

Methods and participant characteristics in the Cancer Risk in Vegetarians Consortium: A cross-sectional analysis across 11 prospective studies

Authors: Yashvee Dunneram^{1,2}, Jia Yi Lee¹, Cody Z. Watling¹, Gary E Fraser³, Fayth Miles³, Dorairaj Prabhakaran^{4,7}, Krithiga Shridhar^{4,8}, Dimple Kondal⁴, Viswanathan Mohan⁹, Mohammed K. Ali^{6,10-12}, Kabayam M. Venkat Narayan^{6,11}, Nikhil Tandon¹³, Tammy Y. N. Tong¹, Tina H.T. Chiu¹⁴, Ming-Nan Lin^{15,16}, Chin-Lon Lin¹⁷, Hsin-Chou Yang¹⁸, Yu-Jen Liang¹⁸, Darren C. Greenwood¹⁹, Huaidong Du^{20,21}, Zhengming Chen^{20,21}, Canqing Yu^{22,23}, Maria G. Kakkoura²⁰, Gillian K. Reeves¹, Keren Papier¹, Sarah Floud¹, Rashmi Sinha²⁴, Linda M. Liao²⁴, Erikka Loftfield²⁴, Janet E. Cade²⁵, Timothy J. Key¹, Aurora Perez-Cornago¹

1. Cancer Epidemiology Unit, Nuffield Department of Population Health, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK
2. Human Nutrition Research Centre, Faculty of Medical Sciences, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, UK
3. Centre for Nutrition, Healthy Lifestyle, and Disease Prevention, School of Public Health, Loma Linda University, Loma Linda, CA, USA
4. Centre for Chronic Disease Control, New Delhi, India
5. Public Health Foundation of India, Gurugram, Haryana, India
6. Emory Global Diabetes Research Center, Woodruff Health Sciences Center and Emory University, Atlanta, GA, USA
7. London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, UK
8. Centre for Health Analytics, Research, and Trends, Trivedi School of Bioscience, Ashoka University, Sonapat, Haryana, India
9. Madras Diabetes Research Foundation (ICMR Center for Advanced Research on Diabetes) and Dr. Mohan's Diabetes Specialities Centre, Chennai, India
10. Hubert Department of Global Health, Emory University, Atlanta, GA, USA

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

11. Department of Epidemiology, Rollins School of Public Health, Emory University, Atlanta, GA, USA
12. Department of Family and Preventive Medicine, School of Medicine, Emory University, Atlanta, GA, USA
13. Department of Endocrinology, All India Institute of Medical Sciences, New Delhi, India
14. Department of Nutritional Science, Fu-Jen Catholic University, New Taipei City, Taiwan
15. Department of Family Medicine, Dalin Tzu Chi Hospital, Buddhist Tzu Chi Medical Foundation, Chiayi 622, Taiwan
16. Department of Family Medicine, College of Medicine, Tzu Chi University, Hualien 970, Taiwan
17. Buddhist Tzu Chi Medical Foundation, Taiwan
18. Institute of Statistical Science, Academia Sinica, Taiwan
19. School of Medicine, University of Leeds, Leeds, UK
20. Clinical Trial Service Unit & Epidemiological Studies Unit, Nuffield Department of Population Health, University of Oxford, UK
21. Medical Research Council Population Health Research Unit, University of Oxford, UK
22. Department of Epidemiology & Biostatistics, School of Public Health, Peking University, Beijing, China
23. Peking University Center for Public Health and Epidemic Preparedness and Response, Beijing, China
24. Division of Cancer Epidemiology and Genetics, National Cancer Institute, Bethesda, MD, USA
25. Nutritional Epidemiology Group, School of Food Science and Nutrition, University of Leeds, Leeds, UK

This work has been funded by the World Cancer Research Fund UK (grant 2019/1953). The funder was not involved in any of the following: study design, collection, analysis, interpretation of data, and writing of the report.

Data described in the manuscript will not be made available because studies pooled by the Cancer Risk in Vegetarians Consortium are not owned by the writing group and so are not available from this consortium. Individual studies may be contacted to request access to their data.

Conflict of interest: None declared.

*** Correspondence:**

Yashvee Dunneram

Human Nutrition Research Centre, Faculty of Medical Sciences, Newcastle University,
Newcastle upon Tyne, NE2 4HH, UK

yashvee.dunneram@newcastle.ac.uk

Timothy J. Key

Cancer Epidemiology Unit, Nuffield Department of Population Health, University of Oxford, Oxford,
OX3 7LF, UK

+44 (0)1865 289648

tim.key@ndph.ox.ac.uk

List of abbreviations: BMI, Body Mass Index; CARRS, Centre for cArdiometabolic Risk Reduction in South Asia; EPIC, European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition; FFQ, Food Frequency Questionnaire; MET, metabolic equivalent of task; NIH-AARP, National Institutes of Health-AARP Diet and Health Study.

1 **Abstract**

2 **Background:** The associations of vegetarian diets with risks for site-specific cancers have not
3 been estimated reliably due to the low number of vegetarians in previous studies. Therefore,
4 the Cancer Risk in Vegetarians Consortium was established.

5 **Objective:** To describe and compare the baseline characteristics between non-vegetarian and
6 vegetarian diet groups and between the collaborating studies.

7 **Methods:** We harmonised individual-level data from 11 prospective cohort studies in the UK,
8 US, India, China, and Taiwan. Comparisons of food intakes, sociodemographic and lifestyle
9 factors were made between diet groups and between cohorts using descriptive statistics.

10 **Results:** 2.3 million participants were included; 66% women and 34% men, with mean ages at
11 recruitment of 57 (SD: 7.8) and 57 (8.6) years, respectively. There were 2.1 million meat eaters,
12 60,903 poultry eaters, 44,780 pescatarians, 81,165 vegetarians, and 14,167 vegans. Food intake
13 differences between the diet groups varied across the cohorts; for example, fruit and vegetable
14 intakes were generally higher in vegetarians than in meat eaters in all the cohorts except in
15 China. BMI was generally lower in vegetarians, particularly vegans, except for the cohorts in
16 India and China. In general, but with some exceptions, vegetarians were also more likely to be
17 highly educated and physically active and less likely to smoke. In the available resurveys,
18 stability of diet groups was high in all the cohorts except in China.

19 **Conclusions:** Food intakes and lifestyle factors of both non-vegetarians and vegetarians varied
20 markedly across the individual cohorts, which may be due to differences in both culture and
21 socioeconomic status, as well as differences in questionnaire design. Therefore, care is needed
22 in the interpretation of the impacts of vegetarian diets on cancer risk.

23

24 **Keywords:** Vegetarians, vegans, meat eaters, poultry eaters, pescatarians, consortium

25 (Words: 273/300)

26 **1. Introduction**

27 Cancer is a leading cause of death and an important barrier to increasing life expectancy
28 throughout the world (1). The World Cancer Research Fund has estimated that between 30 and
29 50% of all cancer cases might be preventable by following a healthy lifestyle, including
30 following a healthy diet (2). However, the effects of diet, and more specifically dietary patterns,
31 on cancer risk are not fully understood (3).

32

33 Diets that exclude red and processed meat, such as vegetarian and vegan diets, may influence
34 cancer risk because of the omission of meat, which has been associated with a higher risk of
35 colorectal cancer and/or because of their higher content of plant foods and associated nutrients
36 (e.g. dietary fibre) (3, 4). In Western cohorts, the risks of cancer in vegetarians and vegans
37 compared to meat eaters have been reported from several large cohorts; the Adventist Health
38 Study-2 (5), EPIC-Oxford (6), the Oxford Vegetarian study (7), the UK Women's Cohort Study
39 (8), the Netherlands Cohort Study - Meat Investigation Cohort (9), and UK Biobank (10).
40 While some individual studies have identified significant associations the overall findings for
41 specific cancer sites remain inconclusive, which may be partly due to the small number of
42 cancer cases and/or the limited number of vegetarians included in these individual studies. For
43 example, a lower risk of prostate cancer was found among vegetarians in UK Biobank (10) but
44 not in the Adventist Health Study-2 (5) or EPIC-Oxford (6).

45

46 Therefore, to enhance the statistical power to assess the associations of vegetarian diets with
47 the risks of site-specific cancers, we harmonised data from pre-existing prospective cohort
48 studies with a substantial number of vegetarians to establish the Cancer Risk in Vegetarians
49 Consortium. The primary aim of the current paper is to describe the data harmonisation
50 methods and to characterise differences between diet groups (meat eaters, poultry eaters,

51 pescatarians, lacto-ovo vegetarians, lacto vegetarians, ovo vegetarians and vegans) and
52 populations included in the consortium. For this, we describe and compare the dietary,
53 demographic, lifestyle, and anthropometric characteristics of the participants in the 11
54 contributing cohorts. The secondary aim is to describe the consistency in diet groups over time
55 by comparing the diet group at baseline to the diet group at resurvey for individuals in those
56 cohorts with information on dietary intakes during the follow-up period.

57

58 **2. Methods**

59 *2.1 Study-level inclusion criteria*

60 Studies were identified from literature searches using PubMed and Web of Science, reference
61 lists from published papers, and discussions with colleagues. Studies were considered eligible
62 if available publications suggested that the cohorts were likely to meet the following criteria:
63 1) the cohort had targeted recruitment to include a high proportion of vegetarians (typically
64 >25%), or the cohort was very large with $\geq 500,000$ participants and was therefore likely to
65 include $\sim 5,000$ vegetarians (assuming that $\sim 1\%$ of many populations may be vegetarian); 2)
66 the cohort had reliable follow-up for cancer occurrence (e.g. linkage to cancer registry, medical
67 records, verbal autopsy).

68

69 *2.2 Participating prospective studies and data collection*

70 In total, 11 prospective studies were identified as likely to meet our criteria, and their principal
71 investigators were invited to collaborate and contribute data to this consortium; all accepted.
72 Seven cohorts had a large proportion of vegetarians: the Adventist Health Study-2 (11), the
73 Center for cArdiometabolic Risk Reduction in South Asia-1 (CARRS-1) (12, 13), CARRS-2
74 (13), EPIC-Oxford (14), the Oxford Vegetarian Study (15), the Tzu Chi Health Study (16) and

75 the UK Women's Cohort Study (17). Four cohorts were very large ($\geq 500,000$ participants) and
76 thus included a substantial number of vegetarians: the China Kadoorie Biobank (18), the
77 Million Women Study (19), the National Institutes of Health-AARP Diet and Health Study
78 (NIH-AARP) (20), and the UK Biobank (21). With reference to our aim to identify cohorts
79 expected to include a large proportion and/or number of vegetarians, the harmonised data
80 showed that three cohorts did not reach these targets: CARRS-1 and the UK Women's Cohort
81 Study had substantial proportions of vegetarians and vegans, but somewhat less than the target
82 of 25% (23% and 14% respectively), while the NIH-AARP had only 1,943 vegetarians and
83 vegans (0.4% of the whole cohort). These cohorts were retained in the consortium nevertheless
84 because they provide substantial information on vegetarians in diverse settings.

85

86 Each study had ethical approval covering the current research topic, and participants in each
87 study gave consent at the time of recruitment. **Table 1** and the Supplementary Methods provide
88 a brief description of these 11 studies, while further details can be found in the original
89 publications from the individual studies (11-21).

90

91 A detailed data dictionary including the variables requested and their required format was
92 circulated to the collaborators (Table S1). Individual participant data were requested for dietary
93 intake, which is described below. Date of birth or date and age at recruitment, as well as socio-
94 demographics, lifestyle factors, medical history, women-specific data, vitamin and mineral
95 supplement use, were requested if available. Follow-up dietary data (as described below) were
96 also requested, where available. Additionally, data on cancer incidence and death (i.e. site and
97 histology of the tumour, date of cancer diagnosis, date of death, hormone receptor status for
98 breast cancer, stage and grade of tumour for prostate cancer) were requested.

99

100 In addition to the above variables, data dictionaries, survey questionnaires, and coding
101 algorithms for derived variables were also requested. Data transfer agreements were signed
102 with the collaborating institutions before transferring the individual participant data to the
103 University of Oxford. Due to the law in Taiwan, individual participant data from the Tzu Chi
104 Health Study (after linkage to cancer registry) could not be transferred to Oxford, and instead
105 the collaborators conducted the statistical analyses at the Health and Welfare Data Science
106 Center (HWDC), Ministry of Health, Taiwan and provided us with the tabulations of results
107 (i.e. no individual data were shared).

108

109 *2.3 Food intake assessment*

110 In all the studies, a dietary questionnaire (mainly food frequency questionnaires, FFQ) was
111 used to assess the food intake of participants at baseline (the number of foods assessed by each
112 dietary questionnaire can be found in **Table 1**). The baseline dietary assessment tools in most
113 of the studies were validated for key dietary components in the relevant study population or a
114 similar population (16, 22-26). After the data were transferred to the University of Oxford,
115 food frequencies were converted into weights in grams/day (g/d) using standard portion sizes
116 specific to the study's population (see Supplementary Methods for further details). Table S2
117 lists the foods for which data on food intake were requested from the individual studies. Intakes
118 of energy and nutrients, as calculated by the collaborators for each study, were also requested
119 and provided by the Adventist Health Study-2, EPIC-Oxford, UK Women's Cohort Study,
120 Million Women Study, and NIH-AARP.

121

122 Resurvey dietary data were available for a subsample of participants from the baseline cohort
123 in seven out of the eleven cohorts: CARRS-1 (n = 7,389; 61% of the whole cohort), EPIC-
124 Oxford (n = 27,529; 51%), Oxford Vegetarian Study (n = 2,837; 27%; these are participants

125 who also took part in EPIC-Oxford, therefore the baseline survey in EPIC-Oxford is considered
126 as a resurvey for this subsample of Oxford Vegetarian Study participants), UK Women's
127 Cohort Study (n = 1,652; 5%), China Kadoorie Biobank (n = 24,586; 5%), Million Women
128 Study (n = 23,525; 4%) and UK Biobank (n = 17,426, 4%), which were used to examine
129 whether participants in each diet group changed their food intakes over time. Further details on
130 the repeat dietary assessments are available in the Supplementary Methods.

131

132 *2.4 Classification of diet groups*

133 The consumption frequencies of animal foods (i.e., pork, beef, lamb, poultry, fish, eggs, dairy
134 products) or dishes containing animal foods were used to classify participants into one of the
135 seven diet groups defined *a priori* (**Table 2**). Meat eaters were defined as participants who
136 consumed red and/or processed meat. To categorise participants as poultry eaters, pescatarians,
137 vegetarians, or vegans, the lowest consumption frequency of the animal food not consumed by
138 the respective diet group was used to define absence of that food from the diet (Table S3). For
139 example, in the Adventist Health Study-2 and the China Kadoorie Biobank, lacto-ovo
140 vegetarians were defined as those who reported consuming dairy products and eggs but
141 reported “never/rarely” for their consumption of red and processed meat, poultry, and fish,
142 because the option “never” was not available on the questionnaires. At follow-up, we also
143 classified the subsamples of participants with follow-up dietary data into the diet groups as
144 defined in **Table 2** to assess the proportion of participants who had changed diet groups over
145 median follow-up periods ranging between 2.5 and 14.3 years. Further details on the diet group
146 classification in each study can be found in the Supplementary Methods.

147

148 *2.5 Data harmonisation*

149 After receiving the datasets from the individual cohorts, each variable was examined to identify
150 outliers and inconsistencies; in such cases, the study collaborators were consulted and a
151 decision was agreed upon to resolve the issue. For physical activity, cut-off points of the
152 metabolic equivalent of task (MET)–hours per day specific to each population were used to
153 categorize participants as inactive, moderately active or highly active in most of the studies. In
154 the Oxford Vegetarian Study, educational status had not been assessed and therefore socio-
155 economic status was used instead as a proxy. A detailed description of the data harmonisation
156 process is available in the Supplementary Methods.

157

158 *2.6 Participant-level exclusions*

159 Prior to the data harmonisation process, participants were excluded from individual studies
160 based on specific criteria unique to each study (referred to as “initial exclusions” in Figures
161 S1-S11). The following exclusions were made across all studies: 1) participants with prevalent
162 invasive cancers as identified by the cancer registry or self-report (CARRS-1 and CARRS-2);
163 2) participants who could not be linked to a cancer registry (except for CARRS-1 and CARRS-
164 2); 3) those with no follow-up data; 4) participants with more than 80% missing dietary data;
165 5) those who reported implausible energy intakes (male: <3,347 or >16,736 kJ/day; female:
166 <2,092 or >14,644 kJ/day) (if such data were available) (27); and 6) those above the age of 89
167 years at baseline. After applying the above exclusions, a total of 2,337,152 participants were
168 included in the analyses.

169

170 *2.7 Statistical analysis*

171 The numbers (and percentages) of participants in each diet group are presented by cohort. The
172 baseline demographic and lifestyle characteristics of the participants by sex and by diet group

173 are presented as means and standard deviations (SD) for continuous variables and numbers and
174 percentages for categorical variables across the cohorts. The women-specific characteristics of
175 the cohorts are also presented.

176

177 The food intakes of major food groups by cohort within each diet group are also presented as
178 means (SDs). In the results section, cohorts are ordered by their design (distinction was made
179 between cohorts with large proportions of vegetarians and very large cohorts) as both types of
180 cohorts have inherently different recruitment strategies which could lead to differing
181 participant characteristics.

182

183 **3. Results**

184 *Baseline and demographic characteristics*

185 The consortium comprises data from 2,337,152 participants, including 81,165 vegetarians and
186 14,167 vegans (**Tables 3** and S4). Moreover, 1,546,217 (66%) of the participants were women
187 and 790,935 (34%) were men, with mean (SD) ages of 56.9 (7.8) years and 57.3 (8.6) years at
188 recruitment, respectively (**Table 4**). Two studies, the UK Women's Cohort Study and the
189 Million Women Study, recruited women only. In the UK cohorts and NIH-AARP, $\geq 90\%$ of
190 participants were of white European ancestry, whereas in the Adventist Health Study-2, 27.6%
191 of women and 20.9% of men were of African American or Caribbean ethnicity (classified as
192 Black) (**Table 5**). Women-specific characteristics are shown in **Table 6** (and with a more
193 detailed categorisation in Table S5). Further information on the baseline demographic
194 characteristics of the participants can be found in **Table 4**, with detailed categorisations shown
195 in Tables S4, S5 and S6.

196

197 *Diet groups at baseline*

198 In total, 2,136,137 (91.4%) participants in this consortium were meat eaters, 60,903 (2.6%)
199 poultry eaters and 44,780 (1.9%) were pescatarians. The largest numbers of vegetarians were
200 in the Adventist Health Study-2 (n = 19,389), EPIC-Oxford (n = 15,433), and the China
201 Kadoorie Biobank (n = 15,587) (**Table 3**). In the UK and US cohorts as well as the Tzu Chi
202 Health Study, vegetarians mostly followed a lacto-ovo vegetarian diet, while in the Indian
203 cohorts a lacto-vegetarian diet was more common. Moreover, the Adventist Health Study-2 (n
204 = 5,225), EPIC-Oxford (n = 1,990), and the China Kadoorie Biobank (n = 5,110) contributed
205 the largest numbers of vegans.

206

207 *Food intakes in vegetarians and vegans across cohorts*

208 The food intakes of participants in each diet group are presented across the individual studies
209 in **Tables 7** (all vegetarians combined, not including vegans) and *S7* (showing each individual
210 diet group separately). Given that the dietary assessment tools used in the individual studies
211 are not closely comparable (e.g. the number of questions asking about consumption of foods
212 of the same category varied), the differences in mean intakes should be interpreted with
213 caution.

214

215 Vegetarians in the Adventist Health Study-2, EPIC-Oxford, and the UK Women's Cohort
216 Study consumed a higher amount of wholegrains than refined grains in comparison to
217 vegetarians in the other cohorts, while the opposite was observed in the other studies (**Table**
218 **7**). The highest total vegetable intakes were among vegetarians in the Tzu Chi Health Study
219 [mean: 520 (SD: 347) g/d], NIH-AARP [471 (317) g/d], and CARRS-1 [449 (203) g/d].
220 Moreover, vegetarians from the two Indian studies also had the highest mean intakes of
221 legumes. Fresh fruit intake was higher in the UK and US cohorts in comparison to the Asian
222 cohorts, except for the Oxford Vegetarian Study where reported intake was low. For sweets,

223 preserves, cakes and confectionery, the mean intake was highest in vegetarians from EPIC-
224 Oxford and the UK Women's Cohort Study. Vegetarians in the NIH-AARP had the highest
225 consumption of sugar-sweetened beverages (this variable includes diet versions in some of the
226 studies). Total dairy intake was lowest among vegetarians in the China Kadoorie Biobank [39
227 (32) g/d] and Tzu Chi Health Study [43 (69) g/d] compared to vegetarians in the other cohorts,
228 who reported more than double the intake.

229 In vegans, broadly similar differences in food intakes between studies as in the vegetarians
230 were observed (Table S7).

231

232 *Food intakes of meat eaters across cohorts*

233 Among all meat eaters, the reported total red and processed meat intake was highest in the
234 Oxford Vegetarian Study [76 (39) g/d] followed by the UK Women's Cohort Study [71 (45)
235 g/d] and NIH-AARP [69 (51) g/d], while the lowest intake was reported in AHS-2 [24 (27)
236 g/d] (**Figure 1**). Total vegetable intake was the highest in the Tzu Chi Health Study [428 (292)
237 g/d], while the lowest intake was reported in the Oxford Vegetarian Study [92 (49) g/d] (**Figure**
238 **2**). For fresh fruit (**Figure 2**), the highest intakes were reported in the UK and US cohorts,
239 except for the Oxford Vegetarian Study, while participants in CARRS-1, CARRS-2, and the
240 China Kadoorie Biobank reported the lowest mean intakes.

241

242 *Estimated nutrient intakes across diet groups and cohorts*

243 In general, the intakes of nutrients such as protein, total fat, saturated fat, monounsaturated fat,
244 vitamin B12, and vitamin D were higher among meat eaters compared to vegetarians and
245 vegans (Table S8). On the other hand, vegans had higher intakes of dietary fibre and vitamin
246 C compared to the other dietary groups, and lower intakes of calcium.

247

248 *Diet group consistency at resurvey*

249 In most of the cohorts with resurvey dietary data, $\geq 90\%$ of baseline meat eaters continued to
250 follow a meat-eating diet at resurvey, with the exceptions being CARRS-1 (72%) and the
251 Oxford Vegetarian Study (87%) (Table S9). In the four UK cohorts with dietary data during
252 the follow-up, 56–83% of the baseline pescatarians remained as pescatarians at resurvey.
253 However, in CARRS-1 and the China Kadoorie Biobank, 46% of people who were pescatarian
254 at baseline were classified as meat eaters at the resurvey. Furthermore, in the UK cohorts and
255 CARRS-1, 68–94% of baseline vegetarians remained as vegetarians at resurvey; however, in
256 the China Kadoorie Biobank, only 19% continued to follow a vegetarian diet, while 69% had
257 incorporated red meat into their diet. Among the baseline vegans in the UK cohorts, most
258 participants either continued to follow a vegan diet or were classified as vegetarian. In contrast,
259 in CARRS-1, the majority of baseline vegans were vegetarians at resurvey (80%), while in the
260 China Kadoorie Biobank the majority of vegans were meat eaters (65%) at resurvey.

261

262 *Sex, sociodemographic and lifestyle factors, and body mass index differences by diet group*

263 Overall, a higher proportion of men were meat eaters (93%) compared to women (91%) while
264 a higher proportion of women were vegetarians (4%) compared to men (3%) (Table S4).
265 However, in the Adventist Health Study-2 and EPIC-Oxford, a greater proportion of men
266 compared to women reported that they were vegetarian or vegan. When comparing ethnicity
267 by diet group across the cohorts, we observed that most of the UK and US studies, except for
268 the Adventist Health Study-2, had a higher proportion of Asian participants among lacto
269 vegetarians compared to the other diet groups (Table S10).

270

271 The proportion of participants with a university degree or equivalent was generally higher
272 among those who followed any vegetarian diet (**Table 8**). However, in the Tzu Chi Health

273 Study and the China Kadoorie Biobank, the proportion of participants with a university degree
274 or equivalent was higher among the meat eaters. **Table 9** shows the lifestyle factors by diet
275 group and cohort. Except for the UK Women's Cohort Study and the Million Women Study, a
276 higher proportion of participants who were classified as poultry eaters, pescatarians,
277 vegetarians and vegans were never smokers compared to meat eaters. In general, meat eaters
278 had a higher mean alcohol intake compared to other diet groups, though such differences were
279 not observed in EPIC-Oxford, the UK Women's Cohort Study and the Million Women Study.
280 In the Adventist Health Study-2, EPIC-Oxford, the Oxford Vegetarian Study, NIH-AARP and
281 UK Biobank, a higher proportion of participants who were poultry eaters, pescatarians,
282 vegetarians or vegans showed a high level of physical activity compared to meat eaters. In
283 CARRS-1, the vegetarians and vegans showed the highest level of physical activity compared
284 to participants in the other diet groups, while in the China Kadoorie Biobank, a smaller
285 proportion of participants who were pescatarians were highly active compared to the other diet
286 groups.

287
288 Overall, participants who were regular meat eaters in the UK and US cohorts and the Tzu Chi
289 Health Study had a higher BMI compared to participants in the other diet groups in the same
290 cohort (**Figure 3**). Regular meat eaters in the Adventist Health Study-2 had the highest mean
291 BMI [31 (7) kg/m²] compared to all diet groups in all the studies. Across all the studies, the
292 Indian cohorts had the highest BMI among all vegetarians (**Figure 3**). Moreover, the Oxford
293 Vegetarian Study had the participants with the lowest BMI when comparing all the diet groups.
294 In the China Kadoorie Biobank, the mean BMIs of participants across the diet groups were
295 relatively similar, with pescatarians having the highest BMI (**Figure 3**).

296

297 **4. Discussion**

298 This unique international consortium of prospective cohort studies with large numbers of
299 vegetarians was established to assess the associations between various diet groups and the risks
300 of site-specific cancers, with a particular focus on vegetarian and vegan diets. Our results
301 presented here on the cohort characteristics showed differences between cohorts in food
302 intakes, BMI, and educational status within each diet group. These findings support the
303 interpretation that while vegetarians worldwide share the avoidance of meat, poultry, and fish,
304 their diets, socio-demographics, and lifestyle factors vary substantially.

305

306 *Dietary groups and food intakes across the different cohorts*

307 The Adventist Health Study-2, EPIC-Oxford, and the China Kadoorie Biobank contributed the
308 largest numbers of vegetarians and vegans; however, the dietary groups in the China Kadoorie
309 Biobank require careful interpretation (see further discussion below). Among vegetarians, the
310 lacto-ovo vegetarian diet was most prevalent in the UK and US cohorts as well as in the Tzu
311 Chi Health Study, while vegetarians in the two Indian studies mostly followed a lacto
312 vegetarian diet. In recent years, vegetarian and vegan diets have become more popular in
313 Western countries, and this is likely motivated by self-choice due to ethical, environmental and
314 health concerns (28, 29). In India, where vegetarianism has been a cultural tradition for
315 centuries, people tend to follow this diet from birth due to religious and cultural beliefs that
316 encourage the avoidance of meat consumption (30); recent statistics show that 29% of women
317 and 17% of men in India are vegetarian (31). In the US, the estimated proportion of the
318 population following a vegetarian diet was around 3% in 2016 (32, 33), while in the UK, as of
319 2023, it is estimated that around 5% of the population is vegetarian (34).

320

321 We found substantial differences in reported food intakes across cohorts, which may be due to
322 both actual dietary variations and to variations in dietary assessment methods. For example,
323 we observed that intakes of wholegrains, total vegetables, and fresh fruit were markedly lower
324 in vegetarians in the Oxford Vegetarian Study compared to vegetarians in EPIC-Oxford, the
325 UK Women's Cohort Study and the Million Women Study. This might in part be due to the
326 limited 28 food items-FFQ in the Oxford Vegetarian Study, with only two questions related to
327 fruit consumption, while the three other UK cohorts had more comprehensive FFQs covering
328 over 100 food items, including at least 11 questions on fruit intake. Higher numbers of the food
329 items used to generate food groups could tend to result in higher mean intakes, which may
330 contribute to some of the observed differences between cohorts. However, the observed
331 differences in reported food intakes may also be influenced by time trends in food consumption
332 and/or the assumptions made within different cohorts when allocating portion sizes. Another
333 example of variations in food intakes due to differences in the dietary questionnaires can be
334 observed in the two Indian cohorts. These cohorts recruited participants from the same
335 demographic regions, yet differences in mean food intakes were noted, which could be
336 attributed to the use of a non-quantitative FFQ at baseline in CARRS-1, while a semi-
337 quantitative FFQ was used in CARRS-2.

338

339 In the China Kadoorie Biobank, the substantial number of participants classified as vegetarians
340 and vegans might not be attributed to personal choices, such as health or religious beliefs.
341 Instead, this may be related to socioeconomic status, poverty, and affordability (35). For
342 instance, in this cohort, the meat eaters, poultry eaters, and pescatarians were more likely to
343 have a university degree or equivalent (and higher income; findings not shown) compared to
344 the vegetarians and vegans. We also found that vegetarians and vegans in this cohort were

345 mostly from two rural regions of China (Gansu and Henan), while pescatarians were mainly
346 from two coastal regions (Qingdao and Harbin; findings not shown).

347

348 *Differences in sex, sociodemographic, and lifestyle factors by diet groups in the different*
349 *cohorts*

350 Comparisons across the individual cohorts showed that pescatarians, vegetarians, and vegans
351 in studies from the UK, US, and India were more likely to have a university degree or
352 equivalent than the meat eaters within the same cohort. These findings are in alignment with
353 cross-sectional analyses in a random sample of Germans (36) and Finnish adults (37), and in
354 the French NutriNet-Santé study (38).

355

356 Differences in sex distribution across the diet groups within each individual study were
357 observed. In most of the cohorts, there was a higher proportion of women in the vegetarian diet
358 group while a higher proportion of men were meat eaters. These findings are in line with
359 previous research in France and Germany (36, 38), which also showed that women typically
360 consume less meat and are more likely to follow a vegetarian or vegan diet.

361

362 *BMI differences across diet groups and studies*

363 In the UK and US cohorts, meat eaters had a higher average BMI, while vegans followed by
364 vegetarians had the lowest. The consumption of red and processed meat may be associated with
365 having a greater body weight; a meta-analysis of 18 studies, mainly from Western countries,
366 showed a positive association with obesity (39). The EPIC-Europe study, which included
367 373,803 men and women, found that higher intakes of total meat, red meat, processed meat,
368 and poultry were associated with greater weight gain over 5 years of follow-up (40). Dietary

369 differences between meat eaters and vegetarians/vegans, such as higher intakes of fibre and
370 lower intakes of protein, may contribute to the latter group's lower BMI (41, 42).

371

372 When comparing the BMI of vegetarians and vegans across the different studies, those in
373 CARRS-1 and CARRS-2 had the highest mean BMI. In these Indian studies, lacto vegetarians
374 had a higher average BMI compared to participants in the other diet groups. These findings are
375 consistent with the cross-sectional National Family Health Survey (2005-06) data in India,
376 which also reported the highest mean BMI in the lacto vegetarians (43). Cross-sectional
377 analyses conducted in CARRS-1 and in adults from the general US population (i.e. including
378 all ethnicities) who completed the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey
379 (NHANES) showed differences in vegetarian diets between these two countries (32); the diets
380 of vegetarians versus meat eaters were healthier in the NHANES compared to the vegetarians
381 in CARRS-1, where the diets of meat eaters were more similar to those of vegetarians.
382 Differences in cooking practices, meal preparation methods, eating frequencies, and eating out
383 habits between vegetarians in India and those from other countries are also important factors
384 that can be associated with variations in BMI (44). However, the evaluation of these dietary
385 and other lifestyle factors such as physical activity was outside the scope of this consortium.

386

387 *Diet groups at resurvey*

388 The agreement of diet groups at baseline and resurvey for meat eaters and vegetarians was
389 generally high (more than ~70%) in the UK cohorts and CARRS-1. This is similar to previous
390 findings in the Adventist Health Study-2, which found greatest stability among non-vegetarians
391 and lacto-ovo vegetarians when lifetime dietary patterns were assessed using a reliable life-
392 course dietary questionnaire (45). Changes in individuals' diet groups during follow up were
393 mostly to the adjacent category(ies) of animal product consumption (e.g. poultry eaters to either

394 meat eaters or pescatarians), which may be due to misclassification or true dietary changes over
395 time.

396

397 Unlike the patterns observed in the other cohorts, in the China Kadoorie Biobank the great
398 majority of baseline vegetarians and vegans reported consuming meat at follow-up (69% and
399 65%, respectively). This shift coincided with an improvement in socioeconomic status among
400 these participants, as indicated by their reported income in the follow-up questionnaire
401 (findings not shown). Moreover, there was a substantial increase in meat consumption in China
402 during this period, unlike in most high-income countries where meat consumption has
403 plateaued or decreased (46, 47). This further supports the interpretation that vegetarians and
404 vegans in the China Kadoorie Biobank were more likely to report very low or no meat
405 consumption at baseline due to economic constraints, rather than intentionally adhering to a
406 vegetarian diet. Moreover, as previously discussed, the participants in this cohort classified as
407 vegetarians at baseline may have occasionally consumed both meat and fish because they
408 reported eating these foods less than monthly due to the design of the FFQ. These findings
409 show the importance of carefully considering the stability of diet groups over time when
410 conducting analyses of the associations of diet group with long-term health outcomes.

411

412 *Strengths and limitations*

413 These analyses have several strengths. This consortium will provide the largest collection of
414 observational data on vegetarian and vegan diets and the risk of individual cancer sites
415 available. The consortium includes participants from the UK, US, and Asia (India, China, and
416 Taiwan). While CARRS-1, CARRS-2 and the Tzu Chi Health Study do not include large
417 numbers of participants, they offer valuable insights for this research on vegetarian and vegan
418 diets because food intakes in these areas differ markedly from those in studies conducted in the

419 UK and the US. We have also compared key participant characteristics, such as sex, BMI, and
420 educational status, across diet groups within the individual cohorts. Further strengths of this
421 consortium are the availability and standardisation of various potential confounders from the
422 different cohorts, which can be used in prospective analyses, offering a unique advantage when
423 investigating the associations between diet groups and the risk of site-specific cancers, which
424 is not possible in meta-analyses of published data.

425

426 It should be noted that the differences reported in this paper are descriptions specific to the
427 participants in the consortium, and therefore some of the differences are likely to be influenced
428 by variations between the studies in factors such as age, gender proportions, body size, social
429 and cultural factors, year of recruitment, recruitment age, and methods of dietary
430 ascertainment. Another potential limitation of this consortium is the possibility of diet group
431 misclassification. In the Adventist Health Study-2, CARRS-1, CARRS-2, Tzu Chi Health
432 Study, and China Kadoorie Biobank, the lowest category in the respective FFQ was either
433 “never/rarely” or “never/less than once a month”. Therefore, participants classified as
434 vegetarians or vegans may occasionally consume the relevant animal foods. Misclassification
435 of the diet groups is also possible depending on food items included or omitted, social
436 desirability, and other factors that may vary between the cohorts.

437

438 In this consortium, which harmonised data from 11 prospective cohort studies, food intakes
439 among vegetarians varied between studies. This variation may be attributed to differences in
440 culture, socioeconomic status, and the specific dietary assessment tools used in each cohort.
441 Vegetarians and vegans were found to have a lower BMI and higher educational status in
442 comparison to regular meat eaters, showing a gradient across the other diet groups; however,
443 this pattern was not observed in some of the Asian cohorts. In general, vegetarians had lower

444 alcohol intake, a higher proportion of individuals who had never smoked, and higher physical
445 activity when compared to meat eaters. The data harmonised will be used in future analyses to
446 assess the prospective associations between vegetarian diets and risks of site-specific cancer.

447

448 **Author contributions**

449 Statement of authors' contributions to manuscript: APC and TJK designed the research; YD,
450 JYL and APC conducted the research; YD, JYL, CZW and APC analysed data; YD wrote the
451 paper; all authors commented on the analysis, made important contributions to interpretation
452 of the findings, reviewed the paper critically for important intellectual content, read and
453 approved the final manuscript.

454

455 **Conflicts of interest**

456 The authors report no conflicts of interest.

457

458 **Funding**

459 This work has been funded by the World Cancer Research Fund UK (grant 2019/1953).
460 Funding details for the individual studies are available in the respective cohort profile papers.
461 The NIH-AARP cohort acknowledgment can be found [here](#).

References

1. Bray F, Laversanne M, Weiderpass E, Soerjomataram I. The ever-increasing importance of cancer as a leading cause of premature death worldwide. *Cancer-Am Cancer Soc.* 2021;127(16):3029-30.
2. World Health Organization. Preventing cancer. Available from: <https://www.who.int/activities/preventing-cancer>
3. World Cancer Research Fund/American Institute for Cancer Research. Diet, Nutrition, Physical Activity and Cancer: a Global Perspective. 2018. Available from: <https://www.wcrf.org/diet-activity-and-cancer/global-cancer-update-programme/resources-and-toolkits/>
4. Key TJ, Bradbury KE, Perez-Cornago A, Sinha R, Tsilidis KK, Tsugane S. Diet, nutrition, and cancer risk: what do we know and what is the way forward? *BMJ.* 2020;368:m511.
5. Tantamango-Bartley Y, Jaceldo-Siegl K, Fan J, Fraser G. Vegetarian diets and the incidence of cancer in a low-risk population. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev.* 2013;22(2):286-94.
6. Key TJ, Appleby PN, Crowe FL, Bradbury KE, Schmidt JA, Travis RC. Cancer in British vegetarians: updated analyses of 4998 incident cancers in a cohort of 32,491 meat eaters, 8612 fish eaters, 18,298 vegetarians, and 2246 vegans. *Am J Clin Nutr.* 2014;100 Suppl 1(1):378S-85S.
7. Thorogood M, Mann J, Appleby P, McPherson K. Risk of death from cancer and ischaemic heart disease in meat and non-meat eaters. *BMJ.* 1994;308(6945):1667-70.
8. Cade JE, Taylor EF, Burley VJ, Greenwood DC. Common dietary patterns and risk of breast cancer: analysis from the United Kingdom Women's Cohort Study. *Nutr Cancer.* 2010;62(3):300-6.
9. Gilsing AM, Schouten LJ, Goldbohm RA, Dagnelie PC, van den Brandt PA, Weijenberg MP. Vegetarianism, low meat consumption and the risk of colorectal cancer in a population based cohort study. *Sci Rep.* 2015;5:13484.
10. Watling CZ, Schmidt JA, Dunneram Y, Tong TYN, Kelly RK, Knuppel A, et al. Risk of cancer in regular and low meat-eaters, fish-eaters, and vegetarians: a prospective analysis of UK Biobank participants. *BMC Medicine.* 2022;20(1):73.
11. Butler TL, Fraser GE, Beeson WL, Knutsen SF, Herring RP, Chan J, et al. Cohort profile: the Adventist Health Study-2 (AHS-2). *Int J Epidemiol.* 2008;37(2):260-5.
12. Nair M, Ali MK, Ajay VS, Shivashankar R, Mohan V, Pradeepa R, et al. CARRS Surveillance study: design and methods to assess burdens from multiple perspectives. *BMC Public Health.* 2012;12.
13. Kondal D, Patel SA, Ali MK, Mohan D, Rautela G, Gujral UP, et al. Cohort profile: the Center for cArdiometabolic Risk Reduction in South Asia (CARRS). *Int J Epidemiol.* 2022;51(6):e358-e71.
14. Davey GK, Spencer EA, Appleby PN, Allen NE, Knox KH, Key TJ. EPIC-Oxford: lifestyle characteristics and nutrient intakes in a cohort of 33 883 meat-eaters and 31 546 non meat-eaters in the UK. *Public Health Nutr.* 2003;6(3):259-69.

15. Appleby PN, Thorogood M, Mann JI, Key TJ. The Oxford Vegetarian Study: an overview. *Am J Clin Nutr.* 1999;70(3 Suppl):525s-31s.
16. Chiu THT, Huang HY, Chen KJ, Wu YR, Chiu JPC, Li YH, et al. Relative validity and reproducibility of a quantitative FFQ for assessing nutrient intakes of vegetarians in Taiwan. *Public Health Nutr.* 2014;17(7):1459-66.
17. Cade JE, Burley VJ, Alwan NA, Hutchinson J, Hancock N, Morris MA, et al. Cohort profile: the UK Women's Cohort Study (UKWCS). *Int J Epidemiol.* 2017;46(2):e11.
18. Chen Z, Chen J, Collins R, Guo Y, Peto R, Wu F, et al. China Kadoorie Biobank of 0.5 million people: survey methods, baseline characteristics and long-term follow-up. *Int J Epidemiol.* 2011;40(6):1652-66.
19. Green J, Reeves GK, Floud S, Barnes I, Cairns BJ, Gathani T, et al. Cohort profile: the Million Women Study. *Int J Epidemiol.* 2019;48(1):28-9e.
20. Schatzkin A, Subar AF, Thompson FE, Harlan LC, Tangrea J, Hollenbeck AR, et al. Design and serendipity in establishing a large cohort with wide dietary intake distributions : the National Institutes of Health–American Association of Retired Persons Diet and Health Study. *Am J Epidemiol.* 2001;154(12):1119-25.
21. Sudlow C, Gallacher J, Allen N, Beral V, Burton P, Danesh J, et al. UK Biobank: an open access resource for identifying the causes of a wide range of complex diseases of middle and old age. *PLOS Med.* 2015;12(3):e1001779.
22. Jaceldo-Siegl K, Fan J, Sabaté J, Knutsen SF, Haddad E, Beeson WL, et al. Race-specific validation of food intake obtained from a comprehensive FFQ: the Adventist Health Study-2. *Public Health Nutr.* 2011;14(11):1988-97.
23. Bingham SA, Gill C, Welch A, Cassidy A, Runswick SA, Oakes S, et al. Validation of dietary assessment methods in the UK arm of EPIC using weighed records, and 24-hour urinary nitrogen and potassium and serum vitamin C and carotenoids as biomarkers. *Int J Epidemiol.* 1997;26 Suppl 1:S137-51.
24. Spence M, Cade J, Burley V, Greenwood D. Ability of the UK Women's Cohort Study Food Frequency Questionnaire to rank dietary intakes: a preliminary validation study. *Proc Nutr Soc.* 2002;61:117A.
25. Qin CX, Guo Y, Pei P, Du HD, Yang L, Chen YP, et al. The relative validity and reproducibility of food frequency questionnaires in the China Kadoorie Biobank study. *Nutrients.* 2022;14(4).
26. Thompson FE, Kipnis V, Midthune D, Freedman LS, Carroll RJ, Subar AF, et al. Performance of a food-frequency questionnaire in the US NIH-AARP (National Institutes of Health-American Association of Retired Persons) Diet and Health Study. *Public Health Nutr.* 2008;11(2):183-95.
27. Willett W. *Nutritional Epidemiology*: Oxford University Press; 2012. Available from: <https://academic.oup.com/book/27443>

28. Sexton AE, Garnett T, Lorimer J. Vegan food geographies and the rise of Big Veganism. *Prog Hum Geogr.* 2022;46(2):605-28.
29. Cramer H, Kessler CS, Sundberg T, Leach MJ, Schumann D, Adams J, Lauche R. Characteristics of Americans choosing vegetarian and vegan diets for health reasons. *J Nutr Educ Behav.* 2017;49(7):561-7.e1.
30. Ruby MB. Vegetarianism. A blossoming field of study. *Appetite.* 2012;58(1):141-50.
31. International Institute for Population Sciences (IIPS) and ICF. National Family Health Survey (NFHS-5), 2019-21: India: Volume I.2021. Available from: <https://dhsprogram.com/pubs/pdf/FR375/FR375.pdf>
32. Jaacks LM, Kapoor D, Singh K, Narayan KMV, Ali MK, Kadir MM, et al. Vegetarianism and cardiometabolic disease risk factors: differences between South Asian and US adults. *Nutrition.* 2016;32(9):975-84.
33. Stahler C. How often do Americans eat vegetarian meals? And how many adults in the US are vegetarian. The Vegetarian Resource Group. 2015;29. Available from: <https://www.vrg.org/blog/2015/05/29/how-often-do-americans-eat-vegetarian-meals-and-how-many-adults-in-the-u-s-are-vegetarian-2/>
34. YouGov. Dietary choices of Brits (e.g. vegetarian, flexitarian, meat-eater etc)? 2022 [Internet]. Available from: <https://yougov.co.uk/topics/society/trackers/dietary-choices-of-brits-eg-vegetarian-flexitarian-meat-eater-etc/>.
35. Papier K, Kakkoura MG, Guo Y, Knuppel A, Pei P, Tong TYN, et al. Intakes of major food groups in China and UK: results from 100,000 adults in the China Kadoorie Biobank and UK biobank. *Eur J Nutr.* 2023;62(2):819-32.
36. Pslakis G, Richardson C, Nohre M, Brahler E, Holzapfel C, Hilbert A, de Zwaan M. Prevalence and psychopathology of vegetarians and vegans - results from a representative survey in Germany (vol 10, 6840, 2020). *Sci Rep.* 2020;10(1).
37. Lehto E, Kaartinen NE, Saaksjarvi K, Mannisto S, Jallinoja P. Vegetarians and different types of meat eaters among the Finnish adult population from 2007 to 2017. *Br J Nutr.* 2022;127(7):1060-72.
38. Allès B, Baudry J, Méjean C, Touvier M, Péneau S, Hercberg S, Kesse-Guyot E. Comparison of sociodemographic and nutritional characteristics between self-reported vegetarians, vegans, and meat-eaters from the NutriNet-Santé Study. *Nutrients.* 2017;9(9).
39. Rouhani MH, Salehi-Abargouei A, Surkan PJ, Azadbakht L. Is there a relationship between red or processed meat intake and obesity? A systematic review and meta-analysis of observational studies. *Obes Rev.* 2014;15(9):740-8.
40. Vergnaud A-C, Norat T, Romaguera D, Mouw T, May AM, Travier N, et al. Meat consumption and prospective weight change in participants of the EPIC-PANACEA study. *Am J Clin Nutr.* 2010;92(2):398-407.

41. Newby P, Tucker KL, Wolk A. Risk of overweight and obesity among semivegetarian, lactovegetarian, and vegan women. *Am J Clin Nutr*. 2005;81(6):1267-74.
42. Spencer EA, Appleby PN, Davey GK, Key TJ. Diet and body mass index in 38,000 EPIC-Oxford meat-eaters, fish-eaters, vegetarians and vegans. *Int J Obes*. 2003;27(6):728-34.
43. Agrawal S, Millett CJ, Dhillon PK, Subramanian SV, Ebrahim S. Type of vegetarian diet, obesity and diabetes in adult Indian population. *Nutr J*. 2014;13:89.
44. Borude S. Which is a good diet-veg or non-veg? Faith-based vegetarianism for protection from obesity-a myth or actuality? *Obes Surg*. 2019;29(4):1276-80.
45. Martins MCT, Jaceldo-Siegl K, Orlich M, Fan J, Mashchak A, Fraser GE. A new approach to assess lifetime dietary patterns finds lower consumption of animal foods with aging in a longitudinal analysis of a health-oriented Adventist population. *Nutrients*. 2017;9(10).
46. Godfray HCJ, Aveyard P, Garnett T, Hall JW, Key TJ, Lorimer J, et al. Meat consumption, health, and the environment. *Science*. 2018;361(6399).
47. Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development/ Food Agricultural Organisation (OECD/FAO). *OECD-FAO Agricultural Outlook 2023-2032*, 2023. Available from: https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/agriculture-and-food/oecd-fao-agricultural-outlook-2023-2032_08801ab7-en.

Table 1. Characteristics of the cohorts included in the Cancer Risk in Vegetarians Consortium (n = 2,337,152)¹.

Cohort	Location	Recruitment years	Baseline sample size ¹	Eligible age range at recruitment (years)	No. of foods assessed in baseline dietary questionnaire	Dietary resurvey years	Follow-up time to cancer incidence (years), median (IQR)
<i>Cohorts with large proportions of vegetarians</i>							
Adventist Health Study-2 (11)	United States	2002–2007	64,555	≥30	130	-	8 (7–10)
CARRS-1 (12)	India	2010–2011	12,218	≥20	26	2017–2018	6 (5–6)
CARRS-2 (12, 13)	India	2014–2016	9,530	≥20	33	-	4 (4–4)
EPIC-Oxford (14)	United Kingdom	1993–1999	53,752	≥20	130	2010	22 (21–23)
Oxford Vegetarian Study (15)	United Kingdom	1980–1984	10,527	≥15	28	1993–1999 ²	27 (14–37)
Tzu Chi Health Study (16)	Taiwan	2007–2009	5,520	≥18	64	-	11 (10–12)
UK Women’s Cohort Study (17)	United Kingdom	1995–1998	30,148	35–69	217	2000	20 (19–21)
<i>Very large cohorts</i>							
China Kadoorie Biobank (18)	China	2004–2008	510,145	30–79	12	2013–2014	12 (11–13)
Million Women Study (19)	United Kingdom	1996–2001	639,026	50–64	130	2010–2020	16 (14–18)
NIH-AARP (20)	United States	1995–1996	527,691	50–69	124	-	16 (10–16)
UK Biobank (21)	United Kingdom	2006–2010	474,040	40–69	16	2012–2013	12 (11–12)

Abbreviations: CARRS, Centre for cArdiometabolic Risk Reduction in South Asia; EPIC, European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition; FFQ, food frequency questionnaire; NIH-AARP, National Institutes of Health-AARP Diet and Health Study.

¹The baseline sample size corresponds to the number of participants in the pooled dataset after exclusions as listed in Figures S1–S11.

²There are 2,837 participants in the Oxford Vegetarian Study who also took part in EPIC-Oxford, therefore the baseline survey in EPIC-Oxford is considered as a resurvey for this subsample of Oxford Vegetarian Study participants.

Table 2. *A priori* ideal definitions of the diet groups.

Diet group	Definition
Meat eaters	Consume red and processed meat
Poultry eaters	Do not consume red or processed meat but consume poultry
Pescatarians	Do not consume meat or poultry but consume fish
Lacto-ovo vegetarians	Do not consume meat, poultry, or fish, but consume eggs and dairy products
Lacto vegetarians	Do not consume meat, poultry, fish, or eggs, but consume dairy products
Ovo vegetarians	Do not consume meat, poultry, fish, or dairy products but consume eggs
Vegans	Do not consume meat, poultry, fish, dairy products, or eggs

Table 3. Number of participants in each diet group (n = 2,337,152)¹.

Cohort	Meat eaters	Poultry eaters	Pescatarians	Vegetarians				Vegans
				Lacto-ovo vegetarians	Lacto vegetarians	Ovo vegetarians	All vegetarians ²	
<i>Cohorts with large proportions of vegetarians</i>								
Adventist Health Study-2	23,245 (36.0)	10,494 (16.3)	6,202 (9.6)	12,798 (19.8)	5,915 (9.2)	676 (1.0)	19,389 (30.0)	5,225 (8.1)
CARRS-1	7,214 (59.0)	1,958 (16.0)	180 (1.5)	365 (3.0)	1,920 (15.7)	129 (1.1)	2,414 (19.8)	452 (3.7)
CARRS-2	4,786 (50.2)	1,938 (20.3)	167 (1.8)	323 (3.4)	2,061 (21.6)	47 (0.49)	2,431 (25.5)	208 (2.2)
EPIC-Oxford	26,498 (49.3)	1,703 (3.2)	8,128 (15.1)	11,390 (21.2)	3,948 (7.3)	95 (0.18)	15,433 (28.7)	1,990 (3.7)
Oxford Vegetarian Study ³	5,180 (49.2)	-	998 (9.5)	3,576 (34.0)	388 (3.7)	52 (0.49)	4,016 (38.1)	333 (3.2)
Tzu Chi Health Study	3,519 (63.8)	120 (2.2)	233 (4.2)	1,277 (23.1)	234 (4.2)	93 (1.7)	1,604 (29.1)	44 (0.80)
UK Women's Cohort Study	21,180 (70.3)	929 (3.1)	3,804 (12.6)	3,300 (10.9)	743 (2.5)	32 (0.11)	4,075 (13.5)	160 (0.53)
<i>Very large cohorts</i>								
China Kadoorie Biobank	485,796 (95.2)	1,949 (0.38)	1,703 (0.33)	2,452 (0.48)	730 (0.14)	12,405 (2.4)	15,587 (3.1)	5,110 (1.0)
Million Women Study	618,450 (96.8)	3,414 (0.53)	10,947 (1.7)	5,361 (0.84)	742 (0.12)	33 (0.01)	6,136 (0.96)	79 (0.01)
NIH-AARP	491,098 (93.1)	32,960 (6.2)	1,690 (0.32)	969 (0.18)	842 (0.16)	14 (0.00)	1,825 (0.35)	118 (0.02)
UK Biobank	449,171 (94.8)	5,438 (1.1)	10,728 (2.3)	7,140 (1.5)	940 (0.20)	175 (0.04)	8,255 (1.7)	448 (0.09)
All cohorts combined	2,136,137 (91.4)	60,903 (2.6)	44,780 (1.9)	48,951 (2.1)	18,463 (0.79)	13,751 (0.59)	81,165 (3.5)	14,167 (0.61)

Abbreviations: CARRS, Centre for cArdiometabolic Risk Reduction in South Asia; EPIC, European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition; NIH-AARP, National Institutes of Health-AARP Diet and Health Study.

¹Values are N (%). Categorisation into diet groups necessarily used the questions asked in each study, therefore some participants in the vegetarian categories may have very low but not zero intakes of meat, and similarly for the other animal foods.

²All vegetarians include lacto-ovo, lacto and ovo vegetarians.

³In the Oxford Vegetarian Study, poultry eaters could not be determined as poultry intake was not assessed.

Table 4. Baseline and demographic characteristics of participants by sex and cohort (n = 2,337,152)¹.

Cohort	N	Age at baseline (years), mean (SD)	Living with partner	University degree or equivalent	Current smokers	Height (cm), mean (SD)	BMI (kg/m ²), mean (SD)	Highly active	Alcohol intake (g/day), mean (SD)	History of diabetes
Women										
<i>Cohorts with large proportions of vegetarians</i>										
Adventist Health Study-2	42,194	57.2 (13.8)	27,503 (65.2)	20,431 (48.4)	410 (0.97)	163.3 (7.4)	27.1 (6.4)	17,753 (42.1)	0.3 (1.6)	3,195 (7.6)
CARRS-1	6,372	41.8 (12.7)	5,671 (89.0)	945 (14.8)	58 (0.91)	151.7 (5.9)	26.6 (5.3)	1,494 (23.4)	-	777 (12.2)
CARRS-2	5,065	43.6 (13.1)	4,332 (85.5)	884 (17.5)	59 (1.2)	152.0 (5.9)	27.0 (5.4)	40 (0.79)	-	830 (16.4)
EPIC-Oxford	41,494	43.9 (13.8)	27,614 (66.8)	16,406 (39.7)	4,439 (10.7)	164.1 (6.8)	23.6 (4.0)	4,770 (11.5)	7.8 (9.8)	459 (1.1)
Oxford Vegetarian Study	6,480	39.4 (15.6)	3,497 (54.0)	434 (6.7)	1,049 (16.2)	163.9 (6.7)	21.8 (2.8)	1,831 (28.3)	6.9 (8.4)	33 (0.51)
Tzu Chi Health Study	3,329	53.3 (9.8)	2,824 (84.8)	670 (20.1)	15 (0.45)	156.1 (5.4)	23.3 (3.3)	999 (30.0)	0.2 (4.1)	155 (4.7)
UK Women's Cohort Study	30,148	51.8 (9.3)	22,282 (73.9)	7,372 (24.5)	3,224 (10.7)	163.7 (6.8)	24.4 (4.2)	1,032 (3.4)	8.7 (10.2)	544 (1.8)
<i>Very large cohorts</i>										
China Kadoorie Biobank	300,912	51.4 (10.5)	267,799 (89.0)	13,322 (4.4)	12,617 (4.2)	154.1 (6.0)	23.8 (3.5)	100,302 (33.3) ²	0.5 (4.7)	18,426 (6.1)
Million Women Study	639,043	59.8 (4.9)	511,789 (80.1)	106,496 (16.7)	71,277 (11.2)	162.4 (6.5)	26.2 (4.6)	60,701 (9.5)	5.9 (7.6)	21,570 (3.4)
NIH-AARP	215,905	61.5 (5.4)	95,749 (44.3)	118,637 (54.9)	30,343 (14.1)	163.3 (6.9)	26.8 (6.0)	34,746 (16.1)	5.7 (14.5)	16,204 (7.5)
UK Biobank	255,454	56.1 (8.0)	176,907 (69.3)	144,629 (56.6)	22,888 (9.0)	162.5 (6.3)	27.1 (5.2)	43,023 (16.8)	8.7 (11.1)	9,555 (3.7)
All cohorts combined	1,546,217	56.9 (7.8)	1,145,967 (74.1)	430,226 (27.8)	146,379 (9.5)	160.9 (6.5)	25.9 (4.8)	570,911 (36.9)	5.2 (9.2)	71,748 (4.6)
Men										
<i>Cohorts with large proportions of vegetarians</i>										
Adventist Health Study-2	22,363	58.0 (13.6)	19,077 (85.3)	12,713 (56.9)	258 (1.2)	177.7 (7.9)	26.6 (4.8)	10,605 (47.4)	0.5 (2.6)	1,880 (8.4)
CARRS-1	5,846	43.6 (13.5)	5,225 (89.4)	1,252 (21.4)	1,628 (27.8)	164.9 (6.9)	24.3 (4.5)	1,097 (18.8)	-	696 (11.9)
CARRS-2	4,465	45.0 (13.8)	3,924 (87.9)	1,069 (23.9)	1,086 (24.3)	165.7 (6.7)	24.7 (4.6)	156 (3.5)	-	696 (15.6)
EPIC-Oxford	12,444	47.2 (14.4)	8,885 (71.6)	6,409 (51.6)	1,648 (13.3)	177.8 (7.0)	24.2 (3.4)	2,201 (17.7)	15.4 (18.0)	263 (2.1)
Oxford Vegetarian Study	4,047	39.7 (15.4)	2,449 (60.5)	640 (15.8)	1,006 (24.9)	177.6 (6.7)	22.7 (2.6)	1,417 (35.0)	12.7 (12.0)	29 (0.72)
Tzu Chi Health Study	2,191	53.6 (10.6)	2,012 (91.8)	792 (36.0)	216 (9.8)	167.5 (6.0)	24.3 (3.1)	834 (37.9)	2.69 (14.1)	139 (6.3)
<i>Very large cohorts</i>										
China Kadoorie Biobank	209,235	52.8 (10.9)	194,417 (92.9)	16,440 (7.9)	151,594 (72.5)	165.2 (6.5)	23.4 (3.2)	69,953 (33.4) ²	18.1 (33.4)	11,579 (5.5)
NIH-AARP	311,786	61.8 (5.3)	267,667 (85.8)	207,254 (66.5)	31,497 (10.1)	178.3 (7.5)	27.2 (4.3)	66,132 (21.2)	14.7 (28.7)	31,927 (10.2)
UK Biobank	218,586	56.6 (8.2)	166,819 (76.3)	136,918 (62.6)	27,580 (12.6)	175.6 (6.8)	27.8 (4.2)	45,905 (21.0)	21.6 (23.5)	15,170 (6.9)
All cohorts combined	790,935	57.3 (8.6)	670,475 (84.8)	383,487 (48.5)	216,513 (27.4)	173.9 (7.0)	26.3 (4.0)	198,300 (25.1)	17.1 (28.1)	62,381 (7.9)

Abbreviations: BMI, body mass index; CARRS, Centre for cArdiometabolic Risk Reduction in South Asia; EPIC, European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition; NIH-AARP, National Institutes of Health-AARP Diet and Health Study.

¹Values are N (%) unless otherwise indicated.

²Sex-specific tertiles of metabolic equivalents were used.

“-” indicates that no information was available for this variable in the specified cohort.

Table 5. Ethnicity of participants by sex and cohort (n = 2,337,152)¹.

Cohort	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian ²	Other
	Women (n = 1,546,217)				
Cohorts with large proportions of vegetarians					
Adventist Health Study-2	26,727 (63.3)	11,632 (27.6)	1,878 (4.5)	83 (0.20)	1,874 (4.4)
CARRS-1	-	-	-	6,372 (100) ³	-
CARRS-2	-	-	-	5,065 (100) ³	-
EPIC-Oxford	39,701 (96.0)	149 (0.36)	-	221 (0.53)	357 (0.86)
Oxford Vegetarian Study	6,480 (100) ³	-	-	-	-
Tzu Chi Health Study	-	-	-	3,329 (100) ³	-
UK Women's Cohort Study	28,953 (96.0)	41 (0.14)	-	165 (0.55)	179 (0.59)
Very large cohorts					
China Kadoorie Biobank	-	-	-	300,909 (100) ³	-
Million Women Study	627,121 (98.1)	1,112 (0.17)	-	1,814 (0.28)	2,004 (0.31)
NIH-AARP	194,213 (90.0)	11,280 (5.2)	3,917 (1.8)	2,355 (1.1)	960 (0.44)
UK Biobank	240,675 (94.2)	4,492 (1.8)	-	5,336 (2.1)	4,220 (1.7)
All cohorts combined⁴	1,163,870 (75.3)	28,706 (1.9)	5,795 (0.37)	325,649 (21.1)	9,594 (0.62)
Men (n = 790,935)					
Cohorts with large proportions of vegetarians					
Adventist Health Study-2	15,763 (70.5)	4,671 (20.9)	888 (4.0)	79 (0.35)	960 (4.3)
CARRS-1	-	-	-	5,846 (100) ³	-
CARRS-2	-	-	-	4,465 (100) ³	-
EPIC-Oxford	11,845 (95.4)	32 (0.26)	-	102 (0.82)	171 (1.4)
Oxford Vegetarian Study	4,047 (100) ³	-	-	-	-
Tzu Chi Health Study	-	-	-	2,191 (100) ³	-
Very large cohorts					
China Kadoorie Biobank	-	-	-	209,236 (100) ³	-
NIH-AARP	290,102 (93.0)	7,786 (2.5)	5,618 (1.8)	3,915 (1.3)	1,069 (0.34)
UK Biobank	205,686 (94.1)	3,251 (1.5)	-	5,713 (2.6)	2,986 (1.4)
All cohorts combined⁴	527,443 (66.7)	15,740 (2.0)	6,506 (0.82)	231,547 (29.3)	5,186 (0.66)

Abbreviations: CARRS, Centre for cArdiometabolic Risk Reduction in South Asia; EPIC, European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition; NIH-AARP, National Institutes of Health-AARP Diet and Health Study.

¹Values are N (%).

²Asian in CARRS-1 and CARRS-2 refers to South Asians, while Asian in China Kadoorie Biobank and Tzu Chi Health Study refers to East Asians.

³All participants in CARRS-1, CARRS-2, China Kadoorie Biobank and Tzu Chi Health Study were considered to be Asians and all participants in the Oxford Vegetarian Study were considered to be White Europeans.

⁴These numbers do not add up to the total number stated above because some participants have missing ethnicity data which is not shown in this table.

“-” indicates that no information was available for this ethnic group in the specified cohort.

Table 6. Women-specific characteristics by cohort (n = 1,546,217)¹.

Cohort	Age at menarche ≤12 years	Parous	Age at first birth ≥25 years	Postmenopausal	Age at menopause ≥50 years ²	Ever used oral contraceptive	Ever used HRT
<i>Cohorts with large proportions of vegetarians</i>							
Adventist Health Study-2	51.4	83.1	31.7	77.0	64.5	58.8	39.4
CARRS-1	12.2	94.1	-	36.9	19.7	3.5	-
CARRS-2	12.9	93.8	-	41.9	23.4	6.9	-
EPIC-Oxford	39.8	61.0	38.2	40.2	54.8	73.7	18.2
Oxford Vegetarian Study	-	47.5	29.4	26.6	-	55.3	-
Tzu Chi Health Study	8.6	91.8	-	63.0	54.2	15.7	19.6
UK Women's Cohort Study	41.6	77.2	44.8	60.9	48.0	66.9	27.2
<i>Very large cohorts</i>							
China Kadoorie Biobank	5.5	98.7	32.5	57.2	43.1	9.8	-
Million Women Study	38.8	88.4	36.4	100	56.8	61.3	53.4
NIH-AARP	48.6	83.7	23.5	100	39.6	34.5	52.9
UK Biobank	37.6	81.2	47.1	77.8	63.3	81.1	37.7
All cohorts combined	33.5	87.3	35.3	84.2	52.1	50.6	37.8

Abbreviations: CARRS, Centre for cArdiometabolic Risk Reduction in South Asia; HRT, hormone replacement therapy; EPIC, European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition; NIH-AARP, National Institutes of Health-AARP Diet and Health Study.

¹Values are % of women within cohort.

²Postmenopausal women only.

“-” indicates that no information was available for this variable in the specified cohort.

Table 7. Food intakes in all vegetarians combined (not including vegans)¹ by cohort (n = 81,165)².

Cohort	Plant foods, g/day						
	Refined grains	Wholegrains	Total vegetables	Legumes	Fresh fruit	Nuts and seeds	Sweets, preserves, cakes & confectionery
<i>Cohorts with large proportions of vegetarians</i>							
Adventist Health Study-2	83.3 (77.5)	176.1 (129.4)	304.9 (194.6)	93.1 (82.8)	332.7 (256.8)	26.2 (24.8)	17.4 (23.8)
CARRS-1	219.4 (230.8)	126.9 (89.7)	449.0 (202.8)	136.1 (111.5)	66.1 (88.7)	6.9 (9.6)	49.0 (49.4)
CARRS-2	201.7 (339.4)	178.0 (122.0)	406.4 (224.7)	137.2 (107.9)	100.0 (128.5)	4.1 (24.1)	21.6 (36.7)
EPIC-Oxford	99.8 (70.4)	113.8 (77.5)	272.9 (148.9)	74.9 (52.2)	276.4 (221.2)	9.5 (14.2)	68.6 (54.2)
Oxford Vegetarian Study	116.8 (66.9)	29.5 (24.8)	120.1 (57.3)	81.7 (44.3)	85.8 (34.0)	19.6 (16.3)	31.8 (25.7)
Tzu Chi Health Study	347.7 (244.9)	66.4 (74.6)	519.9 (347.1)	20.2 (36.0)	154.9 (147.2)	5.6 (11.4)	11.1 (18.9)
UK Women's Cohort Study	93.4 (69.9)	101.5 (74.8)	280.9 (141.5)	93.8 (56.2)	345.4 (250.4)	12.0 (15.1)	65.1 (51.9)
<i>Very large cohorts</i>							
China Kadoorie Biobank ³	242.3 (43.3)	89.9 (66.7)	235.6 (10.1)	-	65.0 (27.0)	-	-
Million Women Study	111.9 (65.6)	99.3 (64.2)	134.7 (90.6)	23.8 (20.8)	356.5 (220.2)	11.0 (15.5)	39.1 (41.1)
NIH-AARP	132.4 (99.3)	90.1 (101.2)	471.4 (317.4)	74.2 (84.4)	494.2 (389.9)	10.6 (18.7)	32.6 (38.2)
UK Biobank ³	142.2 (16.6)	90.6 (27.7)	210.5 (48.6)	-	207.2 (88.4)	-	-
Cohort	Plant foods, g/day			Animal foods, g/day			
	Plant milks	Sugar sweetened beverages	Total dairy products ⁴	Dairy milk	Cheese	Yogurt	Eggs & egg dishes
<i>Cohorts with large proportions of vegetarians</i>							
Adventist Health Study-2	115.8 (161.2)	76.3 (222.6)	104.6 (178.8)	66.9 (157.0)	15.6 (24.2)	22.1 (49.1)	7.8 (13.5)
CARRS-1	-	53.5 (60.5)	217.3 (135.2)	-	-	-	4.3 (9.8)
CARRS-2	-	19.0 (41.9)	229.0 (190.8)	143.8 (157.5)	-	85.2 (90.3)	3.9 (16.1)
EPIC-Oxford	32.4 (97.8)	94.7 (168.1)	376.0 (240.8)	256.6 (203.7)	30.1 (25.2)	33.8 (41.3)	10.6 (12.1)
Oxford Vegetarian Study	-	-	160.0 (109.6)	113.8 (103.2)	46.2 (27.1)	-	25.7 (21.6)
Tzu Chi Health Study	85.7 (126.9)	13.5 (76.3)	42.6 (68.8)	33.0 (56.5)	1.1 (3.6)	8.7 (32.5)	16.4 (16.7)
UK Women's Cohort Study	24.7 (89.2)	54.0 (120.6)	366.4 (227.0)	253.1 (199.6)	34.8 (31.1)	57.1 (69.0)	14.7 (15.4)
<i>Very large cohorts</i>							
China Kadoorie Biobank ³	-	-	38.9 (32.3)	-	-	-	33.0 (9.5)
Million Women Study	24.1 (60.2)	101.2 (216.9)	345.9 (214.0)	223.8 (186.3)	31.1 (21.5)	81.0 (78.6)	15.9 (14.8)
NIH-AARP	-	609.6 (977.4)	302.7 (390.2)	195.6 (360.6)	9.1 (13.7)	33.3 (64.5)	5.3 (11.3)
UK Biobank ³	-	-	-	-	18.3 (6.1)	-	-

Abbreviations: CARRS, Centre for cArdiometabolic Risk Reduction in South Asia; EPIC, European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition; NIH-AARP, National Institutes of Health-AARP Diet and Health Study.

¹All vegetarians include lacto-ovo, lacto and ovo vegetarians.

²Values are mean (SD).

³Mean intakes assessed at resurvey have been assigned to baseline categories based on quintiles of intakes to estimate the baseline intakes.

⁴Total dairy products include dairy milk, cheese, yogurt and other dairy products if available in the specified cohort.

“-” indicates that no information was available for this food group in the specified cohort.

Table 8. Percentage of participants with a university degree or equivalent by main diet groups and cohort¹.

Cohort	Meat eaters	Poultry eaters	Pescatarians	All vegetarians ²	Vegans
<i>Cohorts with large proportions of vegetarians</i>					
Adventist Health Study-2	43.7	49.3	53.1	60.5	53.1
CARRS-1	13.6	14.6	16.1	33.6	20.6
CARRS-2	15.1	18.0	11.4	34.3	13.0
EPIC-Oxford	36.8	43.3	50.4	47.5	45.5
Oxford Vegetarian Study ³	11.9	-	8.4	8.8	6.9
Tzu Chi Health Study	29.9	24.2	22.8	20.0	15.9
UK Women's Cohort Study	20.9	26.7	34.3	33.0	34.4
<i>Very large cohorts</i>					
China Kadoorie Biobank	6.0	6.1	7.6	0.80	0.33
Million Women Study	16.3	20.3	28.6	29.5	46.8
NIH-AARP	61.1	69.7	73.7	79.7	81.4
UK Biobank	58.8	60.8	74.9	70.6	71.0
All cohorts combined	33.8	55.7	47.8	39.4	30.7

Abbreviations: CARRS, Centre for cArdiometabolic Risk Reduction in South Asia; EPIC, European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition; NIH-AARP, National Institutes of Health-American Association of Retired Persons Diet and Health Study.

¹Values are % within diet group in the specified cohort.

²All vegetarians include lacto-ovo, lacto and ovo vegetarians.

³In the Oxford Vegetarian Study, poultry eaters could not be determined as poultry intake was not assessed.

“-” indicates that no information was available for educational status in the specified cohort.

Table 9. Lifestyle factors by main diet groups and cohort.

Cohort	Meat eaters	Poultry eaters	Pescatarians	All vegetarians ¹	Vegans
Never smokers, %					
<i>Cohorts with large proportions of vegetarians</i>					
Adventist Health Study-2	71.7	80.2	82.9	87.9	83.6
CARRS-1	74.3	78.4	88.9	86.7	80.5
CARRS-2	81.6	84.7	91.0	89.1	89.4
EPIC-Oxford	57.1	61.7	59.2	63.0	61.8
Oxford Vegetarian Study ²	47.4	-	48.9	53.3	54.4
Tzu Chi Health Study	78.7	83.3	90.6	92.4	93.2
UK Women's Cohort Study	56.7	51.3	52.2	56.3	58.1
<i>Very large cohorts</i>					
China Kadoorie Biobank	61.4	68.7	74.1	70.7	74.2
Million Women Study	54.3	54.5	54.5	57.3	49.4
NIH-AARP	34.4	42.8	42.4	53.7	46.6
UK Biobank	54.4	59.3	56.8	64.3	55.8
All cohorts combined	51.8	55.4	59.8	69.3	74.8
Alcohol intake (g/day), mean (SD)					
<i>Cohorts with large proportions of vegetarians</i>					
Adventist Health Study-2	0.7 (2.9)	0.3 (1.7)	0.2 (1.6)	0.1 (1.0)	0.0 (0.5)
CARRS-1	-	-	-	-	-
CARRS-2	-	-	-	-	-
EPIC-Oxford	9.9 (12.9)	7.6 (9.5)	9.9 (12.3)	9.3 (12.6)	8.2 (13.3)
Oxford Vegetarian Study ²	11.3 (11.0)	-	8.3 (9.1)	6.9 (9.2)	5.6 (9.1)
Tzu Chi Health Study	1.8 (11.8)	0.3 (2.4)	0.5 (4.3)	0.1 (1.3)	0.4 (2.8)
UK Women's Cohort Study	9.1 (10.4)	7.2 (9.2)	8.7 (9.8)	7.3 (9.8)	6.4 (10.7)
<i>Very large cohorts</i>					
China Kadoorie Biobank	8.0 (23.7)	6.4 (22.8)	4.4 (16.3)	1.1 (8.7)	0.9 (9.2)
Million Women Study	6.0 (7.6)	4.7 (7.1)	5.7 (7.6)	4.7 (7.2)	4.3 (7.1)
NIH-AARP	11.4 (24.9)	5.4 (13.6)	5.8 (15.4)	3.7 (12.6)	3.8 (16.2)
UK Biobank	15.0 (19.3)	8.0 (12.0)	11.0 (14.3)	8.7 (14.7)	6.8 (12.6)
All cohorts combined	9.6 (19.3)	4.8 (12.1)	7.2 (11.0)	4.3 (9.4)	2.1 (8.4)
Highly active, %					
<i>Cohorts with large proportions of vegetarians</i>					
Adventist Health Study-2	38.1	45.3	48.0	46.9	51.2
CARRS-1	16.7	11.5	6.1	41.3	34.1
CARRS-2	2.5	2.2	1.2	1.1	1.9
EPIC-Oxford	10.1	14.6	15.5	15.3	21.4
Oxford Vegetarian Study	27.2	-	36.2	33.4	42.0
Tzu Chi Health Study	33.9	40.0	36.9	30.7	29.6
UK Women's Cohort Study	3.3	4.0	3.2	4.0	1.9
<i>Very large cohorts</i>					
China Kadoorie Biobank	33.4	28.8	19.6	33.5	36.0
Million Women Study	9.4	13.3	13.2	13.6	22.8
NIH-AARP	18.4	29.0	30.2	30.8	50.0
UK Biobank	18.6	23.9	21.0	19.1	23.7
All cohorts combined	33.0	30.8	32.1	31.3	38.6

Abbreviations: CARRS, Centre for cArdiometabolic Risk Reduction in South Asia; EPIC, European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition; NIH-AARP, National Institutes of Health-AARP Diet and Health Study.

¹All vegetarians include lacto-ovo, lacto and ovo vegetarians.

² In the Oxford Vegetarian Study, poultry eaters could not be determined as poultry intake was not assessed.

“-” indicates that no information was available for this variable in the specified cohort.




Figure 1. Mean (95% CI) total red and processed meat intake among meat eaters by cohort.

Abbreviations: CARRS, Centre for cArdiometabolic Risk Reduction in South Asia; EPIC, European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition; NIH-AARP, National Institutes of Health-American Association of Retired Persons Diet and Health Study.




Figure 2. Mean (95% CI) intakes of (A) total vegetables and (B) fruit in meat eaters versus vegetarians (including vegans) by cohort. Abbreviations: CARRS, Centre for cArdiometabolic Risk Reduction in South Asia; EPIC, European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition; NIH-AARP, National Institutes of Health-American Association of Retired Persons Diet and Health Study.




Figure 3. Mean (95% CI) body mass index by diet group in (A) cohorts with large proportions of vegetarians and (B) very large cohorts. Abbreviations: CARRS, Centre for cArdiometabolic Risk Reduction in South Asia; EPIC, European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition; NIH-AARP, National Institutes of Health-AARP Diet and Health Study. All vegetarians include lacto-ovo, lacto and ovo vegetarians. In the Oxford Vegetarian Study, poultry eaters could not be determined as poultry intake was not assessed.