

Examining Generalizability of Nutrient-Based Food Patterns and Their Cross-Sectional Associations with Cardiometabolic Health for Hispanic/Latino Adults in the US: Results from the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES) and the Hispanic Community Health Study/Study of Latinos (HCHS/SOL)

Jeanette J Varela¹, Josiemer Mattei², Daniela Sotres-Alvarez³, Yasmin Mossavar-Rahmani⁴, Amanda C McClain⁵, Luis E Maldonado⁶, Martha L Daviglius⁷, Briana J.K. Stephenson¹

Affiliations

1. Department of Biostatistics, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health
2. Department of Nutrition, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health
3. Department of Biostatistics, Gillings School of Global Public Health, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
4. Department of Epidemiology and Population Health, Albert Einstein College of Medicine
5. School of Exercise and Nutritional Sciences, College of Health and Human Services, San Diego State University College of Health and Human Services
6. Department of Population and Public Health Sciences, Keck School of Medicine, University of Southern California
7. Institute of Minority Health Research, University of Illinois at Chicago

Funding Source: The Hispanic Community Health Study/Study of Latinos is a collaborative study supported by contracts from the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute (NHLBI) to the University of North Carolina (HHSN268201300001I/N01-HC-65233), University of Miami (HHSN268201300004I/N01-HC-65234), Albert Einstein College of Medicine (HHSN268201300002I/N01-HC-65235), University of Illinois at Chicago (HHSN268201300003I/N01-HC-65236 Northwestern Univ), and San Diego State University (HHSN268201300005I/N01-HC-65237). The following Institutes/Centers/Offices have contributed to the HCHS/SOL through a transfer of funds to the NHLBI: National Institute on Minority Health and Health Disparities, National Institute on Deafness and Other Communication Disorders, National Institute of Dental and Craniofacial Research, National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases, National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke, NIH Institution-Office of Dietary Supplements. Dr. McClain is supported by NHLBI Mentored Research Scientist Development Award K01 HL150406.

Author Disclosures: All authors have no conflicts of interest.

Manuscript Information: 4637 words, 2 figures, 5 tables

Send correspondence to BJKS: 665 Huntington Ave, Boston, MA, USA

Supplementary Data: 5 pages, 2 supplementary figures

Running Title: Nutrient-based food patterns and cardiometabolic health for NHANES and HCHS/SOL

Abbreviations: National Health and Nutritional Examination Survey (NHANES), Hispanic Community Health Study/ Study of Latinos (HCHS/SOL), cardiometabolic risk factor (CRF), cardiovascular disease (CVD), United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), long chain saturated fatty acids (LCSFA), myristic acid (SFA 14:0), palmitic acid (SFA 16:0), stearic acid (SFA 18:0), medium chain saturated fatty acids (MCSFA), caprylic acid (SFA 8:0), caproic acid (SFA 6:0), capric acid (SFA 10:0), lauric acid (SFA 12:0), odds ratios (ORs), confidence intervals (CIs), standard error (SE), total monounsaturated fatty acids (MUFA), total polyunsaturated fatty acid (PUFA), Healthy Eating Index (HEI), nutrient-based food pattern (NBFP), socioeconomic status (SES)

1 **Abstract**

2 *Background.* Ethnicity, cultural background, and geographic location differ significantly
3 amongst the US Hispanic/Latino population. These characteristic differences can
4 greatly define measured diet and its relationship with cardiometabolic disease, thus
5 influencing generalizability of results.

6 *Objective.* We aimed to examine dietary patterns of Hispanic/Latino adults and their
7 association with cardiometabolic risk factors (high cholesterol, hypertension, obesity,
8 diabetes) across two representative studies with differing sampling strategies.

9 *Methods.* Data were collected from Mexican or Other Hispanic adult participants from
10 2007-2012 National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES, n=3,209) and
11 2007-2011 Hispanic Community Health Survey/Study of Latinos (HCHS/SOL,
12 n=13,059). Nutrient-based food patterns (NBFPs) were derived using factor analysis on
13 nutrient intake data estimated from 24-hour dietary recalls and interpreted using
14 common foods prominent in these nutrients. Cross-sectional association between
15 NBFPs (quintiles) and cardiometabolic risk factors, defined by clinical measures and
16 self-report, were estimated using survey-weighted logistic regression.

17 *Results.* Five NBFPs were identified in both studies: (1) meats, (2) grains/legumes, (3)
18 fruits/vegetables, (4) dairy, and (5) fats/oils. Association to cardiometabolic risk factors
19 differed by NBFP and study. In HCHS/SOL, persons in the highest quintile of meats
20 NBFP had higher odds of diabetes (OR=1.43, 95%CI: 1.10, 1.86) and obesity
21 (OR=1.36, 95%CI: 1.14, 1.63). Those in the lowest quintile of grains/legumes NBFP
22 (OR=1.22, 95%CI: 1.02, 1.47) and the highest quintile of fats/oils (OR=1.26, 95%CI:

23 1.03, 1.53) also had higher odds of obesity. In NHANES, NBFs associated with higher
24 odds of diabetes included those in the lowest quintile of dairy (OR=1.66, 95%CI: 1.01,
25 2.72) and highest quintile of grains/legumes (OR=2.10, 95%CI: 1.26, 3.50). Persons in
26 the fourth quintile of meats (OR=0.68, 95%CI: 0.47, 0.99) had lower odds of cholesterol.

27 *Conclusion.* Diet-disease relationships among Hispanic/Latino adults vary according to
28 two representative studies. These differences have research and practical implications
29 when generalizing inferences on heterogeneous underrepresented populations.

30 **1 Introduction**

31 Since 2010, Hispanic/Latino people have become the largest ethnic minority group in
32 the US. Recent research found that Hispanics are nearly 10 years younger than non-
33 Hispanic Whites at the time of death from cardiovascular disease (CVD) (1).
34 Furthermore, due to limited access to healthy foods, higher prevalence of food
35 insecurity, and lower socioeconomic status, US Hispanic/Latinos tend to consume less
36 healthy diets when compared to other racial/ethnic groups (2), which then contributes to
37 health complications including cardiovascular diseases (3). Thus, understanding the
38 dietary patterns among Hispanics/Latinos in the US may help better address the CVD-
39 related disparities experienced by this population.

40 Previous literature has shown that cardiometabolic risk factors (CRFs) differ among
41 Hispanic/Latino ethnic groups due to diverse characteristics between groups such as
42 place/country of birth, citizenship, language, race, culture, food, and other factors
43 (4,5,6,7,8,9,10). Despite these known differences in Hispanic/Latino groups, nationally
44 representative surveys continue to lump this population into two large groups; Mexican
45 American and Other Hispanic/Latino. For example, the National Health and Nutrition
46 Examination Survey (NHANES), which studies the health and nutritional status of
47 people in the United States across varying socioeconomic status (SES), race/ethnicity,
48 and geographies, aggregates Hispanic/Latinos into Mexican Americans and other
49 Hispanics. Several studies have since followed suit reinforcing this limitation when
50 evaluating the inter-relationship of diet and disease across different Hispanic/Latino
51 groups (11,12,13,14,15,16).

52 The Hispanic Community Health Study/Study of Latinos (HCHS/SOL) was designed to
53 better understand the health and well-being of this understudied population with data
54 from six Hispanic/Latino ethnic backgrounds (Cuban, Dominican, Mexican, Puerto
55 Rican, and Central/South American) across four US urban areas (Bronx, Chicago,
56 Miami, San Diego). Both NHANES and HCHS/SOL contain vital information about
57 Hispanic/Latino diets and CRFs, but little research has been done to compare how
58 consistent these associations are across the two studies, given their differing sampling
59 designs (17,18). Both diet quality and diet patterns have been examined within the
60 HCHS/SOL cohort (19,20,21). Diet quality has been evaluated in NHANES
61 Hispanic/Latino adults with children (22). While dietary patterns have been examined
62 amongst Mexican American NHANES participants, to our knowledge, no studies have
63 examined diet patterns exclusively for Mexican American and Other Hispanic adults.
64 This is a significant gap as diet patterns provide a more comprehensive measure for
65 examining diet-disease relationships (23).

66 This study aimed to derive and compare nutrient-based food patterns and their cross-
67 sectional associations with cardiometabolic risk factors among US Hispanic/Latino adult
68 participants from two different survey studies.

69 **2 Methods**

70 **2.1 Study Population**

71 This study included two U.S. studies that include Hispanic/Latino adults. Data were
72 harmonized and only measures shared across both surveys were included for analysis.
73 To minimize reverse causality, we excluded participants with previous CVD conditions

74 (such as heart failure, coronary heart disease, angina, heart attack, or stroke) at time of
75 enrollment.

76 We also excluded extreme nutrient intake defined as values below the 0.5th percentile
77 and above the 99.5th percentile. The inclusion criteria for this analysis were adult
78 participants aged 20-74 years old with at least one reliable recall that identify as
79 Mexican American or other Hispanic groups (Supplementary Material Figure 1).

80 **2.1.1 National Health and Nutritional Examination Survey (NHANES)**

81 The National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES) program is a
82 nationally representative repeated cross-sectional survey with a stratified, multistage
83 probability sampling design of nonincarcerated residents of the United States. About
84 5,000 persons each year are interviewed and located in counties across the country.
85 Details of the study design are described elsewhere (24). The data collected include
86 demographic information, dietary intake, and health-related questions along with
87 laboratory tests for three NHANES survey cycles (2007-08, 2009-10, and 2011-12).
88 Dietary intake data were assessed via two 24-hour recalls which collects the types and
89 amounts of foods and beverages consumed and allow estimated intakes of energy,
90 nutrients, and other food components from those foods and beverages. The United
91 States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Food and Nutrient Database for Dietary
92 Studies 4.1 (25), 5.0 (26), and 2011-2012 (27) were used to code dietary intake data
93 and calculate nutrient intakes for the NHANES 2007-08, 2009-10, and 2011-12 survey
94 cycles respectively.

95 The first recall was collected in person. The second recall was administered over the
96 telephone 3 to 10 days later. Nutrient intake data collected from the two interviews are
97 publicly available on the CDC website (28,29,30). Due to data being pooled across
98 three survey cycles (2007-2008, 2009-2010, 2011-2012), survey-weight adjustment was
99 conducted (31,32). The inclusion criteria were adult participants (20-74 years old) that
100 identify as Mexican American or other Hispanic groups as defined by NHANES, with at
101 least one reliable recall (33). After excluding those with no prior CVD condition or
102 extreme nutrient intake, a total of 1,930 Mexican American and 1,279 other Hispanic
103 adults were included for analysis (Supplementary Material Figure 1A).

104 **2.1.2 Hispanic Community Health Survey/Study of Latinos (HCHS/SOL)**

105 The Hispanic Community Health Study/Study of Latinos (HCHS/SOL) is a multi-center
106 prospective study designed to identify risk factors and disease prevalence rates in a
107 diverse population-based cohort of US Hispanic/Latino adults in four urban
108 communities. From 2008-2011, HCHS/SOL recruited a cohort of 16,415 Hispanic/Latino
109 persons aged 18–74 who self-identified as Cuban, Dominican, Mexican, Puerto Rican,
110 and Central/South American and resided in households across four field centers in the
111 US: Bronx, NY, Chicago IL, Miami FL, and San Diego CA. A stratified 2-stage area
112 probability sample of household addresses was selected in each of the 4 field centers.
113 Additional details on the design and sampling methods of HCHS/SOL have been
114 previously described (34). Data on cardiometabolic risk factors, demographic
115 information, and medical history were recorded by questionnaires. Dietary intake was
116 assessed using two 24-hour dietary recalls and then used to calculate nutrient intake
117 using the Nutrition Data System for Research software version 11 (35). The first recall

118 was collected in person. The second recall was administered via telephone after 6
119 weeks. The inclusion criteria were adult participants aged 20-74 years old with at least
120 one reliable recall according to the interviewer. After excluding those with no prior CVD
121 condition or extreme nutrient intake, a total of 5,308 Mexican American and 7,751 other
122 Hispanic adults were included for analysis (Supplementary Material Figure 1B).

123 **2.2 Cardiometabolic Risk Factors (CRFs)**

124 Our analysis focused on four major modifiable, manageable, or treatable
125 cardiometabolic risk factors that were assessed in both surveys during the same
126 collection years described previously: high cholesterol, obesity, diabetes, and
127 hypertension. High cholesterol was defined as having total cholesterol greater than or
128 equal to 240 mg/dL, LDL cholesterol greater than or equal to 160 mg/dL, HDL
129 cholesterol less than 40 mg/dL, self-reported use of cholesterol-lowering medication, or
130 self-reported physician diagnosis of hypercholesterolemia (36). Obesity was defined as
131 a BMI of 30 kg/m² or greater for participants 20-44 years of age and waist
132 circumference (women greater than 88 cm, men greater than 102 cm) for participants
133 45-74 years of age (37,38,39). Diabetes was defined as having a fasting time greater
134 than 8 hours and fasting plasma glucose of 126 mg/dL or greater, fasting time less than
135 or equal to 8 hours and fasting glucose 200 mg/dL or greater, or post-OGTT glucose of
136 200 mg/dL or greater, an HbA1c of 6.5% or greater, self-reported diabetes medication
137 use, or self-reported physician diagnosis (40). Hypertension (high blood pressure) was
138 defined as having systolic blood pressure greater than 140 mm Hg, or diastolic blood
139 pressure 90 mm Hg or greater, or self-reported hypertensive medication use (41).

140 The Framingham CVD 10-year risk score was also calculated in both surveys to
141 estimate a 10-year risk for atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease event (e.g., coronary
142 death, nonfatal myocardial infarction, stroke) (42). This measure is calculated using
143 information on age, sex, total cholesterol, HDL cholesterol, systolic blood pressure,
144 blood pressure-lowering medication use, diabetes status, and smoking status. For
145 NHANES participants, the Framingham CVD risk score was created using the CVrisk R
146 package (43). For HCHS/SOL participants, this score was derived by the HCHS/SOL
147 Coordinating Center (44).

148 Sensitivity analysis was performed to determine the impact of including participants with
149 CVD and/or cancer at baseline to account for potential change in diet due to these
150 diagnoses.

151 **2.3 Sociodemographic and behavioral variables**

152 Covariates used in the analysis included age, energy intake, sex, Mexican vs other
153 Hispanic heritage, educational attainment, annual household income, marital status,
154 years living in the mainland U.S., employment status, self-reported smoking status, and
155 self-reported alcohol use. NHANES classifies race/ethnic background as Mexican and
156 Other Hispanic. In an effort to provide parallel analysis and comparisons, participants
157 with a non-Mexican ethnic background in HCHS/SOL were combined.

158 **2.4 Statistical Analysis**

159 **2.4.1 Identification of Nutrient-Based Food Patterns (NBFPs)**

160 A total of 39 nutrients were included for analysis (Table 2). Nutrient intake was
161 averaged across 24hr dietary recalls, log-transformed via a $\log(1+x)$ transformation, and

162 scaled to achieve normality. To identify nutrient-based food patterns, factor analysis that
163 adjusts for survey sampling design (45,46) was performed separately on each study.
164 The number of factors to retain was determined by the following criteria: factor
165 eigenvalue greater than 1, scree plot construction, and factor interpretability. We applied
166 a varimax rotation to achieve a better-defined loading structure. Nutrients with a rotated
167 factor loading greater than or equal to $|0.60|$ were considered ‘dominant nutrients’ and
168 considered in the description and clinical interpretation of that factor. Using Bartlett’s
169 weighted least squares method, we computed factor scores that indicate the degree to
170 which each subject’s diet conforms to one of the identified patterns. To assess the
171 internal reproducibility of the identified patterns we calculated Cronbach’s coefficient
172 alphas (47). Sensitivity analysis was performed to examine the consistency of the
173 results with analysis using at least one recall versus the average of two recalls. To ease
174 clinical interpretability, patterns were named using common foods that prominently
175 contain the nutrients of each pattern and are referred to as nutrient-based food patterns
176 (NBFPs). These names were reached upon the consensus of three co-authors with no
177 unresolved disagreements.

178 **2.4.2 Association of NBFP Quintiles on CRFs**

179 Quintile-based categories of factor scores were calculated for each survey separately,
180 adjusting for survey design. We use the third quintile to define a moderate intake of
181 each NBFP as the reference category. Survey-weighted logistic regressions were run
182 for each CRF and each pattern as the primary exposure, and jointly with all derived
183 factors included. Odds ratios (ORs) and corresponding 95% confidence intervals (CIs)
184 were estimated after adjusting for age, energy intake, sex, Mexican vs other Hispanic

185 heritage, educational attainment, household income, marital status, years living in the
186 mainland U.S., employment status, self-reported smoking status, and self-reported
187 alcohol use. We considered p-values less than 0.05 significant for all analyses. All
188 analyses were performed in R version 3.6.3 (48) using psych (49), haven (50), survey
189 (46), ggplot2 (51), tidyverse (52) packages.

190 **3 Results**

191 **3.1 Descriptive analysis**

192 Descriptive information of the two studies is provided in Table 1. Similar characteristics
193 that were shared across both survey cohorts included approximately half were female,
194 and most individuals were employed, had lived in the U.S. for more than 10 years, and
195 were non-smokers. Differences between the two studies were also identified. More
196 individuals in NHANES than the HCHS/SOL sample identified as Mexican, had attained
197 an education level higher than high school diploma or GED, had higher household
198 income, were more likely to be married, and reported currently using alcohol. A greater
199 proportion of adults in NHANES were classified with high cholesterol levels while similar
200 proportions of adults had diabetes, obesity, hypertension, and mean Framingham CVD
201 10-year risk scores in both studies. Table 2 shows the mean (SE), adjusted for age, of
202 the 39 nutrients used in the factor analysis. Similar nutrient intake values were observed
203 between the studies.

204 **3.2 Nutrient-Based Food Patterns**

205 Five factors were retained for each study and accounted for 66.9% and 66.8% of the
206 variance explained for NHANES and HCHS/SOL, respectively. Factors were similar

207 between the two studies, but the proportion of variance explained between similar
208 study-specific factors was different. A heatmap of the factor loadings is provided in
209 Figure 1 and, to facilitate comparisons, both studies were ordered according to how the
210 NHANES factors were retained.

211 NHANES Factor 1, named “meats”, had dominant loadings on total protein, niacin,
212 vitamin B6, phosphorus, zinc, selenium, and vitamin B12. This factor alone explained
213 17.0% of the variance in nutrient intake. NHANES Factor 2, named “fats/oils”, had
214 dominant loadings on total monounsaturated fatty acids (MUFA), total fat, long-chain
215 saturated fatty acids (LCSFA), total polyunsaturated fatty acid (PUFA), and sodium.
216 This factor explained 14.3% of the variance in nutrient intake. NHANES Factor 3,
217 named “dairy”, had dominant loadings on retinol, vitamin A, calcium, butanoic (butyric
218 acid or SFA 4:0), and minor-chain saturated fatty acids (MCSFA). The dairy factor
219 explained 13.0% of the variance in nutrient intake. NHANES Factor 4, named
220 “grains/legumes” had dominant loadings on copper, magnesium, and total dietary fiber.
221 This factor explained 12.1% of the variance in nutrient intake. NHANES Factor 5,
222 named “fruits/veggies”, loaded high on vitamin K, lutein + zeaxanthin, beta-carotene,
223 and alpha-carotene. The fruits/veggies factor explained 10.5% of the variance in
224 nutrient intake.

225 HCHS/SOL Factor 1, named “grains/legumes”, had dominant loadings on total dietary
226 fiber, magnesium, copper, potassium, total carbohydrate, total folate, vitamin B1,
227 vitamin B6, and iron. This factor explained 19.9% of the variance in nutrient intake.
228 HCHS/SOL Factor 2, named “dairy”, had dominant loadings on retinol, vitamin B2,
229 vitamin D, calcium, SFA4, and MCSFA. The dairy factor explained 13.6% of the

230 variance in nutrient intake. HCHS/SOL Factor 3, named “fats/oils”, had dominant
231 loadings on total fat, MUFA, PUFA, and LCSFA. This factor explained 12.2% of the
232 variance in nutrient intake. HCHS/SOL Factor 4, named “fruits/veggies”, had the
233 greatest loadings on vitamin A, alpha-carotene, beta-carotene, lutein + zeaxanthin, and
234 vitamin K. The fruits/veggies factor explained 11.4% of the variance in nutrient intake.
235 HCHS/SOL Factor 5, named “meats”, had dominant loadings on total protein and
236 selenium. This factor explained 9.7% of the variance in nutrient intake.

237 Standardized Cronbach’s coefficient alphas confirmed most of the nutrients contributed
238 to high reliability and pattern characterization (see Supplementary Material Tables 1 and
239 2). Internal reproducibility of the two samples was also confirmed by NBFP commonly
240 found in this population using the congruence coefficient (see Supplementary Material
241 Table 3).

242 NBFPs Comparative Analysis

243 The meats factors of HCHS/SOL and NHANES had two similar dominant nutrients: total
244 protein and selenium, however HCHS/SOL differed in that niacin, vitamin B6,
245 phosphorus, zinc, and vitamin B12 were not included. The fats/oils factor also showed
246 strong similarities across both studies, except for sodium (loading value of 0.61) only
247 loading in NHANES. The dairy factor showed many similarities across both studies, but
248 HCHS/SOL also included vitamin D, and B2 and NHANES included vitamin A as
249 dominant nutrients. The grains/legumes factors were similar except for potassium,
250 vitamin B1, vitamin B6, iron, total folate, and total carbohydrate loading only in
251 HCHS/SOL and copper, magnesium, and total dietary fiber loading only in NHANES.

252 Both fruit/vegetable factors reflected consumption of deep-colored fruits and vegetables,
253 but vitamin A had a higher loading in HCHS/SOL, and not in NHANES.

254 The order of the retained factors differed for each study. In NHANES, meats was the
255 first factor retained and explained most of the variation in nutrient intake (~17%). In
256 HCHS/SOL, meats was the last factor retained with 9.7% explained variation in nutrient
257 intake. In NHANES, the second retained factor was fats/oils explaining 14.3% of the
258 variation in nutrient intake while in HCHS/SOL fats/oils was the third retained factor with
259 12.2% of explained variance. In NHANES, the third retained factor and HCHS/SOL
260 second retained factor were both dairy with similar values of explained variation (~13%).
261 The fourth retained factor in NHANES was grains/legumes with 12.1% which differed
262 from HCHS/SOL. In HCHS/SOL, grains/legumes was the first factor retained which
263 explained most of the variation in nutrient intake (~20%). The last factor retained in
264 NHANES was fruits/veggies which explained 10.5% of the variation of nutrient intake.
265 This was lower than HCHS/SOL fourth retained factor, also fruits/veggies, that
266 explaining 11.4% of variation in nutrient intake.

267 **3.3 Quintile-based Factor Score Characteristics**

268 Tables 3 and 4 describe sociodemographic, behavioral and cardiometabolic
269 characteristics among those in the lowest and the highest quintile of each factor for
270 NHANES and HCHS/SOL, respectively.

271 In NHANES, those in the highest quintile of meats were more likely to be male, married,
272 have an annual household income of \$25,000 – \$75,000, current alcohol drinker,
273 smoker, or have diabetes. Those in the highest quintile of fats/oils were more likely to

274 be male, be of Mexican heritage, have an educational attainment greater than HS/GED
275 diploma, currently drink alcohol, or be employed. Those in the lowest quintile of dairy
276 were mostly composed of individuals with an educational attainment less than HS/GED
277 diploma. Those in the lowest quintile of grains/legumes were more likely to be females,
278 be of Mexican heritage, have lived in the USA for more than 10 years, or have obesity.
279 Those in the lowest quintile of fruits/veggies were more likely to be of Mexican heritage,
280 have an educational attainment less than a HS/GED diploma, be a smoker, or have
281 obesity.

282 In HCHS/SOL, those in the highest quintile of meats were more likely to be male, other
283 Hispanic heritage, employed, or a current drinker. Those in the lowest quintile of
284 grains/legumes were more likely to be female, be other Hispanic heritage, have obesity,
285 or not have hypertension. Those in the highest quintile of dairy were more likely to have
286 an educational attainment greater than HS diploma/GED. Those in the lowest quintile of
287 fruits/veggies were more likely to have an educational attainment less than HS
288 diploma/GED. Those in the lowest quintile of fats/oils were more likely to be female or
289 have an educational attainment level less than HS diploma/GED.

290 **3.4 NBFs Association to Cardiometabolic Risk Factors**

291 The forest plots in Figure 2 show the ORs and the 95% CIs for all cardiometabolic risk
292 factors by quintiles of the retained NBFs scores, adjusted for confounders and
293 comorbidities. An additional heatmap plot for the single factor model with ORs is
294 provided in Supplementary Figure 2. Table 5 gives the ORs (95% CI) for all CRFs by
295 quintiles of factor scores, and all the confounders in section 2.4 and comorbidities.

296 **Meats**

297 For the meats NBFP, there were associations between meats and both diabetes and
298 obesity were significant in both studies. In HCHS/SOL, persons in the highest quintile of
299 meats had higher odds of diabetes and obesity, using the third quintile to define a
300 moderate intake of meats for reference. This is similar to findings in NHANES where
301 those in the second quintile of meats had lower odds of diabetes and obesity. In
302 NHANES, the odds of cholesterol were lower for those in the fourth quintile of meats
303 compared to the third quintile. No significant association was found between meats
304 NBFP and hypertension in either study.

305 **Fats/Oils**

306 For the fats/oils NFBP, only one significant association emerged between the highest
307 quintile of fats/oils and obesity in HCHS/SOL. There were no associations between
308 fats/oils and any of the CRFs in NHANES. Compared to those in the third quintile of
309 fats/oils, the odds of obesity were higher for persons in the highest quintile of fats/oils.
310 No other associations were found between fats/oils NFBP and diabetes or high
311 cholesterol in HCHS/SOL.

312 **Fruits/Veggies**

313 For the fruits/veggies NBFP, only one significant association was found for those with
314 diabetes in HCHS/SOL. Compared to those in the third quintile of fruits/veggies, the
315 odds of diabetes were lower for persons in the lowest quintile of fruits/veggies. No
316 association was found between fruits/veggies NBFP and obesity, hypertension, or high
317 cholesterol in either study.

318 **Dairy**

319 For the dairy NFBP, dairy was associated with diabetes in NHANES. Compared to
320 those in the third quintile, higher odds of diabetes were observed among those in the
321 lowest quintile of dairy in NHANES. No significant association was found between dairy
322 NFBP and obesity, hypertension, or high cholesterol in either study.

323 **Grains/Legumes**

324 The odds of diabetes with intake of grains/legumes had fluctuating trends in NHANES.
325 In NHANES, the odds of diabetes were significantly higher for those in the highest
326 quintile of grains/legumes compared to those in the third quintile. In HCHS/SOL, the
327 odds of obesity were lower for those in the highest quintile of grains/legumes when
328 compared to those in the third quintile. No significant association was found between
329 grains/legumes NFBP and hypertension or high cholesterol in either study.

330 **4 Discussion**

331 Our analysis identified five similar nutrient-based food patterns in HCHS/SOL and
332 NHANES which were meats, fats/oils, dairy, grains/legumes, and fruits/vegetables.
333 These factors explained ~70% of the total variance in the nutrient intake. The order
334 (importance) in which retained factors emerged differed between studies, which also
335 indicates nutrient intake differences between studies. For example, the first factor
336 retained in NHANES was meats, while in HCHS/SOL grains/legumes was retained first.
337 When looking at characteristics by quintiles, we saw differences in intake patterns by
338 study. For example, those in the highest quintile of meats in NHANES were more likely
339 to be male, married, have an annual household income of \$25,000 – \$75,000, be a

340 current alcohol drinker or smoker, or have diabetes, while those in HCHS/SOL that were
341 in the highest quintile of meats were more likely to be male, other Hispanic heritage,
342 employed, or current alcohol drinker. Despite these NBFPs similarities across studies,
343 the associations between nutrient-based food patterns and cardiometabolic risk factors
344 were distinctively different. Within the HCHS/SOL cohort, those in the highest quintile of
345 meats were associated with higher odds of diabetes and obesity. NBFPs associated
346 with higher odds of obesity included those in the highest quintile of fats/oils and meats
347 and those in the lowest quintile of grains/legumes. There were no patterns associated
348 with hypertension and high cholesterol in HCHS/SOL. Within the NHANES cohort,
349 patterns associated with higher odds of diabetes included those in the lowest quintile of
350 dairy and highest quintile of grains/legumes, with lower odds of obesity for those in the
351 lowest quintile of meats and lower odds of cholesterol for those in the highest quintile of
352 meats.

353 These discrepancies between studies raises concern of how best to generalize these
354 differing results in characterizing dietary behaviors of US Hispanic/Latino adults (17,18).
355 Each study has limitations regarding the population they represent partly explained by
356 the study sampling design. This is further highlighted in Table 5, where additional
357 demographic covariates included in the model yielded varying odds ratios between the
358 two studies. HCHS/SOL implemented a sampling design aimed to collect an
359 interpretable sized distribution of 7 identifiably different ethnic backgrounds in four large
360 urban areas, omitting populations in non-urban areas. NHANES implemented a
361 sampling design that aimed to collect an interpretable sized distribution relative to the
362 US population for those that identify as Mexican or Other Hispanic in both urban or non-

363 urban areas, but not publicly identifiable information to differentiate geography region or
364 specify ethnicities of Other Hispanic adults (53). Further, while ample information about
365 nativity and acculturation of participants was available for HCHS/SOL participants, this
366 was largely unknown in NHANES. Differences in nativity and acculturation could
367 potentially explain differences in the nutrients contained in the different foods consumed
368 from the two studies, which could impact risks such as diabetes (54). These challenges
369 limit the information we can obtain regarding nutrition and cardiometabolic health of this
370 population from a single study in isolation.

371 Methods such as factor analysis, implemented in this study, or adherence scores to
372 examine diet quality (14,55) rely on the composition of the study population. Greater
373 representation of demographics that are known to influence diet (e.g., cultural
374 background, geographical location) can drive the overall patterns identified in data-
375 driven methods such as principal component analysis. Both studies include different
376 Hispanic/Latino backgrounds, but the representation of Hispanic/Latino backgrounds
377 vary between the two studies. With nutrient intake previously reported to differ by ethnic
378 background in HCHS/SOL (4), different population compositions can yield different
379 patterns between the two studies.

380 Prior work examining diets of Hispanic/Latino adult participants of NHANES or
381 HCHS/SOL have focused on diet quality. Prior HCHS/SOL studies have analyzed
382 adherence to diet quality scores and their associations to CVD by ethnic background
383 (16, 21,55,56). Those of Mexican background had higher adherence to HEI-2015 or
384 DASH with lower risk of cardiometabolic risk (e.g., blood pressure, fasting glucose,
385 cholesterol) (55,56). This is consistent with our present HCHS/SOL findings, wherein

386 persons in the highest quintile of meats NBFP had higher odds of diabetes and obesity
387 compared to those in the third quintile. Nicklas et al. (14) examined diet quality (HEI-
388 2005) differences by race/ethnicity of NHANES adult participants and its association
389 with cardiometabolic risk. Their findings showed that mean HEI scores were higher
390 among Other Hispanics but did not detail which dietary components contribute
391 predominantly to that score. While other NHANES studies have focused primarily on
392 individual nutrients of interest for Mexican American and Other Hispanic adults, none
393 have focused primarily on deriving patterns of multiple nutrients in Hispanic/Latino
394 adults (57,58). Given the unknown distribution of other Hispanic/Latino ethnic groups in
395 NHANES, it is difficult to know how representative these results are over the growing
396 diverse makeup of Hispanic/Latino adults in the United States. Advanced methods have
397 been applied to HCHS/SOL to examine dietary differences by ethnicity and state
398 (10,59), but similar approaches have not yet been explored with NHANES
399 Hispanic/Latino participants for comparison.

400 We implemented an exploratory factor analysis in both studies to illustrate how a
401 commonly used approach for deriving NBFP can impact generalized results of study
402 populations, with similar ethnic backgrounds, but different survey sampling strategies. A
403 strength of this study is the use of two 24hr dietary recalls from two large studies such
404 as NHANES and HCHS/SOL. Due to NHANES oversampling Hispanic/Latino adults we
405 had a moderately large sample size, allowing us enough power to analyze these two
406 samples separately and compare results. The differences in sampling strategies
407 permitted us to examine how different sampled populations can sometimes yield
408 conflicting results. However, the different survey designs prevented us from being able

409 to combine the two surveys and perform a direct comparison, such as a two-group CFA.
410 Further methodological extensions are needed to allow pooling across multiple surveys
411 with different sampling designs.

412 A limitation in our study is the use of 24-hour intake recall data which may affect the
413 derivation of nutrient patterns when they fail to capture the participant's usual diet and
414 consumed nutrients, but this is ameliorated to a certain extent with the average of two
415 recalls. While diet instruments are prone to underestimating energy intake, the 24-hour
416 recalls have the strength given their granularity of capturing cultural and ethnic dietary
417 differences versus food frequency questionnaires (60). Thus, dietary recalls can be
418 useful tools for studies of diverse ethnic composition. We would also like to
419 acknowledge that self-reported dietary assessment tools and cardiometabolic risk
420 factors are prone to measurement error and reporting bias (61,62). Another limitation is
421 that nutrient patterns can differ by sex however in our derivation of NBFPs we did not
422 adjust for sex. While sex was not used to derive nutrient-based food patterns, it was
423 adjusted for in the associations with CRFs. The results reported in this study are based
424 on a cross-sectional study design. Consequently, associations found are fixed at the
425 time points listed. Changes in dietary behaviors or incidence of cardiometabolic risk
426 factors over time are beyond the scope of this study.

427 In conclusion, this study demonstrates the sensitivity of diet patterns and their relation to
428 cardiometabolic risk factors in US Hispanic/Latino adults, when different sampling
429 strategies are implemented. While no single study can address all sampling strategy
430 limitations, further methodological research should be explored to leverage already
431 existing surveys that target underrepresented populations and account for study design

432 differences, in order to generate appropriate population-based inference. For example,
433 as mentioned previously, pooling studies focused on Hispanic/Latino adults whose
434 sampling strategies differ by geography, race, ethnicity, and income would allow us to
435 better examine the true heterogeneity of diet behaviors in the United States for this
436 emerging demographic. This strategy will greatly improve population health disparities
437 research by providing a more comprehensive understanding of nutrition and CVD
438 epidemiology in populations at greatest risk.

439

440 **References**

- 441 1. Manjunath L, Hu J, Palaniappan L, Rodriguez F. Years of Potential Life Lost from
442 Cardiovascular Disease Among Hispanics. *Ethn Dis.* 2019;29(3):477-484.
443 doi:10.18865/ed.29.3.477
- 444 2. Ayala GX, Baquero B, Klinger S. A systematic review of the relationship between
445 acculturation and diet among Latinos in the United States: implications for future
446 research. *J Am Diet Assoc.* 2008;108(8):1330-1344. doi:10.1016/j.jada.2008.05.009
- 447 3. Wartella EA, Lichtenstein AH, Boon CS, editors. *Front-of-Package Nutrition Rating*
448 *Systems and Symbols: Phase I Report.* Washington (DC): National Academies
449 Press (US); Institute of Medicine (US) Committee on Examination of Front-of-
450 Package Nutrition Rating Systems and Symbols; 2010. 4, Overview of Health and
451 Diet in America. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK209844/>
- 452 4. Siega-Riz AM, Sotres-Alvarez D, Ayala GX, et al. Food-group and nutrient-density
453 intakes by Hispanic and Latino backgrounds in the Hispanic Community Health
454 Study/Study of Latinos. *Am J Clin Nutr.* 2014;99(6):1487-1498.
455 doi:10.3945/ajcn.113.082685
- 456 5. Rodriguez CJ, Allison M, Daviglius ML, Isasi CR, Keller C, Leira EC, Palaniappan L,
457 Piña IL, Ramirez SM, Rodriguez B, Sims M; on behalf of the American Heart
458 Association Council on Epidemiology and Prevention, Council on Clinical
459 Cardiology, and Council on Cardiovascular and Stroke Nursing. Status of
460 cardiovascular disease and stroke in Hispanics/Latinos in the United States: a
461 science advisory from the American Heart Association. *Circulation.* 2014;130:593–
462 625.
- 463 6. Daviglius ML, Pirzada A, Talavera GA. Cardiovascular disease risk factors in the
464 Hispanic/Latino population: lessons from the Hispanic Community Health
465 Study/Study of Latinos (HCHS/SOL). *Prog Cardiovasc Dis.* 2014;57(3):230-236.
466 doi:10.1016/j.pcad.2014.07.006
- 467 7. Elfassy T, Zeki AI, Hazzouri A, Cai J, et al. Incidence of Hypertension Among US
468 Hispanics/Latinos: The Hispanic Community Health Study/Study of Latinos, 2008 to
469 2017. *J Am Heart Assoc.* 2020;9(12):e015031. doi:10.1161/JAHA.119.015031
- 470 8. Maldonado LE, Adair LS, Sotres-Alvarez D, Mattei J, Mossavar-Rahmani Y, Perreira
471 KM, Daviglius ML, Van Horn LV, Gallo LC, Isasi CR, Albrecht SS. Dietary Patterns
472 and Years Living in the United States by Hispanic/Latino Heritage in the Hispanic
473 Community Health Study/Study of Latinos (HCHS/SOL), *The Journal of Nutrition*,
474 Volume 151, Issue 9, September 2021, Pages 2749–2759,
475 <https://doi.org/10.1093/jn/nxab165>
- 476 9. Stephenson BJK, Sotres-Alvarez D, Siega-Riz AM, Mossavar-Rahmani Y, Daviglius
477 ML, Van Horn L, Herring AH, Cai J. Empirically Derived Dietary Patterns Using
478 Robust Profile Clustering in the Hispanic Community Health Study/Study of Latinos,
479 *The Journal of Nutrition*, Volume 150, Issue 10, October 2020, Pages 2825–2834,
480 <https://doi.org/10.1093/jn/nxaa208>

- 481 10. De Vito R, Stephenson B, Sotres-Alvarez D, Siega-Riz AM, Mattei J, Parpinel M,
482 Peters BA, Bainter SA, Daviglius ML, Van Horn L, Edefonti V. Shared and ethnic
483 background site-specific dietary patterns in the Hispanic Community Health
484 Study/Study of Latinos (HCHS/SOL), Preprint, medRxiv 2022.06.30.22277013; doi:
485 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.30.22277013>
- 486 11. Krok-Schoen JL, Archdeacon Price A, Luo M. et al. Low Dietary Protein Intakes and
487 Associated Dietary Patterns and Functional Limitations in an Aging Population: A
488 NHANES Analysis. *J Nutr Health Aging* 23, 338–347 (2019).
489 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12603-019-1174-1>
- 490 12. Ganji V, Shi Z, Al-Abdi T, Al Hejap D, Attia Y, Koukach D, Elkassas H. (2022).
491 Association between food intake patterns and serum vitamin D concentrations in US
492 adults. *British Journal of Nutrition*, 1-11. doi:10.1017/S0007114522001702
- 493 13. Aqeel MM, Guo J, Lin L, Gelfand SB, Delp EJ, Bhadra A, Richards EA, Hennessy E,
494 Eicher-Miller HA, Temporal Dietary Patterns Are Associated with Obesity in US
495 Adults, *The Journal of Nutrition*, Volume 150, Issue 12, December 2020, Pages
496 3259–3268, <https://doi.org/10.1093/jn/nxaa287>
- 497 14. Nicklas TA, O'Neil CE, Fulgoni VL, III, Diet Quality Is Inversely Related to
498 Cardiovascular Risk Factors in Adults, *The Journal of Nutrition*, Volume 142, Issue
499 12, December 2012, Pages 2112–2118, <https://doi.org/10.3945/jn.112.164889>
- 500 15. Ha K, Sakaki JR, Chun OK, Nutrient Adequacy Is Associated with Reduced Mortality
501 in US Adults, *The Journal of Nutrition*, Volume 151, Issue 10, October 2021, Pages
502 3214–3222, <https://doi.org/10.1093/jn/nxab240>
- 503 16. Chen F, Du M, Blumberg JB, et al. Association Among Dietary Supplement Use,
504 Nutrient Intake, and Mortality Among U.S. Adults: A Cohort Study. *Annals of Internal*
505 *Medicine*. 2019 May;170(9):604-613. DOI: 10.7326/m18-2478. PMID: 30959527;
506 PMID: PMC6736694.
- 507 17. Edefonti V, De Vito R, Salvatori A, Bravi F, Patel L, Dalmartello M, Ferraroni M.
508 Reproducibility of A Posteriori Dietary Patterns across Time and Studies: A Scoping
509 Review. *Adv Nutr*. 2020 Sep 1;11(5):1255-1281. doi: 10.1093/advances/nmaa032.
510 PMID: 32298420; PMID: PMC7490165.
- 511 18. Edefonti V, De Vito R, Dalmartello M, Patel L, Salvatori A, Ferraroni M.
512 Reproducibility and Validity of A Posteriori Dietary Patterns: A Systematic Review.
513 *Advances in Nutrition* (Bethesda, Md.). 2020 Mar;11(2):293-326. DOI:
514 10.1093/advances/nmz097. PMID: 31578550; PMID: PMC7442345.
- 515 19. Maldonado LE. (2020). A Posteriori Dietary Patterns, Years Living in the US, and
516 Type 2 Diabetes by Cultural Heritage: Unpacking Heterogeneity among
517 Hispanics/Latinos. ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.
- 518 20. Siega-Riz AM, Pace ND, Butera NM, Van Horn L, Daviglius ML, Harnack L,
519 Mossavar-Rahmani Y, Rock CL, Pereira RI, & Sotres-Alvarez D. (2019). How Well
520 Do U.S. Hispanics Adhere to the Dietary Guidelines for Americans? Results from the
521 Hispanic Community Health Study/Study of Latinos. *Health equity*, 3(1), 319–327.
522 <https://doi.org/10.1089/heq.2018.0105>

- 523 21. Mattei J, Sotres-Alvarez D, Daviglius ML, Gallo LC, Gellman M, Hu FB, Tucker KL,
524 Willett WC, Siega-Riz AM, Van Horn L, Kaplan RC, Diet Quality and Its Association
525 with Cardiometabolic Risk Factors Vary by Hispanic and Latino Ethnic Background
526 in the Hispanic Community Health Study/Study of Latinos, *The Journal of Nutrition*,
527 Volume 146, Issue 10, October 2016, Pages 2035–2044,
528 <https://doi.org/10.3945/jn.116.231209>
- 529 22. Overcash F, Reicks M. Diet Quality and Eating Practices among Hispanic/Latino
530 Men and Women: NHANES 2011–2016. *International Journal of Environmental*
531 *Research and Public Health*. 2021; 18(3):1302.
532 <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18031302>
- 533 23. Hu FB, Rimm EB, Stampfer MJ, Ascherio A, Spiegelman D, Willett WC. Prospective
534 study of major dietary patterns and risk of coronary heart disease in men. *Am J Clin*
535 *Nutr*. 2000;72(4):912-921. PMID:
536 11010931 https://doi.org/10.1161/circ.129.suppl_1.p113
- 537 24. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). National Center for Health
538 Statistics (NCHS). National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey Data.
539 Hyattsville, MD: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for
540 Disease Control and Prevention, 2022,
541 [https://wwwn.cdc.gov/nchs/nhanes/analyticguidelines.aspx#sample-](https://wwwn.cdc.gov/nchs/nhanes/analyticguidelines.aspx#sample-design)
542 [design](https://wwwn.cdc.gov/nchs/nhanes/analyticguidelines.aspx#sample-design)<https://wwwn.cdc.gov/nchs/nhanes/analyticguidelines.aspx#sample-design>
- 543 25. USDA Food and Nutrient Database for Dietary Studies, 4.1 (2010). Beltsville, MD:
544 U.S. Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Research Service, Food Surveys
545 Research Group
- 546 26. Ahuja JKA, Montville JB, Omolewa-Tomobi G, Heendeniya KY, Martin CL, Steinfeldt
547 LC, Anand J, Adler ME, LaComb RP, and Moshfegh AJ. 2012. USDA Food and
548 Nutrient Database for Dietary Studies, 5.0. U.S. Department of Agriculture,
549 Agricultural Research Service, Food Surveys Research Group, Beltsville,
550 MD. <https://wwwn.cdc.gov/nchs/nhanes/analyticguidelines.aspx#sample-design>
- 551 27. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Research Service. 2014. USDA Food
552 and Nutrient Database for Dietary Studies 2011-2012. Food Surveys Research
553 Group Home Page, <http://www.ars.usda.gov/ba/bhnrc/fsrg>
- 554 28. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Health Statistics.
555 National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey 2007-2008 Data Documentation,
556 Codebook, and Frequencies (Dietary Interview - Total Nutrient Intakes, First and
557 Second Day, DR1TOT_E and DR2TOT_E). Hyattsville, MD: U.S. Department of
558 Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2007-08.
559 https://wwwn.cdc.gov/Nchs/Nhanes/2007-2008/DR1TOT_E.htm,
560 https://wwwn.cdc.gov/Nchs/Nhanes/2007-2008/DR2TOT_E.htm
- 561 29. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Health Statistics.
562 National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey 2009-2010 Data Documentation,
563 Codebook, and Frequencies (Dietary Interview - Total Nutrient Intakes, First and
564 Second Day, DR1TOT_F and DR2TOT_F). Hyattsville, MD: U.S. Department of
565 Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2009-10.

- 566 https://wwwn.cdc.gov/Nchs/Nhanes/2009-2010/DR1TOT_F.htm,
567 https://wwwn.cdc.gov/Nchs/Nhanes/2009-2010/DR2TOT_F.htm
- 568 30. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Health Statistics.
569 National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey 2011-2012 Data Documentation,
570 Codebook, and Frequencies (Dietary Interview - Total Nutrient Intakes, First and
571 Second Day, DR1TOT_G and DR2TOT_G). Hyattsville, MD: U.S. Department of
572 Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2011-12.
573 https://wwwn.cdc.gov/Nchs/Nhanes/2011-2012/DR1TOT_G.htm,
574 https://wwwn.cdc.gov/Nchs/Nhanes/2011-2012/DR2TOT_G.htm
- 575 31. Mirel LB, Mohadjer LK, Dohrmann SM, et al. National Health and Nutrition
576 Examination Survey: Estimation procedures, 2007–2010. National Center for Health
577 Statistics. *Vital Health Stat* 2(159). 2013.
- 578 32. Chen TC, Parker JD, Clark J, Shin HC, Rammon JR, Burt VL. National Health and
579 Nutrition Examination Survey: Estimation procedures, 2011–2014. National Center
580 for Health Statistics. *Vital Health Stat* 2(177).
581 2018. <https://wwwn.cdc.gov/nchs/nhanes/analyticguidelines.aspx>
- 582 33. Anand J, Raper N, Tong A. (2006). Quality assurance during data processing of food
583 and nutrient intakes. *Subtropical plant science*, 19, S86. doi:
- 584 34. Lavange LM, Kalsbeek WD, Sorlie PD, Aviles-Santa LM, Kaplan RC, Barnhart J, Liu
585 K, Giachello A, Lee DJ, Ryan J, et al. Sample design and cohort selection in the
586 Hispanic Community Health Study/Study of Latinos. *Ann Epidemiol* 2010;20:642–9.
- 587 35. Schakel SF, Buzzard IM, Gebhardt SE. Procedures for estimating nutrient values for
588 food composition databases. *J Food Comp and Anal*. 1997;10:102-114.
- 589 36. Expert Panel on Detection, Evaluation, and Treatment of High Blood Cholesterol in
590 Adults. Executive Summary of The Third Report of The National Cholesterol
591 Education Program (NCEP) Expert Panel on Detection, Evaluation, And Treatment
592 of High Blood Cholesterol In Adults (Adult Treatment Panel III). *JAMA*. 2001;
593 285(19):2486–2497. [PubMed: 11368702]
- 594 37. Clinical guidelines on the identification, evaluation, and treatment of overweight and
595 obesity in adults: the evidence report [NIH Publication No. 98–4083]. National Heart,
596 Lung, and Blood Institute; http://www.nhlbi.nih.gov/guidelines/obesity/ob_gdlns.pdf
- 597 38. Lean MEJ, Han TS, Morrison CE. Waist circumference as a measure for indicating
598 need for weight management *BMJ* 1995; 311 :158 doi:10.1136/bmj.311.6998.158
- 599 39. Nickerson BS. Evaluation of Obesity Cutoff Values in Hispanic Adults: Derivation of
600 New Standards. *J Clin Densitom*. 2021;24(3):388-396.
601 doi:10.1016/j.jocd.2020.10.010
- 602 40. American Diabetes Association; Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes—2010.
603 *Diabetes Care* 1 January 2010; 33 (Supplement_1): S11–S61.
604 <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc10-S011>
- 605 41. Chobanian AV, Bakris GL, Black HR, et al. National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute
606 Joint National Committee on Prevention, Detection, Evaluation, and Treatment of
607 High Blood Pressure; National High Blood Pressure Education Program
608 Coordinating Committee. The Seventh Report of the Joint National Committee on

- 609 Prevention, Detection, Evaluation, and Treatment of High Blood Pressure: the JNC 7
610 report. JAMA. 2003; 289(19):2560–2572. [PubMed: 12748199]
- 611 42. D'Agostino RB Sr, Vasan RS, Pencina MJ, Wolf PA, Cobain M, Massaro JM, Kannel
612 WB. General cardiovascular risk profile for use in primary care: the Framingham
613 Heart Study. Circulation. 2008 Feb 12;117(6):743-53. doi:
614 10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.107.699579. Epub 2008 Jan 22. PMID: 18212285.
- 615 43. Castro V. (2021) CVrisk: Compute Risk Scores for Cardiovascular Diseases.
616 <https://cran.rstudio.com/web/packages/CVrisk/index.html>. Accessed on 7/25/2022.
- 617 44. <https://sites.csc.unc.edu/hchs/study-data-and-analytic-methods-pub> Hispanic
618 Community Health Study/Study of Latinos (HCHS/SOL) Baseline Derived Variable
619 Dictionary Version 4.23 (January 2020). HCHS/SOL Coordinating Center,
620 Collaborative Studies Coordinating Center, Department of Biostatistics, UNC Chapel
621 Hill. Accessed on 1/21/2023
- 622 45. Lumley T. (2020) "survey: analysis of complex survey samples". R package version
623 4.0.
- 624 46. Lumley T. (2004) Analysis of complex survey samples. Journal of Statistical
625 Software 9(1): 1-19
- 626 47. Cronbach, L.J. Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. Psychometrika
627 1951; 18: 297-334
- 628 48. R Core Team (2020). R: language and environment for statistical computing. R
629 Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL [https://www.R-](https://www.R-project.org/)
630 [project.org/](https://www.R-project.org/).
- 631 49. Revelle W. (2021) psych: Procedures for Personality and Psychological Research,
632 Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois, USA, [https://CRAN.R-](https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=psych)
633 [project.org/package=psych](https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=psych) Version = 2.1.9.,.
- 634 50. Wickham H, Miller E. (2020). haven: Import and Export 'SPSS', 'Stata' and 'SAS'
635 Files. R package version 2.3.1. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=haven>
- 636 51. Wickham H. (2016) ggplot2: Elegant Graphics for Data Analysis. Springer-Verlag
637 New York, 2016.
- 638 52. Wickham et al., (2019). Welcome to the tidyverse. Journal of Open Source Software,
639 4(43), 1686, <https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.01686>
- 640 53. Befort CA, Nazir N, Perri MG. (2012), Prevalence of Obesity Among Adults From
641 Rural and Urban Areas of the United States: Findings From NHANES (2005-2008).
642 The Journal of Rural Health, 28: 392-397. [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-0361.2012.00411.x)
643 [0361.2012.00411.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-0361.2012.00411.x)
- 644 54. Kershaw KN, Giacinto RE, Gonzalez F, Isasi CR, Salgado H, Stamler J, Talavera
645 GA, Tarraf W, Van Horn L, Wu D, Daviglius ML. Relationships of nativity and length
646 of residence in the US with favorable cardiovascular health among
647 Hispanics/Latinos: the Hispanic Community Health Study/Study of Latinos
648 (HCHS/SOL). Preventive medicine. 2016 Aug 1;89:84-9.
- 649 55. Chen Y, Chen G, Abittan N, Xing J, Mossavar-Rahmani Y, Sotres-Alvarez D, Mattei
650 J, Daviglius M, Isasi CR, Hu FB, Kaplan R, Qi Q, Healthy dietary patterns and risk of
651 cardiovascular disease in US Hispanics/Latinos: the Hispanic Community Health

- 652 Study/Study of Latinos (HCHS/SOL), *The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*,
653 2022
- 654 56. Joyce BT, Wu D, Hou L, Dai Q, Castaneda SF, Gallo, LC, Talavera GA, Sotres-
655 Alvarez, D, Van Horn L, Beasley J et al. DASH diet and prevalent metabolic
656 syndrome in the Hispanic Community Health Study/Study of Latinos. *Prev. Med.*
657 *Rep.* 2019, 15, 100950
- 658 57. Liu J, Huang Y, Dai Q, Fulda KG, Chen S, Tao M-H. Trends in Magnesium Intake
659 among Hispanic Adults, the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey
660 (NHANES) 1999–2014. *Nutrients.* 2019; 11(12):2867.
661 <https://doi.org/10.3390/nu11122867>
- 662 58. Jackson SL, King SMC, Zhao L, Cogswell ME. (2016). Prevalence of Excess
663 Sodium Intake in the United States — NHANES, 2009–2012. *Morbidity and Mortality*
664 *Weekly Report*, 64(52), 1393–1397. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/24856953>
- 665 59. Stephenson BJ, Wu SM, Dominici F. Identifying Dietary Consumption Patterns from
666 Survey Data: A Bayesian Nonparametric Latent Class Model. *medRxiv.* 2022 Jan
667 1:2021-11.
- 668 60. Baranowski, T. 24-Hour Recall and Diet Record Methods, *Nutritional Epidemiology*,
669 3rd edn, *Monographs in Epidemiology and Biostatistics* (2012; online edn, Oxford
670 Academic, 24 Jan. 2013)
- 671 61. Ravelli MN, Schoeller DA. Traditional Self-Reported Dietary Instruments Are Prone
672 to Inaccuracies and New Approaches Are Needed. *Front Nutr.* 2020;7:90.
673 doi:10.3389/fnut.2020.00090
- 674 62. Mossavar-Rahmani Y, Shaw PA, Wong WW, et al. Applying Recovery Biomarkers to
675 Calibrate Self-Report Measures of Energy and Protein in the Hispanic Community
676 Health Study/Study of Latinos. *Am J Epidemiol.* 2015;181(12):996-1007.
677 doi:10.1093/aje/kwu468
- 678

679 **Tables and Figures**

680 Table 1: Sociodemographic and behavioral characteristics and cardiometabolic risk
 681 factors for NHANES (pooled cycles from 2008-2012) and HCHS/SOL (baseline 2008-
 682 2011) adjusting for age

		NHANES n = 3,209		HCHS/SOL n = 13,059	
		mean or %	SE	mean or %	SE
Sex	Female	51.8	0.80	54.8	0.65
	Male	48.2	0.80	45.2	0.59
Age (yrs)*		40.0	0.25	41.9	0.24
Ethnicity	Mexican	59.5	3.88	37.3	1.62
	Other Hispanic	40.5	3.88	62.7	1.62
Educational Attainment	< HS Diploma/GED	45.7	1.43	33.3	0.80
	HS Diploma/GED	20.7	0.80	26.9	0.59
	> HS Diploma/GED	33.6	1.57	39.8	0.90
US born	US born	27.0	2.80	18.9	0.67
	≤ 10 years in USA	20.9	1.57	28.5	1.00
	> 10 years in USA	52.1	1.95	52.7	0.82
Household Income	< \$25,000	33.0	1.59	56.4	1.11
	\$25,000-\$75,000	49.5	1.35	37.8	0.76
	> \$75,000	17.5	1.31	5.8	0.66
Marital Status	Married	65.7	1.34	53.0	0.82
	Unmarried	34.4	1.34	47.0	0.82
Employment Status	Employed	66.2	1.09	52.0	0.71
	Retired	6.9	0.35	9.5	0.34
	Unemployed	26.9	1.1	38.5	0.75
Energy (kcal)**		2016.2	7.95	1845.8	9.69
Alcohol Use	Current	61.7	1.32	51.1	0.79
	Former	9.9	0.60	30.2	0.72
	Never	28.5	1.28	18.7	0.71
Smoker Status	Non-smoker	82.8	0.85	79.8	0.57
	Smoker	17.2	0.85	20.2	0.57
Framingham CVD	10-yr Risk Score	9.8	0.22	10.5	0.14
Cardiometabolic risk factors					
	High Cholesterol	59.3	1.20	43.1	0.61
	Diabetes	14.1	0.73	15.4	0.46
	Obesity	50.4	1.09	49.2	0.72
	Hypertension	22.7	0.79	24.7	0.49

683 Note: CVD, cardiovascular disease; Conditions were defined for high cholesterol (total cholesterol ≥ 240 mg/dL, LDL cholesterol ≥
 684 160 mg/dL, HDL cholesterol < 40 mg/dL, self-reported use of cholesterol-lowering medication, or self-reported
 685 hypercholesterolemia), diabetes (fasting time > 8 hours & fasting plasma glucose ≥ 126 mg/dL, fasting time ≤ 8 hours and fasting
 686 glucose ≥ 200 mg/dL, or post-OGTT glucose ≥ 200 mg/dL, HbA1c ≥ 6.5%, self-reported medication use, or self-reported physician
 687 diagnosis), hypertension (BP ≥ 140/90 mm Hg or medication use), obesity [BMI ≥ 30 kg/m² for 20-44 years old & waist

688 circumference (women > 88 cm, men > 102 cm) for 45-74 years old], Framingham CVD 10-year risk score (derived using lab
 689 predictors based on the Framingham Study criterion), and hypertension (systolic blood pressure > 140 mm Hg, or diastolic blood
 690 pressure ≥ 90 mm Hg, or self-reported medication use); *reported mean age with no adjustment; ** log version of energy was used
 691 throughout the analyses.

692 Table 2: Nutrient intake summary (geometric mean and 95% CI) for NHANES and
 693 HCHS/SOL, adjusting for age, sex, and energy intake

	NHANES n = 3,209	HCHS/SOL n = 13,059
Nutrients	Geometric mean (95% CI)	Geometric mean (95% CI)
Total Protein (gm)	78.2 (77.0, 79.5)	71.6 (70.7, 72.5)
Total Carbohydrate (gm)	247.4 (244.2, 250.7)	228.4 (226.3, 230.5)
Total Sugars (gm)	99.3 (96.2, 102.5)	88.7 (86.6, 90.8)
Total Dietary Fiber (gm)	16.4 (15.8, 17.1)	15.3 (14.9, 15.7)
Total Fat (gm)	67.8 (66.5, 69.2)	60.2 (59.4, 60.9)
Total MUFA (gm)	24.6 (24.1, 25.2)	21.9 (21.6, 22.3)
Total PUFA (gm)	14.9 (14.5, 15.3)	12.6 (12.4, 12.9)
Dietary Cholesterol (mg)	250.0 (239.4, 261.1)	216.1 (210.1, 222.3)
Vitamin E (mg)	6.1 (5.9, 6.4)	5.9 (5.8, 6.0)
Retinol (mcg)	281.4 (266.1, 297.6)	263.4 (252.0, 275.4)
Vitamin A (mcg)	426.1 (406.4, 446.8)	587.1 (567.0, 607.9)
Alpha-Carotene (mcg)	102.9 (87.7, 120.9)	120.1 (107.8, 133.7)
Beta-Carotene (mcg)	947.3 (862.0, 1041.5)	1110.6 (1044.3, 1181.3)
Beta-Cryptoxanthin (mcg)	40.2 (35.2, 46.1)	41.2 (37.6, 45.2)
Lycopene (mcg)	1550.6 (1261.4, 1910.3)	1028.2 (867.3, 1220.3)
Lutein+Zeaxanthin (mcg)	708.9 (662.5, 758.7)	613.9 (582.7, 647.0)
Vitamin B1 (mg)	1.6 (1.5, 1.6)	1.5 (1.5, 1.6)
Vitamin B2 (mg)	1.9 (1.8, 1.9)	1.7 (1.7, 1.7)
Niacin (mg)	22.7 (22.1, 23.2)	19.8 (19.5, 20.1)
Vitamin B6 (mg)	1.9 (1.9, 2.0)	1.8 (1.7, 1.8)
Total Folate (mcg)	367.2 (356.5, 378.2)	340.9 (334.3, 347.7)
Vitamin B12 (mcg)	3.9 (3.8, 4.1)	3.6 (3.5, 3.7)
Vitamin C (mg)	62.3 (57.4, 67.7)	64.0 (60.9, 67.2)
Vitamin D (mcg)	3.5 (3.2, 3.7)	3.8 (3.6, 3.9)
Vitamin K (mcg)	61.0 (57.6, 64.6)	53.0 (51.0, 55.0)
Calcium (mg)	842.8 (816.1, 870.3)	684.1 (667.5, 701.1)
Phosphorus (mg)	1288.6 (1266.0, 1311.7)	1086.9 (1072.7, 1101.4)
Magnesium (mg)	278.5 (271.7, 285.5)	255.9 (252.1, 259.8)
Iron (mg)	13.8 (13.4, 14.1)	12.4 (12.2, 12.6)
Zinc (mg)	10.3 (10.1, 10.6)	9.5 (9.4, 9.7)
Copper (mg)	1.2 (1.2, 1.3)	1.2 (1.2, 1.2)
Sodium (mg)	3080.9 (3018.6, 3144.5)	2839.4 (2791.8, 2887.8)
Potassium (mg)	2486.6 (2431.3, 2543.2)	2226.1 (2192.7, 2260.1)
Selenium (mcg)	104.9 (102.7, 107.2)	99.3 (97.9, 100.7)

Caffeine (mg)	46.5 (39.0, 55.6)	33.8 (30.0, 38.0)
SFA4 (butyric acid) (gm)	0.5 (0.4, 0.5)	0.4 (0.4, 0.4)
MCSFA (gm)	1.2 (1.1, 1.3)	1.1 (1.1, 1.2)
LCSFA (gm)	19.2 (18.7, 19.7)	17.1 (16.9, 17.4)

694 Note: CI, confidence interval; MUFA, total monounsaturated fatty acids; SUFA, total polyunsaturated fatty acids; MCSFA, medium
695 chain saturated fatty acids; LCSFA, long chain saturated fatty acids; gm, grams; mg, milligrams, mcg, micrograms

696 Table 3: Comparing NHANES characteristics by lowest and highest quintiles of factor scores

		Meats		Fats/Oils		Dairy		Grains/Legumes		Fruits/Veggies	
		Q1	Q5	Q1	Q5	Q1	Q5	Q1	Q5	Q1	Q5
Sex (%)	Female	70.8 (3.9)	20.3 (2.6)	63.7 (3.7)	33.9 (3)	37.4 (3.3)	43.1 (3.4)	59.4 (3.7)	33 (2.5)	40.9 (3.5)	51.3 (3.5)
Age (yrs)		48.3 (0.8)	43.4 (0.6)	49.3 (0.8)	43.8 (0.8)	47.1 (0.9)	45.6 (0.8)	47.4 (0.9)	45.0 (0.8)	46.2 (0.9)	47.6 (0.7)
Ethnicity (%)	Mexican	61.7 (4.8)	62.8 (4.9)	52.1 (4.1)	64.1 (5.8)	64.9 (4.3)	57.5 (4.9)	52.1 (5.5)	72.7 (3.8)	61.5 (5.9)	49.1 (5)
Educational Attainment (%)	< HS Diploma/GED	51.0 (4.5)	44.3 (3.3)	60.2 (3.5)	36.4 (3.9)	55.7 (3.9)	39.6 (3.1)	46.5 (4)	52.2 (4.2)	61.4 (3.7)	36.3 (3.1)
	HS Diploma/GED	20.7 (3.2)	22.9 (3.1)	15.2 (2.1)	21.3 (3.3)	19 (2.7)	25.7 (3.4)	16.4 (2.2)	16.7 (3)	16 (2.5)	22.5 (3)
	> HS Diploma/GED	28.3 (4.4)	32.8 (4.1)	24.6 (2.7)	42.3 (4.3)	25.3 (3.2)	34.7 (2.8)	37.1 (3.6)	31.1 (2.9)	22.6 (3.3)	41.2 (3.3)
US born (%)	US born	25.4 (3.8)	26.3 (3.4)	12.5 (2.2)	42.8 (4.9)	21.7 (3.4)	30.9 (3.6)	32.9 (4.4)	17.5 (3.2)	26.8 (3.9)	25.2 (3.2)
	<= 10 years in USA	16.8 (2.7)	23.3 (3.1)	17.7 (2.4)	14.1 (3.2)	14.7 (2.9)	10.8 (2.1)	17.3 (2.7)	19.5 (3.5)	19.2 (3.2)	19.1 (3)
	> 10 years in USA	57.8 (3.9)	50.4 (3.4)	69.7 (2.7)	43.1 (4.1)	63.6 (2.6)	58.3 (4)	49.7 (4.2)	63 (4.7)	54.1 (4.4)	55.6 (3.1)
Household Income (%)	< \$25,000	42.3 (4.7)	27.7 (2.8)	40 (3.5)	24.9 (3.4)	33 (3.6)	32.8 (2.7)	33.2 (3.3)	29.7 (4.2)	39.6 (4.2)	31.2 (2.9)
	\$25,000-\$75,000	41.4 (3.2)	56.6 (3.2)	47.3 (3.1)	52.6 (3.7)	52.1 (3.5)	45.5 (3.2)	49.7 (2.7)	58.3 (4.1)	46.8 (4.2)	47.2 (2.6)
	> \$75,000	16.4 (4.1)	15.7 (2.9)	12.7 (1.7)	22.5 (4)	14.9 (2.8)	21.6 (3)	17.2 (3.2)	12 (2.5)	13.5 (2)	21.6 (2.9)
Marital Status (%)	Married	64.6 (4)	77 (2.9)	64.1 (3.9)	77.3 (3.1)	68.5 (2.9)	70.4 (3.9)	62.2 (3.2)	76.2 (3.1)	68.5 (3.8)	65.9 (2.7)
Employment Status (%)	Employed	65.3 (2.9)	77.5 (2.6)	54.7 (3.1)	81.8 (3.4)	73.7 (3.3)	69.3 (3.1)	60 (3.4)	80.1 (2.3)	68.5 (3.6)	70.4 (2.5)
	Retired	5.6 (1)	3.9 (0.8)	8.3 (1.3)	2 (0.7)	5.8 (1.4)	5.5 (0.8)	6.7 (1.2)	3.2 (0.8)	4.1 (1.1)	6.4 (1)

	Unemployed	29.1 (2.4)	18.5 (2.6)	36.9 (2.7)	16.2 (3)	20.5 (2.7)	25.3 (2.9)	33.3 (3.1)	16.7 (2.2)	27.5 (3.1)	23.1 (2.2)
Energy (kcal)		1583.8 (33.4)	2449.4 (61.8)	1434.1 (29.4)	2682.7 (48.1)	1838.9 (51.3)	2273.3 (62.7)	1516.1 (40.3)	2505.1 (62.7)	1803.9 (44.4)	2063.3 (61.5)
Alcohol Use (%)	Current	45.7 (3.8)	74 (3.1)	47.1 (4.2)	72.1 (2.7)	58.7 (3.7)	58.6 (3.6)	55.6 (3.6)	62.2 (3.6)	56.6 (4.2)	59.5 (3.9)
	Former	13.8 (2.2)	9.1 (1.9)	8.7 (1.7)	9.7 (2)	9.2 (2.2)	10 (2.6)	9.4 (2)	12.5 (2.2)	9.8 (1.7)	12.7 (2.5)
	Never	40.6 (3.6)	16.9 (2.6)	44.1 (3.7)	18.1 (2.8)	32 (4.1)	31.4 (3.3)	35 (3.5)	25.3 (3.1)	33.6 (4.1)	27.8 (3)
Smoker Status (%)	Smoker	13.9 (3)	21.3 (2.6)	11.8 (2.2)	21.1 (2.8)	20 (2.6)	16.1 (2.3)	16.1 (2.7)	14.3 (2.9)	21.6 (3.3)	13 (2.1)
Framingham CVD 10-yr	Risk Score	8.5 (0.6)	8.6 (0.4)	9.8 (0.7)	8.3 (0.7)	10.9 (0.6)	9.3 (0.8)	8.5 (0.5)	9.2 (0.5)	10.3 (0.8)	9.2 (0.5)
Cardiometabolic risk factors											
High Cholesterol (%)	Yes	57.2 (3.2)	60.8 (3.7)	58.3 (3.3)	63.1 (3.2)	61.3 (3.3)	64.4 (2.8)	63.2 (4)	58.9 (3.3)	65.6 (3.5)	59.7 (3)
Diabetes (%)	Yes	23.8 (3.8)	14.6 (2.2)	23.3 (3)	17.4 (2.5)	22.7 (2.8)	18.5 (3)	16.3 (3)	23.0 (2.6)	19.1 (3.4)	19.5 (2)
Obesity (%)	Yes	55.6 (3.6)	49.8 (4.3)	59.5 (3.1)	60 (4.7)	52.9 (4.1)	50.7 (3.5)	62.4 (3.9)	47.8 (3.7)	46.6 (2.9)	58.1 (3.4)
Hypertension (%)	Yes	30.7 (3.2)	22.5 (2.6)	31.4 (3.3)	26.3 (2.3)	29.9 (2.7)	24.8 (3.7)	26.7 (3.4)	26.6 (3.5)	24.5 (3.3)	28.4 (2.5)

697 Note: Q, quintile; CVD, cardiovascular disease; Conditions were defined for high cholesterol (total cholesterol \geq 240 mg/dL, LDL cholesterol \geq 160 mg/dL, HDL cholesterol $<$ 40 mg/dL,
698 self-reported use of cholesterol-lowering medication, or self-reported hypercholesterolemia), diabetes (fasting time $>$ 8 hours & fasting plasma glucose \geq 126 mg/dL, fasting time \leq 8
699 hours and fasting glucose \geq 200 mg/dL, or post-OGTT glucose \geq 200 mg/dL, HbA1c \geq 6.5%, self-reported medication use, or self-reported physician diagnosis), hypertension (BP
700 \geq 140/90 mm Hg or medication use), obesity [BMI \geq 30 kg/m² for 20-44 years old & waist circumference (women $>$ 88 cm, men $>$ 102 cm) for 45-74 years old], Framingham CVD 10-
701 year risk score (derived using lab predictors based on the Framingham Study criterion), and hypertension (systolic blood pressure $>$ 140 mm Hg, or diastolic blood pressure \geq 90 mm
702 Hg, or self-reported medication use). Dominant nutrients loading onto meats (protein, niacin, vitamin B6, phosphorus, zinc, selenium, vitamin B12), fats/oils (total MUFA, total fat,
703 LCSFA, total PUFA, sodium), dairy (retinol, vitamin A, calcium, SFA4, MCSFA), grains/legumes (copper, magnesium, total dietary fiber), fruits/veggies (vitamin K, lutein+zeaxanthin,
704 beta-carotene, alpha-carotene). Reference levels are male, other Hispanic, $>$ HS Diploma/GED, US born, annual income $>$ \$75k, married, employed, never drinker, and non-smoker.

705

706 Table 4: Comparing HCHS/SOL characteristics by lowest and highest quintiles of factor scores

		Grains/Legumes		Dairy		Fats/Oils		Fruits/Veggies		Meats	
		Q1	Q5	Q1	Q5	Q1	Q5	Q1	Q5	Q1	Q5
Sex (%)	Female	67.4 (1.7)	38.7 (1.6)	54.1 (1.6)	53.7 (1.7)	68.5 (1.4)	43.2 (1.9)	54.8 (1.7)	57.1 (1.7)	72.1 (1.4)	32.3 (1.6)
Age (yrs)		47.3 (0.4)	46.5 (0.4)	47.0 (0.4)	46.6 (0.5)	48.6 (0.4)	45.4 (0.4)	46.6 (0.5)	47.7 (0.4)	49.2 (0.5)	45.4 (0.4)
Ethnicity (%)	Mexican	27.9 (2)	46.6 (2.4)	31.2 (2.3)	45.9 (2.6)	41.2 (2.1)	32.4 (2.3)	30.2 (2.2)	42.1 (2.5)	41.8 (2.2)	32 (2.3)
Educational Attainment (%)	< HS Diploma/GED	37.6 (1.6)	33.9 (1.7)	41.6 (1.7)	30.9 (1.9)	38.2 (1.4)	29.1 (1.6)	39.4 (1.8)	29.6 (1.8)	36.7 (1.5)	30.6 (1.6)
	HS Diploma/GED	24.9 (1.4)	24.2 (1.4)	26.1 (1.5)	27.1 (1.7)	26.6 (1.5)	28.1 (1.8)	28.5 (1.8)	24.4 (1.3)	24.9 (1.4)	28.0 (1.7)
	> HS Diploma/GED	37.5 (1.8)	41.9 (1.9)	32.3 (1.5)	42 (1.9)	35.2 (1.7)	42.8 (1.7)	32.1 (1.8)	45.9 (2.0)	38.4 (1.7)	41.4 (1.9)
US born (%)	US born	17.4 (1.4)	11.2 (1.2)	10.4 (1.1)	18.8 (1.6)	9.6 (1.0)	20.9 (1.9)	21.2 (1.9)	11.7 (1.4)	14.1 (1.1)	15.5 (1.5)
	<= 10 years in USA	21.7 (1.5)	27.5 (1.7)	25.3 (1.8)	24.8 (1.7)	23.2 (1.6)	28.2 (1.8)	20.3 (1.4)	27.5 (1.9)	24.1 (1.5)	23.9 (1.8)
	> 10 years in USA	60.9 (1.7)	61.2 (1.7)	64.2 (1.8)	56.4 (2.0)	67.2 (1.6)	51.0 (1.9)	58.5 (1.9)	60.8 (2.0)	61.8 (1.7)	60.6 (1.9)
Household Income (%)	< \$25,000	62.4 (1.8)	53.6 (1.9)	60.9 (1.9)	53.5 (2.4)	59.5 (1.9)	56.0 (2.0)	64.9 (2.0)	50.3 (2.1)	58.8 (1.7)	51.9 (2.1)
	\$25,000-\$75,000	32.7 (1.6)	38.0 (1.6)	35.4 (1.8)	37.8 (1.9)	35.2 (1.4)	37.4 (1.8)	30.5 (1.8)	40.3 (1.7)	36.1 (1.6)	41.5 (1.8)
	> \$75,000	4.9 (0.9)	8.4 (1.7)	3.7 (0.7)	8.7 (1.9)	5.3 (1.1)	6.6 (1.0)	4.6 (0.9)	9.3 (1.7)	5.1 (0.8)	6.6 (1.4)
Marital Status (%)	Married	53.5 (1.8)	62.1 (1.7)	57.2 (1.7)	60.4 (2.2)	58.3 (1.7)	55.6 (1.9)	54.3 (2.0)	63.5 (1.8)	53.2 (1.7)	58.0 (2.0)
Employment Status (%)	Employed	49.7 (1.6)	59.6 (1.7)	53.5 (1.7)	53.0 (1.9)	48.6 (1.5)	57.9 (1.9)	48.7 (1.8)	57.6 (1.8)	48.5 (1.7)	61.3 (1.8)
	Retired	13.4 (1.1)	7.9 (1.0)	9.6 (1.2)	8.7 (0.9)	14.0 (1.2)	6.1 (1.1)	10.3 (1.0)	9.4 (1.2)	14.6 (1.4)	7.9 (1.2)
	Unemployed	37.0 (1.7)	32.5 (1.6)	37.0 (1.6)	38.3 (2.0)	37.4 (1.4)	36.0 (1.9)	40.9 (1.9)	33.0 (1.7)	36.9 (1.5)	30.8 (1.6)
Energy (kcal)		1285.3 (14.7)	2360.0 (24.4)	1627.2 (21.3)	2048.3 (24.0)	1305.8 (13.8)	2386.6 (26.2)	1628.5 (22.6)	1854.9 (23.0)	1470.7 (16.5)	2142.4 (26.4)
Alcohol Use (%)	Current	45.4 (1.6)	56.4 (1.7)	49.5 (1.8)	50.4 (2.2)	40.3 (1.6)	56.6 (1.9)	47.0 (1.8)	49.1 (1.7)	42.1 (1.5)	60.0 (2.1)
	Former	34.0 (1.8)	29.8 (1.6)	31.6 (1.9)	32.9 (1.8)	38.7 (1.6)	27.6 (1.7)	34.5 (1.7)	32.4 (1.7)	36.7 (1.5)	28.3 (1.9)
	Never	20.6 (1.5)	13.8 (1.1)	19.0 (1.4)	16.7 (1.4)	20.9 (1.4)	15.8 (1.4)	18.5 (1.4)	18.4 (1.3)	21.2 (1.3)	11.7 (1.1)
Smoker Status (%)	Smoker	20.4 (1.4)	20.9 (1.3)	21.7 (1.4)	18.2 (1.5)	11.1 (0.8)	26.4 (1.7)	25.8 (1.8)	15.7 (1.1)	15.4 (1.0)	25.6 (1.5)

Framingham CVD 10-yr	Risk Score	10.0 (0.4)	10.0 (0.4)	9.2 (0.4)	10.1 (0.4)	9.3 (0.3)	10.0 (0.4)	9.5 (0.4)	9.7 (0.4)	10.3 (0.4)	10.0 (0.4)
Cardiometabolic risk factors											
High Cholesterol (%)	Yes	44.9 (1.6)	48.2 (1.6)	48.3 (1.6)	45.0 (1.9)	49.5 (1.5)	43.5 (1.8)	45.3 (1.9)	45.2 (1.7)	44.2 (1.6)	49.7 (1.6)
Diabetes (%)	Yes	18.8 (1.2)	14.7 (1.0)	19.2 (1.4)	15.0 (1.2)	22.2 (1.2)	13.7 (1.3)	16.4 (1.2)	17.7 (1.3)	17.1 (1.2)	18.6 (1.5)
Obesity (%)	Yes	59.7 (1.6)	45.0 (1.6)	53.5 (1.7)	48.1 (1.9)	53.5 (1.7)	53.1 (1.8)	54.7 (1.8)	51.5 (1.8)	55.5 (1.6)	50.4 (1.9)
Hypertension (%)	Yes	34.1 (1.6)	26.1 (1.5)	31.9 (1.6)	26.1 (1.4)	32.2 (1.5)	27.0 (1.5)	30.1 (1.6)	28.6 (1.5)	32.1 (1.5)	28.9 (1.5)

Note: Q, quintile; CVD, cardiovascular disease; Conditions were defined for high cholesterol (total cholesterol \geq 240 mg/dL, LDL cholesterol \geq 160 mg/dL, HDL cholesterol $<$ 40 mg/dL, self-reported use of cholesterol-lowering medication, or self-reported hypercholesterolemia), diabetes (fasting time $>$ 8 hours & fasting plasma glucose \geq 126 mg/dL, fasting time 8 hours and fasting glucose \geq 200 mg/dL, or post-OGTT glucose \geq 200 mg/dL, HbA1c \geq 6.5%, self-reported medication use, or self-reported physician diagnosis), hypertension (BP \geq 140/90 mm Hg or medication use), obesity [BMI \geq 30 kg/m² for 20-44 years old & waist circumference (women $>$ 88 cm, men $>$ 102 cm) for 45-74 years old], Framingham CVD 10-year risk score (derived using lab predictors based on the Framingham Study criterion), and hypertension (systolic blood pressure $>$ 140 mm Hg, or diastolic blood pressure \geq 90 mm Hg, self-reported medication use, or self-reported physician diagnosis). Dominant nutrients loading onto grains/legumes (total carbohydrate, total dietary fiber, total folate, magnesium, copper, potassium, vitamin B1, vitamin B6, iron), meats (total protein, selenium), dairy (retinol, vitamin B2, vitamin D, calcium, SFA4, MCSFA), fats/oils (total fat, MUFA, PUFA, LCSFA), fruits/veggies (vitamin A, alpha-carotene, beta-carotene, lutein+zeaxanthin, vitamin K). Reference levels are male, other Hispanic, $>$ HS Diploma/GED, US born, annual income $>$ \$75k, married, employed, never drinker, and non-smoker.

707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715

716 Table 5: Odds ratio (95% CIs) for association of NHANES and HCHS/SOL respondents characteristics and dietary factors
 717 with cardiometabolic risk factors


	High Cholesterol		Diabetes		Obesity		Hypertension	
	NHANES	HCHS/SOL	NHANES	HCHS/SOL	NHANES	HCHS/SOL	NHANES	HCHS/SOL
Female	0.35 (0.24, 0.53)	0.37 (0.32, 0.43)	0.70 (0.42, 1.16)	0.79 (0.66, 0.95)	0.44 (0.31, 0.64)	2.43 (2.10, 2.82)	0.69 (0.44, 1.07)	0.69 (0.59, 0.82)
Age, yrs	1.01 (1.00, 1.03)	1.02 (1.01, 1.02)	1.04 (1.01, 1.06)	1.05 (1.04, 1.05)	0.98 (0.96, 0.99)	1.02 (1.02, 1.03)	1.10 (1.08, 1.12)	1.09 (1.08, 1.10)
Mexican	0.97 (0.71, 1.32)	1.08 (0.94, 1.23)	1.06 (0.67, 1.69)	1.54 (1.30, 1.83)	0.89 (0.66, 1.20)	1.10 (0.94, 1.29)	1.12 (0.72, 1.73)	0.52 (0.43, 0.62)
Energy, kcal	1.05 (0.48, 2.29)	0.90 (0.60, 1.35)	0.32 (0.10, 1.05)	0.30 (0.19, 0.47)	0.95 (0.31, 2.97)	0.90 (0.63, 1.29)	2.31 (0.82, 6.51)	0.61 (0.39, 0.95)
< HS Diploma/GED	1.31 (0.97, 1.78)	1.10 (0.96, 1.26)	1.35 (0.88, 2.06)	1.16 (0.95, 1.41)	1.07 (0.72, 1.60)	1.09 (0.94, 1.26)	0.92 (0.62, 1.37)	1.09 (0.92, 1.30)
HS Diploma/GED	1.12 (0.79, 1.59)	1.04 (0.91, 1.19)	0.94 (0.54, 1.62)	1.02 (0.82, 1.26)	1.11 (0.69, 1.77)	1.08 (0.93, 1.25)	1.55 (0.90, 2.66)	1.14 (0.95, 1.37)
<= 10 yrs in USA	1.03 (0.64, 1.66)	1.06 (0.87, 1.29)	0.75 (0.36, 1.56)	0.69 (0.50, 0.95)	1.88 (1.26, 2.80)	0.56 (0.46, 0.69)	0.67 (0.40, 1.14)	1.02 (0.78, 1.32)
> 10 yrs in USA	0.97 (0.61, 1.53)	1.10 (0.91, 1.32)	0.94 (0.61, 1.46)	1.07 (0.84, 1.36)	1.35 (0.97, 1.86)	0.73 (0.60, 0.89)	0.60 (0.39, 0.94)	0.90 (0.73, 1.11)
Income < \$25k	0.95 (0.60, 1.52)	1.03 (0.77, 1.36)	1.18 (0.58, 2.41)	1.83 (1.07, 3.13)	0.63 (0.39, 1.00)	0.91 (0.62, 1.32)	0.96 (0.48, 1.91)	1.25 (0.92, 1.70)
Income \$25-75k	0.87 (0.58, 1.29)	1.03 (0.79, 1.35)	0.99 (0.51, 1.91)	1.64 (0.97, 2.79)	0.59 (0.40, 0.88)	0.99 (0.70, 1.38)	0.84 (0.49, 1.44)	1.26 (0.93, 1.70)
Unmarried	1.52 (1.11, 2.08)	0.90 (0.79, 1.02)	1.13 (0.77, 1.65)	0.92 (0.79, 1.08)	0.94 (0.72, 1.24)	1.07 (0.95, 1.20)	0.95 (0.70, 1.29)	1.09 (0.95, 1.25)
Retired	1.28 (0.63, 2.60)	1.07 (0.82, 1.40)	0.87 (0.42, 1.79)	1.27 (0.94, 1.71)	1.77 (0.96, 3.30)	0.68 (0.53, 0.86)	0.80 (0.40, 1.60)	1.33 (1.00, 1.76)
Unemployed	1.07 (0.83, 1.37)	1.16 (1.02, 1.32)	1.28 (0.80, 2.07)	1.28 (1.07, 1.52)	0.81 (0.58, 1.14)	1.05 (0.91, 1.21)	1.18 (0.71, 1.95)	1.02 (0.86, 1.21)
Current Drinker	0.89 (0.63, 1.25)	0.82 (0.70, 0.97)	0.93 (0.58, 1.49)	1.08 (0.87, 1.33)	1.06 (0.74, 1.51)	1.11 (0.94, 1.30)	0.87 (0.57, 1.31)	0.95 (0.78, 1.16)
Former Drinker	1.24 (0.69, 2.25)	0.77 (0.66, 0.90)	1.60 (0.94, 2.73)	0.76 (0.62, 0.93)	1.43 (0.89, 2.30)	1.00 (0.84, 1.18)	0.88 (0.48, 1.60)	0.97 (0.80, 1.17)
Smoker	1.12 (0.75, 1.67)	1.02 (0.89, 1.17)	0.83 (0.44, 1.57)	0.96 (0.77, 1.19)	1.16 (0.84, 1.59)	1.05 (0.89, 1.24)	1.04 (0.67, 1.60)	0.83 (0.69, 0.99)
Cholesterol			1.40 (0.83, 2.36)	2.10 (1.79, 2.47)	0.49 (0.35, 0.68)	1.85 (1.61, 2.12)	1.64 (1.15, 2.33)	1.42 (1.23, 1.64)
Obesity	0.50 (0.35, 0.70)	1.86 (1.62, 2.13)	0.36 (0.24, 0.54)	1.91 (1.63, 2.24)			0.37 (0.23, 0.59)	2.16 (1.86, 2.51)
Hypertension	1.53 (1.06, 2.20)	1.37 (1.18, 1.58)	3.16 (1.85, 5.40)	2.23 (1.89, 2.63)	0.41 (0.26, 0.64)	1.98 (1.71, 2.28)		
Diabetes	1.33 (0.78, 2.29)	2.04 (1.73, 2.40)			0.38 (0.26, 0.58)	1.70 (1.46, 1.99)	3.26 (1.94, 5.48)	2.23 (1.89, 2.63)
Meats								
Q1	0.78 (0.50, 1.23)	1.03 (0.84, 1.26)	0.80 (0.43, 1.48)	0.67 (0.52, 0.86)	1.10 (0.67, 1.82)	1.01 (0.83, 1.22)	1.64 (0.93, 2.90)	0.88 (0.70, 1.11)
Q2	1.02 (0.68, 1.53)	1.01 (0.85, 1.21)	0.56 (0.36, 0.88)	1.01 (0.79, 1.29)	0.61 (0.37, 1.00)	1.07 (0.89, 1.29)	1.45 (0.87, 2.42)	0.96 (0.76, 1.21)
Q4	0.67 (0.44, 1.02)	1.05 (0.89, 1.24)	0.78 (0.43, 1.41)	1.26 (1.00, 1.60)	0.81 (0.52, 1.26)	1.19 (1.01, 1.40)	1.44 (0.78, 2.64)	0.97 (0.79, 1.20)
Q5	0.67 (0.38, 1.19)	1.03 (0.85, 1.24)	0.93 (0.51, 1.70)	1.62 (1.22, 2.15)	0.74 (0.42, 1.31)	1.34 (1.11, 1.62)	1.09 (0.59, 2.00)	1.16 (0.92, 1.46)
Fats/Oils								
Q1	1.04 (0.61, 1.75)	1.06 (0.84, 1.32)	0.88 (0.38, 2.01)	0.80 (0.61, 1.05)	0.97 (0.58, 1.61)	0.95 (0.76, 1.18)	1.62 (0.91, 2.88)	0.79 (0.60, 1.05)
Q2	1.02 (0.77, 1.36)	0.87 (0.72, 1.04)	1.05 (0.51, 2.17)	0.93 (0.73, 1.19)	1.19 (0.79, 1.80)	1.05 (0.86, 1.29)	1.51 (0.83, 2.76)	1.03 (0.82, 1.29)
Q4	1.04 (0.65, 1.67)	0.89 (0.75, 1.07)	1.03 (0.54, 1.97)	1.23 (0.96, 1.57)	1.09 (0.69, 1.74)	1.02 (0.85, 1.23)	0.77 (0.42, 1.41)	1.00 (0.80, 1.24)
Q5	0.91 (0.55, 1.53)	0.82 (0.67, 1.01)	1.69 (0.83, 3.45)	1.33 (1.01, 1.77)	0.79 (0.42, 1.47)	1.24 (1.01, 1.53)	0.96 (0.53, 1.74)	1.18 (0.94, 1.48)
Dairy								
Q1	0.84 (0.56, 1.27)	1.14 (0.92, 1.41)	1.42 (0.83, 2.42)	0.87 (0.67, 1.14)	1.43 (0.91, 2.24)	0.97 (0.80, 1.19)	1.09 (0.64, 1.86)	1.04 (0.82, 1.31)
Q2	0.93 (0.63, 1.38)	1.15 (0.96, 1.37)	1.18 (0.59, 2.39)	0.89 (0.69, 1.14)	1.33 (0.84, 2.11)	1.10 (0.93, 1.31)	0.86 (0.45, 1.66)	0.91 (0.75, 1.11)
Q4	0.76 (0.50, 1.14)	1.02 (0.84, 1.23)	1.24 (0.67, 2.27)	0.95 (0.75, 1.20)	1.32 (0.80, 2.16)	0.99 (0.82, 1.18)	0.75 (0.45, 1.24)	1.09 (0.87, 1.36)

Q5	0.99 (0.67, 1.47)	1.10 (0.89, 1.34)	1.36 (0.64, 2.89)	0.94 (0.71, 1.25)	1.29 (0.82, 2.05)	0.96 (0.81, 1.15)	0.72 (0.37, 1.41)	0.94 (0.74, 1.19)
Grains/Legumes								
Q1	0.98 (0.61, 1.57)	0.91 (0.72, 1.16)	0.74 (0.35, 1.57)	0.67 (0.50, 0.89)	0.72 (0.46, 1.13)	1.14 (0.92, 1.41)	0.93 (0.45, 1.91)	0.97 (0.75, 1.26)
Q2	1.02 (0.65, 1.62)	1.09 (0.89, 1.33)	1.47 (0.84, 2.59)	0.80 (0.61, 1.05)	0.83 (0.52, 1.33)	0.95 (0.79, 1.14)	0.96 (0.58, 1.62)	1.02 (0.82, 1.28)
Q4	0.79 (0.50, 1.26)	0.94 (0.78, 1.12)	0.91 (0.50, 1.65)	1.33 (1.02, 1.74)	0.98 (0.65, 1.48)	0.81 (0.67, 0.97)	0.99 (0.54, 1.79)	0.92 (0.75, 1.14)
Q5	0.76 (0.44, 1.29)	1.06 (0.86, 1.31)	2.33 (1.34, 4.04)	1.18 (0.90, 1.55)	1.15 (0.63, 2.09)	0.84 (0.69, 1.02)	0.98 (0.49, 1.98)	1.09 (0.86, 1.39)
Fruits/Veggies								
Q1	0.85 (0.56, 1.29)	0.88 (0.71, 1.08)	0.96 (0.51, 1.82)	0.72 (0.56, 0.92)	1.29 (0.79, 2.10)	1.18 (0.95, 1.46)	1.28 (0.65, 2.52)	0.94 (0.74, 1.19)
Q2	0.94 (0.61, 1.45)	1.08 (0.90, 1.29)	0.80 (0.44, 1.43)	0.85 (0.66, 1.08)	0.78 (0.48, 1.26)	1.03 (0.86, 1.23)	1.09 (0.59, 2.03)	0.87 (0.71, 1.07)
Q4	0.91 (0.59, 1.40)	1.08 (0.91, 1.28)	0.73 (0.39, 1.36)	0.96 (0.76, 1.20)	0.89 (0.57, 1.40)	1.00 (0.83, 1.21)	1.03 (0.70, 1.53)	0.98 (0.78, 1.22)
Q5	0.83 (0.53, 1.30)	0.95 (0.79, 1.13)	0.93 (0.54, 1.60)	1.00 (0.77, 1.30)	0.97 (0.62, 1.51)	0.97 (0.82, 1.16)	1.11 (0.74, 1.64)	0.92 (0.74, 1.15)

Note: This analysis includes all factors simultaneously. Reference levels are Q3, male, other Hispanic, > HS Diploma/GED, US born, annual income > \$75k, married, employed, never drinker, and non-smoker. Conditions were defined for high cholesterol (total cholesterol \geq 240 mg/dL, LDL cholesterol \geq 160 mg/dL, HDL cholesterol < 40 mg/dL, self-reported use of cholesterol-lowering medication, or self-reported hypercholesterolemia), diabetes (fasting time > 8 hours & fasting plasma glucose \geq 126 mg/dL, fasting time 8 hours and fasting glucose \geq 200 mg/dL, or post-OGTT glucose \geq 200 mg/dL, HbA1c \geq 6.5%, self-reported medication use, or self-reported physician diagnosis), hypertension (BP \geq 140/90 mm Hg or medication use), obesity [BMI \geq 30 kg/m² for 20-44 years old & waist circumference (women > 88 cm, men > 102 cm) for 45-74 years old], Framingham CVD 10-year risk score (derived using lab predictors based on the Framingham Study criterion), and hypertension (systolic blood pressure > 140 mm Hg, or diastolic blood pressure \geq 90 mm Hg, or self-reported medication use).

718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725

726 Figure 1: Heatmap of factor loading values for the five retained factors in NHANES and HCHS/SOL







727

728 Note: MUFA, total monounsaturated fatty acids; SUFA, total polyunsaturated fatty acids; MCSFA, medium chain saturated fatty acids; LCSFA, long chain saturated fatty acids; F,
 729 factor. Proportion of explained variance in nutrient intake for NHANES factors 1-5 are 17.0, 14.3, 13.0, 12.1, and 10.5, respectively while in HCHS/SOL factors 1-5 are 19.9, 13.6, 12.2,
 730 11.4, and 9.7, respectively.

731

732 Figure 2: Forest plots of single factor models (OR and 95% CI) by NBFs and cardiometabolic risk factors for NHANES
733 (n=3,209) and HCHS/SOL (n=13,059) respondents





736 Note: NBFP, nutrient based food pattern; Q, quintile; CI, confidence intervals; CVD, cardiovascular disease; Conditions were defined for high cholesterol (total cholesterol \geq 240 mg/dL,
737 LDL cholesterol \geq 160 mg/dL, HDL cholesterol $<$ 40 mg/dL, self-reported use of cholesterol-lowering medication, or self-reported hypercholesterolemia), diabetes (fasting time $>$ 8
738 hours & fasting plasma glucose \geq 126 mg/dL, fasting time \geq 8 hours and fasting glucose \geq 200 mg/dL, or post-OGTT glucose \geq 200 mg/dL, HbA1c \geq 6.5%, self-reported medication use,
739 or self-reported physician diagnosis), hypertension (BP \geq 140/90 mm Hg or medication use), obesity [BMI \geq 30 kg/m² for 20-44 years old & waist circumference (women $>$ 88 cm, men $>$
740 102 cm) for 45-74 years old], Framingham CVD 10-year risk score (derived using lab predictors based on the Framingham Study criterion), and hypertension (systolic blood pressure $>$
741 140 mm Hg, or diastolic blood pressure \geq 90 mm Hg, or self-reported medication use).

742

743