

1 **Unhealthful plant-based diet associates with frailty risk predominantly in men with low income**  
2 **from the UK Biobank cohort**

3 **Kerstin Schorr<sup>1</sup>, Mar Rodriguez-Girondo<sup>1</sup>, Niels van den Berg<sup>1</sup>, Lisette CPMG de Groot<sup>2</sup>, P.**  
4 **Eline Slagboom<sup>1</sup> and Marian Beekman<sup>1</sup>**

5 1) Department of Biomedical Data Sciences, Leiden University Medical Center, Einthovenweg 20, 2333  
6 ZC Leiden, The Netherlands

7 2) Division of Human Nutrition and Health, Wageningen University, Wageningen, P.O. Box 176700 AA  
8 Wageningen, The Netherlands

9 **Corresponding author** Kerstin Schorr, Department of Molecular Epidemiology, postzone S05-P, P.O. Box  
10 9600, 2300 RC LEIDEN, [k.a.schorr@lumc.nl](mailto:k.a.schorr@lumc.nl), +31 (0) 71 526 9731

11 Marian Beekman, Department of Molecular Epidemiology, postzone S05-P, P.O. Box 9600, 2300 RC LEIDEN,  
12 [m.beekman@lumc.nl](mailto:m.beekman@lumc.nl), +31 (0) 71 526 9735

13

14 **Highlights**

- 15       • Healthful plant-based diet associated with lower frailty risk
- 16       • Association of unhealthful plant-based diet and higher frailty risk is moderated by income and
- 17       sex
- 18       • Unhealthful plant-based diet is associated with frailty particularly in men with low income

19 **Abbreviations**

- 20 PBD: Plant-based diet
- 21 UKB: UK Biobank
- 22 PDI: Plant-based diet index
- 23 hPDI: healthful plant-based diet index
- 24 uPDI: unhealthful plant-based diet index
- 25 SES: socio-economic status
- 26

27 **Abstract**

28 **Objective:** Plant-based diets (PBD) are generally promoted as beneficial for health. However,  
29 whether this is also the case at older ages, when energy deficits, muscle loss and frailty affect health,  
30 is unclear. Research has shown that among older adults, particularly in men, a healthful PBD is  
31 associated with a lower frailty risk. This relation was however, not studied in the context of socio-  
32 economic status (SES), a major factor influencing the risk of frailty. Therefore, we aim to assess  
33 whether plant-based diets associate with frailty risk at older ages and whether this association is  
34 moderated by sex and income in a large population-based dataset.

35 **Methods:** we investigated data from the UK Biobank (UKB) (n=73 180, mean age=55.48±7.87). We  
36 applied a plant-based diet index [range 17-85], differentiating between a healthful (hPDI) and  
37 unhealthful plant-based diet (uPDI). Frailty was assessed by the Fried frailty phenotype and  
38 categorized into 0-4 symptoms of frailty. Average household income was divided into three  
39 categories: low (<18.000 £), medium (18.000-52.000 £) and high (>52.000 £). We applied an ordinal  
40 logistic regression model with frailty as the categorical outcome and PDI as continuous predictor  
41 while adjusting for age, sex, ethnicity, education, BMI and UKB assessment center. Secondly, we  
42 included an interaction term (PDI\*sex\*income). To identify subgroups driving any interactions, we  
43 stratified by sex and subsequently by income group to determine the effect of PDI in subgroups while  
44 additionally adjusting for lifestyle factors.

45 **Results:** a 10-unit increase in hPDI, was associated with 3.4% lower odds for frailty (OR=0.966,  
46 95%CI [0.946, 0.987]), whereas a 10-unit increase in uPDI was associated with 7.7% greater odds for  
47 frailty (OR=1.077, 95%CI [1.054, 1.101]). The association between uPDI and frailty was moderated  
48 by income and sex (uPDI\*income\*sex, p=0.002), whereas no such moderation was found for hPDI  
49 (p=0.602). Subsequent stratification reveals a significant effect of uPDI on frailty particularly among  
50 men with low income (OR=1.177, 95% CI [1.069, 1.298]), but not for women. This association in  
51 men largely persisted after adjustment for additional lifestyle factors (OR=1.119, 95%CI [0.995,  
52 1.258]).

53 **Conclusion:** we observed that adherence to an unhealthful plant-based diet was associated with a  
54 higher risk for frailty. This relation was especially observed for men with lower incomes and not  
55 explained by other lifestyle factors. Therefore, this group may profit from refraining from an  
56 unhealthful plant-based diet.

57 **Keywords:** plant-based diet, frailty, socio-economic status, health inequality, sex differences, dietary  
58 pattern

59 **1. Introduction**

60 Plant-based diets, characterized by a high intake in plant foods and comparatively low intake of  
61 animal foods, have gained attention in recent years as a shift towards more plant foods is  
62 recommended by the EAT-Lancet committee [1] as well as dietary guidelines worldwide. Further,  
63 plant-based diets are recommended for the prevention of age-related diseases, in particular metabolic  
64 diseases. However, for vulnerable populations strict plant-based diets may also lead to energy deficits  
65 and inadequate protein intake, contributing to a loss of muscle mass, which poses a risk factor for  
66 frailty [2]. Frailty has been defined as increased vulnerability resulting from an age-associated decline  
67 in function and may put older adults at an increased risk for adverse outcomes, such as hospitalization  
68 and mortality [3]. Meanwhile, studies have shown that a healthful plant-based diet may actually lower  
69 the risk for frailty, although not in both sexes equally [4, 5]. The role of diet in the prevention of  
70 frailty, may be explained by anti-inflammatory properties of plant foods [4, 6] and men in particular  
71 may respond more to the effects of an inflammatory diet [6, 7]. At the same time, previous research  
72 has shown that women are generally more likely to become frail over the life course [8], indicating  
73 differences between men and women exist in the prevalence of frailty and response to lifestyle factors  
74 [9]. It is therefore important to further investigate the interplay of diet and sex on frailty risk.

75 Sex-differences also exist regarding socioeconomic background and its effect on frailty. Higher  
76 socioeconomic status (SES) has been linked to a healthier lifestyle and reduced frailty risk, while low  
77 SES groups have benefitted more from improving their lifestyle [10]. In addition, sex differences  
78 were observed: women's frailty risk was determined more by education, whereas in men income had  
79 a stronger influence [11]. Similarly, individuals with a lower SES and an unhealthy lifestyle have  
80 been found to have a higher mortality risk compared to individuals with high SES and a comparable  
81 unhealthy lifestyle, with men with low income being a particular at-risk group [12]. Thus, these  
82 findings point towards a potential interaction of lifestyle, sex, and income. It is currently not known  
83 whether each of these characteristics associate additively and independently with the development of  
84 frailty, or whether the interplay of these factors impacts frailty risk.

85 We therefore aim to identify at-risk groups for frailty which may be target groups for future dietary  
86 and lifestyle interventions. We focus on the question whether plant-based diets are differently  
87 associated with frailty in men and women and whether this association dependent on income. To  
88 quantify adherence to a plant-based diet, we apply a plant-based diet index, differentiating between  
89 adherence to a healthful and unhealthy plant-based diet to a population of 73,180 adults (mean  
90 age=55.48 years) from the UK Biobank.

## 91 **2. Methods**

### 92 **2.1. Study population**

93 For this study, we used data from the UK Biobank, a multicenter study with >500,000 participants  
94 conducted in England, Scotland and Wales [13]. Baseline measurements were carried out between

95 2006 and 2010. For the purpose of this study, we included participants that had baseline data on all  
96 variables of interest available and filled at least two 24h-diet recalls. Our final sample consisted of  
97  $n=73,180$  (mean age=55.48 years) (Table 1).

## 98 **2.2. Plant-based diet index**

99 For the calculation of the plant-based diet index, we used preprocessed data that provided information  
100 on dietary intakes of 93 food groups in grams per day (Category 10018, Suppl. Table 1). This dataset  
101 was created by Piernas et al. in 2022 based on raw data from the Oxford WebQ tool [14, 15]. In this  
102 questionnaire, participants indicated their intake in serving sizes within the last 24h. In our study,  
103 participants that completed at least two questionnaires were included in the analysis, to gain an  
104 estimate of usual intake. We further excluded participants with unrealistic energy intake as described  
105 previously [16]. To calculate the PDI for each participant from this data set, intakes of 17 food  
106 groups, consisting of healthy plant foods (e.g., wholegrains, vegetables, nuts), unhealthy plant foods  
107 (e.g., sweets, refined grains) and animal foods, were averaged across questionnaires (Suppl. Table 2).  
108 Vegetable oil was not included since insufficient information was available. The PDI was calculated  
109 following standard procedure [17]: The intakes per food groups were divided into sex-specific  
110 quintiles. For the healthful plant-based diet index (hPDI) this includes scoring healthy plant foods  
111 positively, whereas unhealthful plant foods were scored negatively, and animal foods were always  
112 scored negatively. Since intakes in some food groups were low, the cut-off for several quintiles was 0.  
113 Therefore, quintiles with a low intake (0 g until the cut-off of the first non-zero quintile) were  
114 summarized and awarded a 1. The remaining quintiles were then scored as normal, i.e., those above  
115 the fifth quintile receiving a score of 5 etc. The final score has a theoretical score ranging from 17-85,  
116 with higher scores indicating greater adherence to a healthful (hPDI) or unhealthful (uPDI) diet,  
117 respectively. The index was adjusted for energy intake using the residual method [18].

## 118 **2.3. Frailty Index and Income**

119 The frailty index is an adaption from Fried's frailty index with variables found in the UK Biobank  
120 [19, 20]. This adapted Fried's frailty index includes hand grip strength, usual walking pace, weight  
121 loss in the past year, feelings of exhaustion in the past week and physical activity in the last 4 weeks.  
122 According to this definition participants were considered frail if they fulfil at least three of the  
123 following criteria: weight loss in the previous year, tired or low energy on more than half the days in  
124 the past two weeks, none, or light physical activity with a frequency of once per week or less, slow  
125 usual walking pace and low grip strength (according to sex and bmi specific cut-offs). Participants  
126 that met one or two criteria were classified as pre-frail. The process has been described in more detail  
127 elsewhere [20]. Since only a small percentage of our sample showed all 5 symptoms of frailty ( $n=21$ ),  
128 those who show 4 or 5 symptoms of frailty were grouped together ( $n=188$ ).

129 Total household income before tax was collected in 5 categories. For the sake of data analysis this  
130 variable was coded into three categories: low (<18,000£), medium (18,000 – 51,999£), and high  
131 (>52,000£).

## 132 **2.4. Statistical analysis**

133 We first assessed whether all variables of interest, i.e., PDIs, frailty and income were independently  
134 associated with each other. To assess the association between plant-based diet adherence and frailty,  
135 we applied an ordinal logistic regression model with frailty as the categorical outcome variable and  
136 PDI as continuous predictor (models 1a and 1b). For determining the association between frailty and  
137 income, an ordinal logistic regression model was fit with frailty as the outcome and income as the  
138 categorical predictor (model 2). Lastly, an ordinal logistic regression model was fit with income as the  
139 categorical outcome variable and PDI as a continuous predictor (models 3a and 3b). All models were  
140 adjusted for age, sex, bmi, ethnicity, and education, due to their relevance in the development of  
141 frailty [8, 21-23]. In addition, the analyses were adjusted for the assessment center in which data was  
142 collected to take into account potential differences between centers.

143 Model 1a: frailty ~ hPDI + age + sex + bmi + ethnicity + education + assessment center

144 Model 1b: frailty ~uPDI + age + sex + bmi + ethnicity + education + assessment center

145 Model 2: frailty ~ income + age + sex + bmi + ethnicity + education + assessment center

146 Model 3a: income~hPDI + age + sex + bmi + ethnicity + education + assessment center

147 Model 3b: income ~uPDI + age + sex + bmi + ethnicity + education + assessment center

148 In a second step, we aimed to address the question whether there is an influence of sex and income on  
149 the association between frailty and hPDI (model 4a) or uPDI (model 4b), respectively. For this, we  
150 added a three-way interaction term of sex, hPDI/uPDI and income to an ordinal logistic regression  
151 model with frailty as the categorical outcome variable.

152 Model 4a: frailty ~ hPDI + sex + income + Sex\*Income\*hPDI + age + bmi + ethnicity +  
153 education + assessment center

154 Model 4b: frailty ~ uPDI + sex + income + Sex\*Income\*uPDI + age + bmi + ethnicity +  
155 education + assessment center

156 To assess difference in effect between men and women, we stratified the interaction models by sex.

157 Model 5a: Women, frailty ~ uPDI + income + Income\*hPDI + age + bmi+ethnicity + education  
158 + assessment center

159 Model 5b: Men, frailty ~ uPDI + income + Income\*uPDI + age + bmi + ethnicity + education +  
160 assessment center

161 To identify potentially explanatory characteristics for the interaction, we further adjusted for lifestyle  
162 and health-related factors (physical activity, alcohol, fiber and protein intake, vitamin D levels,  
163 smoking status, number of prescribed medications). Low physical activity has been previously  
164 identified as a risk factor for frailty [24]. Alcohol can be a risk factor for a multitude of diseases, and  
165 multimorbidity is a risk factor for frailty [25]. For the same reason we adjust for number of prescribed  
166 medications as an indicator of overall health status [20]. Vitamin D is related to bone health and  
167 metabolism and may therefore also play a relevant role in the development of frailty [26]. Both, fiber,  
168 and protein intake have been associated with increased muscle mass and may therefore be protective  
169 for frailty [27, 28]. Alcohol, fiber and protein intake were adjusted for energy intake via the residual  
170 method [18].

171 Model 5c: Men, frailty ~ uPDI + income + Interaction (Income\*HPDI) + age+ bmi + ethnicity +  
172 education + assessment center + physical activity + fiber intake + protein  
173 intake + alcohol intake + vitamin D + smoking status + nr of medication

174 In the last step, we stratified models by income group for the models that showed a significant  
175 interaction effect of PDI and income in the previous step to identify the effect of uPDI on frailty risk  
176 per subgroup.

177 MODEL 6a: Men with low income, frailty ~ uPDI + age + bmi + ethnicity + education +  
178 assessment center + physical activity + fiber intake + protein intake + alcohol intake  
179 + vitamin D + smoking status + nr of medication

180 MODEL 6b: Men with medium income, frailty ~ uPDI + age + bmi + ethnicity + education +  
181 assessment center + physical activity + fiber intake + protein intake + alcohol intake  
182 + vitamin D + smoking status + nr of medication

183 MODEL 6c: Men with high income, frailty ~ uPDI + age + bmi +ethnicity + education +  
184 assessment center + physical activity + fiber intake + protein intake + alcohol intake  
185 + vitamin D + smoking status + nr of medication

186 We carried out a sensitivity analysis in which we further adjusted for atypical dietary intake. When  
187 filling the 24h diet records, participants could indicate whether they followed a typical diet that day.  
188 We calculated the percentage of questionnaires with atypical intake and added this to our models. We  
189 further replicated all analysis with a binary logistic regression (i.e., binarization of frailty in no  
190 symptoms of frailty (scores 0), and mild to severe frailty (scores 1-5) to validate to our findings. All  
191 analysis were carried out in R 4.3.2.

### 192 3. Results

193 The complete sample consisted of n=73,180 mostly white adults with a mean age of 55.5 years. A  
194 slight majority of the sample consisted of women (52.50%). Women had slightly lower adherence to

195 uPDI, were more likely to be in the low-income group compared to men. Further, women had a lower  
196 BMI, consumed less alcohol and were less likely to be smokers than men. Despite their seemingly  
197 healthier lifestyle choices, women reported higher medication intake and were more likely to be frail  
198 (Table 1).

199

### 200 **3.1. Plant-based diet and income are independently associated with frailty risk**

201 We first assessed whether frailty is (univariately) associated with PDI (model 1a and 1b) and income  
202 (model 2), and whether PDI is associated with income (model 3a and 3b). Both, hPDI and uPDI were  
203 associated with frailty, as expected in different directions: per 10-unit increase in dietary index, higher  
204 hPDI was associated with 3% (OR=0.966, p=0.002) lower odds for frailty, whereas uPDI was  
205 associated with 8% (OR=1.077, p<0.001) greater odds for frailty (Suppl. Table 3).

206 High income, while adjusted for covariates, such as education level, was associated with 44%  
207 (OR=0.558, p<0.001) lower odds for frailty, whereas those in the medium income group had 28%  
208 (OR=0.718, p<0.001) lower odds (Suppl. Table 4). Lastly, we observed a 10-unit increase in hPDI  
209 and uPDI to be associated with 7% (OR=0.928, p<0.001) and 3% (OR=0.969, p=0.003) lower odds  
210 for high income, respectively (Suppl. Table 5).

### 211 **3.2. Unhealthful plant-based diet, income and sex have interactive effect on frailty risk**

212 We observed differences in the distribution of PDI, income and frailty risk between sexes in our study  
213 population (Table 1). To assess whether the overall association between PDI and frailty is moderated  
214 by income, we included an interaction term between PDI, sex and income.

215 We observed that for hPDI, the three-way interaction terms, i.e., “hPDI-middle income-male sex” and  
216 “hPDI-high income-male sex” showed no significant results (model 4a+b, Suppl. Table 6).

217 Interestingly, we did find a significant interaction between high and middle income, male sex and  
218 uPDI (uPDI-high income-male sex: coef=-0.023, p=0.002; uPDI-middle income-male sex: coef=-  
219 0.016, p=0.024, Suppl Table 6).

### 220 **3.3. Effect of unhealthful plant-based diet primarily in men of low income**

221 To further pinpoint the interaction effects of sex, uPDI and income on frailty, we performed sex-  
222 stratified analyses (model 5a+b). In women uPDI was not associated with frailty and neither did it  
223 interact with income (Suppl. Table 7). Meanwhile, in men, we observed an association of uPDI with  
224 frailty (OR=1.249, p<0.001) with a significant interaction between uPDI and medium (p=0.007) and  
225 high income (p<0.001).

226 The interaction observed in men may be explained by lifestyle and health-related factors such as  
227 physical activity, smoking, alcohol consumption and vitamin D levels. Therefore, we further adjusted



228 the association for these additional lifestyle and health-related factors (model 5c). Interestingly, the  
229 interaction term between uPDI and income remained significant, indicating there is a difference in the  
230 association between uPDI and frailty by income which is not explained by lifestyle and health-related  
231 factors tested (model 5c, Suppl. Table 8). Subsequently, to visualize the interaction effect, we further  
232 stratified by income group (models 6a-c). We observed that for men with a high income, uPDI was  
233 not associated with frailty (OR=0.994, 95% CI [0.933, 1.059]), while in contrast every 10-unit  
234 increase in uPDI was associated with 18% (OR=1.177, 95% CI [1.069, 1.298]) greater odds for frailty  
235 in men with a low income (Fig. 1). This association persisted after adjustment for additional health-  
236 and lifestyle factors (OR=1.119, 95%CI [0.995, 1.258], Fig. 1).

### 237 **3.4. Sensitivity Analysis**

238 To test the influence of atypical dietary intake, we adjusted for the percentage of diet questionnaires in  
239 which an atypical diet was reported. We found that atypical intake was not associated with the overall  
240 results (Suppl. Fig 1). Further, replication of our results with a binary logistic regression yielded  
241 similar results (Suppl. Fig 2).

## 242 **4. Discussion**

243 In a large dataset of over 70 thousand individuals, we dissected how plant-based diets, sex, and  
244 income associate with frailty. We observed for both men and women that greater adherence to a  
245 healthful plant-based diet was associated with a lower risk of frailty, and greater adherence to an  
246 unhealthful plant-based diet was associated with higher risk of frailty. In addition, we established that  
247 higher income and male sex were associated with lower risk of frailty. Because sex, income and diet  
248 are known related factors [4, 8, 11], we tested for a three-way interaction of these variables in their  
249 association with frailty. While we observed no interaction for hPDI, sex and income on their effect  
250 with frailty, we did observe interaction of uPDI, sex and income on frailty. Specifically, men with low  
251 income and a high adherence to unhealthful plant-based diet had remarkable higher risk for frailty,  
252 which was not explained by physical activity, alcohol consumption or smoking. Remarkably, no  
253 effect of uPDI on frailty was observed in high income men or women in either income group.

254 Our findings, that a healthful plant-based diet was associated with a lower frailty risk, while an  
255 unhealthful plant-based diet was associated with a higher risk for frailty, is supported by other  
256 research [4, 5, 7]. Our observations of an interaction between income and unhealthful dietary pattern  
257 were also in line with previous research. A study in the UK Biobank concluded that the association  
258 between unhealthy lifestyle behaviors (including e.g. diet, physical activity, sleep duration and  
259 smoking) and adverse health outcomes were stronger among deprived populations [29]. Similarly, a  
260 more recent large population-based study reported that a healthy lifestyle benefited low socio-  
261 economic status (SES) populations more by having a stronger association with mortality risk  
262 compared to groups with high socio-economic status [12] In Chinese older adults a protective effect

263 of high income on frailty was reported [11]. Our study is unique in that we investigate the interplay of  
264 all three factors, income, sex, and plant-based diet adherence combined, on frailty risk. We identified  
265 men with low income as an at-risk group for frailty when consuming an unhealthful plant-based diet,  
266 even adjusting for lifestyle factors, suggesting a unique effect of diet on frailty.

267 Several hypotheses have been proposed for the higher morbidity observed especially in men with low  
268 income. First, men are generally assumed to engage more in unhealthy behaviors [30]. Similarly, low  
269 SES groups are more likely to engage in unhealthy behaviors in extreme ways compared to higher  
270 SES groups. This has been discussed for alcohol consumption, with low income groups being more  
271 likely to engage in excessive drinking, but may also extend to other health behavior such as diet [31].  
272 When comparing uPDI scores of the frailest individuals, we observe that, men with a low income had  
273 a higher uPDI (55.05) than high income men in the same frailty category, suggesting men with low  
274 income engaged more in unhealthy dietary habits (50.43). While a clear explanation for our findings  
275 is lacking, we observed that women in our sample had consistently higher intakes of vegetables, fruit,  
276 tea, and coffee as well as dairy compared to men. All these food groups have been associated with a  
277 lower frailty risk, supposedly due to concomitant higher intakes of antioxidants, protein, and calcium  
278 [32-34]. Further, men with low income and frailty were the subgroup with the highest intake of soda  
279 (data not shown), potentially explaining the association with frailty in this population group [35].  
280 Future research may explore how dairy and a reduction of soda consumption may fit into a healthful  
281 plant-based diet to contribute to lower frailty risk.

282 At the same time research suggests that low income groups have less access to the medical system or  
283 are less inclined to make use of medical care [29]. Further, low income often goes hand in hand with  
284 increased stress and mental burden associated with the challenge to make a living. In men, the mental  
285 distress of low socioeconomic status may intersect and be amplified by societal expectations to  
286 provide, leading to a greater importance of income in this group [36]. Men with a low income may  
287 therefore be a particularly vulnerable group and may be targeted by dietary interventions.

288 Surprisingly, we observed no interaction effect of income and plant-based diet adherence with frailty  
289 risk in women. Women are generally more likely to be frail yet have a lower mortality risk. This is  
290 known as the male-female health-survival paradox [8]. It has been proposed, that in women, other  
291 factors contribute more to frailty, shifting the focus away from lifestyle. For example, women  
292 accumulate more disabling conditions, such as arthritis, which can limit physical functioning [6, 37].  
293 It has also been suggested, that inflammation may contribute more to the development of frailty in  
294 women [38]. At the same time, men have been proposed to benefit more from an anti-inflammatory  
295 diet, potentially contributing to lower frailty risk [39]. Previously, differences in the gut microbiome  
296 between sexes has been suggested as a potential mechanism [6], however more studies are needed to

297 investigate the interplay of sex and frailty, the gut microbiome and risk factors such as diet and  
298 inflammation.

299 Our analysis has several limitations. Firstly, the UK Biobank sample was still relatively young with a  
300 mean age of 55 (range 40-70 years) years. Subsequently, cases of frailty, especially those who showed  
301 more than three symptoms of frailty, were relatively low in our sample and would be considered early  
302 frailty. Secondly, participants of the UK Biobank study tend to live in less deprived areas [40]. This is  
303 also supported by the fact that the majority of our sample had a medium or high income. In our  
304 analysis, we included participants who had filled at least two 24h diet recalls. It can be argued that  
305 two questionnaires may be not enough to accurately reflect usual intake. However, according to the  
306 median of questionnaires filled, we had 3 or more questionnaires available from 50% of our sample, a  
307 number that has previously been identified as sufficient for estimating energy intake [34]. While we  
308 adjusted for ethnicity, the vast majority of the sample was white, leading to limited transferability of  
309 our results to other ethnic groups. We did not assess the impact of biological factors, such as levels of  
310 inflammatory markers, the gut microbiome, or pre-existing conditions, although we approximated  
311 pre-morbidities by adjusting for medication intake. Further research may therefore extend our findings  
312 by taking into account these factors. Lastly, as we conducted a cross-sectional analysis, causality  
313 cannot be inferred and there is a possibility that reverse confounding contributed to the results. Our  
314 findings on the association between diet and frailty are however in line with other, longitudinal  
315 research, supporting our results. Future studies may replicate our findings in older, more deprived,  
316 and diverse populations and take into account markers of metabolic health.

317 The strength of our analysis lies predominantly in the large sample size of the UK Biobank making  
318 robust observations and allowing to explore the relative contribution of clustering factors influencing  
319 frailty. Despite potentially limited representativeness, it has been suggested, that exposure-disease  
320 relationships are still extrapolatable to the general population [40]. Further, the extensiveness of the  
321 UK Biobank database allowed us to adjust our analysis for a variety of lifestyle and health related  
322 factors. Additionally, the Oxford WebQ that was used to collect dietary data has been validated and  
323 shown to produce reliable results [14].

## 324 **5. Conclusion**

325 We conclude that adherence to an unhealthful plant-based diet contributes to frailty risk  
326 predominantly among men with low income (<£18k). We therefore identified an at-risk group, which  
327 may benefit from dietary and lifestyle interventions. Future research may focus on identifying  
328 potential dietary drivers of the identified association in older and more deprived populations.

## 329 **6. Acknowledgements**

330 This research has been conducted using the UK Biobank Resource under Application Number 78275

## 331 7. Funding and Conflict of Interest

332 P.E. Slagboom, M. Beekman, and L.C.P.G.M de Groot have received funding from the Vitality  
333 Oriented Innovations for the Lifecourse of the Ageing Society (VOILA) Consortium [ZonMw  
334 457001001]. All authors declare no conflict of interest.

## 335 8. Author Contributions

336 KS, MB, PES were involved in study concept and design, acquisition, analysis, and interpretation of  
337 data. NvB and MRG provided statistical and methodological advice. LCPGMdG provided critical  
338 input. KS performed statistical analysis and prepared the manuscript. All authors read and approved  
339 the final version.

## 340 9. References

- 341 1. Willett, W., et al., *Food in the Anthropocene: the EAT-Lancet Commission on healthy diets*  
342 *from sustainable food systems*. Lancet, 2019. **393**(10170): p. 447-492.
- 343 2. Cruz-Jentoft, A.J., et al., *Nutritional strategies for maintaining muscle mass and strength*  
344 *from middle age to later life: A narrative review*. Maturitas, 2020. **132**: p. 57-64.
- 345 3. Clegg, A., et al., *Frailty in elderly people*. The Lancet, 2013. **381**(9868): p. 752-762.
- 346 4. Maroto-Rodriguez, J., et al., *Plant-based diets and risk of frailty in community-dwelling older*  
347 *adults: the Seniors-ENRICA-1 cohort*. Geroscience, 2023. **45**(1): p. 221-232.
- 348 5. Sotos-Prieto, M., et al., *Association between the quality of plant-based diets and risk of*  
349 *frailty*. Journal of Cachexia, Sarcopenia and Muscle, 2022. **13**(6): p. 2854-2862.
- 350 6. Reid, N., et al., *Sex-specific interventions to prevent and manage frailty*. Maturitas, 2022.  
351 **164**: p. 23-30.
- 352 7. Qi, R., et al., *Plant-Based Diet Indices and Their Association with Frailty in Older Adults: A*  
353 *CLHLS-Based Cohort Study*. Nutrients, 2023. **15**(24).
- 354 8. Gordon, E.H., et al., *Sex differences in frailty: A systematic review and meta-analysis*.  
355 *Experimental Gerontology*, 2017. **89**: p. 30-40.
- 356 9. Dorhout, B.G., et al., *In-Depth Analyses of the Effects of a Diet and Resistance Exercise*  
357 *Intervention in Older Adults: Who Benefits Most From ProMuscle in Practice?* J Gerontol A  
358 *Biol Sci Med Sci*, 2021. **76**(12): p. 2204-2212.
- 359 10. Kheifets, M., et al., *Association of socioeconomic status measures with physical activity and*  
360 *subsequent frailty in older adults*. BMC Geriatrics, 2022. **22**(1): p. 439.
- 361 11. Wang, H.-y., M. Zhang, and X. Sun, *Sex-Specific Association Between Socioeconomic Status,*  
362 *Lifestyle, and the Risk of Frailty Among the Elderly in China*. Frontiers in Medicine, 2021. **8**.
- 363 12. Zhang, Y.-B., et al., *Associations of healthy lifestyle and socioeconomic status with mortality*  
364 *and incident cardiovascular disease: two prospective cohort studies*. BMJ, 2021. **373**: p. n604.
- 365 13. Sudlow, C., et al., *UK Biobank: An Open Access Resource for Identifying the Causes of a Wide*  
366 *Range of Complex Diseases of Middle and Old Age*. PLOS Medicine, 2015. **12**(3): p. e1001779.
- 367 14. Greenwood, D.C., et al., *Validation of the Oxford WebQ Online 24-Hour Dietary*  
368 *Questionnaire Using Biomarkers*. Am J Epidemiol, 2019. **188**(10): p. 1858-1867.
- 369 15. Piernas, C., et al., *Describing a new food group classification system for UK biobank: analysis*  
370 *of food groups and sources of macro- and micronutrients in 208,200 participants*. European  
371 *Journal of Nutrition*, 2021. **60**(5): p. 2879-2890.
- 372 16. Thompson, A.S., et al., *Association of Healthful Plant-based Diet Adherence With Risk of*  
373 *Mortality and Major Chronic Diseases Among Adults in the UK*. JAMA Netw Open, 2023. **6**(3):  
374 p. e234714.

- 375 17. Satija, A., et al., *Plant-Based Dietary Patterns and Incidence of Type 2 Diabetes in US Men*  
376 *and Women: Results from Three Prospective Cohort Studies*. PLoS Med, 2016. **13**(6): p.  
377 e1002039.
- 378 18. Willett, W.C., G.R. Howe, and L.H. Kushi, *Adjustment for total energy intake in epidemiologic*  
379 *studies*. Am J Clin Nutr, 1997. **65**(4 Suppl): p. 1220S-1228S; discussion 1229S-1231S.
- 380 19. Fried, L.P., et al., *Frailty in Older Adults: Evidence for a Phenotype*. The Journals of  
381 Gerontology: Series A, 2001. **56**(3): p. M146-M157.
- 382 20. Hanlon, P., et al., *Frailty and pre-frailty in middle-aged and older adults and its association*  
383 *with multimorbidity and mortality: a prospective analysis of 493 737 UK Biobank*  
384 *participants*. The Lancet Public Health, 2018. **3**(7): p. e323-e332.
- 385 21. Pradhananga, S., et al., *Ethnic differences in the prevalence of frailty in the United Kingdom*  
386 *assessed using the electronic Frailty Index*. AGING MEDICINE, 2019. **2**(3): p. 168-173.
- 387 22. Demirdağ, F., et al., *Nutritional status as a mediator between the age-related muscle loss*  
388 *and frailty in community-dwelling older adults*. Archives of Gerontology and Geriatrics, 2022.  
389 **98**: p. 104569.
- 390 23. Hoogendijk, E.O., et al., *Explaining the association between educational level and frailty in*  
391 *older adults: results from a 13-year longitudinal study in the Netherlands*. Annals of  
392 Epidemiology, 2014. **24**(7): p. 538-544.e2.
- 393 24. Kehler, D.S. and O. Theou, *The impact of physical activity and sedentary behaviors on frailty*  
394 *levels*. Mechanisms of Ageing and Development, 2019. **180**: p. 29-41.
- 395 25. Kojima, G., et al., *A systematic review and meta-analysis of prospective associations between*  
396 *alcohol consumption and incident frailty*. Age and Ageing, 2017. **47**(1): p. 26-34.
- 397 26. Webster, J., et al., *Nutritional strategies to optimise musculoskeletal health for fall and*  
398 *fracture prevention: Looking beyond calcium, vitamin D and protein*. Bone Rep, 2023. **19**: p.  
399 101684.
- 400 27. Frampton, J., et al., *Higher dietary fibre intake is associated with increased skeletal muscle*  
401 *mass and strength in adults aged 40 years and older*. Journal of Cachexia, Sarcopenia and  
402 Muscle, 2021. **12**(6): p. 2134-2144.
- 403 28. Struijk, E.A., et al., *Protein intake and risk of frailty among older women in the Nurses' Health*  
404 *Study*. Journal of Cachexia, Sarcopenia and Muscle, 2022. **13**(3): p. 1752-1761.
- 405 29. Foster, H.M.E., et al., *The effect of socioeconomic deprivation on the association between an*  
406 *extended measurement of unhealthy lifestyle factors and health outcomes: a prospective*  
407 *analysis of the UK Biobank cohort*. The Lancet Public Health, 2018. **3**(12): p. e576-e585.
- 408 30. Feraco, A., et al., *Assessing gender differences in food preferences and physical activity: a*  
409 *population-based survey*. Front Nutr, 2024. **11**: p. 1348456.
- 410 31. Lewer, D., et al., *Unravelling the alcohol harm paradox: a population-based study of social*  
411 *gradients across very heavy drinking thresholds*. BMC Public Health, 2016. **16**(1): p. 599.
- 412 32. Lana, A., F. Rodriguez-Artalejo, and E. Lopez-Garcia, *Dairy Consumption and Risk of Frailty in*  
413 *Older Adults: A Prospective Cohort Study*. Journal of the American Geriatrics Society, 2015.  
414 **63**(9): p. 1852-1860.
- 415 33. Lorenzo-López, L., et al., *Nutritional determinants of frailty in older adults: A systematic*  
416 *review*. BMC Geriatrics, 2017. **17**(1): p. 108.
- 417 34. Ma, Y., et al., *Number of 24-Hour Diet Recalls Needed to Estimate Energy Intake*. Annals of  
418 Epidemiology, 2009. **19**(8): p. 553-559.
- 419 35. Struijk, E.A., et al., *Sweetened beverages and risk of frailty among older women in the*  
420 *Nurses' Health Study: A cohort study*. PLOS Medicine, 2020. **17**(12): p. e1003453.
- 421 36. Otten, D., et al., *Similarities and Differences of Mental Health in Women and Men: A*  
422 *Systematic Review of Findings in Three Large German Cohorts*. Frontiers in Public Health,  
423 2021. **9**.
- 424 37. Crimmins, E.M., J.K. Kim, and A. Solé-Auró, *Gender differences in health: results from SHARE,*  
425 *ELSA and HRS*. European Journal of Public Health, 2010. **21**(1): p. 81-91.

- 426 38. Canon, M.E. and E.M. Crimmins, *Sex differences in the association between muscle quality,*  
427 *inflammatory markers, and cognitive decline.* The Journal of nutrition, health and aging,  
428 2011. **15**(8): p. 695-698.
- 429 39. Shivappa, N., et al., *The Relationship Between the Dietary Inflammatory Index and Incident*  
430 *Frailty: A Longitudinal Cohort Study.* Journal of the American Medical Directors Association,  
431 2018. **19**(1): p. 77-82.
- 432 40. Fry, A., et al., *Comparison of Sociodemographic and Health-Related Characteristics of UK*  
433 *Biobank Participants With Those of the General Population.* Am J Epidemiol, 2017. **186**(9): p.  
434 1026-1034.

435

436

437 **Table 1: Descriptive statistics over UK Biobank study population**

	Joint	Female	Male
<b>N</b>	<b>73,180</b>	<b>38,423</b>	<b>34,757</b>
<b>Age, mean ± SD</b>	<b>55.5±7.9</b>	<b>54.6±7.7</b>	<b>56.5±7.9</b>
<b>Female n (%)</b>	<b>38,423 (52,5%)</b>	<b>38,432 (100%)</b>	<b>0 (0%)</b>
<b>hPDI [17-85], mean ± SD</b>	<b>53.2±7.5</b>	<b>53.0±7.6</b>	<b>53.3±7.3</b>
<b>uPDI [17-85], mean ± SD</b>	<b>52.8±7.3</b>	<b>52.2±7.4</b>	<b>53.3±7.2</b>
<b>Income</b>			
<b>Low, n (%)</b>	<b>8,081 (11.0)</b>	<b>4,822 (12.6)</b>	<b>3,259 (9.4)</b>
<b>Medium, n (%)</b>	<b>37,869 (51.8)</b>	<b>20,237 (52.7)</b>	<b>17,632 (50.7)</b>
<b>High, n (%)</b>	<b>27,230 (37.2)</b>	<b>13,364 (34.8)</b>	<b>13,866 (39.9)</b>
<b>Frailty</b>			
<b>0, n (%)</b>	<b>48,529 (66.3)</b>	<b>24,832 (64.6)</b>	<b>23,697 (68.2)</b>
<b>1, n (%)</b>	<b>19,663 (26.9)</b>	<b>10,561 (27.5)</b>	<b>9,102 (26.2)</b>
<b>2, n (%)</b>	<b>3,977 (5.4)</b>	<b>2,387 (6.2)</b>	<b>1,590 (4.6)</b>
<b>3, n (%)</b>	<b>823 (1.1)</b>	<b>519 (1.4)</b>	<b>304 (0.9)</b>
<b>4, n (%)</b>	<b>188 (0.3)</b>	<b>124 (0.3)</b>	<b>64 (0.2)</b>
<b>BMI [kg/m<sup>2</sup>], mean ± SD</b>	<b>26.5±4.4</b>	<b>26.0±4.8</b>	<b>27.0±4.0</b>
<b>Ethnicity</b>			
<b>White, n (%)</b>	<b>71,106 (97.2)</b>	<b>37,251 (97.0)</b>	<b>33,855 (97.4)</b>
<b>Mixed, n (%)</b>	<b>385 (0.5)</b>	<b>250 (0.7)</b>	<b>135 (0.4)</b>
<b>Asian, n (%)</b>	<b>628 (0.9)</b>	<b>263 (0.7)</b>	<b>365 (1.1)</b>
<b>Black, n (%)</b>	<b>505 (0.7)</b>	<b>304 (0.8)</b>	<b>201 (0.6)</b>
<b>Chinese, n (%)</b>	<b>166 (0.2)</b>	<b>112 (0.3)</b>	<b>54 (0.2)</b>
<b>Other, n (%)</b>	<b>390 (0.5)</b>	<b>243 (0.6)</b>	<b>147 (0.4)</b>
<b>Education</b>			
<b>Low, n (%)</b>	<b>16,454 (22.5)</b>	<b>9,319 (24.3)</b>	<b>7,135 (20.5)</b>
<b>Medium, n (%)</b>	<b>14,275 (19.5)</b>	<b>6,975 (18.2)</b>	<b>7,300 (21.0)</b>
<b>High, n (%)</b>	<b>42,454 (58.0)</b>	<b>22,129 (57.6)</b>	<b>20,322 (58.5)</b>
<b>Physical Activity [MET</b>			
<b>min/wk], mean ± SD</b>	<b>2,353.1±2,224.9</b>	<b>2,341.5±2,164.8</b>	<b>2,367±2291</b>
<b>Energy intake [kj/d], mean ± SD</b>	<b>8,606.0±1,927.8</b>	<b>7,960.8±1,637.5</b>	<b>9,319.2±1,972.6</b>
<b>Alcohol [g/d], mean ± SD</b>	<b>17.8±19.8</b>	<b>13.6±15.7</b>	<b>22.4±22.7</b>
<b>Fiber [g/d], mean ± SD</b>	<b>17.9±5.6</b>	<b>17.6±5.4</b>	<b>18.3±5.8</b>
<b>Protein [g/d], mean ± SD</b>	<b>80.3±19.3</b>	<b>75.9±17.5</b>	<b>85.2±20.0</b>
<b>Current smoker n (%), mean ± SD</b>	<b>4,942 (6.8)</b>	<b>2,199 (5.7)</b>	<b>2,743 (7.9)</b>
<b>Nr of medication, mean ± SD</b>			
<b>Nr of medication, mean ± SD</b>	<b>2.0±2.3</b>	<b>2.0±2.3</b>	<b>2.0±2.3</b>
<b>Vitamin D [nmol/l], mean ± SD</b>	<b>49.7±20.8</b>	<b>49.5±20.8</b>	<b>49.9±20.9</b>


438 **hPDI: healthful plant-based diet index, uPDI: unhealthful plant-based diet index,**

439 **income low: <18,000 £, medium: 18,000-51,999£, high: >52,000£**

440 **MET: Metabolic equivalent of task**

441

442



443

444 **Figure 1 Association between unhealthful plant-based diet index (uPDI) and frailty in men of**  
445 **different income groups**

446 OR per 10-unit increase in uPDI

447 – Basic model --- fully adjusted model ● low income ▲ medium income ■ high income

448

449



