

1                                   **The Mediterranean Diet Scale (MDS):**  
2                                   **translation and validation of the Arabic version**

3  
4   **Authors:** Raghdah Aljehani,<sup>1</sup> Ghaidaa Aljehani,<sup>1</sup> Hanaa Alharazi,<sup>2</sup> Paula M Horta,<sup>3</sup> Camila  
5   Kümmel Duarte,<sup>3</sup> Gabriela Lima de Melo Ghisi.<sup>4,5\*</sup>

6  
7   **Affiliations:**

- 8   1. Rehabilitation Department, King Abdullah Medical City, Makkah, Saudi Arabia.  
9   2. Cardiology Department, King Abdullah Medical City, Makkah, Saudi Arabia.  
10   3. Department of Nutrition, Federal University of Minas Gerais, Belo Horizonte, Brazil.  
11   4. Department of Physical Therapy, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada.  
12   5. KITE, Toronto Rehabilitation Institute, University Health Network, Toronto, Canada.

13  
14   **\*Corresponding author:**

15   Department of Physical Therapy, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada.

16   160-500 University Ave, Toronto, Canada M5G 1V7

17   Tel: (416) 597-3422 x. 5261 Fax: (416) 425-0301

18   email: [gabriela.meloghisi@uhn.ca](mailto:gabriela.meloghisi@uhn.ca)

19  
20   **Author Contributions:**

21   Conceptualization, RA and GLMG; Methodology, GLMG; Formal Analysis, GLMG;

22   Investigation, RA, GA, HA, PMH, CK; Resources, RA; Data Curation, RA, GLMG; Writing –

- 23 Original Draft Preparation, GLMG; Writing – Review & Editing RA, GA, HA, PMH, CK;
- 24 Project Administration, GLMG.

## 25 **Abstract**

26 Objectives: The self-administered version of the Mediterranean Diet Scale (MDS) has been  
27 developed to test the inherent characteristics of this dietary pattern in a quick and simple way,  
28 due to the need of this assessment in the clinical and research setting. This study aimed to  
29 translate and psychometrically validate the self-administered MDS in Arabic (CRBS-A).

30 Methods: The original (English) version was originally translated to Arabic, followed by back-  
31 translation. Next, 10 healthcare providers, followed by 10 cardiovascular disease (CVD) patients  
32 rated the face and content validity (CV) of materials, providing input to improve cross-cultural  
33 applicability. Then, 200 patients from Saudi Arabia completed the questionnaire, of which factor  
34 structure, internal consistency, criterion and construct validity were assessed.

35 Results: Content and face validity was supported based on experts and patients' reviews (ranges:  
36 CV scores 0.9-1.0/1.0 and clarity 3.5 to 4.5/5). Minor edits were made. Subsequent factor  
37 analysis revealed 4 factors consistent with the original version of the instrument, all internally  
38 consistent. Total CRBS-A  $\alpha$  was 0.74. Criterion validity was confirmed by the significantly  
39 higher scores in patients who participated in CR. Construct validity was also established by  
40 significant associations between MDS scores and monthly family income, having the diagnosis  
41 of acute coronary syndrome or with a history of valve repair or replacement, being obese or  
42 having dyslipidemia.

43 Conclusions: Overall, these results confirm the validity and reliability of the MDS in Arabic-  
44 speaking patients.

45

46 **Keywords:** Questionnaires and Surveys; Psychometrics; Diet, Mediterranean; Cardiac  
47 Rehabilitation; Coronary Artery Disease/Prevention and Control; Diet Surveys.

## 48 **Introduction**

49           Cardiovascular diseases (CVDs) are the most notable causes of disease burden across  
50 many nations [1], including Arabic-speaking countries [2,3]. In addition to health impacts, CVDs  
51 also carry a substantial economic burden on patients, their families, and societies due to medical  
52 costs, diminished productivity from disability and premature death [4-6]. Cardiovascular  
53 associations - regionally and internationally – recommend secondary prevention interventions to  
54 address this burden, which rely on successful health behaviour change [7-10]. These  
55 recommendations are based on findings linking CVDs to modifiable risk factors, particularly  
56 unhealthy behaviours such as poor-quality diet [10-12].

57           Cardiac rehabilitation (CR) is a comprehensive outpatient chronic disease management  
58 program designed to facilitate *heart*-health behaviours [9]. CR typically includes core  
59 components that address CVD risk factors, including exercise training, patient education,  
60 psychosocial management risk factor modification and nutritional counseling [13]. Research has  
61 shown that when all these multifactorial components are delivered, CR participation is associated  
62 with *reductions of mortality up to 25%*, as well as beneficial effects on morbidity, symptoms,  
63 exercise tolerance and capacity, lipid and blood pressure levels, blood pressure, psychosocial  
64 functioning and behaviour change [14-16]. In order to tailor adequate CR strategies and  
65 sustainable recommendations, it is crucial to fully understand patients' habits that determine  
66 cardiovascular health [17]. One of those is an adequate nutrition [18].

67           Over the years, various dietary patterns have been studied with the goal to identify the  
68 one that is mostly effective on heart health. The Mediterranean Dietary Pattern (MDP) has been  
69 greatly studied, with evidence showing its effects on the prevention and treatment of CVDs, as  
70 well as on the reduction of CVD mortality (MDP) [19-21]. While the MDP is widely

71 recommended to reduce CVD risk, there is not robust evidence for adherence in CR after the  
72 many changes that happened in programs due to the COVID-19 pandemic [22,23].

73 In this context, questionnaires are considered useful means to collect important  
74 information that can support choices related to the care of patients [24]; however, not always  
75 their application can be implemented into clinical practices. For example, full-length food  
76 frequency questionnaires (FFQ) or food records used in dietary assessments have limitations  
77 related to accuracy and time [25], leading to a significant burden on the respondents and  
78 healthcare team [26]. The 14-item Mediterranean Diet Score (MDS) was developed to assess  
79 adherence to the MDP [27], due to its effectiveness for primary and secondary prevention of  
80 CVDs [28-30]. In order to eliminate barriers for its use, a self-administered version of the MDS  
81 was developed and validated by Ghisi et al (2018) [31].

82 The prevalence and control of CVDs is considered the biggest public health challenge in  
83 Arabic-speaking countries [32], with risk factors such as obesity more than doubling in the last  
84 years [33]. Changes in food consumption patterns have been observed in these countries,  
85 including a diet with high content of fat, sugars, sodium and cholesterol [34,35]. In addition,  
86 availability of CR programs in Arab countries is extremely limited, with only 8 programs  
87 identified in a previous global survey of CR programs [36]. In this context, having a validated  
88 questionnaire to evaluate the MDP adherence in Arabic-speaking patients is timely, supporting  
89 practitioners to develop and deliver dietary recommendations that are aligned with patients'  
90 needs. Therefore, this study aimed to translate and psychometrically validate the Arabic version  
91 of the MDS.

## 92 **Methods**

## 93 **Design and Procedures**

94 The study was reviewed and approved by the King Abdullah Medical City, Saudi Arabia  
95 (22-944). Data was collected between September 2022 and January 2023. Permission to conduct  
96 this Arabic translation and validation was obtained, and the first author of the original MDS self-  
97 administered developmental study was invited to be part of the Arabic project. Authors had no  
98 access to information that could identify individual participants during or after data collection.

99 Following best practices [37], this study included the following steps: 1) translation from  
100 English to Arabic and cultural adaptation of the MDS, 2) review by an expert panel and Arabic-  
101 speaking patients, and 3) cross-sectional survey for evaluation of psychometric properties.

102 As the first step, the initial conceptual translation of the scale from English to the target  
103 language (Arabic) was performed by an independent translator. Then, a second translator (now  
104 blinded to the objectives of the study) back translated the scale. All versions – original,  
105 translated, and back translated – were reviewed and combined by the research team into one  
106 version, which was reviewed by an expert team comprised of 10 healthcare providers that care  
107 for CVD patients (step 2). This expert team assessed face and content validity; the later by rating  
108 each item on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 = completely irrelevant to 5 = very  
109 relevant. Content validity index (CVI) for the items (I-CVI) and scale (S-CVI) were computed.  
110 For both, only values higher than 0.80 were considered appropriate [38]. The scale was then  
111 revised based on CVI scores and suggestions made by experts. As part of phase 2, a group of 10  
112 individuals from the target population assessed clarity of the scale using a 5-point Likert-type  
113 scale ranging from 1 = not clear to 5 = very clear. Results were analyzed to further revise the  
114 scale.

115 Finally, psychometric properties were evaluated (step 3). The translated and culturally  
116 adapted tool was administered to a convenience sample of cardiac patients from a cardiology  
117 center in Saudi Arabia. Patients were invited to participate in the study while attending regular  
118 clinical consultations. Those that accepted, signed the consent form, and completed the Arabic  
119 MDS in-person. The following psychometric properties were assessed following the Consensus-  
120 based Standards for the selection of health Measurement Instruments (COSMIN) taxonomy [39]:  
121 factor structure, internal consistency, construct, and criterion validity.

### 122 **The self-administered version of the MDS**

123 The original 14-item MDS was developed in Spanish [27] and later translated to English  
124 [40]. The English version was used to develop the self-administered version [31]. This version  
125 included pictures to facilitate comprehension of questions and a simplified language. It is  
126 comprised of 13 items with yes/no options. The items are divided into 4 domains as follows:  
127 meats and processed foods; olive oil and sauce; fruits, vegetable, nuts, and legumes; and, fish  
128 and seafood [31]. Each item is scored as 0 or 1 in accordance with MDP adherence [41]. The  
129 final score ranges from 0 to 13 ( $< 5$  = low adherence to MDP;  $> 10$  = high adherence to MDP)  
130 [31]. The self-administered version of the MDS is also available in Brazilian [42] and Chinese  
131 [43] languages.

### 132 **Participants**

133 The inclusion criteria for patient participants were confirmed cardiac diagnosis or  
134 presence of cardiovascular risk factors, 18 years of age or older, and being able and willing to  
135 provide informed consent. The exclusion criteria for patient participants were inability to eat by  
136 mouth or having food and dietary restrictions (e.g., nut allergies) and having any impairment

137 which preclude the participant's ability to answer the questionnaire (e.g., visual). A minimum of  
138 200 participants was required following the recommendation for factor analysis [39].

139 Patient participants self-reported their sociodemographic and clinical characteristics,  
140 including the following: age, sex, cardiovascular diagnosis and risk factors, living area,  
141 educational level, and family income. In addition, CR participation (yes/no) was self-reported to  
142 assess criterion validity.

### 143 **Data Analysis**

144 First, exploratory factor analysis was performed, using the main component method for  
145 factor extraction. Only factors with eigenvalues  $> 1.0$  were considered. Item factor loadings  $>$   
146  $0.3$  were used in finalizing the items for each factor and interpreting the factors [44]. Next,  
147 internal consistency was determined by calculating Cronbach's *alpha* values of the scale and  
148 subscales. Cronbach's *alpha* higher than  $0.70$  was considered acceptable [45].

149 Criterion validity was assessed by differences in MDS total scores by CR participation  
150 using independent samples *t*-tests. Construct validity was assessed by exploring the associations  
151 between self-reported sociodemographic characteristics of participants and MDS scores using  
152 Pearson's correlation, independent samples *t*-tests, and analysis of variance.

153 Finally, a descriptive analysis of the Arabic MDS was performed. The Statistical Package  
154 for Social Sciences v. 28 (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA) was used for data analysis. The level of  
155 significance for all tests was set at  $0.05$ .

## 156 **Results**

### 157 **Translation, cultural adaptation and review by an expert panel and patients**

158 Following translation and back translation, a revised Arabic MDS version was reviewed  
159 by an expert panel ( $n=10$ ). The I-CVI ranged from  $0.9$  and  $1.0$  and the S-CVI was  $0.9$ . These



160 results identify an acceptable content validity for the Arabic MDS. For patients' review (n=10),  
161 clarity scores ranged from 3.5 to 4.5/5 (mean 4.2±0.3). Given these results, two items were  
162 culturally adapted as follows: pork removed from items 10 and 11 due to religious and cultural  
163 reasons. In addition, items 6 and 13 were rephrased to increase clarity. Appendix 1 displays the  
164 Arabic MDS.

### 165 **Cross-sectional survey for evaluation of psychometric properties**

166 Overall, 200 patients completed the Arabic MDS. Their sociodemographic and clinical  
167 characteristics are presented in Table 1.

168 Results from the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin index (KMO=0.78) and Bartlett's Sphericity  
169 tests ( $X^2=403.921$ ,  $p<0.001$ ) indicated that the data were suitable for exploratory factor analysis.  
170 Four factors were extracted, similar to the original validation [25]. These factors represented  
171 62.3% of the total variance and were all internally consistent (Cronbach's alpha ranged from  
172 0.70-0.79). Factor 1 reflected items related to meats/processed foods (5 items), factor 2 related to  
173 olive oil/sauce items (3 items), factor 3 related fruits/vegetables and nuts/legumes (4 items), and  
174 factor 4 related to fish/seafood (1 item). Table 2 presents the factor structure of the Arabic MDS  
175 SV, including item loadings. The total Cronbach's alpha of the scale was 0.74, confirming the  
176 internal consistency of the scale.

177 With regard to criterion validity, significant associations were observed between total  
178 scores and CR participation. Those who participated in CR had significantly higher adherence to  
179 the MDP (i.e., higher MDS scores) than those who did not participate ( $p=0.002$ ; Table 1).

180 As also shown in Table 1, with regard to construct validity, there were significant  
181 associations between MDS scores and monthly family income ( $p=0.02$ ), having the diagnosis of  
182 acute coronary syndrome ( $p=0.02$ ), a history of valve repair or replacement ( $p=0.03$ ), being

183 obese ( $p=0.02$ ) or having dyslipidemia ( $p=0.03$ ). In this context, those with a family monthly  
184 income under SAR\$10,000 presented a significantly lower MDP adherence than their  
185 counterparts. In addition, those who had a diagnosis of acute coronary syndrome, those that were  
186 obese, with dyslipidemia, or those who underwent a valve repair or replacement, presented MDP  
187 adherence than those without the diagnosis or a history of these procedures (Table 1).

## 188 **Adherence to the MDP**

189 The total score for the self-administered version of the MDS in this study was  
190  $11.0 \pm 8.0/13$ . Overall, 57 (28.5%) patients were classified as having high adherence to MDP and  
191 29 (14.5%) as having low adherence. Table 2 also displays the number of patients that adhere to  
192 MDP recommendations (i.e., responded “yes” to each item asked in the questionnaire). Items  
193 with the highest adherence included seasoning foods with a combination of tomato, garlic,  
194 onions, or leek ( $n=171$ ; 85.5%), eating poultry more often than red meat ( $n=164$ ; 82.0%), and  
195 eating three servings or more of legumes a week ( $n=137$ ; 68.5%). One item - eating three  
196 servings or more of fish or seafood each week – had the percentage of yes lower than 50%  
197 ( $n=87$ ; 43.5%).

## 198 **Discussion**

199 Research has proven the benefits of the MDP for both primary and secondary prevention  
200 of CVDs [46]. However, multi-level barriers affect adherence to dietary recommendations,  
201 including in participants of CR programs [47]. Having a validated and convenient tool to assess  
202 MDP adherence – and ultimately guide clinical and educational practices – is timely in countries  
203 like Saudi Arabia where a small percentage of population meet dietary recommendations and  
204 programmes to improve dietary behaviours are urgently needed to reduce the current and future  
205 burden of disease [48]. Therefore, this study established the Arabic version of the MDS to assess

206 adherence to the MDP through a multi-step process that included translation, cultural adaptation  
207 and assessment of psychometric properties. Content and face validity was supported based on  
208 experts and patients' reviews. Subsequent factor analysis revealed 4 factors consistent with the  
209 original version of the instrument [31], all internally consistent. Criterion validity was confirmed  
210 by the significantly higher scores in patients who participated in CR. Construct validity was also  
211 established by significant associations between MDS scores and monthly family income, having  
212 the diagnosis of acute coronary syndrome or with a history of valve repair or replacement, being  
213 obese or having dyslipidemia. Overall, these results confirm the validity and reliability of the  
214 MDS in Arabic-speaking patients.

215         The self-administered version of the MDS – originally developed in English [31] and  
216 later translated and validated to Portuguese [41] and Chinese [42] – was developed to simplify  
217 the assessment of MDP adherence in clinical and research settings. This is the 4<sup>th</sup> language  
218 available and other validation projects are underway (including Spanish and French). The  
219 Cronbach's alpha of the Arabic MDS was 0.74, which is higher than previous studies (range:  
220 0.42-0.69). The total MDS score of this score was higher than the Canadian ( $10.2\pm 1.9$ ) [31],  
221 Portuguese ( $6.94\pm 1.99$ ) [41], and Chinese ( $7.7\pm 2.4$ ) [42] versions. Items identified in the current  
222 study as the ones with the highest adherence included flavouring foods with a combination of  
223 tomato, garlic, onions, or leek, eating poultry more often than red meat, and eating three servings  
224 or more of legumes a week. These results are similar to responses identified in the previous  
225 studies using the MDS; in Canada [31], the items with highest adherence included eating poultry  
226 more often than meat and flavouring foods with a combination of tomato, garlic, onions or leek;  
227 in Brazil [41], eating three servings or more of legumes a week and flavoring foods with a  
228 combination of tomato, garlic, onions, or leeks; in China [42], flavouring foods with a

229 combination of tomato, garlic, onions or leek. On the other hand, the self-reported consumption  
230 vegetable in the Arab-speaking sample was lower than the other samples (50% vs. 85% in  
231 Canada, 79% in Brazil and 87% in China) [31,41,42], despite the fact that the Saudi dietary  
232 guidelines strongly recommend a higher intake of vegetables [49].

233 As previously mentioned, construct validity of the Arabic MDS was confirmed in this  
234 study, as well as in other versions of this scale [31,41,42]. Specifically, those with lower monthly  
235 family income had significantly lower MDP adherence than their counterparts. Despite its  
236 complexity, the impact of socioeconomic on dietary pattern is undeniably important [50-52]. In  
237 general, people with higher income tend to follow the MDP recommendations [53]; however, in  
238 any context, recommendations to follow healthy dietary habits should be given to CVD patients.  
239 Future research examining the changes in adherence to the MD over time and after educational  
240 interventions is warranted, including in groups of individuals with low socioeconomic status.

241 Those who participated in CR had significantly higher adherence to the MDP (i.e., higher  
242 MDS scores) than those who did not participate. These results support the effects of participation  
243 in CR – and delivery of nutrition counselling – on adherence to heart-healthy dietary patterns  
244 [54]. Furthermore, studies should describe the strategies, tools, and techniques employed within  
245 the interventions used to adhere to the MDP and barriers and facilitators to follow this behaviour.

246 There are some limitations in this study. First, findings are limited to one center from 1  
247 Arabic-speaking country (Saudi Arabia); results cannot be generalizable to the other 21 countries  
248 in the world that speak Arabic. Second, there may be selection and retention bias, which also  
249 limits the generalizability of the findings. Third, because of the nature of this cross-sectional  
250 study, causal conclusions cannot be drawn; it is recommended to test if the scale is sensitive to  
251 change before and after a nutritional or educational intervention. The final limitation pertains to

252 the assessment of other psychometric properties such as test-retest reliability, which should be  
253 explored in future studies.

## 254 **Conclusion**

255 In conclusion, the Arabic MDS is a valid and reliable tool that can be used to assess MDP  
256 adherence of Arabic-speaking cardiac patients. It is hoped that this scale supports the adequate  
257 assessment of food intake and changes in dietary habits, which plays a highly significant role in  
258 the care of people living with a cardiovascular condition.

259 **Supplementary Materials**

260 Appendix 1: Arabic MDS

261

262 **Conflicts of Interest**

263 The authors declare no conflict of interest.

## 264 **References**

- 265 1. Roth GA, Mensah, GA, Johnson, CO, et al. Global Burden of Cardiovascular Diseases and  
266 Risk Factors, 1990–2019. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2020; 76 (25): 2982–3021.  
267 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacc.2020.11.010>.
- 268 2. Aljefree N, Ahmed F. Prevalence of Cardiovascular Disease and Associated Risk Factors  
269 among Adult Population in the Gulf Region: A Systematic Review. *Adv Public Health*. 2015;  
270 2015:1–23. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2015/235101>.
- 271 3. Ahmed AM, Hersi A, Mashhoud W, et al. Cardiovascular Risk Factors Burden in Saudi  
272 Arabia: The Africa Middle East Cardiovascular Epidemiological (ACE) Study. *J Saudi Heart*  
273 *Assoc*; 2017;29 (4): 235–43. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsha.2017.03.004>.
- 274 4. Carter HE, Schofield D, Shrestha R. Productivity Costs of Cardiovascular Disease Mortality  
275 across Disease Types and Socioeconomic Groups. *Open Heart*. 2019; 6 (1): e000939.  
276 <https://doi.org/10.1136/openhrt-2018-000939>.
- 277 5. Oldridge NB. Economic Burden of Physical Inactivity: Healthcare Costs Associated with  
278 Cardiovascular Disease. *Eur J Cardiovasc Prev Rehabil*. 2008; 15 (2): 130–9.  
279 <https://doi.org/10.1097/HJR.0b013e3282f19d42>.
- 280 6. Salvatore FP, Spada A, Fortunato F, et al. Identification of Health Expenditures Determinants:  
281 A Model to Manage the Economic Burden of Cardiovascular Disease. *IJERPH*. 2021; 18 (9):  
282 4652. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18094652>.
- 283 7. Piepol MF, Hoes AW, Agewall S, et al. 2016 European Guidelines on Cardiovascular Disease  
284 Prevention in Clinical Practice: The Sixth Joint Task Force of the European Society of  
285 Cardiology and Other Societies on Cardiovascular Disease Prevention in Clinical Practice  
286 (Constituted by Representatives of 10 Societies and by Invited Experts) Developed with the

- 287 Special Contribution of the European Association for Cardiovascular Prevention &  
288 Rehabilitation (EACPR). *Eur Heart J*. 2016; 37 (29): 2315–81.  
289 <https://doi.org/10.1093/eurheartj/ehw106>.
- 290 8. Thomas RJ, King M, Lui K, et al. AACVPR/ACCF/AHA 2010 Update: Performance  
291 Measures on Cardiac Rehabilitation for Referral to Cardiac Rehabilitation/Secondary Prevention  
292 Services: A Report of the American Association of Cardiovascular and Pulmonary Rehabilitation  
293 and the American College of Cardiology Foundation/American Heart Association Task Force on  
294 Performance Measures (Writing Committee to Develop Clinical Performance Measures for  
295 Cardiac Rehabilitation). *Circulation*. 2010; 122 (13): 1342–50.  
296 <https://doi.org/10.1161/CIR.0b013e3181f5185b>.
- 297 9. Grace SL, Turk-Adawi KI, Contractor A, et al. Cardiac Rehabilitation Delivery Model for  
298 Low-Resource Settings. *Heart*. 2016; 102 (18): 1449–55. [https://doi.org/10.1136/heartjnl-2015-](https://doi.org/10.1136/heartjnl-2015-309209)  
299 [309209](https://doi.org/10.1136/heartjnl-2015-309209).
- 300 10. Smith SC, Benjamin EJ, Bonow RO, et al. AHA/ACCF Secondary Prevention and Risk  
301 Reduction Therapy for Patients With Coronary and Other Atherosclerotic Vascular Disease:  
302 2011 Update: A Guideline From the American Heart Association and American College of  
303 Cardiology Foundation. *Circulation*. 2011; 124 (22): 2458–73.  
304 <https://doi.org/10.1161/CIR.0b013e318235eb4d>.
- 305 11. Yusuf S, Joseph P, Rangarajan S, et al. Modifiable Risk Factors, Cardiovascular Disease, and  
306 Mortality in 155 722 Individuals from 21 High-Income, Middle-Income, and Low-Income  
307 Countries (PURE): A Prospective Cohort Study. *Lancet*. 2020; 395 (10226): 795–808.  
308 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(19\)32008-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(19)32008-2).



- 309 12. Yusuf S, Hawken S, Ôunpuu S, et al. Effect of Potentially Modifiable Risk Factors  
310 Associated with Myocardial Infarction in 52 Countries (the INTERHEART Study): Case-Control  
311 Study. *Lancet*. 2004; 364 (9438): 937–52. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(04\)17018-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(04)17018-9)
- 312 13. Mehra VM, Gaalema DE, Pakosh M, et al. Systematic Review of Cardiac Rehabilitation  
313 Guidelines: Quality and Scope. *Eur J Prev Cardiol*. 2020; 27 (9): 912–28.  
314 <https://doi.org/10.1177/2047487319878958>.
- 315 14. Taylor RS, Dalal HM, McDonagh STJ. The Role of Cardiac Rehabilitation in Improving  
316 Cardiovascular Outcomes. *Nat Rev Cardiol*. 2022; 19 (3): 180–94.  
317 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41569-021-00611-7>
- 318 15. Kabboul N, Tomlinson G, Francis T, et al. Comparative Effectiveness of the Core  
319 Components of Cardiac Rehabilitation on Mortality and Morbidity: A Systematic Review and  
320 Network Meta-Analysis. *JCM*. 2018; 7 (12): 514. <https://doi.org/10.3390/jcm7120514>
- 321 16. Shi W, Ghisi GLM, Zhang L, et al. Systematic Review, Meta-analysis and Meta-regression  
322 to Determine the Effects of Patient Education on Health Behaviour Change in Adults Diagnosed  
323 with Coronary Heart Disease. *J Clin Nurs*. 2022; jocn.16519. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jocn.16519>
- 324 17. Artinian NT, Fletcher GF, Mozaffarian D, et al. Interventions to Promote Physical Activity  
325 and Dietary Lifestyle Changes for Cardiovascular Risk Factor Reduction in Adults: A Scientific  
326 Statement From the American Heart Association. *Circulation*. 2010; 122 (4): 406–41.  
327 <https://doi.org/10.1161/CIR.0b013e3181e8edf1>
- 328 18. Ravera A, Carubelli V, Sciatti E, et al. Nutrition and Cardiovascular Disease: Finding the  
329 Perfect Recipe for Cardiovascular Health. *Nutrients*. 2016; 8(6): 363.  
330 <https://doi.org/10.3390/nu8060363>

- 331 19. Lichtenstein AH, Appel LJ, Vadiveloo M, et al. 2021 Dietary Guidance to Improve  
332 Cardiovascular Health: A Scientific Statement From the American Heart  
333 Association. *Circulation*. 2021; 144(23): e472–87.  
334 <https://doi.org/10.1161/CIR.0000000000001031>
- 335 20. Galbete C, Schwingshackl L, Schwedhelm C, et al. Evaluating Mediterranean diet and risk of  
336 chronic disease in cohort studies: an umbrella review of meta-analyses. *Eur J Epidemiol*.  
337 2018; 33(10): 909–31. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10654-018-0427-3>
- 338 21. Dinu M, Pagliai G, Casini A, et al. Mediterranean diet and multiple health outcomes: an  
339 umbrella review of meta-analyses of observational studies and randomised trials. *Eur J Clin*  
340 *Nutr*. 2018; 72(1): 30–43. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ejcn.2017.58>
- 341 22. Linan Pinto M, Pinto R, Charneca S, et al. Body composition, lipid profile and mediterranean  
342 diet adherence in cardiovascular disease patients attending a long-term exercise-based cardiac  
343 rehabilitation program during COVID-19 pandemic. *Eur J Prev Cardiol*. 2021; 28(Suppl 1):  
344 zwab061.187. <https://doi.org/10.1093/eurjpc/zwab061.187>
- 345 23. Della Valle PG, Mosconi G, Nucci D, et al. Adherence to the Mediterranean Diet during the  
346 COVID-19 national lockdowns: a systematic review of observational studies. *Acta bio-medica*  
347 *Atenei Parmensis*. 2021; 92(S6): e2021440. <https://doi.org/10.23750/abm.v92iS6.12233>
- 348 24. Testa MA, Simonson DC. Chapter 12 - The Use of Questionnaires and Surveys. In *Clinical*  
349 *and Translational Science (Second Edition)*; Robertson D, Williams GH. Eds.; Academic Press,  
350 2017; 207–26. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-802101-9.00012-0>
- 351 25. Willett W. Future Directions in the Development of Food-Frequency Questionnaires. *Am J*  
352 *Clin Nutr*. 1994; 59 (1): S171–4. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ajcn/59.1.171S>

- 353 26. Kowalkowska J, Slowinska M, Slowinski D, et al. Comparison of a Full Food-Frequency  
354 Questionnaire with the Three-Day Unweighted Food Records in Young Polish Adult Women:  
355 Implications for Dietary Assessment. *Nutrients*. 2013; 5 (7): 2747–76.  
356 <https://doi.org/10.3390/nu5072747>
- 357 27. Martínez-González MA, Salas-Salvadó J, Estruch R, et al. Benefits of the Mediterranean  
358 Diet: Insights From the PREDIMED Study. *Prog Cardiovasc Dis*. 2015; 58 (1): 50–60.  
359 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pcad.2015.04.003>
- 360 28. Martinez-Gonzalez MA, Bes-Rastrollo M. Dietary Patterns, Mediterranean Diet, and  
361 Cardiovascular Disease. *Curr Opin Lipidol*. 2014; 25 (1): 20–6.  
362 <https://doi.org/10.1097/MOL.0000000000000044>
- 363 29. Jimenez-Torres J, Alcalá-Diaz JF, Torres-Peña JD, et al. Mediterranean Diet Reduces  
364 Atherosclerosis Progression in Coronary Heart Disease: An Analysis of the CORDIOPREV  
365 Randomized Controlled Trial. *Stroke*. 2021; 52 (11): 3440–9.  
366 <https://doi.org/10.1161/STROKEAHA.120.033214>
- 367 30. Guasch-Ferré M, Willett WC. The Mediterranean Diet and Health: A Comprehensive  
368 Overview. *J Intern Med*. 2021; 290 (3): 549–66. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joim.13333>
- 369 31. Ghisi GLDM, Mahajan A, Da Silva Chaves GS, et al. Validation of a Self-Administered  
370 Version of the Mediterranean Diet Scale (MDS) for Cardiac Rehabilitation Patients in Canada.  
371 *Int J Food Sci Nutr*. 2019; 70 (2): 202–11. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09637486.2018.1486392>
- 372 32. Elmusharaf K, Grafton D, Jung JS, et al. The Case for Investing in the Prevention and  
373 Control of Non-Communicable Diseases in the Six Countries of the Gulf Cooperation Council:  
374 An Economic Evaluation. *BMJ Global Health*. 2022; 7 (6): e008670.  
375 <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjgh-2022-008670>

- 376 33. World Heart Organization. WHO Global Health Observatory: Prevalence of obesity among  
377 adults, BMI  $\geq$  30, age-standardized estimates by country. [internet]. 2016. Accessed 3 May 2023.  
378 Available from: [https://www.who.int/data/gho/data/themes/topics/indicator-groups/indicator-  
380 34. Musaiger AO. Diet and Prevention of Coronary Heart Disease in the Arab Middle East  
381 Countries. Med Princ Pract. 2002; 11 \(Suppl. 2\): 9–16. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000066415>  
382 35. Al Moraie N, Lietz G, Seal CJ. Dietary Patterns and Risk of Heart Disease in Populations  
383 from Different Geographical Locations in Saudi Arabia. Proc Nutr Soc. 2012; 71 \(OCE2\): E50.  
384 <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0029665112001073>  
385 36. Turk-Adawi KI, Terzic C, Bjarnason-Wehrens B, et al. Cardiac Rehabilitation in Canada and  
386 Arab Countries: Comparing Availability and Program Characteristics. BMC Health Serv Res.  
387 2015; 15 \(1\): 521. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-015-1183-7>  
388 37. Wild D, Grove A, Martin M, et al. Principles of Good Practice for the Translation and  
389 Cultural Adaptation Process for Patient-Reported Outcomes \(PRO\) Measures: Report of the  
390 ISPOR Task Force for Translation and Cultural Adaptation. Value Health. 2005; 8 \(2\): 94–104.  
391 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1524-4733.2005.04054.x>  
392 38. Mastaglia B, Toye C, Kristjanson LJ. Ensuring Content Validity in Instrument Development:  
393 Challenges and Innovative Approaches. Contemporary Nurse. 2003; 14 \(3\): 281–91.  
394 <https://doi.org/10.5172/conu.14.3.281>  
395 39. Terwee CB, Bot SDM, De Boer MR, et al. Quality Criteria Were Proposed for Measurement  
396 Properties of Health Status Questionnaires. J Clin Epidemiol. 2007; 60 \(1\): 34–42.  
397 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2006.03.012>](https://www.who.int/data/gho/data/themes/topics/indicator-groups/indicator-<br/>379 group-details/GHO/bmi-among-adults)

- 398 40. BACPR. The BACPR Standards and Core Components for Cardiovascular Disease  
399 Prevention and Rehabilitation [internet]. 2023. Accessed 3 May 2023. Available from:  
400 [https://www.bacpr.org/\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0021/64236/BACPR-Standards-and-Core-](https://www.bacpr.org/_data/assets/pdf_file/0021/64236/BACPR-Standards-and-Core-Components-2023.pdf)  
401 [Components-2023.pdf](https://www.bacpr.org/_data/assets/pdf_file/0021/64236/BACPR-Standards-and-Core-Components-2023.pdf)
- 402 41. Schröder H, Fitó M, Estruch R, et al. A Short Screener Is Valid for Assessing Mediterranean  
403 Diet Adherence among Older Spanish Men and Women. *Journal Nutr.* 2011; 141 (6): 1140–5.  
404 <https://doi.org/10.3945/jn.110.135566>
- 405 42. Teixeira R, Jansen AK, Pereira DA, et al. Brazilian Portuguese Version of the Mediterranean  
406 Diet Scale: Translation Procedures and Measurement Properties. *Diabetes Metabol Syndr: Clin*  
407 *Res Rev.* 2021; 15 (4): 102165. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dsx.2021.06.002>
- 408 43. Li J, Ding H, Wang Z, et al. Translation, Cultural Adaptation, Reliability, and Validity  
409 Testing of a Chinese Version of the Self-Administered Mediterranean Diet Scale. *Front Nutr.*  
410 2022; 9: 831109. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnut.2022.831109>
- 411 44. Hair JF, Anderson RE. *Multivariate data analysis.* New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1998.
- 412 45. Nunnally JC. *Psychometric Theory.* McGraw-Hill: New York, United States, 1978.
- 413 46. Widmer RJ, Flammer AJ, Lerman LO, et al. The Mediterranean Diet, Its Components, and  
414 Cardiovascular Disease. *Am J Med.* 2015; 128 (3): 229–38.  
415 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amjmed.2014.10.014>
- 416 47. Vanzella LM, Rouse V, Ajwani F, et al. Barriers and Facilitators to Participant Adherence of  
417 Dietary Recommendations within Comprehensive Cardiac Rehabilitation Programmes: A  
418 Systematic Review. *Public Health Nutr.* 2021; 24 (15): 4823–39.  
419 <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1368980021002962>

- 420 48. Moradi-Lakeh M, El Bcheraoui C, Afshin A, et al. Diet in Saudi Arabia: Findings from a  
421 Nationally Representative Survey. *Public Health Nutr.* 2017; 20 (6): 1075–81.  
422 <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1368980016003141>
- 423 49. Ministry of Health. The Dietary Guidelines for Saudis. [internet] 2023. Accessed 3 May  
424 2023. Available from:  
425 <https://www.moh.gov.sa/en/HealthAwareness/Pages/SaudihealthFoodGuide.aspx>
- 426 50. Mayén AL, Marques-Vidal P, Paccaud F, et al. Socioeconomic Determinants of Dietary  
427 Patterns in Low- and Middle-Income Countries: A Systematic Review. *Am J Clin Nutr.* 2014;  
428 100 (6): 1520–31. <https://doi.org/10.3945/ajcn.114.089029>
- 429 51. D’Innocenzo S, Biagi C, Lanari M. Obesity and the Mediterranean Diet: A Review of  
430 Evidence of the Role and Sustainability of the Mediterranean Diet. *Nutrients.* 2019; 11 (6): 1306.  
431 <https://doi.org/10.3390/nu11061306>
- 432 52. Vlismas K, Stavrinou V, Panagiotakos DB. Socio-Economic Status, Dietary Habits and  
433 Health-Related Outcomes in Various Parts of the World: A Review. *Cent Eur J Public Health.*  
434 2009; 17 (2): 55–63. <https://doi.org/10.21101/cejph.a3475>
- 435 53. Cavaliere A, Elisa De Marchi A, Banterle A. Exploring the Adherence to the Mediterranean  
436 Diet and Its Relationship with Individual Lifestyle: The Role of Healthy Behaviors, Pro-  
437 Environmental Behaviors, Income, and Education. *Nutrients.* 2018; 10 (2): 141.  
438 <https://doi.org/10.3390/nu10020141>
- 439 54. Kocanda L, Schumacher TL, Plotnikoff RC, et al. Effectiveness and reporting of nutrition  
440 interventions in cardiac rehabilitation programmes: a systematic review. *Eur J Cardiovasc Nurs.*  
441 2023; 22(1): 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1093/eurjcn/zvac033>  
442

## 443 **Tables**

**Table 1: Characteristics of patient participants and corresponding mean total MDS scores (N=200)**

<b>Characteristic</b>		<b>MDS Total Score mean±SD</b>	<b>p*</b>
<i>Age</i> , mean±SD	46.5±13.6	-	-
<i>Sex</i> , n (%)			0.11
Male	92 (46.0)	8.3±2.3	
Female	108 (54.0)	7.7±2.4	
<i>Area of Living</i> , n (%)			0.51
Urban	180 (90.0)	7.9±2.4	
Rural	19 (9.5)	8.5±1.7	
<i>Highest educational level</i> , n (%)			0.91
Illiterate	9 (4.5)	7.7±2.7	
Less than High School	5 (2.5)	8.2±1.9	
High School	62 (31.0)	7.8±2.5	
College certificate or diploma	109 (54.5)	8.0±2.3	
Higher education	15 (7.5)	8.3±2.0	
<i>Monthly family income</i> , n (%)			0.02
Under SAR\$10,000	78 (39.0)	6.6±2.5	
Between SAR\$10,001-20,000	76 (38.0)	7.6±2.2	



Between SAR\$20,001-\$30,000	38 (19.0)	7.5±2.4	
Higher than SAR\$30,001	8 (4.0)	9.1±2.2	
<i>Cardiac Diagnosis/Procedures, n (%)</i>			
Percutaneous Coronary Intervention	24 (12.0)	8.1±2.2	0.72
Arrhythmia	22 (11.0)	7.4±2.6	0.25
Acute Coronary Syndrome	21 (10.5)	9.0±2.2	0.02
Acute Myocardial Infarction	16 (8.0)	8.0±2.3	0.90
Valve disorders	16 (8.0)	8.5±3.3	0.40
Cardiac Device	11 (5.5)	8.1±2.2	0.85
Valve Repair/Replacement	9 (4.5)	9.4±3.2	0.03
Heart Failure	8 (4.0)	7.4±1.6	0.50
Coronary Artery Bypass Graft	2 (1.0)	7.5±2.1	0.78
<i>Risk factors, n (%)</i>			
Family History of CVD	79 (39.5)	7.7±2.4	0.30
Sedentary/inactivity	72 (36.0)	7.8±2.5	0.50
Smoking	64 (32.0)	8.1±2.1	0.70
Diabetes Type II	60 (30.0)	8.3±2.3	0.23
Hypertension	46 (23.0)	7.8±2.4	0.52
Obesity	44 (22.0)	5.7±2.3	0.02
Depression	43 (21.5)	8.2±2.5	0.44

Dyslipidemia	34 (17.0)	6.5±2.3	0.03
<i>CR participation, yes (%)</i>			0.002
Yes	22 (11.0)	9.5±2.2	
No	178 (89.0)	7.6±2.3	

MDS, Mediterranean Diet Scale; SD standard deviation; CVD cardiovascular diseases; CR cardiac rehabilitation.

\*p is used for association of characteristics and total mean score, tested using t-tests, analysis of variance or Pearson's correlation, as applicable.

Note: Income shown in Saudi Riyal (SAR). 1 SAR corresponds to USD\$0.47 (currency: March 1, 2023)

**Table 2: Factor loadings from exploratory factor analysis, reliability of factors and number of ‘yes’ responses per item, N=202**

Item	Factors				Yes, n (%)
	1. Meats and Processed Foods	2. Olive Oil and Sauces	3. Fruits, Vegetables, Legumes and Nuts	4. Fish and Seafood	
1. Do you use olive oil as the main source of fat when you cook?		0.721			123 (61.5)
2. Do you use at least four tablespoons or more of olive oil when cooking your food each day?		0.733			118 (59.0)
3. Do you eat two servings or more of vegetables each day?			0.689		100 (50.0)
4. Do you eat three servings or more of fruit each day?			0.629		101 (50.5)
5. Do you eat less than one tablespoon of butter, hydrogenated margarine or cream each day?	0.466				111 (55.5)
6. Do you drink less than one serving of sweet or sweetened drinks each day?	0.408				100 (50.0)
7. Do you eat three servings or more of legumes a week?			0.469		137 (68.5)
8. Do you eat three servings or more of fish or seafood each week?				0.474	87 (43.5)
9. Do you eat one serving or more of nuts each week?			0.453		129 (64.5)
10. Do you eat poultry (chicken or turkey) more often than meat (beef, veal, hamburger, or sausage)?	0.453				164 (82.0)
11. Do you limit red meat and processed meats to one serving or less one or two times a week?	0.452				132 (66.0)
12. Do you eat less than three servings of sweets or pastries each week?	0.405				119 (59.5)
13. Do you add some flavorings to your food, such as a mixture of tomatoes, garlic, onions and leeks, two or more times a week?		0.652			171 (85.5)

Variance explained	27.4%	16.8%	9.6%	8.5%	-
Eigenvalues	2.9	1.5	1.3	1.1	-
Reliability	0.79	0.78	0.75	0.70	-

\* Item culturally adapted.