been implicated in all stages of carcinogenesis, including initiation, promotion, and progression (Klaunig et al., 2018). This mechanistic understanding has generated substantial interest in antioxidants as potential chemopreventive agents. Antioxidants function through multiple pathways, including direct ROS scavenging, metal chelation, enzyme modulation, and gene expression regulation (Sharifi-Rad et al., 2020). The oxidative theory of cancer prevention posits that enhancing antioxidant defenses through dietary intake or supplementation may reduce DNA damage, inhibit mutagenesis, and prevent malignant transformation. However, despite compelling biological rationale, clinical evidence supporting antioxidant supplementation for cancer prevention remains controversial and inconsistent.

**Oxidative Stress and Carcinogenesis**

The relationship between oxidative stress and cancer development is complex and multifaceted. ROS, including superoxide anions, hydrogen peroxide, and hydroxyl radicals, are generated through normal cellular metabolism, particularly via mitochondrial respiration, as well as through external sources such as radiation, pollution, and tobacco smoke (Pizzino et al., 2017). While ROS serve essential physiological functions in cell signaling and immune responses, excessive accumulation causes oxidative damage to cellular macromolecules including DNA, proteins, and lipids. DNA oxidation can result in mutations, strand breaks, and chromosomal aberrations that initiate carcinogenesis (Srinivas et al., 2019). Additionally, oxidative stress activates pro-inflammatory signaling pathways, promotes angiogenesis, and contributes to the tumor microenvironment conducive to cancer progression. Endogenous antioxidant systems, including superoxide dismutase, catalase, and glutathione peroxidase, provide primary defense mechanisms against oxidative damage. However, when ROS production overwhelms antioxidant capacity, cellular damage accumulates, potentially leading to malignant transformation.

**Rationale for Antioxidant Intervention**

The theoretical foundation for antioxidant-based cancer prevention stems from observational epidemiological studies demonstrating inverse associations between fruit and vegetable consumption and cancer incidence across multiple cancer types (Aune et al., 2017). These plant-based foods are rich in various antioxidant compounds, including ascorbic acid (vitamin C), tocopherols (vitamin E), carotenoids, flavonoids, and phenolic acids. Laboratory studies have consistently demonstrated that antioxidants can inhibit carcinogen-induced DNA damage, suppress tumor cell proliferation, induce apoptosis, and modulate immune function in animal models (Khan et al., 2018). These findings prompted numerous intervention trials investigating whether antioxidant supplementation could replicate the protective effects observed with dietary intake. However, the transition from observational associations to interventional efficacy has proven challenging, with several large-scale randomized controlled trials yielding disappointing or contradictory results. Understanding the discrepancies between dietary antioxidant effects and supplemental interventions requires critical evaluation of past research, consideration of dose-response relationships, bioavailability factors, population characteristics, and the potential for pro-oxidant effects under certain conditions.

## 2. SURVEY OF LITERATURE

The literature on antioxidants and cancer prevention spans several decades and encompasses diverse study designs, populations, and antioxidant types. Early epidemiological investigations in the 1980s and 1990s established strong inverse associations between dietary antioxidant intake and cancer risk. Observational studies consistently reported that individuals consuming diets rich in fruits, vegetables, and antioxidant nutrients exhibited lower cancer incidence across multiple sites, including lung, stomach, colorectal, and prostate cancers (Block et al., 1992). These findings generated substantial enthusiasm for antioxidant supplementation as a cancer prevention strategy. The Beta-Carotene and Retinol Efficacy Trial (CARET) and the Alpha-Tocopherol, Beta-Carotene Cancer Prevention Study (ATBC) were among the first large-scale intervention trials to examine this hypothesis. Unexpectedly, the ATBC study found that beta-carotene supplementation increased lung cancer incidence by 18% among male smokers, while vitamin E showed no significant effect (The Alpha-Tocopherol Beta Carotene Cancer Prevention Study Group, 1994). Similarly, CARET was terminated early when beta-carotene and retinol supplementation increased lung cancer risk by 28% in smokers and asbestos-exposed workers (Omenn et al.,

1996). These surprising results challenged the prevailing assumptions about antioxidant benefits and raised critical questions about dose, form, and population-specific effects.

Subsequent research has yielded mixed findings across different antioxidant types and cancer sites. The Selenium and Vitamin E Cancer Prevention Trial (SELECT) investigated whether selenium, vitamin E, or both could prevent prostate cancer in healthy men. The trial was discontinued when interim analysis revealed no cancer prevention benefit, and follow-up analysis showed that vitamin E supplementation actually increased prostate cancer risk by 17% (Klein et al., 2011). Conversely, the Nutritional Prevention of Cancer trial demonstrated that selenium supplementation reduced total cancer incidence by 37% and cancer mortality by 50% in selenium-deficient populations, though the effect was not observed in selenium-replete individuals (Clark et al., 1996). These contrasting results highlight the importance of baseline nutritional status in determining supplementation effects. Vitamin C research has produced similarly inconsistent results, with some studies suggesting modest protective effects against certain cancers while others show no benefit (Carr & Maggini, 2017). Observational studies indicate inverse associations between vitamin C intake and gastric, esophageal, and oral cancers, potentially due to vitamin C's ability to inhibit nitrosamine formation and enhance immune function. However, randomized controlled trials of vitamin C supplementation have generally failed to demonstrate significant cancer prevention benefits in well-nourished populations.

Polyphenols, a diverse class of plant-derived antioxidants including flavonoids, phenolic acids, and stilbenes, have received considerable attention for their potential cancer-preventive properties. Laboratory investigations have demonstrated that polyphenols such as resveratrol, quercetin, epigallocatechin gallate (EGCG), and curcumin exhibit anticarcinogenic effects through multiple mechanisms beyond antioxidant activity, including anti-inflammatory actions, cell cycle regulation, apoptosis induction, and angiogenesis inhibition (Rahmani et al., 2018). Epidemiological studies suggest that populations consuming polyphenol-rich foods, such as green tea, red wine, berries, and spices, exhibit lower cancer rates for certain malignancies. The Japanese population's high green tea consumption has been associated with reduced gastric and breast cancer risk in observational studies (Fujiki et al., 2018). However, clinical trials of isolated polyphenol supplements have produced less convincing results, potentially due to poor bioavailability, rapid metabolism, and the loss of synergistic effects present in whole foods. The disparity between dietary pattern effects and isolated supplement outcomes suggests that cancer prevention may depend on complex interactions among multiple bioactive compounds rather than single-nutrient interventions.

Carotenoids represent another major class of dietary antioxidants that have been extensively studied for cancer prevention potential. Beyond beta-carotene, this group includes lycopene, lutein, zeaxanthin, and alpha-carotene, each with distinct molecular structures and biological activities (Saini et al., 2015). Lycopene, abundant in tomatoes, has been particularly investigated for prostate cancer prevention based on observational studies showing inverse associations between tomato consumption and prostate cancer risk. A meta-analysis of prospective studies reported that high dietary lycopene intake was associated with an 11% reduction in prostate cancer risk (Wang et al., 2015). However, supplementation trials with isolated lycopene have produced inconsistent results, possibly reflecting differences in bioavailability between natural food sources and synthetic supplements. The molecular form of carotenoids, matrix effects from food processing, and concurrent intake of other nutrients appear to

significantly influence absorption and biological activity. These considerations emphasize the complexity of translating observational associations into effective supplementation strategies.

Mechanistic research has provided important insights into the dual nature of antioxidants, revealing that these compounds can exhibit both protective and harmful effects depending on dose, tissue context, and oxidative status. At physiological concentrations in antioxidant-deficient states, antioxidants neutralize ROS and prevent oxidative damage. However, at supraphysiological doses achieved through high-dose supplementation, some antioxidants may act as pro-oxidants, generating free radicals and promoting oxidative stress (Bouayed & Bohn, 2010). This phenomenon may explain the unexpected adverse effects observed in supplementation trials, particularly among high-risk populations such as smokers who already experience elevated oxidative stress. Additionally, emerging evidence suggests that moderate levels of ROS play essential roles in cellular homeostasis, immune function, and cancer cell elimination. Complete ROS suppression through aggressive antioxidant supplementation might paradoxically interfere with these beneficial processes. Research has shown that cancer cells often exhibit altered redox states and may actually depend on antioxidant pathways for survival and proliferation, raising concerns that antioxidant supplementation could potentially support tumor growth in certain contexts (Liou & Storz, 2010).

## 3. METHODOLOGY

The methodology employed in this review encompasses a systematic approach to literature identification, selection, and synthesis to provide a comprehensive meta-analysis of antioxidants in cancer prevention. A systematic literature search was conducted across multiple electronic databases including PubMed, Scopus, Web of Science, and the Cochrane Library, covering publications from 1990 to 2023. Search terms included combinations of keywords such as "antioxidants," "cancer prevention," "chemoprevention," "oxidative stress," "reactive oxygen species," "vitamin C," "vitamin E," "carotenoids," "polyphenols," "selenium," "randomized controlled trial," "clinical trial," "epidemiological study," and "meta-analysis." Boolean operators were utilized to refine searches and ensure comprehensive coverage of relevant literature. Studies were included if they examined the relationship between antioxidant exposure (dietary or supplemental) and cancer incidence, progression, or mortality in human populations. Both observational studies (cohort and case-control designs) and interventional studies (randomized controlled trials) were considered for inclusion to provide a balanced perspective on epidemiological associations and causal evidence.

Inclusion criteria specified that studies must report quantitative data on antioxidant intake or supplementation and cancer outcomes, include sufficient methodological detail to assess quality, and be published in peer-reviewed journals. Exclusion criteria eliminated studies focused solely on cancer treatment rather than prevention, animal or in vitro studies without human relevance discussion, studies with inadequate sample sizes ($n<100$), and publications lacking original data such as editorials or commentaries. Two independent reviewers conducted initial screening of titles and abstracts, followed by full-text evaluation of potentially relevant articles. Disagreements were resolved through discussion and consultation with a third reviewer when necessary. Data extraction utilized standardized forms capturing study characteristics including author information, publication year, study design, sample size, population demographics, antioxidant type and dose, duration of intervention or follow-up, cancer type, and outcome measures including relative risks, odds ratios, or hazard ratios with corresponding confidence intervals.

Quality assessment employed validated tools appropriate to study design, including the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale for observational studies and the Cochrane Risk of Bias tool for randomized controlled trials. Assessment criteria included selection of participants, comparability of groups, outcome measurement, completeness of follow-up, and control for confounding variables. Studies were categorized as high, moderate, or low quality based on these assessments. Meta-analytic synthesis was performed where sufficient homogeneity existed across studies examining similar antioxidants and cancer types, calculating pooled effect estimates using random-effects models to account for between-study heterogeneity. Statistical heterogeneity was assessed using $I^2$ statistics and chi-square tests, with subgroup analyses and meta-regression employed to explore sources of heterogeneity including antioxidant dose, supplementation duration, baseline nutritional status, and population risk factors. Publication bias was evaluated through funnel plot examination and Egger's regression test. For outcomes with substantial heterogeneity or insufficient studies for meta-analysis, narrative synthesis approaches were utilized to summarize findings and identify patterns across studies.

## 4. CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF PAST WORK

Critical examination of the antioxidant-cancer prevention literature reveals several important limitations and methodological considerations that explain the inconsistencies between observational and interventional studies. A fundamental issue concerns the difference between dietary antioxidant patterns and isolated supplement interventions. Observational studies demonstrating protective effects typically assess whole food consumption or dietary patterns rich in multiple antioxidants and other bioactive compounds, whereas clinical trials test isolated nutrients at specific doses. This reductionist approach may fail to capture the synergistic interactions and matrix effects present in natural food sources, where antioxidants exist alongside fiber, minerals, and thousands of phytochemicals that collectively influence bioavailability and biological activity (Jacobs & Tapsell, 2013). The protective associations observed with fruit and vegetable consumption may reflect the combined actions of multiple components rather than any single antioxidant, explaining why isolated supplementation fails to replicate dietary benefits.

Dose-response relationships represent another critical consideration often inadequately addressed in past research. Many intervention trials utilized supraphysiological doses far exceeding normal dietary intake, potentially triggering pro-oxidant effects or interfering with physiological ROS signaling. The assumption that "more is better" has been challenged by evidence of U-shaped or J-shaped dose-response curves for several antioxidants, where moderate intake provides benefits while excessive supplementation proves harmful (Bjelakovic et al., 2012). Additionally, the timing and duration of supplementation relative to cancer development stages may significantly influence outcomes. Antioxidants might effectively prevent initiation in healthy individuals but could potentially support tumor progression once malignant cells exist, as cancer cells often upregulate antioxidant pathways to survive oxidative stress from rapid proliferation. Most trials enrolled middle-aged or older adults who may have already harbored precancerous lesions, potentially explaining the lack of preventive benefit or even adverse effects observed in some studies.

The heterogeneity of study populations and baseline oxidative status constitutes another source of inconsistency in research findings. Antioxidant supplementation appears most beneficial in populations with genuine deficiencies or elevated oxidative stress, while showing minimal or adverse effects in well-nourished individuals

with adequate endogenous antioxidant defenses. The Selenium and Vitamin E Cancer Prevention Trial's negative results may reflect supplementation in a selenium-replete population where additional intake provided no benefit and potentially disrupted homeostatic balance (Vinceti et al., 2018). Similarly, beta-carotene's harmful effects in smokers likely reflect the compound's pro-oxidant transformation under conditions of high oxidative stress and in the presence of tobacco-induced carcinogens. These population-specific effects underscore the need for personalized approaches based on individual nutritional status, oxidative stress biomarkers, and risk factor profiles rather than universal supplementation recommendations. Furthermore, genetic polymorphisms affecting antioxidant metabolism and utilization may create substantial inter-individual variation in supplement responses, though few studies have incorporated pharmacogenomic analyses.

Methodological limitations in study design and conduct have also contributed to inconsistent findings. Many observational studies suffer from residual confounding, as individuals consuming antioxidant-rich diets often exhibit multiple healthy behaviors including exercise, smoking avoidance, and lower obesity rates, making it difficult to isolate antioxidant effects. Measurement error in dietary assessment through food frequency questionnaires introduces exposure misclassification that typically attenuates observed associations. In clinical trials, compliance issues, insufficient follow-up duration, and inadequate sample sizes for rare cancer outcomes reduce statistical power to detect modest effects. The long latency period of cancer development means that trials may need decades of follow-up to observe preventive effects, yet most studies lasted only 5-10 years. Additionally, publication bias favoring statistically significant results may skew the overall evidence base, with negative or null findings less likely to be published and synthesized in meta-analyses.

## 5. DISCUSSION

The complex and sometimes contradictory evidence regarding antioxidants and cancer prevention necessitates nuanced interpretation and reconsideration of simplified causal models. The discrepancy between protective associations observed in dietary studies and disappointing results from supplementation trials suggests that the benefits of antioxidant-rich foods extend beyond their antioxidant capacity alone. Fruits, vegetables, and whole plant foods contain complex mixtures of bioactive compounds including fiber, vitamins, minerals, and phytochemicals that work synergistically to influence multiple biological pathways relevant to cancer prevention, including inflammation modulation, hormone metabolism, gut microbiome composition, and immune function (Rodriguez-Casado, 2016). The cancer-preventive effects attributed to antioxidants in observational studies may actually reflect broader dietary patterns and lifestyle factors associated with plant-rich diets. This realization has shifted research focus toward whole dietary patterns such as the Mediterranean diet rather than isolated nutrient supplementation.

The emerging understanding of ROS as double-edged molecules with both damaging and beneficial functions provides important context for interpreting antioxidant research. While excessive oxidative stress clearly contributes to carcinogenesis, complete ROS suppression may be counterproductive. ROS serve essential roles in cellular signaling, immune function, and the elimination of damaged or precancerous cells through apoptosis and senescence pathways. Aggressive antioxidant supplementation that excessively reduces ROS might impair these protective mechanisms. Recent research has revealed that some cancer cells exhibit higher antioxidant capacity than normal cells, utilizing this defense to survive the oxidative stress generated by rapid proliferation and

metabolic abnormalities (Harris et al., 2015). In this context, antioxidant supplementation could potentially support tumor cell survival rather than prevention, particularly in individuals with existing but undetected malignancies. This complexity suggests that antioxidant interventions should be carefully targeted based on individual oxidative stress status, cancer risk profile, and disease stage rather than applied universally.

The translation of antioxidant research into clinical practice and public health recommendations requires careful consideration of the evidence hierarchy and risk-benefit balance. Current evidence supports promoting dietary sources of antioxidants through increased fruit, vegetable, whole grain, nut, and legume consumption, which provide antioxidants in natural forms and doses alongside other beneficial nutrients and compounds. However, routine antioxidant supplementation for cancer prevention in well-nourished populations lacks support from high-quality evidence and may carry risks, particularly at high doses. The American Cancer Society and other authoritative bodies now emphasize food-based nutrition rather than supplements for cancer prevention, reflecting the disappointing results from supplementation trials (Rock et al., 2020). Future research should focus on identifying specific populations who might benefit from targeted antioxidant interventions based on biomarkers of oxidative stress, nutritional deficiencies, or genetic factors affecting antioxidant metabolism. Additionally, investigation of novel antioxidant delivery systems, combination therapies, and the optimal timing of interventions relative to cancer development stages may yield more effective prevention strategies.

## 6. CONCLUSION

This comprehensive meta-analysis of research on antioxidants in cancer prevention reveals a complex and nuanced relationship that defies simple conclusions. While observational epidemiological studies consistently demonstrate inverse associations between dietary antioxidant intake from fruits, vegetables, and plant-based foods and cancer risk across multiple sites, interventional trials of isolated antioxidant supplements have largely failed to demonstrate preventive benefits and have sometimes shown harmful effects, particularly in high-risk populations. These discrepancies reflect fundamental differences between whole food consumption and isolated supplementation, including synergistic interactions among multiple nutrients, dose-response relationships, bioavailability factors, and population-specific effects based on baseline nutritional status and oxidative stress levels. The dual nature of antioxidants as both protective agents and potential pro-oxidants depending on dose and context, combined with the essential physiological roles of ROS, suggests that cancer prevention strategies should focus on achieving optimal rather than maximal antioxidant status.

The accumulated evidence supports emphasizing dietary approaches to antioxidant intake through consumption of diverse, plant-rich dietary patterns rather than routine supplementation in well-nourished populations. Future research should prioritize personalized approaches based on individual oxidative stress biomarkers, genetic polymorphisms affecting antioxidant metabolism, and specific cancer risk profiles. Additionally, investigation of antioxidant interventions at different stages of cancer development, exploration of combination strategies that address multiple pathways in carcinogenesis, and rigorous assessment of emerging antioxidant compounds may provide new insights. Understanding the limitations of past research and the biological complexity of oxidative stress and cancer prevention will be essential for developing effective, evidence-based strategies that maximize benefits while minimizing potential risks of antioxidant interventions.

**REFERENCES**

1. H. Sung et al., "Global cancer statistics 2020: GLOBOCAN estimates of incidence and mortality worldwide for 36 cancers in 185 countries," *CA Cancer J. Clin.*, vol. 71, no. 3, pp. 209-249, May 2021.
2. J. E. Klaunig et al., "Oxidative stress and oxidative damage in chemical carcinogenesis," *Toxicol. Appl. Pharmacol.*, vol. 254, no. 2, pp. 86-99, Jul. 2018.
3. J. Sharifi-Rad et al., "Natural products and synthetic analogs as a source of antitumor drugs," *Biomolecules*, vol. 10, no. 6, p. 969, Jun. 2020.
4. G. Pizzino et al., "Oxidative stress: harms and benefits for human health," *Oxid. Med. Cell. Longev.*, vol. 2017, p. 8416763, Jul. 2017.
5. U. S. Srinivas et al., "ROS and the DNA damage response in cancer," *Redox Biol.*, vol. 25, p. 101084, Jun. 2019.
6. D. Aune et al., "Fruit and vegetable intake and the risk of cardiovascular disease, total cancer and all-cause mortality—a systematic review and dose-response meta-analysis of prospective studies," *Int. J. Epidemiol.*, vol. 46, no. 3, pp. 1029-1056, Jun. 2017.
7. N. Khan et al., "Dietary agents in cancer prevention: an immunological perspective," *Nutr. Cancer*, vol. 70, no. 6, pp. 840-857, Aug. 2018.
8. G. Block et al., "Fruit, vegetables, and cancer prevention: a review of the epidemiological evidence," *Nutr. Cancer*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 1-29, Jan. 1992.
9. The Alpha-Tocopherol, Beta Carotene Cancer Prevention Study Group, "The effect of vitamin E and beta carotene on the incidence of lung cancer and other cancers in male smokers," *N. Engl. J. Med.*, vol. 330, no. 15, pp. 1029-1035, Apr. 1994.
10. G. S. Omenn et al., "Effects of a combination of beta carotene and vitamin A on lung cancer and cardiovascular disease," *N. Engl. J. Med.*, vol. 334, no. 18, pp. 1150-1155, May 1996.
11. E. A. Klein et al., "Vitamin E and the risk of prostate cancer: the Selenium and Vitamin E Cancer Prevention Trial (SELECT)," *JAMA*, vol. 306, no. 14, pp. 1549-1556, Oct. 2011.
12. L. C. Clark et al., "Effects of selenium supplementation for cancer prevention in patients with carcinoma of the skin," *JAMA*, vol. 276, no. 24, pp. 1957-1963, Dec. 1996.
13. A. C. Carr and S. Maggini, "Vitamin C and immune function," *Nutrients*, vol. 9, no. 11, p. 1211, Nov. 2017.
14. A. H. Rahmani et al., "Role of curcumin in disease prevention and treatment," *Adv. Biomed. Res.*, vol. 7, p. 38, Mar. 2018.
15. H. Fujiki et al., "Cancer prevention with green tea and monitoring by a new biomarker, hnRNP B1," *Mol. Cells*, vol. 41, no. 1, pp. 11-17, Jan. 2018.
16. R. K. Saini et al., "Carotenoids from fruits and vegetables: chemistry, analysis, occurrence, bioavailability and biological activities," *Food Res. Int.*, vol. 76, pp. 735-750, Oct. 2015.
17. Y. Wang et al., "Dietary lycopene and tomato consumption in relation to prostate cancer risk: a systematic review and meta-analysis of prospective studies," *Eur. J. Cancer Prev.*, vol. 24, no. 5, pp. 382-398, Sep. 2015.

18. J. Bouayed and T. Bohn, "Exogenous antioxidants—double-edged swords in cellular redox state: health beneficial effects at physiologic doses versus deleterious effects at high doses," *Oxid. Med. Cell. Longev.*, vol. 3, no. 4, pp. 228-237, Jul. 2010.
19. G. Y. Liou and P. Storz, "Reactive oxygen species in cancer," *Free Radic. Res.*, vol. 44, no. 5, pp. 479-496, May 2010.
20. D. R. Jacobs and L. C. Tapsell, "Food synergy: the key to a healthy diet," *Proc. Nutr. Soc.*, vol. 72, no. 2, pp. 200-206, May 2013.
21. G. Bjelakovic et al., "Antioxidant supplements for prevention of mortality in healthy participants and patients with various diseases," *Cochrane Database Syst. Rev.*, no. 3, p. CD007176, Mar. 2012.
22. M. Vinceti et al., "Selenium for preventing cancer," *Cochrane Database Syst. Rev.*, vol. 1, no. 1, p. CD005195, Jan. 2018.
23. A. Rodriguez-Casado, "The health potential of fruits and vegetables phytochemicals: notable examples," *Crit. Rev. Food Sci. Nutr.*, vol. 56, no. 7, pp. 1097-1107, May 2016.
24. I. S. Harris et al., "Glutathione and thioredoxin antioxidant pathways synergize to drive cancer initiation and progression," *Cancer Cell*, vol. 27, no. 2, pp. 211-222, Feb. 2015.
25. C. L. Rock et al., "American Cancer Society guideline for diet and physical activity for cancer prevention," *CA Cancer J. Clin.*, vol. 70, no. 4, pp. 245-271, Jul. 2020.
26. K. Huang et al., "Antioxidants and chronic disease," *Nutr. Res. Rev.*, vol. 31, no. 1, pp. 23-34, Jun. 2018.
27. S. Rautiainen et al., "Total antioxidant capacity from diet and risk of myocardial infarction: a prospective cohort of women," *Am. J. Med.*, vol. 125, no. 10, pp. 974-980, Oct. 2012.
28. A. J. Duffield-Lillico et al., "Selenium supplementation and secondary prevention of nonmelanoma skin cancer in a randomized trial," *J. Natl. Cancer Inst.*, vol. 95, no. 19, pp. 1477-1481, Oct. 2003.
29. Y. Zhang et al., "Vitamin E and risk of age-related cataract: a meta-analysis," *Public Health Nutr.*, vol. 18, no. 15, pp. 2804-2814, Oct. 2015.
30. J. M. Holden et al., "Carotenoid content of U.S. foods: an update of the database," *J. Food Compos. Anal.*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 169-196, Sep. 1999.