

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

Sarah Gregory¹, Alex Griffiths², Amy Jennings^{3,4}, Fiona C Malcomson⁵, Jamie Matu², Anne-Marie Minihane³, Graciela Muniz-Terrera^{1,6}, Craig W. Ritchie^{1,7}, Solange Parra-Soto^{8,9}, Emma Stevenson^{5,10}, Rebecca Townsend¹⁰, Nicola Ward⁴, Oliver Shannon⁵

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

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

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

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

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

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

⁷Scottish Brain Sciences, Edinburgh, UK

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

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

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

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

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

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

Abstract

Background: The Eatwell guide reflects the UK government's recommendations for a healthy and balanced diet. Previous research has identified associations between healthy eating patterns and both cardiovascular and brain health, although there is little evidence specifically focusing on the Eatwell Guide. To date no research has investigated associations between the Eatwell Guide and risk for future dementia.

Methods: Data from the PREVENT dementia cohort study baseline visit was used in this analysis. Binary and graded Eatwell Guide scores (BEWG, GEWG) were created from a self-reported Food Frequency Questionnaire. The CAIDE score was included as the primary outcome measure to represent risk for future Alzheimer's disease. Secondary outcome measures included cardiometabolic health measures and brain health measures. Generalised additive models were run in R.

Results: A total of 517 participants were included in the analysis, with a mean BEWG score of 4.39 (\pm 1.66) (out of a possible 12 points) and GEWG score of 39.88 (\pm 6.19) (out of a possible 60 points). There was no significant association between either Eatwell Guide score and the CAIDE score (BEWG β : 0.07, 95% confidence interval (CI): -0.07, 0.22; GEWG β : 0.02, 95% CI: -0.02, 0.06) or any measures of brain health. There was a significant association between higher GEWG score and lower systolic and diastolic blood pressure and body mass index (BMI) (systolic β : -0.24, 95% CI: -0.45, -0.03; diastolic β : -0.16, 95% CI: -0.29, -0.03; BMI β : -0.09, 95% CI: -0.16, -0.01).

Conclusions: Although not directly associated with the CAIDE score, the Eatwell Guide dietary pattern may be beneficial for dementia prevention efforts through the modification of hypertension and obesity, which are both known risk factors for dementia. Future work could replicate these findings in other UK-based cohorts as well as further development of Eatwell Guide scoring methodologies.

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

1 Introduction

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

8
9 The 'Eatwell Guide' (EWG) communicates the UK government recommendations for a healthy
10 and balanced diet (5). The EWG promotes the consumption of fruit and vegetables, oily and
11 other fish, total fibre, sustainable protein sources, wholegrains and fibre-rich carbohydrate
12 sources, and adequate fluid intake, whilst limiting consumption of red and processed meat,
13 total salt, free sugars, saturated fatty acids (SFAs) and total fat (5, 6).

14
15 Few studies have explored associations between overall adherence to the EWG and health. In
16 one cross-cohort analysis of data from EPIC-Oxford, One Million Women study and UK Biobank
17 aiming to understand health impacts and environmental footprints of the EWG, higher
18 adherence to the EWG was associated with a reduced risk of mortality (7). This study by
19 Scheelbeck *et al* is the first to create an empirical score from the EWG and investigate
20 associations with health outcomes, applying a binary scoring method for nine of the EWG
21 groups. Analyses applying the same EWG scoring methodology in post-menopausal women in
22 the UK Women's Cohort Study (UKWCS) reported that higher adherence to the EWG was
23 associated with lower weight, waist circumference and body mass index (BMI) (8). Further,
24 greater adherence to the EWG at baseline was associated with smaller increases in waist
25 circumference and lower risk of abdominal obesity over 4 years (8). Whilst these provisional
26 findings are promising, they are restricted to a limited number of health outcomes. Moreover,
27 Scheelbeck *et al* did not incorporate all EWG components into their score due to availability of
28 data across datasets and scored each EWG component on a binary basis (i.e., points awarded

29 for achieving a dietary goal), which may fail to capture more nuanced differences in diet quality
30 between individuals (e.g., by partially meeting an EWG recommendation).

31
32 The EWG has a number of notable similarities to a Mediterranean dietary pattern (MedDiet).
33 An analysis of adherence to a MedDiet in the PREVENT dementia cohort, a UK and Ireland
34 midlife cohort used in this current analysis, showed significant associations between higher
35 adherence to the MedDiet and lower systolic and diastolic blood pressure and BMI, particularly
36 in female participants (9). Given the conceptual overlap between the EWG and the MedDiet, it
37 is reasonable to explore associations between the EWG and cardiovascular and brain health.

38
39 Associations between EWG adherence and risk of dementia are currently unknown. Indeed, the
40 SACN (2018) review on *Diet, Cognitive Impairment and Dementia* identified a gap in the
41 research about UK healthy eating recommendations and dementia risk (10). The aim of this
42 current study was to develop a new binary and graded scoring methodologies for EWG
43 adherence, building on the initial methodology developed by Scheelbeek *et al*, in order to
44 explore associations between adherence to the EWG and risk for dementia, cardiometabolic
45 and brain health in a cohort of midlife adults in the UK and Ireland. Furthermore, a comparison
46 was made between the EWG scores and MedDiet scores within the cohort, to explore the
47 comparability of these two models to capture healthy eating.

48
49 Methods

50 *PREVENT Dementia Programme*

51 The data used in this study is drawn from the baseline visit of the PREVENT dementia
52 programme (PREVENT) (11-13). PREVENT is a prospective cohort study of 700 participants aged
53 40 to 59 years of age at baseline, at least half of whom have a parental history of dementia,
54 were fluent in English, and who were free of dementia at study entry. Participants were only
55 excluded if they were unable to tolerate the study protocol, including any contraindications for
56 brain magnetic resonance imaging (MRI). Participants were recruited from five centres in the
57 UK and Ireland (Cambridge, Dublin, Edinburgh, London, and Oxford) through memory clinics

58 when in attendance as the family member of a patient, advertisements, research registries and
59 word of mouth. Participants completed physical health and cognitive assessments at the
60 baseline visit as well as providing information on risk factors for future neurodegeneration
61 through a series of self-report questionnaires.

62

63 *Ethical Approval and Consent to Participate*

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

68

69 *Calculation of Eatwell Guide scores*

70 Dietary data were collected with the Scottish Collaborative Group Food Frequency
71 Questionnaire (SCG-FFQ) (14, 15). The SCG-FFQ was self-administered by each participant. It
72 begins with clear instructions on the first page of the questionnaire including pictures of
73 portion sizes, which all participants were instructed to read before self-reporting their diet.
74 Study staff were on hand to answer any questions that participants had and to check for
75 missing data prior to the participant leaving the site. The SCG-FFQ has been validated in several
76 populations in the UK as a self-report tool (14, 15). Compared to a 7-day food diary, there were
77 moderate correlations with SCQ-FFQ derived nutrients for energy (kJ, r_s : 0.37, $p < 0.001$),
78 percentage energy from fat (r_s : 0.53, $p < 0.001$), percentage energy from SFA (r_s : 0.55, $p < 0.001$),
79 percentage energy from protein (r_s : 0.55, $p < 0.001$), percentage energy from carbohydrates (r_s :
80 0.69, $p < 0.001$) and total sugars (r_s : 0.62, $p < 0.001$) (14). A second study assessing validity in
81 older adults (aged 65 and above) in Scotland compared the SCG-FFQ to a four-day weighted
82 food record, Spearman rank correlation was greater than 0.2 for all nutrients of interest for
83 EWG score calculation with the exception of fat (15). The SCQ-FFQ asks participants to report
84 their consumption of 175 foods and drinks over the previous two to three months. The SCG-
85 FFQ was completed at the baseline visit, with repeated dietary data collection currently
86 ongoing in follow-up visits (Visit 2; 2-4 years post-baseline; Visit 3: 5-8 years post baseline). A

87 comprehensive nutritional breakdown is available for each participant in addition to food level
88 responses. Daily nutrient intake was calculated from the food intake data using the McCance
89 and Widdowson 2021 dataset (16). Intakes of carbohydrates, proteins, total fats and SFA were
90 converted into calorie values to calculate the percentage of calories from each food group
91 included in the diet.

92
93 Two EWG scores were created, one applying a binary scoring methodology, and one a graded
94 score (hereafter referred to as the binary EWG and graded EWG, respectively). Full details of
95 scoring methodologies are available in the supplementary materials (Supplementary Table S1).
96 Each score awarded points for adherence to EWG criteria for the following food and nutrient
97 groups; carbohydrates, proteins, fats, SFA, fibre, sugars, salt, total kilocalories, fruit and
98 vegetables, fish, red and processed meats, and water. For the binary scoring, the method was
99 modelled on a traditional Mediterranean Diet Adherence Screener (MEDAS) score (17);
100 participants were awarded 1 point if they met criteria for the nutritional or food component,
101 else 0 points were awarded, with a total possible score of 12. Intake values were not rounded
102 up for any of the components. For example, a participant would be awarded one point if $\geq 50\%$
103 of calories reported in the diet were from carbohydrates and 0 points for $< 50\%$ of calories from
104 carbohydrates. The graded score was modelled on the Panagiotakos Pyramid MedDiet score
105 (18), with 0 to 5 points allocated according to level of compliance with the EWG
106 recommendations, with a total possible score of 60. 5 points was awarded if a participant met
107 the EWG recommendations for a food or macronutrient group. 0 points were awarded for
108 achieving less than half of the recommended intake for healthy foods (carbohydrates, proteins,
109 fibre, fruit and vegetables, fish and water) and for consuming 1.5 times the recommended limit
110 for unhealthy foods (fats, SFA, sugars, salts, red and processed meats). Taking carbohydrates as
111 an example for the binary EWG score 1 point was awarded if $\geq 50\%$ of calories reported in the
112 diet were from carbohydrates and 0 points for $< 50\%$ of calories from carbohydrates; for the
113 graded EWG score 5 points were awarded for $\geq 50\%$ of calories reported in the diet were from
114 carbohydrates, 4 points for $\geq 43.75\%$ and $< 50\%$ of calories from carbohydrates, 3 points for
115 $\geq 37.5\%$ and $< 43.75\%$ of calories from carbohydrates, 2 points for $\geq 31.25\%$ and $< 37.5\%$ of

116 calories from carbohydrates, 1 point for $\geq 25\%$ and $< 31.5\%$ of calories from carbohydrates and 0
117 points for $< 25\%$ of calories from carbohydrates.

118

119 *Calculation of Mediterranean diet scores*

120 Three MedDiet scores (the MEDAS score, the MEDAS continuous and the MedDiet Pyramid
121 (Pyramid) score) were calculated using previously published scoring methods. Briefly, the
122 MEDAS score was calculated using a binary scoring method, whereby participants were
123 allocated 0 or 1 points for each of 14 food groups depending on whether they met consumption
124 criteria (19). The MEDAS continuous was developed by Shannon *et al* with points allocated for
125 the same consumption criteria as MEDAS but on a continuous scale from 0 to 1, depending
126 upon proximity to the dietary target, as opposed to binary allocations (20). Similarly, the
127 Pyramid score was also coded on a continuous scale of 0 to 1 with a total possible score of 15
128 points (21). Continuous scores have been shown to have more sensitivity to detecting
129 differences in diet quality, particularly in a UK population, where they have shown stronger
130 associations with better cognition (20) and reduced dementia risk (22) compared with binary
131 scores.

132

133 *CAIDE score*

134 The Cardiovascular Risk Factors, Ageing and Dementia (CAIDE) risk score, an estimate of 20-year
135 dementia risk based on risk factors in midlife, was calculated for all participants. The CAIDE
136 score was originally developed in the FINGER study, and ranges from 0 to 18 points with higher
137 scores representing greater dementia risk (23). The CAIDE score combines a number of non-
138 modifiable and potentially modifiable risk factors. It was selected as it has previously been
139 associated with a number of neuroimaging outcomes in the PREVENT dementia cohort (24-28).
140 Additionally, the CAIDE score has been suggested as an appropriate surrogate outcome
141 measure in lifestyle-based multidomain prevention trials (29), and the FINGER multi-domain
142 intervention (which included changes to diet, as well as exercise, cognitive training and
143 management of metabolic and vascular risk factors) significantly reduced the CAIDE score (30,
144 31), demonstrating the score has the potential to be responsive to lifestyle factors. The CAIDE

145 score was calculated using self-reported age, education and sex, systolic blood pressure (SBP)
146 (mean of triplicate blood pressure readings in supine or seated position recorded at baseline
147 visit), BMI (height and weight recorded at baseline visit, used for BMI calculation), fasting
148 plasma total cholesterol, (analysed in local laboratories at the baseline visit), physical activity
149 (self-reported non-validated questionnaire asking participants how often they complete light,
150 moderate and vigorous exercise; 0 points awarded for never up to 5 points for daily, scores
151 summed across all three categories with higher points reflecting more physical activity) and
152 *APOEε4* carrier status (DNA analysed from blood collected at baseline). The score weighting is
153 presented in Table S2

154

155 *Cardiometabolic outcome variables*

156 Data on blood pressure (systolic and diastolic (SBP, DBP)), BMI, and waist-to-hip ratio (WHR)
157 values (recorded at baseline visit) were extracted from the database. Each of these
158 cardiometabolic measures were collected by trained study staff at the baseline visit. A
159 Framingham Risk Score (FRS) was calculated for each participant using the 'CVrisk' package in R
160 (32) and a QRisk3 score was calculated using the 'QRISK3' R package (33). The variables used to
161 create these cardiovascular risk scores are detailed in Supplementary Table S3.

162

163 *Cognitive outcome measures*

164 For the purposes of this analysis, the score for the Four Mountains Task (4MT) was selected as
165 the primary cognitive outcome. The 4MT is a novel tablet-administered task designed to assess
166 allocentric processing. Participants are shown an image of four mountains for approximately 10
167 seconds and after a short interval (~ 1 second) asked to select which scene they were previously
168 shown from a choice of four image options (34). A total score is derived from 15 trials, with
169 higher marks indicating better performance. This cognitive task remains a research rather than
170 clinical tool and no normative values are currently available. The 4MT has been shown to be
171 sensitive to early neurodegenerative disease (35), has previously been associated with CAIDE
172 scores in the PREVENT cohort (36), and has also previously been associated with the MedDiet in
173 a European cohort study (37).

174 *Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) variables*

175 MRI scans were collected using 3T Siemens scanners (Verio, PRISMA, Prisma Fit, Skyra), with
176 data for this study extracted from T1-weighted structural scans processed with FreeSurfer
177 (version 7.1.0) and FLAIR MRI using SPM8. Further details of imaging acquisition, processing and
178 analysis are available in the cohort baseline data descriptive paper (13). Derived variables were
179 extracted from the dataset to include left and right hippocampal volume, left and right
180 hippocampal thickness, white matter hyperintensity volume (cube-transformed and corrected
181 for total intracranial volume) and total estimated intra-cranial volume. Further details on the
182 imaging acquisition and processing in the PREVENT dataset can be found elsewhere (38).

183

184 *Perception of healthy eating*

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

190

191 *Covariates*

192 Several covariates were assessed, including age, sex, years of education, *APOE* ϵ 4, parental
193 history of dementia (self-reported), socioeconomic status (SES) group and physical activity. SES
194 group was determined according to self-reported occupation using the National Statistics socio-
195 economic classification (NS-SEC:

196 [https://www.ons.gov.uk/methodology/classificationsandstandards/otherclassifications/thenati](https://www.ons.gov.uk/methodology/classificationsandstandards/otherclassifications/thenationalstatistics socioeconomic classification nssec based on soc2010)

197 [onalstatistics socioeconomic classification nssec based on soc2010](https://www.ons.gov.uk/methodology/classificationsandstandards/otherclassifications/thenationalstatistics socioeconomic classification nssec based on soc2010)) and grouped in low, middle

198 and high socioeconomic group or into a not in employment group. The not in employment

199 group included both participants who reported they were unemployed and those who had

200 taken early retirement. As total kilocalories were included in the EWG scores, the analyses were

201 not adjusted for total energy intake. For analysis including the CAIDE score as the outcome

202 measure, only parental history of dementia and physical activity were included as covariates so

203 as not to over-correct the model. Where the FRS or QRisk3 was the outcome variable of
204 interest, years of education *APOE* ϵ 4, parental history of dementia and physical activity were
205 included as covariates. The National Adult Reading Test (NART) score was included as an
206 additional covariate in the 4MT analysis as a measure of premorbid intelligence. Finally, for all
207 the brain imaging models, intracranial volume was included as a covariate.

208

209 *Statistical Analysis*

210 All statistical analyses were completed using R (Version 4.1.0). Descriptive statistics were
211 calculated for all participants. Where necessary, to ensure the fulfilment of distributional
212 assumptions of the models fitted, data was transformed. For the main analysis, we excluded
213 participants with missing data in the exposure, outcome, and covariate variables of interest
214 from the analysis (n=183 missing, data missing at random; missing dietary data or implausible
215 calorie intake (n=106), missing outcome data (n=77); additionally a further 38 participants were
216 excluded from analyses including neuroimaging outcome measures due to missing MRI data or
217 incidental MRI findings. Relationships between the binary EWG (BEWG) and graded EWG
218 (GEWG) scores and the MedDiet scores were assessed using correlations. As the BEWG and
219 GEWG scores were slightly skewed, generalised additive models were run. First, we tested the
220 cohort as a whole and fitted univariate and fully adjusted generalised additive models to test
221 for associations between BEWG and GEWG scores and the CAIDE score. The fully adjusted
222 model included parental history of dementia, physical activity scores and SES group. We then
223 ran univariate and fully adjusted generalised additive models to test for associations between
224 BEWG and GEWG scores and measures of cardiometabolic health (SBP, DBP, BMI, WHR, FRS,
225 QRisk3) and brain health (4MT total score, cube-transformed white matter lesion volume, left
226 and right hippocampal volume, and left and right hippocampal thickness). Generalised linear
227 models were used to assess associations between BEWG and GEWG scores and self-rated diet
228 quality. Covariates included in each model are detailed in the tables of results. Finally, an
229 exploratory component level analysis was run for the CAIDE score (as the primary outcome) and
230 for all other outcomes with a statistically significant fully adjusted model. A further exploratory
231 analysis tested for any differences in outcomes with the GEWG score by SES group. Finally, the

232 BEWG was split around the median (4) to categorise participants to lower or higher adherence.
233 Logistic regression models were run to test for associations between categorisation around the
234 median and the primary and secondary outcome measures. Primary and secondary analyses
235 were adjusted for multiple comparisons using the Benjamini-Hochberg False Discovery Rate
236 (FDR) procedure. A formal sample size calculation was not undertaken as this was a secondary
237 analysis of a large observational study.

238

239 Results

240 *Descriptive statistics*

241 A total of 517 participants were included in the primary analyses which investigated CAIDE risk
242 scores and cardiometabolic health. Additional analyses involved fewer participants due to
243 missing data, with sample sizes for each outcome detailed in Table 1. The sample included
244 more women (59.6%), had a similar number of participants with and without a parental history
245 of dementia (52.8% vs 47.2%), with 38.3% *APOE* ϵ 4 carriers. Most participants fell in the highest
246 SES group according to their occupations (64.6%), with a high number of years of education
247 reported in the sample (16.72 (SD 3.31) years). See Table 1 for full demographic and descriptive
248 details.

249

250 *Dietary score descriptive statistics*

251 The sample had a mean BEWG score of 4.39 (standard deviation (SD) 1.66) (range 0 to 9) and a
252 mean GEWG score of 39.88 (SD 6.19) (range 16 to 53). Women had higher BEWG scores
253 compared to men (4.55 (SD 1.66) vs 4.15 (SD 1.65), t : 2.70, p : 0.007) however this difference
254 was smaller when comparing women to men for the GEWG scores (40.31 (SD 6.16) vs 39.24 (SD
255 6.20), t : 1.94, p : 0.05). Participants in the low SES group had lower GEWG scores than the high
256 SES group (Low: 37.50 (SD 6.57); High: 40.55 (SD 5.90), p : 0.003), with no significant difference
257 in BEWG scores by SES group. Age was significantly associated with higher BEWG and GEWG
258 scores (BEWG β : 0.03, standard error (SE): 0.01, 95% confidence interval (CI): 0.002, 0.06, p :
259 0.03; GEWG β : 0.14, SE: 0.05, 95% CI: 0.04, 0.24, p : 0.004). Higher physical activity scores were
260 associated with higher GEWG, but not BEWG, scores (β : 0.22, SE: 0.10, 95% CI: 0.03, 0.41, p :

261 0.02). There were no differences in BEWG or GEWG score by parental history of dementia or
262 *APOE* ϵ 4 status. There was no significant association between the total number of years of
263 education and either the BEWG or GEWG scores. A breakdown of the number of contributing
264 component information for each score is presented in Supplementary Table S4. All participants
265 were consuming more than 5% of calories from sugars and so no participants were awarded a
266 point for this component using the BEWG scoring methodology. This may be due to the way
267 sugars were calculated from the SCQ-FFQ and is explored further in the discussion.

268

269 *Correlations between EWG and MedDiet scores*

270 The BEWG and GEWG scores were highly correlated with each other (R: 0.77, $p < 0.001$). BEWG
271 and GEWG scores were correlated with MedDiet scores to explore the similarity between the
272 dietary patterns. All scores were moderately correlated ($r = 0.3-0.4$), with moderate correlations
273 between the BEWG and GEWG scores with the three MedDiet scores (MEDAS, MEDAS
274 continuous, Pyramid) (see Figure 1).

275

276 *Analytical statistics*

277 *CAIDE*

278 There was no significant association between the BEWG score or GEWG score and the CAIDE
279 score in unadjusted or fully adjusted models (Fully adjusted scores; BEWG β : 0.07, 95% CI: -
280 0.07, 0.22; GEWG β : 0.02, 95% CI: -0.02, 0.06) (see Table 2). Meeting fat requirements (i.e.
281 $\leq 35\%$ calories from fat) for both the BEWG and the GEWG scores was associated with a higher
282 CAIDE score (Fully adjusted scores; BEWG β : 0.61, 95% CI: 0.12, 1.11; GEWG β : 0.24, 95% CI:
283 0.01, 0.48), with no other associations seen at the food or nutritional component level, or when
284 participants were categorised into high and low adherence by the median (see Supplementary
285 Table S5, S6, S10 and S11).

286

287 *Cardiometabolic health*

288 There were no significant associations between BEWG scores and SBP, DBP or BMI, and no
289 significant associations between either scoring methodology and WHR, FRS or QRisk3 scores. In

290 contrast, higher GEWG scores were associated with lower SBP and DBP (fully adjusted SBP β : -
291 0.24, 95% CI: -0.45, -0.03; DBP β : -0.16, 95% CI: -0.29, -0.03), as well as with lower BMI (β : -0.09,
292 95% CI: -0.16, -0.01) (see Table 2). None of the fully adjusted models remained significant after
293 FDR adjustment for multiple comparisons. Higher scores awarded for the GEWG total fat
294 component (i.e. eating fewer total calories from fat and therefore being closer to achieving
295 $\leq 35\%$ calories from fat) were associated with higher SBP (β : 1.53, 95% CI: 0.28, 2.78).
296 Conversely, having higher scores for fibre (indicating being closer to achieving the EWG dietary
297 target of $\geq 22.6\text{g/d}$ of fibre), fruits and vegetables (indicating being closer to achieving the EWG
298 dietary target of $\geq 400\text{g/d}$ of fruits and vegetables), and fish (indicating being closer to achieving
299 the EWG dietary target of $\geq 10\text{g/d}$ of fish) GEWG score components was associated with
300 significantly lower SBP (fibre β : -0.97, 95% CI: -1.69, -0.26; fruits and vegetables β : -1.09, 95%
301 CI: -1.97, -0.20; fish β : -1.03, 95% CI: -1.75, -0.30). Higher scores for the fibre, fruits and
302 vegetables, and red and processed meat (indicating being closer to achieving the EWG dietary
303 target of $\leq 70\text{g/d}$ of red or processed meat, i.e. higher scores reflect eating less of this food
304 group) GEWG score components were associated with significantly lower DBP (fibre β : -0.61,
305 95% CI: -1.05, -0.16; fruits and vegetables β : -0.79, 95% CI: -1.34, -0.24; red and processed
306 meats β : -0.77, 95% CI: -1.34, -0.20). Only higher scores for the fruits and vegetables graded
307 EWG score component were associated with lower BMI (β : -0.38, 95% CI: -0.69, -0.07). Low
308 adherence to the EWG (as defined by a score below the median) was associated with higher
309 SBP and DBP. Further details of these associations are provided in Supplementary Tables S7, S8,
310 S9, S10 and S11.

311

312 *Four Mountains Test and MRI variables*

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

319 associated with higher 4MT total scores, however as this was not statistically significant in the
320 unadjusted model and was conducted as an exploratory analysis this result should be
321 interpreted with caution (see Supplementary Tables S10 and S11).

322

323 *Perception of healthy eating*

324 There was a significant association between the positive self-report of eating a healthy diet, and
325 higher BEWG and GEWG scores (BEWG β : 0.92, 95% CI: 0.21, 0.57; GEWG β : 3.71, 95% CI: 0.05,
326 0.14) (see Table 3). These associations remained significant after FDR adjustment. There was a
327 significant association between the positive self-report of eating a healthy diet and higher
328 BEWG in the middle, high and not in-employment SES groups, but not in the low SES group, and
329 with the GEWG in the high and not in employment SES groups but not low or middle SES groups
330 (see Supplementary Table S9).

331

332 Discussion

333 Both the BEWG and GEWG scores created in this analysis were moderately correlated with
334 three commonly used MedDiet scores (the MEDAS, MEDAS continuous and Pyramid scores).
335 There were no associations between either EWG score and the primary outcome of the CAIDE
336 score. However, when looking at individual cardiometabolic components of the CAIDE there
337 was an association between higher GEWG scores and lower SBP, DBP and BMI. In particular,
338 achieving more points (indicating being closer to meeting the EWG criteria in full) for fruits and
339 vegetables was associated with better cardiometabolic health. It is important to note that these
340 associations did not remain significant after FDR adjustment and all component level analysis
341 are considered to be exploratory. There were no associations noted between binary or graded
342 EWG scores and brain health as assessed by cognitive or brain volume outcomes. There was a
343 significant association between self-perception of a healthy diet and higher binary and graded
344 EWG scores, with the association strongest in the high SES group as well as in those participants
345 who were not in employment at the time of dietary data collection. This replicates previous
346 research that has shown associations between self-perceived diet and more objective measures
347 of dietary quality (39, 40).

348
349 There were no significant associations between either the binary or graded EWG scores and the
350 CAIDE score. The CAIDE score was selected as one of the most commonly used dementia risk
351 scores, with associations between the score and neuroimaging outcomes previously reported in
352 the PREVENT dementia cohort (24-28). Importantly the CAIDE score reflects the accumulation
353 of cardiovascular risk for dementia, factors which may be the most amenable to dietary
354 interventions. However, the CAIDE score is not without limitations and some validation work
355 outside of the original cohort where the score was developed has suggested there is very little
356 discrimination compared to age alone (41), with a limited clinical utility for estimating 10-year
357 dementia risk identified in the UK Biobank cohort (42). Other studies in the USA and The
358 Netherlands conversely have validated the CAIDE score for the prediction of dementia up to
359 four decades later (43) as well as the prediction of cognitive impairment 10 to 15 years later
360 (44, 45), demonstrating the complexity of the ongoing debate about the usefulness of the
361 CAIDE as a predictive dementia risk score. It is also important to consider that many of the
362 components of the CAIDE score would not be modifiable by diet (age, sex, education and
363 *APOEε4*) which may explain the lack of association reported in this analysis. The CAIDE score in
364 the population included in this analysis from the PREVENT cohort is lower compared to the
365 FINGER cohort intervention study where the score was originally developed (PREVENT: 5.95 vs
366 FINGER: 7.76 (intervention) and 7.27 (control) (46)), and it may be that any EWG score
367 associations would only be seen in a cohort with a higher mean CAIDE score where there is
368 more potential for modification. As age is one of the important contributors to the overall
369 CAIDE score, it is worth replicating this analysis between EWG scores and CAIDE score in an
370 older cohort (such as the NICOLA or UK Biobank cohorts (47, 48)) to understand if there is an
371 association in later in midlife, where the mean cohort CAIDE score would be expected to be
372 higher due to age.

373
374 Despite no statistically significant associations with the CAIDE score, there were a number of
375 significant associations between the GEWG score and cardiometabolic health which themselves
376 are likely protective of brain health. Importantly these are the elements of the CAIDE score

377 which would be expected to be modifiable by diet. GEWG scores were associated with lower
378 SBP, DBP and BMI. As there were no significant associations between the BEWG score and
379 cardiometabolic health measures, this suggests the GEWG score is more appropriate to apply to
380 this population with partial compliance to EWG criteria important for health. This may reflect
381 previously reported statistics that only 0.1% of the UK population adhere to all nine
382 recommendations (7). In the context of dementia prevention efforts, it is particularly important
383 to note that the GEWG was associated with lower blood pressure and BMI values, given both
384 hypertension and obesity are known midlife risk factors for Alzheimer's disease (AD) (49). A
385 ten-point change in the GEWG was associated with a 2.4 mmHg reduction in SBP, a 1.6 mmHg
386 reduction in DBP and a 0.9kg/m² reduction in BMI. A 2mmHg reduction in SBP has been
387 estimated to decrease the risk of death from stroke by 10% (50), although larger reductions in
388 SBP may be needed to reduce the risk of dementia with a potential U-shaped association where
389 both low and high BP confers risk (51, 52). Similarly, a 2 mmHg reduction in DBP has been
390 estimated to result in a 17% decrease in hypertension and a 15% reduction of risk from stroke
391 and transient ischaemic attacks (53). In midlife, each 1 unit increase in BMI was associated with
392 a higher risk of dementia in a 38-year follow-up of the Framingham Study (54).

393
394 There were no associations seen between either EWG score and any of the brain health
395 outcome measures, with the exception of an association between higher GEWG score and
396 lower left hippocampal volume in the high SES group only. As this was only seen in the left and
397 not right hippocampus and in a single SES group only, it should be interpreted with caution,
398 although previous studies have also found a stronger effect of a healthy diet in the left
399 compared to the right hippocampus (55, 56) and this warrants further research. Exploring
400 whether the EWG scores are associated with functional brain imaging measures as well as with
401 AD pathology (such as amyloid beta, tau and neurofilament light) will also be important next
402 steps for research. The 4MT was selected as the only cognitive measure used in this analysis,
403 and was selected due to previously associations with dementia risk, early neurodegeneration
404 and MedDiet adherence (35-37). Future research should consider whether other measures of

405 cognition included in the PREVENT cohort warrant investigation with dietary quality as
406 measured by the EWG.

407
408 Unsurprisingly and reassuringly, there were significant but moderate correlations between the
409 EWG scores and MedDiet scores which demonstrates some overlap in these healthy eating
410 patterns as well as a divergence in how the scores are created. For example, whilst both dietary
411 patterns prioritise the consumption of fruits and vegetables and fish, with limited red and
412 processed meats, the EWG otherwise focuses on a recommended macronutrient intake whilst
413 the MedDiet recommends foods such as olive oil, legumes, and nuts. This should be a noted
414 limitation of the EWG compared to MedDiet scores when translating to public health
415 approaches, as the EWG requires people to know their nutrient intake and understand
416 percentages of intake by calories. Further development of the EWG to translate the
417 recommendations to a more food-based approach, as in the MedDiet and recommended by the
418 Nutrition for Dementia Prevention Working Group (57), will be important. In particular,
419 evidence suggests that using olive oil as the predominant fat in a diet has promise for mitigating
420 vascular risk factors for AD (58).

421
422 Meeting, or approaching the set criteria, for fruit and vegetable consumption ($\geq 400\text{g/d}$) was
423 associated with lower SBP, DBP and BMI. A one-point change on this criteria (indicating being
424 closer to consuming $\geq 400\text{g/d}$ of fruit and vegetables) was associated with a 1.09 mmHg
425 reduction in SBP, a -0.79 mmHg reduction in DBP, and a -0.38 kg/m^2 reduction in BMI. This has
426 been seen in a number of studies (59, 60), included in Scheelbeck *et al* where fruit and
427 vegetable consumption was associated with the largest reduction in mortality risk (7). Given
428 adopting dietary change is complex and multifactorial (61), public health messaging (alongside
429 policy changes to ensure affordability) focusing on increasing fruit and vegetable intake as the
430 one food group consistently associated with better health outcomes may be a sensible
431 approach. A rapid review of the EWG has suggested a number of recommendations for better
432 communication of the tool which, if adopted, may result in better adherence to the dietary
433 guidelines (62).

434
435 There are some noted limitations of this analysis. The use of total fat as a diet quality measure
436 is recognised to be crude and potentially misleading. We observed significant associations
437 between meeting or getting higher scores on the fat component (i.e. eating, or being closer to
438 eating, less than 35% of calories from fat) and both higher CAIDE score (greater risk for future
439 dementia) and higher SBP, in the absence of any specific findings with SFA. Understanding the
440 role of dietary fats in health has been a topic of much debate in the scientific literature and
441 there is consensus that total fat content alone has little meaning for many health outcomes
442 (63). Indeed, we know from many studies that nuts (source of omega 3 polyunsaturated fatty
443 acids) and olive oil (source of monounsaturated fatty acids alongside some saturated and
444 polyunsaturated fatty acids) is associated with favourable health outcomes (58, 64). This again
445 suggests that further development of the EWG scores to better reflect the foods contributing to
446 the macronutrients rather than the macronutrients themselves may be a more helpful
447 approach to untangle the complexity of dietary fats. Finally, no participants met criteria for the
448 sugars cut off applied to the dataset ($\leq 5\%$ calories from sugar), which is likely caused by the
449 sugars calculated for PREVENT reflecting total sugars (glucose, galactose, fructose, sucrose,
450 maltose and lactose) as opposed to free sugars (added sugars and naturally occurring sugars
451 excluding galactose and lactose). Future nutritional analysis should consider a more detailed
452 breakdown of sugars to better explore this component. The dietary data was collected from
453 self-report questionnaires. Whilst the questionnaire has been validated in a number of settings
454 (14), self-report of such data is known to be potentially fallible to bias through social desirability
455 (65) and underreporting of energy intake (66). A further limitation to note is the lack of
456 diversity of participants in the PREVENT cohort, with nearly all participants reporting their
457 ethnicity as Caucasian (96.2%), and with an average of more than 16 years of education. This
458 does not accurately reflect the UK and Irish populations, with a lack of ethnic diversity and a
459 higher than average reported years of education. Finally, as this was a cross-sectional analysis,
460 it is not possible to determine the directionality of any associations seen with reverse causality
461 of poorer cardiovascular health driving dietary choices a possibility. Prospective studies are

462 needed to confirm this relationship and replication of this analysis in the PREVENT cohort when
463 the follow-up data is available will be important.

464

465 Conclusions

466 This study developed scoring methodologies for a BEWG and GEWG score. Whilst there was no
467 association between these scores and either risk for dementia or brain health in this mid-life
468 cohort, there were significant associations between higher graded EWG scores and lower SBP,
469 DBP and BMI. Adhering to fibre, fish, and fruit and vegetable were particularly associated with
470 better cardiovascular health. Future research should further develop the EWG scores to reflect
471 a food-based approach as opposed to the current reliance on macronutrient contributions to
472 overall energy intake. Higher adherence to the EWG may be an important part of dementia risk
473 reduction interventions through reductions in hypertension and obesity, both of which are
474 important modifiable risk factors for dementia (49).

475

476

477 Abbreviations

4MT	Four Mountains Test
AD	Alzheimer's Disease
<i>APOEε4</i>	Apolipoprotein E Epsilon 4
BEWG	Binary Eatwell Guide
BMI	Body Mass Index
CAIDE	Cardiovascular Risk Factors, Ageing and Dementia
CI	Confidence Interval
DBP	Diastolic Blood Pressure
EWG	Eatwell Guide
FDR	False Discovery Rate
FRS	Framingham Risk Score
GEWG	Graded Eatwell Guide
MEDAS	Mediterranean Diet Adherence Screener
MedDiet	Mediterranean Diet
MRI	Magnetic Resonance Imaging
NART	National Adult Reading Test
NS-SEC	National Statistics Socioeconomic Classification
REC	Research Ethics Committee
SBP	Systolic Blood Pressure
SCG-FFQ	Scottish Collaborative Group-Food Frequency Questionnaire

SD	Standard Deviation
SE	Standard Error
SES	Socioeconomic Status
SFA	Saturated Fatty Acids
UK	United Kingdom
UKWMCS	UK Women's Cohort Study
USA	United States of America
WHR	Waist-to-Hip Ratio

478

479 Acknowledgements

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

485

486

487

488 Authors' contributions

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

493

494 Funding

495 PREVENT is funded by the Alzheimer's Society (grant numbers 178, 264 and 329), Alzheimer's
496 Association (grant number TriBEKa-17-519007) and philanthropic donations. The analytical
497 work was funded by the MRC (MRC UK Nutrition Research Partnership (NRP) Collaboration
498 Award NuBrain (MR/T001852/1). Prof. Muniz-Terrera acknowledges the support of the
499 Osteopathic Heritage Foundation through funding for the Osteopathic Heritage Foundation
500 Ralph S. Licklider, D.O., Research Endowment in the Heritage College of Osteopathic Medicine.

501 The funders had no involvement in the protocol design, data collection, analysis or manuscript
502 preparation.

503

504 Competing interests

505 None.

506

507 Consent for publication

508 Not applicable.

509

510 Availability of data and materials

511 Data from the PREVENT Dementia study can be accessed via the AD workbench

512 (<https://www.alzheimersdata.org/ad-workbench>). DOI:

513 https://doi.org/10.34688/PREVENTMAIN_BASELINE_700V1.

514

515

516

517

518

519

520

521 References

522 1. Sotos-Prieto M, Bhupathiraju SN, Mattei J, Fung TT, Li Y, Pan A, et al. Association of
523 Changes in Diet Quality with Total and Cause-Specific Mortality. *New England Journal of*
524 *Medicine*. 2017;377(2):143-53.

525 2. Morze J, Danielewicz A, Hoffmann G, Schwingshackl L. Diet Quality as Assessed by the
526 Healthy Eating Index, Alternate Healthy Eating Index, Dietary Approaches to Stop Hypertension
527 Score, and Health Outcomes: A Second Update of a Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of
528 Cohort Studies. *Journal of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics*. 2020;120(12):1998-
529 2031.e15.

530 3. Health effects of dietary risks in 195 countries, 1990-2017: a systematic analysis for the
531 Global Burden of Disease Study 2017. *Lancet*. 2019;393(10184):1958-72.

532 4. Office for National Statistics. Leading causes of death, UK: 2001 to 2018 2020 [Available
533 from:

534 [https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/causesofdeath/
535 articles/leadingcausesofdeathuk/2001to2018](https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/causesofdeath/articles/leadingcausesofdeathuk/2001to2018).

536 5. Public Health England. The Eatwell guide-helping you eat a healthy balanced diet 2018
537 [Available from:

538 [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/
539 file/742750/Eatwell_Guide_booklet_2018v4.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/742750/Eatwell_Guide_booklet_2018v4.pdf).

- 540 6. Public Health England. Government Dietary Recommendations: Government
541 recommendations for energy and nutrients for males and females aged 1-18 years and 19+
542 years. . 2016.
- 543 7. Scheelbeek P, Green R, Papier K, Knuppel A, Alae-Carew C, Balkwill A, et al. Health
544 impacts and environmental footprints of diets that meet the Eatwell Guide recommendations:
545 analyses of multiple UK studies. *BMJ Open*. 2020;10(8):e037554.
- 546 8. Best N, Flannery O. Association between adherence to the Mediterranean Diet and the
547 Eatwell Guide and changes in weight and waist circumference in post-menopausal women in
548 the UK Women's Cohort Study. *Post Reproductive Health*. 2023:20533691231156643.
- 549 9. Gregory S, Ntalianis G, Shannon O, Stevenson E, Ritchie C, Wells K, et al. The
550 Mediterranean diet is associated with better cardiometabolic health for women in mid-life but
551 not men: A PREVENT dementia cohort cross-sectional analysis. *Nutrition, Metabolism and*
552 *Cardiovascular Diseases*. 2023.
- 553 10. SACN. SACN Statement on Diet, Cognitive Impairment and Dementia 2018.
- 554 11. Ritchie CW, Ritchie K. The PREVENT study: a prospective cohort study to identify mid-life
555 biomarkers of late-onset Alzheimer's disease. *BMJ Open*. 2012;2(6):e001893.
- 556 12. Ritchie CW, Wells K, Ritchie K. The PREVENT research programme--a novel research
557 programme to identify and manage midlife risk for dementia: the conceptual framework.
558 *International review of psychiatry (Abingdon, England)*. 2013;25(6):748-54.
- 559 13. Ritchie CW, Wells K, Gregory S, Carriere I, Danso SO, Driscoll D, et al. The PREVENT
560 Dementia programme: Baseline demographic, lifestyle, imaging and cognitive data from a
561 midlife cohort study investigating risk factors for dementia. *medRxiv*.
562 2023:2023.07.14.23292648.
- 563 14. Hollis JL, Craig LC, Whybrow S, Clark H, Kyle JA, McNeill G. Assessing the relative validity
564 of the Scottish Collaborative Group FFQ for measuring dietary intake in adults. *Public Health*
565 *Nutr*. 2017;20(3):449-55.
- 566 15. Jia X, Craig LC, Aucott LS, Milne AC, McNeill G. Repeatability and validity of a food
567 frequency questionnaire in free-living older people in relation to cognitive function. *J Nutr*
568 *Health Aging*. 2008;12(10):735-41.
- 569 16. McCance RA, Widdowson EM. McCance and Widdowson's composition of foods
570 integrated dataset. 2021.
- 571 17. Martínez-González M, Hershey MS, Zazpe I, Trichopoulou A. Transferability of the
572 Mediterranean Diet to Non-Mediterranean Countries. What Is and What Is Not the
573 Mediterranean Diet. *Nutrients*. 2017;9(11).
- 574 18. Panagiotakos DB, Pitsavos C, Arvaniti F, Stefanadis C. Adherence to the Mediterranean
575 food pattern predicts the prevalence of hypertension, hypercholesterolemia, diabetes and
576 obesity, among healthy adults; the accuracy of the MedDietScore. *Preventive Medicine*.
577 2007;44(4):335-40.
- 578 19. Estruch R, Ros E, Salas-Salvadó J, Covas M-I, Corella D, Arós F, et al. Primary Prevention
579 of Cardiovascular Disease with a Mediterranean Diet Supplemented with Extra-Virgin Olive Oil
580 or Nuts. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2018;378(25):e34.
- 581 20. Shannon OM, Stephan BCM, Granic A, Lentjes M, Hayat S, Mulligan A, et al.
582 Mediterranean diet adherence and cognitive function in older UK adults: the European

- 583 Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition-Norfolk (EPIC-Norfolk) Study. *Am J Clin*
584 *Nutr.* 2019;110(4):938-48.
- 585 21. Tong TY, Wareham NJ, Khaw KT, Imamura F, Forouhi NG. Prospective association of the
586 Mediterranean diet with cardiovascular disease incidence and mortality and its population
587 impact in a non-Mediterranean population: the EPIC-Norfolk study. *BMC Med.* 2016;14(1):135.
- 588 22. Shannon OM, Ranson JM, Gregory S, Macpherson H, Milte C, Lentjes M, et al.
589 Mediterranean diet adherence is associated with lower dementia risk, independent of genetic
590 predisposition: findings from the UK Biobank prospective cohort study. *BMC Medicine.*
591 2023;21(1):81.
- 592 23. Kivipelto M, Ngandu T, Laatikainen T, Winblad B, Soininen H, Tuomilehto J. Risk score for
593 the prediction of dementia risk in 20 years among middle aged people: a longitudinal,
594 population-based study. *Lancet Neurol.* 2006;5(9):735-41.
- 595 24. Dounavi M-E, Newton C, Jenkins N, Mak E, Low A, Muniz-Terrera G, et al.
596 Macrostructural brain alterations at midlife are connected to cardiovascular and not inherited
597 risk of future dementia: the PREVENT-Dementia study. *Journal of Neurology.* 2022;269(8):4299-
598 309.
- 599 25. Dounavi M-E, Low A, Muniz-Terrera G, Ritchie K, Ritchie CW, Su L, et al. Fluid-attenuated
600 inversion recovery magnetic resonance imaging textural features as sensitive markers of white
601 matter damage in midlife adults. *Brain Communications.* 2022;4(3):fcac116.
- 602 26. Liu X, Dounavi ME, Ritchie K, Wells K, Ritchie CW, Su L, et al. Higher midlife CAIDE score
603 is associated with increased brain atrophy in a cohort of cognitively healthy middle-aged
604 individuals. *J Neurol.* 2021;268(5):1962-71.
- 605 27. O'Brien JT, Firbank MJ, Ritchie K, Wells K, Williams GB, Ritchie CW, et al. Association
606 between midlife dementia risk factors and longitudinal brain atrophy: the PREVENT-Dementia
607 study. *Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery & Psychiatry.* 2020;91(2):158.
- 608 28. Low A, Prats-Sedano MA, Stefaniak JD, McKiernan EF, Carter SF, Douvani M-E, et al.
609 CAIDE dementia risk score relates to severity and progression of cerebral small vessel disease in
610 healthy midlife adults: the PREVENT-Dementia study. *Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery*
611 *& Psychiatry.* 2022;93(5):481.
- 612 29. Coley N, Hoevenaer-Blom MP, van Dalen J-W, Moll van Charante EP, Kivipelto M,
613 Soininen H, et al. Dementia risk scores as surrogate outcomes for lifestyle-based multidomain
614 prevention trials—rationale, preliminary evidence and challenges. *Alzheimer's & Dementia.*
615 2020;16(12):1674-85.
- 616 30. Stephen R, Ngandu T, Liu Y, Peltonen M, Antikainen R, Kemppainen N, et al. Change in
617 CAIDE Dementia Risk Score and Neuroimaging Biomarkers During a 2-Year Multidomain
618 Lifestyle Randomized Controlled Trial: Results of a Post-Hoc Subgroup Analysis. *The Journals of*
619 *Gerontology: Series A.* 2021;76(8):1407-14.
- 620 31. Solomon A, Levälahti E, Antikainen R, Laatikainen T, Soininen H, Strandberg T, et al. O3-
621 05-05: EFFECTS OF A MULTIDOMAIN LIFESTYLE INTERVENTION ON OVERALL RISK FOR
622 DEMENTIA: THE FINGER RANDOMIZED CONTROLLED TRIAL. *Alzheimer's & Dementia.*
623 2018;14(7S_Part_19):P1024-P5.
- 624 32. Castro V. Package 'CVrisk' 2022 [Available from: <https://github.com/vcastro/CVrisk>].
- 625 33. Li Y, Sperrin M, ClinRisk Ltd., van Staa TP. Package 'QRISK3' 2022 [Available from:
626 <https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/QRISK3/QRISK3.pdf>].

- 627 34. Chan D, Gallaher LM, Moodley K, Minati L, Burgess N, Hartley T. The 4 Mountains Test: A
628 Short Test of Spatial Memory with High Sensitivity for the Diagnosis of Pre-dementia
629 Alzheimer's Disease. *JoVE*. 2016(116):e54454.
- 630 35. Ritchie K, Ropacki M, Albala B, Harrison J, Kaye J, Kramer J, et al. Recommended
631 cognitive outcomes in preclinical Alzheimer's disease: Consensus statement from the European
632 Prevention of Alzheimer's Dementia project. *Alzheimer's & dementia : the journal of the*
633 *Alzheimer's Association*. 2017;13(2):186-95.
- 634 36. Ritchie K, Carrière I, Howett D, Su L, Hornberger M, O'Brien JT, et al. Allocentric and
635 Egocentric Spatial Processing in Middle-Aged Adults at High Risk of Late-Onset Alzheimer's
636 Disease: The PREVENT Dementia Study. *Journal of Alzheimer's Disease*. 2018;65:885-96.
- 637 37. Gregory S, Ritchie CW, Ritchie K, Shannon O, Stevenson EJ, Muniz-Terrera G.
638 Mediterranean diet score is associated with greater allocentric processing in the EPAD LCS
639 cohort: A comparative analysis by biogeographical region. *Frontiers in Aging*. 2022;3.
- 640 38. Mak E, Dounavi M-E, Low A, Carter SF, McKiernan E, Williams GB, et al. Proximity to
641 dementia onset and multi-modal neuroimaging changes: The prevent-dementia study.
642 *NeuroImage*. 2021;229:117749.
- 643 39. Sleboda P, Bruine de Bruin W, Arangua L, Gutsche T. Associations of Eating Identities
644 With Self-Reported Dietary Behaviors and Body Mass Index. *Front Nutr*. 2022;9:894557.
- 645 40. Holub SC, Haney AM, Roelse H. Deconstructing the concept of the healthy eater self-
646 schematic: relations to dietary intake, weight and eating cognitions. *Eat Behav*. 2012;13(2):106-
647 11.
- 648 41. Licher S, Yilmaz P, Leening MJG, Wolters FJ, Vernooij MW, Stephan BCM, et al. External
649 validation of four dementia prediction models for use in the general community-dwelling
650 population: a comparative analysis from the Rotterdam Study. *European Journal of*
651 *Epidemiology*. 2018;33(7):645-55.
- 652 42. Kivimäki M, Livingston G, Singh-Manoux A, Mars N, Lindbohm JV, Pentti J, et al.
653 Estimating Dementia Risk Using Multifactorial Prediction Models. *JAMA Network Open*.
654 2023;6(6):e2318132-e.
- 655 43. Exalto LG, Quesenberry CP, Barnes D, Kivipelto M, Biessels GJ, Whitmer RA. Midlife risk
656 score for the prediction of dementia four decades later. *Alzheimer's & Dementia*.
657 2014;10(5):562-70.
- 658 44. Sara K, Aline D, Alexis E, Martin JS, Séverine S, Mika K, et al. Predicting cognitive decline.
659 *Neurology*. 2013;80(14):1300.
- 660 45. Reijmer YD, van den Berg E, van Sonsbeek S, Dekker JM, Nijpels G, Stehouwer CDA, et al.
661 Dementia Risk Score Predicts Cognitive Impairment after a Period of 15 Years in a
662 Nondemented Population. *Dementia and Geriatric Cognitive Disorders*. 2011;31(2):152-7.
- 663 46. Sindi S, Calov E, Fokkens J, Ngandu T, Soininen H, Tuomilehto J, et al. The CAIDE
664 Dementia Risk Score App: The development of an evidence-based mobile application to predict
665 the risk of dementia. *Alzheimers Dement (Amst)*. 2015;1(3):328-33.
- 666 47. Neville CE, Cruise SM, Burns F. The Northern Ireland Cohort for the Longitudinal Study of
667 Ageing (NICOLA). In: Gu D, Dupre ME, editors. *Encyclopedia of Gerontology and Population*
668 *Aging*. Cham: Springer International Publishing; 2021. p. 5087-90.
- 669 48. Hewitt J, Walters M, Padmanabhan S, Dawson J. Cohort profile of the UK Biobank:
670 diagnosis and characteristics of cerebrovascular disease. *BMJ Open*. 2016;6(3):e009161.

- 671 49. Livingston G, Huntley J, Sommerlad A, Ames D, Ballard C, Banerjee S, et al. Dementia
672 prevention, intervention, and care: 2020 report of the Lancet Commission. The
673 Lancet. 2020;396(10248):413-46.
- 674 50. Lewington S, Clarke R, Qizilbash N, Peto R, Collins R. Age-specific relevance of usual
675 blood pressure to vascular mortality: a meta-analysis of individual data for one million adults in
676 61 prospective studies. Lancet. 2002;360(9349):1903-13.
- 677 51. Holm H, Nägga K, Nilsson ED, Melander O, Minthon L, Bachus E, et al. Longitudinal and
678 postural changes of blood pressure predict dementia: the Malmö Preventive Project. Eur J
679 Epidemiol. 2017;32(4):327-36.
- 680 52. Kim D, Yang P-S, Jang E, Tae Yu H, Kim T-H, Uhm J-S, et al. Blood Pressure Control and
681 Dementia Risk in Midlife Patients With Atrial Fibrillation. Hypertension. 2020;75(5):1296-304.
- 682 53. Cook NR, Cohen J, Hebert PR, Taylor JO, Hennekens CH. Implications of small reductions
683 in diastolic blood pressure for primary prevention. Arch Intern Med. 1995;155(7):701-9.
- 684 54. Li J, Joshi P, Ang TFA, Liu C, Auerbach S, Devine S, et al. Mid- to Late-Life Body Mass
685 Index and Dementia Risk: 38 Years of Follow-up of the Framingham Study. American Journal of
686 Epidemiology. 2021;190(12):2503-10.
- 687 55. Akbaraly T, Sexton C, Zsoldos E, Mahmood A, Filippini N, Kerleau C, et al. Association of
688 Long-Term Diet Quality with Hippocampal Volume: Longitudinal Cohort Study. The American
689 Journal of Medicine. 2018;131(11):1372-81.e4.
- 690 56. Jacka FN, Cherbuin N, Anstey KJ, Sachdev P, Butterworth P. Western diet is associated
691 with a smaller hippocampus: a longitudinal investigation. BMC Medicine. 2015;13(1):215.
- 692 57. Yassine HN, Samieri C, Livingston G, Glass K, Wagner M, Tangney C, et al. Nutrition state
693 of science and dementia prevention: recommendations of the Nutrition for Dementia
694 Prevention Working Group. The Lancet Healthy Longevity. 2022;3(7):e501-e12.
- 695 58. Román GC, Jackson RE, Reis J, Román AN, Toledo JB, Toledo E. Extra-virgin olive oil for
696 potential prevention of Alzheimer disease. Revue Neurologique. 2019;175(10):705-23.
- 697 59. Artegoitia VM, Krishnan S, Bonnel EL, Stephensen CB, Keim NL, Newman JW. Healthy
698 eating index patterns in adults by sex and age predict cardiometabolic risk factors in a cross-
699 sectional study. BMC Nutr. 2021;7(1):30.
- 700 60. Liu S, Manson JE, Lee IM, Cole SR, Hennekens CH, Willett WC, et al. Fruit and vegetable
701 intake and risk of cardiovascular disease: the Women's Health Study. The American Journal of
702 Clinical Nutrition. 2000;72(4):922-8.
- 703 61. Helland MH, Nordbotten GL. Dietary Changes, Motivators, and Barriers Affecting Diet
704 and Physical Activity among Overweight and Obese: A Mixed Methods Approach. Int J Environ
705 Res Public Health. 2021;18(20).
- 706 62. Culliford AE, Bradbury J, Medici EB. Improving Communication of the UK Sustainable
707 Healthy Dietary Guidelines the Eatwell Guide: A Rapid Review. Sustainability [Internet]. 2023;
708 15(7).
- 709 63. Forouhi NG, Krauss RM, Taubes G, Willett W. Dietary fat and cardiometabolic health:
710 evidence, controversies, and consensus for guidance. BMJ. 2018;361:k2139.
- 711 64. De Souza RGM, Schincaglia RM, Pimentel GD, Mota JF. Nuts and Human Health
712 Outcomes: A Systematic Review. Nutrients. 2017;9(12):1311.

- 713 65. Hebert JR, Clemow L, Pbert L, Ockene IS, Ockene JK. Social desirability bias in dietary
714 self-report may compromise the validity of dietary intake measures. *Int J Epidemiol.*
715 1995;24(2):389-98.
- 716 66. Ravelli MN, Schoeller DA. Traditional Self-Reported Dietary Instruments Are Prone to
717 Inaccuracies and New Approaches Are Needed. *Front Nutr.* 2020;7:90-
718

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

Variable	n= 516		Very low adherence n= 56	Low adherence n= 228	Moderate-to-high adherence n= 232
	n (%)	Range			
Self-rated healthy diet (yes) (n, %)	442 (85.7)	N/A	33 (58.9)	193 (84.6)	216 (93.1)
Variable	n= 503		Very low adherence n= 54	Low adherence n= 220	Moderate-to-high adherence n= 229
	Mean (SD)	Range			
FRS (mean, SD)	8.69 (6.41)	1.04 – 30.00	9.29 (6.96)	8.99 (6.75)	8.26 (5.92)
QRisk3 (mean, SD)	4.81 (4.04)	0.43 – 30.70	4.76 (3.55)	4.94 (4.59)	4.70 (3.58)
Variable	n= 342		Very low adherence n= 39	Low adherence n= 159	Moderate-to-high adherence n= 232
	Mean (SD)	Range			
4MT total score (mean, SD)	9.85 (3.39)	0 - 15	9.46 (3.71)	9.82 (3.37)	10.00 (3.34)
Variable	n= 479		Very low adherence n= 49	Low adherence n= 214	Moderate-to-high adherence n= 216
	Mean (SD)	Range			
Cube-transformed white matter lesion volume (mL) (mean, SD)	1.19 (0.37)	0.35 – 2.97	1.14 (0.31)	1.22 (0.42)	1.17 (0.34)
Left hippocampus volume (mm ³) (mean, SD)	4035.84 (382.91)	2936.8 – 5374.8	4020.32 (356.59)	4062.25 (374.82)	4013.19 (396.50)
Right hippocampus volume (mm ³) (mean, SD)	4159.37 (426.13)	2939.7 – 5676.5	4137.48 (432.17)	4191.31 (424.89)	4132.69 (425.83)
Left hippocampus thickness (mm) (mean, SD)	2.44 (0.07)	2.24 – 2.66	2.44 (0.06)	2.44 (0.07)	2.44 (0.07)

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

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

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

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

Dietary score	Unadjusted				Fully adjusted			
	β	SE	95% CI	p	β	SE	95% CI	p
Four Mountains Test								
EWG	0.04	0.11	-0.18, 0.26	0.72	0.05	0.11	-0.18, 0.28	0.68
EWG graded	0.02	0.03	-0.04, 0.08	0.52	0.02	0.03	-0.04, 0.08	0.58
White Matter Lesion Volume								
EWG	-0.005	0.01	-0.03, 0.02	0.64	-0.005	0.01	-0.02, 0.01	0.63
EWG graded	-0.001	0.003	-0.007, 0.004	0.66	-0.002	0.003	-0.007, 0.003	0.47
Left Hippocampus								
EWG	-17.05	8.50	-34.04, -0.05	0.05	-14.85	8.74	-32.33, 2.63	0.09
EWG graded	-5.11	2.27	-9.66, -0.57	0.02	-4.28	2.38	-9.04, 0.48	0.07
Right Hippocampus								
EWG	-15.43	9.50	-34.44, 3.57	0.11	-13.99	9.77	-33.52, 5.55	0.15
EWG graded	-1.47	2.55	-6.57, 3.63	0.57	-0.74	2.67	-6.07, 4.60	0.78
Left Hippocampal Thickness								
EWG	0.001	0.002	-0.003, 0.005	0.51	0.002	0.002	-0.002, 0.006	0.40
EWG graded	0.0006	0.0005	-0.0004, 0.002	0.24	0.0008	0.0005	-0.0003, 0.002	0.13
Right Hippocampal Thickness								
EWG	0.0006	0.002	-0.003, 0.004	0.73	0.001	0.002	-0.003, 0.005	0.54
EWG graded	0.0003	0.0005	-0.0006, 0.001	0.49	0.0006	0.0005	-0.0004, 0.002	0.26
Self-reported healthy eating								
EWG	0.43	0.09	0.26, 0.60	<0.001 [†]	0.38	0.09	0.21, 0.57	<0.001 [†]
EWG graded	0.11	0.02	0.07, 0.16	<0.001 [†]	0.10	0.02	0.05, 0.14	<0.001 [†]

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