## RISK-BENEFIT ANALYSIS: NUTRITIONAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL SAFETY OF FISH CONSUMPTION

Shirra Freeman, Harvard School of Public Health, USA and University of Haifa, Israel James Hammitt, University of Toulouse, France and Harvard School of Public Health, USA

**Background and Aims:** Research reveals associations between fish consumption and long-chain polyunsaturated fatty acid (n·3PUFA) intake, exposure to environmental contaminants and health outcomes including developmental, coronary heart disease (CHD) and cancer (IOM, 2007; Mozaffarian and Rimm, 2006; Willett, 2005). There is also evidence of public confusion about risks and benefits inherent in consuming fish, raising concerns about food safety communication. (WHO, 2009; McManus et. al., 2009). The aims of this study are to: (1)demonstrate the influence of fish consumption choice on exposures to risks and benefits; and (2)quantify associated health and socio-economic outcomes.

Methods: A risk-benefit framework is applied to the association between CHD and low-dose, chronic exposure to methyl mercury (MeHg) and n-3PUFAs resulting from fish consumption. Ecological exposure assessment is conducted with reference to species and quantity consumed and whether fish are farmed or wild. A baseline consumption profile and exposure factors are constructed for the US population. Five consumption/exposure scenarios are elaborated and input into a dose-response synthesis to assess associated changes in CHD. The Value of a Statistical Life Year (VSLY) method is used to analyse the socio-economic implications of the dose-response results. **Results:** The dstribution of fish species within the consumption portfolio is the main determinant of exposure factors. Significant improvements are achievable with minor adjustments in consumption patterns. The dose-response synthesis supports assertions that for CHD outcomes, n-3PUFAs and MeHg are, respectively, the main sources of benefits and risk. The simulations point to associations between lower relative risk of CHD death and consumption profiles featuring lower MeHg/ higher n-3PUFAs species. **Conclusions:** This risk benefit framework is effective for analyzing and communicating food safety information and is applicable to multiple attributes and health associations. Incorporating socio-economic analysis translates health information for a wider audience.

IOM (Institute of Medicine) (2007) Seafood choices: Balancing benefits and risks. Washington, DC:National AcademyPress. McManus A, Howieson J, and C. Nicholson (2009) Review of literature and resources relating to the health benefit of regular consumption of seafood as part of a health diet. Curtin Health Innovation Research Institute, Curtin University of Technology, Perth. Report 090101.

Mozaffarian, D. and E.B. Rimm (2006) Fish intake, contaminants, and human health. Evaluating the risks and benefits. Journal of the American Medical Association 296. pp.1885–1899.

Willett, W.C. (2005) Balancing health risks and benefits. American Journal of Preventative Medicine. 29:4, pp. 320321.

WHO (World Health Organization) (2009) Population nutrient intake goals for preventing diet-related chronic diseases. Geneva: World Health Organization.