

## Title Page

**Title:** Relationship between adherence to the 2019 Canada's Food Guide recommendations on healthy food choices and nutrient intakes in older adults

### Author names:

Brassard, Didier (1)

Chevalier, Stéphanie (1, 2)

### Affiliations:

- 1) School of Human Nutrition, McGill University, Québec, Canada
- 2) Research Institute of the McGill University Health Centre, McGill University, Québec, Canada

**Sources of support:** This research received no external funding.

**Conflict of Interest and Funding Disclosure:** DB was a casual employee of Health Canada (2019-2020), held a doctoral training award from the *Fonds de recherche du Québec – Santé* (2019-2021) and holds a Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR) Fellowship award (MFE-181852). SC receives research funding from the CIHR, Dairy Farmers of Canada and the Canadian Foundation for Dietetics Research. None of these agencies has funded nor was involved in this work. DB and SC have no conflicts of interest.

### Corresponding author:

Stéphanie Chevalier, PhD,

School of Human Nutrition, McGill University

21111 Lakeshore Rd, Sainte-Anne-de-Bellevue, QC H9X 3V9

Tel : 514-398-8603

Email: [stephanie.chevalier@mcgill.ca](mailto:stephanie.chevalier@mcgill.ca)

**Running title:** Nutrient adequacy of older adults adhering to CFG

**Abbreviations list:** CCHS: Canadian Community Health Survey; CFG: Canada's Food Guide; DRI, Dietary Reference Intake; HEFI-2019: Healthy Eating Food Index-2019; NCI: National Cancer Institute.

1 **Abstract**

2 **Background:** Following Canada's food guide (CFG) recommendations should ensure adequate  
3 nutrient intakes. Older adults have increased needs for certain nutrients and nutrient density; the  
4 extent to which adherence to CFG recommendations can help reduce inadequate nutrient intakes is  
5 unknown.

6 **Objective:** Our aim was to assess the relationship between adherence to CFG recommendations on  
7 healthy food choices and intake of key nutrients in adults 65 years and older from the Canadian  
8 Community Health Survey (CCHS) 2015 - Nutrition.

9 **Methods:** Secondary analysis of data from 4,093 older adults of the CCHS 2015 - Nutrition (mean  
10 age, 73.6 years, 54% females). Dietary intakes were measured using an interviewer-administered  
11 24-hour dietary recall including one repeat in a subsample (42%). The National Cancer Institute  
12 multivariate method was used to estimate usual (i.e., long-term) dietary intakes. Adherence to CFG  
13 recommendations was measured using the Healthy Eating Food Index (HEFI)-2019 score. Simple  
14 linear and logistic regression models estimated the effect of increased HEFI-2019 score on usual  
15 nutrient intakes and the prevalence of inadequate nutrient intakes (i.e., below the estimated  
16 average requirements), respectively.

17 **Results:** Compared with the prevalence of inadequate intakes at median HEFI-2019 score (46.4/80  
18 points), a higher HEFI-2019 (+11 points) was associated with reductions in the prevalence of  
19 inadequate intakes of magnesium, vitamin B6, and protein (-19.8% [95%CI: -30.8, -8.9], -12.7%  
20 [95%CI: -22.5, -3.0], and -4.7% [95%CI: -9.4, -0.1], respectively). In contrast, data for higher HEFI-  
21 2019 scores were compatible with increased prevalence of inadequate intakes of folate, vitamin D,  
22 and calcium (4.0% [95%CI: -8.4, 16.3], 2.6% [95%CI: 1.1, 4.0], and 2.3% [95%CI: -3.0, 7.5],  
23 respectively).

24 **Conclusions:** Based on dietary intakes of Canadian older adults in 2015, increasing the degree of  
25 adherence to CFG recommendations on healthy food choices may reduce nutrient intake  
26 inadequacy for most key nutrients except folate, vitamin D and calcium.

27

28 **Keywords:** older adults, 24-hour dietary recalls; CFG; HEFI-2019; Canada's Food Guide; dietary  
29 guidelines; healthy eating food index; Canadian Community Health Survey; CCHS.

30

## 31 Introduction

32 Previous editions of the Canada's Food Guide (CFG) informed on food choices to prevent  
33 malnutrition as the primary goal. Recommendations of the CFG-2007 were expressed in terms of  
34 number of servings to consume every day for the broad categories of foods: Vegetables and fruits,  
35 Grains, Dairy and Alternatives, and Meat and Alternatives (1, 2). The CFG-2007 recommended daily  
36 servings based on comprehensive diet simulations, thus ensuring that Dietary Reference Intakes  
37 (DRI) were met (2). The latest CFG (2019) adopted a different approach and primarily aims at  
38 chronic disease risk reduction (3-6). In addition, recommendations in CFG-2019 (e.g., "eat more  
39 often ...") are more flexible than those of CFG-2007 and rely on proportions of food categories to  
40 constitute a healthy plate, without recommended quantitative daily servings.

41  
42 The release of the CFG-2019 elicited positive reactions (7, 8), but also raised concerns on nutrient  
43 adequacy. For example, preliminary modeling of eating patterns consistent with the CFG-2019 plate  
44 snapshot revealed that adherence may be insufficient to meet calcium and vitamin D requirements  
45 (9). The ability of consumers and policymakers to properly implement CFG-2019 recommendations  
46 on protein foods was also found unclear (10). In the Canadian Community Health Survey (CCHS)  
47 2015 – Nutrition, animal-based protein foods contributed more than two thirds of total protein  
48 intake (11) as well as to overall nutrient intakes (12), which contrasts with CFG-2019  
49 recommendations aiming at increasing intake of plant-based foods. Accordingly, following CFG-  
50 2019 recommendations while failing to include nutrient-dense foods and beverages could amplify  
51 the proportion of the population with inadequate nutrient intakes, especially for certain age groups  
52 at higher risk. In that regard, maintaining adequate nutrient intakes is a challenge for older adults  
53 (13, 14). Older adults face social (e.g., loneliness, inability to buy or prepare foods) and  
54 physiological (e.g., changes in taste, loss of appetite, malabsorption) barriers to consuming a  
55 nutrient-dense diet (14). Notably, calcium, vitamin D, fibre, potassium and protein were identified  
56 as nutrients of concern among older adults in the United States 2015 Dietary Guidelines report  
57 (15). Similarly, a high proportion of long-term care residents in Canada had inadequate calcium,  
58 folate, vitamin B6 and magnesium intakes (16). In sum, the one-size-fits-all recommendations in  
59 CFG-2019 may not be well-suited for older adults who face unique challenges to healthy eating  
60 compared with other strata of the population.

61  
62 Whether adherence to CFG-2019 recommendations on healthy food choices fulfils nutritional needs  
63 of older Canadians is currently unknown; no evidence from contemporary eating patterns exists.  
64 The general aim of this study was therefore to assess the relationship between adherence to CFG-  
65 2019 recommendations, using the Healthy Eating Food Index-2019 (HEFI-2019), and intakes of  
66 key nutrients from food sources only, of adults aged  $\geq 65$  years from the CCHS 2015 – Nutrition. The  
67 HEFI-2019 score is a metric measuring the alignment of eating patterns with CFG-2019  
68 recommendations on food choices (17, 18). More precisely, we assessed 1) the continuous  
69 relationship between the HEFI-2019 score and nutrient intakes, and 2) the estimated change in the  
70 prevalence of nutrient inadequacy according to a hypothetical increase in HEFI-2019 score. We

71 hypothesized that higher adherence to CFG-2019 recommendations would show an inverse  
72 relationship with intakes of nutrients more commonly found or eaten in animal-based foods, such  
73 as protein, calcium, vitamin D, iron, zinc, vitamin B6 and B12, and a positive relationship with  
74 intakes of nutrients more commonly found in plant-based foods such as fibre, folate, magnesium,  
75 potassium, vitamin A.

## 76 **Methods**

### 77 **Study design and participants**

78 This study is based on a sample of older adults aged 65 years or older from the CCHS 2015 –  
79 Nutrition (19). The CCHS 2015 -Nutrition is a nationally representative survey of individuals aged 1  
80 year and older living in private dwellings in the 10 Canadian provinces. Full-time members of the  
81 Canadian Forces and individuals living in the Territories, on reserves, in remote areas, and in  
82 institutions were not included. Data collection occurred between January 1st to December 31, 2015.  
83 Respondents aged less than 65 years (n=16,394) and those reporting zero energy on their first 24-  
84 hour dietary recall intake were excluded (n=4), yielding a final sample of 4,089 respondents. The  
85 public use microdata file (PUMF) of CCHS 2015 – Nutrition was obtained from Statistics Canada.

### 86 **Data collection and dietary assessment**

87 Interviewer-administered 24-hour dietary recalls were used to assess dietary intakes. The  
88 interviews were mostly (98%) conducted in person for the first 24-hour recall and by telephone for  
89 the second 24-hour recall. All 24-hour recall interviews were structured according to the  
90 Automated Multiple Pass Method (19). Portion size estimation of foods and beverages in plates,  
91 bowls, glasses and mugs was facilitated using a food booklet designed for the survey (19). All  
92 respondents completed one 24-hour recall and a subsample of 1,706 respondents (42%) completed  
93 a second 24-hour recall. Nutrient intakes were calculated based on the Canadian Nutrient File 2015  
94 (20), except for intakes of free sugars which were recently published by Health Canada (21). Total  
95 food intakes expressed in reference amounts (RA) (22) were calculated for each respondent, 24-  
96 hour dietary recall and HEFI-2019 food and beverage categories. The interviewers measured body  
97 weight of respondents with a standard scale (LifeSource Scales Model US-321).

98

### 99 ***The Healthy Eating Food Index (HEFI) 2019***

100 The HEFI-2019 is a continuous score which measures the degree of adherence between dietary  
101 intakes and Canada's Food Guide 2019 recommendations on healthy food choices. Complete details  
102 about the development and the evaluation of the HEFI-2019 are available elsewhere (17, 18).  
103 Briefly, the HEFI-2019 has 10 components including 5 based on intake of foods (*Vegetables and*  
104 *fruits, Whole-grain foods, Grain foods ratio, Protein foods, Plant-based protein foods*), 1 on beverages  
105 (*Beverages*), and 4 on nutrients (*Fatty acids ratio, Saturated fats, Free sugars, and Sodium*). The  
106 *Saturated fats, Free sugars and Sodium* components are so-called “moderation” components, for  
107 which higher scores are attributed to intakes below thresholds consistent with CFG-2019  
108 recommendations. The remaining components are “adequacy” components for which higher scores  
109 are attributed to greater intakes. Details about each component and scoring standards are  
110 presented in **Supplemental Table 1**. The total HEFI-2019 score sums up to 80 points with higher  
111 scores indicating greater adherence to recommendations. The HEFI-2019 was evaluated using  
112 dietary intake data from the CCHS 2015 – Nutrition (18). Notably, the variability of the HEFI-2019  
113 score was sufficient, the HEFI-2019 score was correlated with the Healthy Eating Index (HEI)-2015  
114 ( $r=0.79$ ) and differences of HEFI-2019 score were found among subgroups with known diet quality

115 differences based on sex, age, and smoking status (18). Finally, a prospective analysis of UK  
116 Biobank data suggested that a hypothetical increase in HEFI-2019 score reduces the 11-year risk of  
117 cardiovascular disease in middle-aged and older adults (6).

118

### 119 ***Nutrient intakes***

120 Key nutrients for older adults were selected *a priori* according to data availability in the CCHS 2015  
121 – Nutrition as well as previous literature (13, 23). The nutrients were protein, calcium, vitamin D,  
122 iron, zinc, vitamin B6, vitamin B12, dietary folate equivalent (folate hereafter), magnesium,  
123 potassium, fibre, and retinol activity equivalent (vitamin A hereafter). Nutrient intakes from  
124 supplements were not included since Canada’s Food Guide recommendations on healthy food  
125 choices focus on foods and beverages. The proportion of respondents with inadequate intakes was  
126 estimated using the cut-point method and the Estimated Average Requirements (EAR) of the  
127 Dietary Reference Intake (24). Because there is no EAR for potassium and fibre, the prevalence of  
128 intake inadequacy cannot be assessed. Instead, the proportion of respondents with intakes above  
129 the adequate intake (AI) value was considered.

130 Recognizing the consensus that recommended protein intakes for older adults should be higher  
131 than current recommendations (25-27), we also estimated the proportion of respondents with  
132 inadequate protein intakes at cut-offs higher than the current EAR. The hypothetical EAR cut-offs of  
133 0.8 and 1.0 grams of protein per kg of bodyweight were selected to reflect hypothetical higher  
134 recommended daily allowance (RDA) of 1.0 and 1.2 g/kg, respectively. The latter analysis was not  
135 pre-specified and is considered exploratory.

136

### 137 **Statistical analyses**

138 Sampling weights provided by Statistics Canada were used in all analyses to reflect the Canadian  
139 population of older adults in 2015 as well as bootstrap replicate weights for variance estimation.  
140 The sampling weights accounting for missing data on body weight were also used where  
141 appropriate. Analyses were performed in SAS Studio v3.8 (SAS Institute) and R v4.2.2 (R  
142 Foundation for Statistical Computing).

143 To assess the relationship between the HEFI-2019 score and nutrient intakes, analyses involved  
144 four steps, detailed below: 1) measurement error correction of dietary intakes to estimate usual  
145 intakes using the National Cancer Institute (NCI) Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) multivariate  
146 method; 2) linear regression of continuous nutrient intakes on total HEFI-2019 scores; 3) logistic  
147 regression of the proportion of individuals below EAR on total HEFI-2019 scores; and 4) variance  
148 estimation using bootstrap replicate weights provided by Statistics Canada.

149 First, the 24-hour dietary recalls are mainly affected by within-individual random errors, which  
150 require correction to estimate distribution of intakes (28, 29). To account for correlated random  
151 errors of all dietary constituents of the HEFI-2019 (e.g., vegetables and fruits, free sugars) and those

152 of nutrient intakes (e.g., protein), the NCI MCMC multivariate method was used  
153 (MULTIVAR\_MCMC\_MACRO\_V2.1 and MULTIVAR\_DISTRIB\_MACRO\_V2.1, 2017) (30, 31). Briefly,  
154 the multivariate method uses Monte Carlo simulation to estimate distribution of usual intakes (i.e.,  
155 long-term average) of multiple dietary constituents correlated with each other. The multivariate  
156 method also accounts for systematic differences due to “nuisance” factors (day of the week,  
157 sequence of recall) and considers foods that are episodically consumed (e.g., plant-based protein  
158 foods) (30).

159 Nutrients with common food sources were modelled together to have parsimonious measurement  
160 error correction models, yielding 5 different models each combining 1 to 4 nutrients with the 15  
161 dietary constituents of the HEFI-2019 (see below). Model 1 included protein only; model 2 included  
162 calcium and vitamin D; model 3 included iron, zinc, vitamin B6 and vitamin B12; model 4 included  
163 folate, magnesium, potassium and fibre; model 5 included vitamin A only. The 15 dietary  
164 constituents of the HEFI-2019 were vegetables and fruits, whole-grain foods, animal-based protein  
165 foods, plant-based protein foods, unsweetened milk, water and other healthy beverages (e.g.,  
166 unsweetened coffee or tea), refined grain foods, “other” foods not recommended, “other” beverages  
167 not recommended (i.e., sugary drinks, artificially sweetened beverages, vegetable and fruit juices,  
168 sweetened milk and plant-based beverages, alcohol), free sugars, monounsaturated fats,  
169 polyunsaturated fats, saturated fats, sodium and total energy intake. A total of 5 food and beverage  
170 categories (i.e., whole-grain foods, refined grain foods, plant-based protein foods, “other” beverages  
171 not recommended and unsweetened milk) were considered episodically consumed since at least  
172 10% of respondents reported zero consumption on the first 24-h recall (31). All the remaining  
173 foods and nutrients were considered as consumed daily.

174 The measurement error correction models were stratified by sex to reflect sex-specific random  
175 variations in dietary intakes and to derive sex-specific associations (31, 32). The models also  
176 included the covariates age (indicator for 71 years or older), sequence of recall (indicator for  
177 second recall) and weekend (indicator for a 24-hour recall of intakes on Friday, Saturday or  
178 Sunday). In addition, the model for protein intake also included body weight (kg) as a covariate to  
179 derive protein intake per kg and assess the proportion of individuals below the EAR. A total of 500  
180 pseudo-individuals were generated in the Monte Carlo simulation step of the NCI multivariate  
181 method. Simulations from each stratum (i.e., males and females) were pooled together. The HEFI-  
182 2019 scoring algorithm was then applied using the modelled dietary constituents among the 500  
183 pseudo-individuals to derive HEFI-2019 scores. Descriptive statistics were calculated based on  
184 usual intakes among the 500 pseudo-individuals including the prevalence of intake inadequacy,  
185 mean (SD) dietary intakes and HEFI-2019 scores as well as correlations between dietary  
186 constituents of the HEFI-2019 and nutrient intakes.

187 Second, based on the Monte Carlo simulation data, simple linear regression models were used to  
188 assess the relationship between the continuous HEFI-2019 score, as the independent variable, and  
189 continuous nutrient intakes, as the dependent variable. A restricted cubic spline transformation  
190 with 5 knots (percentiles 5, 27, 50, 73 and 95) was applied *a priori* to the HEFI-2019 score to assess  
191 potential non-linearity (33). To estimate change according to feasible increases in adherence,  
192 expected nutrient intake differences were calculated according to an increase in HEFI-2019 score



193 from the median score to the 90<sup>th</sup> percentile of the usual intake distribution. In other words, we  
194 estimated nutrient intake difference according to a hypothetical change where respondents would  
195 have had high HEFI-2019 scores compared with the HEFI-2019 score respondents had on average,  
196 taken as the median of this sample.

197 Third, also based on the Monte Carlo simulation data, logistic regression models were used to  
198 assess the odds of having nutrient intake below the age- and sex-specific EAR and the continuous  
199 HEFI-2019 score. A restricted cubic spline transformation was also applied to the HEFI-2019 score.  
200 Predicted odds of nutrient intake inadequacy were generated for the 90<sup>th</sup> percentile and the  
201 median. Both predicted odds were then re-expressed as risk of inadequacy ( $risk = \frac{e^X}{1+e^X}$ , where  $X$   
202 corresponds to predicted odds at a given HEFI-2019 score percentile). The expected change in the  
203 prevalence of inadequate nutrient intakes, i.e., risk difference, was calculated by the difference  
204 between the estimated risk of inadequacy at the 90<sup>th</sup> percentile vs. the median HEFI-2019 score.

205 Fourth, steps 1 to 3 were repeated 500 times using bootstrap replicate weights to generate  
206 standard errors and 95% CI via normal approximation. The convergence of bootstrap standard  
207 errors and the normality of bootstrap estimates were confirmed graphically. Data from one  
208 bootstrap replicate was removed for potassium due to non-convergence.

209

## 210 Results

### 211 HEFI-2019 score and dietary constituents

212 The mean (SD) HEFI-2019 score among all adults 65 years and older was 46.0 (8.9) (/80 points).  
213 Among age and sex subgroups, the mean HEFI-2019 score was the highest in females, 65 to 70  
214 years (48.2 points) and the lowest in males, 65 to 70 years (44.9 points; **Figure 1**).

215 **Supplemental Table 2 and 3** present, respectively, usual mean intakes and percentile of the  
216 distribution of foods and beverages, as well as nutrients, contributing to the HEFI-2019 score. Older  
217 adults consumed approximately 84% of their total protein foods from animal-based source and  
218 65% of their total grain foods intake as non-whole grain foods.

219 **Supplemental Figure 1** presents Pearson correlations between food and beverage categories  
220 contributing to the HEFI-2019 score and key nutrients. Most food and beverage categories  
221 recommended in CFG 2019 were correlated with greater nutrient intakes. Notably, the highest  
222 correlations were observed between milk and calcium ( $r=0.56$ ), milk and vitamin D ( $r=0.54$ ),  
223 vegetables and fruits and fibre ( $r=0.54$ ) as well as whole-grain foods and fibre ( $r=0.54$ ). Among  
224 foods and beverages not recommended in CFG, non-whole grain foods was the only group showing  
225 positive correlations with nutrient intakes including with folate ( $r=0.16$ ) and with vitamin D  
226 ( $r=0.12$ ).

### 227 Prevalence of inadequate nutrient intake

228 The prevalence of inadequate nutrient intakes ranged from 1% (iron) to 96% (vitamin D; **Figure 2**).  
229 The prevalence of inadequate intakes was high for vitamin D, calcium, magnesium (96%, 83%, 64%,  
230 respectively), and moderately high for vitamin B6, vitamin A, folate and zinc (38%, 36%, 30%, 28%,  
231 respectively); **Figure 1**. Results were similar for most nutrients when stratified by DRI age and sex  
232 group (**Supplemental Table 4**).

233

### 234 Relationship between HEFI-2019 score and nutrient intakes

235 Relationships between the HEFI-2019 score and nutrient intakes are illustrated in **Figure 3**.  
236 Respondents with higher HEFI-2019 score had higher intakes of fibre, magnesium, vitamin B6,  
237 potassium, and protein, but lower intakes of vitamin D, vitamin B12, dietary folate equivalent, and  
238 iron. The associations between the HEFI-2019 score and intakes of vitamin A, calcium, and zinc  
239 were weak or null. **Table 1** presents the expected differences in nutrient intakes associated with an  
240 increase in HEFI-2019 score to the 90<sup>th</sup> percentile of the score distribution compared with median  
241 HEFI-2019 score. For example, increasing HEFI-2019 from the median to the 90<sup>th</sup> percentile of the  
242 score distribution was associated with a 3.4 g/day higher fiber intake (95%CI: 2.0, 4.8; **Table 1**). In  
243 contrast, the same HEFI-2019 score increase was associated with a 0.5 µg/day lower vitamin D  
244 intake (95%CI: -1.0, 0.0; **Table 1**).

245

## 246 **Relationship between the HEFI-2019 score and nutrient intake inadequacy**

### 247 **Inadequate nutrient intakes**

248 **Figure 4** presents the prevalence and the difference in the prevalence of inadequate nutrient intake  
249 according to the HEFI-2019 score. An increase of HEFI-2019 score to the 90<sup>th</sup> percentile of the score  
250 distribution compared with median HEFI-2019 score was associated with reduction of 20, 13, and 5  
251 percentage points in the prevalence of inadequate nutrient intakes for magnesium, vitamin B6, and  
252 protein, respectively. Inversely, the same HEFI-2019 score increase was associated with a minor  
253 increase in the prevalence of inadequate vitamin D intakes (prevalence difference, +2.6%; 95%CI:  
254 1.1, 4.0%). The prevalence of inadequate iron intake was 0% and thus unaffected by hypothetical  
255 HEFI-2019 score change. For vitamin A, zinc, vitamin B12, calcium and folate, the 95%CI were wide  
256 and compatible with both increase and decrease in the prevalence of inadequate intakes (Figure 3).

257

### 258 ***Hypothetical higher Estimated Average Requirements for protein***

259 Compared with the median HEFI-2019 score, scores at the 90<sup>th</sup> percentile decreased the proportion  
260 of respondents with protein intakes below hypothetical EAR of 0.8 g/kg/day and 1.0 g/kg/day  
261 (**Supplemental Figure 2**). For 0.8 g/kg/day, the prevalence of inadequacy decreased from 29.3%  
262 to 18.5% (prevalence difference: -10.8; 95%CI: -20.0, -1.6). For 1.0 g/kg/day, the prevalence  
263 decreased from 64.7% to 50.8% (prevalence difference: -13.9; 95%CI: -25.0, -2.8).

264

### 265 **Adequate intakes for fibre and potassium**

266 Compared with the median HEFI-2019 score, score at the 90<sup>th</sup> percentile increased the proportion  
267 of respondents with intakes above the adequate intake for both fibre and potassium. For fibre, the  
268 prevalence increased from 6.5% to 20.5% (prevalence difference: +14.1; 95%CI: 5.1, 23.0). For  
269 potassium, the prevalence increased from 25.1% to 36.8% (prevalence difference: +11.7; 95%CI:  
270 2.2, 21.1).

271

## 272 Discussion

273 The objective of this study was to describe the relationship between adherence to CFG-2019  
274 recommendations on healthy food choices, measured using the HEFI-2019, and nutrient intakes  
275 from food sources in adults 65 years and older from Canada in 2015. We found that higher  
276 adherence was associated with higher intakes of fibre, magnesium, vitamin B6, potassium and  
277 protein. Had respondents had a higher adherence, we estimated that the prevalence of nutrient  
278 inadequacy from foods and beverages for magnesium, vitamin B6 and protein would have been  
279 20%, 13% and 5% lower, respectively. However, a higher adherence was not associated with higher  
280 intakes of calcium, zinc, iron, folate, vitamin B12 and vitamin D. In turn, we estimated that the high  
281 prevalence of calcium inadequacy would not have changed and that of food-based vitamin D would  
282 have been 3% higher in 2015. Overall, these results indicate that CFG-2019 recommendations are  
283 insufficient to mitigate nutrient intake inadequacy for certain key nutrients based on the eating  
284 patterns of adults aged 65 years or more from Canada in 2015. These findings partially confirm our  
285 hypothesis that nutrients typically found in animal-based foods (e.g., iron, vitamin B12, calcium,  
286 vitamin D) were inversely associated with adherence to CFG.

287

288 Few studies have examined nutrient intake inadequacy according to adherence to the CFG-2019  
289 recommendations. Barr (9) assessed the probability of intake inadequacy upon adherence to an  
290 eating pattern consistent with foods depicted in the CFG-2019 plate snapshot. The probability of  
291 inadequacy was near 100% for calcium and vitamin D for males and females aged 71 years or more.  
292 This result is consistent with findings in the present study, where a higher adherence to  
293 recommendations on healthy food choices was insufficient to mitigate the prevalence of inadequacy  
294 for calcium and vitamin D. The lack of specific recommendations regarding dairy foods and  
295 alternatives in CFG-2019, and consequently the absence of points in the HEFI-2019, may partly  
296 explain these findings. Among food and beverage categories contributing to the HEFI-2019,  
297 unsweetened milk had the highest correlation with intakes of calcium ( $r=0.56$ ) and vitamin D  
298 ( $r=0.53$ ; Supplemental Figure 1). Indeed, the main food source of calcium and vitamin D in  
299 Canadians' diet was the "Milk & Alternatives" food group in 2015 (34-36). Of note, the prevalence of  
300 inadequacy for vitamin D was very high in this sample (>95%), supporting the notion that meeting  
301 vitamin D recommendations through foods alone is an important challenge (36). Similarly, data  
302 from the CCHS indicate that calcium intake inadequacy in supplement non-users increased from  
303 58% to 68% between 2004 and 2015, respectively (35). All in all, higher adherence to CFG-2019  
304 recommendations on food choices was insufficient to mitigate the high prevalence of inadequate  
305 calcium and vitamin D intakes. Thus, meeting calcium and vitamin D needs would require  
306 additional strategies such as specific recommendations in CFG in addition to supplementation or  
307 food fortification.

308

309 A review by Fernandez et al. highlighted potential gaps in the application of CFG-2019  
310 recommendations, notably whether the CFG-2019 permitted the adequate consumption of  
311 nutrient-rich protein foods or not (10). Our results revealed that a higher adherence to CFG-2019

312 recommendations slightly reduced the low proportion of older adults with intakes below the  
313 current EAR (0.66 g/kg) and reduced by 11% and 14% the proportion of those below the  
314 hypothetical EAR of 0.8 g/kg and 1.0 g/kg. Notwithstanding, the prevalence of inadequacy for the  
315 hypothetical EAR would remain considerable, with 25% and 50% inadequate protein intakes,  
316 respectively, thus representing an additional risk factor for sarcopenia (26). Furthermore, these  
317 findings only reflect the total daily protein intake and the impact on overall protein food quality or  
318 distribution during the day is unknown. Future studies should investigate the relationship between  
319 higher adherence to CFG-2019 and overall protein food quality and should examine how to increase  
320 consumption of high-quality plant-based protein foods. In that regard, a qualitative study among  
321 older adults highlighted that health benefits and food preparation skills would facilitate  
322 consumption of plant-based protein foods (37). Increasing consumption of unsweetened soy  
323 beverage (currently zero in the present study) or unsweetened milk (mean intake of 125 ml/d;  
324 Supplemental Table 2) could also contribute to higher intake of high-quality protein. Finally, we  
325 stress that the CCHS 2015 – Nutrition excluded individuals living in institutions who likely have  
326 additional needs as well as barriers to consuming higher protein diets (14).

327

328 The inverse associations between the HEFI-2019 and intakes of iron, folate, and vitamin B12 also  
329 raise concerns. On one hand, the prevalence of inadequacy for these nutrients did not increase at  
330 the population level, partly because the EAR can be met at relatively low intakes for these nutrients.  
331 On the other hand, at the individual level, meeting nutrient requirements while following CFG-2019  
332 recommendations may be more difficult in individuals at risk of inadequate intakes, e.g., older  
333 adults with loss of appetite (13, 14). Further, vitamin B12 may be particularly important for older  
334 adults and recent evidence support that food groups contribute differently at reducing risk of  
335 deficiency (38). Meeting folate requirements while following CFG may also be challenging for some  
336 individuals since refined grains, not recommended in CFG, showed the highest correlations with  
337 folate intake in the present study (Supplemental Figure 1). Indeed, non-whole grain foods are  
338 subject to mandatory fortification in Canada which is not the case of whole grain foods (39). In sum,  
339 CFG-2019 recommendations should be carefully implemented to ensure meeting nutrient intakes  
340 both at the population and individual level. Health Canada published additional guidance in 2022  
341 on how to apply dietary guidelines to support health professionals and policy (40). The guidance  
342 describes the type and frequency of foods to support nutritional needs. The extent to which the  
343 additional guidance helps older adults shift their eating patterns to be both consistent with CFG-  
344 2019 and provide optimal nutrient intakes remains to be determined. Findings of the present study  
345 highlight that eating patterns of older adults in 2015 failed to provide optimal intakes of calcium,  
346 folate and vitamin D despite adhering to CFG-2019 recommendations thereby supporting the need  
347 for additional guidance, perhaps with quantitative recommendations.

348

349 The use of national survey data to estimate the impact of higher adherence on the prevalence of  
350 nutrient inadequacy in Canada is a strength of this study. But it must be recognized that  
351 relationships between adherence to CFG-2019 recommendations and nutrient intakes reflect the  
352 underlying eating patterns of adults 65 years or older from Canada in 2015. A variety of underlying

353 food and beverage consumption patterns may be highly consistent with CFG-2019  
354 recommendations yet, have diverging associations with intakes of certain nutrients. As well, eating  
355 patterns of older adults, though generally stable, may evolve over time which would result in  
356 different associations between adherence to CFG-2019 and nutrients intakes. Another key strength  
357 of this work is the use of the NCI MCMC multivariate method to account for random errors in  
358 dietary intakes measured with 24-hour recall (30, 31). Using the multivariate method permitted the  
359 joint assessment of the relationship between usual nutrient intakes and adherence to CFG-2019  
360 recommendations on healthy food choices, as measured with the HEFI-2019, and the modelling of  
361 higher adherence to CFG-2019 recommendations compared with average adherence. Limitations  
362 must be addressed. First, self-reported dietary intakes with 24-hour dietary recall are affected by  
363 systematic errors or bias (41, 42). The working assumption that intakes are unbiased cannot be  
364 verified. Of note, we did not adjust for “misreporting status” to account for energy under-reporting  
365 in the present study. The proportion of under-reporters among older adults is not higher than in  
366 other age and sex group samples of the CCHS 2015 – Nutrition (43) and evidence indicates that diet  
367 quality based on 24-hour dietary recall may not be prone to large bias (44). Second, the food  
368 composition database, the Canadian Nutrient File 2015, may not adequately reflect the nutrient  
369 profile of foods actually consumed (45). Accordingly, estimates of prevalence of nutrient  
370 inadequacy based on self-reported dietary intakes data are not as accurate as estimates based on  
371 biomarker data. Third, our results cannot be used to extrapolate nutrient intake inadequacy at the  
372 national level. Although calcium and vitamin D supplements could contribute to reducing  
373 inadequacies (35, 36), nutrient intakes from dietary supplements were not included since the  
374 objective was to assess the relationship between nutrients and adherence to CFG-2019  
375 recommendations on healthy food choices (4, 5, 17).

376

377 In conclusion, higher adherence to CFG-2019 recommendations on healthy food choices was  
378 associated with greater intakes of protein, fiber, magnesium and many nutrients considered, based  
379 on eating patterns of adults aged 65 years or more from the CCHS 2015 – Nutrition. However,  
380 higher adherence was associated with lower intakes of iron, folate, vitamin B12 and vitamin D, and  
381 not associated with calcium, zinc or vitamin A intakes, thus insufficient to mitigate dietary  
382 inadequacy in these key nutrients. Knowledge of shortfalls of CFG-2019 recommendations  
383 regarding nutrient intake inadequacy are relevant to help government, policymakers and registered  
384 dietitians in providing more comprehensive and appropriate recommendations to older adults. Our  
385 findings support the need for additional guidance, as that recently published by Health Canada to  
386 help ensure that eating patterns are both consistent with CFG-2019 and adequate nutrient intakes  
387 (40). Future studies should investigate how eating patterns changed after the publication of CFG-  
388 2019 and the additional guidelines and how these changes may affect the relationship between  
389 adherence to recommendations and nutrient intakes.

390

391 **Acknowledgments**

392

393 **Data availability statement:** The Canadian Community Health Survey 2015 – Nutrition Public Use

394 Microdata File are available upon request at

395 <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/en/catalogue/82M0024X2018001>. The analytic code will be

396 made freely available at <https://github.com/didierbrassard>.

397

398 **Authors' contributions to the manuscript:** DB and SC designed the research; DB performed

399 statistical analysis; DB wrote the first draft of the manuscript; DB and SC gave final approval and

400 critically reviewed the manuscript.

## References

1. Health Canada. Eating Well with Canada's Food Guide. Ottawa: Health Canada, 2007:1-6.
2. Katamay SW, Esslinger KA, Vigneault M, Johnston JL, Junkins BA, Robbins LG, et al. Eating well with Canada's Food Guide (2007): development of the food intake pattern. *Nutr Rev* 2007;65:155-66.
3. Health Canada. Food, Nutrients and Health: Interim Evidence Update 2018 for Health Professionals and Policy Makers. Ottawa: Health Canada, 2019.
4. Health Canada. Canada's food guide. Ottawa: Health Canada, 2019.
5. Health Canada. Canada's Dietary Guidelines - for Health Professionals and Policy Makers. 2019.
6. Brassard D, Manikpurage HD, Thériault S, Arsenault BJ, Lamarche B. Greater adherence to the 2019 Canada's Food Guide recommendations on healthy food choices reduces the risk of cardiovascular disease in adults: a prospective analysis of UK Biobank data. *Am J Clin Nutr* 2022;116:1748-58.
7. Asher KE, Doucet S, Luke A. Registered dietitians' perceptions and use of the plant-based recommendations in the 2019 Canada's Food Guide. *J Hum Nutr Diet* 2021;34:715-23.
8. Barco Leme AC, Laila A, Hou S, Fisberg RM, Ma DWL, Fisberg M, et al. Perceptions of the 2019 Canada's Food Guide: a qualitative study with parents from Southwestern Ontario. *Appl Physiol Nutr Metab* 2021.
9. Barr SI. Is the 2019 Canada's Food Guide Snapshot nutritionally adequate? *Appl Physiol Nutr Metab* 2019;44:1387-90.
10. Fernandez MA, Bertolo RF, Duncan AM, Phillips SM, Elango R, Ma DWL, et al. Translating "protein foods" from the new Canada's Food Guide to consumers: knowledge gaps and recommendations. *Appl Physiol Nutr Metab* 2020;45:1311-23.
11. Auclair O, Burgos SA. Protein consumption in Canadian habitual diets: usual intake, inadequacy, and the contribution of animal- and plant-based foods to nutrient intakes. *Appl Physiol Nutr Metab* 2021;46:501-10.
12. Fabek H, Sanchez-Hernandez D, Ahmed M, Marinangeli CPF, House JD, Anderson GH. An examination of contributions of animal- and plant-based dietary patterns on the nutrient quality of diets of adult Canadians. *Appl Physiol Nutr Metab* 2021;46:877-86.
13. Shlisky J, Bloom DE, Beaudreault AR, Tucker KL, Keller HH, Freund-Levi Y, et al. Nutritional Considerations for Healthy Aging and Reduction in Age-Related Chronic Disease. *Adv Nutr* 2017;8:17-26.
14. Remond D, Shahar DR, Gille D, Pinto P, Kachal J, Peyron MA, et al. Understanding the gastrointestinal tract of the elderly to develop dietary solutions that prevent malnutrition. *Oncotarget* 2015;6:13858-98.
15. Millen BE, Abrams S, Adams-Campbell L, Anderson CA, Brenna JT, Campbell WW, et al. The 2015 dietary guidelines advisory committee scientific report: development and major conclusions. *Adv Nutr* 2016;7:438-44.
16. Keller HH, Lengyel C, Carrier N, Slaughter SE, Morrison J, Duncan AM, et al. Prevalence of inadequate micronutrient intakes of Canadian long-term care residents. *Br J Nutr* 2018;119:1047-56.
17. Brassard D, Elvidge Munene LA, St-Pierre S, Guenther PM, Kirkpatrick SI, Slater J, et al. Development of the Healthy Eating Food Index (HEFI)-2019 measuring adherence to Canada's Food Guide 2019 recommendations on healthy food choices. *Appl Physiol Nutr Metab* 2022;47:595-610.
18. Brassard D, Elvidge Munene LA, St-Pierre S, Gonzalez A, Guenther PM, Jessri M, et al. Evaluation of the Healthy Eating Food Index (HEFI)-2019 measuring adherence to Canada's Food Guide 2019 recommendations on healthy food choices. *Appl Physiol Nutr Metab* 2022;47:582-94.
19. Health Canada. Reference Guide to Understanding and Using the Data: 2015 Canadian Community Health Survey - Nutrition. 2017:1-91.



20. Health Canada. Internet: <https://food-nutrition.canada.ca/cnf-fce/index-eng.jsp>.
21. Rana H, Mallet M-C, Gonzalez A, Verreault M-F, St-Pierre S. Free Sugars Consumption in Canada. *Nutrients* 2021;13:1471.
22. Health Canada. Nutrition Labelling: Table of Reference Amounts for Food. Ottawa, 2016.
23. Dorrington N, Fallaize R, Hobbs DA, Weech M, Lovegrove JA. A Review of Nutritional Requirements of Adults Aged  $\geq 65$  Years in the UK. *J Nutr* 2020;150:2245-56.
24. Otten JJ, Hellwig JP, Meyers LD. Dietary reference intakes : the essential guide to nutrient requirements. Washington, D.C.: National Academies Press, 2006.
25. Phillips SM, Chevalier S, Leidy HJ. Protein "requirements" beyond the RDA: implications for optimizing health. *Appl Physiol Nutr Metab* 2016;41:565-72.
26. Bauer J, Biolo G, Cederholm T, Cesari M, Cruz-Jentoft AJ, Morley JE, et al. Evidence-based recommendations for optimal dietary protein intake in older people: a position paper from the PROT-AGE Study Group. *J Am Med Dir Assoc* 2013;14:542-59.
27. Traylor DA, Gorissen SHM, Phillips SM. Perspective: Protein Requirements and Optimal Intakes in Aging: Are We Ready to Recommend More Than the Recommended Daily Allowance? *Adv Nutr* 2018;9:171-82.
28. Dodd KW, Guenther PM, Freedman LS, Subar AF, Kipnis V, Midthune D, et al. Statistical methods for estimating usual intake of nutrients and foods: a review of the theory. *J Am Diet Assoc* 2006;106:1640-50.
29. Thompson FE, Kirkpatrick SI, Subar AF, Reedy J, Schap TE, Wilson MM, et al. The National Cancer Institute's Dietary Assessment Primer: A Resource for Diet Research. *J Acad Nutr Diet* 2015;115:1986-95.
30. Zhang S, Midthune D, Guenther PM, Krebs-Smith SM, Kipnis V, Dodd KW, et al. A New Multivariate Measurement Error Model with Zero-Inflated Dietary Data, and Its Application to Dietary Assessment. *Ann Appl Stat* 2011;5:1456-87.
31. Kirkpatrick SI, Guenther PM, Subar AF, Krebs-Smith SM, Herrick KA, Freedman LS, et al. Using short-term dietary intake data to address research questions related to usual dietary intake among populations and subpopulations: Assumptions, statistical techniques, and considerations. *J Acad Nutr Diet* 2022;122:1246-62.
32. Herrick KA, Rossen LM, Parsons R, Dodd KW. Estimating Usual Dietary Intake From National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey Data Using the National Cancer Institute Method. *Vital Health Stat* 2018;2:1-63.
33. Harrell FE. General Aspects of Fitting Regression Models. Edtion ed. *Regression Modeling Strategies: With Applications to Linear Models, Logistic and Ordinal Regression, and Survival Analysis*. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2015:13-44.
34. Vatanparast H, Islam N, Shafiee M. Consumption of Milk and alternatives decreased among Canadians from 2004 to 2015: evidence from the Canadian community health surveys. *BMC Nutr* 2021;7:63.
35. Vatanparast H, Islam N, Patil RP, Shafiee M, Whiting SJ. Calcium Intake from Food and Supplemental Sources Decreased in the Canadian Population from 2004 to 2015. *J Nutr* 2020;150:833-41.
36. Vatanparast H, Patil RP, Islam N, Shafiee M, Whiting SJ. Vitamin D Intake from Supplemental Sources but Not from Food Sources Has Increased in the Canadian Population Over Time. *J Nutr* 2020;150:526-35.
37. Drolet-Labelle V, Laurin D, Bedard A, Drapeau V, Desroches S. Beliefs underlying older adults' intention to consume plant-based protein foods: A qualitative study. *Appetite* 2022:106346.
38. Huang HH, Cohen AA, Gaudreau P, Auray-Blais C, Allard D, Boutin M, et al. Vitamin B-12 Intake from Dairy But Not Meat is Associated with Decreased Risk of Low Vitamin B-12 Status and Deficiency in Older Adults from Quebec, Canada. *J Nutr* 2022;152:2483-92.
39. Government of Canada. 2022. Internet: <https://inspection.canada.ca/food-labels/labelling/industry/nutrient-content/reference-information/eng/1389908857542/1389908896254?chap=1> (accessed June 2023).

40. Health Canada. 2022. Internet: <https://food-guide.canada.ca/en/guidelines> (accessed June 2023).
41. Freedman LS, Commins JM, Moler JE, Willett W, Tinker LF, Subar AF, et al. Pooled results from 5 validation studies of dietary self-report instruments using recovery biomarkers for potassium and sodium intake. *Am J Epidemiol* 2015;181:473-87.
42. Freedman LS, Commins JM, Moler JE, Arab L, Baer DJ, Kipnis V, et al. Pooled results from 5 validation studies of dietary self-report instruments using recovery biomarkers for energy and protein intake. *Am J Epidemiol* 2014;180:172-88.
43. Garriguet D. Accounting for misreporting when comparing energy intake across time in Canada. *Health Rep* 2018;29:3-12.
44. Kirkpatrick SI, Dodd KW, Potischman N, Zimmerman TP, Douglass D, Guenther PM, et al. Healthy Eating Index-2015 Scores Among Adults Based on Observed vs Recalled Dietary Intake. *J Acad Nutr Diet* 2021;121:2233-41 e1.
45. Satija A, Yu E, Willett WC, Hu FB. Understanding nutritional epidemiology and its role in policy. *Adv Nutr* 2015;6:5-18.

## Tables

**Table 1.** Usual nutrient intake difference between HEFI-2019 scores at the 90<sup>th</sup> percentile and the median HEFI-2019 score distribution in 4,089 adults aged 65 years or more from the CCHS 2015 - Nutrition.

Nutrients <sup>1</sup>	Dietary Reference Intake group				
	Adults, 65 y+ (n=4,089)	Males, 65 to 70 y (n=567)	Females, 65 to 70 y (n=720)	Males, 71 y+ (n=1,246)	Females, 71 y+ (n=1,556)
Protein, g/d	3 (-2, 8)	2 (-4, 9)	5 (-1, 11)	2 (-4, 8)	4 (-2, 10)
Calcium, mg/d	4 (-50, 57)	-16 (-96, 65)	21 (-47, 89)	-14 (-88, 60)	25 (-38, 89)
Vitamin D, mcg/d	-0.5 (-1.0, 0.0)	-0.8 (-1.6, -0.1)	-0.1 (-0.7, 0.5)	-0.7 (-1.5, 0.0)	-0.1 (-0.7, 0.6)
Iron, mg/d	-0.2 (-1.0, 0.5)	-0.6 (-1.8, 0.6)	0.2 (-0.7, 1.1)	-0.6 (-1.8, 0.6)	0.3 (-0.5, 1.1)
Vitamin B12, mcg/d	-0.3 (-0.7, 0.1)	-0.4 (-0.9, 0.0)	-0.1 (-0.7, 0.4)	-0.4 (-0.8, 0.1)	-0.1 (-0.6, 0.4)
Vitamin B6, mg/d	0.1 (0.0, 0.2)	0.1 (0.0, 0.2)	0.1 (0.0, 0.3)	0.1 (0.0, 0.2)	0.1 (0.0, 0.2)
Zinc, mg/d	0.0 (-0.7, 0.7)	-0.4 (-1.5, 0.7)	0.4 (-0.3, 1.2)	-0.3 (-1.3, 0.6)	0.5 (-0.2, 1.2)
Folate, mcg/d	-13 (-39, 14)	-15 (-56, 26)	-6 (-36, 25)	-16 (-55, 22)	-2 (-31, 27)
Fibre, g/d	3 (2, 5)	4 (2, 7)	3 (1, 5)	4 (2, 6)	3 (1, 5)
Magnesium, mg/d	33 (14, 52)	44 (14, 73)	30 (6, 55)	39 (13, 65)	31 (9, 53)
Potassium, mg/d	173 (17, 328)	230 (6, 455)	170 (-27, 368)	214 (3, 424)	178 (-7, 363)
Vitamin A, RAE/d	16 (-37, 69)	9 (-54, 71)	26 (-54, 106)	10 (-48, 68)	26 (-42, 95)

<sup>1</sup>Values are expected nutrient intake differences (95%CI) for a HEFI-2019 score at the 90<sup>th</sup> compared with the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile of the score distribution, and were estimated using linear regression models. Estimates reflect the expected nutrient intake difference when HEFI-2019 scores are increased to correspond to the 90<sup>th</sup> percentile of the score distribution, compared with the median HEFI-2019 score. All dietary intakes were modelled using the National Cancer Institute multivariate method to estimate usual intakes (see Methods). 95%CI were estimated using 500 bootstrap weight replicates. Sample size indicate the number of respondents without applying sampling weights, but other estimates were weighted to reflect the Canadian population. CCHS, Canadian Community Health Survey; d, day; HEFI-2019, Healthy Eating Food Index-2019.

## Figure legends

**Figure 1:** Distribution of total HEFI-2019 score, based on usual dietary intakes in 4,089 adults aged 65 years and more from the CCHS 2015 - Nutrition. Diamonds are means. Left and right whiskers indicate the 5th and 95th percentile, respectively. Dietary intakes were modelled using the National Cancer Institute multivariate method to estimate usual intakes (see Methods). CCHS, Canadian Community Health Survey; DRI, Dietary Reference Intake.

**Figure 2:** Prevalence of inadequate nutrient intakes in 4,089 adults aged 65 years and older from the CCHS 2015 - Nutrition. Only nutrient intakes from foods were considered (i.e., excluding intakes from dietary supplement). Inadequate intakes are intakes below the age- and sex-specific Estimated Average Requirements (EAR). Potassium and fibre are not shown, because only Adequate Intakes (AI) values are available for these nutrients. All dietary intakes were modelled using the National Cancer Institute multivariate method to estimate usual intakes (see Methods). 95%CI were estimated using 500 bootstrap weight replicates. CCHS, Canadian Community Health Survey.

**Figure 3:** Linear regression of nutrient intake on the total HEFI-2019 score in 4,089 adults aged 65 years or more from the CCHS 2015 - Nutrition. A positive relationship indicates that greater HEFI-2019 scores are associated with greater nutrient intake, and inversely. For visualization purpose, data points are from a random sample of 200 respondents selected proportionally to sampling weights. All dietary intakes were modelled using the National Cancer Institute multivariate method to estimate usual intakes (see Methods). 95%CI were estimated using 500 bootstrap weight replicates. CCHS, Canadian Community Health Survey; HEFI-2019, Healthy Eating Food Index-2019.

**Figure 4:** Prevalence of inadequate intakes and difference for HEFI-2019 scores at the 90th compared with the 50th percentile of the score distribution in 4,089 adults aged 65 years or more from the CCHS 2015 - Nutrition. Inadequate intakes are intakes below the age- and sex-specific Estimated Average Requirements (EAR). Potassium and fibre are not shown, because only Adequate Intakes (AI) values are available for these nutrients. All dietary intakes were modelled using the National Cancer Institute multivariate method to estimate usual intakes (see Methods). 95%CI were estimated using 500 bootstrap weight replicates. CCHS, Canadian Community Health Survey; HEFI-2019, Healthy Eating Food Index-2019.


Age and sex group

Females, 71 y+


Males, 71 y+


Females, 65 to 70 y

Males, 65 to 70 y



HEFI-2019 score based on usual intakes (/80), points





○ 50th perc. ● 90th perc.

