

Adherence to the Eatwell Guide and cardiometabolic, cognitive and neuroimaging parameters: An analysis from the PREVENT Dementia study

Sarah Gregory<sup>1</sup>, Alex Griffiths<sup>2</sup>, Amy Jennings<sup>3,4</sup>, Fiona C Malcomson<sup>5</sup>, Jamie Matu<sup>2</sup>, Anne-Marie Minihane<sup>3</sup>, Graciela Muniz-Terrera<sup>1,6</sup>, Craig W. Ritchie<sup>1,7</sup>, Solange Parra-Soto<sup>8,9</sup>, Emma Stevenson<sup>5,10</sup>, Rebecca Townsend<sup>10</sup>, Nicola Ward<sup>4</sup>, Oliver Shannon<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Edinburgh Dementia Prevention, Centre for Clinical Brain Sciences, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK

<sup>2</sup>School of Health, Leeds Beckett University, Leeds, UK

<sup>3</sup>Norwich Medical School, University of East Anglia, Norwich, UK

<sup>4</sup>Centre for Public Health, Institute for Global Food Security, Queen's University Belfast, Belfast, UK

<sup>5</sup>Human Nutrition & Exercise Research Centre, Population Health Sciences Institute, Faculty of Medicine Sciences, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, UK

<sup>6</sup>Ohio University Heritage College of Osteopathic Medicine, Ohio University, Ohio, USA

<sup>7</sup>Scottish Brain Sciences, Edinburgh, UK

<sup>8</sup>Department of Nutrition and Public Health, Universidad del Bío-Bío, Chillan 3780000, Chile

<sup>9</sup>School of Cardiometabolic and Metabolic Health, University of Glasgow, UK

<sup>10</sup>School of Biomedical, Nutritional and Sport Sciences, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, UK

<sup>11</sup>Centre for Public Health, Institute for Global Food Security, Queen's University Belfast, Belfast, UK

Corresponding author: Sarah.Gregory@ed.ac.uk

Edinburgh Dementia Prevention, Outpatient Department 2, Western General Hospital, Crewe Road South, Edinburgh, EH4 2XU, UK.

Short title: Eatwell Guide in the PREVENT Dementia study

Keywords: diet, Eatwell Guide, cohort study, cardiometabolic health

## Abstract

Healthy diet behaviours are important in a globally ageing population, particularly in relation to cardiometabolic and brain health. The Eatwell guide (EWG) reflects the UK government's recommendations for a healthy and balanced diet. Data from the PREVENT dementia cohort study baseline visit was used in this analysis. Binary and graded EWG scores (BEWG, GEWG) were created from a self-reported Food Frequency Questionnaire. The CAIDE score was included as the primary outcome measure to represent risk for future AD. Secondary outcome measures included cardiometabolic health measures, and brain health measures. Generalised additive models were run in R. A total of 517 participants were included in the analysis, with a mean BEWG score of 4.39 ( $\pm 1.66$ ) (out of a possible 12 points) and GEWG score of 39.88 ( $\pm 6.19$ ) (out of a possible 60 points). There was no significant association between either EWG score and the CAIDE (BEWG  $\beta$ : 0.07; p: 0.32; GEWG  $\beta$ : 0.02, p: 0.36) or any measures of brain health. There was a significant association between higher GEWG score and lower systolic and diastolic blood pressure and body mass index (BMI) (systolic  $\beta$ : -0.24, p: 0.03; diastolic  $\beta$ : -0.16, p: 0.01; BMI  $\beta$ : -0.09, p: 0.02). Although not directly associated with the CAIDE score, the EWG dietary pattern may be beneficial for dementia prevention efforts through modification of hypertension and obesity, which are both known risk factors for dementia. Future work could replicate these findings in other UK-based cohorts as well as further development of EWG scoring methodologies.

## 1 Introduction

2 Modification of dietary patterns has been considered as a potential strategy for the  
3 improvement of multiple health conditions. Healthy eating behaviours have been associated  
4 with reduced risk of all-cause mortality and many chronic age-related conditions [1, 2]. Indeed,  
5 one in seven UK deaths and one in five premature deaths in the UK is thought to be attributable  
6 to poor diet [3]. The role of healthier dietary behaviours is critical in the context of a globally  
7 aging population, particularly for cardiometabolic and brain health, with dementia and heart  
8 disease the leading causes of death in the UK [4].

9  
10 There is substantial evidence supporting an association between adherence to a Mediterranean  
11 dietary pattern (MedDiet) and better cardiometabolic health [5-12]. The MedDiet is rich in  
12 whole plant foods such as fruit, nuts, vegetables and legumes, olive oil and fish [13]. Recent  
13 reviews have reported conflicting findings on the association between the MedDiet and brain  
14 health [14], with certain subgroups, such as those living in the Mediterranean region,  
15 potentially more likely to benefit from MedDiet adherence [15]. A recent analysis of the  
16 European Prevention of Alzheimer's Dementia Longitudinal Cohort Study (EPAD LCS) (n=1826,  
17 mean age 65.6 years) found that participants living in the Mediterranean had a stronger  
18 association with MedDiet adherence and brain health outcomes compared to those living in  
19 non-Mediterranean countries [16]. This may reflect the fact that high adherence to a MedDiet  
20 in non-Mediterranean regions differs from the pattern followed in the Mediterranean basin,  
21 where the consumption of olive oil, fish, vegetables and legumes is higher, differences or the  
22 fact the MedDiet scoring tools do not fully capture a high-quality diet in non-Mediterranean  
23 regions [17]. Scores such as the Dutch Dietary Guidelines and the Japanese Diet Index have  
24 been developed to better reflect the traditional healthy eating habits and national healthy  
25 eating guidelines [15], and are likely to be more considerate of national sustainability and  
26 sociocultural factors [18].

27  
28 Public Health England (now The Office for Health Improvement and Disparities) produced the  
29 'Eatwell Guide' (EWG) to communicate UK government recommendations for a healthy and

30 balanced diet, with the ultimate aim of improving health and reducing non-communicable  
31 disease [19]. The EWG broadly aligns with key characteristics of the MedDiet, and promotes the  
32 consumption of fruit and vegetables, legumes and fish as sustainable protein sources,  
33 unsaturated oils, wholegrains and fibre rich carbohydrates sources, and adequate fluid intake,  
34 whilst limiting consumption of sugar-rich discretionary foods and processed meats [19, 20]. As  
35 the EWG is modelled around UK food and dietary habits, it may provide a more realistic dietary  
36 pattern goal than, for example, a MedDiet [21]. A number of the components of the EWG have  
37 been consistently associated with better health, including better cardiometabolic outcomes  
38 [22], reduced cancer incidence [23, 24] and cognitive health [25]. However, few studies have  
39 explored associations between overall adherence to the EWG and health. In one cross-cohort  
40 analysis of data from EPIC-Oxford, One Million Women study and UK Biobank, higher  
41 adherence to the EWG was associated with a reduced risk of mortality [26]. This study by  
42 Scheelbeck *et al* is the first to create an empirical score from the EWG and investigate  
43 associations with health outcomes. Analyses applying the same EWG scoring methodology in  
44 post-menopausal women in the UK Women's Cohort Study (UKWCS) reported that higher  
45 adherence to the EWG was associated with lower weight, waist circumference and BMI [27].  
46 Further, greater adherence to the EWG at baseline was associated with smaller increases in  
47 waist circumference and lower risk of abdominal obesity over 4 years [27]. Whilst these  
48 provisional findings are promising, they are restricted to a limited number of health outcomes.  
49 Moreover, Scheelbeck *et al* did not incorporate all EWG components into their score due to  
50 availability of data across datasets and scored each EWG component on a binary basis (i.e.,  
51 points awarded for achieving a dietary goal), which may fail to capture more nuanced  
52 differences in diet quality between individuals (e.g., by partially meeting an EWG  
53 recommendation).

54  
55 Associations between EWG adherence and risk of dementia are currently unknown. Indeed, the  
56 SACN (2018) review on *Diet, Cognitive Impairment and Dementia* identified a gap in the  
57 research about UK healthy eating recommendations and dementia risk [28]. The aim of this  
58 current study was to develop a new binary and graded scoring methodologies for EWG

59 adherence, building on the initial methodology developed by Scheelbeek *et al*, in order to  
60 explore associations between adherence to the EWG and risk for dementia, cardiometabolic  
61 and brain health in a cohort of midlife adults in the UK and Ireland. Furthermore, a comparison  
62 was made between the EWG scores and MedDiet scores within the cohort, to explore the  
63 comparability of these two models to capture healthy eating.

64

## 65 Methods

### 66 *PREVENT Dementia Programme*

67 The data used in this study is drawn from the baseline visit of the PREVENT dementia  
68 programme (PREVENT) [29, 30]. PREVENT is a prospective cohort study of 700 participants aged  
69 40 to 59 years of age at baseline, at least half of whom have a parental history of dementia.  
70 Participants were recruited from five centres in the UK and Ireland (Cambridge, Dublin,  
71 Edinburgh, London, and Oxford). Participants completed physical health and cognitive  
72 assessments at the baseline visit as well as providing information on risk factors for future  
73 neurodegeneration through a series of self-report questionnaires.

74

### 75 *Ethical Approval and Consent*

76 The study was conducted according to the guidelines laid down in the Declaration of Helsinki  
77 and all procedures involving human participants were approved by the London-Camberwell St  
78 Giles National Health Service Research Ethics Committee (REC reference 12/LO/1023). Written  
79 informed consent was provided by all participants prior to any protocol procedures.

80

### 81 *Calculation of Eatwell Guide scores*

82 Dietary data were collected with the Scottish Collaborative Group Food Frequency  
83 Questionnaire (SCG-FFQ) [31, 32]. The SCG-FFQ was self-administered by each participant. It  
84 begins with clear instructions on the first page of the questionnaire including pictures of  
85 portion sizes, which all participants were instructed to read before self-reporting their diet.  
86 Study staff were on hand to answer any questions that participants had and to check for  
87 missing data prior to the participant leaving the site. The SCG-FFQ has been validated in several

88 populations in the UK as a self-report tool [31, 32]. The SCQ-FFQ asks participants to report  
89 their consumption of 175 foods and drinks over the previous two to three months. The SCG-  
90 FFQ was completed at the baseline visit, with repeated dietary data collection currently  
91 ongoing in follow up visits (Visit 2; 2-4 years post-baseline; Visit 3: 5-8 years post baseline). A  
92 comprehensive nutritional breakdown is available for each participant in addition to food level  
93 responses. Daily nutrient intake was calculated from the food intake data using the McCance  
94 and Widdowson 2021 dataset [33]. Intakes of carbohydrates, proteins, total fats and saturated  
95 fatty acids (SFA) were converted into calorie values to calculate the percentage of calories from  
96 each food group included in the diet.

97  
98 Two EWG scores were created, one applying a binary scoring methodology, and one a graded  
99 score (hereafter referred to as the binary EWG and graded EWG respectively). Full details of  
100 scoring methodologies are available in the supplementary materials (Supplementary Table S1).  
101 Each score awarded points for adherence to EWG criteria for the following food and nutrient  
102 groups; carbohydrates, proteins, fats, SFA, fibre, sugars, salt, total kilocalories, fruit and  
103 vegetables, fish, red and processed meats, and water. For the binary scoring, the method was  
104 modelled on a traditional MEDAS score [34]; participants were awarded 1 point if they met  
105 criteria for the nutritional or food component, else 0 points were awarded, with a total possible  
106 score of 12. Intake values were not rounded up for any of the components. The graded score  
107 was modelled on the Panagiotakos Pyramid MedDiet score [35], with 0 to 5 points allocated  
108 according to level of compliance with the EWG recommendations, with a total possible score of  
109 60. 5 points was awarded if a participant met the EWG recommendations for a food or  
110 macronutrient group. 0 points were awarded for achieving less than half of the recommended  
111 intake for healthy foods (carbohydrates, proteins, fibre, fruit and vegetables, fish and water)  
112 and for consuming 1.5 times the recommended limit for unhealthy foods (fats, SFA, sugars,  
113 salts, red and processed meats). Taking carbohydrates as an example for the binary EWG score  
114 1 point was awarded if  $\geq 50\%$  of calories reported in the diet were from carbohydrates and 0  
115 points for  $< 50\%$  of calories from carbohydrates; for the graded EWG score 5 points were  
116 awarded for  $\geq 50\%$  of calories reported in the diet were from carbohydrates, 4 points for

117  $\geq 43.75\%$  and  $< 50\%$  of calories from carbohydrates, 3 points for  $\geq 37.5\%$  and  $< 43.75\%$  of calories  
118 from carbohydrates, 2 points for  $\geq 31.25\%$  and  $< 37.5\%$  of calories from carbohydrates, 1 point  
119 for  $\geq 25\%$  and  $< 31.5\%$  of calories from carbohydrates and 0 points for  $< 25\%$  of calories from  
120 carbohydrates.

121

### 122 *Calculation of Mediterranean diet scores*

123 Three MedDiet scores (the Mediterranean Diet Adherence Screener (MEDAS) score, the MEDAS  
124 continuous and the MedDiet Pyramid (Pyramid) score) were calculated using previously  
125 published scoring methods. Briefly, the MEDAS score was calculated using a binary scoring  
126 method, whereby participants were allocated 0 or 1 points for each of 14 food groups  
127 depending on whether they met consumption criteria [36]. The MEDAS continuous was  
128 developed by Shannon *et al* with points allocated for the same consumption criteria as MEDAS  
129 but on a continuous scale from 0 to 1, depending upon proximity to the dietary target, as  
130 opposed to binary allocations [37]. Similarly, the Pyramid score was also coded on a continuous  
131 scale of 0 to 1 with a total possible score of 15 points [38]. Continuous scores have been shown  
132 to have more sensitivity to detecting differences in diet quality, particularly in a UK population,  
133 where they have shown stronger associations with better cognition [37] and reduced dementia  
134 risk [39] compared with binary scores.

135

### 136 *CAIDE score*

137 The Cardiovascular Risk Factors, Ageing and Dementia (CAIDE) risk score was calculated for all  
138 participants. The CAIDE score was originally developed in the FINGER study, and ranges from 0  
139 to 18 points with higher scores representing greater dementia risk [40]. The CAIDE score was  
140 calculated using self-reported age, education and sex, systolic blood pressure (SBP) (mean of  
141 triplicate blood pressure readings in supine or seated position recorded at baseline visit), body  
142 mass index (BMI) (height and weight recorded at baseline visit, used for BMI calculation),  
143 fasting plasma total cholesterol, (analysed in local laboratories at the baseline visit), physical  
144 activity (self-reported non-validated questionnaire asking participants how often they complete  
145 light, moderate and vigorous exercise; 0 points awarded for never up to 5 points for daily,

146 scores summed across all three categories with higher points reflecting more physical activity)  
147 and *APOEε4* carrier status (DNA analysed from blood collected at baseline). The score weighting  
148 is presented in TableS2

149

#### 150 *Cardiometabolic outcome variables*

151 Data on blood pressure (systolic and diastolic (SBP, DBP)), BMI, and waist-to-hip ratio (WHR)  
152 values (recorded at baseline visit) were extracted from the database. Each of these  
153 cardiometabolic measures were collected by trained study staff at the baseline visit. A  
154 Framingham Risk Score (FRS) was calculated for each participant using the 'CVrisk' package in R  
155 [41] and a QRisk3 score was calculated using the 'QRISK3' R package [42]. The variables used to  
156 create these cardiovascular risk scores are detailed in Supplementary Table S3.

157

#### 158 *Cognitive outcome measures*

159 For the purposes of this analysis, the score for the Four Mountains Task (4MT) was selected as  
160 the primary cognitive outcome. The 4MT is a novel tablet-administered task designed to assess  
161 allocentric processing. Participants are shown an image of four mountains for approximately 10  
162 seconds and after a short interval (~ 1 second) asked to select which scene they were previously  
163 shown from a choice of four image options [43]. The 4MT has been shown to be sensitive to  
164 early neurodegenerative disease [44] and has also previously been associated with the MedDiet  
165 in a European cohort study [16].

166

#### 167 *Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) variables*

168 Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) scans were collected using 3T Siemens scanners (Verio,  
169 PRISMA, Prisma Fit, Skyra). Derived variables were extracted from the dataset to include left  
170 and right hippocampal volume, left and right hippocampal thickness, white matter  
171 hyperintensity volume (cube-transformed) and total estimated intra-cranial volume. Further  
172 details on the imaging acquisition and processing in the PREVENT dataset can be found  
173 elsewhere [45].

174



175 *Self-reported diet quality*

176 Participants were asked to indicate (yes or no) if they felt they ate a healthy diet. No further  
177 context was provided as to what defined a healthy diet and there was no set time period,  
178 rather participants were asked to respond about how they felt generally about their diet.

179

180 *Covariates*

181 Several covariates were assessed, including age, sex, years of education, *APOE* $\epsilon$ 4, parental  
182 history of dementia (self-reported), socioeconomic status (SES) group and physical activity. SES  
183 group was determined according to self-reported occupation using the National Statistics socio-  
184 economic classification (NS-SEC:

185 [https://www.ons.gov.uk/methodology/classificationsandstandards/otherclassifications/thenati](https://www.ons.gov.uk/methodology/classificationsandstandards/otherclassifications/thenationalstatistics socioeconomic classification nssec based on soc 2010)  
186 [onalstatistics socioeconomic classification nssec based on soc 2010](https://www.ons.gov.uk/methodology/classificationsandstandards/otherclassifications/thenationalstatistics socioeconomic classification nssec based on soc 2010)) and grouped in low, middle

187 and high socioeconomic group or into a not in employment group. The not in employment  
188 group included both participants who reported they were unemployed and those who had  
189 taken early retirement. As total kilocalories were included in the EWG scores, the analyses were  
190 not adjusted for total energy intake. For analysis including the CAIDE score as the outcome  
191 measure, only parental history of dementia and physical activity were included as covariates so  
192 as not to over-correct the model. Where the FRS or QRisk3 was the outcome variable of  
193 interest, years of education *APOE* $\epsilon$ 4, parental history of dementia and physical activity were  
194 included as covariates. The National Adult Reading Test (NART) score was included as an  
195 additional covariate in the 4MT analysis as a measure of premorbid intelligence. Finally, for all  
196 the brain imaging models, intracranial volume was included as a covariate.

197

198 *Statistical Analysis*

199 All statistical analyses were completed using R (Version 4.1.0). Descriptive statistics were  
200 calculated for all participants. Where necessary, to ensure the fulfilment of distributional  
201 assumptions of the models fitted, data was transformed. For the main analysis, we excluded  
202 participants with missing data in the exposure, outcome, and covariate variables of interest  
203 from the analysis. Relationships between the binary EWG (BEWG) and graded EWG (GEWG)

204 scores and the MedDiet scores were assessed using correlations. As the BEWG and GEWG  
205 scores were slightly skewed, generalised additive models were run. First, we tested the cohort  
206 as a whole and fitted univariate and fully adjusted generalised additive models to test for  
207 associations between BEWG and GEWG scores and the CAIDE score. The fully adjusted model  
208 included parental history of dementia, physical activity scores and SES group. We then ran  
209 univariate and fully adjusted generalised additive models to test for associations between  
210 BEWG and GEWG scores and measures of cardiometabolic health (SBP, DBP, BMI, WHR, FRS,  
211 QRisk3), brain health (4MT total score, cube-transformed white matter lesion volume, left and  
212 right hippocampal volume, and left and right hippocampal thickness), and self-rated diet  
213 quality. Covariates included in each model are detailed in the tables of results. Finally  
214 component level analysis was run for the CAIDE score (as the primary outcome) and for all  
215 other outcomes with a statistically significant fully adjusted model. An exploratory analysis  
216 tested for any differences in outcomes with the GEWG score by SES group. A formal sample size  
217 calculation was not undertaken as this was a secondary analysis of a large observational study.

218

## 219 Results

### 220 *Descriptive statistics*

221 A total of 517 participants were included in the primary analyses which investigated CAIDE risk  
222 scores and cardiometabolic health. Additional analyses involved fewer participants due to  
223 missing data, with sample sizes for each outcome detailed in Table 1. The sample included  
224 more women (59.6%), had a similar number of participants with and without a parental history  
225 of dementia (52.8% vs 47.2%), with 38.3% *APOE* $\epsilon$ 4 carriers. Most participants fell in the highest  
226 SES group according to their occupations (64.6%), with a high number of years of education  
227 reported in the sample (16.72 ( $\pm$ 3.31) years). See Table 1 for full demographic and descriptive  
228 details.

229

230 The sample had a mean BEWG score of 4.39 ( $\pm$ 1.66) (range 0 to 9) and a mean GEWG score of  
231 39.88 ( $\pm$ 6.19) (range 16 to 53). Women had higher BEWG scores compared to men (4.55 ( $\pm$ 1.66)  
232 vs 4.15 ( $\pm$ 1.65),  $t$ : 2.70,  $p$ : 0.007) however this difference was smaller when comparing women

233 to men for the GEWG scores (40.31 ( $\pm$ 6.16) vs 39.24 ( $\pm$ 6.20),  $t$ : 1.94,  $p$ : 0.05). Participants in the  
234 low SES group had lower GEWG scores than the high SES group (Low: 37.50 ( $\pm$ 6.57); High: 40.55  
235 ( $\pm$ 5.90),  $p$ : 0.003), with no significant difference in BEWG scores by SES group. Age was  
236 significantly associated with higher BEWG and GEWG scores (BEWG  $\beta$ : 0.03, SE: 0.01,  $p$ : 0.03;  
237 GEWG  $\beta$ : 0.14, SE: 0.05,  $p$ : 0.004). Higher physical activity scores were associated with higher  
238 GEWG, but not BEWG, scores ( $\beta$ : 0.22, SE: 0.10,  $p$ : 0.02). There were no differences in BEWG or  
239 GEWG score by parental history of dementia or *APOE* $\epsilon$ 4 status. There was no significant  
240 association between the total number of years of education and either the BEWG or GEWG  
241 scores. A breakdown of the number of contributing component information for each score is  
242 presented in Supplementary Table S4. All participants were consuming more than 5% of  
243 calories from sugars and so no participants were awarded a point for this component using the  
244 BEWG scoring methodology. This may be due to the way sugars were calculated from the SCQ-  
245 FFQ and is explored further in the discussion.

246  
247 The BEWG and GEWG scores were highly correlated with each other ( $R$ : 0.77,  $p$ <0.001). BEWG  
248 and GEWG scores were correlated with MedDiet scores to explore the similarity between the  
249 dietary patterns. All scores were moderately correlated ( $r$ = 0.3-0.4), with moderate correlations  
250 between the BEWG and GEWG scores with the three MedDiet scores (MEDAS, MEDAS  
251 continuous, Pyramid) (see Figure 1).

252  
253 *Analytical statistics*

#### 254 *CAIDE*

255 There was no significant association between the BEWG score or GEWG score and the CAIDE  
256 score in unadjusted or fully adjusted models (Fully adjusted scores; BEWG  $\beta$ : 0.07, SE: 0.07,  $p$ :  
257 0.33; GEWG  $\beta$ : 0.02, SE: 0.02,  $p$ : 0.36) (see Table 2). Meeting fat requirements (i.e.  $\leq$ 35%  
258 calories from fat) for both the BEWG and the GEWG scores was associated with a higher CAIDE  
259 score (Fully adjusted scores; BEWG  $\beta$ : 0.61, SE: 0.25,  $p$ : 0.01; GEWG  $\beta$ : 0.24, SE: 0.12,  $p$ : 0.04),  
260 with no other associations seen at the food or nutritional component level (see Supplementary  
261 Table S5 and Supplementary Table S6).

262 *Cardiometabolic health*

263 There were no significant associations between BEWG scores and SBP, DBP or BMI, and no  
264 significant associations between either scoring methodology and WHR, FRS or QRisk3 scores. In  
265 contrast, higher GEWG scores were associated with lower SBP and DBP (fully adjusted SBP  $\beta$ : -  
266 0.24, SE: 0.11, p: 0.03; DBP  $\beta$ : -0.16, SE: 0.06, p: 0.01), as well as with lower BMI ( $\beta$ : -0.09, SE:  
267 0.04, p: 0.02) (see Table 2). Higher scores awarded for the GEWG total fat component (i.e.  
268 eating fewer total calories from fat and therefore being closer to achieving  $\leq 35\%$  calories from  
269 fat) were associated with higher SBP ( $\beta$ : 1.53, SE: 0.63, p: 0.01). Conversely, having higher  
270 scores for the fibre (indicating being closer to achieving the EWG dietary target of  $\geq 22.6\text{g/d}$  of  
271 fibre), fruits and vegetables (indicating being closer to achieving the EWG dietary target of  
272  $\geq 400\text{g/d}$  of fruits and vegetables), and fish (indicating being closer to achieving the EWG dietary  
273 target of  $\geq 10\text{g/d}$  of fish) GEWG score components was associated with significantly lower SBP  
274 (fibre  $\beta$ : -0.97, SE: 1.30, p: 0.007; fruits and vegetables  $\beta$ : -1.09, SE: 0.44, p: 0.01; fish  $\beta$ : -1.03,  
275 SE: 0.36, p: 0.005). Higher scores for the fibre, fruits and vegetables, and red and processed  
276 meat (indicating being closer to achieving the EWG dietary target of  $\leq 70\text{g/d}$  of red or processed  
277 meat, i.e. higher scores reflect eating less of this food group) GEWG score components were  
278 associated with significantly lower DBP (fibre  $\beta$ : -0.61, SE: 0.22, p: 0.006; fruits and vegetables  
279  $\beta$ : -0.79, SE: 0.27, p: 0.004; red and processed meats  $\beta$ : -0.77, SE: 0.29, p: 0.007). Only higher  
280 scores for the fruits and vegetables graded EWG score component were associated with lower  
281 BMI ( $\beta$ : -0.38, SE: 0.15, p: 0.01) Further details of these associations are provided in  
282 Supplementary Tables S7, S8 and S9.

283

284 *Four Mountains Test and MRI variables*

285 There was no significant association between either the BEWG or the GEWG score and the 4MT  
286 total score (BEWG  $\beta$ : 0.05, SE: 0.11, p: 0.68; GEWG  $\beta$ : 0.02, SE: 0.03, p: 0.58) (see Table 3).  
287 There were no significant associations between the BEWG or GEWG scores and any MRI  
288 variables in the fully adjusted models (see Table 3). In the high SES group only, there was a  
289 significant negative association between GEWG scores and left hippocampal volume (see  
290 Supplementary Table S9).

291 *Perception of healthy eating*

292 There was a significant association between the positive self-report of eating a healthy diet, and  
293 higher BEWG and GEWG scores (BEWG  $\beta$ : 0.92, SE: 0.21,  $p < 0.001$ ; GEWG  $\beta$ : 3.71, SE: 0.78,  
294  $p < 0.001$ ) (see Table 3). There was a significant association between the positive self-report of  
295 eating a healthy diet and higher BEWG in the middle, high and not in-employment SES groups,  
296 but not in the low SES group, and with the GEWG in the high and not in employment SES groups  
297 but not low or middle SES groups (see Supplementary Table S9).

298

299 Discussion

300 Both the BEWG and GEWG scores created in this analysis were moderately correlated with  
301 three commonly used MedDiet scores (the MEDAS, MEDAS continuous and Pyramid scores).  
302 There were no associations between either EWG score and the primary outcome of the CAIDE  
303 score. However, when looking at individual cardiometabolic components of the CAIDE there  
304 was an association between higher GEWG scores and lower SBP, DBP and BMI. In particular,  
305 achieving more points (indicating being closer to meeting the EWG criteria in full) for fruits and  
306 vegetables was associated with better cardiometabolic health. There were no associations  
307 noted between binary or graded EWG scores and brain health as assessed by cognitive or brain  
308 volume outcomes. There was a significant association between self-perception of a healthy diet  
309 and higher binary and graded EWG scores, with the association strongest in the high SES group  
310 as well as in those participants who were not in employment at the time of dietary data  
311 collection.

312

313 There were no significant associations between either the binary or graded EWG scores and the  
314 CAIDE score, suggesting EWG adherence is not associated with risk for dementia in this midlife  
315 cohort. The CAIDE score was selected as one of the most commonly used dementia risk scores,  
316 with associations between the score and neuroimaging outcomes previously reported in the  
317 PREVENT dementia cohort [46-49]. Importantly the CAIDE score reflects the accumulation of  
318 cardiovascular risk for dementia, factors which may be the most amenable to dietary  
319 interventions. However, the CAIDE score is not without limitations and validation work outside

320 of the original cohort where the score was developed has suggested there is very little  
321 discrimination compared to age alone [50]. It is also important to consider that many of the  
322 components of the CAIDE score would not be modifiable by diet (age, sex, education and  
323 *APOEε4*) which may explain the lack of association reported in this analysis. The CAIDE score in  
324 the population included in this analysis from the PREVENT cohort is lower compared to the  
325 FINGER cohort intervention study where the score was originally developed (PREVENT: 5.95 vs  
326 FINGER: 7.76 (intervention) and 7.27 (control) [51]), and it may be that any EWG score  
327 associations would only be seen in a cohort with a higher mean CAIDE score where there is  
328 more potential for modification. As age is one of the important contributors to the overall  
329 CAIDE score, it is worth replicating this analysis between EWG scores and CAIDE score in an  
330 older cohort (such as the NICOLA or UK Biobank cohorts [52, 53]) to understand if there is an  
331 association in later in midlife, where the mean cohort CAIDE score would be expected to be  
332 higher due to age.

333  
334 Despite no statistically significant associations with the CAIDE score, there were a number of  
335 significant associations between the GEWG score and cardiometabolic health which themselves  
336 are likely protective of brain health. Importantly these are the elements of the CAIDE score  
337 which would be expected to be modifiable by diet. GEWG scores were associated with lower  
338 SBP, DBP and BMI. As there were no significant associations between the BEWG score and  
339 cardiometabolic health measures, this suggests the GEWG score is more appropriate to apply to  
340 this population with partial compliance to EWG criteria important for health. This may reflect  
341 previously reported statistics that only 0.1% of the UK population adhere to all nine  
342 recommendations [26]. In the context of dementia prevention efforts, it is particularly  
343 important to note that the GEWG was associated with lower blood pressure and BMI values,  
344 given both hypertension and obesity are known midlife risk factors for AD [54]. A ten-point  
345 change in the GEWG was associated with a 2.4 mmHg reduction in SBP, a 1.6 mmHg reduction  
346 in DBP and a 0.9kg/m<sup>2</sup> reduction in BMI. A 2mmHg reduction in SBP has been estimated to  
347 decrease the risk of death from stroke by 10% [55], although larger reductions in SBP may be  
348 needed to reduce the risk of dementia with a potential U-shaped association where both low

349 and high BP confers risk [56, 57]. Similarly, a 2 mmHg reduction in DBP has been estimated to  
350 result in a 17% decrease in hypertension and a 15% reduction of risk from stroke and transient  
351 ischaemic attacks [58]. In midlife, each 1 unit increase in BMI was associated with a higher risk  
352 of dementia in a 38-year follow-up of the Framingham Study [59].

353  
354 There were no associations seen between either EWG score and any of the brain health  
355 outcome measures, with the exception of an association between higher GEWG score and  
356 lower left hippocampal volume in the high SES group only. As this was only seen in the left and  
357 not right hippocampus and in a single SES group only, it should be interpreted with caution,  
358 although previous studies have also found a stronger effect of a healthy diet in the left  
359 compared to the right hippocampus [60, 61] and this warrants further research. Exploring  
360 whether the EWG scores are associated with functional brain imaging measures as well as with  
361 AD pathology (such as amyloid beta, tau and neurofilament light) will also be important next  
362 steps for research.

363  
364 Unsurprisingly and reassuringly, there were significant but moderate correlations between the  
365 EWG scores and MedDiet scores which demonstrates some overlap in these healthy eating  
366 patterns as well as a divergence in how the scores are created. For example, whilst both dietary  
367 patterns prioritise the consumption of fruits and vegetables and fish, with limited red and  
368 processed meats, the EWG otherwise focuses on a recommended macronutrient intake whilst  
369 the MedDiet recommends foods such as olive oil, legumes, and nuts. This should be a noted  
370 limitation of the EWG compared to MedDiet scores when translating to public health  
371 approaches, as the EWG requires people to know their nutrient intake and understand  
372 percentages of intake by calories. Further development of the EWG to translate the  
373 recommendations to a more food-based approach, as in the MedDiet and recommended by the  
374 Nutrition for Dementia Prevention Working Group [62], will be important. In particular,  
375 evidence suggests that using olive oil as the predominant fat in a diet has promise for mitigating  
376 vascular risk factors for AD [63].

377

378 This is particularly pertinent given most of the positive individual food component associations  
379 with cardiometabolic health were seen in the food groups rather than the nutrient intakes,  
380 except for higher fibre consumption associated with lower SBP. Meeting, or approaching the  
381 set criteria, for fruit and vegetable consumption ( $\geq 400\text{g/d}$ ) was associated with lower SBP, DBP  
382 and BMI. A one-point change on this criteria (indicating being closer to consuming  $\geq 400\text{g/d}$  of  
383 fruit and vegetables) was associated with a 1.09 mmHg reduction in SBP, a -0.79 mmHg  
384 reduction in DBP, and a -0.38  $\text{kg/m}^2$  reduction in BMI. This has been seen in a number of studies  
385 [64, 65], included in Scheelbeck *et al* where fruit and vegetable consumption was associated  
386 with the largest reduction in mortality risk [26]. Given adopting dietary change is complex and  
387 multifactorial [66], public health messaging (alongside policy changes to ensure affordability)  
388 focusing on increasing fruit and vegetable intake as the one food group consistently associated  
389 with better health outcomes may be a sensible approach. A rapid review of the EWG has  
390 suggested a number of recommendations for better communication of the tool which, if  
391 adopted, may result in better adherence to the dietary guidelines [67].

392  
393 There are some noted limitations of this analysis. The use of total fat as a diet quality measure  
394 is recognised to be crude and potentially misleading. We observed significant associations  
395 between meeting or getting higher scores on the fat component (i.e. eating, or being closer to  
396 eating, less than 35% of calories from fat) and both higher CAIDE score (greater risk for future  
397 dementia) and higher SBP, in the absence of any specific findings with SFA. Understanding the  
398 role of dietary fats in health has been a topic of much debate in the scientific literature and  
399 there is consensus that total fat content alone has little meaning for many health outcomes  
400 [68]. Indeed, we know from many studies that nuts (source of omega 3 polyunsaturated fatty  
401 acids) and olive oil (source of monounsaturated fatty acids alongside some saturated and  
402 polyunsaturated fatty acids) is associated with favourable health outcomes [63, 69]. This again  
403 suggests that further development of the EWG scores to better reflect the foods contributing to  
404 the macronutrients rather than the macronutrients themselves may be a more helpful  
405 approach to untangle the complexity of dietary fats. Finally, no participants met criteria for the  
406 sugars cut off applied to the dataset ( $\leq 5\%$  calories from sugar), which is likely caused by the



407 sugars calculated for PREVENT reflecting total sugars (glucose, galactose, fructose, sucrose,  
408 maltose and lactose) as opposed to free sugars (added sugars and naturally occurring sugars  
409 excluding galactose and lactose). Future nutritional analysis should consider a more detailed  
410 breakdown of sugars to better explore this component.

411  
412 This study developed scoring methodologies for a BEWG and GEWG score. Whilst there was no  
413 association between these scores and either risk for dementia or brain health in this mid-life  
414 cohort, there were significant associations between higher graded EWG scores and lower SBP,  
415 DBP and BMI. Adhering to fibre, fish, and fruit and vegetable were particularly associated with  
416 better cardiovascular health. Future research should further develop the EWG scores to reflect  
417 a food-based approach as opposed to the current reliance on macronutrient contributions to  
418 overall energy intake. Higher adherence to the EWG may be an important part of dementia risk  
419 reduction interventions through reductions in hypertension and obesity, both of which are  
420 important modifiable risk factors for dementia [54].

421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435

436 Acknowledgements

437 We would like to acknowledge the sites involved with the project, West London NHS Trust, NHS  
438 Lothian, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough NHS Foundation trust, Oxford Heath NHS  
439 Foundation trust and Trinity College. Special thanks also to the PREVENT participants, the  
440 participant panel, members of the Scientific Advisory Committee, and funders for their support  
441 of the PREVENT dementia programme.

442

443 Author contributions

444 SG, OS: Conceptualization, Methodology, Formal Analysis, Writing- Original Draft, Writing-  
445 Reviewing and Editing; AG, AJ, FCM, JM, RT, NW: Methodology, Formal Analysis, Writing-  
446 Reviewing and Editing; SP-S: Methodology, Writing-Reviewing and Editing; A-MM, GMT, CWR,  
447 ES: Supervision, Writing- Reviewing and Editing.

448

449 Funding

450 PREVENT is funded by the Alzheimer's Society (grant numbers 178, 264 and 329), Alzheimer's  
451 Association (grant number TriBEKa-17-519007) and philanthropic donations. The analytical  
452 work was funded by the MRC (MRC UK Nutrition Research Partnership (NRP) Collaboration  
453 Award NuBrain (MR/T001852/1). Prof. Muniz-Terrera acknowledges the support of the  
454 Osteopathic Heritage Foundation through funding for the Osteopathic Heritage Foundation  
455 Ralph S. Lickliger, D.O., Research Endowment in the Heritage College of Osteopathic Medicine.  
456 The funders had no involvement in the protocol design, data collection, analysis or manuscript  
457 preparation.

458

459 Conflict of interest.

460 None.

461

462

463

464

465

466 References

- 467 1. Sotos-Prieto, M., et al., *Association of Changes in Diet Quality with Total and Cause-*  
468 *Specific Mortality*. New England Journal of Medicine, 2017. **377**(2): p. 143-153.
- 469 2. Morze, J., et al., *Diet Quality as Assessed by the Healthy Eating Index, Alternate Healthy*  
470 *Eating Index, Dietary Approaches to Stop Hypertension Score, and Health Outcomes: A*  
471 *Second Update of a Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Cohort Studies*. Journal of  
472 the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics, 2020. **120**(12): p. 1998-2031.e15.
- 473 3. *Health effects of dietary risks in 195 countries, 1990-2017: a systematic analysis for the*  
474 *Global Burden of Disease Study 2017*. Lancet, 2019. **393**(10184): p. 1958-1972.
- 475 4. Office for National Statistics. *Leading causes of death, UK: 2001 to 2018*. 2020 7 April  
476 2023]; Available from:  
477 [https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/causesof](https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/causesofdeath/articles/leadingcausesofdeathuk/2001to2018)  
478 [fdeath/articles/leadingcausesofdeathuk/2001to2018](https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/causesofdeath/articles/leadingcausesofdeathuk/2001to2018).
- 479 5. Bédard, A., et al., *Sex differences in the impact of the Mediterranean diet on*  
480 *cardiovascular risk profile*. Br J Nutr, 2012. **108**(8): p. 1428-34.
- 481 6. Bédard, A., et al., *Sex Differences in the Impact of the Mediterranean Diet on LDL Particle*  
482 *Size Distribution and Oxidation*. Nutrients, 2015. **7**(5): p. 3705-23.
- 483 7. Bédard, A., et al., *Effects of the traditional Mediterranean diet on adiponectin and leptin*  
484 *concentrations in men and premenopausal women: do sex differences exist?* Eur J Clin  
485 Nutr, 2014. **68**(5): p. 561-6.
- 486 8. Bédard, A., et al., *Sex differences in the impact of the Mediterranean diet on systemic*  
487 *inflammation*. Nutr J, 2015. **14**: p. 46.
- 488 9. Leblanc, V., et al., *Differences between men and women in dietary intakes and metabolic*  
489 *profile in response to a 12-week nutritional intervention promoting the Mediterranean*  
490 *diet*. J Nutr Sci, 2015. **4**: p. e13.
- 491 10. Jennings, A., et al., *Mediterranean-Style Diet Improves Systolic Blood Pressure and*  
492 *Arterial Stiffness in Older Adults*. Hypertension, 2019. **73**(3): p. 578-586.
- 493 11. Franconi, F., I. Campesi, and A. Romani, *Is Extra Virgin Olive Oil an Ally for Women's and*  
494 *Men's Cardiovascular Health?* Cardiovasc Ther, 2020. **2020**: p. 6719301.
- 495 12. Bédard, A., et al., *Impact of the traditional Mediterranean diet on the Framingham risk*  
496 *score and the metabolic syndrome according to sex*. Metab Syndr Relat Disord, 2014.  
497 **12**(2): p. 95-101.
- 498 13. Trichopoulou, A., et al., *Mediterranean diet and cognitive decline over time in an elderly*  
499 *Mediterranean population*. Eur J Nutr, 2015. **54**(8): p. 1311-21.
- 500 14. Gregory, S., et al., *Mediterranean diet and structural neuroimaging biomarkers of*  
501 *Alzheimer's and cerebrovascular disease: A systematic review*. Experimental  
502 Gerontology, 2023. **172**: p. 112065.
- 503 15. Townsend, R.F., et al. *Whole Dietary Patterns, Cognitive Decline and Cognitive Disorders:*  
504 *A Systematic Review of Prospective and Intervention Studies*. Nutrients, 2023. **15**, DOI:  
505 10.3390/nu15020333.
- 506 16. Gregory, S., et al., *Mediterranean diet score is associated with greater allocentric*  
507 *processing in the EPAD LCS cohort: A comparative analysis by biogeographical region*.  
508 Frontiers in Aging, 2022. **3**.

- 509 17. Minihane, A.M. and K.J. Murphy, *The health benefits and practical considerations for the*  
510 *adoption of a Mediterranean-style dietary pattern*. British Journal of Nutrition, 2022.  
511 **128**(7): p. 1201-1205.
- 512 18. Machado, P., et al., *Measuring Adherence to Sustainable Healthy Diets: A Scoping*  
513 *Review of Dietary Metrics*. Advances in Nutrition, 2022.
- 514 19. Public Health England. *The Eatwell guide-helping you eat a healthy balanced diet 2018*;  
515 Available from:  
516 [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachm](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/742750/Eatwell_Guide_booklet_2018v4.pdf)  
517 [ent data/file/742750/Eatwell Guide booklet 2018v4.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/742750/Eatwell_Guide_booklet_2018v4.pdf).
- 518 20. Public Health England, *Government Dietary Recommendations: Government*  
519 *recommendations for energy and nutrients for males and females aged 1-18 years and*  
520 *19+ years*. . 2016.
- 521 21. Steenson, S. and J.L. Buttriss, *Healthier and more sustainable diets: What changes are*  
522 *needed in high-income countries?* Nutrition Bulletin, 2021. **46**(3): p. 279-309.
- 523 22. Bazzano, L.A., M.K. Serdula, and S. Liu, *Dietary intake of fruits and vegetables and risk of*  
524 *cardiovascular disease*. Current Atherosclerosis Reports, 2003. **5**(6): p. 492-499.
- 525 23. Soerjomataram, I., et al., *Increased consumption of fruit and vegetables and future*  
526 *cancer incidence in selected European countries*. European Journal of Cancer, 2010.  
527 **46**(14): p. 2563-2580.
- 528 24. Reiss, R., et al., *Estimation of cancer risks and benefits associated with a potential*  
529 *increased consumption of fruits and vegetables*. Food and Chemical Toxicology, 2012.  
530 **50**(12): p. 4421-4427.
- 531 25. Gehlich, K.H., et al., *Consumption of fruits and vegetables: improved physical health,*  
532 *mental health, physical functioning and cognitive health in older adults from 11*  
533 *European countries*. Aging & Mental Health, 2020. **24**(4): p. 634-641.
- 534 26. Scheelbeek, P., et al., *Health impacts and environmental footprints of diets that meet*  
535 *the Eatwell Guide recommendations: analyses of multiple UK studies*. BMJ Open, 2020.  
536 **10**(8): p. e037554.
- 537 27. Best, N. and O. Flannery, *Association between adherence to the Mediterranean Diet and*  
538 *the Eatwell Guide and changes in weight and waist circumference in post-menopausal*  
539 *women in the UK Women's Cohort Study*. Post Reproductive Health, 2023: p.  
540 20533691231156643.
- 541 28. SACN, *SACN Statement on Diet, Cognitive Impairment and Dementia 2018*.
- 542 29. Ritchie, C.W. and K. Ritchie, *The PREVENT study: a prospective cohort study to identify*  
543 *mid-life biomarkers of late-onset Alzheimer's disease*. BMJ open, 2012. **2**(6): p. e001893.
- 544 30. Ritchie, C.W., K. Wells, and K. Ritchie, *The PREVENT research programme--a novel*  
545 *research programme to identify and manage midlife risk for dementia: the conceptual*  
546 *framework*. Int Rev Psychiatry, 2013. **25**(6): p. 748-54.
- 547 31. Hollis, J.L., et al., *Assessing the relative validity of the Scottish Collaborative Group FFQ*  
548 *for measuring dietary intake in adults*. Public Health Nutr, 2017. **20**(3): p. 449-455.
- 549 32. Jia, X., et al., *Repeatability and validity of a food frequency questionnaire in free-living*  
550 *older people in relation to cognitive function*. J Nutr Health Aging, 2008. **12**(10): p. 735-  
551 41.

- 552 33. McCance, R.A. and E.M. Widdowson, *McCance and Widdowson's composition of foods*  
553 *integrated dataset*. 2021.
- 554 34. Martínez-González, M., et al., *Transferability of the Mediterranean Diet to Non-*  
555 *Mediterranean Countries. What Is and What Is Not the Mediterranean Diet*. *Nutrients*,  
556 2017. **9**(11).
- 557 35. Panagiotakos, D.B., et al., *Adherence to the Mediterranean food pattern predicts the*  
558 *prevalence of hypertension, hypercholesterolemia, diabetes and obesity, among healthy*  
559 *adults; the accuracy of the MedDietScore*. *Preventive Medicine*, 2007. **44**(4): p. 335-340.
- 560 36. Estruch, R., et al., *Primary Prevention of Cardiovascular Disease with a Mediterranean*  
561 *Diet Supplemented with Extra-Virgin Olive Oil or Nuts*. *New England Journal of Medicine*,  
562 2018. **378**(25): p. e34.
- 563 37. Shannon, O.M., et al., *Mediterranean diet adherence and cognitive function in older UK*  
564 *adults: the European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition-Norfolk (EPIC-*  
565 *Norfolk) Study*. *Am J Clin Nutr*, 2019. **110**(4): p. 938-948.
- 566 38. Tong, T.Y., et al., *Prospective association of the Mediterranean diet with cardiovascular*  
567 *disease incidence and mortality and its population impact in a non-Mediterranean*  
568 *population: the EPIC-Norfolk study*. *BMC Med*, 2016. **14**(1): p. 135.
- 569 39. Shannon, O.M., et al., *Mediterranean diet adherence is associated with lower dementia*  
570 *risk, independent of genetic predisposition: findings from the UK Biobank prospective*  
571 *cohort study*. *BMC Medicine*, 2023. **21**(1): p. 81.
- 572 40. Kivipelto, M., et al., *Risk score for the prediction of dementia risk in 20 years among*  
573 *middle aged people: a longitudinal, population-based study*. *Lancet Neurol*, 2006. **5**(9):  
574 p. 735-41.
- 575 41. Castro, V. *Package 'CVrisk'*. 2022; Available from: <https://github.com/vcastro/CVrisk>.
- 576 42. Li, Y., et al. *Package 'QRISK3'* 2022; Available from: [https://cran.r-](https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/QRISK3/QRISK3.pdf)  
577 [project.org/web/packages/QRISK3/QRISK3.pdf](https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/QRISK3/QRISK3.pdf).
- 578 43. Chan, D., et al., *The 4 Mountains Test: A Short Test of Spatial Memory with High*  
579 *Sensitivity for the Diagnosis of Pre-dementia Alzheimer's Disease*. *JoVE*, 2016(116): p.  
580 e54454.
- 581 44. Ritchie, K., et al., *Recommended cognitive outcomes in preclinical Alzheimer's disease:*  
582 *Consensus statement from the European Prevention of Alzheimer's Dementia project*.  
583 *Alzheimers Dement*, 2017. **13**(2): p. 186-195.
- 584 45. Mak, E., et al., *Proximity to dementia onset and multi-modal neuroimaging changes: The*  
585 *prevent-dementia study*. *NeuroImage*, 2021. **229**: p. 117749.
- 586 46. Dounavi, M.-E., et al., *Macrostructural brain alterations at midlife are connected to*  
587 *cardiovascular and not inherited risk of future dementia: the PREVENT-Dementia study*.  
588 *Journal of Neurology*, 2022. **269**(8): p. 4299-4309.
- 589 47. Low, A., et al., *Modifiable and non-modifiable risk factors of dementia on midlife*  
590 *cerebral small vessel disease in cognitively healthy middle-aged adults: the PREVENT-*  
591 *Dementia study*. *Alzheimer's Research & Therapy*, 2022. **14**(1): p. 154.
- 592 48. Dounavi, M.-E., et al., *Fluid-attenuated inversion recovery magnetic resonance imaging*  
593 *textural features as sensitive markers of white matter damage in midlife adults*. *Brain*  
594 *Communications*, 2022. **4**(3): p. fcac116.

- 595 49. Liu, X., et al., *Higher midlife CAIDE score is associated with increased brain atrophy in a*  
596 *cohort of cognitively healthy middle-aged individuals.* J Neurol, 2021. **268**(5): p. 1962-  
597 1971.
- 598 50. Licher, S., et al., *External validation of four dementia prediction models for use in the*  
599 *general community-dwelling population: a comparative analysis from the Rotterdam*  
600 *Study.* European Journal of Epidemiology, 2018. **33**(7): p. 645-655.
- 601 51. Sindi, S., et al., *The CAIDE Dementia Risk Score App: The development of an evidence-*  
602 *based mobile application to predict the risk of dementia.* Alzheimers Dement (Amst),  
603 2015. **1**(3): p. 328-33.
- 604 52. Neville, C.E., S.M. Cruise, and F. Burns, *The Northern Ireland Cohort for the Longitudinal*  
605 *Study of Ageing (NICOLA), in Encyclopedia of Gerontology and Population Aging,* D. Gu  
606 and M.E. Dupre, Editors. 2021, Springer International Publishing: Cham. p. 5087-5090.
- 607 53. Hewitt, J., et al., *Cohort profile of the UK Biobank: diagnosis and characteristics of*  
608 *cerebrovascular disease.* BMJ Open, 2016. **6**(3): p. e009161.
- 609 54. Livingston, G., et al., *Dementia prevention, intervention, and care: 2020 report of the*  
610 *Lancet Commission.* The Lancet, 2020. **396**(10248): p. 413-446.
- 611 55. Lewington, S., et al., *Age-specific relevance of usual blood pressure to vascular mortality:*  
612 *a meta-analysis of individual data for one million adults in 61 prospective studies.*  
613 *Lancet,* 2002. **360**(9349): p. 1903-13.
- 614 56. Holm, H., et al., *Longitudinal and postural changes of blood pressure predict dementia:*  
615 *the Malmö Preventive Project.* Eur J Epidemiol, 2017. **32**(4): p. 327-336.
- 616 57. Kim, D., et al., *Blood Pressure Control and Dementia Risk in Midlife Patients With Atrial*  
617 *Fibrillation.* Hypertension, 2020. **75**(5): p. 1296-1304.
- 618 58. Cook, N.R., et al., *Implications of small reductions in diastolic blood pressure for primary*  
619 *prevention.* Arch Intern Med, 1995. **155**(7): p. 701-9.
- 620 59. Li, J., et al., *Mid- to Late-Life Body Mass Index and Dementia Risk: 38 Years of Follow-up*  
621 *of the Framingham Study.* American Journal of Epidemiology, 2021. **190**(12): p. 2503-  
622 2510.
- 623 60. Akbaraly, T., et al., *Association of Long-Term Diet Quality with Hippocampal Volume:*  
624 *Longitudinal Cohort Study.* The American Journal of Medicine, 2018. **131**(11): p. 1372-  
625 1381.e4.
- 626 61. Jacka, F.N., et al., *Western diet is associated with a smaller hippocampus: a longitudinal*  
627 *investigation.* BMC Medicine, 2015. **13**(1): p. 215.
- 628 62. Yassine, H.N., et al., *Nutrition state of science and dementia prevention:*  
629 *recommendations of the Nutrition for Dementia Prevention Working Group.* The Lancet  
630 Healthy Longevity, 2022. **3**(7): p. e501-e512.
- 631 63. Román, G.C., et al., *Extra-virgin olive oil for potential prevention of Alzheimer disease.*  
632 *Revue Neurologique,* 2019. **175**(10): p. 705-723.
- 633 64. Artegoitia, V.M., et al., *Healthy eating index patterns in adults by sex and age predict*  
634 *cardiometabolic risk factors in a cross-sectional study.* BMC Nutr, 2021. **7**(1): p. 30.
- 635 65. Liu, S., et al., *Fruit and vegetable intake and risk of cardiovascular disease: the Women's*  
636 *Health Study.* The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition, 2000. **72**(4): p. 922-928.

- 637 66. Helland, M.H. and G.L. Nordbotten, *Dietary Changes, Motivators, and Barriers Affecting*  
638 *Diet and Physical Activity among Overweight and Obese: A Mixed Methods Approach.*  
639 *Int J Environ Res Public Health*, 2021. **18**(20).
- 640 67. Culliford, A.E., J. Bradbury, and E.B. Medici *Improving Communication of the UK*  
641 *Sustainable Healthy Dietary Guidelines the Eatwell Guide: A Rapid Review.* *Sustainability*,  
642 2023. **15**, DOI: 10.3390/su15076149.
- 643 68. Forouhi, N.G., et al., *Dietary fat and cardiometabolic health: evidence, controversies, and*  
644 *consensus for guidance.* *BMJ*, 2018. **361**: p. k2139.
- 645 69. De Souza, R.G.M., et al., *Nuts and Human Health Outcomes: A Systematic Review.*  
646 *Nutrients*, 2017. **9**(12): p. 1311.  
647

Variable	Whole cohort n= 517		Very low adherence (0 - 2.5 points) n= 56	Low adherence (3 - 4.5 points) n= 228	Moderate-to-high adherence (5 - 9 points) n= 233
	n (%) / Mean (SD)	Range			
Sex (male) (n, %)	210 (40.6)	N/A	27 (48.2)	100 (43.9)	83 (35.6)
Parental history of dementia (yes) (n, %)	273 (52.8)		30 (53.6)	119 (52.2)	124 (53.2)
APOE $\epsilon$ 4 (yes) (n, %)	198 (38.3)		19 (33.9)	93 (40.8)	86 (36.9)
Age (years) (mean, SD)	51 (5.38)	40 - 59	50 (5.27)	51 (5.50)	52 (5.27)
Education (years) (mean, SD)	17 (3.31)	9 – 38	16 (3.31)	17 (3.45)	17 (3.15)
SES Group (n, %).	Low	N/A	7 (12.5)	17 (7.5)	16 (6.9)
	Middle		13 (23.2)	39 (17.1)	29 (12.4)
	High		30 (53.6)	141 (61.8)	163 (70.0)
	Not in employment		6 (10.7)	31 (13.6)	25 (10.7)
Physical activity score (mean, SD)	10.91 (2.82)	0 - 15	10.43 (2.92)	10.78 (2.89)	11.15 (2.70)
BEWG score (mean, SD)	4.39 (1.66)	0 – 9	1.64 (0.60)	3.56 (0.50)	5.85 (1.09)
GEWG score (mean, SD)	39.88 (6.19)	16 - 53	30.62 (5.78)	37.95 (4.09)	43.99 (4.44)
MEDAS (mean, SD)	5.44 (1.72)	1 - 12	3.95 (1.27)	5.29 (1.56)	5.94 (1.73)
MEDAS continuous (mean, SD)	7.29 (1.58)	1.68 – 12.59	5.87 (1.35)	7.20 (1.47)	7.71 (1.53)
Pyramid score (mean, SD)	8.11 (1.55)	2.35 – 14.54	6.77 (1.62)	8.05 (1.37)	8.50 (1.50)
CAIDE score (mean, SD)	5.95 (2.83)	0 - 13	5.57 (2.98)	6.05 (2.98)	5.94 (2.64)
SBP (mmHg) (mean, SD)	124.91 (15.54)	82.67 – 182.67	129.02 (14.67)	125.12 (15.00)	123.71 (16.14)
DBP (mmHg) (mean, SD)	76.25 (9.57)	46.00 – 122.67	79.21 (7.63)	76.31 (9.88)	75.49 (9.58)
BMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> ) (mean, SD)	27.23 (5.19)	16.52 – 69.06	27.57 (5.59)	27.68 (5.71)	26.70 (4.47)



Variable	Whole cohort n= 516		Very low adherence n= 56	Low adherence n= 228	Moderate-to-high adherence n= 232
	n (%)	Range			
Self-rated healthy diet (yes) (n, %)	442 (85.7)	N/A	33 (58.9)	193 (84.6)	216 (93.1)
Variable	Whole cohort n= 503		Very low adherence n= 54	Low adherence n= 220	Moderate-to-high adherence n= 229
	Mean (SD)	Range			
FRS (mean, SD)	8.69 (6.41)	1.04 – 30.00	9.29 (6.96)	8.99 (6.75)	8.26 (5.92)
QRisk3 (mean, SD)	4.81 (4.04)	0.43 – 30.70	4.76 (3.55)	4.94 (4.59)	4.70 (3.58)
Variable	Whole cohort n= 342		Very low adherence n= 39	Low adherence n= 159	Moderate-to-high adherence n= 232
	Mean (SD)	Range			
4MT total score (mean, SD)	9.85 (3.39)	0 - 15	9.46 (3.71)	9.82 (3.37)	10.00 (3.34)
Variable	Whole cohort n= 514		Very low adherence n= 56	Low adherence n= 226	Moderate-to-high adherence n= 232
	Mean (SD)	Range			
Cube-transformed white matter lesion volume (mL) (mean, SD)	1.21 (0.40)	0.35 – 3.38	1.17 (0.42)	1.24 (0.43)	1.20 (0.36)
Left hippocampus volume (mm <sup>3</sup> ) (mean, SD)	4034.01 (393.11)	2744.4 – 4374.8	4045.12 (397.54)	4052.21 (381.55)	4013.59 (401.54)
Right hippocampus volume (mm <sup>3</sup> ) (mean, SD)	4158.40 (428.04)	2939.7 – 5676.5	4160.46 (436.81)	4184.51 (427.47)	4132.47 (426.77)

Left hippocampus thickness (mm) (mean, SD)	2.44 (0.07)	2.24 – 2.66	2.43 (0.06)	2.43 (0.08)	2.44 (0.07)
Right hippocampus thickness (mm) (mean, SD)	2.43 (0.07)	2.23 – 2.60	2.43 (0.07)	2.43 (0.07)	2.43 (0.06)

Table 1: Demographic and descriptive statistics of sample included in Eatwell Guide score analysis. 4MT: Four Mountains Test; BMI: body mass index; DBP: diastolic blood pressure; EWG: Eatwell Guide; FRS: Framingham Risk Score; SBP: systolic blood pressure; SES: socioeconomic status.

Dietary score	Unadjusted			Fully adjusted		
	$\beta$	SE	p	$\beta$	SE	p
<b>CAIDE</b>						
<b>EWG</b>	0.03	0.07	0.64	0.07	0.07	0.32
<b>EWG graded</b>	0.0001	0.02	0.96	0.02	0.02	0.36
<b>Systolic Blood Pressure</b>						
<b>EWG</b>	-0.77	0.41	0.06	-0.45	0.39	0.25
<b>EWG graded</b>	-0.27	0.11	0.01	-0.24	0.11	0.03
<b>Diastolic Blood Pressure</b>						
<b>EWG</b>	-0.44	0.25	0.08	-0.22	0.24	0.37
<b>EWG graded</b>	-0.19	0.07	0.006	-0.16	0.06	0.01
<b>BMI</b>						
<b>EWG</b>	-0.14	0.14	0.32	-0.04	0.14	0.78
<b>EWG graded</b>	-0.12	0.04	0.001	-0.09	0.04	0.02
<b>WHR</b>						
<b>EWG</b>	-0.005	0.003	0.06	-0.0006	0.002	0.79
<b>EWG graded</b>	-0.002	0.0007	0.02	-0.0006	0.0006	0.32
<b>FRS</b>						
<b>EWG</b>	-0.27	0.17	0.11	-0.25	0.17	0.14
<b>EWG graded</b>	-0.09	0.05	0.05	-0.06	0.05	0.17
<b>QRisk3</b>						
<b>EWG</b>	-0.08	0.11	0.46	-0.06	0.11	0.58
<b>EWG graded</b>	-0.01	0.03	0.61	0.0003	0.03	0.99

Table 2: Table of generalised additive models for associations between EWG and EWG graded with CAIDE and cardiometabolic health outcomes. BMI: body mass index; EWG: Eatwell Guide score; FRS: Framingham Risk Score; WHR: waist-to-hip ratio. CAIDE score fully adjusted model includes parental history of dementia, physical activity score and socioeconomic status as covariates. Systolic/diastolic blood pressure, BMI and WHR models include age, sex, education, *APOEε4*, parental history of dementia, physical activity score and socioeconomic status as covariates. FRS and QRisk3 models include education, *APOEε4*, parental history of dementia, physical activity score and socioeconomic status as covariates.

Dietary score	$\beta$	SE	p	$\beta$	SE	p
<b>Four Mountains Test</b>						
<b>EWG</b>	0.04	0.11	0.72	0.05	0.11	0.68
<b>EWG graded</b>	0.02	0.03	0.52	0.02	0.03	0.58
<b>White Matter Lesion Volume</b>						
<b>EWG</b>	-0.004	0.01	0.69	-0.005	0.01	0.59
<b>EWG graded</b>	-0.002	0.003	0.40	-0.003	0.003	0.31
<b>Left Hippocampus</b>						
<b>EWG</b>	-15.81	0.82	0.06	-13.61	8.48	0.11
<b>EWG graded</b>	-4.61	2.21	0.04	-3.96	2.32	0.09
<b>Right Hippocampus</b>						
<b>EWG</b>	-15.78	9.05	0.08	-14.32	9.31	0.12
<b>EWG graded</b>	-1.17	2.44	0.63	-0.68	2.55	0.79
<b>Left Hippocampal Thickness</b>						
<b>EWG</b>	0.002	0.002	0.32	0.002	0.002	0.30
<b>EWG graded</b>	0.0008	0.0005	0.12	0.0009	0.0005	0.09
<b>Right Hippocampal Thickness</b>						
<b>EWG</b>	0.001	0.002	0.59	0.001	0.002	0.49
<b>EWG graded</b>	0.0005	0.0005	0.30	0.0007	0.0005	0.18
<b>Self-reported healthy eating</b>						
<b>EWG</b>	1.04	0.20	<0.001	0.92	0.21	<0.001
<b>EWG graded</b>	4.47	0.75	<0.001	3.71	0.78	<0.001

Table 3: Table of generalised additive models for associations between EWG and EWG graded with cardiometabolic risk scores, 4MT score and self-reported healthy eating. 4MT: Four Mountains Test; EWG: Eatwell Guide score; FRS: Framingham Risk Score. 4MT score fully adjusted model includes age, sex, education, *APOEε4*, parental history of dementia, NART score, physical activity score and socioeconomic status as covariates. Self-reported healthy eating score includes age, sex, education, *APOEε4*, parental history of dementia, *APOEε4*, physical activity score and socioeconomic status as covariates