Adherence to the Eatwell Guide and cardiometabolic, cognitive and neuroimaging parameters: An analysis from the PREVENT Dementia study

Sarah Gregory[1], Alex Griffiths[2], Amy Jennings[3, 4], Fiona C Malcomson[5], Jamie Matu[2], Anne-Marie Minihane[3], Graciela Muniz-Terrera[1,6], Craig W. Ritchie[1,7], Solange Parra-Soto[8,9], Emma Stevenson[5, 10] Rebecca Townsend[10], Nicola Ward[4], Oliver Shannon[5]

[1]Edinburgh Dementia Prevention, Centre for Clinical Brain Sciences, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK

[2]School of Health, Leeds Beckett University, Leeds, UK

[3]Norwich Medical School, University of East Anglia, Norwich, UK

[4]Centre for Public Health, Institute for Global Food Security, Queen's University Belfast, Belfast, UK

[5]Human Nutrition & Exercise Research Centre, Population Health Sciences Institute, Faculty of Medicine Sciences, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, UK

[6]Ohio University Heritage College of Osteopathic Medicine, Ohio University, Ohio, USA

[7]Scottish Brain Sciences, Edinburgh, UK

[8]Department of Nutrition and Public Health, Universidad del Bío-Bío, Chillan 3780000, Chile

[9]School of Cardiometabolic and Metabolic Health, University of Glasgow, UK

[10]School of Biomedical, Nutritional and Sport Sciences, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, UK

[11]Centre for Public Health, Institute for Global Food Security, Queen's University Belfast, Belfast, UK

Corresponding author: Sarah.Gregory@ed.ac.uk

Edinburgh Dementia Prevention, Outpatient Department 2, Western General Hospital, Crewe Road South, Edinburgh, EH4 2XU, UK.

Short title: Eatwell Guide in the PREVENT Dementia study

Keywords: diet, Eatwell Guide, cohort study, cardiometabolic health

Abstract

The Eatwell guide (EWG) reflects the UK government's recommendations for a healthy and balanced diet. Data from the PREVENT dementia cohort study baseline visit was used in this analysis. Binary and graded EWG scores (BEWG, GEWG) were created from a self-reported Food Frequency Questionnaire. The CAIDE score was included as the primary outcome measure to represent risk for future AD. Secondary outcome measures included cardiometabolic health measures and brain health measures. Generalised additive models were run in R. A total of 517 participants were included in the analysis, with a mean BEWG score of 4.39 (SD 1.66) (out of a possible 12 points) and GEWG score of 39.88 (SD 6.19) (out of a possible 60 points). There was no significant association between either EWG score and the CAIDE (BEWG β: 0.07, 95% CI: -0.07, 0.22; GEWG β: 0.02, 95% CI: -0.02, 0.06) or any measures of brain health. There was a significant association between higher GEWG score and lower systolic and diastolic blood pressure and body mass index (BMI) (systolic β: -0.24, 95% CI: -0.45, -0.03; diastolic β: -0.16, 95% CI: -0.29, -0.03; BMI β: -0.09, 95% CI: -0.16, -0.01). Although not directly associated with the CAIDE score, the EWG dietary pattern may be beneficial for dementia prevention efforts through the modification of hypertension and obesity, which are both known risk factors for dementia. Future work could replicate these findings in other UK-based cohorts as well as further development of EWG scoring methodologies.

Introduction

Healthy eating behaviours have been associated with reduced risk of all-cause mortality and many chronic age-related conditions [1, 2]. Indeed, one in seven UK deaths and one in five premature deaths in the UK is thought to be attributable to poor diet [3]. The role of healthier dietary behaviours is critical in the context of a globally aging population, particularly for cardiometabolic and brain health, with dementia and heart disease the leading causes of death in the UK [4].

The 'Eatwell Guide' (EWG) communicates the UK government recommendations for a healthy and balanced diet, with the ultimate aim of improving health and reducing non-communicable diseases [5]. The EWG promotes the consumption of fruit and vegetables, oily and other fish, total fibre, sustainable protein sources, wholegrains and fibre-rich carbohydrate sources, and adequate fluid intake, whilst limiting consumption of red and processed meat, total salt, free sugars, saturated fatty acids (SFAs) and total fat [5, 6]. Analysis by Public Health England suggests that despite the publication of the EWG, the UK population tends to consume too much sugar and SFAs, and insufficient fruit, vegetables and fibre [7].

One of the components of the EWG, fruit and vegetable consumption, has been consistently associated with better health, including better cardiometabolic outcomes [8], reduced cancer incidence [9, 10] and cognitive health [11]. However, few studies have explored associations between overall adherence to the EWG and health. In one cross-cohort analysis of data from EPIC-Oxford, One Million Women study and UK Biobank aiming to understand health impacts and environmental footprints of the EWG, higher adherence to the EWG was associated with a reduced risk of mortality [12]. This study by Scheelbeck *et al* is the first to create an empirical score from the EWG and investigate associations with health outcomes. This score applied a binary scoring method for nine of the EWG groups (fruit and vegetables, oily fish, other fish, red and processed meat, total fibre, total salt, free sugars, SFAs and total fat), with a point awarded for meeting the EWG criteria for each component though carbohydrates and protein were excluded due to heterogeneity in data from the four databases included in the study. For

example, a participant would be awarded one point for eating at least 400g of fruit and vegetables each day. Participants could score a total of 9 points and were grouped to very low adherence (0-2 points), low adherence (3-4 points), and intermediate to high adherence (5-9 points).

Analyses applying the same EWG scoring methodology in post-menopausal women in the UK Women's Cohort Study (UKWCS) reported that higher adherence to the EWG was associated with lower weight, waist circumference and BMI [13]. Further, greater adherence to the EWG at baseline was associated with smaller increases in waist circumference and lower risk of abdominal obesity over 4 years [13]. Whilst these provisional findings are promising, they are restricted to a limited number of health outcomes. Moreover, Scheelbeek *et al* did not incorporate all EWG components into their score due to availability of data across datasets and scored each EWG component on a binary basis (i.e., points awarded for achieving a dietary goal), which may fail to capture more nuanced differences in diet quality between individuals (e.g., by partially meeting an EWG recommendation).

The EWG has a number of notable similarities to a Mediterranean dietary pattern (MedDiet), which is rich in whole plant foods such as fruit, nuts, vegetables and legumes, olive oil and fish [14]. There is substantial evidence supporting an association between adherence to the MedDiet and better cardiometabolic health [15-22], as well as better brain health outcomes [23, 24], particularly for those living in the Mediterranean region [25]. Indeed an analysis of adherence to a MedDiet in the PREVENT dementia cohort, a UK and Ireland midlife cohort used in this current analysis, showed significant associations between higher adherence to the MedDiet and lower systolic and diastolic blood pressure and body mass index (BMI), particularly in female participants [26]. Given the conceptual overlap between the EWG and the MedDiet, it is reasonable to explore associations between the EWG and cardiovascular and brain health.

There has also been an increased interest in recent years as to the impact and importance of whether individuals believe they eat a healthy diet. Individuals who believe they are healthier eaters have been shown to have healthier dietary behaviours [27], to eat more fruits and vegetables and to eat fewer discretionary foods [28]. It is unclear whether those who feel they eat a healthier diet have a greater adherence to the EWG in the context of a UK and Irish population however, this knowledge could be valuable for helping to identify those who may benefit from dietary advice or intervention and warrants investigation.

Associations between EWG adherence and risk of dementia are currently unknown. Indeed, the SACN (2018) review on *Diet, Cognitive Impairment and Dementia* identified a gap in the research about UK healthy eating recommendations and dementia risk [29]. The aim of this current study was to develop a new binary and graded scoring methodologies for EWG adherence, building on the initial methodology developed by Scheelbeek *et al*, in order to explore associations between adherence to the EWG and risk for dementia, cardiometabolic and brain health in a cohort of midlife adults in the UK and Ireland. Furthermore, a comparison was made between the EWG scores and MedDiet scores within the cohort, to explore the comparability of these two models to capture healthy eating.

Methods

PREVENT Dementia Programme

The data used in this study is drawn from the baseline visit of the PREVENT dementia programme (PREVENT) [30-32]. PREVENT is a prospective cohort study of 700 participants aged 40 to 59 years of age at baseline, at least half of whom have a parental history of dementia, were fluent in English, and who were free of dementia at study entry. Participants were only excluded if they were unable to tolerate the study protocol, including any contraindications for brain magnetic resonance imaging (MRI). Participants were recruited from five centres in the UK and Ireland (Cambridge, Dublin, Edinburgh, London, and Oxford) through memory clinics when in attendance as the family member of a patient, advertisements, research registries and word of mouth. Participants completed physical health and cognitive assessments at the

baseline visit as well as providing information on risk factors for future neurodegeneration through a series of self-report questionnaires.

Ethical Approval and Consent

The study was conducted according to the guidelines laid down in the Declaration of Helsinki and all procedures involving human participants were approved by the London-Camberwell St Giles National Health Service Research Ethics Committee (REC reference 12/LO/1023). Written informed consent was provided by all participants prior to any protocol procedures.

Calculation of Eatwell Guide scores

Dietary data were collected with the Scottish Collaborative Group Food Frequency Questionnaire (SCG-FFQ) [33, 34]. The SCG-FFQ was self-administered by each participant. It begins with clear instructions on the first page of the questionnaire including pictures of portion sizes, which all participants were instructed to read before self-reporting their diet. Study staff were on hand to answer any questions that participants had and to check for missing data prior to the participant leaving the site. The SCG-FFQ has been validated in several populations in the UK as a self-report tool [33, 34]. Compared to a 7-day food diary, there were moderate correlations with SCQ-FFQ derived nutrients for energy (kJ, r_s: 0.37, $p<0.001$), percentage energy from fat (r_s: 0.53, $p<0.001$), percentage energy from SFA (r_s: 0.55, $p<0.001$), percentage energy from protein (r_s: 0.55, $p<0.001$), percentage energy from carbohydrates (r_s: 0.69, $p<0.001$) and total sugars (r_s: 0.62, $p<0.001$) [33]. A second study assessing validity in older adults (aged 65 and above) in Scotland compared the SCG-FFQ to a four-day weighted food record, Spearman rank correlation was greater than 0.2 for all nutrients of interest for EWG score calculation with the exception of fat [34]. The SCQ-FFQ asks participants to report their consumption of 175 foods and drinks over the previous two to three months. The SCG-FFQ was completed at the baseline visit, with repeated dietary data collection currently ongoing in follow-up visits (Visit 2; 2-4 years post-baseline; Visit 3: 5-8 years post baseline). A comprehensive nutritional breakdown is available for each participant in addition to food level

responses. Daily nutrient intake was calculated from the food intake data using the McCance and Widdowson 2021 dataset [35]. Intakes of carbohydrates, proteins, total fats and saturated fatty acids (SFA) were converted into calorie values to calculate the percentage of calories from each food group included in the diet.

Two EWG scores were created, one applying a binary scoring methodology, and one a graded score (hereafter referred to as the binary EWG and graded EWG, respectively). Full details of scoring methodologies are available in the supplementary materials (Supplementary Table S1). Each score awarded points for adherence to EWG criteria for the following food and nutrient groups; carbohydrates, proteins, fats, SFA, fibre, sugars, salt, total kilocalories, fruit and vegetables, fish, red and processed meats, and water. For the binary scoring, the method was modelled on a traditional Mediterranean Diet Adherence Screener (MEDAS) score [36]; participants were awarded 1 point if they met criteria for the nutritional or food component, else 0 points were awarded, with a total possible score of 12. Intake values were not rounded up for any of the components. For example, a participant would be awarded one point if ≥50% of calories reported in the diet were from carbohydrates and 0 points for <50% of calories from carbohydrates. The graded score was modelled on the Panagiotakos Pyramid MedDiet score [37], with 0 to 5 points allocated according to level of compliance with the EWG recommendations, with a total possible score of 60. 5 points was awarded if a participant met the EWG recommendations for a food or macronutrient group. 0 points were awarded for achieving less than half of the recommended intake for healthy foods (carbohydrates, proteins, fibre, fruit and vegetables, fish and water) and for consuming 1.5 times the recommended limit for unhealthy foods (fats, SFA, sugars, salts, red and processed meats). Taking carbohydrates as an example for the binary EWG score 1 point was awarded if ≥50% of calories reported in the diet were from carbohydrates and 0 points for <50% of calories from carbohydrates; for the graded EWG score 5 points were awarded for ≥50% of calories reported in the diet were from carbohydrates, 4 points for ≥43.75% and <50% of calories from carbohydrates, 3 points for ≥37.5% and <43.75% of calories from carbohydrates, 2 points for ≥31.25% and <37.5% of

calories from carbohydrates, 1 point for ≥25% and <31.5% of calories from carbohydrates and 0 points for <25% of calories from carbohydrates.

Calculation of Mediterranean diet scores

Three MedDiet scores (the MEDAS score, the MEDAS continuous and the MedDiet Pyramid (Pyramid) score) were calculated using previously published scoring methods. Briefly, the MEDAS score was calculated using a binary scoring method, whereby participants were allocated 0 or 1 points for each of 14 food groups depending on whether they met consumption criteria [38]. The MEDAS continuous was developed by Shannon *et al* with points allocated for the same consumption criteria as MEDAS but on a continuous scale from 0 to 1, depending upon proximity to the dietary target, as opposed to binary allocations [39]. Similarly, the Pyramid score was also coded on a continuous scale of 0 to 1 with a total possible score of 15 points [40]. Continuous scores have been shown to have more sensitivity to detecting differences in diet quality, particularly in a UK population, where they have shown stronger associations with better cognition [39] and reduced dementia risk [41] compared with binary scores.

CAIDE score

The Cardiovascular Risk Factors, Ageing and Dementia (CAIDE) risk score, an estimate of 20-year dementia risk based on risk factors in midlife, was calculated for all participants. The CAIDE score was originally developed in the FINGER study, and ranges from 0 to 18 points with higher scores representing greater dementia risk [42]. It was selected as it has previously been associated with a number of neuroimaging outcomes in the PREVENT dementia cohort [43-47]. The CAIDE score was calculated using self-reported age, education and sex, systolic blood pressure (SBP) (mean of triplicate blood pressure readings in supine or seated position recorded at baseline visit), body mass index (BMI) (height and weight recorded at baseline visit, used for BMI calculation), fasting plasma total cholesterol, (analysed in local laboratories at the baseline visit), physical activity (self-reported non-validated questionnaire asking participants how often they complete light, moderate and vigorous exercise; 0 points awarded for never up

to 5 points for daily, scores summed across all three categories with higher points reflecting more physical activity) and *APOEε4* carrier status (DNA analysed from blood collected at baseline). The score weighting is presented in Table S2

Cardiometabolic outcome variables

Data on blood pressure (systolic and diastolic (SBP, DBP)), BMI, and waist-to-hip ratio (WHR) values (recorded at baseline visit) were extracted from the database. Each of these cardiometabolic measures were collected by trained study staff at the baseline visit. A Framingham Risk Score (FRS) was calculated for each participant using the 'CVrisk' package in R [48] and a QRisk3 score was calculated using the 'QRISK3' R package [49]. The variables used to create these cardiovascular risk scores are detailed in Supplementary Table S3.

Cognitive outcome measures

For the purposes of this analysis, the score for the Four Mountains Task (4MT) was selected as the primary cognitive outcome. The 4MT is a novel tablet-administered task designed to assess allocentric processing. Participants are shown an image of four mountains for approximately 10 seconds and after a short interval (~ 1 second) asked to select which scene they were previously shown from a choice of four image options [50]. A total score is derived from 15 trials, with higher marks indicating better performance. This cognitive task remains a research rather than clinical tool and no normative values are currently available. The 4MT has been shown to be sensitive to early neurodegenerative disease [51], has previously been associated with CAIDE scores in the PREVENT cohort [52], and has also previously been associated with the MedDiet in a European cohort study [25].

Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) variables

Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) scans were collected using 3T Siemens scanners (Verio, PRISMA, Prisma Fit, Skyra), with data for this study extracted from T1-weighted structural scans processed with FreeSurfer (version 7.1.0) and FLAIR MRI using SPM8. Further details of imaging acquisition, processing and analysis are available in the cohort baseline data descriptive paper

[32]. Derived variables were extracted from the dataset to include left and right hippocampal volume, left and right hippocampal thickness, white matter hyperintensity volume (cube-transformed) and total estimated intra-cranial volume. Further details on the imaging acquisition and processing in the PREVENT dataset can be found elsewhere [53].

Perception of healthy eating

Participants were asked to indicate (yes or no) if they felt they ate a healthy diet. No further context was provided as to what defined a healthy diet and there was no set time period, rather participants were asked to respond about how they felt generally about their diet. Self-reported diet quality was included to investigate if participants' beliefs about their healthy eating habits aligned with higher EWG guide scores as a model of healthy eating.

Covariates

Several covariates were assessed, including age, sex, years of education, *APOE4,* parental history of dementia (self-reported), socioeconomic status (SES) group and physical activity. SES group was determined according to self-reported occupation using the National Statistics socio-economic classification (NS-SEC: https://www.ons.gov.uk/methodology/classificationsandstandards/otherclassifications/thenationalstatisticssocioeconomicclassificationnssecrebasedonsoc2010) and grouped in low, middle and high socioeconomic group or into a not in employment group. The not in employment group included both participants who reported they were unemployed and those who had taken early retirement. As total kilocalories were included in the EWG scores, the analyses were not adjusted for total energy intake. For analysis including the CAIDE score as the outcome measure, only parental history of dementia and physical activity were included as covariates so as not to over-correct the model. Where the FRS or QRisk3 was the outcome variable of interest, years of education *APOE4,* parental history of dementia and physical activity were included as covariates. The National Adult Reading Test (NART) score was included as an additional covariate in the 4MT analysis as a measure of premorbid intelligence. Finally, for all the brain imaging models, intracranial volume was included as a covariate.

Statistical Analysis

All statistical analyses were completed using R (Version 4.1.0). Descriptive statistics were calculated for all participants. Where necessary, to ensure the fulfilment of distributional assumptions of the models fitted, data was transformed. For the main analysis, we excluded participants with missing data in the exposure, outcome, and covariate variables of interest from the analysis (n=183 missing). Relationships between the binary EWG (BEWG) and graded EWG (GEWG) scores and the MedDiet scores were assessed using correlations. As the BEWG and GEWG scores were slightly skewed, generalised additive models were run. First, we tested the cohort as a whole and fitted univariate and fully adjusted generalised additive models to test for associations between BEWG and GEWG scores and the CAIDE score. The fully adjusted model included parental history of dementia, physical activity scores and SES group. We then ran univariate and fully adjusted generalised additive models to test for associations between BEWG and GEWG scores and measures of cardiometabolic health (SBP, DBP, BMI, WHR, FRS, QRisk3) and brain health (4MT total score, cube-transformed white matter lesion volume, left and right hippocampal volume, and left and right hippocampal thickness). Generalised linear models were used to assess associations between BEWG and GEWG scores and self-rated diet quality. Covariates included in each model are detailed in the tables of results. Finally, an exploratory component level analysis was run for the CAIDE score (as the primary outcome) and for all other outcomes with a statistically significant fully adjusted model. A further exploratory analysis tested for any differences in outcomes with the GEWG score by SES group. Primary and secondary analyses were adjusted for multiple comparisons using the Benjamini-Hochberg False Discovery Rate (FDR) procedure. A formal sample size calculation was not undertaken as this was a secondary analysis of a large observational study.

Results

Descriptive statistics

A total of 517 participants were included in the primary analyses which investigated CAIDE risk scores and cardiometabolic health. Additional analyses involved fewer participants due to

missing data, with sample sizes for each outcome detailed in Table 1. The sample included more women (59.6%), had a similar number of participants with and without a parental history of dementia (52.8% vs 47.2%), with 38.3% *APOE4* carriers. Most participants fell in the highest SES group according to their occupations (64.6%), with a high number of years of education reported in the sample (16.72 (SD 3.31) years). See Table 1 for full demographic and descriptive details.

Dietary score descriptive statistics

The sample had a mean BEWG score of 4.39 (SD 1.66) (range 0 to 9) and a mean GEWG score of 39.88 (SD 6.19) (range 16 to 53). Women had higher BEWG scores compared to men (4.55 (SD 1.66) vs 4.15 (SD 1.65), t: 2.70, p: 0.007) however this difference was smaller when comparing women to men for the GEWG scores (40.31 (SD 6.16) vs 39.24 (SD 6.20), t: 1.94, p: 0.05). Participants in the low SES group had lower GEWG scores than the high SES group (Low: 37.50 (SD 6.57); High: 40.55 (SD 5.90), p: 0.003), with no significant difference in BEWG scores by SES group. Age was significantly associated with higher BEWG and GEWG scores (BEWG β: 0.03, SE: 0.01, 95% CI: 0.002, 0.06, p: 0.03; GEWG β: 0.14, SE: 0.05, 95% CI: 0.04, 0.24, p: 0.004). Higher physical activity scores were associated with higher GEWG, but not BEWG, scores (β: 0.22, SE: 0.10, 95% CI: 0.03, 0.41, p: 0.02). There were no differences in BEWG or GEWG score by parental history of dementia or *APOE4* status. There was no significant association between the total number of years of education and either the BEWG or GEWG scores. A breakdown of the number of contributing component information for each score is presented in Supplementary Table S4. All participants were consuming more than 5% of calories from sugars and so no participants were awarded a point for this component using the BEWG scoring methodology. This may be due to the way sugars were calculated from the SCQ-FFQ and is explored further in the discussion.

Correlations between EWG and MedDiet scores

The BEWG and GEWG scores were highly correlated with each other (R: 0.77, p<0.001). BEWG and GEWG scores were correlated with MedDiet scores to explore the similarity between the

dietary patterns. All scores were moderately correlated (r= 0.3-0.4), with moderate correlations between the BEWG and GEWG scores with the three MedDiet scores (MEDAS, MEDAS continuous, Pyramid) (see Figure 1).

Analytical statistics

CAIDE

There was no significant association between the BEWG score or GEWG score and the CAIDE score in unadjusted or fully adjusted models (Fully adjusted scores; BEWG β: 0.07, 95% CI: -0.07, 0.22; GEWG β: 0.02, 95% CI: -0.02, 0.06) (see Table 2). Meeting fat requirements (i.e. ≤35% calories from fat) for both the BEWG and the GEWG scores was associated with a higher CAIDE score (Fully adjusted scores; BEWG β: 0.61, 95% CI: 0.12, 1.11; GEWG β: 0.24, 95% CI: 0.01, 0.48), with no other associations seen at the food or nutritional component level (see Supplementary Table S5 and Supplementary Table S6).

Cardiometabolic health

There were no significant associations between BEWG scores and SBP, DBP or BMI, and no significant associations between either scoring methodology and WHR, FRS or QRisk3 scores. In contrast, higher GEWG scores were associated with lower SBP and DBP (fully adjusted SBP β: -0.24, 95% CI: -0.45, -0.03; DBP β: -0.16, 95% CI: -0.29, -0.03), as well as with lower BMI (β: -0.09, 95% CI: -0.16, -0.01) (see Table 2). None of the fully adjusted models remained significant after FDR adjustment for multiple comparisons. Higher scores awarded for the GEWG total fat component (i.e. eating fewer total calories from fat and therefore being closer to achieving ≤35% calories from fat) were associated with higher SBP (β: 1.53, 95% CI: 0.28, 2.78). Conversely, having higher scores for fibre (indicating being closer to achieving the EWG dietary target of ≥22.6g/d of fibre), fruits and vegetables (indicating being closer to achieving the EWG dietary target of ≥400g/d of fruits and vegetables), and fish (indicating being closer to achieving the EWG dietary target of ≥10g/d of fish) GEWG score components was associated with significantly lower SBP (fibre β: -0.97, 95% CI: -1.69, -0.26; fruits and vegetables β: -1.09, 95% CI: -1.97, -0.20; fish β: -1.03, 95% CI: -1.75, -0.30). Higher scores for the fibre, fruits and

vegetables, and red and processed meat (indicating being closer to achieving the EWG dietary target of ≤70g/d of red or processed meat, i.e. higher scores reflect eating less of this food group) GEWG score components were associated with significantly lower DBP (fibre β: -0.61, 95% CI: -1.05, -0.16; fruits and vegetables β: -0.79, 95% CI: -1.34, -0.24; red and processed meats β: -0.77, 95% CI: -1.34, -0.20). Only higher scores for the fruits and vegetables graded EWG score component were associated with lower BMI (β: -0.38, 95% CI: -0.69, -0.07). Further details of these associations are provided in Supplementary Tables S7, S8 and S9.

Four Mountains Test and MRI variables

There was no significant association between either the BEWG or the GEWG score and the 4MT total score (BEWG β: 0.05, 95% CI: -0.18, 0.28; GEWG β: 0.02, 95% CI: -0.04, 0.08) (see Table 3). There were no significant associations between the BEWG or GEWG scores and any MRI variables in the fully adjusted models (see Table 3). In the high SES group only, there was a significant negative association between GEWG scores and left hippocampal volume (see Supplementary Table S9).

Perception of healthy eating

There was a significant association between the positive self-report of eating a healthy diet, and higher BEWG and GEWG scores (BEWG β: 0.92, 95% CI: 0.21, 0.57; GEWG β: 3.71, 95% CI: 0.05, 0.14) (see Table 3). These associations remained significant after FDR adjustment. There was a significant association between the positive self-report of eating a healthy diet and higher BEWG in the middle, high and not in-employment SES groups, but not in the low SES group, and with the GEWG in the high and not in employment SES groups but not low or middle SES groups (see Supplementary Table S9).

Discussion

Both the BEWG and GEWG scores created in this analysis were moderately correlated with three commonly used MedDiet scores (the MEDAS, MEDAS continuous and Pyramid scores). There were no associations between either EWG score and the primary outcome of the CAIDE

score. However, when looking at individual cardiometabolic components of the CAIDE there was an association between higher GEWG scores and lower SBP, DBP and BMI. In particular, achieving more points (indicating being closer to meeting the EWG criteria in full) for fruits and vegetables was associated with better cardiometabolic health. It is important to note that these associations did not remain significant after FDR adjustment and all component level analysis are considered to be exploratory. There were no associations noted between binary or graded EWG scores and brain health as assessed by cognitive or brain volume outcomes. There was a significant association between self-perception of a healthy diet and higher binary and graded EWG scores, with the association strongest in the high SES group as well as in those participants who were not in employment at the time of dietary data collection. This replicates previous research that has shown associations between self-perceived diet and more objective measures of dietary quality [27, 28].

There were no significant associations between either the binary or graded EWG scores and the CAIDE score. The CAIDE score was selected as one of the most commonly used dementia risk scores, with associations between the score and neuroimaging outcomes previously reported in the PREVENT dementia cohort [43-47]. Importantly the CAIDE score reflects the accumulation of cardiovascular risk for dementia, factors which may be the most amenable to dietary interventions. However, the CAIDE score is not without limitations and some validation work outside of the original cohort where the score was developed has suggested there is very little discrimination compared to age alone [54], with a limited clinical utility for estimating 10-year dementia risk identified in the UK Biobank cohort [55]. Other studies in the USA and The Netherlands conversely have validated the CAIDE score for the prediction of dementia up to four decades later [56] as well as the prediction of cognitive impairment 10 to 15 years later [57, 58], demonstrating the complexity of the ongoing debate about the usefulness of the CAIDE as a predictive dementia risk score. It is also important to consider that many of the components of the CAIDE score would not be modifiable by diet (age, sex, education and *APOEε4*) which may explain the lack of association reported in this analysis. The CAIDE score in the population included in this analysis from the PREVENT cohort is lower compared to the

FINGER cohort intervention study where the score was originally developed (PREVENT: 5.95 vs FINGER: 7.76 (intervention) and 7.27 (control) [59]), and it may be that any EWG score associations would only be seen in a cohort with a higher mean CAIDE score where there is more potential for modification. As age is one of the important contributors to the overall CAIDE score, it is worth replicating this analysis between EWG scores and CAIDE score in an older cohort (such as the NICOLA or UK Biobank cohorts [60, 61]) to understand if there is an association in later in midlife, where the mean cohort CAIDE score would be expected to be higher due to age.

Despite no statistically significant associations with the CAIDE score, there were a number of significant associations between the GEWG score and cardiometabolic health which themselves are likely protective of brain health. Importantly these are the elements of the CAIDE score which would be expected to be modifiable by diet. GEWG scores were associated with lower SBP, DBP and BMI. As there were no significant associations between the BEWG score and cardiometabolic health measures, this suggests the GEWG score is more appropriate to apply to this population with partial compliance to EWG criteria important for health. This may reflect previously reported statistics that only 0.1% of the UK population adhere to all nine recommendations [12]. In the context of dementia prevention efforts, it is particularly important to note that the GEWG was associated with lower blood pressure and BMI values, given both hypertension and obesity are known midlife risk factors for AD [62]. A ten-point change in the GEWG was associated with a 2.4 mmHg reduction in SBP, a 1.6 mmHg reduction in DBP and a 0.9kg/m^2 reduction in BMI. A 2mmHg reduction in SBP has been estimated to decrease the risk of death from stroke by 10% [63], although larger reductions in SBP may be needed to reduce the risk of dementia with a potential U-shaped association where both low and high BP confers risk [64, 65]. Similarly, a 2 mmHg reduction in DBP has been estimated to result in a 17% decrease in hypertension and a 15% reduction of risk from stroke and transient ischaemic attacks [66]. In midlife, each 1 unit increase in BMI was associated with a higher risk of dementia in a 38-year follow-up of the Framingham Study [67].

There were no associations seen between either EWG score and any of the brain health outcome measures, with the exception of an association between higher GEWG score and lower left hippocampal volume in the high SES group only. As this was only seen in the left and not right hippocampus and in a single SES group only, it should be interpreted with caution, although previous studies have also found a stronger effect of a healthy diet in the left compared to the right hippocampus [68, 69] and this warrants further research. Exploring whether the EWG scores are associated with functional brain imaging measures as well as with AD pathology (such as amyloid beta, tau and neurofilament light) will also be important next steps for research. The 4MT was selected as the only cognitive measure used in this analysis, and was selected due to previously associations with dementia risk, early neurodegeneration and MedDiet adherence [25, 51, 52]. Future research should consider whether other measures of cognition included in the PREVENT cohort warrant investigation with dietary quality as measured by the EWG.

Unsurprisingly and reassuringly, there were significant but moderate correlations between the EWG scores and MedDiet scores which demonstrates some overlap in these healthy eating patterns as well as a divergence in how the scores are created. For example, whilst both dietary patterns prioritise the consumption of fruits and vegetables and fish, with limited red and processed meats, the EWG otherwise focuses on a recommended macronutrient intake whilst the MedDiet recommends foods such as olive oil, legumes, and nuts. This should be a noted limitation of the EWG compared to MedDiet scores when translating to public health approaches, as the EWG requires people to know their nutrient intake and understand percentages of intake by calories. Further development of the EWG to translate the recommendations to a more food-based approach, as in the MedDiet and recommended by the Nutrition for Dementia Prevention Working Group [70], will be important. In particular, evidence suggests that using olive oil as the predominant fat in a diet has promise for mitigating vascular risk factors for AD [71].

Meeting, or approaching the set criteria, for fruit and vegetable consumption (≥400g/d) was associated with lower SBP, DBP and BMI. A one-point change on this criteria (indicating being closer to consuming ≥400g/d of fruit and vegetables) was associated with a 1.09 mmHg reduction in SBP, a -0.79 mmHg reduction in DBP, and a -0.38 kg/m^2 reduction in BMI. This has been seen in a number of studies [72, 73], included in Scheelbeck *et al* where fruit and vegetable consumption was associated with the largest reduction in mortality risk [12]. Given adopting dietary change is complex and multifactorial [74], public health messaging (alongside policy changes to ensure affordability) focusing on increasing fruit and vegetable intake as the one food group consistently associated with better health outcomes may be a sensible approach. A rapid review of the EWG has suggested a number of recommendations for better communication of the tool which, if adopted, may result in better adherence to the dietary guidelines [75].

There are some noted limitations of this analysis. The use of total fat as a diet quality measure is recognised to be crude and potentially misleading. We observed significant associations between meeting or getting higher scores on the fat component (i.e. eating, or being closer to eating, less than 35% of calories from fat) and both higher CAIDE score (greater risk for future dementia) and higher SBP, in the absence of any specific findings with SFA. Understanding the role of dietary fats in health has been a topic of much debate in the scientific literature and there is consensus that total fat content alone has little meaning for many health outcomes [76]. Indeed, we know from many studies that nuts (source of omega 3 polyunsaturated fatty acids) and olive oil (source of monounsaturated fatty acids alongside some saturated and polyunsaturated fatty acids) is associated with favourable health outcomes [71, 77]. This again suggests that further development of the EWG scores to better reflect the foods contributing to the macronutrients rather than the macronutrients themselves may be a more helpful approach to untangle the complexity of dietary fats. Finally, no participants met criteria for the sugars cut off applied to the dataset (≤5% calories from sugar), which is likely caused by the sugars calculated for PREVENT reflecting total sugars (glucose, galactose, fructose, sucrose, maltose and lactose) as opposed to free sugars (added sugars and naturally occurring sugars

excluding galactose and lactose). Future nutritional analysis should consider a more detailed breakdown of sugars to better explore this component. The dietary data was collected from self-report questionnaires. Whilst the questionnaire has been validated in a number of settings [33], self-report of such data is known to be potentially fallible to bias through social desirability [78] and underreporting of energy intake [79]. A further limitation to note is the lack of diversity of participants in the PREVENT cohort, with nearly all participants reporting their ethnicity as Caucasian (96.2%), and with an average of more than 16 years of education. This does not accurately reflect the UK and Irish populations, with a lack of ethnic diversity and a higher than average reported years of education. Finally, as this was a cross-sectional analysis, it is not possible to determine the directionality of any associations seen with reverse causality of poorer cardiovascular health driving dietary choices a possibility. Prospective studies are needed to confirm this relationship and replication of this analysis in the PREVENT cohort when the follow-up data is available will be important.

This study developed scoring methodologies for a BEWG and GEWG score. Whilst there was no association between these scores and either risk for dementia or brain health in this mid-life cohort, there were significant associations between higher graded EWG scores and lower SBP, DBP and BMI. Adhering to fibre, fish, and fruit and vegetable were particularly associated with better cardiovascular health. Future research should further develop the EWG scores to reflect a food-based approach as opposed to the current reliance on macronutrient contributions to overall energy intake. Higher adherence to the EWG may be an important part of dementia risk reduction interventions through reductions in hypertension and obesity, both of which are important modifiable risk factors for dementia [62].

Acknowledgements

We would like to acknowledge the sites involved with the project, West London NHS Trust, NHS Lothian, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough NHS Foundation trust, Oxford Heath NHS Foundation trust and Trinity College. Special thanks also to the PREVENT participants, the participant panel, members of the Scientific Advisory Committee, and funders for their support of the PREVENT dementia programme.

Author contributions

SG, OS: Conceptualization, Methodology, Formal Analysis, Writing- Original Draft, Writing-Reviewing and Editing; AG, AJ, FCM, JM, RT, NW: Methodology, Formal Analysis, Writing-Reviewing and Editing; SP-S: Methodology, Writing-Reviewing and Editing; A-MM, GMT, CWR, ES: Supervision, Writing- Reviewing and Editing.

Funding

PREVENT is funded by the Alzheimer's Society (grant numbers 178, 264 and 329), Alzheimer's Association (grant number TriBEKa-17-519007) and philanthropic donations. The analytical work was funded by the MRC (MRC UK Nutrition Research Partnership (NRP) Collaboration Award NuBrain (MR/T001852/1). Prof. Muniz-Terrera acknowledges the support of the Osteopathic Heritage Foundation through funding for the Osteopathic Heritage Foundation Ralph S. Licklider, D.O., Research Endowment in the Heritage College of Osteopathic Medicine. The funders had no involvement in the protocol design, data collection, analysis or manuscript preparation.

Conflict of interest.

None.

Data availability

Data from the PREVENT Dementia study can be accessed via the AD workbench (https://www.alzheimersdata.org/ad-workbench)

References

1. Sotos-Prieto, M., et al., *Association of Changes in Diet Quality with Total and Cause-Specific Mortality*. New England Journal of Medicine, 2017. **377**(2): p. 143-153.
2. Morze, J., et al., *Diet Quality as Assessed by the Healthy Eating Index, Alternate Healthy Eating Index, Dietary Approaches to Stop Hypertension Score, and Health Outcomes: A Second Update of a Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Cohort Studies*. Journal of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics, 2020. **120**(12): p. 1998-2031.e15.

3. *Health effects of dietary risks in 195 countries, 1990-2017: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2017.* Lancet, 2019. **393**(10184): p. 1958-1972.
4. Office for National Statistics. *Leading causes of death, UK: 2001 to 2018.* 2020 7 April 2023]; Available from: https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/causesofdeath/articles/leadingcausesofdeathuk/2001to2018.
5. Public Health England. *The Eatwell guide-helping you eat a healthy balanced diet* 2018; Available from: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/742750/Eatwell_Guide_booklet_2018v4.pdf.
6. Public Health England, *Government Dietary Recommendations: Government recommendations for energy and nutrients for males and females aged 1-18 years and 19+ years.* . 2016.
7. Public Health England. *NDNS: results from years 9 to 11 (combined) – statistical summary*. 2020 [cited 2023 20 July 2023]; Available from: https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/ndns-results-from-years-9-to-11-2016-to-2017-and-2018-to-2019/ndns-results-from-years-9-to-11-combined-statistical-summary.
8. Bazzano, L.A., M.K. Serdula, and S. Liu, *Dietary intake of fruits and vegetables and risk of cardiovascular disease.* Current Atherosclerosis Reports, 2003. **5**(6): p. 492-499.
9. Soerjomataram, I., et al., *Increased consumption of fruit and vegetables and future cancer incidence in selected European countries.* European Journal of Cancer, 2010. **46**(14): p. 2563-2580.
10. Reiss, R., et al., *Estimation of cancer risks and benefits associated with a potential increased consumption of fruits and vegetables.* Food and Chemical Toxicology, 2012. **50**(12): p. 4421-4427.
11. Gehlich, K.H., et al., *Consumption of fruits and vegetables: improved physical health, mental health, physical functioning and cognitive health in older adults from 11 European countries.* Aging & Mental Health, 2020. **24**(4): p. 634-641.
12. Scheelbeek, P., et al., *Health impacts and environmental footprints of diets that meet the Eatwell Guide recommendations: analyses of multiple UK studies.* BMJ Open, 2020. **10**(8): p. e037554.
13. Best, N. and O. Flannery, *Association between adherence to the Mediterranean Diet and the Eatwell Guide and changes in weight and waist circumference in post-menopausal women in the UK Women's Cohort Study.* Post Reproductive Health, 2023: p. 20533691231156643.
14. Trichopoulou, A., et al., *Mediterranean diet and cognitive decline over time in an elderly Mediterranean population.* Eur J Nutr, 2015. **54**(8): p. 1311-21.
15. Bédard, A., et al., *Sex differences in the impact of the Mediterranean diet on cardiovascular risk profile.* Br J Nutr, 2012. **108**(8): p. 1428-34.
16. Bédard, A., et al., *Sex Differences in the Impact of the Mediterranean Diet on LDL Particle Size Distribution and Oxidation.* Nutrients, 2015. **7**(5): p. 3705-23.

17. Bédard, A., et al., *Effects of the traditional Mediterranean diet on adiponectin and leptin concentrations in men and premenopausal women: do sex differences exist?* Eur J Clin Nutr, 2014. **68**(5): p. 561-6.
18. Bédard, A., et al., *Sex differences in the impact of the Mediterranean diet on systemic inflammation.* Nutr J, 2015. **14**: p. 46.
19. Leblanc, V., et al., *Differences between men and women in dietary intakes and metabolic profile in response to a 12-week nutritional intervention promoting the Mediterranean diet.* J Nutr Sci, 2015. **4**: p. e13.
20. Jennings, A., et al., *Mediterranean-Style Diet Improves Systolic Blood Pressure and Arterial Stiffness in Older Adults.* Hypertension, 2019. **73**(3): p. 578-586.
21. Franconi, F., I. Campesi, and A. Romani, *Is Extra Virgin Olive Oil an Ally for Women's and Men's Cardiovascular Health?* Cardiovasc Ther, 2020. **2020**: p. 6719301.
22. Bédard, A., et al., *Impact of the traditional Mediterranean diet on the Framingham risk score and the metabolic syndrome according to sex.* Metab Syndr Relat Disord, 2014. **12**(2): p. 95-101.
23. Townsend, R.F., et al. *Whole Dietary Patterns, Cognitive Decline and Cognitive Disorders: A Systematic Review of Prospective and Intervention Studies*. Nutrients, 2023. **15**, DOI: 10.3390/nu15020333.
24. Townsend, R.F., et al., *Associations Between Dietary Patterns and Neuroimaging Markers: A Systematic Review.* Front Nutr, 2022. **9**: p. 806006.
25. Gregory, S., et al., *Mediterranean diet score is associated with greater allocentric processing in the EPAD LCS cohort: A comparative analysis by biogeographical region.* Frontiers in Aging, 2022. **3**.
26. Gregory, S., et al., *The Mediterranean diet is associated with better cardiometabolic health for women in mid-life but not men: A PREVENT dementia cohort cross-sectional analysis.* Nutrition, Metabolism and Cardiovascular Diseases, 2023.
27. Sleboda, P., et al., *Associations of Eating Identities With Self-Reported Dietary Behaviors and Body Mass Index.* Front Nutr, 2022. **9**: p. 894557.
28. Holub, S.C., A.M. Haney, and H. Roelse, *Deconstructing the concept of the healthy eater self-schematic: relations to dietary intake, weight and eating cognitions.* Eat Behav, 2012. **13**(2): p. 106-11.
29. SACN, *SACN Statement on Diet, Cognitive Impairment and Dementia* 2018.
30. Ritchie, C.W. and K. Ritchie, *The PREVENT study: a prospective cohort study to identify mid-life biomarkers of late-onset Alzheimer's disease.* BMJ open, 2012. **2**(6): p. e001893.
31. Ritchie, C.W., K. Wells, and K. Ritchie, *The PREVENT research programme--a novel research programme to identify and manage midlife risk for dementia: the conceptual framework.* Int Rev Psychiatry, 2013. **25**(6): p. 748-54.
32. Ritchie, C.W., et al., *The PREVENT Dementia programme: Baseline demographic, lifestyle, imaging and cognitive data from a midlife cohort study investigating risk factors for dementia.* medRxiv, 2023: p. 2023.07.14.23292648.
33. Hollis, J.L., et al., *Assessing the relative validity of the Scottish Collaborative Group FFQ for measuring dietary intake in adults.* Public Health Nutr, 2017. **20**(3): p. 449-455.

34. Jia, X., et al., *Repeatability and validity of a food frequency questionnaire in free-living older people in relation to cognitive function.* J Nutr Health Aging, 2008. **12**(10): p. 735-41.
35. McCance, R.A. and E.M. Widdowson, *McCance and Widdowson's composition of foods integrated dataset.* 2021.
36. Martínez-González, M., et al., *Transferability of the Mediterranean Diet to Non-Mediterranean Countries. What Is and What Is Not the Mediterranean Diet.* Nutrients, 2017. **9**(11).
37. Panagiotakos, D.B., et al., *Adherence to the Mediterranean food pattern predicts the prevalence of hypertension, hypercholesterolemia, diabetes and obesity, among healthy adults; the accuracy of the MedDietScore.* Preventive Medicine, 2007. **44**(4): p. 335-340.
38. Estruch, R., et al., *Primary Prevention of Cardiovascular Disease with a Mediterranean Diet Supplemented with Extra-Virgin Olive Oil or Nuts.* New England Journal of Medicine, 2018. **378**(25): p. e34.
39. Shannon, O.M., et al., *Mediterranean diet adherence and cognitive function in older UK adults: the European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition-Norfolk (EPIC-Norfolk) Study.* Am J Clin Nutr, 2019. **110**(4): p. 938-948.
40. Tong, T.Y., et al., *Prospective association of the Mediterranean diet with cardiovascular disease incidence and mortality and its population impact in a non-Mediterranean population: the EPIC-Norfolk study.* BMC Med, 2016. **14**(1): p. 135.
41. Shannon, O.M., et al., *Mediterranean diet adherence is associated with lower dementia risk, independent of genetic predisposition: findings from the UK Biobank prospective cohort study.* BMC Medicine, 2023. **21**(1): p. 81.
42. Kivipelto, M., et al., *Risk score for the prediction of dementia risk in 20 years among middle aged people: a longitudinal, population-based study.* Lancet Neurol, 2006. **5**(9): p. 735-41.
43. Dounavi, M.-E., et al., *Macrostructural brain alterations at midlife are connected to cardiovascular and not inherited risk of future dementia: the PREVENT-Dementia study.* Journal of Neurology, 2022. **269**(8): p. 4299-4309.
44. Dounavi, M.-E., et al., *Fluid-attenuated inversion recovery magnetic resonance imaging textural features as sensitive markers of white matter damage in midlife adults.* Brain Communications, 2022. **4**(3): p. fcac116.
45. Liu, X., et al., *Higher midlife CAIDE score is associated with increased brain atrophy in a cohort of cognitively healthy middle-aged individuals.* J Neurol, 2021. **268**(5): p. 1962-1971.
46. O'Brien, J.T., et al., *Association between midlife dementia risk factors and longitudinal brain atrophy: the PREVENT-Dementia study.* Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery & Psychiatry, 2020. **91**(2): p. 158.
47. Low, A., et al., *CAIDE dementia risk score relates to severity and progression of cerebral small vessel disease in healthy midlife adults: the PREVENT-Dementia study.* Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery & Psychiatry, 2022. **93**(5): p. 481.
48. Castro, V. *Package 'CVrisk'*. 2022; Available from: https://github.com/vcastro/CVrisk.
49. Li, Y., et al. *Package 'QRISK3'* 2022; Available from: https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/QRISK3/QRISK3.pdf.

50. Chan, D., et al., *The 4 Mountains Test: A Short Test of Spatial Memory with High Sensitivity for the Diagnosis of Pre-dementia Alzheimer's Disease.* JoVE, 2016(116): p. e54454.
51. Ritchie, K., et al., *Recommended cognitive outcomes in preclinical Alzheimer's disease: Consensus statement from the European Prevention of Alzheimer's Dementia project.* Alzheimers Dement, 2017. **13**(2): p. 186-195.
52. Ritchie, K., et al., *Allocentric and Egocentric Spatial Processing in Middle-Aged Adults at High Risk of Late-Onset Alzheimer's Disease: The PREVENT Dementia Study.* Journal of Alzheimer's Disease, 2018. **65**: p. 885-896.
53. Mak, E., et al., *Proximity to dementia onset and multi-modal neuroimaging changes: The prevent-dementia study.* NeuroImage, 2021. **229**: p. 117749.
54. Licher, S., et al., *External validation of four dementia prediction models for use in the general community-dwelling population: a comparative analysis from the Rotterdam Study.* European Journal of Epidemiology, 2018. **33**(7): p. 645-655.
55. Kivimäki, M., et al., *Estimating Dementia Risk Using Multifactorial Prediction Models.* JAMA Network Open, 2023. **6**(6): p. e2318132-e2318132.
56. Exalto, L.G., et al., *Midlife risk score for the prediction of dementia four decades later.* Alzheimer's & Dementia, 2014. **10**(5): p. 562-570.
57. Sara, K., et al., *Predicting cognitive decline.* Neurology, 2013. **80**(14): p. 1300.
58. Reijmer, Y.D., et al., *Dementia Risk Score Predicts Cognitive Impairment after a Period of 15 Years in a Nondemented Population.* Dementia and Geriatric Cognitive Disorders, 2011. **31**(2): p. 152-157.
59. Sindi, S., et al., *The CAIDE Dementia Risk Score App: The development of an evidence-based mobile application to predict the risk of dementia.* Alzheimers Dement (Amst), 2015. **1**(3): p. 328-33.
60. Neville, C.E., S.M. Cruise, and F. Burns, *The Northern Ireland Cohort for the Longitudinal Study of Ageing (NICOLA),* in *Encyclopedia of Gerontology and Population Aging*, D. Gu and M.E. Dupre, Editors. 2021, Springer International Publishing: Cham. p. 5087-5090.
61. Hewitt, J., et al., *Cohort profile of the UK Biobank: diagnosis and characteristics of cerebrovascular disease.* BMJ Open, 2016. **6**(3): p. e009161.
62. Livingston, G., et al., *Dementia prevention, intervention, and care: 2020 report of the Lancet Commission.* The Lancet, 2020. **396**(10248): p. 413-446.
63. Lewington, S., et al., *Age-specific relevance of usual blood pressure to vascular mortality: a meta-analysis of individual data for one million adults in 61 prospective studies.* Lancet, 2002. **360**(9349): p. 1903-13.
64. Holm, H., et al., *Longitudinal and postural changes of blood pressure predict dementia: the Malmö Preventive Project.* Eur J Epidemiol, 2017. **32**(4): p. 327-336.
65. Kim, D., et al., *Blood Pressure Control and Dementia Risk in Midlife Patients With Atrial Fibrillation.* Hypertension, 2020. **75**(5): p. 1296-1304.
66. Cook, N.R., et al., *Implications of small reductions in diastolic blood pressure for primary prevention.* Arch Intern Med, 1995. **155**(7): p. 701-9.
67. Li, J., et al., *Mid- to Late-Life Body Mass Index and Dementia Risk: 38 Years of Follow-up of the Framingham Study.* American Journal of Epidemiology, 2021. **190**(12): p. 2503-2510.

68. Akbaraly, T., et al., *Association of Long-Term Diet Quality with Hippocampal Volume: Longitudinal Cohort Study*. The American Journal of Medicine, 2018. **131**(11): p. 1372-1381.e4.
69. Jacka, F.N., et al., *Western diet is associated with a smaller hippocampus: a longitudinal investigation.* BMC Medicine, 2015. **13**(1): p. 215.
70. Yassine, H.N., et al., *Nutrition state of science and dementia prevention: recommendations of the Nutrition for Dementia Prevention Working Group.* The Lancet Healthy Longevity, 2022. **3**(7): p. e501-e512.
71. Román, G.C., et al., *Extra-virgin olive oil for potential prevention of Alzheimer disease.* Revue Neurologique, 2019. **175**(10): p. 705-723.
72. Artegoitia, V.M., et al., *Healthy eating index patterns in adults by sex and age predict cardiometabolic risk factors in a cross-sectional study*. BMC Nutr, 2021. **7**(1): p. 30.
73. Liu, S., et al., *Fruit and vegetable intake and risk of cardiovascular disease: the Women's Health Study*. The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition, 2000. **72**(4): p. 922-928.
74. Helland, M.H. and G.L. Nordbotten, *Dietary Changes, Motivators, and Barriers Affecting Diet and Physical Activity among Overweight and Obese: A Mixed Methods Approach.* Int J Environ Res Public Health, 2021. **18**(20).
75. Culliford, A.E., J. Bradbury, and E.B. Medici *Improving Communication of the UK Sustainable Healthy Dietary Guidelines the Eatwell Guide: A Rapid Review*. Sustainability, 2023. **15**, DOI: 10.3390/su15076149.
76. Forouhi, N.G., et al., *Dietary fat and cardiometabolic health: evidence, controversies, and consensus for guidance.* BMJ, 2018. **361**: p. k2139.
77. De Souza, R.G.M., et al., *Nuts and Human Health Outcomes: A Systematic Review.* Nutrients, 2017. **9**(12): p. 1311.
78. Hebert, J.R., et al., *Social desirability bias in dietary self-report may compromise the validity of dietary intake measures.* Int J Epidemiol, 1995. **24**(2): p. 389-98.
79. Ravelli, M.N. and D.A. Schoeller, *Traditional Self-Reported Dietary Instruments Are Prone to Inaccuracies and New Approaches Are Needed.* Frontiers in nutrition, 2020. **7**: p. 90-90.

Variable	n= 517		Very low adherence (0 - 2.5 points) n= 56	Low adherence (3 - 4.5 points) n= 228	Moderate-to-high adherence (5 - 9 points) n= 233
	n (%) / Mean (SD)	Range			
Sex (male) (n, %)	210 (40.6)	N/A	27 (48.2)	100 (43.9)	83 (35.6)
Parental history of dementia (yes) (n, %)	273 (52.8)		30 (53.6)	119 (52.2)	124 (53.2)
*APOE*4 (yes) (n, %)	198 (38.3)		19 (33.9)	93 (40.8)	86 (36.9)
Age (years) (mean, SD)	51 (5.38)	40 - 59	50 (5.27)	51 (5.50)	52 (5.27)
Education (years) (mean, SD)	17 (3.31)	9 – 38	16 (3.31)	17 (3.45)	17 (3.15)
SES Group (n, %). Low	40 (7.7)	N/A	7 (12.5)	17 (7.5)	16 (6.9)
Middle	81 (15.7)		13 (23.2)	39 (17.1)	29 (12.4)
High	334 (64.6)		30 (53.6)	141 (61.8)	163 (70.0)
Not in employment	62 (12.0)		6 (10.7)	31 (13.6)	25 (10.7)
Physical activity score (mean, SD)	10.91 (2.82)	0 - 15	10.43 (2.92)	10.78 (2.89)	11.15 (2.70)
BEWG score (mean, SD)	4.39 (1.66)	0 – 9	1.64 (0.60)	3.56 (0.50)	5.85 (1.09)
GEWG score (mean, SD)	39.88 (6.19)	16 - 53	30.62 (5.78)	37.95 (4.09)	43.99 (4.44)
MEDAS (mean, SD)	5.44 (1.72)	1 - 12	3.95 (1.27)	5.29 (1.56)	5.94 (1.73)
MEDAS continuous (mean, SD)	7.29 (1.58)	1.68 – 12.59	5.87 (1.35)	7.20 (1.47)	7.71 (1.53)
Pyramid score (mean, SD)	8.11 (1.55)	2.35 – 14.54	6.77 (1.62)	8.05 (1.37)	8.50 (1.50)
CAIDE score (mean, SD)	5.95 (2.83)	0 - 13	5.57 (2.98)	6.05 (2.98)	5.94 (2.64)
SBP (mmHg) (mean, SD)	124.91 (15.54)	82.67 – 182.67	129.02 (14.67)	125.12 (15.00)	123.71 (16.14)
DBP (mmHg) (mean, SD)	76.25 (9.57)	46.00 – 122.67	79.21 (7.63)	76.31 (9.88)	75.49 (9.58)
BMI (kg/m^2) (mean, SD)	27.23 (5.19)	16.52 – 69.06	27.57 (5.59)	27.68 (5.71)	26.70 (4.47)

Variable	n= 516		Very low adherence n= 56	Low adherence n= 228	Moderate-to-high adherence n= 232
	n (%)	Range			
Self-rated healthy diet (yes) (n, %)	442 (85.7)	N/A	33 (58.9)	193 (84.6)	216 (93.1)
Variable	**n= 503**		**Very low adherence n= 54**	**Low adherence n= 220**	**Moderate-to-high adherence n= 229**
	Mean (SD)	**Range**			
FRS (mean, SD)	8.69 (6.41)	1.04 – 30.00	9.29 (6.96)	8.99 (6.75)	8.26 (5.92)
QRisk3 (mean, SD)	4.81 (4.04)	0.43 – 30.70	4.76 (3.55)	4.94 (4.59)	4.70 (3.58)
Variable	**n= 342**		**Very low adherence n= 39**	**Low adherence n= 159**	**Moderate-to-high adherence n= 232**
	Mean (SD)	**Range**			
4MT total score (mean, SD)	9.85 (3.39)	0 - 15	9.46 (3.71)	9.82 (3.37)	10.00 (3.34)
Variable	**n= 514**		**Very low adherence n= 56**	**Low adherence n= 226**	**Moderate-to-high adherence n= 232**
	Mean (SD)	**Range**			
Cube-transformed white matter lesion volume (mL) (mean, SD)	1.21 (0.40)	0.35 – 3.38	1.17 (0.42)	1.24 (0.43)	1.20 (0.36)
Left hippocampus volume (mm^3) (mean, SD)	4034.01 (393.11)	2744.4 – 4374.8	4045.12 (397.54)	4052.21 (381.55)	4013.59 (401.54)
Right hippocampus volume (mm^3) (mean, SD)	4158.40 (428.04)	2939.7 – 5676.5	4160.46 (436.81)	4184.51 (427.47)	4132.47 (426.77)
Left hippocampus thickness (mm) (mean, SD)	2.44 (0.07)	2.24 – 2.66	2.43 (0.06)	2.43 (0.08)	2.44 (0.07)

Right hippocampus thickness (mm) (mean, SD)	2.43 (0.07)	2.23 – 2.60	2.43 (0.07)	2.43 (0.07)	2.43 (0.06)

Table 1:Demographic and descriptive statistics of sample included in Eatwell Guide score analysis. 4MT: Four Mountains Test; BMI: body mass index; DBP: diastolic blood pressure; EWG: Eatwell Guide; FRS: Framingham Risk Score; SBP: systolic blood pressure; SES: socioeconomic status.

Dietary score	Unadjusted				Fully adjusted			
	β	SE	95% CI	p	β	SE	95% CI	p
CAIDE								
EWG	0.03	0.07	-0.11, 0.18	0.64	0.07	0.07	-0.07, 0.22	0.32
EWG graded	0.0001	0.02	-0.04, 0.04	0.96	0.02	0.02	-0.02, 0.06	0.36
Systolic Blood Pressure								
EWG	-0.77	0.41	-1.59, 0.05	0.06	-0.45	0.39	-1.23, 0.33	0.25
EWG graded	-0.27	0.11	-0.49, -0.05	0.01	-0.24	0.11	-0.45, -0.03	0.03
Diastolic Blood Pressure								
EWG	-0.44	0.25	-0.94, 0.07	0.08	-0.22	0.24	-0.70, 0.27	0.37
EWG graded	-0.19	0.07	-0.32, -0.05	0.006	-0.16	0.06	-0.29, -0.03	0.01
BMI								
EWG	-0.14	0.14	-0.41, 0.14	0.32	-0.04	0.14	-0.31, 0.23	0.78
EWG graded	-0.12	0.04	-0.19, -0.05	0.001[¶]	-0.09	0.04	-0.16, -0.01	0.02
WHR								
EWG	-0.005	0.003	-0.01, 0.0003	0.06	-0.0006	0.002	-0.005, 0.004	0.79
EWG graded	-0.002	0.0007	-0.003, -0.0002	0.02	-0.0006	0.0006	-0.002, 0.0007	0.32
FRS								
EWG	-0.27	0.17	-0.61, 0.07	0.11	-0.25	0.17	-0.59, 0.09	0.14
EWG graded	-0.09	0.05	-0.18, 0.002	0.05	-0.06	0.05	-0.16, 0.03	0.17
QRisk3								
EWG	-0.08	0.11	-0.30, 0.14	0.46	-0.06	0.11	-0.28, 0.16	0.58
EWG graded	-0.01	0.03	-0.07, 0.04	0.61	0.0003	0.03	-0.06, 0.06	0.99

Table 2: Table of generalised additive models for associations between EWG and EWG graded with CAIDE and cardiometabolic health outcomes. BMI: body mass index; CI: confidence interval; EWG: Eatwell Guide score; FRS: Framingham Risk Score; WHR: waist-to-hip ratio. CAIDE score fully adjusted model includes parental history of dementia, physical activity score and socioeconomic status as covariates. Systolic/diastolic blood pressure, BMI and WHR models include age, sex, education, *APOEε4,* parental history of dementia, physical activity score and socioeconomic status as covariates. FRS and QRisk3 models include education, *APOEε4,* parental history of dementia, physical activity score and socioeconomic status as covariates. [¶]$p<0.05$ after False Discovery Rate (FDR) adjustment.

Dietary score	Unadjusted				Fully adjusted			
	β	SE	95% CI	p	β	SE	95% CI	p
Four Mountains Test								
EWG	0.04	0.11	-0.18, 0.26	0.72	0.05	0.11	-0.18, 0.28	0.68
EWG graded	0.02	0.03	-0.04, 0.08	0.52	0.02	0.03	-0.04, 0.08	0.58
White Matter Lesion Volume								
EWG	-0.004	0.01	-0.02, 0.02	0.69	-0.005	0.01	-0.02, 0.01	0.59
EWG graded	-0.002	0.003	-0.008, 0.003	0.40	-0.003	0.003	-0.008, 0.003	0.31
Left Hippocampus								
EWG	-15.81	0.82	-32.25, 0.64	0.06	-13.61	8.48	-30.57, 3.35	0.11
EWG graded	-4.61	2.21	-9.04, -0.19	0.04	-3.96	2.32	-8.59, 0.67	0.09
Right Hippocampus								
EWG	-15.78	9.05	-33.87, 2.31	0.08	-14.32	9.31	-32.94, 4.31	0.12
EWG graded	-1.17	2.44	-6.06, 3.71	0.63	-0.68	2.55	-5.78, 4.43	0.79
Left Hippocampal Thickness								
EWG	0.002	0.002	-0.002, 0.006	0.32	0.002	0.002	-0.002, 0.006	0.30
EWG graded	0.0008	0.0005	-0.0002, 0.002	0.12	0.0009	0.0005	-0.0002, 0.002	0.09
Right Hippocampal Thickness								
EWG	0.001	0.002	-0.003, 0.005	0.59	0.001	0.002	-0.002, 0.005	0.49
EWG graded	0.0005	0.0005	-0.0005, 0.001	0.30	0.0007	0.0005	-0.0003, 0.002	0.18
Self-reported healthy eating								
EWG	0.43	0.09	0.26, 0.60	<0.001¶	0.38	0.09	0.21, 0.57	<0.001¶
EWG graded	0.11	0.02	0.07, 0.16	<0.001¶	0.10	0.02	0.05, 0.14	<0.001¶

Table 3: Table of generalised additive models for associations between EWG and EWG graded with cardiometabolic risk scores, 4MT score and self-reported healthy eating. CI: confidence interval; 4MT: Four Mountains Test; EWG: Eatwell Guide score; FRS: Framingham Risk Score. 4MT score fully adjusted model includes age, sex, education, *APOEε4,* parental history of dementia, NART score, physical activity score and socioeconomic status as covariates. Self-reported healthy eating score includes age, sex, education, *APOEε4,* parental history of dementia, *APOEε4,* physical activity score and socioeconomic status as covariates. ¶p<0.05 after False Discovery Rate (FDR) adjustment.