
NutriFD: Proving the medicinal value of food nutrition based on food-disease association and treatment networks

Abstract

Wanting Su^{1,2}, Feng Tan¹, Dongwei Liu³, Pengwei Hu¹

There is rising evidence of the health benefit associated with specific dietary interventions. Current food-disease databases focus on associations and treatment relationships but haven't provided a reasonable assessment of the strength of the relationship, and lack of attention on food nutrition. There is an unmet need for a large database that can guide dietary therapy. We fill the gap with NutriFD, a scoring network based on associations and therapeutic relationships between foods and diseases. NutriFD integrates 9 databases including foods, nutrients, diseases, genes, miRNAs, compounds, disease ontology and their relationships. To our best knowledge, this database is the only one that can score the associations and therapeutic relationships of everyday foods and diseases by weighting inference scores of food compounds to diseases. In addition, NutriFD demonstrates the predictive nature of nutrients on the therapeutic relationships between foods and diseases through machine learning models, laying the foundation for a mechanistic understanding of food therapy.

Keywords: Food Dietary, Nutrition, Food-disease Networks, Machine Learning Models

¹Merck KGaA, Science and Technology Office. ²The University of Manchester, Faculty of Biology, Medicine and Health. ³ByteDance (Nanjing) Technology R&D Co., Ltd. ✉email: hupengwei@hotmail.com

Introduction

The Global Burden of Disease (GBD) 2017 Diet Collaborators used observational data and short-term trials of intermediate outcomes to establish causal associations between individual dietary components and death and disease (1). Nutrients are essential for the proper functioning of the human body as they provide energy for activity, materials for growth and repair, and maintain a healthy immune system (2). Moreover, nutritional deficiencies are major risk factors for many chronic diseases and conditions, such as cardiovascular disease, stroke, type 2 diabetes, obesity, cancer, and others. Hence, The 2020-2030 NIH Nutrition Research Strategic Plan is focused on advancing precision nutrition to answer the key question: "How can we improve the use of food as medicine?" (3).

Studies have shown that naturally occurring bioactive compounds, including those found in turmeric, broccoli sprouts, berries, propolis, and other foods, have the potential to be used as nutritional therapies for chronic kidney disease by regulating the expression of pro-inflammatory transcription factors and inflammatory cytokines (4). Specifically, nutrients such as catechins, sulforaphane, and curcumin that stimulate the cell-protective transcription factor nuclear factor erythroid 2-related factor 2 (NRF2) improve mitochondrial function and reduce aging through induction of the anti-aging pathway (5).

Nutrients are not the only compounds found in food that can impact disease development and progression. Non-nutrient bioactive compounds, such as resveratrol found in nuts and red wine, have antioxidant, anti-thrombotic, anti-inflammatory properties, and can even inhibit carcinogenesis (6). Therefore, it is crucial to consider both nutrients and bioactive compounds when examining the relationship between food and disease.

Traditional methods for studying the connection between food and disease often rely on time-consuming long-term experiments (7,8). However, with the vast amount of biomedical data available, it is now possible to build links between diseases and foods through compounds using data-driven approaches. This study aims to develop a dataset for exploring the relationship between foods and diseases from the perspective of nutrients. This dataset can be used to guide AI dietary therapy for regulating chronic disease courses through daily diet. In addition, it can be used to investigate potential relationships between foods and diseases, providing directions for future research for biologists.

Currently, food-disease datasets fall into two primary categories. The first category comprises associations between plant foods and diseases, such as NutriChem (9) and FooDisNET (10). NutriChem contains 6242 text-mining connections between 1066 plant foods and 751 diseases, while FooDisNET links 6329 plant foods and 18689 diseases. The second type is traditional Chinese medicine (TCM) datasets, which examine the therapeutic relationship between herbs and diseases. For instance, TCMID 2.0 (11–13) includes 1356 TCMs and their associations with 842 diseases. Nonetheless, since most herbs are not part of daily human dietary intake, TCM datasets are not suitable for this study.

The accuracy and validity of food-disease databases depend largely on the methodology used to link foods and diseases. One approach involves extracting food-disease associations directly through text mining. For instance, the MAPS database (14) extracted data on over 500 medicinal plants from PubMed papers.

The second method is to connect foods and diseases by agent, such as compound. NutriChem was reportedly the first to link foods and diseases through compounds which were represented by

simplified molecular-input line-entry system (SMILES). To obtain further in-depth information on foods and diseases, NutriChem 2.0 considered the interaction of overlapping targets between food compounds and drugs (15). While SMILES are widely used for storage and interchange of chemical structures (16), no standard exists to generate a canonical SMILES string (17). Some matching bias may be caused. Nevertheless, the InChI is a more precise representation of compound, which aims to provide a unique, or canonical identifier for chemical structures (17,18). FooDisNet (10) established compound connections between plant foods and disease targets through InChiKey, a compression of InChi, which improved the accuracy of integrating compounds. In addition to "compound-target" linkage method, ABCkb (19) established such associations by "compound-gene" linkages.

Regarding the assessment of the relationship between foods and diseases, FooDisNet evaluated associations between plant foods and diseases by developing four scoring strategies (10). These strategies included the prevalence of food, the rarity of compounds, specificity of proteins, and universality of the disorder. However, this approach reduced the usability and objectivity of the data. While NutriChem provided information on 'preventive' and 'promoting' associations between foods and diseases, it did not propose a method for assessing such relationships. Previous studies investigating relationships between foods and diseases have not utilized a standardized method for quantitative analysis.

Although several food-disease databases have been constructed, most of them are limited in compounds integration accuracy and scoring method objectivity. Moreover, lack of attention on food nutrition has existed as a problem for many years since the relation exploration between food nutrients and diseases is a major contributor to food therapy. In addition, what is not yet clear is the assessment of the treatment relation from foods to diseases.

To address these gaps, we have created NutriFD, which includes both NutriFDA and NutriFDT. NutriFDA focuses on scoring associations between foods and diseases, while NutriFDT focuses on scoring treatment relations. This resource enables researchers to browse and analyze food-disease associations and treatment relations from a nutrient-based perspective. The current version of NutriFDA consists of 591 foods and 2208 diseases, while NutriFDT consists of 591 foods and 671 diseases. NutriFD provides nutrient features and disease similarity features based on disease-mirna associations, disease-gene associations, and disease ontology. To prove the predictive nature of nutrients on food dietary, we developed multi-classification tasks of NutriFDT and NutriFDA by machine learning models. We anticipate that this database will be widely utilized and will promote new avenues for research in the field of food therapy.

Methods

Overview

The process of constructing NutriFD was conducted in six stages (see Figure 1). The first five steps involved datasets creation, while the final step was devoted to validating the datasets effectiveness. We began by acquiring a food-nutrition dataset from USDA (20). The second step involved constructing two types of food-disease relationships: scoring associations and scoring treatment relations. Additionally, to generate disease characteristics, we developed three disease similarity datasets based on disease-mirna associations, disease-gene associations, and disease ontology. After consolidating the consensus foods and diseases from these datasets, we constructed two food-disease networks based on

different food-disease relationships: NutriFDA considering associations and NutriFDT considering treatment relations. The structure of the networks is characterized by food and disease nodes, the connections between them, food nutrition characteristics, and disease similarity characteristics. Ultimately, the generalization performance of the networks was evaluated by developing multi-classification tasks for NutriFDA and NutriFDT, employing machine learning models.




Figure 1 Process of NutriFD establishment

Setting & Assumption

To establish NutriFDA and NutriFDT, we set the below assumptions:

- InChiKey and CASRN to represent compounds for connecting food-compound and compound-disease are assumed to be unique. Although there is a possibility of two different compounds having the same InChiKey, this is extremely unlikely (21).
- We introduced association and treatment inference scores of compounds to diseases from CTD (22,23). They performed a weighted scoring inference of relationships between compounds and diseases through chemical-gene-disease networks by evaluating the hypergeometric clustering coefficient (24), as well as two common neighbor statistics (25). This scoring inference allowed us to determine the degree of association between compounds and diseases.
- When integrating food names from FooDB (26) and USDA, we focused on integrating everyday foods with high unprocessed level. For unmatched FooDB foods, we used partial and handy matching methods to find the best match in the USDA dataset, as shown in the Figure 4, assuming that such FooDB foods are equivalent to the matched USDA foods.

Materials and methods

(1) Food-nutrition collection and criteria

Food-nutrition datasets were collected from USDA by limiting the food type to "Foundation Foods",

"SR Legacy Foods", and "Survey Foods", which contain everyday foods with high unprocessed levels.

(2) Food-compound-disease datasets building criteria

Compound CASRNs were achieved by FooDB, CTD and PubChem API. Compound InChiKeys were achieved by PubChem API and ChemSpider API. The search approach was followed by manual curation. In the end, we obtained InChiKeys for 90.3% and CASRNs for 77.5% of the compounds. The relationships between foods and diseases were linked by 848 compounds, representing 22.9% of food compounds.

To calculate the inference scores between foods and diseases, a new method was proposed as Figure 2.




Figure 2 Method to calculate adjacent matrix between foods and diseases

Figure 2. The figure displays a schematic representation of the variables considered in the study. Specifically, it shows the designation of D_i for the i -th disease, C_j for the j -th compound, and F_k for the k -th food item. This notation is used consistently throughout the paper to describe the various disease-compound-food relationships that are examined.

Inference scores between compounds and diseases were obtained from CTD, which were then combined with the food compound content to calculate the inference scores between foods and diseases. For the treatment relations between foods and diseases, therapeutic evidence data from CTD were selected. Using the method proposed in Figure 2, the resulting association matrix had a shape of 684*5840, while the inference score matrix for treatment relations had a shape of 684*691.

(3) Three types of disease similarity features

To create three types of disease similarity datasets, we utilized disease Gaussian similarity for disease-miRNA associations and disease-gene associations, and disease semantic similarity for disease ontology.




Figure 3 Methods to calculate three types of disease features

Figure 3. Before calculating the semantic features of diseases using disease ontology, it is important to note that we first took the intersection of diseases with ontology and those related to foods. This resulted in a total of 2109 diseases for semantic similarity calculation.

1) Disease semantic similarity (27)

Diseases can be classified by Medical Subject Headings (MeSH) disease descriptors in a strict system. In the NCBI database (28), each disease is represented by a Directed Acyclic Graph (DAG) where diseases are nodes and edges connect the parent and child nodes. Given any disease d , the corresponding directed acyclic graph is denoted as $DAG_d = (D, C_d, P_d)$, where C_d is the child nodes of d and P_d is the parent nodes of d . Therefore, any a disease term d in DAG_d , the semantic characteristic is defined as,

$$\begin{cases} D_d(t) = 1 \\ D_d(t) = \max\{\Delta^* D_d(t') \mid t' \in \text{children of } t\} \text{ if } t \neq d \end{cases} \quad [1]$$

In simpler terms, the decay factor (Δ) determines the extent to which ancestor diseases contribute to the semantic value of disease d . As the distance between a disease and disease d increases, the contribution of its ancestor diseases decreases. Disease d is in the 0th layer of the DAG, which makes it the most specific disease term with a contribution of 1 to the semantic value of disease d . Diseases in the 1st layer are considered more general, so their contribution is multiplied by the decay factor which is 0.5. This formula differentiates the semantic contribution of diseases in different layers to the semantic value of disease d .

The semantic value of a disease d is calculated as the sum of the semantic contribution values of all diseases in its corresponding DAG, as defined below,

$$DV(d) = \sum_{t \in T_d} D_d(t) \quad [2]$$

Hence, for any disease d_1 and d_2 , the semantic similarity between them can be defined as,

$$Sim(D_{d_1}, D_{d_2}) = \frac{\sum_{t \in D_{d_1} \cap D_{d_2}} (D_{d_1}(t) + D_{d_2}(t))}{\sum_{t \in D_{d_1}} (D_{d_1}(t)) + \sum_{t \in D_{d_2}} (D_{d_2}(t))} \quad [3]$$

2) Disease Gaussian similarity (29)

We computed the Gaussian interaction distribution nuclear similarity between two diseases (denoted as d_1 and d_2) in the matrix M , which represents disease features. In particular, the i -th row of D is the vector $V(d_i)$, which describes the feature of disease i . The similarity between d_1 and d_2 can be defined as follows,

$$sim_M(d_1, d_2) = \exp(-\gamma_d * \|V(d_1) - V(d_2)\|^2) \quad [4]$$

where γ_d parameter is applied to regulate the kernel bandwidth and nd is the column amount of M , which can be defined as,

$$\gamma_d = 1 / \left(\frac{1}{nd} \sum_{i=1}^{nd} \|V(D_i)\|^2 \right) \quad [5]$$

(4) The process of foods integration

To unify the foods between the food-disease dataset and the food-nutrition dataset, we took into consideration the discrepancies between FooDB (26) and USDA, as shown in Figure 4.




Figure 4 The process of integrating food names

Figure 4. The figure provides definitions and explanations of certain terms and concepts used in the study. The term "unprocessed foods" refers to food items listed by the USDA with names containing "100%", "raw" and "NFS". The phrase "core foods" refers to the part of the food name before the first comma. The study uses different methods for matching food items from the FooDB and USDA databases. "Full match" requires every word in the FooDB food name to be present in the USDA food name. "Partial and manual match" accepts matches where at least one word from the FooDB food name is present in the USDA food name and filters manually the best match. "Homology de-duplication" retains the latest record and calculates the median nutrition for foods with similar names. "Heterogeneous de-duplication" selects the food item with the highest priority according to the source priority in Table 1. These definitions and methods are used consistently throughout the paper to ensure clarity and consistency in the analysis of the data.

To obtain USDA foods with high unprocessed levels, we ranked the unprocessed degrees of food sources based on a priority list (Table 1), since foods with the same core term in USDA may have different processing methods. In cases where a FooDB food had multiple USDA food records, we selected the USDA food with the highest unprocessed degree (Figure 6). As a result, we were able to match 591 foods containing nutrition information with 487 foods containing compound information.

Table 1 Rankings of food sources

Source	Data type	Description	Rank
Foundation	foundation_food	included many samples	1
Foundation	sub_sample food	the sample of sample food	5

Foundation	market acquisition	collected for chemical experiments	3
Foundation	agriculture_acquisition	collected directly from the original places	3
Foundation	sample_food	the sample food of foundation_food	4
SR_legacy	sr_legacy_food	collected from USDA National Nutrient Database	2
Survey	survey_fndds_food	consumption of food nutrients	6

(5) The process of diseases integration

To achieve better integration of diseases, we removed certain insignificant words such as "disease", "to", "syndrome", "disorders", "and", "of", "or" and "with" from disease names. Then, we used an exact match method to integrate disease names between diseases containing features and those related to foods.




Figure 5 Intersection of disease names from different sources in NutriFDA




Figure 6 Intersection of disease names from different sources in NutriFDT

Figure 5 and Figure 6. The blue highlighted portion of the figure represents the diseases that are related to food.

The analysis showed that 2208 diseases associated with food have a minimum of one feature type in NutriFDA, and the same was found for 671 diseases in NutriFDT.

(6) Evaluation and Prediction

The paper used machine learning methods to evaluate the generalization capability of NutriFD datasets. The process was divided into the following steps,

- 1) Independent variables were generating by connecting the nutritional characteristics of each food with the similarity characteristics of each disease.
- 2) Corresponding dependent variables were the corresponding value of the food-disease relationship matrix.
- 3) Data pre-processing was to classify the value of 0 in the dependent variable as a separate category, then group the remaining values using a binning method.
- 4) Machine learning models including decision tree models and random forest models were used.
- 5) The f1-score and AUC in the testing datasets were reported as evaluation indicators.

Results

After the above steps, we generated NutriFDA and NutriFDT networks based on food-disease associations and treatment relations, as shown in Figure 7 and Figure 8.

A. Networks Study




Figure 7 Network of associations between foods and diseases (NutriFDT)




Figure 8 Network of treatment relations between foods and diseases (NutriFDA)

Figure 7 and Figure 8. The blue points in the figure represent diseases, while the yellow points represent foods. Twenty six diseases and eleven foods were selected. The strength of their association scores and therapeutic scores were plotted as the thickness of the lines.




Figure 9 Comparison of distributions of association and treatment inference score

Figure 9. Eleven foods from our previous analysis were selected. Their association and therapeutic inference scores were plotted in kernel density graphs. Inference scores that were less than 6 and not equal to 0 were included.

There are fewer relationships capable of producing therapeutic effects than those capable of producing associations, as shown in Figure 7 and Figure 8. The strongest association observed was between "Fish oil" and "Diabetes mellitus, type 2"(30,31), followed by "Fish oil" and "Kidney failure, chronic"(32). However, the strongest therapeutic relationship was found between "Yogurt" and "Diabetes mellitus, type 2"(33), followed by "Fennel" and "Stomach ulcer"(34). These relationships are supported by previous research indicating that these foods may have therapeutic effects on specific diseases, mediated by complex relationships between multiple compounds and targets.

When examining the plot of distributions of association inference scores from Figure 9, we found that most inference scores of foods were concentrated between 0 and 0.7, with the highest peak observed for fennel. However, acorn and breakfast cereal produced small peaks between 1 and 2. For fish

oil, its highest peak was observed at around 2.5, indicating a relatively strong association with certain diseases. In contrast, when examining the plot of distributions of treatment inference scores from Figure 9, the peak of inference scores for all foods were concentrated between 0 and 0.5, with the highest peak observed for burbot. However, fish oil displayed a broader and smoother curve, indicating its potential therapeutic effects across a wide range of diseases.

These findings suggest that different foods may have varying degrees of association and therapeutic effects on different diseases. Further research is needed to fully understand the complex relationships between foods and diseases.

B. Case Study



Figure 10 Nutrient-disease network of Adzuki bean




Figure 11 Comparing association and treatment inference scores of adzuki bean to 30 diseases

Figure 10. A treatment relationship network for adzuki beans were constructed by adding its relationships with 49 nutrients and 27 diseases. Blue nodes represented nutrients, while green nodes represented diseases. The top three diseases with the strongest treated relationships by adzuki bean were highlighted in red.

Figure 11. Top 30 diseases treated by adzuki bean were selected.

Adzuki beans, a type of legume commonly used in Asian cuisine and medicine, exhibited the strongest dose-dependent inhibitory effect against ovary cancer cell SK-OV-3 and breast cancer cell MCF-7 compared with other commonly consumed food legumes (35). Hence, adzuki beans may reduce the risk of breast cancer, although no evidence is available for the mechanism of action of

common beans on other kinds of cancer.

A diet high in legume consumption, including adzuki beans, has been associated with a low risk of colorectal cancer (CRC). Adzuki beans contain phytochemicals like phenolic compounds, total dietary fiber (TDF), lectins, unsaturated fatty acids, phytic acid, and trypsin inhibitors, which may prevent or reduce chronic degenerative diseases such as CRC(36–38). Non-digestible fraction (NDF) and phenolic compounds may reach the colon to be fermented by microflora, producing short-chain fatty acids like butyric acid, which can inhibit tumor cell proliferation and induce apoptosis leading to a more differentiated phenotype, thus reducing the risk of CRC(39).

Research has suggested that a hot-water extract of adzuki beans has the potential to stimulate tyrosinase activity in cultured mouse B16 melanoma cells, without inhibiting cell growth(40). This extract is believed to increase the content of cAMP in cells, thereby activating adenylyl cyclase and protein kinase pathways and translocating cytosolic PKC to the membrane-bound PKC. The extract has also demonstrated the ability to stimulate hair color pigmentation in C3H mice, indicating potential usefulness in anti-graying and protecting human skin from irradiation. However, these findings only suggest that adzuki bean extract may have pigmentation activity and promote melanogenesis. There is currently insufficient evidence to support the use of adzuki beans as a treatment for melanoma, and further research is warranted.

C. Dataset Analysis

Table 2 Final data presentation

Network	Food *nutrition	Disease feature	The shape of disease and disease features
Nu-triFDA	591*213	disease-mirna	320*320
		disease-gene	670*670
		disease ontology	2109*2109
Nu-triFDT	591*213	disease-mirna	178*178
		disease-gene	208*208
		disease ontology	663*663

Table 2. The result of NutriFDA and NutriFDT networks were presented. Only diseases that are related to food were included in the calculation of disease similarity features. The diseases included in "The shape of disease and disease

features" section of the figure represent the intersection between diseases related to food and those with disease feature information.

Table 3 Results of multi-classification tasks of NutriFDT and NutriFDA

	Disease feature	AUC	F1-score	Model	Max depth	Criterion	No. of categories
NutriFDT	Disease-gene	0.79	0.61	Random-ForestClassifier	2.00	gini	12.00
		0.78	0.59	Decision-TreeClassifier	2.00	entropy	
	Disease-miRNA	0.78	0.60	Random-ForestClassifier	4.00	gini	
		0.78	0.60	Decision-TreeClassifier	2.00	gini	
	DO	0.79	0.61	Random-ForestClassifier	2.00	gini	
		0.79	0.61	Decision-TreeClassifier	2.00	gini	
Mean results		0.78	0.60				
NutriFDA	Disease-gene	0.72	0.62	Random-ForestClassifier	4.00	gini	3.00
		0.71	0.61	Decision-TreeClassifier	2.00	entropy	
	Disease-miRNA	0.70	0.59	Random-ForestClassifier	4.00	gini	
		0.69	0.59	Decision-TreeClassifier	2.00	gini	
	DO	0.71	0.61	Random-ForestClassifier	2.00	gini	
		0.69	0.58	Decision-TreeClassifier	2.00	gini	
Mean results		0.70	0.60				

Table 3. The value of 0 was classified as a separate category, while the remaining categories were grouped using a binning method.

The results of multi-classification models on NutriFDT are shown in Table 3. The area under the receiver operating characteristic curve (AUC) and F1 Score are robust evaluation metrics that work great for many classification problems. F1 score combines precision and recalls into one metric by calculating the harmonic mean(41) . The AUC is a widely-used quantitative measure of classification performance(42). The higher the value, the better the classifier effect.

The results of the study in Table 3 indicate that both the random forest and decision tree models demonstrated high performance for NutriFDT and NutriFDA, suggesting that these networks possess strong generalization abilities. However, due to the decrease in performance observed with an increase in category types, we restricted the categories of NutriFDA to three types. This situation may be

explained by the fact that nutrition can play a therapeutic role in dietary treatments, rather than simply displaying association relationships with diseases.

Discussion

Nutritional components of food interact with specific protein genes indirectly or directly to influence the development of diseases or even prevent their occurrence (43) (9). To observe the relationship between food and disease from the perspective of nutrients, this paper made certain assumptions about the compound matching method, food matching method, and inference scores of the compound-disease relationship, and established the "nutrient-food-disease-disease similarity feature" connection. The number of associations between food and disease reaches as 3237640, while the amount of treatment relation between those reaches as 170531. Previously, the study of the relationship between food and disease from a nutritional perspective had focused on experimental studies, while this paper validated dietary feasibility of nutrition from a perspective of big data. To verify the advanced nature of NutriFDA and NutriFDT, it is compared and analyzed with NutriChem, FooDisNET, and ABCkb in four aspects.

1) The amount of data in the food-disease dataset

The following table compares the amount of connected data between NutriFDA, NutriFDT, and other food-disease databases.

Table 4 Food-disease associations in different networks

Disease similarity type	Food	Disease	Food-disease association
NutriFDA ^{*#}	591	2208	3237640
NutriFDT ^{*#}	591	671	170531
NutriChem (9) ^{*#}	1772	7828	
FooDisNET (10) [*]	6329	18,689	53,920
ABCkb (19) [#]	229143	53302	29,124

Table 4. Note that the "*" symbol indicates that the database primarily focuses on associations, while the "#" symbol indicates that the database focuses on treatment relations.

The results, given in Table 4, show that in addition to exploring more food-disease relationships, NutriFD focuses on everyday foods and provides a new paradigm for evaluating therapeutic

relationships, which haven't existed in other databases.

2) Compound integration method

In this paper, compounds were expressed using InChiKey, which is a more unique and complete method of compound expression compared to SMILES used in NutriChem. Compared with DisGeNET (44) and ABCkb (19) databases that expressed compounds with InChiKey, this paper incorporated a multi-layer check of compound name, mesh, and CASRN in the compound matching process, which largely improved the accuracy of the database.

3) Accession of food and disease characteristics

The database built in this paper incorporated food nutrient element characteristics, which were not considered in previous food-disease databases. Besides, we successfully proved that nutrients dominate the effect of dietary therapy, allowing machine learning models to generalise well.

4) Food-disease scoring method

This paper utilized the inference score data calculated by Common Neighbor Statistics (CNS) in CTD (22,44), which takes into account the compound-gene-disease local network topology information, i.e. when two similar nodes share many interacting neighbors, the local network topology information can significantly increase the possibility of two nodes sharing related biological functions. Compared with the food-disease association scoring method defined by FoodDisNET from four perspectives of compound sparsity, protein universality, disease-protein association, and food compound association, the food-disease scoring relation established in this paper has more biological significance.

New Perspectives

Although there are challenges in conducting diet trials (29), the use of nutrition to treat disease represents a unique opportunity. Current diet research is focused on designing and evaluating effective interventions, with less research on clear molecular pathway targets for diet therapy. This dataset might provide researchers with a food-related dataset for disease, thus providing guidance for researchers to explore the direction of trials and helping to guide future trials of dietary interventions.

We also provide food nutrient profiles from USDA and diseases similarity profiles for researchers to study the potential relationship between them. Researchers can propose improved machine learning models to enhance the accuracy of predicting the relationship between food and disease. It is also hoped that researchers can use KEGG (45,46) to establish an inference score that takes into account the metabolic pathways of multiple compounds.

Conclusion

Food therapy has been developed for a long time, mainly in the field of nutrition, where the analysis of nutritional elements gives the different nutritional needs during the human life cycle. However, the field of establishing the relationship between food and disease from the perspective of big data has just emerged. In this paper, we developed an association scoring network called NutriFDA and a treatment scoring network called NutriFDT. We also used machine learning models to evaluate their effectiveness. To some extent, the present dataset may be able to provide researchers with food-related datasets for diseases that can inform trials of dietary therapy and help guide future trials of dietary interventions.

References

1. Afshin A, Sur PJ, Fay KA, Cornaby L, Ferrara G, Salama JS, et al. Health effects of dietary risks in 195 countries, 1990–2017: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2017. *The Lancet*. 2019 May 11;393(10184):1958–72.
2. Soetan KO, Olaiya CO, Oyewole OE. The importance of mineral elements for humans, domestic animals and plants: A review. *Afr J Food Sci*. 2010;4(5):200-222.
3. Rodgers GP, Collins FS. Precision Nutrition—the Answer to “What to Eat to Stay Healthy”. *JAMA*. 2020 Aug 25;324(8):735–6.
4. Mafra D, Borges NA, Lindholm B, Shiels PG, Evenepoel P, Stenvinkel P. Food as medicine: targeting the uraemic phenotype in chronic kidney disease. *Nat Rev Nephrol*. 2021 Mar;17(3):153–71.
5. Dinkova-Kostova AT, Abramov AY. The emerging role of Nrf2 in mitochondrial function. *Free Radical Biology and Medicine*. 2015 Nov 1;88:179–88.
6. Kris-Etherton PM, Hecker KD, Bonanome A, Coval SM, Binkoski AE, Hilpert KF, et al. Bioactive compounds in foods: their role in the prevention of cardiovascular disease and cancer. *The American Journal of Medicine*. 2002 Dec 30;113(9, Supplement 2):71–88.
7. Wolk A, Manson JE, Stampfer MJ, Colditz GA, Hu FB, Speizer FE, et al. Long-term Intake of Dietary Fiber and Decreased Risk of Coronary Heart Disease Among Women. *JAMA*. 1999 Jun 2;281(21):1998–2004.
8. Teong XT, Liu K, Vincent AD, Bensalem J, Liu B, Hattersley KJ, et al. Intermittent fasting plus early time-restricted eating versus calorie restriction and standard care in adults at risk of type 2 diabetes: a randomized controlled trial. *Nat Med*. 2023 Apr 6;1–10.
9. Jensen K, Panagiotou G, Kouskoumvekaki I. NutriChem: a systems chemical biology resource to explore the medicinal value of plant-based foods. *Nucleic Acids Res*. 2015 Jan;43(Database issue):D940-945.
10. Lin CY, Lee JY, Huang SH, Hsu YC, Hsu NY, Yang JM. FooDisNET: a database of food-compound-protein-disease associations. In: 2020 IEEE 20th International Conference on Bioinformatics and Bioengineering (BIBE). 2020. p. 190–5.
11. Huang L, Xie D, Yu Y, Liu H, Shi Y, Shi T, et al. TCMID 2.0: a comprehensive resource for TCM. *Nucleic acids research*. 2018;46(D1):D1117–20.
12. Zeng X, Zhang P, Wang Y, Qin C, Chen S, He W, et al. CMAUP: a database of collective molecular activities of useful plants. *Nucleic Acids Res*. 2019 Jan 8;47(D1):D1118–27.
13. Ru J, Li P, Wang J, Zhou W, Li B, Huang C, et al. TCMSP: a database of systems pharmacology for drug discovery from herbal medicines. *Journal of cheminformatics*. 2014;6(1):1–6.
14. Ashfaq UA, Mumtaz A, Qamar T ul, Fatima T. MAPS Database: Medicinal plant Activities, Phytochemical and Structural Database. *Bioinformatics*. 2013 Dec 6;9(19):993–5.
15. Ni Y, Jensen K, Kouskoumvekaki I, Panagiotou G. NutriChem 2.0: exploring the effect of plant-based foods on human health and drug efficacy. 2017 Jan 1;2017:bax044.
16. Weininger D. SMILES, a chemical language and information system. 1. Introduction to methodology and encoding rules. *J Chem Inf Comput Sci*. 1988 Feb 1;28(1):31–6.
17. O’Boyle NM. Towards a Universal SMILES representation - A standard method to generate canonical SMILES based on the InChI. *J Cheminform*. 2012 Sep 18;4(1):22.

-
18. Vinaixa M, Schymanski EL, Neumann S, Navarro M, Salek RM, Yanes O. Mass spectral databases for LC/MS- and GC/MS-based metabolomics: State of the field and future prospects. *TrAC Trends in Analytical Chemistry*. 2016 Apr 1;78:23–35.
 19. Trautman A, Linchangco R, Walstead R, Jay JJ, Brouwer C. The Aliment to Bodily Condition knowledgebase (ABCkb): a database connecting plants and human health. *BMC Res Notes*. 2021 Nov 27;14(1):433.
 20. USDA N. The plants database. National Plant Data Team, Greensboro, NC. Available from: <https://plants.usda.gov>. Accessed April 6, 2022.
 21. Heller S, McNaught A, Stein S, Tchekhovskoi D, Pletnev I. InChI - the worldwide chemical structure identifier standard. *J Cheminform*. 2013 Jan 24;5:7.
 22. King BL, Davis AP, Rosenstein MC, Wiegiers TC, Mattingly CJ. Ranking Transitive Chemical-Disease Inferences Using Local Network Topology in the Comparative Toxicogenomics Database. *PLOS ONE*. 2012 Nov 7;7(11):e46524.
 23. Davis AP, Grondin CJ, Johnson RJ, Sciaky D, Wiegiers J, Wiegiers TC, et al. Comparative Toxicogenomics Database (CTD): update 2021. *Nucleic Acids Research*. 2021 Jan 8;49(D1):D1138–43.
 24. Goldberg DS, Roth FP. Assessing experimentally derived interactions in a small world. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 2003 Apr 15;100(8):4372–6.
 25. Li H, Liang S. Local Network Topology in Human Protein Interaction Data Predicts Functional Association. *PLOS ONE*. 2009 Jul 29;4(7):e6410.
 26. FoodDB. Food Database. <http://foodb.ca>. Accessed April 6, 2022.
 27. Ma Y. DeepMNE: Deep Multi-Network Embedding for lncRNA-Disease Association Prediction. *IEEE J Biomed Health Inform*. 2022 Jul;26(7):3539–49.
 28. Geer LY, Marchler-Bauer A, Geer RC, Han L, He J, He S, Liu C, Shi W, Bryant SH. The NCBI BioSystems database. *Nucleic Acids Res*. 2010 Jan;38(Database issue):D492-6. DOI: 10.1093/nar/gkp858. PMID: 19854944; PMCID: PMC2808896.
 29. Chen X, Clarence Yan C, Luo C, Ji W, Zhang Y, Dai Q. Constructing lncRNA functional similarity network based on lncRNA-disease associations and disease semantic similarity. *Sci Rep*. 2015 Jun 10;5(1):11338.
 30. Montori VM, Farmer A, Wollan PC, Dinneen SF. Fish oil supplementation in type 2 diabetes: a quantitative systematic review. *Diabetes Care*. 2000 Sep;23(9):1407–15.
 31. Chen C, Yu X, Shao S. Effects of Omega-3 Fatty Acid Supplementation on Glucose Control and Lipid Levels in Type 2 Diabetes: A Meta-Analysis. *PLoS One*. 2015 Oct 2;10(10):e0139565.
 32. Guebre-Egziabher F, Debard C, Draï J, Denis L, Pesenti S, Bienvenu J, et al. Differential dose effect of fish oil on inflammation and adipose tissue gene expression in chronic kidney disease patients. *Nutrition*. 2013 May 1;29(5):730–6.
 33. Ejtahed HS, Mohtadi-Nia J, Homayouni-Rad A, Niafar M, Asghari-Jafarabadi M, Mofid V. Probiotic yogurt improves antioxidant status in type 2 diabetic patients. *Nutrition*. 2012 May 1;28(5):539–43.
 34. Kooti W, Moradi M, Ali-Akbari S, Sharafi-Ahvazi N, Asadi-Samani M, Ashtary-Larky D. Therapeutic and pharmacological potential of *Foeniculum vulgare* Mill: a review. *J Herbmed Pharmacol*. 4(1):1–9.
 35. Xu B, Chang SKC. Comparative study on antiproliferation properties and cellular antioxidant

-
- activities of commonly consumed food legumes against nine human cancer cell lines. *Food Chemistry*. 2012 Oct 1;134(3):1287–96.
36. Campos-Vega R, Guevara-Gonzalez RG, Guevara-Olvera BL, Dave Oomah B, Loarca-Piña G. Bean (*Phaseolus vulgaris* L.) polysaccharides modulate gene expression in human colon cancer cells (HT-29). *Food Research International*. 2010 May 1;43(4):1057–64.
37. Beninger CW, Hosfield GL. Antioxidant Activity of Extracts, Condensed Tannin Fractions, and Pure Flavonoids from *Phaseolus vulgaris* L. Seed Coat Color Genotypes. *J Agric Food Chem*. 2003 Dec 1;51(27):7879–83.
38. Waldecker M, Kautenburger T, Daumann H, Busch C, Schrenk D. Inhibition of histone-deacetylase activity by short-chain fatty acids and some polyphenol metabolites formed in the colon. *The Journal of Nutritional Biochemistry*. 2008 Sep 1;19(9):587–93.
39. Sengupta S, Muir JG, Gibson PR. Does butyrate protect from colorectal cancer? *Journal of Gastroenterology and Hepatology*. 2006;21(1):209–18.
40. Itoh T, Furuichi Y. Hot-water extracts from adzuki beans (*Vigna angularis*) stimulate not only melanogenesis in cultured mouse B16 melanoma cells but also pigmentation of hair color in C3H mice. *Biosci Biotechnol Biochem*. 2005 May;69(5):873–82.
41. Chinchor N, Sundheim B. MUC-5 Evaluation Metrics. In: *Proceedings of the Fifth Message Understanding Conference (MUC-5)*; 1993 Aug 25-27.
42. Jing-Hao Xue, Hall P. Why Does Rebalancing Class-Unbalanced Data Improve AUC for Linear Discriminant Analysis? *IEEE Trans Pattern Anal Mach Intell*. 2015 May 1;37(5):1109–12.
43. Boushey CJ, Coulston AM, Rock CL, Monsen E. *Nutrition in the Prevention and Treatment of Disease*. Elsevier; 2001. 821 p.
44. Piñero J, Bravo À, Queralt-Rosinach N, Gutiérrez-Sacristán A, Deu-Pons J, Centeno E, et al. DisGeNET: a comprehensive platform integrating information on human disease-associated genes and variants. *Nucleic Acids Research*. 2017 Jan 4;45(D1):D833–9.
45. Kanehisa M, Goto S. KEGG: Kyoto Encyclopedia of Genes and Genomes. *Nucleic Acids Res*. 2000 Jan 1;28(1):27–30.
46. Brug J, Oenema A, Ferreira I. Theory, evidence and Intervention Mapping to improve behavior nutrition and physical activity interventions. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*. 2005 Apr 4;2(1):2.