

Re: Coffee is number one source of antioxidants

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.med.cardiology/2005-08/msg00722.html>

- *From:* "jay1000" <jfschonSpamguarD@xxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Tue, 30 Aug 2005 22:04:17 -0400
-

"William Wagner" <PainInAss__williamwag@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
news:PainInAss__williamwag-E41B4A.08223130082005@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
> In article <3nj0soF1oobmU1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>,
> "Juhana Harju" <shantigiri@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:
>
>> William Wagner wrote:
>> : In article <3nic28F1jkanU1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>,
>> : "Juhana Harju" <shantigiri@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:
>> :: William Wagner wrote:
>>
>> ::: I just don't know!
>> :::
>> :: Coffee consumption is one of those J-shape things. Coffee has
>> :: antioxidants, which is the reason 1-2 cups a day might be
>> :: beneficial, but high consumption of coffee also raises homocysteine
>> :: and the risk of acute cardiac events. Limiting coffee consumption to
>> :: 1-2 cups a day is probably the best thing to do.
>> ::
>> : Thanks Juhana !
>> :
>> : The about url has a bar graph that compares the antioxidant levels.
>>
>> There are many analysis methods and the analysis method used in that site
>> is
>> likely to dismiss some important phytochemicals, which act as
>> antioxidants,
>> like anthocyanins.
>>
>> : Coffee is a mild diuretic useful for BP lowering which is of interest
>> : to folks like me who take avalid.
>>
>> On the other hand caffeine might raise blood pressure - it is not that
>> simple.
>>
>> J Hypertens. 2005 May;23(5):921-8. Related Articles, Links
>>
>> Blood pressure response to chronic intake of coffee and caffeine: a
>> meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials.

Re: Coffee is number one source of antioxidants

>>
>> Noordzij M, Uiterwaal CS, Arends LR, Kok FJ, Grobbee DE, Geleijnse JM.
>>
>> Division of Human Nutrition, Wageningen University, Wageningen bJulius
>> Center for Health Sciences and Primary Care, Utrecht University, Utrecht,
>> The Netherlands.
>>
>> PURPOSE: Coffee is a widely consumed beverage and small health effects of
>> substances in coffee may have large public health consequences. It has
>> been
>> suggested that caffeine in coffee increases the risk of hypertension. We
>> performed a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials of coffee or
>> caffeine and blood pressure (BP). DATA IDENTIFICATION: BP trials of
>> coffee
>> or caffeine published between January 1966 and January 2003 were
>> identified
>> through literature databases and manual search. STUDY SELECTION: A total
>> of
>> 16 studies with a randomized, controlled design and at least 7 days of
>> intervention was selected, comprising 25 strata and 1010 subjects. DATA
>> EXTRACTION: Two persons independently obtained data on sample size, type
>> and
>> duration of intervention, changes in BP and heart rate (HR), and
>> subjects'
>> characteristics for each trial. Meta-analysis was performed using a
>> random-effects model. RESULTS: A significant rise of 2.04 mmHg [95%
>> confidence interval (CI), 1.10–2.99] in systolic BP and 0.73 mmHg (95%
>> CI,
>> 0.14–1.31) in diastolic BP was found after pooling of coffee and caffeine
>> trials. When coffee trials (n = 18, median intake: 725 ml/day) and
>> caffeine
>> trials (n = 7, median dose: 410 mg/day) were analysed separately, BP
>> elevations appeared to be larger for caffeine [systolic: 4.16 mmHg
>> (2.13–6.20); diastolic: 2.41 mmHg (0.98–3.84)] than for coffee [systolic:
>> 1.22 mmHg (0.52–1.92) and diastolic: 0.49 mmHg (–0.06–1.04)]. Effects on
>> HR
>> were negligible. CONCLUSIONS: Regular caffeine intake increases BP. When
>> ingested through coffee, however, the blood pressure effect of caffeine
>> is
>> small. PMID: 15834273
>>
>> --
>> Juhana
>
>
> Dam Statistics. ;))) Last quote in below post is interesting.
>
> Bill
>
> http://www.newscientist.com/article.ns?id=dn7915&feedId=online-news_rss20
>

Re: Coffee is number one source of antioxidants

- >
- >
- > Most scientific papers are probably wrong
- > ? 02:00 30 August 2005
- > ? NewScientist.com news service
- > ? Kurt Kleiner
- >
- > Most published scientific research papers are wrong, according to a new
- > analysis. Assuming that the new paper is itself correct, problems with
- > experimental and statistical methods mean that there is less than a 50%
- > chance that the results of any randomly chosen scientific paper are true.
- > John Ioannidis, an epidemiologist at the University of Ioannina School
- > of Medicine in Greece, says that small sample sizes, poor study design,
- > researcher bias, and selective reporting and other problems combine to
- > make most research findings false. But even large, well-designed studies
- > are not always right, meaning that scientists and the public have to be
- > wary of reported findings.
- > "We should accept that most research findings will be refuted. Some will
- > be replicated and validated. The replication process is more important
- > than the first discovery," Ioannidis says.
- > In the paper, Ioannidis does not show that any particular findings are
- > false. Instead, he shows statistically how the many obstacles to getting
- > research findings right combine to make most published research wrong.
- > Massaged conclusions
- > Traditionally a study is said to be "statistically significant" if the
- > odds are only 1 in 20 that the result could be pure chance. But in a
- > complicated field where there are many potential hypotheses to sift
- > through – such as whether a particular gene influences a particular
- > disease – it is easy to reach false conclusions using this standard. If
- > you test 20 false hypotheses, one of them is likely to show up as true,
- > on average.
- > Odds get even worse for studies that are too small, studies that find
- > small effects (for example, a drug that works for only 10% of patients),
- > or studies where the protocol and endpoints are poorly defined, allowing
- > researchers to massage their conclusions after the fact.
- > Surprisingly, Ioannidis says another predictor of false findings is if a
- > field is "hot", with many teams feeling pressure to beat the others to
- > statistically significant findings.
- > But Solomon Snyder, senior editor at the Proceedings of the National
- > Academy of Sciences, and a neuroscientist at Johns Hopkins Medical
- > School in Baltimore, US, says most working scientists understand the
- > limitations of published research.
- > "When I read the literature, I'm not reading it to find proof like a
- > textbook. I'm reading to get ideas. So even if something is wrong with
- > the paper, if they have the kernel of a novel idea, that's something to
- > think about," he says.
- > Journal reference: Public Library of Science Medicine (DOI:
- > 10.1371/journal.pmed.0020124)
- >
- > ---
- > Garden Shade Zone 5 S Jersey USA in a Japanese Jungle

Re: Coffee is number one source of antioxidants

- > Manner.39.6376 –75.0208
- > This article is posted under fair use rules in accordance with
- > Title 17 U.S.C. Section 107, and is strictly for the educational
- > and informative purposes. This material is distributed without profit.

You may not agree with the politics or content etc. etc. but John Leo's comments on statistics are right on.

<http://www.usnews.com/usnews/opinion/articles/050801/ljohn.htm>

• **References:**

- ◆ **Coffee is number one source of antioxidants**
 - ◇ From: William Wagner
 - ◆ **Re: Coffee is number one source of antioxidants**
 - ◇ From: Juhana Harju
 - ◆ **Re: Coffee is number one source of antioxidants**
 - ◇ From: William Wagner
 - ◆ **Re: Coffee is number one source of antioxidants**
 - ◇ From: Juhana Harju
 - ◆ **Re: Coffee is number one source of antioxidants**
 - ◇ From: William Wagner
-
- Prev by Date: **Re: CABG Alzheimer's Study**
 - Next by Date: **Re: Statin drugs lower heart attack death–study – 2nd article**
 - Previous by thread: **Re: Coffee is number one source of antioxidants**
 - Next by thread: **Statin drugs lower heart attack death–study**
 - Index(es):
 - ◆ **Date**
 - ◆ **Thread**