

1 **The EAT-Lancet Planetary Health Diet: Impact on Cardiovascular Disease and the**
2 **Environment in the EPIC Cohort**

3

4 Chiara Colizzi¹, Joline WJ Beulens^{1,2,3,4}, Reina E Vellinga⁵, Krasimira Aleksandrova⁶, Christina C
5 Dahm⁷, Inge Huybrechts⁸, Timothy J Key⁹, Jessica E Laine¹⁰, Keren Papier⁹, Paolo Vineis¹¹, Elisabete
6 Weiderpass⁸, Claudia Agnoli¹², Jeroen Berden^{8,13}, Paolo Chiodini¹⁴, Jytte Halkjer¹⁵, Alicia Heath¹⁶,
7 Verena Katzke¹⁷, Giovanna Masala¹⁸, Olatz Mokoroa^{19,20}, Conchi Moreno-Iribas^{21,22,23}, Genevieve
8 Nicolas⁸, Daniele Rodriguez-Palacios^{24,25}, Carlotta Sacerdote²⁶, Maria-Jose Sanchez^{22,27,28}, Matthias B.
9 Schulze^{29,30}, Anne Tjønneland^{15,31}, W.M.Monique Verschuren^{1,5}, Yvonne T van der Schouw¹

10

11

12

13 ¹ Department of Global Public Health and Bioethics, Julius Center for Health Sciences and Primary
14 Care, University Medical Center Utrecht, Utrecht University, Utrecht, The Netherlands

15 ² Amsterdam UMC location Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Epidemiology and Data Science,
16 Amsterdam, the Netherlands

17 ³ Amsterdam Public Health, Amsterdam, the Netherlands

18 ⁴ Upstream Team, www.upstreamteam.nl, Amsterdam UMC, Amsterdam, the Netherlands

19 ⁵ Public Health and Health Services, Center for Prevention, Lifestyle and Health, Department Healthy
20 and Sustainable Nutrition, National Institute for Public Health and the Environment, Bilthoven, The
21 Netherlands

22 ⁶ Department of Epidemiological Methods and Etiologic Research, Leibniz Institute for Prevention
23 Research and Epidemiology, Bremen, Germany

24 ⁷ Uddannelsesleder for Den Sundhedsfaglige Kandidatuddannelse, Department of Public Health,
25 Aarhus University, Denmark

26 ⁸ Nutrition and Metabolism Branch, International Agency for Research on Cancer, Lyon, Rhône-
27 Alpes, France

28 ⁹ Cancer Epidemiology Unit, Nuffield Department of Population Health, University of
29 Oxford, Oxford, UK

30 ¹⁰ Institute of Social and Preventive Medicine (ISPM), University of Bern, Switzerland

31 ¹¹ MRC Centre for Environment and Health, School of Public Health, Imperial College London,
32 London, UK

33 ¹² Epidemiology and Prevention Unit, Fondazione IRCCS Istituto Nazionale dei Tumori, Milano, Italy

34 ¹³ Department of Food Technology, Safety and Health, Faculty of Bioscience Engineering, Ghent
35 University, Ghent, Belgium

36 ¹⁴ Department of Mental and Physical Health and Preventive Medicine, University of Naples
37 "L.Vanvitelli", Napoli, Italy

38 ¹⁵ Danish Cancer Institute, Copenhagen, Denmark

39 ¹⁶ Cancer Epidemiology and Prevention Research Unit, School of Public Health, Imperial College
40 London, London, UK

41 ¹⁷ Division of Cancer Epidemiology, Nutritional Epidemiology, German Cancer Research Center
42 (DKFZ), Heidelberg, Germany.

43 ¹⁸ Clinical Epidemiology Unit, Institute for Cancer Research, Prevention and Clinical Network
44 (ISPRO), Firenze, Italy

45 ¹⁹ Ministry of Health of the Basque Government, Sub Directorate for Public Health and Addictions of
46 Gipuzkoa, San Sebastian, Spain

47 ²⁰ BioGipuzkoa (BioDonostia) Health Research Institute, Epidemiology of Chronic and
48 Communicable Diseases Group, San Sebastián, Spain

49 ²¹ Instituto de Salud Pública y Laboral de Navarra, Pamplona, Spain

50 ²² Centro de Investigación Biomédica en Red de Epidemiología y Salud Pública (CIBERESP), Madrid,
51 Spain

52 ²³ Navarra Institute for Health Research, Navarra, Spain

53 ²⁴ Department of Epidemiology, Murcia Regional Health Council-IMIB, Murcia, Spain

54 ²⁵ CIBER Epidemiología y Salud Pública (CIBERESP), Madrid, Spain.

55 ²⁶ Department of Health Sciences, University of Eastern Piedmont, Novara, Italy.

56 ²⁷ Escuela Andaluza de Salud Pública (EASP), Granada, Spain

57 ²⁸ Instituto de Investigación Biosanitaria ibs.GRANADA, Granada, Spain.

58 ²⁹ Department of Molecular Epidemiology, German Institute of Human Nutrition Potsdam-
59 Rehbruecke, Nuthetal, Germany

60 ³⁰ Institute of Nutritional Science, University of Potsdam, Nuthetal, Germany

61 ³¹ Department of Public Health, University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark

62

63

64

65

66

67

68

69 **Corresponding author:**

70 Yvonne T van der Schouw

71 Julius Center for Health Sciences and Primary Care, UMC Utrecht

72 P.O. Box 85500, 3508 GA Utrecht, The Netherlands

73 Phone: +31 31 11 86 68

74 E-mail: y.t.vanderschouw@umcutrecht.nl

75

76 **Abstract**

77 **Background:** Diet plays an important role in the development of cardiovascular diseases and in
78 maintaining sustainable planetary boundaries. The EAT-Lancet Planetary Health Diet could
79 potentially provide co-benefits for human and environmental health, yet evidence on the association
80 between adherence to the EAT-Lancet Planetary Health Diet and risk of cardiovascular events and
81 environmental impact is limited.

82 **Methods:** We investigated the association between adherence to the EAT-Lancet diet and coronary
83 heart disease (CHD) and stroke risk, and with greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, land use, and dietary
84 species richness (DSR). We included 364,745 adult men and women participating in the European
85 Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition (EPIC) study. Food frequency questionnaires were
86 used to create a score reflecting adherence to the EAT-Lancet diet (EAT-Lancet diet-score), ranging
87 from 0 (no adherence) to 140 (complete adherence). A (pro-) vegetarian version of the score, the EAT-
88 Lancet dietVV-score, was also created, which rewarded low to no consumption of all animal-based
89 foods. Cox proportional hazard regressions were used to study the association of adherence to the
90 EAT-Lancet diet with CHD and stroke incidence. Linear regression analyzed the association with
91 GHG emissions, land use, and DSR.

92 **Findings:** Over a median follow-up of 12.8 years, we identified 12,690 CHD and 7,088 stroke cases.
93 After multivariable adjustment, those most adherent to the EAT-Lancet diet had lower risk of incident
94 stroke (HR_{Q5vsQ1} : 0.59, 95%CI = 0.54 to 0.64), and of incident CHD for those younger than 60 years
95 old at baseline (HR_{Q5vsQ1} : 0.86, 95%CI = 0.79 to 0.93). High adherence to the EAT-Lancet diet
96 reduced GHG emissions by 1.7% (95%CI = -1.9 to -1.5) and land use by 6.2% (95%CI = -6.4 to -5.9).
97 The EAT-Lancet dietVV-score further reduced GHG emissions and land use by 14.3% (95%CI = -14.5
98 to -14.0) and 18.8% (95%CI = -19.0 to -18.5), respectively, when comparing extreme quintiles, while
99 hazard ratios for CHD and stroke remained unchanged. Those most adherent to the EAT-Lancet diet
100 consumed 16.1% (95%CI = 15.9 to 16.4) more plant species and 19.7% (95%CI = -20.11 to -19.40)
101 fewer animal species.

102 **Interpretation:** Higher adherence to the EAT-Lancet diet was associated with co-benefits for both
103 cardiovascular outcomes and environmental indicators, including dietary species richness. Lower
104 GHG emissions and land use were achieved by further reducing consumption of animal-based
105 products.

106 **Funding:** The coordination of EPIC-Europe is financially supported by the International Agency for
107 Research on Cancer (IARC) and also by the Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, School of
108 Public Health, Imperial College London which has additional infrastructure support provided by the
109 NIHR Imperial Biomedical Research Centre (BRC). Exposure indicators were calculated with
110 financial support of the Wereld Kanker Onderzoek Fonds (WKOF), as part of the World Cancer
111 Research Fund International grant programme (IIG_FULL_2020_034).

112

113

114

115

116

117

118 **Research in context**

119 **Evidence before this study**

120 The authors considered all evidence available to them on the EAT-Lancet Planetary Health Diet,
121 published up until May 2024. The authors searched for relevant articles on the association between
122 adherence to the diet and cardiovascular outcomes and environmental indicators. Studies investigating
123 the association between the diet and outcomes not of interest in this study were not considered. We
124 restricted to evidence from prospective cohort studies with similar analyses and methodology, thereby
125 excluding studies modelling the environmental impact. We found two research articles that explored
126 the association of EAT-Lancet Planetary Health Diet with both cardiovascular outcomes and
127 environmental impact, four that only assessed the association with cardiovascular outcomes, and three
128 only focused on environmental indicators. We found no studies on the association between adherence
129 to the EAT-Lancet Planetary Health Diet and food biodiversity. These studies spanned across varied
130 population groups, focused on different cardiovascular endpoints and reported inconclusive evidence.
131 This also streams from the use of different scores and indices to measure adherence to the EAT-Lancet
132 Planetary Health Diet, which strongly influences evidence on risk estimates. Similarly, evidence on
133 greenhouses gas emissions and land use are hindered by the use of different methodologies to
134 calculate the associated environmental impact of foods and beverages.

135 **Added value of this study**

136 This study benefits from the use of a large pan-European cohort, which used a standardized nutrient
137 and food database to determine individual dietary intake, as well as environmental data derived by
138 Life Cycle Assessment analyses validated at the European level. The use of two diet scores—one
139 representing an omnivorous version of the EAT-Lancet Planetary Health Diet (EAT-Lancet diet-score)
140 and the other representing a plant-based variation (EAT-Lancet dietVV-score) —demonstrates that
141 greater environmental benefits can be achieved with the EAT-Lancet dietVV-score by further
142 restricting consumption of animal-based products, without impacting the benefits on human health.
143 The study adds to the current evidence on the impact of the EAT-Lancet Planetary Health Diet on both
144 cardiovascular health and environmental well-being, and additionally supports evidence of an
145 association between adherence to the EAT-Lancet Planetary Health Diet and food biodiversity. The
146 association with food biodiversity adds an important complementary measure of health and
147 sustainability to the current body of evidence on co-benefits of the EAT-Lancet Planetary Health Diet.

148 **Implications of all the available evidence**

149 Our findings substantiate the co-benefits of adherence to the EAT-Lancet Planetary Health Diet found
150 in previous studies for cardiovascular health and environmental indicators, with evidence from a large
151 pan-European population-based study. This research study found evidence that adherence to the EAT-
152 Lancet diet was associated with lower risk of stroke across the whole population and with lower risk
153 of CHD among those younger than 60 years old. This study also highlights the impact of the ways in
154 which we operationalise adherence to the EAT-Lancet Planetary Health Diet, emphasizing its
155 importance for comparing studies and developing national policies.

156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168

169
170

171 **Introduction**

172

173 Our current food production processes put high pressure on environmental resources, with agriculture
174 taking up more than 43% of habitable land and contributing to 26% of global greenhouse gas (GHG)
175 emissions, resulting in profound adverse effects on biodiversity and resilience of ecosystems^{1,2}. At the
176 same time, the United Nations estimates that the world population will continue to grow from 7.7
177 billion people in 2019 to 9.7 billion people in 2050³. Addressing the nutritional needs of this
178 expanding world population while ensuring access to adequate and healthy diets is therefore becoming
179 an increasing global concern.

180 In response to this challenge, the EAT-Lancet Commission on Healthy Diets From Sustainable Food
181 Systems proposed the Planetary Health diet (EAT-Lancet diet)⁴. The EAT-Lancet diet is a universal
182 diet emphasizing intake of plant-based foods and suggesting a limited intake of animal-sourced foods
183 and starchy vegetables. The EAT-Lancet diet Commission has estimated that global adoption of the
184 EAT-Lancet diet would prevent 10.8 to 11.6 million deaths per year, equaling 19-24% of total deaths
185 among adults. Simultaneously, adherence to the EAT-Lancet diet would aid in keeping within the
186 earth's food production boundaries with regard to environmental resources, although the Commission
187 estimates that other measures, such as reducing food waste and improving production practices, are
188 needed as well⁴.

189 The health and environmental effects have been modelled by the EAT-Lancet diet Commission, yet
190 empirical evidence from population-based cohort studies is still scarce. Both coronary heart disease
191 (CHD) and stroke are important drivers of mortality, accounting for 5.3 million and 5.5 million annual
192 deaths, respectively, and dietary factors have been attributed to a higher risk of both diseases.^{5,6} Five
193 studies have explored the association of the EAT-Lancet diet with risk of CHD and stroke, showing
194 inconsistent findings⁷⁻¹¹, which may be partly due to the heterogenous use of scoring systems^{12,13}.
195 Because the EAT-Lancet proposed diet is meant to be healthy and sustainable, it is also essential to
196 assess the environmental impact of the diet, by using two gold-standard indicators of sustainability,
197 GHG emissions and land use. However, current evidence on the environmental impact of the EAT-
198 Lancet diet remains fragmented and dependent on the methodology used to assess environmental
199 impact^{9,14,15}.

200 Additionally, increasing food biodiversity is a strategy that co-benefits human nutrition and
201 environmental well-being. Indeed, studies have found that increasing diversity in someone's diet leads
202 to a greater probability of eating a wide range of (potentially) nutritious and healthy foods¹⁶⁻¹⁸. At the
203 same time, increasing food biodiversity helps minimize the risk of ecosystems being disrupted by
204 overconsumption of one single species¹⁷⁻¹⁹. Dietary species richness (DSR) is the sum of the number
205 of species consumed per day on average, and is a measure of food biodiversity²⁰. Thus, assessing the
206 species richness associated with the EAT-Lancet diet provides us with the opportunity to add a
207 complementary dimension in the association of the EAT-Lancet diet with human and environmental
208 health that has not been previously explored. Therefore, this research aims at studying the adherence
209 to the EAT-Lancet diet in a pan-European study and its association with cardiovascular events,
210 indicators of environmental impact, and food biodiversity.

211 **Methods**

212 *Study population*

213 We used data from the European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition (EPIC-Europe)
214 study: an ongoing prospective cohort study of 521,323 men and women aged between 25 to 70 years
215 at baseline between 1992 and 2000 from 23 centers across 10 European countries. For the present
216 analysis we used data from Italy, Spain, the United Kingdom (UK), the Netherlands, Germany,
217 Denmark, and Sweden, and excluded participants from Greece (n=28,561) and Norway (n=36,442)
218 due to an unresolved data protection regulation issue and participants from France due to
219 inconsistencies in the outcome definition with the other EPIC-centers (n=74,523). We further excluded
220 participants with missing diet assessment data (n=6,310), and those with implausible energy intakes

221 defined as being in the top and bottom 1% of the distribution of the ratio of energy intake over
222 estimated energy requirement (n=8,196). Additionally excluding participants with prevalent CHD or
223 stroke at baseline (n=2,546) resulted in an analytical sample of 364,745 participants (**Supplemental**
224 **Figure 1**).

225 Most centers recruited participants from the general population, with a few exceptions. First,
226 participants from the centers in Utrecht (Netherlands) and Florence (Italy) were recruited through a
227 population-based breast cancer screening program. Second, participants from some of the Spanish and
228 Italian centers were recruited from local blood donor associations. In Oxford (UK), half of the cohort
229 was recruited among (lacto-ovo) vegetarian and vegan individuals, thereby representing a generally
230 'health-conscious' cohort. The cohorts in Utrecht (Netherlands) and Naples (Italy) only included
231 women. Detailed information on the rationale and design of EPIC has been described previously^{21,22}.
232 The EPIC study was approved by the Ethical Review Boards of the International Agency for Research
233 on Cancer (IARC) and the Institutional Review Board of each participating EPIC center.

234 *Diet assessment*

235 At baseline, habitual dietary intake over the past 12 months was assessed using country-specific
236 validated dietary questionnaires. Most centers used a validated (semi-)quantitative food frequency
237 questionnaire (FFQ), although a combination of dietary assessment methods was used in Malmö
238 (Sweden). Nutrient and food intakes were derived through the standardized EPIC Nutrient Database,
239 which contains over 11,000 food and beverage items²³.

240 Dietary intake assessments were used to calculate adherence to the EAT-Lancet diet. The EAT-Lancet
241 diet score was constructed as described by Colizzi et al.⁹. This proportional scoring method has been
242 found to reflect well adherence to the EAT-Lancet diet recommendations and was preferred over
243 binary-style scoring methods in a recent systematic review²⁴. Participants were assigned a
244 proportional score ranging between 0-10 points for each dietary recommendation in the EAT-Lancet
245 diet, totaling to a score between 0 (no adherence) and 140 points (complete adherence). The
246 methodology of the scoring was informed by the Dutch Healthy Diet 2015 index distinguishing
247 adequacy, moderation, optimum and ratio components (**Supplemental Figure 2**)²⁵. The dietary
248 recommendations for the food groups in the EAT-Lancet diet are based on intakes of 2500 kcal per
249 day for both men and women⁴. As energy requirements for women are lower, we re-calculated the
250 food group recommendations to 2000 kcal/day for women (except for the ratio-component and fiber
251 intake, since we deemed these to be energy-independent).

252 The scoring approach is shown in **Supplemental Table 1** and described in detail elsewhere⁹. In brief,
253 all recommendations were scored proportionally from 0-10 as an adequacy (whole grains, fruit,
254 vegetables, non-soy legumes, soy foods), optimum (dairy, starchy vegetables, chicken and other
255 poultry, eggs, and fish), moderation (red and processed meat, sweets), or ratio component (unsaturated
256 and saturated fats)⁹. For this study, two sub-components were created for the recommendation on
257 whole grains (including rice, wheat, corn and other grains). As information on type of cereal (e.g.,
258 wholegrain) was not available, fiber intake was used as an indicator of wholegrain consumption. This
259 sub-component was scored as an adequacy component, with participants being assigned 5 points if
260 they had an intake equaling or larger than 30g of fiber per day, 0 points for no consumption, and a
261 proportional score for intermediate intakes. The second subcomponent reflected the recommendation
262 to limit consumption of (dry) grains to 232g/day, equaling to 464g in converted wet weight²⁶, for
263 which participants were assigned 5 points or 0 points, for meeting or not meeting the recommendation,
264 respectively.

265 In the original scoring approach, consumption of selected animal-sourced foods (whole milk or
266 derivative equivalents, chicken and other poultry, eggs, and fish) was scored as optimum components
267 and assigned zero points or a proportionally increasing score, respectively for no or low intake and 10
268 points for the optimum intake⁹. In order to reflect adherence among those eating (pro) vegetarian and
269 vegan diets, we also constructed an alternative score, for which dairy, chicken, eggs, and fish were
270 scored as moderation components, meaning those participants with no or low intakes of animal-
271 sourced foods were assigned 10 points. We refer to this alternative score as the EAT-Lancet dietVV-
272 score.

273

274 *Cardiovascular events ascertainment*

275 Incident CHD was defined as any first fatal or non-fatal CHD event, which was a composite
276 myocardial infarction (International Classification of Diseases, 10th Revision (ICD-10) codes I21,
277 I22), angina (ICD-10 code I20) and other types of acute or chronic ischemic heart diseases (ICD-10
278 codes I23, I24, I25). Incident stroke was defined as any first fatal or non-fatal stroke event, which was
279 a composite of hemorrhagic stroke (I60-I61), ischemic stroke (I63), unclassified stroke (I64), and
280 other acute cerebrovascular events (I62, I65-69, F01). Fatal outcome events were generally ascertained
281 through linkage with death registries. Non-fatal outcome events were ascertained through a variety of
282 methods across centers, including follow-up questionnaires or linkage with morbidity/hospital
283 registries.

284

285 *Environmental impact assessment*

286 Environmental impact of adhering to the EAT-Lancet diet was measured via two indicators, GHG
287 emissions and land use. The GHG emissions and land use associated with each food and drink
288 measured via the dietary intake assessments were calculated using SHARP Indicator Database
289 (SHARP-ID). More details on this database can be found elsewhere²⁷. Briefly, SHARP-ID uses life
290 cycle analyses to calculate the GHG emissions and land use of 994 food items coded with a unique
291 FoodEx2-code from the FoodEx2 Exposure Hierarchy of the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA)
292²⁸. Items included in the SHARP-ID are based on the reported food intake of four European countries
293 included in the SUSFANS project (2005-2008), i.e. Denmark, Czech Republic, Italy and France. The
294 database's system boundaries includes cradle to plate, excluding industrial food processing, storage,
295 and transport from local retailers to home. SHARP-ID applies economical allocation (based on
296 economic value) for all non- animal-sources food, whereas nitrogen content is used for animal-source
297 foods. For the present analysis, the environmental impact of each food group included in the EAT-
298 Lancet diet score was summed into two variables describing the GHG emissions and land use of the
299 diet.

300

301 *Food Biodiversity assessment*

302 In this study we use DSR as indicator of food biodiversity. DSR was measured as described by Lachat
303 et al.²⁰ and Hanley-Cook et al.¹⁷. Shortly, DSR is calculated by the sum of the number of all species
304 (both plant- and animal-based) consumed by each individual. For this cohort, DSR was calculated
305 using all unique biological species of all foods and drinks using the EFSA's Food-Ex2 food
306 classification system²⁸. Composite dishes were decomposed into single ingredients and then into
307 species. All food items eaten "never or less than once per month" were not included in the DSR. A
308 total of 108 species were included in the data. Quantities were not considered when calculating the
309 DSR, as irrelevant towards the overall count of species consumed¹⁷. The DSR results in a total count
310 of species consumed, expressed continuously. Additionally, species were split for further analyses into
311 DSR_{Plant} and DSR_{Animal} , representing respectively the total number of plant-based species and the total
312 amount of animal-based species. All food items that could not be uniquely identified with either a
313 plant or animal species were excluded from the total. These included food items such as mixed fats,
314 confectionary and cakes, alcoholic and non-alcoholic beverages, condiments and dressings.

315 *Assessment of other covariates*

316 Data on socio-demographic (age, sex), lifestyle and other factors were collected at baseline through
317 validated questionnaires²¹. Educational level was categorized into primary school,
318 technical/professional school, secondary school, and longer education (including university degree).
319 Alcohol intake was a continuous variable, measured in grams per day. Physical activity was assessed
320 through the Cambridge Physical Activity index, which captures occupational physical activity and
321 other physical exercise (e.g., cycling, walking), and was used to categorize participants as inactive,
322 moderately inactive, moderately active, and active. Smoking status was categorized into never, former,
323 and current smoking.

324 Body mass index (BMI) was calculated from measured height and weight, although for participants
325 from Norway and for some participants from France and the UK these data were self-reported. BMI

326 was categorized into healthy weight (<25 kg/m²), overweight (≥25 - <30 kg/m²), and obese (≥30
327 kg/m²). Waist circumference was measured either at the narrowest circumference of the torso or at the
328 midpoint between the lower ribs and the iliac crest. Hypertension, hyperlipidemia, and diabetes status
329 were self-reported.

330 *Statistical analysis*

331 Statistical analyses were conducted in R 4.2.3 and the α threshold for significance was set at P<0.05.
332 Baseline characteristics were presented across quintiles of EAT-Lancet diet-adherence and for the full
333 cohort. Normally distributed continuous variables were presented as means with standard deviations,
334 and skewed continuous variables were presented as medians and interquartile range (IQR). Categorical
335 variables were presented as counts and percentages. For some of these covariates there were missing
336 data (educational level n=15,317; physical activity n=7,220; smoking status n=2,999; waist
337 circumference n=61,571; hypertension n=71,536; hyperlipidemia n=109,366; diabetes status
338 n=34,648). These missings were imputed using multiple imputation methods²⁹. We used the R
339 package MICE³⁰, using 10 imputation sets and 10 burn-in iterations. The assumption of missing at
340 random (MAR) was checked before conducting multiple imputation. MICE *pool()* function was used
341 to combine results from the Cox proportional hazard regression analyses across the imputed
342 datasets using Rubin's rule^{29,30}.

343 Cox proportional hazard regression was used to evaluate the association between quintiles
344 of adherence to the EAT-Lancet diet-score and CHD and stroke incidence, with the lowest quintile as
345 reference. Additionally, associations were examined linearly with EAT-Lancet diet-scores modelled
346 per 10-point increment. Confounder adjustments were determined a priori and were informed by
347 literature. In model 1 we adjusted for age and sex; in model 2 we further adjusted for educational
348 level, smoking, alcohol consumption, physical activity, and energy intake. In model 3 we additionally
349 adjusted for cardiovascular risk factors, such as BMI, waist circumference, hypertension,
350 hyperlipidemia, and diabetes status. In this study, we consider model 3 to be the main model. All
351 models were stratified by EPIC study center. The proportional hazards assumption was tested using
352 the Schoenfeld test, indicating no violation of the assumption. Analyses were repeated for the EAT-
353 Lancet dietVV-score.

354 To examine whether associations were consistent across various subgroups, we tested for interaction
355 for levels of age, sex, educational level, and BMI. Interaction was tested by using a likelihood ratio
356 test (LRT) for a model with and without interaction term, for each imputed dataset. When the LRT
357 was statistically significant (p-value <0.05) for all imputation datasets, we conducted separate analyses
358 by subgroups. For this analysis, age was categorized in two groups, those younger than 60 years old
359 and those older than 60. Additionally, we carried out a number of sensitivity analyses. First, we
360 excluded the first 2 years of follow-up, as subclinical disease may have affected eating habits and have
361 induced reverse causation. Second, we excluded food group recommendations individually in order to
362 explore the food groups driving the association. Finally, we measured adherence to the EAT-Lancet
363 diet across countries and centers.

364 We used linear regression models to estimate the association between EAT-Lancet diet-adherence and
365 GHG emissions, land use, and DSR. GHG emissions and land use were calculated as the sum of the
366 associated environmental impact of all the food groups included in the EAT-Lancet diet. The lowest
367 quintile was used as reference. In model 1, we adjusted for age, sex, and energy intake, as informed by
368 the literature³¹⁻³³. Bootstrapping was used to estimate the percentage difference between Q1 and Q5
369 and its 95% CI. Additionally, the impact on GHG emissions, land use, and DSR was estimated using
370 the EAT-Lancet dietVV-score.

371 *Roles of the funding source*

372 The funders of the study did not play a role in data collection, data analysis, data interpretation,
373 writing of the manuscript, or the decision to submit for publication.

374

375 **Results**

376

377 *Baseline characteristics*

378 The EAT-Lancet diet-score in the population ranged from 10 to 120 and the mean was 64 (SD=15).
379 Participants generally scored most points on the recommendations for grains (rice, wheat and corn),
380 added fats, and dairy, and the least points on the recommendations for red meat, added sugar, legumes,
381 soy and nuts. Participants in Spain, UK, and Italy had the highest average EAT-Lancet diet-scores and
382 in Sweden, the Netherlands, and Germany the lowest (**Supplemental Table 2**). Participants in the
383 highest EAT-Lancet diet-adherence quintile were more likely to be female, non-smokers, had higher
384 total energy intake, lower alcohol consumption, and smaller waist circumference (**Table 1**).

385 *Association of EAT-Lancet diet-adherence with incident CHD*

386 After a median follow-up time of 12.8 years 12,690 cases of CHD occurred. High adherence to the
387 EAT-Lancet diet was not associated with a lower risk of incident CHD after adjustment for
388 cardiovascular risk factors (HR_{Q5vsQ1}: 0.98, 95%CI = 0.93 – 1.04; HR_{10-point increment}: 0.99, 95%CI = 0.98
389 – 1.01) (**Table 2**). However, in subgroup analysis (p-values for interaction <0.001), those younger
390 than 60 years old did show a modestly lower risk for CHD (HR_{Q5vsQ1}: 0.86, 95%CI = 0.79 – 0.93;
391 HR_{10-point increment}: 0.96, 95% CI = 0.94 – 0.98), while those older than 60 had a higher risk of CHD
392 (HR_{Q5vsQ1}: 1.16, 95%CI = 1.06 – 1.26; HR_{10-point increment}: 1.03, 95%CI = 1.01 – 1.05) (**Supplemental**
393 **Figure 3**). There were no differences in subgroups by sex, educational level, or BMI. When exploring
394 the association of the EAT-Lancet dietVV-score with CHD risk, the association was comparable to the
395 original EAT-Lancet score, which still includes animal products scored with an optimum component
396 (**Table 3**). Neither exclusion of cases in the first two years of follow-up (**Supplemental Table 3**) nor
397 the exclusion of each dietary score component from the EAT-Lancet score (**Supplemental Table 4**)
398 altered our findings.

399 *Association of EAT-Lancet diet-adherence with incident stroke*

400 After a median follow-up time of 12.7 years 7,088 cases of stroke occurred. High adherence to the
401 EAT-Lancet diet was associated with a lower risk of incident stroke after adjustment for
402 cardiovascular risk factors (HR_{Q5vsQ1}: 0.59, 95%CI = 0.54 – 0.64; HR_{10-point increment}: 0.88, 95%CI = 0.86
403 – 0.89) (**Table 2**). The association of EAT-Lancet diet-adherence with incident stroke was slightly
404 stronger in the subgroup analysis by age (p-values for interaction <0.001), with those aged 60 years or
405 younger (HR_{Q5vsQ1}: 0.55, 95%CI = 0.49 – 0.61; HR_{10-point increment}: 0.86, 95%CI = 0.84 – 0.88) having a
406 lower risk of stroke than those older than 60 years, (HR_{Q5vsQ1}: 0.65, 95%CI = 0.58 – 0.73; HR_{10-point}
407 _{increment}: 0.90, 95%CI = 0.88 – 0.92). A stronger association was also found for males (HR_{males},
408 HR_{Q5vsQ1}: 0.54, 95%CI = 0.48 – 0.61; HR_{10-point increment}: 0.85, 95%CI = 0.83 – 0.87), compared to
409 females (HR_{females}, HR_{Q5vsQ1}: 0.67, 95%CI = 0.60 – 0.76; HR_{10-point increment}: 0.91, 95%CI = 0.89 – 0.93)
410 (p-values for interaction <0.05). (**Supplemental Figure 4**). No differences were found for subgroups
411 of educational level and BMI.

412 When exploring the association of the EAT-Lancet dietVV-score with stroke risk, HRs attenuated
413 slightly (HR_{Q5vsQ1}: 0.60, 95%CI = 0.55 – 0.65; HR_{10-point increment}: 0.87, 95%CI = 0.85 – 0.88) (**Table 3**).
414 Exclusion of cases in the first two years of follow-up did not alter findings (**Supplemental Table 3**).
415 When excluding single components of the EAT-Lancet diet, the association was attenuated to almost
416 the null when excluding fruit (HR_{10-point increment}: 0.99, 95%CI = 0.99 – 0.99), and became slightly more
417 inverse when excluding added fats (HR_{10-point increment}: 0.85, 95%CI = 0.84 – 0.87) (**Supplemental**
418 **Table 4**).

419 *Association of EAT-Lancet diet-adherence with environmental indicators*

420 The EAT-Lancet diet-related greenhouse gas emissions in the population were on average 4.62 kg
421 CO₂-eq, ranging between 0.03 to 27.55 kg CO₂-eq, and land use was 6.1 m² per year on average, with
422 a range between 0.03 and 45.89 m² per year. In the adjusted models, adherence to the EAT-Lancet diet
423 was associated with lower GHG emissions (β_{Q5vsQ1} : -0.08 kg CO₂-eq, 95%CI = -0.09 – -0.07), and
424 lower land use (β_{Q5vsQ1} : -0.38 m² per year, 95%CI = -0.39 – -0.36) (Table 4). This translated to 1.7%
425 (95%CI = -1.9 – -1.5) and 6.2% (95%CI = -6.4 – -5.9) lower GHG emission and land use,
426 respectively, between the highest and lowest quintiles of adherence.

427 Lower levels of both GHG emissions and land use were found when using the adjusted EAT-Lancet
428 dietVV-score, which rewards no to very low consumption of any animal product (**Table 4**). Further
429 restriction of consumption of meat and animal derivatives was associated with 14.3% (95%CI= -14.5 –
430 -14.0) less GHG emissions and 18.8% (95%CI = -19.0 – -18.5) less land use.

431 *Association of EAT-Lancet diet-adherence with food biodiversity*

432 The total number of unique species count was on average equal to 67.5 (SD=15) unique species. The
433 average total number of unique plant species was 19.8 (SD=5.1), while the mean animal species was
434 7.4 (SD=2.5). In the adjusted model, adherence to the EAT-Lancet diet was associated with lower
435 DSR (β_{Q5vsQ1} : -2.43 species count, 95%CI = -2.59 – -2.28), when comparing extreme quintiles (**Table**
436 **5**). This translated to 3.6% (95%CI = -3.9 – -3.4) lower DSR among those with the highest adherence
437 (Table 5). The relationship between the EAT-Lancet diet and food biodiversity differed when
438 measuring DSR_{Plant} and DSR_{Animal} separately. In adjusted models, higher adherence to the EAT-Lancet
439 diet was associated with higher DSR_{Plant} (β_{Q5vsQ1} : 3.19 species count, 95%CI = 3.14 – 3.24) and lower
440 DSR_{Animal} (β_{Q5vsQ1} : -1.45 species count, 95%CI = -1.50 – -1.43). When comparing extreme quintiles,
441 this translated with adherence to the EAT-Lancet diet being associated with consuming approximately
442 16.1% (95%CI = 15.9 – 16.4) more plant species, and 19.7% (95%CI = -20.11 – -19.40) less animal
443 species (**Table 5**).

444 Highest adherence to the (pro) vegetarian EAT-Lancet dietVV-score was associated with lower DSR
445 than the original EAT-Lancet diet score (β_{Q5vsQ1} : -2.68 species, 95%CI = -2.83 – -2.52), corresponding
446 to 4.0% (95%CI = -4.2 – -3.7) less species consumed, when comparing extreme quintiles (**Table 5**).
447 When considering plant and animal species separately, the EAT-Lancet dietVV-score was associated
448 with consuming approximately 17.3% (95%CI = 17.0 – 17.5) more plant species and 22.0% (95%CI =
449 -22.3 – -21.6) less animal species (Table 5).

450

451 **Discussion**

452 Our study demonstrated the co-benefits of adhering to the EAT-Lancet Planetary Health Diet for
453 cardiovascular health and environmental sustainability. We observed that higher adherence to this diet
454 was associated with a 41% lower risk of stroke in the total population and 14% lower risk of CHD
455 among individuals under 60 years old. Although the EAT-Lancet diet was only modestly associated
456 with lower GHG emissions and land use, using the dietVV-score to measure adherence resulted in a
457 14.3% decrease in GHG emissions and an 18.8% reduction in land use, without compromising
458 cardiovascular benefits. Additionally, adherence to the diet was associated with 16.1% more plant
459 species richness and 19.7% less animal species richness. In this large pan-European prospective cohort
460 study, adherence to the EAT-Lancet diet varied between countries, with the UK, Spain, and Italy
461 showing the highest adherence, and Sweden, the Netherlands, and Germany showing the lowest
462 adherence. Individual recommendations for meat (e.g., lamb, beef, and pork), added sugar, soy, nuts,
463 and legumes had particularly low scores. Generally, the maximum total EAT-Lancet diet-score was
464 120, indicating that in observed diets across Europe there is still room for improvement with regards to
465 reaching the EAT-Lancet diet recommendations.

466 The present study is the first to report on a nuanced diet-score measuring adherence to the EAT-Lancet
467 diet in relation to cardiovascular outcomes in a large pan-European cohort. Studies in some of the
468 individual EPIC cohorts included in this study, namely the Dutch, Danish, Swedish, and Oxford
469 cohorts, generally reported similar directions of associations, although statistical significance often
470 differed (**Supplemental Tables 5 & 6**)^{7-9,11}. Potential explanations for discrepancies between this
471 study and studies conducted in the various individual EPIC cohorts include the operationalization of
472 the score, disease definitions, follow-up durations, and participants' exclusions criteria. Also, dietary
473 intake derived by the country's specific dietary assessment method differed slightly from the dietary
474 intake for the whole cohort derived by the standardized food items.

475 We observed that the association of EAT-Lancet diet-adherence with stroke was stronger as compared
476 to the association with CHD. This discrepancy may be explained by somewhat different risk profiles for

477 CHD and stroke are comparable, but do show some differences in magnitude with low-density
478 lipoprotein cholesterol being of particular importance for CHD, and hypertension being of greater
479 influence for stroke^{34,35}. Additionally, several studies have found a differential effect of individual
480 food groups with CHD and stroke. For example, high consumption of fruit, vegetables, fish, dairy
481 (e.g., cheese, fermented dairy) and limited consumption of red and processed meat and sugar-
482 sweetened beverages have all been related to both lower risk of stroke and CHD³⁶⁻⁴¹, while intakes of
483 whole grains, nuts, and legumes have been more consistently associated with CHD rather than stroke
484^{36,38,40}. This may explain the inconsistent results across individual EPIC cohort studies. Furthermore,
485 we observed that risks of both CHD and stroke associated with EAT-Lancet diet adherence were lower
486 among those younger than 60 years old compared to the overall cohort, which may indicate that
487 adoption of the EAT-Lancet diet is of importance for cardiovascular risk in this population.

488 With regards to the environmental impact of the EAT-Lancet diet, the observed lower levels of GHG
489 emissions and land use in relation to higher adherence are modest, yet statistically significant. These
490 modest effects may be explained by higher consumption of dairy, eggs, chicken, and fish in those with
491 higher adherence compared to those with the least adherence. This may offset the effects on GHG
492 emissions and land use we would expect from consuming less red and processed meat. Albeit less
493 pronounced, the effects on environmental indicators are comparable to those we observed in the Dutch
494 EPIC cohorts⁹. The difference between the two studies may be related to the distinct underlying
495 methodologies used to calculate the environmental impact of foods. This study used SHARP-ID data,
496 which uses different databases and sources for transport than the Dutch Life Cycle Assessment (LCA)
497 database used in Colizzi et al.^{27,42}. The two databases also considered other system boundaries,
498 allocation methods, and geographical zones^{27,43,44}. Furthermore, SHARP-ID data does not include
499 country-specific estimates, which may lead to different or less pronounced associations.

500 Of note, the impact on levels of both GHG emissions and land use was much higher when using the
501 EAT-Lancet dietVV-score. The scoring method for meat and animal-based products are the sole
502 difference between the two scores, underlying the impact that limiting meat and dairy products has on
503 environmental indicators in this population. A (pro-) vegetarian or vegan version of the EAT-Lancet
504 diet score did not particularly alter benefits to health, compared to the original score, but largely
505 impacted the GHG emissions and land use associated with the diet. These findings are in line with the
506 large body of evidence on the environmental footprint of the production and consumption of meat, and
507 on the reduction in environmental impact that can be achieved by switching to more plant-based diets
508^{14,45,46}. Our findings using the EAT-Lancet dietVV-score are also in line with the reduction in GHG
509 emissions and land use measured by similar studies assessing the environmental footprint of the EAT-
510 Lancet diet^{15,47-50}, for example with a previous study in EPIC by Laine et al. (2021) that used
511 counterfactual attributable fraction modelling for shifting from low adherence to full adherence to the
512 diet, and showed a 50% reduction in GHG emissions and 62% lower land use⁵⁰. Although more
513 modest, adherence to the EAT-Lancet dietVV-score — which resembles the most the scoring used by
514 Laine et al.⁵⁰ — in our population shows similar co-benefits to the study by Laine et al.⁵⁰.

515 With regards to food biodiversity, to our knowledge, this is the first study measuring the DSR
516 associated with the EAT-Lancet diet. Higher adherence to the EAT-Lancet diet was associated with
517 higher plant species richness and lower animal species richness, but it did not reflect higher diversity
518 in an individual's total food consumption. These findings can be largely explained by the fact that the
519 EAT-Lancet diet-score values higher intakes of plant-based foods and lower intakes of animal-based
520 products. An individual with a high EAT-Lancet diet-score is likely to eat a varied group of plant
521 species, and a small number (or no) animal species. Additionally, we excluded all other foods that
522 could not be uniquely allocated to plant or animal species, which can explain the discrepancies
523 between overall DSR and DSR_{Plant} and DSR_{Animal}. Because of the importance of biodiversity for
524 human nutrition and agricultural ecosystems, future research on sustainable diets could consider
525 including DSR as a valuable tool for the development of environmental and food policies.

526 Lastly, we need to address some of this study's strengths and limitations. Strengths of the current
527 study include the large pan-European population with a substantial number of cases, the prospective
528 design, the diversity of diets captured, and the use of validated food frequency questionnaire (FFQ)
529 data. Furthermore, our scoring approach complies with various preferable features of a priori dietary

530 indices, including the use of various index dimensions (e.g., adequacy, moderation, optimum, and ratio
531 components), the use of metric measures as opposed to ordinal or dichotomous metrics, and the use of
532 normative cut-off values^{12,13}. However, this study also has limitations. First, dietary data were self-
533 reported and only assessed at baseline, possibly introducing misclassification of exposure status. Not
534 only dietary habits in the population may have changed throughout the years, dietary data were
535 collected almost 30 years before the publication of the recommendations by the EAT-Lancet
536 Commission. Second, due to the multicenter design, non-fatal CHD and stroke events were ascertained
537 through a variety of methods (e.g., linkage with disease registries, follow-up questionnaires), which
538 may have led to non-differential misclassification of outcome status. Similarly, environmental impact
539 assessment through SHARP-ID relied on data published across a number of years and may not entirely
540 reflect the environmental impact of foods and beverages at the time of data collection²⁷. Third, despite
541 adjusting for various demographic, lifestyle, and cardiometabolic risk factors, residual confounding
542 bias cannot be ruled out, for instance, because of socio-economic differences and additional
543 cardiometabolic risk factors unaccounted for in this study. Additionally, we did not observe complete
544 adherence to the EAT-Lancet diet in our population, possibly resulting in smaller effects for
545 cardiovascular and planetary health.

546 Finally, we need to address that the EAT-Lancet diet represents a global diet that should be translated
547 to national food-based dietary guidelines. In order to do so, additional dimensions relevant to a
548 sustainable food system transition would need to be measured in context. These include, for instance,
549 the affordability of the diet, cultural acceptance, and nutritional adequacy of the diet, all of which were
550 not tested in this study. Two previous studies aimed to translate the generic EAT-Lancet diet
551 recommendations to country-specific contexts and found country-specific EAT-Lancet diets to be
552 nutritionally adequate, except for vitamin D, iodine and calcium^{51,52}. A recent modelling study
553 measured the impact of adherence to EAT-Lancet diet recommendations on all-cause mortality
554 compared to adherence to current food-based dietary guidelines⁵³. While it found that more ambitious
555 recommendations for whole grains, nuts and seeds, legumes, vegetables, and processed meat were
556 linked to greater reductions in mortality, it also showed that none of the 85 countries included in the
557 analysis adhered to all food-based dietary guidelines⁵³. This highlights an important concern about the
558 feasibility of transitioning to dietary patterns compliant with EAT-Lancet diet recommendations.
559 Moreover, this study showed that the way in which adherence to the EAT-Lancet diet is being
560 operationalised may result in different estimates of co-benefits for health and the environment,
561 limiting comparability of findings on the EAT-Lancet diet and the use of these research studies as the
562 base for the development of national policies.

563 To conclude, this prospective cohort study showed co-benefits of the EAT-Lancet diet for human
564 cardiovascular health and environmental well-being in a large European cohort. This research showed
565 that adherence to the EAT-Lancet diet was associated with lower risk of stroke but not of CHD,
566 modestly lower GHG emissions and lower land use, higher plant species richness and lower animal
567 species richness. Future research should further explore the role of animal-sourced foods,
568 operationalization of the diet, nutritional adequacy and affordability of the EAT-Lancet diet.

569 **Contributors**

570 All authors contributed to reviewing and editing the writing of the manuscript, interpretation of
571 statistics and findings, critically revised the article for content, and approved the final version. CC
572 verified the underlying data, did the formal analysis, contributed to conceptualization, methodology
573 and writing and reviewing of the original manuscript. JWJB and YTvdS contributed to the
574 conceptualization, methodology, supervision, and writing and reviewing of the original manuscript.
575 REV, KA, CCD, IH, TJK, JEL, KP, PV, EW, CA, JB, PC, JH, AH, VK, GM, OM, CMI, GN, DRP,
576 CS, MJS, MBS, AT, and WMMV were working group members, representing a centre of EPIC and
577 thus provided one of the following: data curation, project administration, or resources, and provided
578 feedback and contributed to the writing of the original manuscript.

579 **Data sharing**

580 EPIC data and biospecimens are available for investigators who seek to answer important questions on
581 health and disease in the context of research projects that are consistent with the legal and ethical
582 standard practices of the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC), WHO, and the EPIC
583 centres. The primary responsibility for accessing the data, obtained in the frame of the present
584 publication, belongs to the EPIC centres that provided them. Access to EPIC data can be requested to
585 the EPIC Steering Committee, as detailed in the [EPIC-Europe Access Policy](#).

586 **Sources of Funding**

587 The coordination of EPIC-Europe is financially supported by International Agency for Research on
588 Cancer (IARC) and also by the Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, School of Public
589 Health, Imperial College London which has additional infrastructure support provided by the NIHR
590 Imperial Biomedical Research Centre (BRC).

591 The national cohorts are supported by: Danish Cancer Society (Denmark); German Cancer Aid,
592 German Cancer Research Center (DKFZ), German Institute of Human Nutrition Potsdam-Rehbruecke
593 (DIfE), Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF) (Germany); Associazione Italiana per la
594 Ricerca sul Cancro-AIRC-Italy, Italian Ministry of Health, Italian Ministry of University and Research
595 (MUR), Compagnia di San Paolo (Italy); Dutch Ministry of Public Health, Welfare and Sports (VWS),
596 the Netherlands Organisation for Health Research and Development (ZonMW), World Cancer
597 Research Fund (WCRF), (The Netherlands); Instituto de Salud Carlos III (ISCIII), Regional
598 Governments of Andalucía, Asturias, Basque Country, Murcia and Navarra, and the Catalan Institute
599 of Oncology - ICO (Spain); Swedish Cancer Society, Swedish Research Council and County Councils
600 of Skåne and Västerbotten (Sweden); Cancer Research UK (C864/A14136 to EPIC-Norfolk;
601 C8221/A29017 to EPIC-Oxford), Medical Research Council (MR/N003284/1, MC-UU_12015/1 and
602 MC_UU_00006/1 to EPIC-Norfolk; MR/Y013662/1 to EPIC-Oxford) (United Kingdom).

603 Previous support has come from “Europe against Cancer” Programme of the European Commission
604 (DG SANCO).

605 The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or
606 preparation of this manuscript.

607 **Acknowledgments**

608 We acknowledge that Hyblean Association for Epidemiology Research, AIRE ONLUS Ragusa, Italy
609 is data contributor for EPIC-Ragusa.

610 **Disclaimer**

611 Where authors are identified as personnel of the International Agency for Research on Cancer / World
612 Health Organization, the authors alone are responsible for the views expressed in this article and they
613 do not necessarily represent the decisions, policy or views of the International Agency for Research on
614 Cancer / World Health Organization.

615 List of References

- 616 1 Poore J, Nemecek T. Reducing food's environmental impacts through producers and
617 consumers. *Science (1979)* 2018; **360**: 987–92.
- 618 2 Crist E, Mora C, Engelman R. The interaction of human population, food production, and
619 biodiversity protection. *Science* 2017; **356**: 260–4.
- 620 3 Nations U, of Economic D, Affairs S, Division P. World Population Prospects 2019 Highlights.
621 .
- 622 4 Willett W, Rockström J, Loken B, *et al.* Food in the Anthropocene: the EAT-Lancet
623 Commission on healthy diets from sustainable food systems. *Lancet* 2019; **393**: 447–92.
- 624 5 Johnson CO, Nguyen M, Roth GA, *et al.* Global, regional, and national burden of stroke, 1990-
625 2016: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2016. *Lancet Neurol* 2019;
626 **18**: 439–58.
- 627 6 Dai H, Much AA, Maor E, *et al.* Global, regional, and national burden of ischaemic heart
628 disease and its attributable risk factors, 1990–2017: results from the Global Burden of Disease
629 Study 2017. *Eur Heart J Qual Care Clin Outcomes* 2022; **8**: 50–60.
- 630 7 Knuppel A, Papier K, Key TJ, Travis RC. EAT-Lancet score and major health outcomes: the
631 EPIC-Oxford study. *Lancet* 2019; **394**: 213–4.
- 632 8 Ibsen DB, Christiansen AH, Olsen A, *et al.* Adherence to the EAT-Lancet Diet and Risk of
633 Stroke and Stroke Subtypes: A Cohort Study. *Stroke* 2022; **53**: 154–63.
- 634 9 Colizzi C, Harbers MC, Vellinga RE, *et al.* Adherence to the EAT-Lancet Healthy Reference
635 Diet in Relation to Risk of Cardiovascular Events and Environmental Impact: Results From the
636 EPIC-NL Cohort. *J Am Heart Assoc* 2023; **12**: e026318.
- 637 10 Berthy F, Brunin J, Allès B, *et al.* Association between adherence to the EAT-Lancet diet and
638 risk of cancer and cardiovascular outcomes in the prospective NutriNet-Santé cohort. *Am J Clin*
639 *Nutr* 2022; **116**: 980–91.
- 640 11 Zhang S, Dukuzimana J, Stubbendorff A, Ericson U, Born Y, Sonestedt E. Adherence to the
641 EAT-Lancet diet and risk of coronary events in the Malmö Diet and Cancer cohort study.
642 2023. DOI:10.1016/j.ajcnut.2023.02.018.
- 643 12 Burggraf C, Teuber R, Brosig S, Meier T. Review of a priori dietary quality indices in relation
644 to their construction criteria. *Nutr Rev* 2018; **76**: 747–64.
- 645 13 Stubbendorff A, Stern D, Ericson U, *et al.* One Score to Rule Them All? – A Systematic
646 Evaluation of Seven Different Scores Representing the EAT-Lancet Reference Diet and
647 Mortality, Stroke, and Greenhouse Gas Emissions in Three Cohorts.
648 DOI:10.2139/SSRN.4427440.
- 649 14 Cambeses-Franco C, Feijoo G, Moreira MT, González-García S. Co-benefits of the EAT-
650 Lancet diet for environmental protection in the framework of the Spanish dietary pattern. *Sci*
651 *Total Environ* 2022; **836**. DOI:10.1016/J.SCITOTENV.2022.155683.
- 652 15 Bui LP, Pham TT, Wang F, *et al.* Planetary Health Diet Index and risk of total and cause-
653 specific mortality in three prospective cohorts. *Am J Clin Nutr*; **0**.
654 DOI:10.1016/J.AJCNUT.2024.03.019.
- 655 16 DeClerck FAJ, Jessica F, Cheryl P, Roseline R. Ecological approaches to human nutrition.
656 *Food Nutr Bull* 2011; **32**. DOI:10.1177/15648265110321S106.

- 657 17 Hanley-Cook GT, Huybrechts I, Biessy C, *et al.* Food biodiversity and total and cause-specific
658 mortality in 9 European countries: An analysis of a prospective cohort study. *PLoS Med* 2021;
659 **18**: e1003834.
- 660 18 Deckelbaum RJ, Palm C, Mutuo P, DeClerck F. Ecnutrition: implementation models from the
661 Millennium Villages Project in Africa. *Food Nutr Bull* 2006; **27**: 335–42.
- 662 19 Frison EA, Smith IF, Johns T, Cherfas J, Eyzaguirre PB. Agricultural Biodiversity, Nutrition,
663 and Health: Making a Difference to Hunger and Nutrition in the Developing World.
664 <http://dx.doi.org.proxy.library.uu.nl/101177/156482650602700208> 2006; **27**: 167–79.
- 665 20 Lachat C, Raneri JE, Smith KW, *et al.* Dietary species richness as a measure of food
666 biodiversity and nutritional quality of diets. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2018; **115**: 127–32.
- 667 21 Riboli E, Hunt K, Slimani N, *et al.* European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and
668 Nutrition (EPIC): study populations and data collection. *Public Health Nutr* 2002; **5**: 1113–24.
- 669 22 E R, R K. The EPIC Project: rationale and study design. European Prospective Investigation
670 into Cancer and Nutrition. *Int J Epidemiol* 1997; **26 Suppl 1**: 6S – 14.
- 671 23 Slimani N, Deharveng G, Unwin I, *et al.* The EPIC nutrient database project (ENDB): a first
672 attempt to standardize nutrient databases across the 10 European countries participating in the
673 EPIC study. *Eur J Clin Nutr* 2007; **61**: 1037–56.
- 674 24 Stubbendorff A, Stern D, Ericson U, *et al.* A systematic evaluation of seven different scores
675 representing the EAT–Lancet reference diet and mortality, stroke, and greenhouse gas
676 emissions in three cohorts. *Lancet Planet Health* 2024; **8**: e391–401.
- 677 25 Looman M, Feskens EJM, De Rijk M, *et al.* Development and evaluation of the Dutch Healthy
678 Diet index 2015. *Public Health Nutr* 2017; **20**: 2289–99.
- 679 26 van Dooren C, Mensink F, Eversteijn K, Schrijnen M. Development and Evaluation of the
680 Eetmaatje Measuring Cup for Rice and Pasta as an Intervention to Reduce Food Waste. *Front*
681 *Nutr* 2020; **6**. DOI:10.3389/FNUT.2019.00197.
- 682 27 Mertens E, Kaptijn G, Kuijsten A, Van Zanten H, Geleijnse JM, Van 't Veer P. SHARP-
683 Indicators Database towards a public database for environmental sustainability. *Data Brief*
684 2019; **27**: 104617.
- 685 28 The food classification and description system FoodEx 2 (revision 2). *EFSA Supporting*
686 *Publications* 2017; **12**. DOI:10.2903/SP.EFSA.2015.EN-804.
- 687 29 Rubin DB. Inference and Missing Data. *Biometrika* 1976; **63**: 581.
- 688 30 van Buuren S, Groothuis-Oudshoorn K. mice: Multivariate Imputation by Chained Equations
689 in R. *J Stat Softw* 2011; **45**: 1–67.
- 690 31 Vieux F, Darmon N, Touazi D, Soler LG. Greenhouse gas emissions of self-selected individual
691 diets in France: Changing the diet structure or consuming less? *Ecological Economics* 2012;
692 **75**: 91–101.
- 693 32 Hendrie GA, Baird D, Ridoutt B, Hadjidakou M, Noakes M. Overconsumption of Energy and
694 Excessive Discretionary Food Intake Inflates Dietary Greenhouse Gas Emissions in Australia.
695 *Nutrients* 2016; **8**. DOI:10.3390/NU8110690.
- 696 33 Vellinga RE, van de Kamp M, Toxopeus IB, *et al.* Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Blue Water
697 Use of Dutch Diets and Its Association with Health. *Sustainability* 2019, Vol 11, Page 6027
698 2019; **11**: 6027.

- 699 34 Leening MJG, Cook NR, Franco OH, *et al.* Comparison of Cardiovascular Risk Factors for
700 Coronary Heart Disease and Stroke Type in Women. *J Am Heart Assoc* 2018; **7**.
701 DOI:10.1161/JAHA.117.007514.
- 702 35 Stoekenbroek RM, Matthijs Boekholdt S, Luben R, *et al.* Heterogeneous impact of classic
703 atherosclerotic risk factors on different arterial territories: the EPIC-Norfolk prospective
704 population study. *Eur Heart J* 2016; **37**: 880–9.
- 705 36 Bechthold A, Boeing H, Schwedhelm C, *et al.* Food groups and risk of coronary heart disease,
706 stroke and heart failure: A systematic review and dose-response meta-analysis of prospective
707 studies. *Crit Rev Food Sci Nutr* 2019; **59**: 1071–90.
- 708 37 Alexander DD, Bylsma LC, Vargas AJ, *et al.* Dairy consumption and CVD: a systematic
709 review and meta-analysis. *Br J Nutr* 2016; **115**: 737–50.
- 710 38 Iacoviello L, Bonaccio M, Cairella G, *et al.* Diet and primary prevention of stroke: Systematic
711 review and dietary recommendations by the ad hoc Working Group of the Italian Society of
712 Human Nutrition. *Nutr Metab Cardiovasc Dis* 2018; **28**: 309–34.
- 713 39 Key TJ, Appleby PN, Bradbury KE, *et al.* Consumption of Meat, Fish, Dairy Products, and
714 Eggs and Risk of Ischemic Heart Disease. *Circulation* 2019; **139**: 2835–45.
- 715 40 Tong TYN, Appleby PN, Key TJ, *et al.* The associations of major foods and fibre with risks of
716 ischaemic and haemorrhagic stroke: a prospective study of 418 329 participants in the EPIC
717 cohort across nine European countries. *Eur Heart J* 2020; **41**: 2632–40.
- 718 41 Mozaffarian D. Dietary and Policy Priorities for Cardiovascular Disease, Diabetes, and
719 Obesity: A Comprehensive Review. *Circulation* 2016; **133**: 187–225.
- 720 42 Milieubelasting van voedingsmiddelen | RIVM. <https://www.rivm.nl/voedsel-en-voeding/duurzaam-voedsel/database-milieubelasting-voedingsmiddelen> (accessed Jan 10,
721 2024).
722
- 723 43 Vellinga RE, van de Kamp M, Toxopeus IB, *et al.* Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Blue Water
724 Use of Dutch Diets and Its Association with Health. *Sustainability* 2019, Vol 11, Page 6027
725 2019; **11**: 6027.
- 726 44 Blonk Sustainability | Giving shape to sustainability. <https://blonksustainability.nl/> (accessed
727 Jan 10, 2024).
- 728 45 Aleksandrowicz L, Green R, Joy EJM, Smith P, Haines A. The Impacts of Dietary Change on
729 Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Land Use, Water Use, and Health: A Systematic Review. *PLoS*
730 *One* 2016; **11**: e0165797.
- 731 46 Grosso G, Fresán U, Bes-rastrollo M, Marventano S, Galvano F. Environmental Impact of
732 Dietary Choices: Role of the Mediterranean and Other Dietary Patterns in an Italian Cohort. *Int*
733 *J Environ Res Public Health* 2020; **17**. DOI:10.3390/IJERPH17051468.
- 734 47 Tepper S, Kissinger M, Avital K, Shahar DR. The Environmental Footprint Associated With
735 the Mediterranean Diet, EAT-Lancet Diet, and the Sustainable Healthy Diet Index: A
736 Population-Based Study. *Front Nutr* 2022; **9**. DOI:10.3389/FNUT.2022.870883.
- 737 48 Semba RD, de Pee S, Kim B, McKenzie S, Nachman K, Bloem MW. Adoption of the
738 ‘planetary health diet’ has different impacts on countries’ greenhouse gas emissions. *Nat Food*
739 2020; **1**: 481–4.
- 740 49 Bozeman JF, Springfield S, Theis TL. Meeting EAT-Lancet Food Consumption, Nutritional,
741 and Environmental Health Standards: A U.S. Case Study across Racial and Ethnic Subgroups.
742 *Environ Justice* 2020; **13**: 160–72.

- 743 50 Laine JE, Huybrechts I, Gunter MJ, *et al.* Co-benefits from sustainable dietary shifts for
744 population and environmental health: an assessment from a large European cohort study.
745 *Lancet Planet Health* 2021; **5**: e786.
- 746 51 Lassen AD, Christensen LM, Trolle E. Development of a Danish Adapted Healthy Plant-Based
747 Diet Based on the EAT-Lancet Reference Diet. *Nutrients* 2020; **12**.
748 DOI:10.3390/NU12030738.
- 749 52 Tucci M, Martini D, Del Bo' C, *et al.* An Italian-Mediterranean Dietary Pattern Developed
750 Based on the EAT-Lancet Reference Diet (EAT-IT): A Nutritional Evaluation. *Foods* 2021; **10**.
751 DOI:10.3390/FOODS10030558.
- 752 53 Springmann M, Spajic L, Clark MA, *et al.* The healthiness and sustainability of national and
753 global food based dietary guidelines: modelling study. *BMJ* 2020; **370**: 2322.
- 754

Tables

The EAT-Lancet Planetary Health Diet: Impact on Cardiovascular Disease and the Environment in the EPIC Cohort

Chiara Colizzi et al.

Table 1. Baseline characteristics across quintiles of EAT-Lancet diet-score (N=364,745)¹

	Full EPIC-cohort	Q1 (10-51)	Q2 (51-60)	Q3 (60-68)	Q4 (68-77)	Q5 (77-120)
Number of participants, n (%)	364,745	72,949 (20.0)	72,949 (20.0)	72,949 (20.0)	72,949 (20.0)	72,949 (20.0)
Age at recruitment (y)	51.3 ± 10.6	51 ± 10.6	52.3 ± 10.0	52.5 ± 10.1	51.6 ± 10.6	49.0 ± 11.1
Sex, n (%)						
Male	134,276 (36.8)	36,625 (50.2)	29,060 (39.8)	25,541 (35.0)	22,821 (31.3)	20,229 (27.7)
Female	230,469 (63.2)	36,324 (49.8)	43,889 (60.2)	47,408 (65.0)	50,128 (68.7)	52,720 (72.3)
Smoking status, n (%) ²						
Never	169,989 (46.6)	29,277 (40.1)	31,266 (42.9)	33,496 (45.9)	36,135 (49.5)	39,815 (54.6)
Former	104,661 (28.7)	19,656 (26.9)	21,725 (29.8)	22,127 (30.3)	21,651 (29.7)	19,502 (26.7)
Current	87,096 (23.9)	23,461 (33.2)	19,411 (26.6)	16,709 (23.8)	14,449 (20.8)	13,066 (18.7)
Physical activity, n (%) ²						
Inactive	77,780 (21.3)	14,024 (19.2)	13,393 (18.4)	14,334 (17.6)	16,111 (22.1)	19,918 (27.3)
Moderately inactive	121,359 (33.3)	23,303 (31.9)	23,888 (32.7)	24,572 (32.2)	25,001 (34.3)	24,595 (33.7)
Moderately active	82,447 (22.6)	17,145 (23.5)	16,926 (23.2)	16,677 (27.0)	16,204 (22.2)	15,495 (21.2)
Active	75,939 (20.8)	16,002 (21.9)	16,892 (23.2)	16,015 (21.0)	14,696 (20.1)	12,334 (16.9)
Educational level, n (%) ²						
None or primary	115,765 (31.7)	23,777 (32.8)	21,686 (29.5)	21,532 (28.7)	22,440 (29.7)	26,330 (35.6)
Secondary	53,205 (14.6)	11,932 (17.1)	10,766 (16.4)	10,584 (16.4)	10,314 (16.1)	9,609 (14.1)
Vocational or university	180,458 (49.5)	36,130 (49.3)	38,432 (52.4)	37,663 (52.1)	35,916 (50.0)	32,317 (45.2)
Alcohol consumption (g/day)	6.2 (1.1, 16.4)	5.5 (0.9, 17.6)	6.7 (1.4, 18.1)	7.0 (1.5, 17.3)	6.6 (1.1, 16.1)	5.3 (0.4, 13.5)

Energy intake (kcal/d)	2098.1 ± 626.6	2059.9 ± 666.8	2092.4 ± 635.4	2107.4 ± 624.3	2116.2 ± 613.2	2114.3 ± 589.2
Body mass index, kg/m ²	25.8 ± 4.2	25.6 ± 4.1	25.7 ± 4.1	25.7 ± 4.2	25.8 ± 4.2	26.0 ± 4.4
Waist circumference, cm	85.1 ± 12.9	87.2 ± 12.9	85.8 ± 12.8	84.8 ± 12.6	84 ± 12.7	83.9 ± 13
EAT-Lancet diet-score	63.9 ± 14.5	43.6 ± 6.1	55.7 ± 2.5	63.7 ± 2.2	71.8 ± 2.6	84.4 ± 6.3
GHG Emissions (kg CO ₂ -eq)	4.6 ± 1.7	4.5 ± 1.8	4.7 ± 1.7	4.7 ± 1.7	4.7 ± 1.7	4.5 ± 1.63
Land use (m ² /year)	6.1 ± 5.2	6.0 ± 2.5	6.2 ± 2.5	6.3 ± 2.5	6.2 ± 2.5	5.8 ± 2.5
Dietary Species Richness (species count) *	67.5 ± 15.0	66.2 ± 13.6	68.9 ± 13.9	69.5 ± 14.4	68.7 ± 15.3	64.1 ± 17.1
DSR _{plant} *	19.8 ± 5.1	17.5 ± 5.0	19.2 ± 5.0	20.3 ± 4.9	21.0 ± 4.9	20.9 ± 5
DSR _{Animal} *	7.4 ± 2.5	8.0 ± 2.3	7.7 ± 2.4	7.5 ± 2.4	7.2 ± 2.5	6.5 ± 2.5
Food Consumption (grams/day)						
Whole grains	200.9 (142.8, 276.8)	183.3 (130.6, 254.2)	192.7 (137.9, 265)	199.3 (141.9, 275.3)	208.9 (148.9, 287.5)	222.1 (159.3, 297.6)
Potatoes & cassava	83 (47.6, 132.3)	126.6 (69.9, 177.3)	100.2 (53.1, 148.5)	83.2 (43.7, 130.3)	71.9 (40.1, 114.2)	66.0 (43.3, 87.9)
All vegetables	156.8 (101.7, 240.2)	91.6 (58.2, 130.7)	125 (88.9, 176)	156.3 (110.9, 222.3)	197 (140.5, 275.6)	254.8 (188.3, 340.2)
All fruit	184.6 (100.3, 301.4)	93.9 (48.1, 161.1)	143.8 (87.8, 245.6)	187.8 (112.9, 293.4)	230 (145.9, 344)	279.5 (190.6, 408.5)
Dairy	300.5 (170.3, 473.7)	285.6 (114.5, 595.2)	296.2 (155.3, 515.8)	303 (175.9, 474.1)	305.9 (189.9, 440)	302.8 (203.1, 403)
Red and processed meat	70.9 (40.1, 107.5)	79 (48.6, 119)	79.7 (49.8, 116.2)	75.4 (45.6, 110)	67.8 (36.5, 102)	51.4 (11.5, 87.2)
Chicken & poultry	13.7 (5.1, 25.7)	7.2 (2.5, 13.1)	10.5 (4.9, 19.1)	15.4 (7.2, 25.7)	16.9 (8.2, 34.2)	21.4 (8.1, 40.6)
Eggs	12.6 (5.5, 22.7)	8 (2.5, 24.6)	11.7 (5, 23)	13.3 (6.7, 22.4)	13.8 (7.1, 22.2)	14.8 (7.4, 22.4)
Fish	25.3 (11.2, 44.5)	12.3 (4.5, 23.8)	19.9 (9.8, 36.6)	26.9 (15, 44.2)	32 (18.2, 50.4)	37.8 (22.5, 60)
Legumes	5.4 (0.6, 15.8)	1.2 (0.1, 6.2)	1.6 (0.3, 7)	3.1 (0.3, 11.3)	8.1 (1.5, 21.6)	30.8 (10.8, 50)
Soy foods	0.0 (0.0, 0.2)	0 (0, 0.03)	0 (0, 0.08)	0 (0, 0.2)	0 (0, 0.6)	0 (0, 4)
Nuts	0.8 (0.0, 3.5)	0.6 (0.02, 1.7)	0.8 (0.02, 3)	0.8 (0.2, 3.4)	0.8 (0.2, 3.5)	1.5 (0, 5.7)
Added fats	8.2 (1.7, 57.4)	2.4 (0.7, 9.9)	4.8 (1.2, 36.1)	8.6 (2, 60.6)	17.6 (4.6, 82.4)	30.3 (9.5, 90.7)

Added sugars	178.7 (93.0, 314.4)	196.2 (106.9, 344.7)	243.3 (105.9, 333.5)	236.7 (99.2, 318.4)	232.9 (89.2, 303.7)	208.7 (66.7, 269.3)
--------------	---------------------	----------------------	----------------------	---------------------	---------------------	---------------------

¹Continuous variables are displayed as means \pm SDs or as medians (P25, P75). ²Data was missing on smoking status (n=2,999), physical activity (n=7,220), educational level (n=15,317), and waist circumference (n=61,571), hypertension (n=71,536), hyperlipidemia (n=109,366), diabetes status (n=34,648).

*DSR contains all plant, animal, and miscellaneous species. DSR_{Plant} contains the number of plant species. DSR_{Animal} contains the number of animal species.

Table 2. Hazard ratio's and 95% confidence intervals for quintiles of EAT-Lancet diet adherence with incident CHD and stroke.

	Quintiles of EAT-Lancet diet-score					Per 10-point increment
	Q1 (10-51)	Q2 (51-60)	Q3 (60-68)	Q4 (68-77)	Q5 (77-120)	
CHD						
Events, n	2,852	2,745	2,640	2,355	2,098	12,690
Person-years	19,941	19,770	18,993	16,925	15,386	91,015
Crude model	1.00	0.95 (0.91 – 1.01)	0.91 (0.87 – 0.96)	0.81 (0.77 – 0.86)	0.70 (0.67 – 0.74)	0.92 (0.91 – 0.93)
Model 1 ^a	1.00	0.94 (0.89 – 0.99)	0.92 (0.87 – 0.97)	0.87 (0.83 – 0.92)	0.92 (0.87 – 0.97)	0.97 (0.96 – 0.99)
Model 2 ^b	1.00	0.98 (0.93 – 1.04)	0.98 (0.93 – 1.04)	0.96 (0.90 – 1.01)	0.99 (0.94 – 1.05)	0.99 (0.98 – 1.01)
Model 3 ^c	1.00	0.97 (0.92 – 1.02)	0.97 (0.92 – 1.03)	0.95 (0.90 – 1.01)	0.98 (0.93 – 1.04)	0.99 (0.98 – 1.01)
Stroke						
Events, n	1,829	1,674	1,448	1,231	906	7,088
Person-years	13,668	12,682	11,386	9,767	7,895	55,397
Crude model	1.00	0.92 (0.86 – 0.99)	0.80 (0.74 – 0.85)	0.67 (0.62 – 0.72)	0.45 (0.42 – 0.49)	0.84 (0.82 – 0.85)
Model 1 ^a	1.00	0.86 (0.80 – 0.92)	0.74 (0.69 – 0.79)	0.66 (0.61 – 0.71)	0.54 (0.50 – 0.59)	0.86 (0.84 – 0.87)
Model 2 ^b	1.00	0.89 (0.83 – 0.95)	0.78 (0.73 – 0.83)	0.71 (0.66 – 0.76)	0.58 (0.53 – 0.63)	0.87 (0.86 – 0.89)
Model 3 ^c	1.00	0.89 (0.83 – 0.95)	0.78 (0.73 – 0.84)	0.72 (0.67 – 0.77)	0.59 (0.54 – 0.64)	0.88 (0.86 – 0.89)

^a Model 1 was adjusted for age, sex; ^b Model 2 was adjusted for age, sex, educational level, smoking, alcohol consumption, physical activity, and energy intake; ^c Model 3 was additionally adjusted for BMI, waist circumference, hypertension, hyperlipidemia, and diabetes status. Models were stratified by EPIC center.

Table 3. Hazard ratio's and 95% confidence intervals for quintiles of EAT-Lancet dietVV-score with incident CHD and stroke.

	Quintiles of EAT-Lancet dietVV-score ¹					Per 10-point increment
	Q1 (17-65)	Q2 (65-72)	Q3 (72-79)	Q4 (79-87)	Q5 (87-134)	
CHD						
Events, n	3,086	2,755	2,532	2,486	1,831	12,690
Person-years	22,074	19,574	18,220	17,933	13,214	91,015
Crude model	1.00	0.90 (0.85 – 0.94)	0.83 (0.78 – 0.87)	0.81 (0.77 – 0.86)	0.59 (0.55 – 0.62)	0.87 (0.86 – 0.88)
Model 1 ^a	1.00	0.95 (0.91 – 1.00)	0.93 (0.88 – 0.98)	0.97 (0.92 – 1.03)	0.88 (0.83 – 0.94)	0.97 (0.95 – 0.98)
Model 2 ^b	1.00	1.00 (0.95 – 1.05)	0.99 (0.94 – 1.04)	1.04 (0.98 – 1.10)	0.95 (0.89 – 1.01)	0.99 (0.97 – 1.00)
Model 3 ^c	1.00	0.98 (0.93 – 1.03)	0.97 (0.91 – 1.02)	1.02 (0.97 – 1.08)	0.97 (0.91 – 1.03)	0.97 (0.91 – 1.03)
Stroke						
Events, n	2,038	1,657	1,432	1,133	828	7,088
Person-years	15,380	12,674	11,197	8,997	7,148	55,397
Crude model	1.00	0.83 (0.78 – 0.88)	0.71 (0.67 – 0.76)	0.56 (0.52 – 0.60)	0.39 (0.36 – 0.42)	0.78 (0.77 – 0.79)
Model 1 ^a	1.00	0.85 (0.80 – 0.91)	0.76 (0.71 – 0.81)	0.63 (0.58 – 0.68)	0.54 (0.50 – 0.58)	0.84 (0.82 – 0.86)
Model 2 ^b	1.00	0.90 (0.84 – 0.96)	0.81 (0.76 – 0.87)	0.67 (0.62 – 0.72)	0.58 (0.54 – 0.63)	0.86 (0.84 – 0.88)
Model 3 ^c	1.00	0.89 (0.83 – 0.95)	0.80 (0.75 – 0.86)	0.67 (0.62 – 0.72)	0.60 (0.55 – 0.65)	0.87 (0.85 – 0.88)

^a Model 1 was adjusted for age, sex; ^b Model 2 was adjusted for age, sex, educational level, smoking, alcohol consumption, physical activity, and energy intake; ^c Model 3 was additionally adjusted for BMI, waist circumference, hypertension, hyperlipidemia, and diabetes status. Models were stratified by EPIC center.

¹No or low intakes of animal-sourced foods (e.g., those initially scored as optimum components, including whole milk or derivative equivalents, chicken and other poultry, eggs, and fish) were assigned with 10 points.

Table 4. Beta coefficients, percentage change and 95% confidence intervals for quintiles of EAT-Lancet diet adherence with GHG emissions and land use.

	GHG emissions (kg CO ₂ -eq)		Land use (m ² per year)	
	Beta Coefficient (95% CI)	Percentage Change (95% CI)	Beta Coefficient (95% CI)	Percentage Change (95% CI)
EAT-Lancet diet-score				
Crude model				
Q1 [Ref]				
Q2vsQ1	0.20 (0.19 – 0.22)	4.45 (4.01 – 4.78)	2.68 (2.53 – 2.83)	3.97 (3.76 – 4.19)
Q3vsQ1	0.28 (0.26 – 0.30)	6.16 (5.69 – 6.47)	3.25 (3.10 – 3.40)	4.82 (4.59 – 5.04)
Q4vsQ1	0.26 (0.25 – 0.28)	5.82 (5.36 – 6.09)	2.52 (2.37 – 2.67)	3.73 (3.51 – 3.95)
Q5vsQ1	0.04 (0.03 – 0.06)	0.98 (0.56 – 1.30)	-2.06 (-2.21 – -1.91)	-3.05 (-3.30 – -2.83)
Model 1^a				
Q1 [Ref]				
Q2vsQ1	0.09 (0.08 – 0.11)	2.06 (1.80 – 2.25)	2.70 (2.55 – 2.85)	4.00 (3.79 – 4.23)
Q3vsQ1	0.13 (0.12 – 0.14)	2.82 (2.53 – 3.03)	3.24 (3.08 – 3.39)	4.80 (4.57 – 5.04)
Q4vsQ1	0.10 (0.09 – 0.11)	2.26 (1.97 – 2.45)	-0.02 (-0.04 – -0.00)	-0.31 (-0.59 – -0.05)
Q5vsQ1	-0.08 (-0.09 – -0.07)	-1.71 (-1.92 – -1.47)	-0.38 (-0.39 – -0.36)	-6.16 (-6.44 – -5.88)
EAT-Lancet dietVV-score¹				
Crude model				
Q1 [Ref]				
Q2vsQ1	-0.39 (-0.41 – -0.37)	-8.48 (-8.86 – -8.12)	-0.52 (-0.54 – -0.49)	-8.48 (-8.88 – -8.08)
Q3vsQ1	-0.50 (-0.52 – -0.49)	-10.87 (-11.25 – -10.52)	-0.67 (-0.69 – -0.64)	-10.95 (-11.32 – -10.52)
Q4vsQ1	-0.60 (-0.62 – -0.58)	-12.95 (-13.33 – -12.62)	-0.85 (-0.87 – -0.82)	-13.90 (-14.30 – -13.52)
Q5vsQ1	-1.28 (-1.30 – -1.26)	-27.71 (-28.06 – -27.31)	-0.85 (-0.87 – -0.82)	-33.49 (-33.89 – -33.02)
Model 1^a				

Q1 [Ref]				
Q2vsQ1	-0.10 (-0.12 – -0.09)	-2.27 (-2.49 – -2.00)	-0.10 (-0.12 – -0.37)	-1.65 (-1.89 – -1.36)
Q3vsQ1	-0.14 (-0.15 – -0.13)	-3.10 (-3.31 – -2.84)	-0.14 (-0.15 – -0.12)	-2.23 (-2.48 – -1.95)
Q4vsQ1	-0.18 (-0.19 – -0.17)	-3.98 (-4.22 – -3.74)	-0.23 (-0.25 – -0.21)	-3.78 (-4.07 – -3.52)
Q5vsQ1	-0.66 (-0.67 – -0.65)	-14.26 (-14.51 – -14.01)	-1.14 (-1.16 – -1.13)	-18.75 (-19.04 – -18.46)

^aModel 1 was adjusted for age, sex, and energy intake.

¹No or low intakes of animal-sourced foods (e.g., those initially scored as optimum components, including whole milk or derivative equivalents, chicken and other poultry, eggs, and fish) were assigned with 10 points.

Table 5. Beta coefficients, percentage change and 95% confidence intervals for quintiles of EAT-Lancet diet adherence with DSR, DSRPlant, and DSRAnimal.

	DSR (species count) ¹		DSRPlant (species count) ²		DSRAnimal (species count) ³	
	Beta Coefficient (95% CI)	Percentage change (95% CI)	Beta Coefficient (95% CI)	Percentage change (95% CI)	Beta Coefficient (95% CI)	Percentage change (95% CI)
EAT-Lancet diet-score						
Crude model						
Q1 [Ref]						
Q2vsQ1	2.68 (2.53 – 2.83)	3.97 (3.76 – 4.19)	1.72 (1.67 – 1.77)	8.70 (8.46 – 8.97)	-0.25 (-0.28 – -0.23)	-3.41 (-3.76 – -3.11)
Q3vsQ1	3.25 (3.10 – 3.40)	4.82 (4.59 – 5.04)	2.77 (2.72 – 2.82)	13.99 (13.73 – 14.25)	-0.50 (-0.52 – -0.47)	-6.77 (-7.14 – -6.44)
Q4vsQ1	2.52 (2.37 – 2.67)	3.73 (3.51 – 3.95)	3.53 (3.48 – 3.58)	17.83 (17.57 – 18.10)	-0.79 (-0.81 – -0.76)	-10.68 (-11.02 – -10.38)
Q5vsQ1	-2.06 (-2.21 – -1.91)	-3.05 (-3.30 – -2.83)	3.40 (3.35 – 3.45)	17.17 (16.92 – 17.42)	-1.43 (-1.45 – -1.40)	-19.39 (-19.75 – -19.07)
Model 1^a						
Q1 [Ref]						
Q2vsQ1	2.70 (2.55 – 2.85)	4.00 (3.79 – 4.23)	1.69 (1.64 – 1.74)	8.56 (8.30 – 8.83)	-0.26 (-0.28 – -0.23)	-3.49 (-3.87 – -3.17)
Q3vsQ1	3.24 (3.08 – 3.39)	4.80 (4.57 – 5.04)	2.71 (2.66 – 2.76)	13.70 (13.45 – 13.99)	-0.51 (-0.54 – -0.49)	-6.93 (-7.28 – -6.59)
Q4vsQ1	2.39 (2.24 – 2.55)	3.55 (3.32 – 3.78)	3.42 (3.37 – 3.47)	17.28 (17.03 – 17.56)	-0.80 (-0.83 – -0.78)	-10.92 (-11.25 – -10.60)
Q5vsQ1	-2.43 (-2.59 – -2.28)	-3.61 (-3.86 – -3.38)	3.19 (3.14 – 3.24)	16.13 (15.88 – 16.38)	-1.45 (-1.50 – -1.43)	-19.73 (-20.11 – -19.40)
EAT-Lancet dietVV-score^b						
Crude model						
Q1 [Ref]						
Q2vsQ1	1.38 (1.22 – 1.53)	2.04 (1.82 – 2.25)	0.90 (0.85 – 0.95)	4.56 (4.31 – 4.81)	0.27 (0.25 – 0.30)	3.72 (3.43 – 4.00)
Q3vsQ1	1.04 (0.88 – 1.19)	1.53 (1.32 – 1.76)	1.62 (1.57 – 1.68)	8.21 (7.96 – 8.48)	0.27 (0.25 – 0.30)	3.68 (3.33 – 3.95)
Q4vsQ1	-0.44 (-0.60 – -0.29)	-0.66 (-0.85 – -0.41)	2.33 (2.28 – 2.38)	11.79 (11.57 – 12.06)	0.15 (0.13 – 0.18)	2.10 (1.82 – 2.40)
Q5vsQ1	-2.37 (-2.52 – -2.21)	-3.51 (-3.71 – -3.30)	3.43 (3.38 – 3.48)	17.35 (17.12 – 17.59)	-1.66 (-1.68 – -1.63)	-22.51 (-22.84 – -22.17)

Model 1 ^a						
Q1 [Ref]						
Q2vsQ1	1.47 (1.32 – 1.62)	2.18 (1.95 – 2.40)	0.96 (0.91 – 1.01)	4.84 (4.59 – 5.09)	0.32 (0.30 – 0.35)	4.40 (4.12 – 4.68)
Q3vsQ1	1.12 (0.97 – 1.28)	1.66 (1.46 – 1.89)	1.67 (1.62 – 1.72)	8.42 (8.17 – 8.69)	0.34 (0.31 – 0.36)	4.59 (4.26 – 4.87)
Q4vsQ1	-0.40 (-0.57 – -0.25)	-0.60 (-0.80 – -0.36)	2.36 (2.31 – 2.41)	11.92 (11.70 – 12.18)	0.23 (0.20 – 0.25)	3.09 (2.80 – 3.40)
Q5vsQ1	-2.68 (-2.83 – -2.52)	-3.97 (-4.17 – -3.74)	3.42 (3.37 – 3.47)	17.28 (17.04 – 17.53)	-1.62 (-1.64 – -1.59)	-21.96 (-22.31 – -21.62)

^a Models were adjusted for age, sex, and energy intake.

^b No or low intakes of animal-sourced foods (e.g., those initially scored as optimum components, including whole milk or derivative equivalents, chicken and other poultry, eggs, and fish) were assigned with 10 points. ¹DSR contains all plant, animal, and miscellaneous species. ²DSRPlant contains only plant species. ³DSR_{Animal} contains only animal species.