

**Feasibility, acceptability, and cognitive benefits of a theory-informed intervention to increase Mediterranean diet adherence and physical activity in older adults at risk of dementia: the MedEx-UK randomised controlled trial.**

Jennings A\*, Shannon OM\*, Gillings R, Lee V, Elsworth R, Rao G, Hanson S, Hardeman W, Paddick S-M, Siervo M, Aldred S, Mathers JC, Hornberger M, Minihane AM

\*Joint first authors

Norwich Medical School, University of East Anglia, Norwich, UK (AJ, RG, MH AMM)

Behavioural and Implementation Science Group, School of Health Sciences, University of East Anglia, Norwich, UK (SH, WH)

Norwich Institute of Healthy Ageing, University of East Anglia, Norwich, UK (AJ, RG, SH, WH, MH AMM)

Human Nutrition & Exercise Research Centre, Population Health Sciences Institute, Newcastle University, Newcastle, UK (OS, GR, JM)

School of Sport, Exercise and Rehabilitation Sciences, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK (RE, SA)

The George Institute for Global Health, NSW, Australia (VL)

Faculty of Medicine, University of New South Wales, NSW, Australia (VL)

Translational and Clinical Medicine, Newcastle University, Campus for Ageing and Vitality, Westgate Road Newcastle upon Tyne, NE4 6BE (SMP)

Gateshead Health NHS Foundation Trust, Bensham Hospital, Saltwell Road Gatehead NE8 4YL (SMP)

Curtin Dementia Centre of Excellence, enAble Institute, Curtin University, Perth, Australia (MS).

**Corresponding author:** Anne-Marie Minihane, BCRE, Rosalind Franklin Road, University of East Anglia, Norwich, UK NR4 7UQ. [a.minihane@uea.ac.uk](mailto:a.minihane@uea.ac.uk)

Jennings, Shannon, Gillings, Lee, Elsworth, Rao, Hanson, Hardeman, Hornberger, Paddick, Siervo, Aldred, Mathers, Minihane

**Sources of support:** The main trial funding was from Alzheimer's Research UK Prevention and Risk Reduction Fund (ARUK-PRRF2017-006) with additional support provided by the UK Nutrition Research Partnership (UK NRP), an initiative supported by the Medical Research Council (MRC), Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council (BBSRC) and the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) (MR/T001852/1) as part of the NuBrain Consortium work programme.

**Short running head:** Mediterranean diet and activity intervention

**Clinical Trial registry:** <https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT03673722>

1 **Abstract**

2 **Background:** Despite an urgent need for multi-domain lifestyle interventions to reduce  
3 dementia risk there is a lack of interventions which are informed by theory- and evidence-  
4 based behaviour change strategies and no interventions in this domain have investigated the  
5 feasibility or effectiveness of behaviour change maintenance.

6 **Objectives:** We tested the feasibility, acceptability, and cognitive effects of MedEx-UK, a  
7 personalised theory-based 24-week intervention to improve Mediterranean-diet (MD)  
8 adherence alone, or in combination with physical activity (PA), in older-adults at risk of  
9 dementia, defined using a cardiovascular risk-score of >10%.

10 **Design:** 104 participants (74% female, 57–76 years) were randomised to three parallel  
11 intervention arms: 1) control, 2) MD, or 3) MD+PA for 24-weeks and invited to an additional  
12 24-week follow-up period with no active intervention. Behaviour change was supported  
13 using personalised targets, a web-based intervention, group sessions and food provision.

14 **Results:** The intervention was feasible and acceptable with the intended number of ‘at risk’  
15 participants completing the study. Participant engagement with group sessions and food  
16 provision components was high. There was improved MD adherence in the two MD groups  
17 compared with control at 24-weeks (3.7 points on a 14-point scale (95% CI 2.9, 4.5,  $p < 0.01$ )  
18 and 48-weeks (2.7 points (95% CI 1.6, 3.7)  $p < 0.01$ ). Intervention did not change objectively  
19 measured PA. Improvements in general cognition (0.22 (95% CI 0.05, 0.35,  $p = 0.01$ ),  
20 memory (0.31 (95% CI 0.10, 0.51,  $p < 0.01$ ), and select cardiovascular outcomes captured as  
21 underpinning physiological mechanisms were observed in the MD groups at 24-weeks.

22 **Conclusion:** The intervention was successful in initiating and maintaining dietary behaviour  
23 change for up to 12-months, which was likely due to the intense early support provided  
24 which resulted in cognitive benefits. These results will inform larger-scale complex  
25 behaviour change interventions with health and well-being endpoints.

26 **Key words:** Mediterranean diet; physical activity; behaviour change; RCT; dementia

27

## 28 **Introduction**

29 Dementia is a major public health concern with a substantial social and economic cost (1).

30 Given the considerable and rising prevalence of this condition, the identification of feasible,  
31 acceptable and effective dementia prevention strategies is a major research priority (2). The  
32 modification of behavioural risk factors, including eating behaviours and physical activity,  
33 may play a key role in mitigating dementia risk (3).

34

35 Improving both dietary behaviours and physical activity (PA) levels could have additive and  
36 synergistic effects on brain health through overlapping physiological processes and activation  
37 of common intracellular pathways (4). Recent studies have reported beneficial effects on  
38 cognitive function in large-scale, multi-domain interventions which comprise dietary and PA  
39 changes (5) including those in specific ‘at risk’ sub-groups (6, 7).

40

41 Data from randomised controlled trials (RCTs) suggest that intervention to support adoption  
42 of a MD can improve cognitive function (8, 9). Our previous prospective cohort research  
43 indicated that a three-point increase in Mediterranean Diet Adherence Screener (MEDAS)  
44 score on a 14- or 15-point scale was associated with up to five less years of global cognitive  
45 ageing (10). Increased PA has also been associated with improved cognitive function and  
46 reduced dementia risk (11, 12). Several mechanisms could explain such effects, including  
47 improvement of cardiometabolic health (13), through physiological processes such as blood  
48 brain barrier function, cerebrovascular function, inflammation and  $\beta$ -amyloid clearance (14-  
49 16).

50

51 To our knowledge only one previous intervention has examined the impact of multidomain  
52 behaviours, including MD adoption, on neurocognitive function, with none conducted in the

53 UK (17). This previous six-month MD plus exercise intervention improved spatial working  
54 memory performance in older adults in Australia (17). In addition, there are a lack of MD and  
55 PA interventions which are informed by theory- and evidence-based behaviour change  
56 strategies and no interventions in this domain have investigated the feasibility or  
57 effectiveness of behaviour change maintenance. Various barriers make adoption of a MD in a  
58 non-Mediterranean setting challenging, including cultural identity and acceptability of MD  
59 components, which necessitates careful intervention development (18). Development of  
60 theory- and evidence-based interventions and feasibility testing are critical phases in complex  
61 intervention development (19), hence the importance of establishing the feasibility of  
62 intervention with the MD in a UK setting prior to progression to a definitive RCT.

63

64 In the current manuscript, we report the primary and secondary outcomes of the MedEx-UK  
65 study, a 24-week multi-domain, theory-based intervention to improve MD adherence alone,  
66 or in combination with PA, in older adults at risk of dementia, defined using a cardiovascular  
67 risk-score (20). The intervention targets key influences on behaviour based on the Capability,  
68 Opportunity, Motivation and Behaviour Model (COM-B model) and includes evidence-based  
69 behaviour change techniques (BCTs) to encourage initial behaviour change and maintenance  
70 of any changes (21, 22). Following this 24-week intervention we invited all participants to a  
71 further 24-week follow-up period with no active intervention to investigate behaviour change  
72 maintenance. The primary outcomes were feasibility and acceptability of the intervention  
73 and the secondary outcomes included behaviour change (changes in MEDAS score and PA  
74 levels), cognitive function, cardiometabolic health (BMI and 24-hour ambulatory blood  
75 pressure) and process measures such as theory-based mediators of behaviour change. Data  
76 are presented for outcomes at both 24- and 48-weeks follow-up.

77

## 78 **Methods**

### 79 **Study design**

80 The study was pre-registered with ClinicalTrials.gov (NCT03673722) and the details of the  
81 protocol have been published (20). Briefly, participants from three UK centres (Norwich,  
82 Newcastle, and Birmingham) were randomised to a personalised, multi-domain intervention  
83 into one of three parallel intervention arms: 1) control, 2) MD, and 3) MD+PA. The main 24-  
84 week intervention took place between March 2019 and September 2020 and the 24 to 48-  
85 week trial add-on behaviour maintenance phase was completed by March 2021.

86  
87 The sample size calculation for the study, based on dietary change of three-points on the  
88 MEDAS indicated 90 participants (30 participants in each arm) would be required to  
89 complete the study, which was increased to 108 participants to account for a 20% drop-out  
90 rate (20). With this sample size the smallest detectable change in MEDAS score with 90%  
91 power and 5% error was 1.23 points, within our minimum target for dietary change of 3  
92 points, suggesting we would have a sufficiently precise estimate of whether a dietary change  
93 is achievable in this study.

94

### 95 **Participants**

96 Individuals aged 55 to 74 years were recruited to take part in the intervention through  
97 primary care, in collaboration with the local Clinical Research Networks at each study site,  
98 and via direct-to-public advertisements. Full details of the study inclusion/exclusion criteria  
99 can be found elsewhere (20). Briefly, participants were required to: 1) have a QRISK2 score  
100  $\geq 10\%$ , which indicates a  $\geq 10\%$  risk of having a cardiovascular event in the next 10 years; 2)  
101 have normal cognitive function as determined by a Montreal Cognitive Assessment (MoCA)  
102 score  $\geq 23$  (23); 3) be free of mild cognitive impairment, dementia or other severe

103 neuropsychological complaints; 4) have a baseline MEDAS score <9 according to a modified  
104 version of MEDAS (24); and 5) undertake <90 minutes self-reported moderate-intensity PA  
105 each week. Eligibility to participate was determined through online, telephone and in-person  
106 screening sessions. Participants provided initial consent for the 24-week study intervention  
107 during the online screening, and written consent during the in-person screening. During the  
108 initial 24-week intervention, participants were invited to take part in the 24 to 48-week  
109 behaviour maintenance phase, and further written consent was obtained.

110

### 111 **Randomisation**

112 Individuals who were deemed eligible to participate in MedEx-UK were allocated randomly  
113 to one of the three study intervention arms within each centre, with minimisation for MEDAS  
114 score (low = 0-4; high = 5-8) and sex, to ensure treatment arms were balanced for these  
115 parameters. Randomisation and allocation were completed by researchers who were not  
116 blinded to group assignment.

117

### 118 **Intervention phase**

119 The first 24 weeks of the study comprised an intensive intervention period, during which  
120 participants in the MD and MD+PA arms were encouraged to change their behaviour via a  
121 combination of personalised targets based on participants' self-assessment of their MD  
122 consumption and PA levels, a web-based intervention, group sessions with facilitators trained  
123 in behaviour change techniques, and supermarket vouchers or food delivery to support  
124 behaviour change and the potential extra costs of Mediterranean foods. Subsequently,  
125 participants were invited to take part in a behavioural maintenance phase (weeks 24-48),  
126 during which they had continued access to the web-based intervention only.

127



128 The intervention targets were to improve MEDAS scores by at least three points and increase  
129 levels of activity to 150 minutes of moderate, or 75 minutes of vigorous, activity per week.  
130 These targets were personalised: as part of the website intervention, participants were asked  
131 to self-assess their consumption of the Mediterranean diet and their PA levels. They then  
132 received personalised feedback and were encouraged to focus on specific behavioural  
133 changes from which they were expected to benefit. Participants were encouraged to select  
134 their own goals to meet these targets, which were introduced in a gradual process. Due to the  
135 negative associations between alcohol consumption and brain health, participants were not  
136 asked to increase their alcohol intake but if they consumed alcohol to switch the type of  
137 alcohol they consumed to wine, preferably red wine.

138

139 The web-based intervention was administered via an interactive, modular platform called  
140 LEAP<sup>2</sup>, as described elsewhere (20). LEAP<sup>2</sup> included the ‘Eating Well’ module, designed to  
141 help participants increase their MEDAS score by providing real-time access to their score and  
142 details of the goals they were meeting, and facilitating participants to choose their own goals  
143 based on individual food preferences. Full details of the MEDAS targets are presented in  
144 **Supplemental Table 1.**

145

146 The ‘Moving More’ module (accessible only by participants in the MD+PA arm) was  
147 designed to help participants increase their PA. The module included a questionnaire to allow  
148 participants to determine their current PA levels and receive an award based on the level  
149 achieved (bronze ( $\geq 100$  min of moderate or 50 min of vigorous-intensity PA per week), silver  
150 ( $\geq 120$  min of moderate or 60 min of vigorous-intensity PA per week) or gold ( $\geq 150$  min of  
151 moderate or 75 min of vigorous-intensity PA per week). Participants were encouraged to set a  
152 goal of moderate and/or vigorous activity in minutes per week and LEAP<sup>2</sup> provided tailored

153 PA suggestions based around participants preferences for cost, intensity, and type (group or  
154 individual) of exercise, and guided participants through overcoming key barriers associated  
155 with increasing PA levels.

156

157 In addition, LEAP<sup>2</sup> included a diary feature to help participants plan meals and PA, and links  
158 to the study dietary assessment tool (Intake24) and the food provision element of the MedEx-  
159 UK study. Participants were encouraged to visit LEAP<sup>2</sup> regularly throughout the 24-week  
160 intervention period.

161

162 Participants in the MD and MD+PA arms were invited to attend four group sessions (at  
163 weeks 0, 2, 4 and 12) that were designed to complement the web-based intervention. The  
164 group sessions were two hours for the MD group and 2.5 hours for the MD+PA group and  
165 comprised ~6 participants and ~6 supportive others (i.e., a friend or relative to provide social  
166 support). The group sessions were designed to target key influences on behaviour change  
167 based on the COM-B model (25) and incorporated evidence-based behaviour change  
168 techniques (BCTs) to encourage change and maintenance. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic,  
169 group sessions were conducted both in-person (prior to March 2020) and via  
170 videoconferencing software (after March 2020 during ‘lockdown’ periods). Participants were  
171 notified of their intervention group allocation at the start of their first group session.

172

173 Finally, participants in the MD and MD+PA groups were provided with £30 per week in  
174 vouchers for an online food retailer. Participants were encouraged to purchase foods that  
175 contributed to their MEDAS target score but this was not monitored. In cases where online  
176 food delivery was not possible (e.g., due to delivery restrictions to rural areas), participants  
177 were provided with equivalent vouchers for a supermarket of their choice.

178  
179 Participants in the control group received dietary and PA advice in accordance with the UK  
180 National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) guidelines for individuals with a  
181 moderately elevated QRISK2 score (26). They also attended a one-hour group session at  
182 week 0, during which they were informed of their intervention group allocation and received  
183 a brief verbal presentation outlining the importance of a control group in research. Following  
184 completion of the 24-week intervention phase, the control group received £240 shopping  
185 vouchers (equivalent to £10 per week participation) as remuneration.

186

### 187 **Behavioural maintenance phase**

188 Following the initial 24-week intervention period, consenting participants entered a  
189 behavioural maintenance phase during which they had continued access to the LEAP<sup>2</sup>  
190 platform but no longer received group support sessions or food provision. The LEAP<sup>2</sup>  
191 platform was modified to include content which aimed to support participants in maintaining  
192 healthy behaviour change achieved during the initial study intervention period, full details are  
193 provided in **Supplemental Methods 1**. This study maintenance phase was a trial add-on  
194 initiated after participants were recruited and consented to the main 24-week intervention.

195

### 196 **Outcomes**

197 A baseline assessment was conducted in-person at a clinical testing facility prior to the study  
198 intervention, during which cognitive, vascular and biological outcomes were evaluated (1).  
199 The study protocol was adapted at the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic to minimise  
200 participant-researcher contact and to ensure safety and compliance with social distancing  
201 measures. Therefore, only a sub-set of secondary measurements, not including biological  
202 samples, or MRI were obtained at 24- and 48-weeks via remote (i.e., at-home) data

203 collection. Specific adaptations have been highlighted for each measurement below, where  
204 relevant.

205

### 206 **Feasibility and acceptability**

207 The feasibility of the intervention was assessed using recruitment and retention rates.

208 Intervention fidelity and participant engagement were evaluated via group session attendance

209 (intervention phase) and self-reported usage of LEAP<sup>2</sup> (intervention and behaviour

210 maintenance phases) in the MD and MD+PA groups. Acceptability of the intervention was

211 assessed at 24- and 48-weeks by a custom questionnaire using 5-point Likert-type scales,

212 informed by the Theoretical Framework of Acceptability (27).

213

### 214 **Dietary assessment**

215 Dietary intake, to determine level of adherence to the MD, was evaluated via two different

216 approaches. Firstly, participants completed an online version of the 14-point MEDAS

217 questionnaire (24), which was the primary dietary outcome measure in this study. Secondly,

218 participants completed a series of 24-hour recalls (on five non-consecutive days at baseline

219 and at 24- and 48-weeks) via Intake24, a validated online dietary assessment tool (28). These

220 data were also used to calculate adherence to the 14-point MEDAS scale as detailed in

221 **Supplemental Table 1.**

222

### 223 **Physical activity**

224 PA levels were recorded for all participants throughout the entire intervention and behaviour

225 maintenance periods via wrist worn activity monitors (Vivosmart 3, Garmin). The activity

226 monitors were set to show the time and date only, to prevent participants receiving any

227 activity-based feedback. Age, height, and weight were entered when setting up the devices to

228 improve accuracy. The devices recorded total step count, heart rate and PA energy  
229 expenditure. In addition, total activity levels in minutes of moderate intensity PA per week  
230 were calculated as: moderate minutes (defined as 40–59% heart rate reserve) + (vigorous  
231 minutes ( $\geq 60\%$  heart rate reserve)\*2) (29).

232

### 233 **Cognitive function**

234 Cognitive function was determined using an extended version of the neuropsychological test  
235 battery (NTB)(20) measured at baseline, 24- and 48-weeks (**Supplemental Methods 2**).

236 Additionally, we included assessments of spatial navigation via the virtual reality  
237 Supermarket Trolley Task(30) and the Sea Hero Quest Test(31). The duration of each  
238 cognitive assessment was approximately 90 minutes. Baseline assessments were conducted  
239 in-person at a clinical testing facility and follow-up assessments at 24- and 48-weeks were  
240 conducted remotely via video conferencing software, to reduce in-person contact while  
241 COVID-19 social distancing measures were in effect. A researcher was present virtually  
242 during the testing and paper-based cognitive tests were posted to participants before the  
243 session. It was not possible to collect data on the spatial navigation tasks during these remote  
244 sessions.

245

246 Scores from each test were converted to Z scores standardised on baseline grand mean and  
247 standard deviation with response time variables reversed by [ $Z * -1$ ], so higher scores always  
248 suggested better outcomes. Individual Z scores test scores were mean aggregated into  
249 summary scores for: Processing speed [Digit symbol substitution (total correct); Trail Making  
250 Test (A, seconds)]; Executive Function [Controlled Oral Word Association Test (total);  
251 Categorical verbal fluency test (total); Trail Making Test (B-A, seconds); Wechsler Memory  
252 Digit Span (backwards, total)] and Memory [Visual paired (immediate and delayed totals);

253 Verbal paired (immediate and delayed totals); Rey Auditory Verbal Learning Test  
254 (immediate and recall)]. A general cognition score was calculated using all Processing  
255 Speed, Executive Function and Memory tests.

256

## 257 **BMI**

258 At baseline, height and weight were measured after an overnight fast by a member of the  
259 research team using standard laboratory techniques and used to calculate body mass index  
260 (BMI). At 24- and 48-weeks, due to social distancing measures during the COVID-19  
261 pandemic, participants were asked to measure their body weight at home using either their  
262 own electronic scales or those provided by the research team.

263

## 264 **24-hour ambulatory BP**

265 24-hour ambulatory BP (AMBP) was measured at baseline and week-24 using portable  
266 devices (Mobil-O-Graph, Stolberg, Germany and Spacelab Healthcare, Washington, United  
267 States) which consisted of an inflatable cuff attached to a small monitoring system. The cuff  
268 was secured around the upper arm and readings were taken every 20 minutes during daytime  
269 (06:00 to 22:00) and every hour overnight (22:00 to 06:00) for an entire 24-hour period.

270

## 271 **Process evaluation**

272 The process evaluation was informed by UK Medical Research Council guidance for process  
273 evaluation (32). Here we present the quantitative measures related to mechanism of impact.  
274 The findings from interviews with group session facilitators and focus groups with  
275 participants, which focus additionally on contextual factors and implementation (e.g.,  
276 fidelity) will be reported separately. Hypothesised mediators of behaviour change (intention,  
277 perceived control and self-reported use of behaviour change techniques) were assessed in all

278 groups at baseline (intention and perceived control only), 24- and 48-weeks using five-point  
279 Likert-type scales.

280

### 281 **Statistical analyses**

282 Between group differences in group-session attendance and use of the online-platform were  
283 examined using a 2-sample t-test or  $\chi^2$  test for categorical data. The effect of the intervention  
284 on eating behaviour and other outcomes at 24- and 48-weeks were assessed using ANCOVA,  
285 with the 24-week value as the dependent variable, group as the independent variable. We  
286 compared the difference in the mean of the control group with the mean of the two MD  
287 intervention groups (contrast 1), and the mean of the MD and MD+PA groups (contrast 2).  
288 Covariates included baseline value, study site, and baseline BMI. The cognitive outcomes  
289 were additionally adjusted for age and years of education. We checked for effect  
290 modification by sex by including an interaction term for group\*sex in the models. Data are  
291 presented as the difference in mean values at 24- or 48-weeks for the two intervention groups  
292 (mean MD+PA and MD) minus the control group.

293 .

294 For eating behaviour change, we also examined if change over 24-weeks was associated with  
295 maintenance or further change at 48-weeks by including an interaction term for  
296 group\*continuing to 48-weeks (y/n) in the model. We also calculated the percentage of  
297 participants who changed their diets sufficiently to meet the criteria for individual MEDAS  
298 components at 24-weeks. Finally, participants across all three groups (control, MD+PA,  
299 MD) were assigned to tertiles of 24-week change in MEDAS score and minutes of moderate  
300 activity and associations with cognitive and cardiometabolic outcomes at 24-weeks were  
301 examined.

302

303 All data are presented as unadjusted mean (SD) at individual timepoints, change (95% CI) or  
304 percentages where indicated. All analyses were performed using STATA (version 16;  
305 StataCorp).

306

### 307 **Role of the funding source**

308 The funders of the study had no role in study design, data collection, data analysis, data  
309 interpretation, or writing of the report.

310

## 311 **Results**

### 312 **Feasibility and acceptability**

313 Of the n=2776 participants who completed online screening, n=239 met the criteria and  
314 attended in-person screening, n=104 (74% female, 57–76 years (mean 67.4 years (SD 4.6))  
315 were recruited to the MedEx-UK study between 15<sup>th</sup> April 2019 and 10<sup>th</sup> January 2020. The  
316 main 24-week intervention was completed by n=99 (5% drop out rate) of whom n=76 (77 %)  
317 consented and n=69 (9% drop out rate) completed to the 24 to 48-week trial add-on  
318 behaviour maintenance phase (**Supplementary Figure 1 and Table 1**). Complete data for  
319 the change in dietary and physical activity behaviour, were available for n=87 completers  
320 (88%) at 24-weeks and n=52 completers (75%) at 48-weeks.

321

322 Engagement with the group sessions was high, with participants attending 3.6 (SD 0.7) and  
323 3.5 (SD 0.9) of the four group sessions in the MD+PA and PA groups, respectively  
324 (**Supplemental Table 2**). Most participants (84%) reported accessing the online platform  
325 once per month or less, with the average session length 15 to 30 minutes. Uptake of food  
326 delivery or supermarket vouchers was 100% each month. Ninety-five percent of participants  
327 reported the intervention to be acceptable, with no significant difference between the MD and



328 MD+PA intervention groups (**Supplementary Figure 2**). Overall, participants rated the  
329 acceptability of the online platform lower than other intervention components (**Supplemental**  
330 **Table 3**). Participants rated their understanding of how the intervention aimed to facilitate  
331 behaviour change highly and reported a good fit with their beliefs about behaviour change  
332 (both average scores 4.3 out of possible five, **Supplemental Table 3**).

333

### 334 **Eating behaviour**

335 After the 24-week intervention, there was improved MD adherence in the two MD groups  
336 compared with control when assessed using the MEDAS questionnaire (3.7 points (95% CI  
337 2.9, 4.5,  $p < 0.01$ ) **Figure 1A and Supplemental Table 4**) and using 24-hour recall (3.4  
338 points (95% CI 2.4, 4.4,  $p < 0.01$ ), (**Figure 1B and Supplemental Table 5**). There was no  
339 evidence of a group by sex interaction (data not shown). Likewise, at 48-weeks there was  
340 improved adherence in the two MD groups compared with control when assessed using the  
341 MEDAS questionnaire (2.7 points (95% CI 1.6, 3.7)  $p < 0.01$ ) and using 24-hour recall (2.6  
342 points (95% CI 1.5, 3.8)  $p < 0.01$ ) data (**Figures 2A and 2B**). Participants in the MD group  
343 who participated in the maintenance phase had significantly higher MEDAS scores at 24-  
344 weeks compared to those who did not continue (between group difference of 1.5 points (95%  
345 CI 0.4, 2.8)  $p = 0.01$ ), with no significant difference in the MD+PA group (between group  
346 difference of 0.9 points (95% CI -0.4, 2.3)  $p = 0.17$ ).

347

348 Consumption of all components of the MEDAS score improved in the MD diet groups  
349 compared with control over the 24-week intervention except for vegetables and sugar-  
350 sweetened drinks (when assessed by questionnaire), and sugar-sweetened drinks and butter  
351 and cream (when assessed by 24-hour recall) (**Supplemental Tables 4-5**). According to the  
352 MEDAS questionnaire data, red meat and sugar-sweetened beverages were the

353 recommendations met by the highest proportion of participants at baseline (**Supplementary**  
354 **Figure 3**) and the nut and fish components were most likely to be changed by participants in  
355 the MD groups, with 60 % and 57 % of participants, respectively, adapting their diet  
356 sufficiently to meet the recommendations over the 24-week intervention (**Figure 2**). Using  
357 24-hour recall data, the ratio of white to red meat and sofrito were the components that were  
358 most likely to be adapted (**Supplementary Figure 4**).

359

### 360 **Physical activity**

361 Total number of steps, energy expenditure and minutes of moderate activity increased in the  
362 MD+PA group and decreased in the MD and control groups after the 24-week intervention,  
363 but no significant between-group differences were observed (**Table 2**). Likewise, at 48-weeks  
364 no significant between-group differences were observed in PA (**Table 2**). There was no  
365 evidence of a group by sex interaction for minutes of moderate activity at 24-weeks and there  
366 was no difference in minutes of moderate activity at 24-weeks between the participants in the  
367 MD+PA group who did, or did not, continue to 48-weeks (data not shown).

368

### 369 **Cognitive function**

370 After the 24-week intervention, there were improvements in test scores for general cognition  
371 (0.22 (95% CI 0.05, 0.35,  $p=0.01$ ) and memory (0.31 (95% CI 0.10, 0.51,  $p<0.01$ ) domains  
372 in the two MD groups compared with control (**Figure 3 and Supplemental Table 6**). These  
373 changes were determined by improvements observed in the Verbal Paired Associates task, a  
374 measure of verbal memory (4.2 (95% CI 0.06, 0.77,  $p<0.01$ , **Supplemental Table 7**). There  
375 were no significant differences in the test score for the processing speed domain, and the z-  
376 score for Executive Function was of borderline significance ( $p=0.05$ ). Differences between

377 the MD+PA and MD groups were not observed for any of the domains. At 48-weeks no  
378 between-group differences were observed in test scores in any domain.

379

380 In the Hayling test of Executive Function (another measure of executive function, not in the  
381 NTB test battery), response times reduced for section A (-5.0 seconds (95% CI -7.5, -2.5),  
382  $p<0.01$ ) and section B (-13.5 seconds (95% CI -21.8, -5.3),  $p<0.01$ ) over the 24-week  
383 intervention in the two MD groups compared with the control group, with no differences  
384 observed in the number of errors made (raw or scaled) (**Supplemental Table 8**). There were  
385 no significant differences in response times or number of errors made between-groups at 48-  
386 weeks (**Supplemental Table 8**). The Hayling overall scaled score improved in the two  
387 intervention groups relative to control at 24-weeks (0.7 (95% CI 0.4, 1.0),  $p<0.01$ ) but not  
388 48-weeks (**Supplemental Table 8**). Differences between the MD+PA and MD groups were  
389 not observed for any of the Hayling outcome measures.

390

391 Improvements in test scores in the general cognition (T3-T1 0.29 (95% CI 0.08, 0.50,  
392  $p<0.01$ ) and memory domains (T3-T1 0.35 (95% CI 0.10, 0.60,  $p<0.01$ ) over 24-weeks were  
393 greater in the participants with the highest change in MEDAS score over the same time  
394 (**Supplemental Table 9**). Likewise, there were also improvements in the Hayling test scores  
395 with overall scaled scores improved in the participants with the highest change in MEDAS  
396 score (T3-T1 1.1 (95% CI -0.3, 1.9),  $p<0.01$ ). For physical activity, fewer section B errors  
397 were observed in the participants with the greatest increases in moderate activity (T3-T1 1.8  
398 (95% CI -3.3, -0.2),  $p=0.02$ , **Supplemental Table 10**).

399

400 **Cardiometabolic outcomes**

401 At 24-weeks there was no significant intervention effect on BMI (**Table 2**) but at 48-weeks  
402 BMI reduced (-0.71 kg/m<sup>2</sup> (95% CI -1.30, -0.13), p=0.02) in the MD+PA and MD groups  
403 compared with control. There were no intervention effects on 24-hour mean systolic,  
404 diastolic or pulse pressure at 24-weeks but a reduction in pulse pressure variability (-2.9 mm  
405 Hg (95% CI -5.3, -0.5), p<0.01) and Ambulatory Arterial Stiffness Index (-0.07 (95% CI -  
406 0.2, 0.02), p=0.01) was observed in the MD+PA group. AMBP data were not collected at 48-  
407 weeks.

408  
409 Improvements in pulse pressure variability (T3-T1 -3.4 (95% CI -6.1, -0.7), p=0.01,  
410 **Supplemental Table 9**) and Ambulatory Arterial Stiffness Index (T3-T1 -0.2 (95% CI -0.3, -  
411 0.1), p<0.01) over 24-weeks were greater in those participants with the highest change in  
412 MEDAS score. No associations were observed between change in physical activity and  
413 cardiometabolic outcomes (**Supplemental Table 10**).

414

#### 415 **Mechanism of impact measures**

416 At baseline, participants were confident (perceived control) and motivated to change their  
417 diet and increase physical activity. Confidence and motivation reduced over the 24-week  
418 intervention period in all groups, with no significant between-group differences observed  
419 (**Supplemental Table 11**). Self-reported use of behaviour change techniques taught in the  
420 intervention was higher among intervention participants than control participants. Goal  
421 setting and incorporating dietary and physical activity change into daily routines were the  
422 most frequently utilised behaviour change techniques by intervention participants (with  
423 slightly lower levels for PA compared with diet). Conversely, social support and self-rewards  
424 were used least often (**Supplemental Table 12**).

425

426 **Discussion**

427 This 24-week multi-domain, theory-informed intervention in older, ‘at risk’ adults living in  
428 the UK proved to be feasible and acceptable as judged by our ability to recruit the intended  
429 number of completers (with pre-specified characteristics), the high levels of retention at  
430 follow up and our ability to deliver the intervention as intended despite COVID-19 and social  
431 distancing restrictions. In addition, participant engagement with two of the three intervention  
432 components designed to support behaviour change was high, specifically the group sessions  
433 and uptake of food provision. Conversely, whilst the website was accessible to all  
434 participants, use was low and rated poorly. Focus groups highlighted this was mainly due to  
435 the poor functionality, which will need to be optimised prior to large-scale evaluation.  
436 Adherence to intervention was associated with cognitive (global cognition and memory) and  
437 cardiovascular (pulse pressure variability and arterial stiffness) benefits.

438

439 A previous study in the UK evaluating the feasibility of a peer support intervention to  
440 encourage adoption of a MD reported challenges with recruitment and retention of  
441 participants (33, 34). The successful recruitment and retention in the current study may be  
442 due to the use of individual-level recruitment, rather than the group-based approaches  
443 employed in the previous study, which may have ensured the inclusion of more engaged  
444 participants. The addition of a food provision component to remove barriers associated with  
445 the perceived higher price and inconvenience of healthy foods is also likely to have improved  
446 retention. Previous studies have shown that financial support improves adherence to a MD  
447 when accompanied by an educational intervention (35). We provided participants with  
448 options to choose MD components that met their personal food preferences, rather than being  
449 prespecified by study design, as personalisation has shown to lead to sustained changes in  
450 dietary behaviour (36).

451  
452 The MedEx-UK intervention was also successful in improving eating behaviour with these  
453 changes maintained during the six months follow-up. A-priori we specified successful  
454 behaviour change as a three-point increase on the MEDAS. Participants in the intervention  
455 groups achieved a 3.7-point increase in MEDAS at 24-weeks, with a 2.7-point increase  
456 maintained at 48-weeks follow-up. Change in MEDAS scores of this magnitude are likely to  
457 be biologically and clinically important with previous studies reporting an approximate 30 %  
458 reduced risk of major cardiovascular events (16), a 12.6 to 20.7% reduced risk of dementia  
459 (37) and up to five years of reduced global cognitive ageing (10) with a change in MEDAS  
460 score of 2 -3 points.

461  
462 Participants in the current study reported improved adherence to all dietary components (in  
463 particular, fish, nuts and olive oil), except for sugar-sweetened beverages which were  
464 habitual relatively low at baseline. Conversely, in the PREDIMED study, conducted in a  
465 Mediterranean-region, dietary changes were only apparent for foods attributable to the free  
466 products provided (olive oil and nuts), legumes and fish (16). This suggests that more food  
467 changes were required by UK participants to align with the MD, but these changes were  
468 achievable and maintained for one year.

469  
470 Significant between group differences in PA were not observed and increases in the MD+PA  
471 group were modest at 24-weeks. These modest changes in PA of approximately 70 minutes  
472 per week were not entirely unexpected given that the study took place during COVID-19  
473 lockdowns where activity opportunities were restricted. It was of interest that activity levels  
474 only increased in the MD+PA group and decreased in the other groups which may suggest  
475 that the PA component was effective at maintaining activity levels during COVID-19

476 lockdowns. A recent large US cohort study reported that increasing activity by 10 minutes  
477 per day could reduce preventable deaths by seven percent per year (38) and 10 minute  
478 activity bouts have been linked to improved cognition (39) suggesting that even small  
479 changes in activity are important from a public health perspective. Of note, at screening, all  
480 participants self-reported <90 minutes moderate-intensity PA each week, although at  
481 baseline, using directly measured activity, mean moderate activity was 191 minutes per week  
482 in the MD+PA group, with only 34 % of the group below the 90 minutes threshold. This  
483 highlights the weaknesses of subjective versus objective PA assessment and suggests  
484 refinement of PA methodology at screening is required in future studies to ensure recruitment  
485 of intended participants. This may be another factor to explain the moderate changes in PA  
486 we observed in the intervention.

487

488 Whilst the current study did not observe significant changes in PA, it is notable that the  
489 additional behaviour targets in the MD+PA group was not a deterrent to improving eating  
490 behaviour and was associated with improvements in cognition and cardiometabolic health.  
491 Pulse pressure and ambulatory stiffness index, measured using 24-hour ambulatory blood  
492 pressure, were improved in the MD+PA group alone at 24-weeks. We also observed a dose  
493 effect with greater improvements in cognition and cardiovascular health in participants with  
494 the highest levels of behaviour change. Research suggests there are synergistic associations  
495 between an individual's lifestyle risk behaviours and health outcomes which highlights the  
496 importance of developing interventions that tackle multiple behavioural risk factors (40).

497

498 The intervention was effective at improving general cognition and memory (including verbal  
499 memory) over 24-weeks. It was unexpected that these improvements were not maintained at  
500 48-weeks and may indicate that a longer duration of intervention is required for sustained

501 cognitive benefits associated with modest maintained behaviour change. Our findings of  
502 improvements in general cognition and memory support those of the FINGER trial with the  
503 trend for the same beneficial effects on executive function (with exception of significant  
504 effect in the Hayling test), which again may reflect the shorter duration of our intervention  
505 (5). The Hayling processing speed component appeared to be the most sensitive cognitive  
506 measure and may be important to explore in future studies.

507

508 Process evaluation was an essential part of this feasibility study and provides us with  
509 important insights to inform the development of a larger-scale trial. The intervention  
510 recruited a highly motivated sample; participants reported high confidence and motivation to  
511 change their diet and increase physical activity. However, confidence and motivation reduced  
512 over the 24-week period. This may be due to unrealistic optimism at baseline, with  
513 participants becoming more realistic over time due to experiences with behaviour change  
514 (41). In addition, the COVID-19 lockdown and other restrictions may have made behaviour  
515 change especially challenging. The behaviour change observed after the intervention was not  
516 due to increased motivation and confidence and is more likely due to increasing participants'  
517 use of behaviour change techniques, promoted by the intervention, in their daily lives. The  
518 most frequently used techniques (goal setting, building routines) facilitate behaviour  
519 maintenance. Participants in the MD+PA reported using these techniques slightly less  
520 frequently for PA, than for dietary change, which may have contributed to the differences  
521 between observed change in MD and in PA at 24 weeks. In contrast, social support was used  
522 least often. Although it was included in the group sessions, the restrictions resulting from the  
523 pandemic limited opportunities for social support, especially face-to-face.

524



525 Strengths of the current study include: i) the development of intervention components which  
526 targeted key influences on behaviour based on the COM-B model and included evidence-  
527 based behaviour change techniques, ii) the robust measurements of feasibility and  
528 acceptability, which were informed by Medical Research Council guidance for process  
529 evaluation (19), iii) the use of validated measurement tools for assessing the primary (diet  
530 and PA) and secondary (cognition and cardiometabolic) outcomes and iv) the inclusion of  
531 both behavioural and clinical data. The COVID-19 pandemic created unique challenges for  
532 the intervention study and restricted our ability to collect the data for our secondary  
533 cardiometabolic outcomes. However, our successful experiences around remote delivery of  
534 this complex intervention will be invaluable for the design and delivery of future  
535 interventions. We defined participants ‘at risk’ of dementia using a scale to monitor risk of  
536 cardiovascular disease which does not include assessment of other important risk factors for  
537 dementia, including cognitive function and family history. We were not successful in  
538 recruiting socio-economically disadvantaged and racially and ethnically diverse participants  
539 and the recruitment protocol and study design for a future study will need to be modified to  
540 ensure such inclusion. Further learnings for the development of a larger scale trial include the  
541 need to improve the poor conversion rate from screening to recruitment and to further  
542 develop and test intervention tools that are acceptable, feasible and inclusive to our target  
543 population, in particular, the online platform.

544

545 In conclusion, this feasibility study to increase Mediterranean diet adherence and physical  
546 activity in older adults at risk of dementia was acceptable and feasible. In addition, it was  
547 effective at improving eating behaviour, alone and when increased PA was an additional  
548 behavioural target. The intervention was also successful in behaviour change maintenance for  
549 up to 12 months, which was likely due to intense early support and investment to achieving

550 long-term behaviour change. The behaviour change was associated with cognitive and  
551 cardiovascular benefits especially in the combined Mediterranean-style diet and physical  
552 activity intervention group. This feasibility testing will be essential in developing a larger  
553 scale intervention based on MedEx-UK and to other researchers in planning complex  
554 behaviour change interventions.

555

#### 556 **Author contributions**

557 SH, WH, MH, SMP, MS, SA, JCM and AMM were responsible for the conception and  
558 design of the work and funding acquisition. AJ, OS, RG, VL, RE and GR conducted the  
559 investigation. AJ accessed and verified the data and completed the statistical analyses. All  
560 authors had access to the study data and contributed to the data interpretation. AJ and OS  
561 wrote the original draft. All authors provided critical revision of the manuscript and  
562 approved it prior to publication.

563

#### 564 **Conflict of interests**

565 The authors declare no competing interests.

566

#### 567 **Data sharing**

568 The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author,  
569 upon reasonable request.

570

#### 571 **Acknowledgements**

572 The authors would like to thank the participants of the MedEx-UK study.

573

574

575

576

577

578

579 **References**

- 580 1. GBD 2019 Dementia Forecasting Collaborators. Estimation of the global prevalence  
581 of dementia in 2019 and forecasted prevalence in 2050: an analysis for the Global  
582 Burden of Disease Study 2019. *Lancet Public Health*. 2022;7(2):e105-e25. doi:  
583 10.1016/s2468-2667(21)00249-8.
- 584 2. Livingston G, Huntley J, Sommerlad A, Ames D, Ballard C, Banerjee S, et al.  
585 Dementia prevention, intervention, and care: 2020 report of the Lancet Commission.  
586 *The Lancet*. 2020;396(10248):413-46. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016-S0140-](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30367-6)  
587 [6736\(20\)30367-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30367-6).
- 588 3. Lourida I, Hannon E, Littlejohns TJ, Langa KM, Hypponen E, Kuzma E, Llewellyn  
589 DJ. Association of Lifestyle and Genetic Risk With Incidence of Dementia. *JAMA : the journal of the American Medical Association*. 2019;322(5):430–7. doi:  
590 10.1001/jama.2019.9879.
- 591 4. Gómez-Pinilla F. Brain foods: the effects of nutrients on brain function. *Nat Rev*  
592 *Neurosci*. 2008;9(7):568-78. doi: 10.1038/nrn2421.
- 593 5. Ngandu T, Lehtisalo J, Solomon A, Levälähti E, Ahtiluoto S, Antikainen R, et al. A 2  
594 year multidomain intervention of diet, exercise, cognitive training, and vascular risk  
595 monitoring versus control to prevent cognitive decline in at-risk elderly people  
596 (FINGER): a randomised controlled trial. *Lancet*. 2015;385(9984):2255-63. doi:  
597 10.1016/s0140-6736(15)60461-5.
- 598 6. Moll van Charante EP, Richard E, Eurelings LS, van Dalen JW, Ligthart SA, van  
599 Bussel EF, Hoevenaar-Blom MP, Vermeulen M, van Gool WA. Effectiveness of a 6-  
600 year multidomain vascular care intervention to prevent dementia (preDIVA): a  
601 cluster-randomised controlled trial. *Lancet*. 2016;388(10046):797-805. doi:  
602 10.1016/s0140-6736(16)30950-3.
- 603 7. Andrieu S, Guyonnet S, Coley N, Cantet C, Bonnefoy M, Bordes S, et al. Effect of  
604 long-term omega 3 polyunsaturated fatty acid supplementation with or without  
605 multidomain intervention on cognitive function in elderly adults with memory  
606 complaints (MAPT): a randomised, placebo-controlled trial. *The Lancet Neurology*.  
607 2017;16(5):377-89. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1474-4422\(17\)30040-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1474-4422(17)30040-6).
- 608 8. Martínez-Lapiscina EH, Clavero P, Toledo E, Estruch R, Salas-Salvadó J, San Julián  
609 B, Sanchez-Tainta A, Ros E, Valls-Pedret C, Martínez-González M. Mediterranean  
610 diet improves cognition: the PREDIMED-NAVARRA randomised trial. *Journal of*  
611 *neurology, neurosurgery, and psychiatry*. 2013;84(12):1318-25. doi: 10.1136/jnnp-  
612 2012-304792.
- 613 9. Valls-Pedret C, Sala-Vila A, Serra-Mir M, Corella D, de la Torre R, Martínez-  
614 González MÁ, et al. Mediterranean Diet and Age-Related Cognitive Decline: A  
615 Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA internal medicine*. 2015;175(7):1094-103. doi:  
616 10.1001/jamainternmed.2015.1668.
- 617 10. Shannon OM, Stephan BCM, Granic A, Lentjes M, Hayat S, Mulligan A, et al.  
618 Mediterranean diet adherence and cognitive function in older UK adults: the  
619 European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition-Norfolk (EPIC-  
620 Norfolk) Study. *Am J Clin Nutr*. 2019;110(4):938-48. doi: 10.1093/ajcn/nqz114.
- 621 11. Sanders LMJ, Hortobágyi T, la Bastide-van Gemert S, van der Zee EA, van Heuvelen  
622 MJG. Dose-response relationship between exercise and cognitive function in older  
623 adults with and without cognitive impairment: A systematic review and meta-  
624 analysis. *PLoS One*. 2019;14(1):e0210036. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0210036.
- 625 12. Xu W, Wang HF, Wan Y, Tan CC, Yu JT, Tan L. Leisure time physical activity and  
626 dementia risk: a dose-response meta-analysis of prospective studies. *BMJ Open*.  
627 2017;7(10):e014706. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2016-014706.
- 628

- 629 13. Siervo M, Shannon OM, Llewellyn DJ, Stephan BC, Fontana L. Mediterranean diet  
630 and cognitive function: From methodology to mechanisms of action. *Free radical*  
631 *biology & medicine*. 2021;176:105-17. doi: 10.1016/j.freeradbiomed.2021.09.018.
- 632 14. Cowell OR, Mistry N, Deighton K, Matu J, Griffiths A, Minihane AM, Mathers JC,  
633 Shannon OM, Siervo M. Effects of a Mediterranean diet on blood pressure: a  
634 systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials and observational  
635 studies. *J Hypertens*. 2021;39(4):729-39. doi: 10.1097/hjh.0000000000002667.
- 636 15. Shannon OM, Mendes I, Köchl C, Mazidi M, Ashor AW, Rubele S, Minihane AM,  
637 Mathers JC, Siervo M. Mediterranean Diet Increases Endothelial Function in Adults:  
638 A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials. *The*  
639 *Journal of nutrition*. 2020;150(5):1151-9. doi: 10.1093/jn/nxaa002.
- 640 16. Estruch R, Ros E, Salas-Salvadó J, Covas M-I, Corella D, Arós F, et al. Primary  
641 Prevention of Cardiovascular Disease with a Mediterranean Diet Supplemented with  
642 Extra-Virgin Olive Oil or Nuts. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2018;378(25):e34.  
643 doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa1800389.
- 644 17. Hardman RJ, Meyer D, Kennedy G, Macpherson H, Scholey AB, Pipingas A.  
645 Findings of a Pilot Study Investigating the Effects of Mediterranean Diet and Aerobic  
646 Exercise on Cognition in Cognitively Healthy Older People Living Independently  
647 within Aged-Care Facilities: The Lifestyle Intervention in Independent Living Aged  
648 Care (LIILAC) Study. *Curr Dev Nutr*. 2020;4(5):nzaa077. doi: 10.1093/cdn/nzaa077.
- 649 18. Moore SE, McEvoy CT, Prior L, Lawton J, Patterson CC, Kee F, et al. Barriers to  
650 adopting a Mediterranean diet in Northern European adults at high risk of developing  
651 cardiovascular disease. *J Hum Nutr Diet*. 2018;31(4):451-62. doi: 10.1111/jhn.12523.
- 652 19. Skivington K, Matthews L, Simpson SA, Craig P, Baird J, Blazeby JM, et al. A new  
653 framework for developing and evaluating complex interventions: update of Medical  
654 Research Council guidance. *BMJ*. 2021;374:n2061. doi: 10.1136/bmj.n2061.
- 655 20. Shannon OM, Lee V, Bundy R, Gillings R, Jennings A, Stephan B, et al. Feasibility  
656 and acceptability of a multi-domain intervention to increase Mediterranean diet  
657 adherence and physical activity in older UK adults at risk of dementia: protocol for  
658 the MedEx-UK randomised controlled trial. *BMJ Open*. 2021;11(2):e042823. doi:  
659 10.1136/bmjopen-2020-042823.
- 660 21. Michie S, van Stralen MM, West R. The behaviour change wheel: a new method for  
661 characterising and designing behaviour change interventions. *Implementation science*  
662 *: IS*. 2011;6:42. doi: 10.1186/1748-5908-6-42.
- 663 22. Michie S, Richardson M, Johnston M, Abraham C, Francis J, Hardeman W, Eccles  
664 MP, Cane J, Wood CE. The behavior change technique taxonomy (v1) of 93  
665 hierarchically clustered techniques: building an international consensus for the  
666 reporting of behavior change interventions. *Annals of behavioral medicine : a*  
667 *publication of the Society of Behavioral Medicine*. 2013;46(1):81-95. doi:  
668 10.1007/s12160-013-9486-6.
- 669 23. Carson N, Leach L, Murphy KJ. A re-examination of Montreal Cognitive Assessment  
670 (MoCA) cutoff scores. *Int J Geriatr Psychiatry*. 2018;33(2):379-88. doi:  
671 10.1002/gps.4756.
- 672 24. Schröder H, Fitó M, Estruch R, Martínez-González MA, Corella D, Salas-Salvadó J,  
673 et al. A short screener is valid for assessing Mediterranean diet adherence among  
674 older Spanish men and women. *J Nutr*. 2011;141(6):1140-5. doi:  
675 10.3945/jn.110.135566.
- 676 25. Michie S, van Stralen MM, West R. The behaviour change wheel: A new method for  
677 characterising and designing behaviour change interventions. *Implementation*  
678 *Science*. 2011;6(1):42. doi: 10.1186/1748-5908-6-42.

- 679 26. National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence. Cardiovascular disease: risk  
680 assessment and reduction, including lipid modification. London, 2016.
- 681 27. Sekhon M, Cartwright M, Francis JJ. Acceptability of healthcare interventions: an  
682 overview of reviews and development of a theoretical framework. *BMC Health*  
683 *Services Research*. 2017;17(1):88. doi: 10.1186/s12913-017-2031-8.
- 684 28. Foster E, Lee C, Imamura F, Hollidge SE, Westgate KL, Venables MC, et al. Validity  
685 and reliability of an online self-report 24-h dietary recall method (Intake24): a doubly  
686 labelled water study and repeated-measures analysis. *J Nutr Sci*. 2019;8:e29. doi:  
687 10.1017/jns.2019.20.
- 688 29. Medicine ACoS. ACSM's guidelines for exercise testing and prescription. 8th ed:  
689 Lippincott williams & wilkins, 2009.
- 690 30. Tu S, Wong S, Hodges JR, Irish M, Piguet O, Hornberger M. Lost in spatial  
691 translation - A novel tool to objectively assess spatial disorientation in Alzheimer's  
692 disease and frontotemporal dementia. *Cortex*. 2015;67:83-94. doi:  
693 10.1016/j.cortex.2015.03.016.
- 694 31. Coutrot A, Schmidt S, Coutrot L, Pittman J, Hong L, Wiener JM, Hölscher C, Dalton  
695 RC, Hornberger M, Spiers HJ. Virtual navigation tested on a mobile app is predictive  
696 of real-world wayfinding navigation performance. *PloS one*. 2019;14(3):e0213272.  
697 doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0213272.
- 698 32. Moore GF, Audrey S, Barker M, Bond L, Bonell C, Hardeman W, et al. Process  
699 evaluation of complex interventions: Medical Research Council guidance. *Bmj*.  
700 2015;350:h1258. doi: 10.1136/bmj.h1258.
- 701 33. O'Neill RF, McGowan L, McEvoy CT, Wallace SM, Moore SE, McKinley MC, Kee  
702 F, Cupples ME, Young IS, Woodside JV. The feasibility of a peer support  
703 intervention to encourage adoption and maintenance of a Mediterranean diet in  
704 established community groups at increased CVD risk: the TEAM-MED EXTEND  
705 study: a pilot cluster randomised controlled trial. *The British journal of nutrition*.  
706 2021;128(7):1-14. doi: 10.1017/s0007114521004050.
- 707 34. Appleton KM, McEvoy CT, Lloydwin C, Moore S, Salamanca-Gonzalez P, Cupples  
708 ME, et al. A peer support dietary change intervention for encouraging adoption and  
709 maintenance of the Mediterranean diet in a non-Mediterranean population (TEAM-  
710 MED): lessons learned and suggested improvements. *Journal of Nutritional Science*.  
711 2023;12:e13. doi: 10.1017/jns.2023.2.
- 712 35. Miguel-Berges ML, Jimeno-Martínez A, Larruy-García A, Moreno LA, Rodríguez G,  
713 Iguacel I. The Effect of Food Vouchers and an Educational Intervention on Promoting  
714 Healthy Eating in Vulnerable Families: A Pilot Study. *Nutrients*. 2022;14(23). doi:  
715 10.3390/nu14234980.
- 716 36. Celis-Morales C, Livingstone KM, Marsaux CF, Macready AL, Fallaize R,  
717 O'Donovan CB, et al. Effect of personalized nutrition on health-related behaviour  
718 change: evidence from the Food4Me European randomized controlled trial. *Int J*  
719 *Epidemiol*. 2017;46(2):578-88. doi: 10.1093/ije/dyw186.
- 720 37. Shannon O, Ranson, J., Minihane, A-M., Adamson, A. J., Macpherson, H., Servo, M.,  
721 Hill, T., Ritchie, C., Mathers, J. C., Llewellyn, D. J., & Stevenson, E. . Mediterranean  
722 diet adherence is associated with lower dementia risk, independent of genetic  
723 predisposition: Findings from the UK Biobank prospective cohort study. . *BMC*  
724 *Medicine*. 2023;In press.
- 725 38. Saint-Maurice PF, Graubard BI, Troiano RP, Berrigan D, Galuska DA, Fulton JE,  
726 Matthews CE. Estimated Number of Deaths Prevented Through Increased Physical  
727 Activity Among US Adults. *JAMA internal medicine*. 2022;182(3):349-52. doi:  
728 10.1001/jamainternmed.2021.7755.

- 729 39. Niedermeier M, Weiss EM, Steidl-Müller L, Burtscher M, Kopp M. Acute Effects of  
730 a Short Bout of Physical Activity on Cognitive Function in Sport Students. *Int J*  
731 *Environ Res Public Health*. 2020;17(10). doi: 10.3390/ijerph17103678.
- 732 40. Ding D, Rogers K, van der Ploeg H, Stamatakis E, Bauman AE. Traditional and  
733 Emerging Lifestyle Risk Behaviors and All-Cause Mortality in Middle-Aged and  
734 Older Adults: Evidence from a Large Population-Based Australian Cohort. *PLoS*  
735 *medicine*. 2015;12(12):e1001917. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1001917.
- 736 41. Hardeman W, Kinmonth AL, Michie S, Sutton S. Impact of a physical activity  
737 intervention program on cognitive predictors of behaviour among adults at risk of  
738 Type 2 diabetes (ProActive randomised controlled trial). *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act*.  
739 2009;6:16. doi: 10.1186/1479-5868-6-16.
- 740



**Figure 1: Mediterranean Diet Adherence Screener (MEDAS) score by intervention group at baseline, 24- and 48- weeks calculated by questionnaire and 24-hour recall.**

Values represent unadjusted means (SD) from MEDAS questionnaire (panel A) and 24-hour recall (panel B). P-value for group and contrast 1 (Control v. (MD + MD+PA)) \* $< 0.01$  or \*\* $< 0.05$  at relevant time point compared to baseline, calculated using ANCOVA (adjusted for baseline value, study site and baseline BMI). P-values for contrast 2 (MD v. MD+PA) were non-significant at all timepoints compared to baseline as were all contrasts comparing values at 48- to 24-weeks. Participant numbers at 48-weeks were n=20 MD+PA, n=22 MD, n=21 Control for questionnaire data and n=17 MD+PA, n=17 MD, n=12 Control for 24=hr recall data. MD = Mediterranean diet, MEDAS =Mediterranean Diet Adherence Screener, PA = Physical activity.

**Figure 2: Proportion of participants adapting to meet the criteria for individual Mediterranean Diet Adherence Screener components at 24-weeks by intervention group in 86 MedEx-UK participants.**

Bars represent the percentage of participants who met the criteria at 24-weeks but not at baseline according to the questionnaire data. Only participants with complete data for all components were included (n=86).

**Figure 3: Cognitive summary scores by intervention group at baseline, 24- and 48-weeks.**

Values represent unadjusted means (SD) for General cognition (panel A), processing speed (panel B), executive function (panel C) and executive function (panel D).

\* P-value  $< 0.01$  for group and contrast 1 (Control v. (MD & MD+PA)) at relevant time point compared to baseline, calculated using ANCOVA (adjusted for baseline value, study site



baseline age, and years of education). P-values for contrast 2 (MD v. MD+PA) were non-significant at all timepoints compared to baseline as were all contrasts comparing values at 48- to 24-weeks. Missing data at 48-weeks were General cognition (MD+PA n=7, MD n=3, Control n=8), processing (MD+PA n=5, MD n=5, Control n=9), executive function (MD+PA n=6, MD n=10, Control n=11) and executive function (MD+PA n=11, MD n=9, Control n=8). Individual test scores were converted to Z scores standardised on Baseline grand mean and standard deviation with response time variables reversed by  $[Z * -1]$ , so a higher time indicates a better outcome. Individual Z scores test scores were mean aggregated into Summary Scores for: Processing speed [Digit symbol substitution (total correct); Trail Making Test (A, seconds)]; Executive Function [Controlled Oral Word Association Test (total); Categorical verbal fluency test (total); Trail Making Test (B-A, seconds); Wechsler Memory Digit Span (backwards, total)] and Memory [Verbal paired immediate (total); Visual paired immediate (total); Verbal paired delayed (total); Visual paired delayed (total); Rey Auditory Verbal Learning Test (immediate); Rey Auditory Verbal Learning Test (recall)]. A general cognition score was calculated using all Processing speed, Executive function and Memory tests. MD = Mediterranean diet, MEDAS =Mediterranean Diet Adherence Screener, PA = Physical activity. Full data is presented in Supplemental Table 6.

**Table 1: Baseline characteristics of the MedEx-UK study participants, according to intervention group**

Characteristic	MD+PA (n=35)	MD (n=35)	Control (n=34)
Sex, female	25 (71.4%)	27 (77.1%)	25 (73.5%)
Age, years	68.1 (5.1)	67.3 (4.3)	67.1 (4.4)
Ethnicity, white	34 (100%)	35 (100%)	33 (97%)
IMD, decile	5.9 (3.1)	5.2 (2.6)	6.3 (2.3)
BMI, kg/m <sup>2</sup>	27.5 (4.2)	30.1 (5.0)	28.4 (3.5)
MEDAS, score	6.8 (2.2)	5.9 (2.0)	6.8 (2.1)
Moderate activity, min/d	181 (154)	230 (205)	261 (308)
QRISK, score	17.2 (5.8)	16.7 (4.9)	15.9 (4.7)
General cognition score, z-score	-0.07 (0.5)	0.12 (0.6)	-0.01 (0.6)
Processing speed score, z-score	-0.14 (0.8)	0.09 (0.9)	0.05 (0.9)
Executive function score, z-score	-0.12 (0.6)	0.13 (0.8)	-0.01 (0.6)
Memory score, z-score	0.05 (0.7)	0.05 (0.6)	-0.08 (0.7)
24hr mean systolic BP, mm Hg	128 (12.5)	127 (14.3)	128 (11.1)
24hr mean diastolic BP, mm Hg	78.3 (10.3)	77.0 (9.6)	75.2 (9.8)
24hr mean pulse pressure, mm Hg	51.2 (9.3)	52.2 (10.9)	53.0 (7.5)
24h systolic BP variability, mm Hg	10.8 (2.9)	10.6 (2.5)	10.1 (2.9)
24h diastolic BP variability, mm Hg	11.0 (3.7)	11.0 (4.3)	10.8 (3.5)
24h pulse pressure variability, mm Hg	16.3 (11.9)	13.9 (8.9)	14.1 (8.0)
Ambulatory Arterial Stiffness Index	0.61 (0.18)	0.58 (0.19)	0.51 (0.29)

Values are mean (SD) or n= (%). Data was missing for BMI (n=1 MD+PA), IMD (n=1 MD+PA; n= 1 MD), Moderate activity (n=1 MD+PA; n=2 Control) and QRISK (n=4 MD+PA; n= 3 MD; n=5 Control). IMD = Index of Multiple Deprivation, MD = Mediterranean diet, MEDAS = Mediterranean Diet Adherence Screener, PA = Physical activity, QRISK = cardiovascular risk score.

**Table 2: Physical activity and cardiometabolic outcomes at baseline, 24- and 48-weeks by intervention group in 99 MedEx-UK participants.**

	MD+PA			MD			Control			P1	P2	P3
	n=	Baseline	24-weeks	n=	Baseline	24-weeks	n=	Baseline	24-weeks			
Total Steps, d	28	5743(2100)	6348(3343)	31	6137 (2364)	5760 (2501)	31	6282(2562)	5913(2680)	0.13	0.23	0.31
Energy expenditure, kcal/week	28	281 (171)	327 (304)	31	322 (189)	277 (154)	30	303 (189)	239 (131)	0.06	0.12	0.30
Moderate activity, min/week	28	191 (163)	262 (183)	31	233 (214)	228 (195)	31	256 (311)	213 (210)	0.10	0.14	0.49
BMI, kg/m <sup>2</sup>	33	27.6 (4.2)	27.1 (4.4)	34	30.3 (5.0)	30.3 (5.2)	32	28.4 (3.6)	28.3 (3.4)	0.20	0.67	0.06
24hr mean SBP, mm Hg	13	128 (14.0)	125 (14.4)	13	128 (14.2)	130 (15.5)	11	131 (9.8)	128 (10.6)	0.57	0.58	0.04
24hr mean DBP, mm Hg	13	75.7 (10.0)	75.4 (10.1)	13	80.2 (10.7)	75.8 (6.0)	11	76.4 (7.5)	75.1 (4.8)	0.89	0.67	0.66
24hr mean PP, mm Hg	13	52.4 (7.3)	51.4 (7.2)	13	51.4 (11.0)	53.7 (12.1)	11	54.7 (7.8)	53.1 (8.2)	0.87	0.37	0.08
24h SBP CV, mm Hg	13	10.5 (2.7)	9.5 (1.8)	13	9.6 (1.5)	9.6 (1.8)	11	9.4 (1.9)	9.6 (1.8)	0.32	0.49	0.41
24h DBP CV, mm Hg	13	10.2 (3.2)	9.8 (3.6)	13	9.5 (2.6)	10.4 (2.7)	11	10.6 (2.9)	10.6 (2.6)	0.32	0.85	0.10
24h PP CV, mm Hg	13	14.0 (9.9)	11.4 (6.9)	13	15.6 (8.3)	15.7 (9.1)	11	14.1 (7.4)	15.9 (8.4)	<0.01	0.02	0.02
AASI	13	0.58 (0.19)	0.50 (0.10)	13	0.62 (0.17)	0.64 (0.16)	11	0.60 (0.20)	0.64 (0.14)	0.01	0.13	<0.01
			<b>48-weeks</b>			<b>48-weeks</b>			<b>48-weeks</b>			
Total Steps, d	17	5497(2187)	5470(2647)	21	6264 (2055)	5683 (2499)	18	5895(2284)	5586(2822)	0.85	0.81	0.96
Energy expenditure, kcal/week	17	228 (97)	242 (134)	21	310 (165)	289 (201)	16	301 (166)	248 (195)	0.56	0.66	0.67
Moderate activity, min/week	17	204 (167)	246 (247)	21	216 (209)	314 (228)	18	273 (316)	288 (374)	0.59	0.37	0.61
BMI, kg/m <sup>2</sup>	24	27.0 (3.2)	26.3 (3.2)	23	30.3 (4.7)	29.9 (4.9)	21	27.8 (3.2)	28.0 (3.2)	<0.01	0.02	0.31

Values are unadjusted means (SD). P1 = p-value for group using ANCOVA (adjusted for baseline value, study site and baseline BMI), P2 = p-value for contrast 1: Control v. (MD + MDPA), P3 = p-value for contrast 2: MD v. MDPA. Moderate activity minutes have been derived from light, moderate and vigorous intensity minutes normalised to moderate intensity. AASI = Ambulatory stiffness index, CV = variability, DBP = diastolic blood pressure, MD = Mediterranean diet, PA = physical activity, PP = pulse pressure, SBP = systolic blood pressure.







