

# Adherence to a healthful plant-based diet and risk of chronic kidney disease among individuals with diabetes: A prospective cohort study

*Running Title: Plant-based diets and chronic kidney disease*

---

**Alysha S. Thompson<sup>1</sup>, Anna Tresserra-Rimbau<sup>1,2,3</sup>, Amy Jennings<sup>1</sup>, Nicola P. Bondonno<sup>1,4,5</sup>, Catharina J. Candussi<sup>6,7</sup>, Joshua K. O'Neill<sup>1</sup>, Claire Hill<sup>8</sup>, Martina Gaggl<sup>7</sup>, Aedín Cassidy<sup>1\*</sup> and Tilman Kühn<sup>1,6,7\*</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>The Institute for Global Food Security, School of Biological Sciences, Queen's University Belfast, Northern Ireland, UK

<sup>2</sup>Department of Nutrition, Food Science and Gastronomy, XIA, School of Pharmacy and Food Sciences, INSA, University of Barcelona, 08921 Barcelona, Spain

<sup>3</sup>Centro de Investigación Biomédica en Red Fisiopatología de la Obesidad y la Nutrición (CIBEROBN), Instituto de Salud Carlos III, 28029 Madrid, Spain

<sup>4</sup>Danish Cancer Institute, Copenhagen, Denmark

<sup>5</sup>Nutrition & Health Innovation Research Institute, School of Medical and Health Sciences, Edith Cowan University, Joondalup, WA, Australia

<sup>6</sup>University of Vienna, Department of Nutritional Sciences, Vienna, Austria

<sup>7</sup>Medical University of Vienna, Center for Public Health, Vienna, Austria

<sup>8</sup>Centre for Public Health, Queen's University Belfast, Belfast, United Kingdom

\*Correspondence: [t.kuhn@qub.ac.uk](mailto:t.kuhn@qub.ac.uk) and [a.cassidy@qub.ac.uk](mailto:a.cassidy@qub.ac.uk)

**Corresponding Authors:** Prof Dr Tilman Kühn and Prof Aedín Cassidy

Queen's University Belfast

Institute for Global Food Security (IGFS) / School of Biological Sciences

19 Chlorine Gardens

Belfast BT9 5DL

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

UK

Email: [t.kuhn@qub.ac.uk](mailto:t.kuhn@qub.ac.uk)

Telephone: +44 28 9097 1387

**Funding Source:** Alysha S. Thompson holds a PhD studentship of the Department for the Economy (DfE), Northern Ireland.

**Word count abstract:** 251

**Word count:** 3,980

## 1 Abstract

2 **Background:** Chronic kidney disease (CKD) is highly prevalent among people with diabetes.  
3 While identifying modifiable risk factors to prevent a decline in kidney function among those  
4 living with diabetes is pivotal, there is limited evidence on dietary risk factors for CKD. In  
5 this study we examined the associations between healthy and less healthy plant-based diets  
6 (PBDs) and the risk of CKD among those with diabetes, and to identify potential underlying  
7 mechanisms.

8 **Methods:** We conducted a prospective analysis among 7,747 UK Biobank participants with  
9 prevalent diabetes. Multivariable Cox proportional hazard regression models were used to  
10 examine the associations between healthful and unhealthful PBDs and the risk of CKD.  
11 Causal mediation analyses were further employed to explore the underlying mechanisms of  
12 the observed associations.

13 **Results:** Among 7,747 study participants with diabetes, 1,030 developed incident CKD over  
14 10.2 years of follow-up. Higher adherence to a healthy PBD was associated with a 24% lower  
15 CKD risk ( $HR_{Q4 \text{ versus } Q1}: 0.76 [95\%CI: 0.63-0.92]$ ,  $p_{\text{trend}} = 0.002$ ), while higher adherence to  
16 an unhealthy PBD was associated with a 35% higher risk ( $HR_{Q4 \text{ versus } Q1}: 1.35 [95\%CI: 1.11-$   
17  $1.65]$ ,  $p_{\text{trend}} = 0.006$ ). The observed associations were predominantly mediated by markers of  
18 body fatness (proportion mediated: 11-25%) and kidney function (23-89%).

19 **Conclusions:** In this prospective cohort study of middle-aged adults with diabetes, adherence  
20 to a healthy PBD was associated with lower CKD risk, whereas adherence to an unhealthy  
21 PBD was associated with a higher CKD risk. Associations were primarily mediated by  
22 markers of lower body fatness and improved kidney function.

23 **Key Words:** Plant-based diet index; diabetes mellitus; chronic kidney disease; primary  
24 prevention; mediation analysis

## 25 **1. Introduction**

26 Chronic kidney disease (CKD) is a major global health issue affecting over one-tenth of the  
27 world's population, ranking among one of the leading causes of death according to the Global  
28 Burden of Disease Study in 2017 (1). CKD is of particular concern among individuals living  
29 with diabetes, with 40% of new CKD cases being attributed to diabetes as the primary cause  
30 (1, 2). Although CKD is a comorbid condition causing progressive and irreversible loss of  
31 kidney function that bears a substantial economic burden worldwide (3, 4), differences in  
32 CKD risk among people with diabetes are not fully understood. Thus, identifying modifiable  
33 risk factors to aid in the preservation of kidney function and improve outcomes among those  
34 living with diabetes is pivotal for primary prevention.

35 Modifying dietary intake is a key component of diabetes management. It has been suggested  
36 that low-carbohydrate, Mediterranean, and Low-glycaemic Index dietary patterns are  
37 effective for improving outcomes for people with type 2 diabetes (5), while greater adherence  
38 to a Western diet (6), including higher intakes of ultra-processed foods (7, 8) has been  
39 associated with worse outcomes. The first study in the general population indicated that  
40 plant-based diets (PBD) are associated with lower CKD risk (9). This finding is in line with  
41 recent studies suggesting that replacing animal protein with plant protein is associated with  
42 lower CKD risk (10, 11). Conversely, a general reduction of protein intake is recommended  
43 as part of treatment guidelines for diabetic patients with CKD (12).

44 Given the preliminary evidence on a potential benefit of PBDs for CKD prevention, we  
45 hypothesized that a healthful PBD is related to lower CKD risk among people with diabetes.  
46 Therefore, the main objective of this study was to investigate whether PBDs, specifically  
47 adherence to a healthful vs unhealthful plant-based diet index (PDI), is associated with lower  
48 risks of CKD among individuals with diabetes, using data from the UK Biobank, a large-

49 scale prospective cohort study. Our secondary objective was to assess which biological  
50 mechanisms may potentially mediate associations between PDI and CKD incidence among  
51 people with diabetes.

## 52 **2. Methods**

### 53 **2.1 Study population**

54 The UK Biobank is a large-scale population-based prospective cohort study of half a million  
55 adults aged between 40-69 years from the United Kingdom. The study recruited participants  
56 from 22 assessment centres across England, Scotland, and Wales between 2006 and 2010. At  
57 recruitment, study participants completed a baseline assessment comprising a touchscreen  
58 questionnaire, a face-to-face verbal interview, and a series of physical measurements.  
59 Further details on the study protocol have been documented previously (13). The UK  
60 Biobank has received ethical approval from the NHS North West Multicentre Research  
61 Ethics Committee (Ref. 11/NW/0382). All participants provided signed informed consent at  
62 recruitment to participate in the study. We used the STROBE cohort checklist when writing  
63 this report (14).

64 Participants who had a prior diagnosis of diabetes and had completed at least one 24-hr  
65 dietary assessment were considered eligible for inclusion in this study. Participants were  
66 excluded if they withdrew their consent during the study follow-up, had implausible energy  
67 intakes ( $>17,573\text{KJ}$  or  $< 3,347\text{KJ}$  for men and  $> 14,644\text{KJ}$  or  $< 2,092\text{KJ}$  for women (15)),  
68 had prevalent CKD (self-reported or hospital inpatient record of CKD diagnosed before  
69 recruitment), an estimated glomerular filtration rate (eGFR)  $<60\text{ml}/\text{min}/1.73\text{m}^2$ , were  
70 diagnosed with CKD before the final 24hr dietary assessment, or if follow-up ended before  
71 completion of the final dietary assessment (**Figure S1**).

## 72 **2.2 Dietary assessment**

73 Dietary information was collected using the Oxford WebQ 24-hour dietary assessment (16).  
74 The Oxford WebQ dietary questionnaire was issued on five separate occasions between April  
75 2009 and June 2012, permitting up to 210,947 UK Biobank participants to complete at least  
76 one questionnaire. Mean (SD) duration (years) between baseline and first and last dietary  
77 assessments were 1.5 (1.4) and 2.2 (1.4), respectively. The Oxford WebQ has been validated  
78 to represent a true approximation of dietary intake through comparison to objective  
79 nutritional biomarkers and an interviewer-administrated 24-hr dietary recall (17-19).

## 80 **2.3 Plant-based diet indices**

81 Following methods described in previous studies (20-22), the Oxford WebQ dietary  
82 questionnaire (16, 23) was used to calculate a healthful plant-based diet index (hPDI) and an  
83 unhealthful plant-based diet index (uPDI). A total of 17 food groups (whole grains, fruits,  
84 vegetables, nuts, legumes and vegetarian protein alternatives, tea and coffee, fruit juices,  
85 refined grains, potatoes, sugar-sweetened beverages (SSBs), sweets and desserts, animal fat,  
86 dairy, eggs, fish or seafood, meat, and miscellaneous animal-based foods) were used to  
87 calculate the PDIs. Although used previously as a component of the PDI, data on vegetable  
88 oils was not available for use in this study (22). The 17 food groups were further classified  
89 into a hPDI and a uPDI. The hPDI consisted of scoring healthy plant-food groups (whole  
90 grains, fruits, vegetables, nuts, legumes and vegetarian protein alternatives and tea and  
91 coffee) positively, and unhealthy plant-food groups (fruit juices, refined grains, potatoes,  
92 SSBs, sweets and desserts) and animal-based food groups (animal fat, dairy, eggs, fish or  
93 seafood, meat, and miscellaneous animal-based foods) negatively. For the uPDI, unhealthy  
94 plant-food groups were scored positively, while healthy plant-food groups and animal-based  
95 food groups were scored negatively. Participants with intakes of more than zero portions  
96 were ranked into quartiles of intake for each of the 17 food groups. For positive scores,

97 participants were assigned a score between 2 and 5 (2 for the lowest quartile of intake and 5  
98 for the highest) for each food group. Those with intakes of zero were assigned a score of 1.  
99 For reverse scores, the scoring pattern was inverted. To calculate hPDI and uPDI, the scores  
100 assigned to each participant across the 17 food groups were summed and categorised into  
101 sex-specific quartiles.

## 102 **2.4 Ascertainment of diabetes**

103 Prevalent diabetes was defined using the algorithms reported previously (24). Participants  
104 were considered as having prevalent diabetes if they were diagnosed with diabetes (self-  
105 reported or hospital inpatient diagnosed) before completing the first dietary assessment,  
106 reported taking anti-diabetic medications, had a random blood glucose  $\geq 11.1$  mmol/l, or had a  
107 haemoglobin A1c (HbA1c) level of  $\geq 6.5\%$ .

## 108 **2.5 Ascertainment of CKD**

109 The primary outcome of this study was incident CKD. Incident CKD cases were defined  
110 using the International Classification of Diseases, 10<sup>th</sup> Revision (ICD-10) codes in Hospital  
111 Inpatient data and Death Registry data (ICD-10 codes: N03, N06, N08, N11, N12, N13, N14,  
112 N15, N16, N18, N19, Z49, I12, I13) or Office of Population Censuses and Surveys  
113 Classification of Interventions and Procedures-version 4 (OPCS-4) codes in Hospital  
114 Inpatient data (OPCS-4 codes: L74.1-L74.6, L74.8, L74.9, M01.2, M01.3-M01.5, M01.8, M01.9,  
115 M02.3, M08.4, M17.2, M17.4, M17.8, M17.9, X40.1-X40.9, X41.1, X41.2, X41.8, X41.9, X42.1,  
116 X42.8, X42.9, and X43.1). Follow-up time was calculated from the date of the last dietary  
117 assessment and was censored at the date of CKD diagnosis, death, lost to follow-up or end of  
118 follow-up, whichever occurred first. Hospital admission data was available up until 31<sup>st</sup>  
119 October 2022 from the Hospital Episode Statistics (HES) for participants in England, 31<sup>st</sup>  
120 August 2022 from the Scottish Morbidity Records (SMR) for participants in Scotland and

121 31<sup>st</sup> May 2022 from the Patient Episode Database for Wales (PEDW) for participants in  
122 Wales.

## 123 **2.6 Assessment of covariates**

124 Information on sociodemographic, dietary, lifestyle and medical history was collected at  
125 baseline via a touchscreen questionnaire and verbal interview between 2006 and 2010.  
126 Further, study participants had physical measurements and biological samples collected by a  
127 trained member of staff (13). Serum creatinine, measured by enzymatic analysis on a  
128 Beckman Coulter AU5800, was used to calculate eGFR using the CKD-EPI (Chronic Kidney  
129 Disease Epidemiology Collaboration) creatinine equation (25). Further details on data  
130 collection and classification of covariates used in this study can be found in **Supplementary**  
131 **Table S1**.

## 132 **2.7 Assessment of genetic risk score of eGFR**

133 The polygenic risk score (PRS) of eGFR was calculated by a weighted method using 161  
134 single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) of eGFR (**Supplementary Table S2**) identified by  
135 Wuttke et al. 2019. A higher eGFR PRS was indicative of a lower genetic predisposition to  
136 kidney diseases. Further information on the genotyping and quality control (QC) for this  
137 study can be found in the **Supplementary Methods**.

## 138 **2.8 Statistical analysis**

139 Baseline characteristics are presented as mean  $\pm$  standard deviation (SD) for continuous  
140 variables and as proportions for categorical variables across quartiles of PBD scores. Cox  
141 proportional hazards regression models were used to examine the associations between PDIs  
142 and risk of CKD, producing hazard ratios (HR) and 95% confidence intervals (CIs). Linear  
143 trend tests were carried out by modelling the PDIs as continuous exposure variables (P-  
144 trend). Model 1 was adjusted for sex (female, male) and education (Low: CSEs or



145 equivalent, O levels/GCSEs or equivalent; Medium: A levels/AS levels or equivalent, NVQ  
146 or HND or HNC or equivalent; High: College or University degree, other professional  
147 qualifications eg: nursing, teaching; unknown/missing/prefer not to say (15.1%)), stratified  
148 by age (<55 years, 55-<65, ≥65 years) and region (10 regions). Model 2 was further adjusted  
149 for body mass index (BMI) (18·5-24·9 kg/m<sup>2</sup>, 25·0-29·9 kg/m<sup>2</sup>, ≥30 kg/m<sup>2</sup>, or  
150 unknown/missing (0.3%)), waist circumference (continuous scale, cm), ethnicity (Asian,  
151 Black, Multiple, White, other/unknown/missing (1.8%)), physical activity (METs hr/week in  
152 quintiles, or unknown/missing (2.7%)), smoking status (never, previous, current, or  
153 unknown/missing (0.5%)), alcohol intake (continuous scale, g/day), energy intake  
154 (continuous scale, kJ/day), multimorbidity index (number of pre-existing long-term  
155 conditions; 0, 1, 2, or >3), Townsend deprivation index (quintiles from low to high  
156 deprivation index), type of diabetes (type 1, type 2, unspecified), diabetes medication use (no,  
157 yes, or missing (25.0%)) and number of completed dietary assessments (continuous scale,  
158 ranging between 1-5). Model 3 further included total protein intake (continuous scale, g/day)  
159 as a potential confounder.

160 Subgroup analyses were carried out to examine effect modification. Potential effect modifiers  
161 included, age (<60 or ≥60 years), sex (male or female), BMI (<25 or ≥25kg/m<sup>2</sup>), smoking  
162 status (never or ever), alcohol intake (low [<1g/day] or moderate [1-≤15g/day] or high  
163 [≥16g/day]), total protein intake (<median [<81g/day] or ≥ median [≥81g/day]), history of  
164 hypertension (no or yes), and diabetes type (type 1 or type 2). To assess the robustness of  
165 findings, several sensitivity analyses were carried out. Firstly, eGFR, nephrolithiasis and  
166 blood biomarkers, including HDL-cholesterol (HDL-C), LDL-cholesterol (LDL-C),  
167 lipoprotein(a), c-reactive protein (CRP) and albumin were further adjusted for. Secondly, to  
168 assess whether associations between adherence to the PDI and CKD were influenced by  
169 genetic susceptibility to kidney diseases, a PRS of CKD (eGFR) was further adjusted for.

170 Thirdly, primary analyses were repeated excluding participants with less than two years of  
171 follow-up time to account for potential reverse causality. Fourthly, primary analyses were  
172 repeated excluding sugar-sweetened beverages from the score, as these food items were most  
173 strongly associated with CKD risk on the food group level (see Results). Finally, the E-value  
174 methodology (27) was used to assess the overall strength of potential unmeasured  
175 confounding.

176 Mediation analyses were carried out to assess the mediating role of measures commonly  
177 associated with renal function on the PDI-CKD relationship. To conduct this mediation  
178 analysis, the *paramed* package in Stata (28, 29) was used. This approach uses parametric  
179 regression to estimate two models: a model for the mediator conditional on the exposure and  
180 covariates, and a model for the outcome conditional on the exposure, the mediator and  
181 covariates. Based on previous studies, the following mediators were chosen: markers of  
182 obesity and lipid metabolism (BMI (30), waist circumference (31), cholesterol (LDL-C,  
183 including lipoprotein A and apolipoprotein A, as well as HDL-C and triglycerides)) (30, 32),  
184 kidney function (eGFR (33), cystatin C (34), urate (35), creatinine (36) nephrolithiasis (37)),  
185 hypertension (30) and inflammation (CRP) (38). To calculate the percentage proportion of  
186 the association mediated through each potential mediator, the log of the natural indirect effect  
187 (NIE) HR was divided by the sum of the log of the natural indirect effect (NIE) HR and the  
188 log of the controlled direct effect (CDE) HR ( $\log(\text{NIE})/\log(\text{NIE})+\log(\text{NDE})$ ).

189 A two-sided  $P < 0.05$  was considered statistically significant. All statistical analyses were  
190 carried out using Stata 18.0 (StataCorp LLC). Upon completing the Schoenfeld residuals test,  
191 there was no indication of violation of the proportional hazards assumption.

## 192 3. Results

### 193 3.1 Characteristics of the study population

194 Baseline characteristics, including key nutrient intakes of study participants are shown across  
195 quartiles of hPDI and uPDI in **Table 1 and Tables S3-S5 in the Supplement**. Of the  
196 502,236 UK Biobank participants enrolled, 42,713 had prevalent diabetes, 8,308 of which  
197 had data available from 1 or more dietary assessments (**Figure S1**). In the current study,  
198 7,747 (1.5%) participants had prevalent diabetes, 3,038 (39.2%) were female and 4,709 were  
199 male (60.8%). The mean (SD) age was 58.8 (7.2) years, 6,910 (89.2%) were White, and  
200 3,829 (49.4%) had a BMI over  $\geq 30\text{kg/m}^2$ . Participants in the highest quartile of hPDI were  
201 older, were more likely to have a lower BMI, be more physically active, have a higher level  
202 of education, and have never smoked compared to participants in the lowest quartile.  
203 Participants in the highest quartile of uPDI were younger, were more likely to have a higher  
204 BMI, be less physically active, have a lower level of education and have never smoked  
205 compared to participants in the lowest quartile.

### 206 3.2 Plant-based diets and chronic kidney disease risk

207 During 10.2 years of follow-up, 1,030 (13.3%) participants developed CKD. Minimal and  
208 multivariable-adjusted models, including a tiered modelling approach are presented in **Table**  
209 **2**. In model 2, those in the highest quartile (Quartile 4 (Q4)) of hPDI had a 25% lower risk of  
210 CKD (HR: 0.75 [95%CI: 0.62-0.91],  $p_{\text{trend}} = 0.001$ ) compared to those in the lowest quartile  
211 of hPDI (Quartile 1 (Q1)). Upon adjusting for total protein intake as a potential confounder in  
212 model 3, associations were only marginally attenuated with higher hPDI scores (Q4) being  
213 associated with a 24% lower risk of CKD (HR: 0.76 [95%CI: 0.63-0.92],  $p_{\text{trend}} = 0.002$ ).  
214 In contrast, after multivariable adjustments (model 2), participants with higher uPDI scores  
215 (Q4) had a 40% higher risk of CKD (HR: 1.39 [95%CI: 1.16-1.70],  $p_{\text{trend}} = 0.001$ ) compared

216 to those with lower scores (Q1)). Risk estimates were slightly attenuated after further  
217 adjusting for total protein intake (model 3), with higher uPDI scores (Q4) being associated  
218 with a 35% higher risk of CKD (HR: 1.35 [95%CI: 1.11-1.65],  $p_{\text{trend}} = 0.006$ ) compared to  
219 lower scores (Q1).

220 On the food group level, higher intakes (Q4) of SSBs were associated with a 24% increased  
221 risk of CKD (HR: 1.24 [95%CI: 1.05-1.47],  $p_{\text{trend}} = 0.04$ ) compared to lower intakes (Q1). An  
222 inverse trend was shown for tea and coffee intake ( $p_{\text{trend}} = 0.02$ ), while a positive trend was  
223 evident for meat intake and CKD risk ( $p_{\text{trend}} = 0.02$ ) (**Table 3**).

### 224 **3.3 Subgroup and sensitivity analyses**

225 In stratified analyses, there was no indication of heterogeneity across potential effect  
226 modifiers (**Supplementary Table S6**). In sensitivity analyses, further adjusting for eGFR,  
227 laboratory measurements (LDL-C, HDL-C, lipoprotein(a), C-reactive protein, albumin) and  
228 prevalent nephrolithiasis only marginally affected the associations between hPDI (Q4 vs Q1)  
229 and CKD risk (**Supplementary Table S7**). Further adjusting for genetic susceptibility of  
230 kidney diseases did not notably alter results for either hPDI or uPDI and risk of CKD  
231 (**Supplementary Table S8**). Results also remained unchanged on excluding participants who  
232 were diagnosed with CKD within the first 2 years of follow-up (**Supplementary Table S9**).  
233 Statistically significant associations also persisted on excluding SSBs from the score  
234 (**Supplementary Table S10**).

235 After employing the E-value methodology in our primary analyses, we found that the E-  
236 values were substantially greater than the Hazard ratios observed in fully adjusted models.  
237 This suggests that it is unlikely for unmeasured confounding to nullify the significant  
238 associations observed. For detailed information, the E-values and upper confidence limits for  
239 the fully adjusted main analyses can be found in **Supplementary Tables S12 and S13**.

### 240 **3.4 Mediation analyses**

241 Among mediation analyses, cystatin C was shown to mediate the observed associations  
242 between hPDI and CKD most strongly (proportion mediated: 47%). In addition, creatinine,  
243 waist circumference and eGFR showed mediating effects of 39%, 25%, 23% respectively,  
244 followed by BMI, triglycerides and urate (6% each), and HDL-C (5%), although p-values for  
245 these indirect effects were borderline non-significant (**Table 4**). For uPDI and CKD, cystatin  
246 C again showed to mediate the observed associations most strongly (89%), followed by  
247 creatinine (44%), waist circumference (25%) and triglycerides (11%). BMI, HDL-C and  
248 eGFR also showed to mediate the observed associations between uPDI and CKD by 9-13%,  
249 although indirect effects were non-significant (**Supplementary Table S11**). Other potential  
250 mediators (including LDL-C, lipoprotein(a), apolipoprotein(a), nephrolithiasis, prevalent  
251 hypertension, systolic blood pressure and CRP) were also considered in these analyses but  
252 demonstrated no statistically mediating effects.

## 253 **4. Discussion**

254 In this cohort of UK adults living with diabetes, greater adherence to a healthy PBD was  
255 associated with a 24% lower risk of CKD, while greater adherence to an unhealthy PBD was  
256 associated with a 35% higher risk. The associations between a healthy PBD and CKD were  
257 primarily mediated by improved kidney function (specifically by cystatin C) and lower body  
258 fatness.

259 To the best of our knowledge, this is the first prospective study to examine the associations  
260 between a healthy and unhealthy PBD and risk of CKD among middle-aged adults living  
261 with diabetes. Our results are in line with a retrospective study of 2,797 diabetic patients from  
262 Taiwan where they showed that vegetarian participants had a lower risk of CKD compared to  
263 omnivores (39), and a cross-sectional analysis in 420 diabetic patients from the Netherlands

264 which showed higher vegetable protein intake to be associated with improved renal function  
265 compared to lower intakes (40). While our findings add to the growing body of evidence that  
266 dietary patterns rich in plant foods improve outcomes among people with diabetes (5), they  
267 also align with those from meta-analyses on healthy dietary patterns and CKD incidence in  
268 people with and without diabetes. These studies show a diet rich in whole grains, vegetables,  
269 fruit, legumes, nuts, and fish, and a lower intake of red and processed meats, sodium, and  
270 SSBs to be associated with lower CKD risk and albuminuria (41, 42).

271 In our study, the overall quality of PBDs was associated with CKD risk, while analyses on  
272 the food group level showed SSBs to be most strongly associated with increased CKD risk,  
273 which is in line with previous studies (43). Several plausible mechanisms may explain the  
274 associations found between SSBs and CKD in our study. Firstly, SSBs are typically energy-  
275 dense and, when overconsumed, can contribute to weight gain, overweight and obesity (44) –  
276 a known risk factor for new-onset kidney disease (45). Further, SSBs have a high glycaemic  
277 index (46) which may increase glucose and insulin levels, both of which can impair renal  
278 function through chronic low-grade inflammation and hyperglycaemia (47, 48). Additionally,  
279 fructose, which is a main component of SSBs, is associated with hyperuricemia and increased  
280 renin expression, which in turn can accelerate the onset of renal disease and progression  
281 through vascular disease and interstitial fibrosis (49, 50). Fructose has also been  
282 independently associated with kidney stone incidence (51), which is an established CKD risk  
283 factor associated with adverse renal outcomes (37, 52). Of note, however, the associations in  
284 our study remained similar upon excluding SSBs from the PBD scores, which speaks for  
285 other benefits of healthy PBDs beyond lower SSBs consumption.

286 The beneficial effects of a healthy PBD on kidney function may also be explained through  
287 greater dietary fibre intake. Although no associations were found between whole grain intake  
288 and CKD risk in our study, we found that those in the highest quartile of hPDI had greater

289 overall dietary fibre intake. In the Tehran Lipid and Glucose study (n=1,630), a 5 g/day  
290 increase in total fibre was associated with an 11% lower risk of CKD (53), while higher  
291 dietary fibre intake was associated with a 24% lower risk of incident CKD in a recent study  
292 of the UK Biobank cohort (54). Mechanisms explaining the beneficial associations of dietary  
293 fibre on CKD risk include its cholesterol-lowering (55, 56) and blood pressure lowering (57)  
294 attributes. Further, dietary fibre improves glycaemic control and insulin secretion, which  
295 significantly lowers the risk of developing microalbuminuria and proteinuria (58). In our  
296 study of participants with diabetes, improved glycaemic control through higher dietary fibre  
297 intake may in part explain the benefit of a healthy PBD on CKD risk. Dietary fibre intake can  
298 delay gastric emptying, slow post-meal glucose absorption, and increase satiety improving  
299 overall insulin sensitivity, which may in turn delay the onset and progression of CKD (59-  
300 61).

301 While our goal was to investigate PBDs in relation to CKD risk among people with diabetes,  
302 there is one previous similar study conducted in the general population (9). Specifically, data  
303 from a U.S cohort of healthy adults found that higher adherence to a healthy plant-based  
304 dietary pattern was associated with a 14% lower risk of CKD and slower eGFR decline, while  
305 higher adherence to a less healthy plant-based dietary pattern was associated with an 11%  
306 higher risk of CKD. Unlike this study, our analyses considered total protein intake as a  
307 potential confounder because dietary protein intake may affect kidney health (62-65).  
308 Further, those following an animal-based diet typically have a higher protein intake, making  
309 total protein intake an important confounding factor to consider (66). A prospective study  
310 recently carried out on plant protein intake and incident CKD demonstrated that those in the  
311 highest quartile of intake had an 18% lower risk of CKD compared with the lowest quartile of  
312 intake (10). Our findings suggest that a healthy PBD is beneficial for lowering CKD risk  
313 irrespective of protein intake. This is potentially because healthy PBDs are typically of higher

314 nutritional value, providing a rich source of micronutrients which have been shown to  
315 improve kidney function through lowering oxidative stress, inflammation, dietary acid load  
316 and endothelial dysfunction (67, 68). There are no randomized controlled trials on plant  
317 protein intake and incident CKD to support these observational findings, however, results  
318 from 3 small human trials in patients with albuminuria and type 2 diabetes found a  
319 statistically significant reduction in albuminuria upon replacing animal protein with plant  
320 protein, controlling for total protein intake (69-71).

#### 321 **4.1 Limitations**

322 Although this study has many strengths including its large sample size, prospective design,  
323 and substantial follow-up time, there are also some limitations to consider. Firstly, while the  
324 observed associations were obtained after meticulous adjustment for potential confounding  
325 factors, we cannot rule out residual confounding. Secondly, to utilise the maximum number  
326 of patients with diabetes and 24-hr dietary data in this cohort, the PDI was estimated using  
327 dietary data from participants who completed a minimum of one 24-h dietary assessment.  
328 Therefore, it is possible that the PDI does not fully represent participants' habitual dietary  
329 intake (72). Despite this, the PDIs have previously been shown to have good reproducibility  
330 over time (73). Thirdly, hospital inpatient and death registry data were used to ascertain  
331 incident CKD cases, but not primary care data. Linkage to primary care data in the UK  
332 Biobank is currently ongoing (data is available for approximately 45% of UK Biobank  
333 cohort) and was therefore not used for this analysis. Finally, the UK Biobank cohort is made  
334 up of British middle-aged adults, predominantly of which are of White European ancestry  
335 (>90%), higher education level, and live a healthier lifestyle (74); all of which may limit the  
336 generalizability of our findings to other non-European and ethnic populations.



## 337 **5. Conclusion**

338 Findings from this cohort study of 7,747 middle-aged adults with diabetes suggest that a  
339 healthy PBD is associated with a 24% lower CKD risk irrespective of established CKD risk  
340 factors, genetic susceptibility to kidney disease and total protein intake. In contrast, an  
341 unhealthy PBD was associated with a 35% higher risk of CKD. Markers of kidney function,  
342 obesity, lipid metabolism and inflammation were found to potentially mediate the observed  
343 associations between plant-based dietary intake and CKD. These findings highlight the  
344 potential importance of PBD quality in the form of higher intakes of healthy plant foods and  
345 lower intakes of unhealthy plant foods to lower CKD risk among those living with diabetes.  
346 In addition, our findings suggest that SSBs should be restricted for the prevention of CKD in  
347 diabetic patients. RCTs would be an important next step to confirm the role of PBDs in CKD  
348 prevention among people with diabetes.

349

350

351

352

353

354

355

356

357

358

359

360 **Authors' contributions:** Design and concept: AT, TK, AC; database development: AT,  
361 ATR, JKO, CH; analysed and interpreted data: AT, AC, TK; drafted manuscript: AT, TK,  
362 AC; provided critical review of the manuscript: ATR, AJ, NB, CC, JO, CH, MG; guarantors  
363 of the work: AT and TK.

364 **Funding and Acknowledgements:** This research was conducted using UK Biobank funded  
365 and sourced data (application 64426). The UK Biobank was established by the Wellcome  
366 Trust, the Medical Research Council, the UK Department of Health, and the Scottish  
367 Government. The UK Biobank has also received funding from the Welsh Assembly  
368 Government, the British Heart Foundation, and Diabetes United Kingdom, Northwest  
369 Regional Development Agency, Scottish Government. In addition, Alysha S. Thompson  
370 holds a PhD studentship of the Department for the Economy (DfE), Northern Ireland.

371 **Availability of data:** UK Biobank data can be requested by all bona fide researchers for  
372 approved projects, including replication, through <https://www.ukbiobank.ac.uk/>. This  
373 research was conducted using UK Biobank funded and sourced data (application 64426).

374 **Conflict of interest:** None were reported.

375 **Ethics approval:** All UK Biobank participants provided informed consent to participate and  
376 be followed through linkage to their health records. The UK Biobank study received ethical  
377 approval from the NHS North West Multicentre Research Ethics Committee (Ref.  
378 11/NW/0382).

## References

1. Bikbov B, Purcell CA, Levey AS, Smith M, Abdoli A, Abebe M, et al. Global, regional, and national burden of chronic kidney disease, 1990–2017: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2017. *The Lancet*. 2020;395(10225):709-33.
2. Couser WG, Remuzzi G, Mendis S, Tonelli M. The contribution of chronic kidney disease to the global burden of major noncommunicable diseases. *Kidney international*. 2011;80(12):1258-70.
3. Levin A, Tonelli M, Bonventre J, Coresh J, Donner J-A, Fogo AB, et al. Global kidney health 2017 and beyond: a roadmap for closing gaps in care, research, and policy. *The Lancet*. 2017;390(10105):1888-917.
4. Eckardt K-U, Coresh J, Devuyst O, Johnson RJ, Köttgen A, Levey AS, et al. Evolving importance of kidney disease: from subspecialty to global health burden. *The Lancet*. 2013;382(9887):158-69.
5. Whiteley C, Benton F, Matwiejczyk L, Luscombe-Marsh N. Determining Dietary Patterns to Recommend for Type 2 Diabetes: An Umbrella Review. *Nutrients*. 2023;15(4):861. PubMed PMID: doi:10.3390/nu15040861.
6. Xu S-S, Hua J, Huang Y-Q, Shu L. Association between dietary patterns and chronic kidney disease in a middle-aged Chinese population. *Public Health Nutr*. 2020;23(6):1058-66.
7. Gu Y, Li H, Ma H, Zhang S, Meng G, Zhang Q, et al. Consumption of ultraprocessed food and development of chronic kidney disease: the Tianjin Chronic Low-Grade Systemic Inflammation and Health and UK Biobank Cohort Studies. *The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*. 2023;117(2):373-82. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajcnut.2022.11.005>.
8. Du S, Kim H, Crews DC, White K, Rebholz CM. Association Between Ultraprocessed Food Consumption and Risk of Incident CKD: A Prospective Cohort Study. *American Journal of Kidney Diseases*. 2022;80(5):589-98.e1. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1053/j.ajkd.2022.03.016>.
9. Kim H, Caulfield LE, Garcia-Larsen V, Steffen LM, Grams ME, Coresh J, et al. Plant-Based Diets and Incident CKD and Kidney Function. *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol*. 2019;14(5):682-91. Epub 2019/04/27. doi: 10.2215/cjn.12391018. PubMed PMID: 31023928; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC6500948.
10. Heo GY, Koh HB, Kim HJ, Kim KW, Jung C-Y, Kim HW, et al. Association of Plant Protein Intake With Risk of Incident CKD: A UK Biobank Study. *American Journal of Kidney Diseases*. 2023. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1053/j.ajkd.2023.05.007>.
11. Haring B, Selvin E, Liang M, Coresh J, Grams ME, Petruski-Ivleva N, et al. Dietary protein sources and risk for incident chronic kidney disease: results from the Atherosclerosis Risk in Communities (ARIC) Study. *Journal of Renal Nutrition*. 2017;27(4):233-42.
12. Rossing P, Caramori ML, Chan JC, Heerspink HJ, Hurst C, Khunti K, et al. KDIGO 2022 clinical practice guideline for diabetes management in chronic kidney disease. *Kidney International*. 2022;102(5):S1-S127.
13. Sudlow C, Gallacher J, Allen N, Beral V, Burton P, Danesh J, et al. UK biobank: an open access resource for identifying the causes of a wide range of complex diseases of middle and

old age. *PLoS medicine*. 2015;12(3):e1001779-e. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1001779. PubMed PMID: 25826379.

14. Von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, Pocock SJ, Gøtzsche PC, Vandenbroucke JP. The Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) statement: guidelines for reporting observational studies. *The Lancet*. 2007;370(9596):1453-7.

15. Schofield WN, Schofield C, James WPT. Basal metabolic rate: review and prediction, together with an annotated bibliography of source material. 1985.

16. Perez-Cornago A, Pollard Z, Young H, van Uden M, Andrews C, Piernas C, et al. Description of the updated nutrition calculation of the Oxford WebQ questionnaire and comparison with the previous version among 207,144 participants in UK Biobank. *European Journal of Nutrition*. 2021;60(7):4019-30. doi: 10.1007/s00394-021-02558-4.

17. Greenwood DC, Hardie LJ, Frost GS, Alwan NA, Bradbury KE, Carter M, et al. Validation of the Oxford WebQ Online 24-Hour Dietary Questionnaire Using Biomarkers. *Am J Epidemiol*. 2019;188(10):1858-67. doi: 10.1093/aje/kwz165.

18. Galante J, Adamska L, Young A, Young H, Littlejohns TJ, Gallacher J, et al. The acceptability of repeat Internet-based hybrid diet assessment of previous 24-h dietary intake: administration of the Oxford WebQ in UK Biobank. *British Journal of Nutrition*. 2016;115(4):681-6.

19. Liu B, Young H, Crowe FL, Benson VS, Spencer EA, Key TJ, et al. Development and evaluation of the Oxford WebQ, a low-cost, web-based method for assessment of previous 24 h dietary intakes in large-scale prospective studies. *Public Health Nutr*. 2011;14(11):1998-2005. Epub 2011/06/01. doi: 10.1017/S1368980011000942.

20. Satija A, Bhupathiraju SN, Rimm EB, Spiegelman D, Chiuve SE, Borgi L, et al. Plant-Based Dietary Patterns and Incidence of Type 2 Diabetes in US Men and Women: Results from Three Prospective Cohort Studies. *PLOS Medicine*. 2016;13(6):e1002039. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1002039.

21. Satija A, Bhupathiraju SN, Spiegelman D, Chiuve SE, Manson JE, Willett W, et al. Healthful and Unhealthful Plant-Based Diets and the Risk of Coronary Heart Disease in U.S. Adults. *Journal of the American College of Cardiology*. 2017;70(4):411-22. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacc.2017.05.047>.

22. Heianza Y, Zhou T, Sun D, Hu FB, Qi L. Healthful plant-based dietary patterns, genetic risk of obesity, and cardiovascular risk in the UK biobank study. *Clinical Nutrition*. 2021;40(7):4694-701.

23. Piernas C, Perez-Cornago A, Gao M, Young H, Pollard Z, Mulligan A, et al. Describing a new food group classification system for UK biobank: analysis of food groups and sources of macro-and micronutrients in 208,200 participants. *European Journal of Nutrition*. 2021;60:2879-90.

24. Eastwood SV, Mathur R, Atkinson M, Brophy S, Sudlow C, Flaig R, et al. Algorithms for the capture and adjudication of prevalent and incident diabetes in UK Biobank. *PLoS one*. 2016;11(9):e0162388.

25. Levey AS, Stevens LA, Schmid CH, Zhang Y, Castro III AF, Feldman HI, et al. A new equation to estimate glomerular filtration rate. *Annals of internal medicine*. 2009;150(9):604-12.
26. Wuttke M, Li Y, Li M, Sieber KB, Feitosa MF, Gorski M, et al. A catalog of genetic loci associated with kidney function from analyses of a million individuals. *Nature genetics*. 2019;51(6):957-72.
27. VanderWeele TJ, Ding P. Sensitivity analysis in observational research: introducing the E-value. *Annals of internal medicine*. 2017;167(4):268-74.
28. Emsley RA, Liu H, Dunn G, Valeri L, VanderWeele TJ. Paramed: A command to perform causal mediation analysis using parametric models. *The Stata Journal*. 2014.
29. Dunn G, Emsley R, Liu H, Landau S, Green J, White I, et al. Evaluation and validation of social and psychological markers in randomised trials of complex interventions in mental health: a methodological research programme. *Health Technology Assessment (Winchester, England)*. 2015;19(93):1-116.
30. Fox CS, Larson MG, Leip EP, Cullerton B, Wilson PW, Levy D. Predictors of new-onset kidney disease in a community-based population. *Jama*. 2004;291(7):844-50.
31. Liu L, Wang Y, Zhang W, Chang W, Jin Y, Yao Y. Waist height ratio predicts chronic kidney disease: a systematic review and meta-analysis, 1998-2019. *Arch Public Health*. 2019;77:55. Epub 2019/12/24. doi: 10.1186/s13690-019-0379-4. PubMed PMID: 31867106; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC6918668.
32. Bae JC, Han JM, Kwon S, Jee JH, Yu TY, Lee MK, et al. LDL-C/apoB and HDL-C/apoA-1 ratios predict incident chronic kidney disease in a large apparently healthy cohort. *Atherosclerosis*. 2016;251:170-6. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atherosclerosis.2016.06.029>.
33. Eknoyan G, Lameire N, Eckardt K, Kasiske B, Wheeler D, Levin A, et al. KDIGO 2012 clinical practice guideline for the evaluation and management of chronic kidney disease. *Kidney int*. 2013;3(1):5-14.
34. Benoit SW, Ciccia EA, Devarajan P. Cystatin C as a biomarker of chronic kidney disease: latest developments. *Expert review of molecular diagnostics*. 2020;20(10):1019-26.
35. Kang D-H, Nakagawa T, Feng L, Watanabe S, Han L, Mazzali M, et al. A role for uric acid in the progression of renal disease. *Journal of the American Society of Nephrology*. 2002;13(12):2888-97.
36. Zhang WR, Parikh CR. Biomarkers of acute and chronic kidney disease. *Annual review of physiology*. 2019;81:309-33.
37. Rule AD, Bergstralh EJ, Melton III LJ, Li X, Weaver AL, Lieske JC. Kidney stones and the risk for chronic kidney disease. *Clinical journal of the American Society of Nephrology: CJASN*. 2009;4(4):804.
38. Kugler E, Cohen E, Goldberg E, Nardi Y, Levi A, Krause I, et al. C reactive protein and long-term risk for chronic kidney disease: a historical prospective study. *Journal of Nephrology*. 2015;28(3):321-7. doi: 10.1007/s40620-014-0116-6.
39. Hou YC, Huang HF, Tsai WH, Huang SY, Liu HW, Liu JS, et al. Vegetarian Diet Was Associated With a Lower Risk of Chronic Kidney Disease in Diabetic Patients. *Front Nutr*.

2022;9:843357. Epub 2022/05/14. doi: 10.3389/fnut.2022.843357. PubMed PMID: 35558755; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC9087577.

40. Oosterwijk MM, Soedamah-Muthu SS, Geleijnse JM, Bakker SJ, Navis G, Binnenmars SH, et al. High dietary intake of vegetable protein is associated with lower prevalence of renal function impairment: results of the Dutch DIALECT-1 cohort. *Kidney international reports*. 2019;4(5):710-9.

41. Bach KE, Kelly JT, Palmer SC, Khalesi S, Strippoli GFM, Campbell KL. Healthy Dietary Patterns and Incidence of CKD: A Meta-Analysis of Cohort Studies. *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol*. 2019;14(10):1441-9. Epub 2019/09/26. doi: 10.2215/cjn.00530119. PubMed PMID: 31551237; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC6777603.

42. He L-Q, Wu X-H, Huang Y-Q, Zhang X-Y, Shu L. Dietary patterns and chronic kidney disease risk: a systematic review and updated meta-analysis of observational studies. *Nutrition Journal*. 2021;20(1):4. doi: 10.1186/s12937-020-00661-6.

43. Lo W-C, Ou S-H, Chou C-L, Chen J-S, Wu M-Y, Wu M-S. Sugar- and artificially-sweetened beverages and the risks of chronic kidney disease: a systematic review and dose-response meta-analysis. *Journal of Nephrology*. 2021;34(6):1791-804. doi: 10.1007/s40620-020-00957-0.

44. Malik VS, Pan A, Willett WC, Hu FB. Sugar-sweetened beverages and weight gain in children and adults: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *The American journal of clinical nutrition*. 2013;98(4):1084-102.

45. Kovesdy CP, Furth S, Zoccali C, Committee WKDS. Obesity and kidney disease: hidden consequences of the epidemic. *Physiology international*. 2017;104(1):1-14.

46. Atkinson FS, Foster-Powell K, Brand-Miller JC. International tables of glycemic index and glycemic load values: 2008. *Diabetes care*. 2008;31(12):2281-3.

47. Gopinath B, Harris DC, Flood VM, Burlutsky G, Brand-Miller J, Mitchell P. Carbohydrate Nutrition Is Associated with the 5-Year Incidence of Chronic Kidney Disease. *The Journal of Nutrition*. 2011;141(3):433-9. doi: <https://doi.org/10.3945/jn.110.134304>.

48. Liu S, Manson JE, Buring JE, Stampfer MJ, Willett WC, Ridker PM. Relation between a diet with a high glycemic load and plasma concentrations of high-sensitivity C-reactive protein in middle-aged women. *The American journal of clinical nutrition*. 2002;75(3):492-8.

49. Zheng Z, Harman JL, Coresh J, Köttgen A, McAdams-DeMarco MA, Correa A, et al. The dietary fructose: vitamin C intake ratio is associated with hyperuricemia in african-american adults. *The Journal of Nutrition*. 2018;148(3):419-26.

50. Johnson RJ, Segal MS, Sautin Y, Nakagawa T, Feig DI, Kang D-H, et al. Potential role of sugar (fructose) in the epidemic of hypertension, obesity and the metabolic syndrome, diabetes, kidney disease, and cardiovascular disease. *The American journal of clinical nutrition*. 2007;86(4):899-906.

51. Asselman M, Verkoelen C. Fructose intake as a risk factor for kidney stone disease. *Kidney International*. 2008;73(2):139-40.

52. Alexander RT, Hemmelgarn BR, Wiebe N, Bello A, Morgan C, Samuel S, et al. Kidney stones and kidney function loss: a cohort study. *Bmj*. 2012;345.

53. Mirmiran P, Yuzbashian E, Asghari G, Sarverzadeh S, Azizi F. Dietary fibre intake in relation to the risk of incident chronic kidney disease. *British Journal of Nutrition*. 2018;119(5):479-85.
54. Heo GY, Kim HJ, Kalantar D, Jung CY, Kim HW, Park JT, et al. Association between Fiber Intake and Risk of Incident Chronic Kidney Disease: The UK Biobank Study. *The journal of nutrition, health & aging*. 2023;27(11):1018-27. doi: 10.1007/s12603-023-1998-6.
55. Chutkan R, Fahey G, Wright WL, McRorie J. Viscous versus nonviscous soluble fiber supplements: Mechanisms and evidence for fiber-specific health benefits. *Journal of the American Academy of Nurse Practitioners*. 2012;24(8):476-87.
56. Trautwein EA, McKay S. The Role of Specific Components of a Plant-Based Diet in Management of Dyslipidemia and the Impact on Cardiovascular Risk. *Nutrients*. 2020;12(9). Epub 2020/09/05. doi: 10.3390/nu12092671. PubMed PMID: 32883047; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC7551487.
57. Streppel MT, Arends LR, van't Veer P, Grobbee DE, Geleijnse JM. Dietary fiber and blood pressure: a meta-analysis of randomized placebo-controlled trials. *Archives of internal medicine*. 2005;165(2):150-6.
58. Fioretto P, Bruseghin M, Berto I, Gallina P, Manzato E, Mussap M. Renal protection in diabetes: role of glycemic control. *Journal of the American Society of Nephrology*. 2006;17(4\_suppl\_2):S86-S9.
59. Shurraw S, Hemmelgarn B, Lin M, Majumdar SR, Klarenbach S, Manns B, et al. Association between glycemic control and adverse outcomes in people with diabetes mellitus and chronic kidney disease: a population-based cohort study. *Archives of internal medicine*. 2011;171(21):1920-7.
60. Kalantar-Zadeh K, Rhee CM, Joshi S, Brown-Tortorici A, Kramer HM. Medical nutrition therapy using plant-focused low-protein meal plans for management of chronic kidney disease in diabetes. *Current opinion in nephrology and hypertension*. 2022;31(1):26-35.
61. Tuttle KR, Bakris GL, Bilous RW, Chiang JL, De Boer IH, Goldstein-Fuchs J, et al. Diabetic kidney disease: a report from an ADA Consensus Conference. *Diabetes care*. 2014;37(10):2864-83.
62. Knight EL, Stampfer MJ, Hankinson SE, Spiegelman D, Curhan GC. The impact of protein intake on renal function decline in women with normal renal function or mild renal insufficiency. *Annals of internal medicine*. 2003;138(6):460-7.
63. Lew Q-LJ, Jafar TH, Koh HWL, Jin A, Chow KY, Yuan J-M, et al. Red meat intake and risk of ESRD. *Journal of the American Society of Nephrology: JASN*. 2017;28(1):304.
64. Lin J, Fung TT, Hu FB, Curhan GC. Association of dietary patterns with albuminuria and kidney function decline in older white women: a subgroup analysis from the Nurses' Health Study. *Am J Kidney Dis*. 2011;57(2):245-54. Epub 2011/01/22. doi: 10.1053/j.ajkd.2010.09.027. PubMed PMID: 21251540; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC3026604.
65. Rebholz CM, Crews DC, Grams ME, Steffen LM, Levey AS, Miller III ER, et al. DASH (Dietary Approaches to Stop Hypertension) diet and risk of subsequent kidney disease. *American Journal of Kidney Diseases*. 2016;68(6):853-61.

66. Clarys P, Deliens T, Huybrechts I, Deriemaeker P, Vanaelst B, De Keyzer W, et al. Comparison of nutritional quality of the vegan, vegetarian, semi-vegetarian, pescovegetarian and omnivorous diet. *Nutrients*. 2014;6(3):1318-32.
67. Mirmiran P, Yuzbashian E, Bahadoran Z, Asghari G, Azizi F. Dietary acid-base load and risk of chronic kidney disease in adults. 2016.
68. Farhadnejad H, Asghari G, Mirmiran P, Yuzbashian E, Azizi F. Micronutrient intakes and incidence of chronic kidney disease in adults: Tehran Lipid and Glucose Study. *Nutrients*. 2016;8(4):217.
69. Azadbakht L, Esmailzadeh A. Soy-protein consumption and kidney-related biomarkers among type 2 diabetics: a crossover, randomized clinical trial. *Journal of Renal Nutrition*. 2009;19(6):479-86.
70. Teixeira SR, Tappenden KA, Carson L, Jones R, Prabhudesai M, Marshall WP, et al. Isolated soy protein consumption reduces urinary albumin excretion and improves the serum lipid profile in men with type 2 diabetes mellitus and nephropathy. *The Journal of nutrition*. 2004;134(8):1874-80.
71. Azadbakht L, Atabak S, Esmailzadeh A. Soy protein intake, cardiorenal indices, and C-reactive protein in type 2 diabetes with nephropathy: a longitudinal randomized clinical trial. *Diabetes care*. 2008;31(4):648-54.
72. Jackson KA, Byrne NM, Magarey AM, Hills AP. Minimizing random error in dietary intakes assessed by 24-h recall, in overweight and obese adults. *European journal of clinical nutrition*. 2008;62(4):537-43.
73. Thompson AS, Tresserra-Rimbau A, Karavasiloglou N, Jennings A, Cantwell M, Hill C, et al. Association of Healthful Plant-based Diet Adherence With Risk of Mortality and Major Chronic Diseases Among Adults in the UK. *JAMA Network Open*. 2023;6(3):e234714-e. doi: 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2023.4714.
74. Fry A, Littlejohns TJ, Sudlow C, Doherty N, Adamska L, Sprosen T, et al. Comparison of sociodemographic and health-related characteristics of UK Biobank participants with those of the general population. *Am J Epidemiol*. 2017;186(9):1026-34.



**Table 1.** Baseline characteristics across quartiles (Q) of the healthful plant-based diet index in the UK Biobank (n=7,747)

Characteristics across hPDI	Participants, No. (%) <sup>1</sup>				
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Whole sample
<b>Number of participants</b>	1,901 (24.5)	1,829 (23.6)	1,836 (23.7)	2,181 (28.2)	7,747 (100.0)
<b>CKD cases</b>	287 (15.1)	248 (13.6)	256 (13.9)	239 (11.0)	1,030 (13.3)
<b>Deaths</b>	228 (12.0)	221 (12.1)	219 (11.9)	217 (10.0)	885 (11.4)
<b>Healthful plant-based diet index, mean (SD)</b>	49.4 (3.2)	55.2 (1.2)	59.0 (1.2)	64.7 (3.0)	57.4 (6.2)
<b>Sex-Female</b>	550 (28.9)	627 (34.3)	765 (41.7)	1,096 (50.3)	3,038 (39.2)
<b>Age at recruitment (years), mean (SD)</b>	57.5 (7.5)	58.9 (7.2)	59.3 (7.0)	59.5 (7.0)	58.8 (7.2)
<b>BMI (kg/m<sup>2</sup>), mean (SD)</b>	32.3 (6.0)	31.1 (5.9)	30.3 (5.6)	29.6 (5.6)	30.8 (5.9)
<b>Waist circumference (cm), mean (SD)</b>	105.7 (14.4)	102.6 (14.0)	99.6 (13.7)	97.1 (14.6)	101.1 (14.6)
<b>Energy intake (kJ/day), mean (SD)</b>	9312.6 (2088.0)	8481.2 (2134.0)	8089.8 (2124.8)	7634.2 (2093.3)	8354.0 (2199.7)
<b>Physical activity (MET-h/wk), mean (SD)</b>	24.2 (36.7)	27.4 (38.5)	28.7 (39.4)	31.0 (38.7)	28.0 (38.4)
<b>Ethnicity</b>					
Asian	68 (3.6)	71 (3.9)	75 (4.1)	103 (4.7)	317 (4.1)
Black	24 (1.3)	16 (0.9)	25 (1.4)	36 (1.7)	101 (1.3)
Multiple	68 (3.6)	61 (3.3)	75 (4.1)	78 (3.6)	282 (3.6)
White	1,709 (89.9)	1,646 (90.0)	1,632 (88.9)	1,923 (88.2)	6,910 (89.2)
Other/missing <sup>2</sup>	32 (1.7)	35 (1.9)	29 (1.6)	41 (1.9)	137 (1.8)
<b>Education</b>					
Low	458 (24.1)	464 (25.4)	443 (24.1)	484 (22.2)	1,849 (23.9)
Medium	382 (20.1)	349 (19.1)	307 (16.7)	372 (17.1)	1,410 (18.2)
High	764 (40.2)	741 (40.5)	798 (43.5)	1,013 (46.5)	3,316 (42.8)
Missing	297 (15.6)	275 (15.0)	288 (15.7)	312 (14.3)	1,172 (15.1)
<b>Smoking status</b>					
Never	831 (43.7)	823 (45.0)	841 (45.8)	1,063 (48.7)	3,558 (45.9)
Previous	861 (45.3)	845 (46.2)	832 (45.3)	962 (44.1)	3,500 (45.2)
Current	202 (10.6)	151 (8.3)	152 (8.3)	146 (6.7)	651 (8.4)
Missing	7 (0.4)	10 (0.6)	11 (0.6)	10 (0.5)	38 (0.5)
<b>Alcohol intake (g/day), mean (SD)</b>	16.0 (24.8)	17.1 (24.8)	15.3 (21.7)	12.2 (20.0)	15.0 (22.9)
<b>Diabetes type</b>					
Type 1 diabetes	287 (15.1)	298 (16.3)	303 (16.5)	365 (16.7)	1,253 (16.2)
Type 2 diabetes	1,317 (69.3)	1,214 (66.4)	1,238 (67.4)	1,446 (66.3)	5,215 (67.3)
Unspecified	295 (15.6)	317 (17.3)	295 (16.1)	370 (17.0)	1,279 (16.5)
<b>Hypertension</b>	1,183 (62.2)	1,116 (61.0)	1,060 (57.7)	1,193 (54.7)	4,552 (58.8)
<b>HbA1c (mmol/mol), mean (SD)</b>	52.3 (14.6)	51.2 (13.6)	50.4 (12.4)	50.4 (12.8)	51.1 (13.4)
<b>SBP (mm Hg), mean (SD)</b>	135.9 (16.4)	136.8 (16.6)	136.3 (17.0)	136.4 (17.0)	136.3 (16.8)
<b>DBP (mm Hg), mean (SD)</b>	83.2 (10.4)	80.6 (11.1)	83.6 (9.6)	83.2 (11.0)	82.6 (10.6)
<b>Multimorbidity</b>					
0 LTCs	415 (21.8)	404 (22.1)	436 (23.8)	512 (23.5)	1,767 (22.8)
1 LTC	628 (33.0)	642 (35.1)	640 (34.9)	831 (38.1)	2,741 (35.4)
2 LTCs	482 (25.4)	457 (25.0)	463 (25.2)	489 (22.4)	1,891 (24.4)
≥3 LTCs	376 (19.8)	326 (17.8)	297 (16.2)	349 (16.0)	1,348 (17.4)
<b>eGFR (mL/min/1.73 m<sup>2</sup>), mean (SD)</b>	93.0 (12.8)	91.7 (12.7)	91.9 (12.4)	92.5 (12.1)	92.3 (12.5)
<b>Protein intake (g/day), mean (SD)</b>	88.3 (25.0)	82.5 (24.4)	80.4 (24.2)	77.8 (24.0)	82.1 (24.7)
<b>hPDI food item intake, mean (SD) portions/day<sup>3</sup></b>					
<b>Healthy plant food</b>					
Whole grains	1.4 (1.5)	2.0 (1.7)	2.5 (1.8)	2.9 (1.8)	2.2 (1.8)
Fruit	1.6 (1.5)	2.0 (1.6)	2.4 (1.8)	3.1 (1.9)	2.3 (1.9)
Vegetables	1.6 (1.8)	1.9 (1.8)	2.3 (2.0)	3.3 (2.6)	2.3 (2.2)
Nuts	0.1 (0.2)	0.1 (0.3)	0.2 (0.4)	0.3 (0.5)	0.1 (0.4)
Legumes	0.3 (0.4)	0.3 (0.5)	0.4 (0.5)	0.6 (0.7)	0.4 (0.6)
Tea and coffee	3.6 (1.8)	4.0 (1.8)	4.3 (1.8)	4.7 (1.9)	4.2 (1.9)

**Unhealthy plant food**

Refined grains	2.1 (1.6)	1.4 (1.3)	1.0 (1.2)	0.5 (0.8)	1.2 (1.4)
Potatoes	1.0 (0.7)	0.8 (0.7)	0.7 (0.7)	0.6 (0.7)	0.8 (0.7)
Sugar-sweetened beverages	1.3 (1.4)	0.7 (1.1)	0.6 (1.0)	0.3 (0.8)	0.7 (1.1)
Fruit juices	0.5 (0.7)	0.4 (0.6)	0.3 (0.5)	0.2 (0.4)	0.3 (0.6)
Sweets and desserts	1.8 (1.5)	1.4 (1.4)	1.2 (1.3)	0.8 (1.0)	1.3 (1.3)

**Animal-derived food**

Animal fat	1.3 (1.5)	0.8 (1.2)	0.6 (1.2)	0.3 (0.9)	0.8 (1.3)
Dairy	1.1 (0.9)	1.0 (0.9)	0.9 (0.9)	0.9 (0.9)	1.0 (0.9)
Eggs	0.5 (0.7)	0.3 (0.6)	0.3 (0.5)	0.2 (0.5)	0.3 (0.6)
Fish or seafood	0.3 (0.6)	0.3 (0.5)	0.3 (0.5)	0.3 (0.4)	0.3 (0.5)
Meat	1.7 (1.2)	1.4 (1.1)	1.2 (0.9)	1.0 (0.9)	1.3 (1.1)
Miscellaneous animal-based foods	0.1 (0.5)	0.1 (0.3)	0.1 (0.3)	0.0 (0.2)	0.1 (0.3)

<sup>1</sup>Relative frequencies (%) include missing values which may not equate to 100%.

<sup>2</sup>Other includes any race or ethnic group not otherwise specified.

<sup>3</sup>Portion sizes were specified as a “serving” in the Oxford WebQ tool.

*Abbreviations: Q, quartile; hPDI, healthful plant-based diet index; BMI, body mass index; MET, metabolic equivalent task; SD, standard deviation; SBP, systolic blood pressure; DBP, diastolic blood pressure; LTC, long term condition; eGFR, estimated glomerular filtration rate.*

**Table 2.** Hazard ratios (95% confidence intervals) of chronic kidney disease among all individuals with diabetes across sex-specific quartiles (Q) of the healthful plant-based diet index (hPDI) and unhealthy plant-based diet index (uPDI) (n=7,747)

<b>hPDI</b>	<b>Q1</b>	<b>Q2</b>	<b>Q3</b>	<b>Q4</b>	<b>P-trend</b>
Cases/total	287/1,901	248/1,829	256/1,836	239/2,181	
HR (95% CI)					
Model 1	1.00 <sup>1</sup>	0.81 (0.68-0.96)	0.84 (0.71-0.99)	0.63 (0.53-0.76)	<0.001
Model 2	1.00 <sup>1</sup>	0.89 (0.74-1.06)	0.96 (0.80-1.15)	0.75 (0.62-0.91)	0.001
Model 3	1.00 <sup>1</sup>	0.89 (0.75-1.06)	0.97 (0.81-1.16)	0.76 (0.63-0.92)	0.002
<b>uPDI</b>	<b>Q1</b>	<b>Q2</b>	<b>Q3</b>	<b>Q4</b>	<b>P-trend</b>
Cases/total	232/1,983	308/2,295	248/1,790	242/1,679	
HR (95% CI)					
Model 1	1.00 <sup>1</sup>	1.21 (1.02-1.44)	1.30 (1.08-1.55)	1.50 (1.25-1.81)	<0.001
Model 2	1.00 <sup>1</sup>	1.21 (1.02-1.44)	1.23 (1.03-1.48)	1.40 (1.16- 1.70)	0.001
Model 3	1.00 <sup>1</sup>	1.20 (1.01-1.43)	1.20 (1.00-1.45)	1.35 (1.11- 1.65)	0.006

Model 1 adjusted for sex and education; stratified by age (3-year categories) and region.

Model 2: Model 1 plus BMI, waist circumference, ethnicity, physical activity, smoking status, alcohol intake, energy intake, multimorbidity index, townsend deprivation index, type of diabetes, diabetes medication use and number of completed dietary assessments.

Model 3: Model 2 plus total protein intake.

P-trend is for linear trend.

<sup>1</sup>Reference categories.

Abbreviations: Q, quartile; hPDI, healthful plant-based diet index; uPDI, unhealthy plant-based diet index; BMI, Body Mass Index; HR, hazard ratio; CI, confidence interval.

**Table 3.** Hazard ratios (95% confidence intervals) of chronic kidney disease across key food groups from the plant-based diet index (n=7,747)

	Food group intake quartiles				
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	P-trend
<b>Healthy Plant Food</b>					
<b>Wholegrains</b>					
Intake (servings/d) <sup>1</sup>	0 (0-0)	1 (0.1-1.5)	2.3 (1.6-3.1)	4.3 (3.1-13.0)	
Cases/total	139/995	295/2,310	341/2,515	255/1,927	
HR (95% CI) <sup>2</sup>	1.00 <sup>3</sup>	0.93 (0.75-1.14)	1.00 (0.81-1.23)	0.92 (0.74-1.14)	0.86
<b>Fruit</b>					
Intake (servings/d) <sup>1</sup>	0 (0-0)	1.0 (0.1-1.7)	2.0 (1.8-2.9)	4.0 (3.0-20.0)	
Cases/total	120/909	312/2,221	241/2,018	357/2,599	
HR (95% CI) <sup>2</sup>	1.00 <sup>3</sup>	1.05 (0.85-1.31)	0.88 (0.70-1.11)	0.95 (0.77-1.18)	0.24
<b>Vegetables</b>					
Intake (servings/d) <sup>1</sup>	0 (0-0)	1.0 (0.1-1.4)	2.0 (1.5-3.0)	4.2 (3.0-29.0)	
Cases/total	173/1,224	264/1,909	286/2,181	307/2,433	
HR (95% CI) <sup>2</sup>	1.00 <sup>3</sup>	1.07 (0.87-1.31)	1.02 (0.83-1.25)	0.96 (0.79-1.17)	0.50
<b>Nuts</b>					
Intake (servings/d) <sup>1</sup>	0 (0-0)	0.2 (0.1-0.3)	0.5 (0.3-0.7)	1.0 (0.8-9.0)	
Cases/total	826/6,095	58/432	83/635	65/585	
HR (95% CI) <sup>2</sup>	1.00 <sup>3</sup>	1.02 (0.77-1.36)	1.01 (0.80-1.27)	0.92 (0.71-1.19)	0.93
<b>Legumes</b>					
Intake (servings/d) <sup>1</sup>	0 (0-0)	0.3 (0.1-0.4)	0.5 (0.4-0.8)	1.0 (0.9-6.0)	
Cases/total	487/3,518	160/1,196	178/1,442	205/1,591	
HR (95% CI) <sup>2</sup>	1.00 <sup>3</sup>	1.04 (0.85-1.27)	0.97 (0.80-1.17)	0.93 (0.79-1.10)	0.11
<b>Tea and coffee</b>					
Intake (servings/d) <sup>1</sup>	0 (0-0)	2.5 (0.2-3.4)	4.3 (3.5-5.1)	6.0 (5.1-18.0)	
Cases/total	28/214	338/2,433	384/2,986	280/2,114	
HR (95% CI) <sup>2</sup>	1.00 <sup>3</sup>	1.04 (0.70-1.55)	0.89 (0.60-1.32)	0.85 (0.57-1.27)	0.02
<b>Unhealthy Plant Food</b>					
<b>Refined grains</b>					
Intake (servings/d) <sup>1</sup>	0 (0-0)	0.5 (0.1-0.9)	1.0 (1.0-1.9)	3.0 (2.0-11.0)	
Cases/total	284/2,151	190/1,537	247/1,956	309/2,103	
HR (95% CI) <sup>2</sup>	1.00 <sup>3</sup>	1.02 (0.83-1.25)	1.01 (0.84-1.21)	1.06 (0.89-1.26)	0.28
<b>Potatoes</b>					
Intake (servings/d) <sup>1</sup>	0 (0-0)	0.5 (0.1-0.8)	1.0 (0.8-1.2)	1.8 (1.2-5.0)	
Cases/total	229/1,773	280/2,253	300/2,231	221/1,490	
HR (95% CI) <sup>2</sup>	1.00 <sup>3</sup>	1.01 (0.83-1.23)	1.02 (0.85-1.22)	1.10 (0.90-1.35)	0.45
<b>Sugar-sweetened beverages</b>					
Intake (servings/d) <sup>1</sup>	0 (0-0)	0.5 (0.1-0.7)	1.0 (0.8-1.4)	2.0 (1.5-11.0)	
Cases/total	486/3,899	158/1,183	166/1,212	220/1,453	
HR (95% CI) <sup>2</sup>	1.00 <sup>3</sup>	1.09 (0.90-1.31)	1.10 (0.92-1.31)	1.24 (1.05-1.47)	0.04
<b>Fruit juices</b>					
Intake (servings/d) <sup>1</sup>	0 (0-0)	0.3 (0.1-0.4)	0.5 (0.5-0.9)	1.0 (1.0-7.0)	
Cases/total	626/4,477	70/692	164/1,299	170/1,279	
HR (95% CI) <sup>2</sup>	1.00 <sup>3</sup>	0.74 (0.57-0.95)	0.94 (0.79-1.12)	0.97 (0.82-1.15)	0.48
<b>Sweets and desserts</b>					
Intake (servings/d) <sup>1</sup>	0 (0-0)	0.5 (0.1-1.0)	1.1 (1.0-2.0)	2.8 (2.0-11.0)	
Cases/total	231/1,900	172/1,506	279/2,057	348/2,284	

HR (95% CI) <sup>2</sup>	1.00 <sup>3</sup>	0.96 (0.77-1.18)	1.09 (0.90-1.32)	1.14 (0.95-1.38)	0.28
<b>Animal-Derived Food</b>					
<b>Animal fat</b>					
Intake (servings/d) <sup>1</sup>	0 (0-0)	0.8 (0.1-1.2)	2.0 (1.3-2.3)	3.0 (2.3-10.0)	
Cases/total	604/4,738	132/1,097	142/1,027	152/885	
HR (95% CI) <sup>2</sup>	1.00 <sup>3</sup>	1.01 (0.83-1.23)	0.96 (0.80-1.16)	1.11 (0.92-1.34)	0.30
<b>Dairy</b>					
Intake (servings/d) <sup>1</sup>	0 (0-0)	0.5 (0.1-0.8)	1.0 (0.8-1.4)	2.0 (1.5-11.0)	
Cases/total	228/1,615	232/1,793	296/2,231	274/2,108	
HR (95% CI) <sup>2</sup>	1.00 <sup>3</sup>	0.91 (0.75-1.11)	0.89 (0.75-1.07)	0.91 (0.75-1.09)	0.94
<b>Eggs</b>					
Intake (servings/d) <sup>1</sup>	0 (0-0)	0.4 (0.1-0.5)	1.0 (0.6-1.0)	2.0 (1.1-6.0)	
Cases/total	641/4,894	135/1,071	178/1,218	76/564	
HR (95% CI) <sup>2</sup>	1.00 <sup>3</sup>	0.98 (0.80-1.20)	1.09 (0.91-1.29)	0.86 (0.67-1.10)	0.80
<b>Fish and seafood</b>					
Intake (servings/d) <sup>1</sup>	0 (0-0)	0.3 (0.1-0.4)	0.5 (0.4-0.8)	1.0 (0.8-6.0)	
Cases/total	628/4,496	92/877	143/1,109	167/1,265	
HR (95% CI) <sup>2</sup>	1.00 <sup>3</sup>	0.77 (0.60-0.98)	0.96 (0.79-1.17)	0.99 (0.83-1.19)	0.79
<b>Meat</b>					
Intake (servings/d) <sup>1</sup>	0 (0-0)	0.5 (0.1-0.9)	1.0 (1.0-1.7)	2.2 (1.8-11.0)	
Cases/total	161/1,213	142/1,243	405/3,090	322/2,201	
HR (95% CI) <sup>2</sup>	1.00 <sup>3</sup>	0.96 (0.75-1.22)	1.05 (0.86-1.28)	1.18 (0.94-1.47)	0.02
<b>Miscellaneous animal-based foods</b>					
Intake (servings/d) <sup>1</sup>	0 (0-0)	0.3 (0.1-0.4)	0.5 (0.5-0.8)	1.3 (1.0-4.0)	
Cases/total	959/7,104	24/190	18/186	29/267	
HR (95% CI) <sup>2</sup>	1.00 <sup>3</sup>	1.04 (0.69-1.59)	0.84 (0.53-1.35)	0.95 (0.65-1.39)	0.71

<sup>1</sup>Intake values are median (range) and portion sizes were specified as a “serving” in the Oxford WebQ tool.

<sup>2</sup>Hazard Ratios with 95% Confidence Intervals (CI) adjusted for sex, education, BMI, waist circumference, ethnicity, physical activity, smoking status, alcohol intake, energy intake, multimorbidity index, townsend deprivation index, type of diabetes, diabetes medication use, number of completed dietary assessments, and total protein intake; stratified by age (3-year categories) and region.

<sup>3</sup>Reference categories.

P-trend is for linear trend.

Abbreviations: *Q*, quartile; *BMI*, Body Mass Index; *HR*, hazard ratio; *CI*, confidence interval.

**Table 4.** Mediation analysis between healthful plant-based diet score and chronic kidney disease

	Healthful Plant-Based Diet Index Score (1-point increments)							
	Participants, No.	Total effect (HR; 95% CI) <sup>1</sup>	<i>P</i> -value	Direct effect (HR; 95% CI) <sup>1</sup>	<i>P</i> -value	Natural indirect effect (HR; 95% CI) <sup>1</sup>	<i>P</i> -value	Proportion mediated (Log(NIE) / (Log(NIE)+log(NDE) )
<b>Potential mediators<sup>2</sup></b>								
<b>Obesity and lipid metabolism</b>								
BMI	4,756	0.982 [0.968-0.997]	0.022	0.984 [0.969-0.999]	0.037	0.999 [0.997-1.000]	0.070	6%
Waist circumference	4,756	0.980 [0.965-0.995]	0.008	0.985 [0.970-1.000]	0.047	0.995 [0.993-0.997]	<0.001	25%
LDL Cholesterol	4,744	0.983 [0.968-0.998]	0.029	0.983 [0.969-0.999]	0.032	1.000 [0.999-1.000]	0.362	NA
HDL Cholesterol	4,361	0.982 [0.966-0.997]	0.022	0.982 [0.967-0.998]	0.030	0.999 [0.998-1.000]	0.066	5%
Triglycerides	4,753	0.983 [0.968-0.998]	0.030	0.984 [0.969-0.999]	0.037	0.999 [0.999-1.000]	0.079	6%
Lipoprotein A	3,639	0.979 [0.962-0.996]	0.015	0.979 [0.962-0.996]	0.016	1.000 [0.999-1.000]	0.579	NA
Apolipoprotein A	4,351	0.981 [0.966-0.997]	0.021	0.982 [0.966-0.997]	0.023	1.000 [0.999-1.000]	0.334	NA
<b>Kidney function</b>								
eGFR	4,756	0.983 [0.967-0.999]	0.034	0.987 [0.972-1.003]	0.105	0.996 [0.993-0.999]	0.007	23%
Cystatin C	4,754	0.982 [0.967-0.998]	0.032	0.991 [0.975-1.007]	0.255	0.992 [0.988-0.995]	<0.001	47%
Urate	4,748	0.982 [0.967-0.998]	0.025	0.984 [0.969-0.999]	0.038	0.999 [0.997-1.000]	0.106	6%
Creatinine	4,756	0.982 [0.967-0.998]	0.027	0.989 [0.973-1.004]	0.154	0.993 [0.990-0.997]	<0.001	39%
Nephrolithiasis	4,756	0.983 [0.968-0.998]	0.030	0.983 [0.968-0.998]	0.029	1.000 [0.999-1.000]	0.962	NA
<b>Hypertension</b>								
Prevalent hypertension	4,756	0.983 [0.967-1.000]	0.045	0.983 [0.969-0.998]	0.030	1.000 [0.994-1.006]	0.999	NA
Systolic blood pressure	4,601	0.982 [0.967-0.997]	0.019	0.982 [0.967-0.997]	0.018	1.000 [0.999-1.001]	0.655	NA

Inflammatory biomarkers								
C-reactive protein	4,746	0.983 [0.968-0.998]	0.029	0.984 [0.969-0.999]	0.033	1.000 [0.999-1.000]	0.551	NA
<p><sup>1</sup>Hazard Ratios with 95% Confidence Intervals (CI) for healthful plant-based diet score (1-point increments), adjusted for sex, BMI (excluding when considered as a potential mediator), waist circumference (excluding when considered as a potential mediator), ethnicity, physical activity, smoking status, education, alcohol intake, energy intake, multimorbidity index, Townsend deprivation index, type of diabetes, diabetes medication use, number of completed dietary assessments, and total protein intake; stratified by age (3-year categories) and region.</p> <p><sup>2</sup>Potential mediators are modelled on the continuous scale (excluding prevalent nephrolithiasis and prevalent hypertension which are binary).</p> <p>Abbreviations: <i>HR</i>, hazard ratios; <i>CI</i>, confidence intervals; <i>BMI</i>, body mass index; <i>eGFR</i>, estimated glomerular filtration rate; <i>NIE</i>, natural indirect effect; <i>NDE</i>, natural direct effect.</p>								