

1 **Breakfast energy intake and dietary quality and trajectories of cardiometabolic**
2 **risk factors in older Spanish adults**

3

4 Karla Alejandra Pérez-Vega^{a,b,c}, Camille Lassale^{a,b,d,e}, María Dolores Zomeño^{a,b,f}, Olga
5 Castañer^{a,g}, Jordi Salas-Salvadó^{b,h,i}, F. Javier Basterra-Gortari^{j,k}, Dolores Corella^{b,l},
6 Ramón Estruch^{b,m,n}, Emilio Ros^{b,n,o}, Francisco J. Tinahones^{b,p}, Gemma Blanchart^a,
7 Mireia Malcampo^{a,b}, Daniel Muñoz-Aguayo^{a,b}, Helmut Schröder^{a,g}, Montserrat Fitó^{a,b},
8 Álvaro Hernáez^{a,f,q,r,*}

9

- 10 a. Hospital del Mar Medical Research Institute (IMIM), Barcelona, Spain.
- 11 b. Consorcio Centro de Investigación Biomédica En Red (CIBER), M.P.
12 Fisiopatología de la Obesidad y Nutrición (CIBEROBN), Instituto de Salud
13 Carlos III, Madrid, Spain.
- 14 c. PhD Program in Food Science and Nutrition, Universitat de Barcelona,
15 Barcelona, Spain
- 16 d. Barcelona Institute for Global Health (ISGlobal), Barcelona, Spain
- 17 e. Universitat Pompeu Fabra (UPF), Barcelona, Spain
- 18 f. Blanquerna School of Health Sciences, Universitat Ramon Llull, Barcelona,
19 Spain.
- 20 g. Consorcio Centro de Investigación Biomédica En Red (CIBER), M.P.
21 Epidemiología y Salud Pública (CIBERESP), Instituto de Salud Carlos III,
22 Madrid, Spain.
- 23 h. Universitat Rovira i Virgili, Departament de Bioquímica i Biotecnologia,
24 Alimentació, Nutrició, Desenvolupament i Salut Mental ANUT-DSM, Reus,
25 Spain.
- 26 i. Institut d'Investigació Pere Virgili, Reus, Spain.
- 27 j. University of Navarra, Department of Preventive Medicine and Public Health,
28 IdiSNA, Pamplona, Spain

- 29 k. Department of Endocrinology and Nutrition, Hospital Universitario de Navarra,
30 IdiSNA, Universidad Pública de Navarra, Pamplona, Spain
- 31 l. Department of Preventive Medicine, Universidad de Valencia, Valencia, Spain.
- 32 m. Internal Medicine Service, Hospital Clinic, Barcelona, Spain.
- 33 n. August Pi i Sunyer Biomedical Research Institute (IDIBAPS), Barcelona, Spain.
- 34 o. Lipid Clinic, Endocrinology and Nutrition Service, Hospital Clínic, Barcelona,
35 Spain.
- 36 p. Virgen de la Victoria Hospital, Department of Endocrinology, Biomedical
37 Research Institute of Málaga, University of Málaga, Málaga, Spain.
- 38 q. Centre for Fertility and Health, Norwegian Institute of Public Health, Oslo,
39 Norway.
- 40 r. Consorcio Centro de Investigación Biomédica En Red (CIBER), M.P.
41 Enfermedades Cardiovasculares (CIBERCV), Instituto de Salud Carlos III,
42 Madrid, Spain.

43

44 **Corresponding author:**

45 Álvaro Hernáez, PharmD, PhD

46 Blanquerna School of Health Sciences, Universitat Ramon Llull

47 Carrer Padilla 326, 08025 Barcelona, Spain

48 Telephone: (+34) 679384179

49 e-mail: alvarohc1@blanquerna.url.edu

50

51 **Word count (from Introduction to References): 4,612**

52 **ABSTRACT**

53

54 **Aims:** To explore the associations between breakfast energy intake and quality and
55 time trajectories of cardiometabolic traits in high cardiovascular risk.

56 **Methods:** 383 participants aged 55-75 from the PREDIMED-Plus cohort were
57 included. Longitudinal averages of breakfast energy intake and quality were calculated.
58 Three categories were defined for energy intake: 20-30% (reference), <20% (low), and
59 >30% (high). Quality was estimated using the Meal Balance Index; categories were
60 above (reference) or below the median score (low). Smoothed cubic spline mixed
61 effects regressions described trajectories of cardiometabolic indicators (anthropometry,
62 blood pressure, lipids, glucose, glycated hemoglobin, and estimated glomerular
63 filtration rate) at breakfast groups. Inter-group differences in predicted values were
64 estimated by linear regressions.

65 **Results:** At 36 months, compared to the reference, low- or high-energy breakfasts
66 were associated with differences in: body mass index (low: 0.62 kg/m² [95% confidence
67 interval: 0.28; 0.96]; high: 1.17 kg/m² [0.79; 1.56]), waist circumference (low: 2.24 cm
68 [1.16; 3.32]; high: 4.55 cm [3.32; 5.78]), triglycerides (low: 18.3 mg/dL [15.3; 21.4];
69 high: 34.5 mg/dL [31.0; 38.1]), and HDL cholesterol (low: -2.13 mg/dL [-3.40; -0.86]; high: -
70 4.56 mg/dL [-6.02; -3.10]). At 36 months, low-quality breakfast was associated with
71 higher waist circumference (1.49 cm [0.67; 2.31]), and triglycerides (3.46 mg/dL [1.13;
72 5.80]) and less HDL cholesterol (-1.65 mg/dL [-2.61; -0.69]) and glomerular filtration
73 rate (-1.21 mL/min/1.73m² [-2.01; -0.41]).

74 **Conclusions:** Low- or high-energy and low-quality breakfasts were associated with
75 higher adiposity and circulating triglycerides, and lower HDL cholesterol in high-risk
76 older adults. Low-quality breakfasts were also linked to poorer kidney function.

77

78 **Abstract word count:** 248 words

79

80 **Keywords:** breakfast, energy intake, body mass index, waist circumference,
81 triglycerides, HDL cholesterol, glomerular filtration rate.

82 **LAY SUMMARY**

83

84 Our work studied the relationship of the amount of energy consumed at breakfast or
85 the dietary quality of breakfast with the evolution over time of 10 cardiometabolic traits
86 (body mass index, waist circumference, triglycerides, HDL cholesterol, LDL cholesterol,
87 systolic blood pressure, diastolic blood pressure, fasting plasma glucose, glycated
88 hemoglobin, and estimated glomerular filtration rate) in older adults with excess weight
89 and metabolic syndrome.

90

91 **Key findings:**

- 92 • Compared to a breakfast with an adequate energy intake (containing 20-30% of
93 daily energy), participants consuming either an insufficient or excessive energy
94 in breakfast had higher values of body mass index, waist circumference, and
95 triglycerides, and lower levels of HDL cholesterol.
- 96 • Participants with poor breakfast quality, compared to those following a breakfast
97 of higher quality, had higher waist circumference and triglycerides, and lower
98 HDL cholesterol levels and estimated glomerular filtration rate.

99 **INTRODUCTION**

100

101 Breakfast is a pivotal meal because it breaks the longest fasting time in the day
102 [1]. According to Spanish dietary recommendations, an adequate breakfast provides
103 20-25% of energy intake [2]. Eating breakfast has been associated with a better quality
104 of the whole diet [3]. Frequent breakfast consumption (three or more times/week,
105 compared to less than three times/week) is related to less risk of obesity, metabolic
106 syndrome, hypertension, type II diabetes, stroke, and cardiovascular mortality [4].
107 However, only two cross-sectional studies have assessed the relationship between
108 qualitative measurements of breakfast and cardiometabolic health. One study found an
109 association between better breakfast quality and lower values of glycated hemoglobin
110 (Hb1Ac) and better values of a composite cardiometabolic risk score based on high-
111 density lipoprotein cholesterol (HDL-C), low-density lipoprotein cholesterol (LDL-C),
112 triglycerides, and Hb1Ac in older overweight men [5]. The other study, conducted in a
113 general adult population, reported a relationship between high breakfast quality and
114 lower blood pressure, fasting plasma glucose, insulin resistance, total cholesterol, and
115 LDL-C, and risk of being overweight [6]. To the best of our knowledge, no prospective
116 studies have assessed calorie intake in breakfast or the dietary quality of this meal as
117 the exposure. Additionally, none have used repeated measurements of cardiometabolic
118 risk factors over time as the outcome in a well-characterized population.

119 Our aim was to examine, in older adults with overweight or obesity and
120 metabolic syndrome, the relationship of the amount of energy consumed at breakfast
121 or the dietary quality of breakfast with time-dependent trajectories of a set of
122 cardiometabolic traits: body mass index (BMI), waist circumference (WC), blood
123 triglycerides, HDL-C, LDL-C, systolic blood pressure (SBP), diastolic blood pressure
124 (DBP), fasting plasma glucose, Hb1Ac, and estimated glomerular filtration rate (eGFR).

125 **METHODS**

126

127 **Study design and population**

128 This work was performed in a subsample of individuals recruited in the
129 Prevención con Dieta Mediterránea-Plus (PREDIMED-Plus) study, and we used the
130 study data for a set of observational analyses. PREDIMED-Plus is a randomized
131 clinical trial that compares the effect of a lifestyle intervention with an energy reduced
132 Mediterranean diet (MedDiet) plus physical activity with an *ad libitum* MedDiet without
133 advice on exercise (control group) on the incidence of cardiovascular disease [7].
134 Eligible participants were women between 60–75 years and men between 55–75 years
135 with BMI between 27 and 40 kg/m² and at least three criteria for metabolic syndrome:
136 1) triglycerides ≥150 mg/dL or triglyceride-lowering medication; 2) fasting glucose ≥100
137 mg/dL or glucose-lowering medication; 3) SBP/DBP ≥130/85 mmHg or
138 antihypertensive medication; 4) HDL-C <50 mg/dL in women and <40 mg/dL in men;
139 and/or 5) WC ≥88 cm in women and ≥102 cm in men [7]. Complementary information
140 of the protocol (setting, locations, relevant dates, periods of recruitment, follow-up) and
141 details of the intervention are available elsewhere [7,8]. Participants in the two arms of
142 the study received no instructions on how to prepare breakfast other than structuring it
143 following a MedDiet. They were advised to consume low-fat dairy products, whole grain
144 cereal or bread, a protein rich food, extra virgin olive oil and/or nuts as a source of fat,
145 and a fresh seasonal fruit, and to avoid ultra-processed foods [7,9]. Participants in both
146 arms of the trial experienced weight loss in the first 12 months of the study and an
147 associated improvement in some parameters such as lipid profile and blood pressure,
148 although the improvements were significantly greater in the energy reduced MedDiet
149 group [8].

150 This sub-study was conducted in PREDIMED-Plus participants recruited at
151 Hospital del Mar Research Institute (Barcelona, Spain) who had completed at least one
152 three-day food record (**Figure 1**). Our analyses are reported following the guidelines

153 described by the STrengthening the Reporting of OBservational studies in
154 Epidemiology statement.

155

156 **Breakfast data**

157 We first assessed dietary intake with three-day food records at three time
158 points: baseline, 24 months, and 36 months of follow-up. Before each visit, a nutritionist
159 facilitated a pre-structured form to record everything the participant ate and drank in the
160 following meals: breakfast, morning snack, lunch, afternoon snack, dinner, and night
161 snack. Participants were instructed to self-report consumption of all foods and
162 beverages in two labor days and one weekend day, with detailed descriptions using
163 household measures or weighted food, and explain the ingredients in recipes or brands
164 of processed food. Trained nutritionists reviewed the food records together with the
165 participants to check for completeness, searching particularly unrecorded items such
166 as sugar, bread, oil, or butter. Reviewed food records were computerized and analyzed
167 in the PCN Pro 1.0 software [10] (University of Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain), with
168 Spanish-specific nutritional composition table [11]. We obtained total energy (kcal) and
169 macronutrients (g) from the whole day and separately for breakfast. We considered as
170 breakfast any food or beverage reported before lunch and registered as breakfast
171 and/or morning snack. We included the morning snack as part of the breakfast
172 because a relevant proportion of our population divided it into two meals, one of them
173 being lighter but still considered a breakfast (for example, coffee with milk upon waking
174 up and a mid-morning sandwich). Food records with an average daily energy intake of
175 <500 and >3,500 kcal for women or <800 and >4,200 for men [12] were discarded and
176 participants with less than one full record (three days) were excluded. For sensitivity
177 analyses, we also estimated the proportion of energy intake at breakfast and mid-
178 morning snack.

179 We used these data to calculate the proportion of energy consumed at
180 breakfast relative to the total daily energy intake. We also used it to estimate the

181 breakfast quality using the Meal Balance Index [13]. This score informs of the quality of
182 a meal according to the content of nine nutrients (proteins, total fat, fiber, potassium,
183 calcium, iron, sodium, added sugars and saturated fat). It uses: 1) Acceptable
184 Macronutrient Distribution Ranges as reference for proteins and fats; 2) Daily Values
185 for fiber, potassium, calcium, and iron; and 3) World Health Organization
186 recommendations for proportions of added sugars, saturated fats, and sodium. We
187 estimated the amount of the nutrients ingested at breakfast and expressed it per 2,000
188 kcal, compared it to the reference values, and assigned a score (ranging from 0 to 100
189 for each nutrient) according to these levels. The translation of the intake values of the
190 nine nutrients or food groups into scores is described in **Table 1**. Finally, we calculated
191 the breakfast quality score as the weighted average of the nine nutrient/food group
192 scores (scores for potassium and saturated fat weighed double). Total score ranged
193 from 0 to 100. Higher scores mean greater quality of the meal [13].

194

195 **Cardiometabolic risk factors**

196 Healthcare professionals measured weight, height and WC using calibrated
197 equipment and following the study protocol (www.predimedplus.com) [8]. Participants'
198 weight was recorded without shoes and with light clothing using a calibrated high-
199 quality electronic scale. Height was measured with a calibrated stadiometer at the
200 beginning of the study. BMI was calculated as weight (kg) divided by height squared
201 (m^2). WC was determined in the midpoint between the lowest rib and the iliac crest
202 using an anthropometric tape. Blood pressure (BP) was measured in triplicate using a
203 calibrated automated oscillometer (Omron HEM-705CP, Netherlands) with participants
204 seated and after five minutes of rest, and the mean of the three measurements was
205 calculated [8].

206 We collected fasting ethylenediaminetetraacetic acid plasma at baseline and in
207 the follow-up visits at six, 12, and 36 months and measured triglycerides (Triglycerides
208 CP, Horiba ABX), total cholesterol (Cholesterol CP, Horiba ABX), HDL-C (HDL Direct

209 CP, Horiba ABX), glucose (Glucose HK CP, Horiba ABX), HbA1c (HbA1c WB, Horiba
210 ABX), and creatinine (Creatinine 120 CP, Horiba ABX) in an autoanalyzer ABX Pentra
211 (Horiba ABX SAS, Spain). We calculated LDL-C with the Friedewald formula only when
212 triglycerides were <300 mg/dL, higher values (≥ 300 mg) implied a missing value for
213 LDL-C. eGFR was estimated using plasma creatinine, sex, and age in the equation for
214 European population [14].

215

216 **Other variables**

217 Healthcare professionals collected data at baseline on: age, sex, educational
218 level (elementary school, middle/high school or higher education), smoking habit (never
219 smoker, current smoker or former smoker), and prevalence of diabetes,
220 hypercholesterolemia, and hypertension as previously described [8].

221

222 **Ethical aspects**

223 This study follows the Declaration of Helsinki for Medical Research on human
224 subjects. Before the study started, local institutional ethic committees approved the
225 protocol. All participants signed an informed consent before enrolling in the study. The
226 protocol was registered in the ISRCTN Registry (PREDIMED-Plus: ISRCTN89898870).
227 We followed the EQUATOR Network principles for guidance on study ethics and
228 reporting.

229

230 **Statistical analysis**

231 We described normally distributed continuous variables using means and
232 standard deviations (SD), non-normally distributed continuous variables using medians
233 and 1st-3rd quartiles, and categorical variables as proportions. We analyzed the
234 association between the percentage of energy consumed at breakfast and the
235 breakfast quality score by a Spearman's Rank correlation coefficient.

236 We evaluated the association of energy intake at breakfast or the dietary quality
237 of breakfast with time-dependent trajectories of cardiometabolic risk factors. We first
238 calculated the longitudinal average of the percentage of energy consumed at breakfast
239 and the breakfast quality score through all food records available for a given
240 participant. We then defined three categories according to the longitudinal average of
241 the breakfast energy intake: 20-30% (reference group), <20% (low intake), and >30%
242 (high intake). Although recommendations suggest 20-25% of daily energy intake for
243 breakfast, we widened the range up to 30% to consider morning snacks. Similarly, we
244 defined two categories according to breakfast quality: score above the median
245 (reference group) and below the median (low quality). We modeled the trajectories of
246 each cardiometabolic risk factor using smoothed cubic spline mixed effects regression
247 models, including an interaction term between age at every follow-up visit (as the time
248 variable) and breakfast-related groups to allow for different trajectories in participants in
249 the different groups [15]. Analyses were adjusted for age, sex, PREDIMED-Plus
250 intervention group, educational level, smoking, and total daily intake of kilocalories.
251 Analyses that used lipid profile biomarkers as outcomes were further adjusted for
252 prevalence of hypercholesterolemia at baseline, those that assessed BP were adjusted
253 for hypertension at baseline, and those on glucose and Hb1Ac were adjusted for
254 diabetes at baseline. Analyses on breakfast energy intake groups were further adjusted
255 for breakfast quality, and those on breakfast quality groups were further adjusted for
256 the percentage of energy consumed at breakfast. We used predicted values to plot
257 mean trajectories in the different groups. We calculated the mean inter-group
258 differences in cardiometabolic risk factors at baseline, six, 12, 18, 24, 30 and 36
259 months using linear regressions.

260 Analyses were performed in R Software, version 4.1.2. The code for these
261 analyses is available in: https://github.com/alvarohernaez/Breakfast_trajectories/.

262 RESULTS

263

264 Study population

265 Our study subjects were 383 participants of the PREDIMED-Plus study with
266 available and plausible 1,103 diet records (**Figure 1**). By study design, all participants
267 were older adults (51.4% women), had overweight (19.3%) or obesity (80.7%), and
268 harbored the metabolic syndrome. Consequently, participants presented a high
269 prevalence of cardiovascular risk factors (**Table 2**). We found no clinically meaningful
270 differences in baseline characteristics among participants in different breakfast energy
271 intake groups and different breakfast quality categories.

272 Average energy intake at breakfast was 23% at baseline, 24% at 24 months of
273 follow-up, and 25% at 36 months of follow-up. We found no association between the
274 percentage of energy consumed at breakfast and breakfast quality ($r = -0.037$, p -value
275 = 0.47).

276

277 Breakfast and adiposity

278 Participants with low and high breakfast energy intake showed increasing
279 values of BMI over time compared to the reference group (inter-group difference at 36
280 months, low energy intake: $+0.62 \text{ kg/m}^2$, 95% confidence interval (CI) 0.28 to 0.96; high
281 energy intake: $+1.17 \text{ kg/m}^2$, 95% CI 0.79 to 1.56; **Figures 2A-2C**). No sustained inter-
282 group differences according to breakfast quality were found (**Figures 2D-2E**).

283 Participants with low and high energy intake at breakfast showed a more
284 pronounced rebound in WC values after the first year of the study and increasing
285 differences over time (inter-group difference at 36 months: low energy intake: $+2.24$
286 cm, 95% CI 1.16 to 3.32; high energy intake: $+4.55$ cm, 95% CI 3.32 to 5.78; **Figures**
287 **2F-2H**). Participants with low breakfast quality also showed higher WC (inter-group
288 differences at 36 months: $+1.49$ cm, 95% CI 0.67 to 2.31) (**Figures 2I-2J**).

289 **Breakfast and lipid profile**

290 Triglyceride trajectories were different depending on breakfast groups.
291 Participants with low and high energy intake at breakfast showed a rebound in
292 triglyceride values after six months of follow-up (particularly for those with high energy
293 intake) that was not evident under the reference energy consumption at breakfast
294 (**Figure 3A**). Triglyceride values were higher and inter-group differences grew over
295 time (inter-group difference at 36 months, low energy intake: +18.3 mg/dL, 95% CI 15.3
296 to 21.4; high energy intake: +34.5 mg/dL, 95% CI 31.0 to 38.1; **Figures 3B-3C**).
297 Participants with low breakfast quality also showed an early rebound in triglyceride
298 concentrations after the decrease in the first months of the PREDIMED-Plus
299 intervention (**Figure 3D**) and higher mean triglyceride values (inter-group difference at
300 36 months: +3.46 mg/dL, 95% CI 1.13 to 5.80) (**Figure 3E**).

301 The shape of HDL-C trajectories in all breakfast groups was similar, but
302 predicted mean HDL-C levels were consistently lower in both low and high breakfast
303 energy groups compared to the reference group (inter-group difference at 36 months,
304 low energy intake: -2.13 mg/dL, 95% CI -3.40 to -0.86; high energy intake: -4.56 mg/dL,
305 95% CI -6.02 to -3.10; **Figures 3F-3H**). Predicted mean HDL-C concentrations were
306 also lower in participants with low breakfast quality (inter-group difference at 36
307 months, -1.65 mg/dL, 95% CI -2.61 to -0.69) (**Figures 3I-3J**).

308 LDL-C trajectories were comparable across breakfast energy intake groups and
309 breakfast quality groups, and no inter-group differences were observed (**Figures 3K-**
310 **3O**).

311

312 **Breakfast and blood pressure**

313 There were no differences in the SBP trajectories according to energy intake at
314 breakfast (**Figures 4A-4C**). Regarding breakfast quality, slightly higher mean predicted
315 values of SBP were observed at 12-18 months of follow-up in participants with low
316 breakfast quality (**Figures 4D-4E**). Similarly, DBP trajectories were comparable for

317 energy intake groups (**Figures 4F-4H**) and slightly higher mean predicted values of
318 DBP were reported at 12-18 months in participants with low breakfast quality (**Figures**
319 **4I-4J**).

320

321 **Breakfast and glucose metabolism**

322 Participants in the reference group for energy intake at breakfast disclosed a
323 more pronounced decrease in fasting plasma glucose values during the first 6 months
324 of the study compared to participants with low and high energy intakes at breakfast.
325 However, glucose levels were not different between groups at ensuing follow-up points
326 (**Figures 5A-5C**). Trajectories in groups according to breakfast quality were
327 comparable (**Figures 5D-5E**). Hb1Ac trajectory curves were similar among groups of
328 breakfast energy intake and breakfast quality (**Figures 5F-5J**). Nonetheless, fasting
329 plasma glucose and Hb1Ac values were slightly higher in participants with a low-quality
330 breakfast, although differences were neither significant nor clinically relevant.

331

332 **Breakfast and estimated glomerular filtration rate**

333 eGFR trajectories in the groups of energy intake had a similar shape (**Figures**
334 **6A-6C**). In relation to breakfast quality, participants in the group with a low-quality
335 breakfast had lower mean predicted eGFR (inter-group differences at 36 months, -1.21
336 mL/min/1.73m², 95% CI -2.01 to -0.41; **Figures 6D-6E**).

337 **DISCUSSION**

338

339 In older adults at high cardiovascular risk, the energy consumed at breakfast
340 and its nutritional quality are linked to differences in cardiometabolic health. Compared
341 to a breakfast containing 20-30% of daily energy intake, participants consuming either
342 low or high energy breakfasts displayed higher values of BMI, WC, and circulating
343 triglycerides, and lower HDL-C. Additionally, they showed a rebound in WC and
344 triglycerides after the first year of intervention that was not evident in participants with
345 an adequate energy intake at breakfast. When focusing on the quality of breakfast,
346 participants with poor breakfast quality also had higher WC and triglycerides and lower
347 HDL-C levels and eGFR than those with a higher breakfast quality.

348 Our findings show that an insufficient energy intake at breakfast is associated
349 with greater adiposity, which concurs with previous evidence. Adults consuming less
350 than 22% of their daily energy at breakfast in a cohort study had a higher BMI
351 regardless of their total intake of energy when compared to consumers of higher
352 intakes [16]. In a retrospective cross-sectional study, men who ate a small breakfast
353 had higher BMI than those who had standard or large breakfasts [17]. Finally, in a
354 clinical trial involving women participating in a 12-week isocaloric weight loss program,
355 those who consumed 14% of energy intake at breakfast and 50% at dinner achieved
356 less weight loss and lower decreases in WC compared to those who had 50% at
357 breakfast and 14% at dinner [18]. Eating breakfast has been linked to increased
358 satiety, which in turn leads to reduced total energy intake [19] and greater postprandial
359 thermogenesis [20], providing a possible mechanism for less adiposity. On the other
360 hand, our results on an association between high energy intakes at breakfast (>30%)
361 with greater adiposity are novel. Unlike previous studies, we distinguished between
362 reference and high energy intakes at breakfast and adjusted our analyses for the total
363 energy intake in the day and the quality of the breakfast, which may explain our
364 capacity to detect these differences. Having 20-30% of daily calories for breakfast was

365 also associated with favorable changes in other cardiovascular risk factors related to
366 adiposity, such as lower levels of triglycerides (triglyceride differences were clinically
367 relevant, up to 36 mg/dL) and higher concentrations of HDL-C. These results align with
368 one cross-sectional study reporting that participants eating breakfast had lower levels
369 of triglycerides and higher HDL-C than those skipping breakfast [21].

370 In terms of the quality of breakfast, higher scores were also associated with
371 lower adiposity (lower WC). While the ideal breakfast composition is debatable, our
372 findings are in line with another study suggesting that people who choose to consume
373 fruit, unprocessed and unsweetened cereal flakes, nuts, and yogurt for breakfast tend
374 to have lower abdominal obesity [22]. Breakfast quality could modulate factors that may
375 impact adiposity, as a high-quality breakfast (rich in protein and carbohydrates)
376 decreased appetite, cravings, and postprandial ghrelin levels in a randomized
377 controlled trial with obese adults [23]. Our study is the first to associate a high-quality
378 breakfast with lower triglyceride and higher HDL-C levels, something that can be
379 explained by the association between lower adiposity and a better triglyceride and
380 HDL-C status [24]. Besides, we also observed for the first time, that participants
381 following a high-quality breakfast had higher eGFR than people in the low-quality
382 breakfast group. Evidence on breakfast and renal function is mainly focused on studies
383 about skipping breakfast, as adults who omitted breakfast had greater odds of chronic
384 kidney disease and proteinuria in cross-sectional studies [25,26]. Lower adiposity in
385 individuals with a high-quality breakfast may explain better kidney function [27].

386 We observed no clear differences in BP according to energy intake at breakfast,
387 despite the slightly higher BP levels in participants with low-quality breakfast in some
388 time points. These differences were not clinically relevant (≤ 3 mmHg), as opposed to
389 those observed for BMI, WC, triglycerides and HDL-C. Compared to skipping
390 breakfast, eating breakfast has been associated with lower SBP (differences of ≤ 5
391 mmHg) and DBP (differences of ≤ 2 mmHg) in previous studies [28,29]. We also
392 observed no clear differences for fasting plasma glucose or Hb1Ac levels, apart from a

393 more pronounced decrease in glucose values during the first six months of the study in
394 participants who consumed 20-30% of daily calories at breakfast and a non-clinically
395 relevant difference in fasting plasma glucose and Hb1Ac values in those with a low-
396 quality breakfast. These slight differences could be explained by the greater content of
397 fiber in a healthy breakfast, which could delay the absorption of carbohydrates and
398 optimize insulin sensitivity through a wide range of molecular mechanisms [30]. The
399 lack of robust differences in parameters related to glucose metabolism does not concur
400 with previous studies that have reported an increased risk of developing type II
401 diabetes among adults who skip breakfast [31–33]. Discrepancies between previous
402 findings and our results can be explained by the different definition of exposure
403 (previous studies are focused on skipping breakfast and our exposures were energy
404 consumed at breakfast or breakfast quality), the fact that some of these studies were
405 cross-sectional, and that their participants were younger and had fewer cardiovascular
406 risk factors [31–33].

407 Our study had some limitations. First, this study is observational, and we do not
408 know whether the associations between the quantity and quality of breakfast and the
409 risk factors trajectories of breakfast are causal or whether they may be explained by
410 residual confounding. We tried to minimize this source of bias by adjusting for several
411 covariates (e.g., age, sex, intervention group, education level, smoking habit, total daily
412 intake of energy, and diet quality). Nevertheless, these relationships should be verified
413 in future nutritional intervention studies. Second, nutritional assessment was based on
414 three-day food diaries. Although it is the gold standard, it may imply some bias due to
415 the subjective nature of participants' self-reporting. We tried to minimize this limitation
416 by reviewing the food records with the participants and by excluding energy under- and
417 over-reporters before statistical analyses. Third, the score selected to measure meal
418 quality may have some limitations for breakfast. A healthy breakfast may imply a low
419 intake of iron-rich foods, which may decrease the overall score even though the
420 breakfast may still meet requirements for a healthy meal (the main source of iron in

421 breakfast in Spain would be cured meats, which were discouraged by the PREDIMED-
422 Plus interventions for everybody). Finally, our findings only apply to older adults with
423 excess body weight and metabolic syndrome and cannot be generalized to other
424 populations. Despite these limitations, our research offers a novel approach to the
425 study of the health implications of breakfast that goes beyond the mere consideration
426 of its intake.

427 In conclusion, individuals at high cardiovascular risk may benefit from a
428 balanced breakfast to maintain a healthy body weight, waist circumference, lipid profile,
429 and renal function. A breakfast containing 20-30% of total caloric intake was linked to
430 lower values of BMI, WC, triglycerides, and higher HDL-C concentrations, and a high-
431 quality breakfast was associated with healthier values of WC, HDL-C, and eGFR. Our
432 findings highlight the importance of not just eating breakfast, but paying attention to the
433 quantity and quality of what is consumed. More studies are needed to clarify the role of
434 breakfast quantity and quality in cardiovascular outcomes and other chronic diseases,
435 which could help refine dietary recommendations.

436 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

437 A full list of names of all PREDIMED-Plus study collaborators is available in the
438 **Appendix**. The authors also thank the PREDIMED-Plus Biobank Network as a part of
439 the National Biobank Platform of the ISCIII for storing and managing the PREDIMED-
440 Plus biological samples. CIBER Fisiopatología de la Obesidad y Nutrición
441 (CIBEROBN), CIBER Epidemiología y Salud Pública (CIBERESP), and CIBER
442 Enfermedades Cardiovasculares (CIBERCV) are initiatives of Instituto de Salud Carlos
443 III (Madrid, Spain), and are financed by the European Regional Development Fund.

444

445 **FUNDING**

446 This work was supported by the Instituto de Salud Carlos III (grant numbers
447 IFI20/00002, PI19/00017, PI15/00047, PI18/00020, PI16/00533, PI13/00233,
448 PI21/00024, PI20/00012, and CP21/00097) and co-funded by the European Union. The
449 funders played no role in study design, collection, analysis, or interpretation of data,
450 and neither in the process of writing the manuscript and the publish process.

451

452 **CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

453 J.S.-S. reports being a board member and personal fees from Instituto Danone
454 Spain; being a board member and grants from the International Nut and Dried Fruit
455 Foundation. R.E. reports being a board member of the Research Foundation on Wine
456 and Nutrition, the Beer and Health Foundation, and the European Foundation for
457 Alcohol Research; personal fees from KAO Corporation; lecture fees from Instituto
458 Cervantes, Fundación Dieta Mediterranea, Cerveceros de España, Lilly Laboratories,
459 AstraZeneca, and Sanofi; and grants from Novartis, Amgen, Bicerntury, and Grand
460 Fontaine. E.R. reports personal fees, grants, and nonfinancial support from the
461 California Walnut Commission and Alexion; and nonfinancial support from the
462 International Nut Council. All other authors report no conflicts of interest.

463

464 **AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTION**

465 K.A.P.V.: data extraction, formal analysis, methodology, data interpretation,
466 writing – original draft. C.L.: methodology, data interpretation, writing – review and
467 editing. M.D.Z.: methodology, data interpretation, writing–review and editing, O.C: data
468 interpretation, writing–review and editing. J.S.S.: funding acquisition, project
469 administration, data interpretation, writing – review and editing. F.J.B.G.: data
470 interpretation, writing – review and editing. D.C: funding acquisition, project
471 administration, data interpretation, writing - review and editing. R.E.: funding
472 acquisition, project administration, data interpretation, writing - review and editing. E.R.:
473 funding acquisition, project administration, data interpretation, writing – review and
474 editing. F.J.T.: funding acquisition, project administration, data interpretation, writing –
475 review and editing. G.B.: methodology, writing – review and editing. M.M.: data
476 interpretation, writing – review and editing. D.M.A.: methodology, writing – review and
477 editing. H.S.: data interpretation, writing – review and editing. M.F.: study design and
478 conceptualization, methodology, funding acquisition, project administration, data
479 interpretation, writing – review and editing. A.H.: study design and conceptualization,
480 data curation, formal analysis, methodology, visualization, data interpretation, writing –
481 review and editing.

482

483 **DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT**

484 The generation and analysis of the data sets within this study are not projected
485 to be open to access beyond the core research group. This is because the participants'
486 consent forms and ethical approval did not include provisions for public accessibility.
487 However, we follow a controlled data-sharing collaboration model, as the informed
488 consent documents signed by the participants allowed for regulated collaboration with
489 other researchers for study-related research. Following an application and approval
490 process by the PREDIMED-Plus Steering Committee, the data described in the
491 manuscript, alongside the codebook and analytic code, will be available upon request.

492 Researchers interested in this study can reach out to the Committee by sending a
493 request letter to predimed_plus_scommittee@googlegroups.com. For those proposals
494 that gain approval, a data-sharing agreement, outlining the specifics of the
495 collaboration and data management, will be prepared and finalized.

496 **REFERENCES**

497

- 498 1. O'Neil CE, Byrd-Bredbenner C, Hayes D *et al.* The role of breakfast in health:
499 Definition and criteria for a quality breakfast. *J Acad Nutr Diet* 2014;**114**:S8–26.
- 500 2. Ruiz E, Ávila JM, Valero T *et al.* Breakfast consumption in Spain: Patterns, nutrient
501 intake and quality. findings from the ANIBES study, a study from the international
502 breakfast research initiative. *Nutrients* 2018;**10**:1324.
- 503 3. Wang W, Grech A, Gemming L *et al.* Breakfast size is associated with daily energy
504 intake and diet quality. *Nutrition* 2020;**75–76**:110764.
- 505 4. Li ZH, Xu L, Dai R *et al.* Effects of regular breakfast habits on metabolic and
506 cardiovascular diseases: A protocol for systematic review and meta-analysis. *Medicine*
507 *(Baltimore)* 2021;**100**:e27629.
- 508 5. Iqbal K, Schwingshackl L, Gottschald M *et al.* Breakfast quality and cardiometabolic
509 risk profiles in an upper middle-aged German population. *Eur J Clin Nutr*
510 2017;**71**:1312–20.
- 511 6. Félix PV, Pereira JL, Leme ACB *et al.* Nutritional breakfast quality and
512 cardiometabolic risk factors: Health Survey of São Paulo, a population-based study.
513 *Public Health Nutr* 2021;**24**:4102–12.
- 514 7. Martínez-González MA, Buil-Cosiales P, Corella D *et al.* Cohort Profile: Design and
515 methods of the PREDIMED-Plus randomized trial. *Int J Epidemiol* 2019;**48**:387–388o.
- 516 8. Salas-Salvadó J, Díaz-López A, Ruiz-Canela M *et al.* Effect of a Lifestyle
517 Intervention Program With Energy-Restricted Mediterranean Diet and Exercise on
518 Weight Loss and Cardiovascular Risk Factors: One-Year Results of the PREDIMED-
519 Plus Trial. *Diabetes Care* 2019;**42**:777–88.
- 520 9. Agència de Salut Pública de Catalunya. Petits canvis per menjar millor. *Generalitat*
521 *de Catalunya* 2018.
- 522 10. Cantós López D, Farran A, Palma Linares I. Programa de Càlcul Nutricional
523 Professional (PCN Pro). 2013.

- 524 11. Tablas de composición de alimentos del Cesnid. *Rev Esp Salud Publica* 2004;**78**,
525 DOI: 10.1590/s1135-57272004000300011.
- 526 12. Banna JC, McCrory MA, Fialkowski MK *et al.* Examining Plausibility of Self-
527 Reported Energy Intake Data: Considerations for Method Selection. *Front Nutr* 2017;**4**,
528 DOI: 10.3389/fnut.2017.00045.
- 529 13. Mainardi F, Prozorovscaia D, Sweeney G *et al.* Development and validation of a
530 meal quality index with applications to NHANES 2005-2014. *PLoS One*
531 2021;**15**:e0244391.
- 532 14. Inker LA, Schmid CH, Tighiouart H *et al.* Estimating Glomerular Filtration Rate from
533 Serum Creatinine and Cystatin C. *New England Journal of Medicine* 2012;**367**, DOI:
534 10.1056/nejmoa1114248.
- 535 15. Elhakeem A, Hughes RA, Tilling K *et al.* Using linear and natural cubic splines,
536 SITAR, and latent trajectory models to characterise nonlinear longitudinal growth
537 trajectories in cohort studies. *BMC Med Res Methodol* 2022;**22**:68.
- 538 16. Purslow LR, Sandhu MS, Forouhi N *et al.* Energy intake at breakfast and weight
539 change: Prospective study of 6,764 middle-aged men and women. *Am J Epidemiol*
540 2008;**167**:188–92.
- 541 17. Kent LM, Worsley A. Breakfast size is related to body mass index for men, but not
542 women. *Nutrition Research* 2010;**30**:240–5.
- 543 18. Jakubowicz D, Barnea M, Wainstein J *et al.* High Caloric intake at breakfast vs.
544 dinner differentially influences weight loss of overweight and obese women. *Obesity*
545 2013;**21**:2504–12.
- 546 19. de Castro JM. The time of day and the proportions of macronutrients eaten are
547 related to total daily food intake. *British Journal of Nutrition* 2007;**98**:1077–83.
- 548 20. Farshchi HR, Taylor MA, Macdonald IA. Beneficial metabolic effects of regular meal
549 frequency on dietary thermogenesis, insulin sensitivity, and fasting lipid profiles in
550 healthy obese women. *Am J Clin Nutr* 2005;**81**:16–24.

- 551 21. Chen L, Li X, Du X *et al.* Cross-sectional association of meal skipping with lipid
552 profiles and blood glucose in Chinese adults. *Nutrition* 2021;**90**:111245.
- 553 22. Chatelan A, Castetbon K, Pasquier J *et al.* Association between breakfast
554 composition and abdominal obesity in the Swiss adult population eating breakfast
555 regularly. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*
556 2018;**15**:115.
- 557 23. Jakubowicz D, Froy O, Wainstein J *et al.* Meal timing and composition influence
558 ghrelin levels, appetite scores and weight loss maintenance in overweight and obese
559 adults. *Steroids*. Vol 77. 2012, 323–31.
- 560 24. Cornier MA, Després JP, Davis N *et al.* Assessing adiposity: A scientific statement
561 from the american heart association. *Circulation* 2011;**124**:1996–2019.
- 562 25. Tokumaru T, Toyama T, Hara A *et al.* Association between unhealthy dietary habits
563 and proteinuria onset in a Japanese general population: A retrospective cohort study.
564 *Nutrients* 2020;**12**, DOI: 10.3390/nu12092511.
- 565 26. Gahm C, Park S. The association between skipping breakfast and chronic kidney
566 disease. *Int Urol Nephrol* 2023, DOI: 10.1007/s11255-023-03590-5.
- 567 27. Chang AR, Grams ME, Ballew SH *et al.* Adiposity and risk of decline in glomerular
568 filtration rate: Meta-analysis of individual participant data in a global consortium. *BMJ*
569 (*Online*) 2019;**364**, DOI: 10.1136/bmj.k5301.
- 570 28. Almoosawi S, Prynne CJ, Hardy R *et al.* Time-of-day of energy intake: Association
571 with hypertension and blood pressure 10 years later in the 1946 British Birth Cohort. *J*
572 *Hypertens* 2013;**31**:882–92.
- 573 29. di Giuseppe R, Di Castelnuovo A, Melegari C *et al.* Typical breakfast food
574 consumption and risk factors for cardiovascular disease in a large sample of Italian
575 adults. *Nutrition, Metabolism and Cardiovascular Diseases* 2012;**22**:347–54.
- 576 30. Goff HD, Repin N, Fabek H *et al.* Dietary fibre for glycaemia control: Towards a
577 mechanistic understanding. *Bioactive Carbohydrates and Dietary Fibre* 2018;**14**:39–53.

- 578 31. Mekary RA, Giovannucci E, Cahill L *et al.* Eating patterns and type 2 diabetes risk
579 in older women: Breakfast consumption and eating frequency. *American Journal of*
580 *Clinical Nutrition* 2013;**98**:436–43.
- 581 32. Uemura M, Yatsuya H, Hilawe EH *et al.* Breakfast skipping is positively associated
582 with incidence of type 2 diabetes mellitus: Evidence from the Aichi Workers' Cohort
583 Study. *J Epidemiol* 2015;**25**:351–8.
- 584 33. Bi H, Gan Y, Yang C *et al.* Breakfast skipping and the risk of type 2 diabetes: A
585 meta-analysis of observational studies. *Public Health Nutr* 2015;**18**:3013–9.
- 586
- 587

588 **FIGURE LEGENDS**

589

590 **Figure 1.** Study flow chart

591 **Figure 2.** Trajectories at breakfast energy intake groups and breakfast quality groups
592 plus inter-group differences, for body mass index (A-E) and waist circumference (F-J).

593 **Figure 3.** Trajectories at breakfast energy intake groups and breakfast quality groups
594 plus inter-group differences, for triglycerides (A-E), high-density lipoprotein cholesterol
595 (F-J) and for low-density lipoprotein cholesterol (K,O).

596 **Figure 4.** Trajectories at breakfast energy intake groups and breakfast quality groups
597 plus inter-group differences, for systolic blood pressure (A-E) and diastolic blood
598 pressure (F-J).

599 **Figure 5.** Trajectories at breakfast energy intake groups and breakfast quality groups
600 plus inter-group differences, for fasting plasma glucose (A-E) and glycated hemoglobin
601 (F-J).

602 **Figure 6.** Trajectories at breakfast energy intake groups and breakfast quality groups
603 plus inter-group differences, for glomerular filtration rate.

604

605 **Graphical abstract.** BMI: body mass index; DBP: diastolic blood pressure; eGFR:
606 estimated glomerular filtration rate; Hb1Ac: glycated hemoglobin; HDL-C: high-density
607 lipoprotein cholesterol; LDL-C: low-density lipoprotein cholesterol; SBP: systolic blood
608 pressure; WC: waist circumference.

609 **TABLES**610 **Table 1.** Intake values for the calculation of the Meal Balance Score.

611

	Score 0	0 to 100 points (increasing, proportional values)	Score 100	100 to 0 points (decreasing, proportional values)	Score 0
Protein (%)	≤5	>5 to <10	≥10 to ≤35	>35 to <52.5	≥52.5
Total fat (%)	≤10	>10 to <20	≥20 to ≤35	>35 to <52.5	≥52.5
Fiber (g/2,000 kcal)	≤14	>14 to <28	≥28 to ≤56	>56 to <84	≥84
Potassium (mg/2,000 kcal)	≤1750	>1,750 to <3,500	≥3,500 to ≤7,000	>7,000 to <10,500	≥10,500
Calcium (mg/2,000kcal)	≤500	>500 to <1,000	≥1,000 to ≤2,000	>2,000 to <3,000	≥3,000
Iron (mg/2,000 kcal)	≤9	>9 to <18	≥18 to ≤36	>36 to <54	≥54
Added sugar (%)	-	-	0 to ≤10	>10 to <15	≥15
Saturated fat (%)	-	-	0 to ≤10	>10 to <15	≥15
Sodium (mg/2,000kcal)	-	-	0 to ≤2,000	>2,000 to <3,000	≥3,000

612 Adapted from Mainardi F et al., Plos One, 2020 (DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0244391)

613 **Table 2.** Characteristics of study participants.

	All <i>n</i> = 383	Groups by % of energy intake at breakfast				Groups by breakfast quality score		
		<20 % (<i>n</i> = 65)	20-30% (<i>n</i> = 271)	>30% (<i>n</i> = 47)	<i>p</i> -value	Low score (<i>n</i> = 199)	High score (<i>n</i> = 184)	<i>p</i> -value
Age (years, mean ± SD)	65.4 ± 4.60	65.1 ± 4.24	65.7 ± 4.61	64.5 ± 4.97	0.235	65.1 ± 4.67	65.8 ± 4.53	0.142
Women (<i>n</i> , %)	197 (51.4%)	31 (47.7%)	146 (53.9%)	20 (42.6%)	0.287	87 (47.3%)	110 (55.3%)	0.144
Education					0.873			0.323
Elementary school (<i>n</i> , %)	163 (42.6%)	30 (46.2%)	116 (42.8%)	17 (36.2%)		72 (39.1%)	91 (45.7%)	
Middle/High school (<i>n</i> , %)	133 (34.7%)	22 (33.8%)	93 (34.3%)	18 (38.3%)		65 (35.3%)	68 (34.2%)	
Higher education (<i>n</i> , %)	87 (22.7%)	13 (20.0%)	62 (22.9%)	12 (25.5%)		47 (25.5%)	40 (20.1%)	
Tobacco use					0.003			0.116
Never smoker (<i>n</i> , %)	187 (48.8%)	27 (41.5%)	136 (50.2%)	24 (51.1%)		81 (44.0%)	106 (53.3%)	
Current smoker (<i>n</i> , %)	33 (8.62%)	14 (21.5%)	14 (5.17%)	5 (10.6%)		20 (10.9%)	13 (6.53%)	
Former smoker (<i>n</i> , %)	163 (42.6%)	24 (36.9%)	121 (44.6%)	18 (38.3%)		83 (45.1%)	80 (40.2%)	
Type-2 diabetes mellitus (<i>n</i> , %)	136 (35.5%)	26 (40.0%)	91 (33.6%)	19 (40.4%)	0.470	61 (33.2%)	75 (37.7%)	0.412
Hypercholesterolemia (<i>n</i> , %)	267 (69.7%)	50 (76.9%)	182 (67.2%)	35 (74.5%)	0.511	130 (70.7%)	137 (68.8%)	0.584

Hypertension (<i>n</i> , %)	328 (85.6%)	56 (86.2%)	229 (84.5%)	43 (91.5%)	0.448	162 (88.0%)	166 (83.4%)	0.253
Body mass index (kg/m ² , mean ± SD)	33.4 ± 3.54	33.3 ± 3.43	33.3 ± 3.57	34.1 ± 3.52	0.391	33.3 ± 3.51	33.5 ± 3.57	0.532
Body mass index categories					0.272			0.999
Overweight (<i>n</i> , %)	74 (19.3%)	13 (20.0%)	56 (20.7%)	5 (10.6%)		38 (19.1%)	36 (19.6%)	
Obesity (<i>n</i> , %)	309 (80.7%)	52 (80.0%)	215 (79.3%)	42 (89.4%)		161 (80.9%)	148 (80.4%)	
Energy intake per day (kcal, longitudinal mean ± SD)	1,630 ± 300	1,609 ± 288	1,635 ± 291	1,634 ± 368	0.821	1,671 ± 320	1,593 ± 276	0.011
Energy intake at breakfast (%, longitudinal mean ± SD)	24.2 ± 5.48	16.4 ± 3.71	24.4 ± 2.62	33.7 ± 3.37	<0.001	24.3 ± 6.44	24.1 ± 4.42	0.765
Breakfast score (points, longitudinal mean ± SD)	63.2 ± 11.7	62.1 ± 11.0	64.2 ± 11.0	58.6 ± 15.3	0.007	53.4 ± 8.23	72.2 ± 5.69	<0.001

PREDIMED-Plus Participants

Food records

Total participants in Hospital del Mar recruitment center
(*n* = 407)

Participants with at least one food record returned
(*n* = 385)

Total three days food records up to february 2020
(*n* = 1140)

Exclusion (*n* = 37)

- Underreporters (<500 kcal for women or <800 kcal for men) (*n* = 20)
- Less than three days (*n* = 17)

Participants included
(*n* = 383)

Total three days food records included
(*n* = 1103)









