

1 **Adherence to the EAT-Lancet Healthy Reference Diet in relation to Coronary Heart**
2 **Disease, All-Cause Mortality Risk and Environmental Impact: Results from the EPIC-**
3 **NL Cohort**

4

5 Chiara Colizzi^{1,2}, Marjolein C Harbers¹, Reina E Vellinga³, WM Monique Verschuren^{1,3},
6 Jolanda MA Boer³, Elisabeth HM Temme³, Yvonne T van der Schouw¹

7

8 ¹ Julius Center for Health Sciences and Primary Care, University Medical Center Utrecht,
9 Utrecht University, Utrecht, The Netherlands.

10 ² Institute of Tropical Medicine in Antwerpen, Antwerpen, Belgium

11 ³ Centre for Nutrition, Prevention and Health Services, National Institute for Public Health
12 and the Environment (RIVM), Bilthoven, The Netherlands

13

14 **Corresponding author**

15 Prof. Yvonne T. van der Schouw, PhD

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

17 PO Box 85500, 3508 GA Utrecht, The Netherlands

18 Phone +31887559301

19

20 **Abstract**

21

22 **Objectives:** To construct a diet-score measuring the level of adherence to the Healthy
23 Reference Diet (HRD), to explore whether adherence to the HRD is associated with coronary
24 heart disease (CHD), all-cause mortality risk, and to calculate its environmental impact.

25 **Design:** Prospective cohort study.

26 **Setting:** The Dutch contribution to the European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and
27 Nutrition (EPIC-NL).

28 **Participants:** 37,349 adults (20-70y) without CHD at baseline.

29 **Main outcome measures:** Primary outcomes were incident CHD and all-cause mortality.
30 Secondary outcomes were greenhouse gas emission (GHGE), land use, blue water use,
31 freshwater eutrophication, marine eutrophication, and terrestrial acidification.

32 **Results:** During a median 15.3-year follow-up, 2,543 cases of CHD occurred, and 5,648
33 individuals died from all causes. The average HRD-score was 73 (SD=10). High adherence to
34 the HRD was associated with a 15% lower risk of CHD (hazard ratio 0.85, 95% confidence

35 interval 0.75 to 0.96), as well as a 17% lower risk of all-cause mortality (hazard ratio 0.83,
36 95% confidence interval 0.77 to 0.90) in multivariable-adjusted models. Better adherence to
37 the HRD was associated with lower environmental impact from GHGE ($\beta = -0.10$ kg CO₂-eq,
38 95% confidence interval -0.13 to -0.07), land use ($\beta = -0.11$ m² per year, 95% confidence
39 interval -0.12 to -0.09), freshwater eutrophication ($\beta = -0.000002$ kg P-eq, 95% confidence
40 interval -0.000004 to -0.000001), marine eutrophication ($\beta = -0.00035$ kg N-eq, 95%
41 confidence interval -0.00042 to -0.00029), and terrestrial acidification ($\beta = -0.004$ kg SO₂-eq,
42 95% confidence interval -0.004 to -0.003), but with higher environmental impact from blue
43 water use ($\beta = 0.044$ m³, 95% confidence interval 0.043 to 0.045).

44 **Conclusion:** High adherence to the HRD was associated with lower risk of CHD and all-
45 cause mortality. Additionally, increasing adherence to the HRD could lower some aspects of
46 the environmental impact of diets, but attention is needed for the associated increase in blue
47 water use.

48

49 **Keywords:** EAT-Lancet, food-frequency questionnaire, healthy reference diet, sustainability

50 **1. Introduction**

51

52 Diet has a profound impact on human health as well as the environment.¹ According to the
53 Global Burden of Disease Study 2017, 11 million deaths and 255 million DALYs can be
54 attributed to high sodium intake, and low intake of whole grains and fruit across the world.²
55 Unhealthy diets are considered one of the main risk factors for the development of
56 cardiovascular diseases.³ At the same time, current dietary practices are likely to exhaust our
57 planet in the light of the expected growth of the world population.¹ Food production practices
58 account for up to 30% of global greenhouse-gas emissions (GHGE) and 70% of freshwater
59 use¹, most of which is intended for meat and dairy production.⁴⁻⁶ For these reasons, shifting
60 towards healthy and sustainable diets could co-benefit public and planetary health.

61 The EAT-Lancet Commission on Healthy Diets From Sustainable Food Systems is
62 the first large-scale and coordinated scientific collaboration to provide dietary guidelines on
63 healthy diets within the food production boundaries for the world population.⁷ The
64 commission proposed the Healthy Reference Diet (HRD), that was constructed based on
65 scientifically established targets for healthy diets and fitting within a safe operating space of
66 food systems, for which the Planetary Boundaries framework was used. The diet includes
67 high consumption of fruits and vegetables, whole grains, legumes, nuts, and unsaturated oils;
68 low to moderate consumption of dairy, starchy vegetables, poultry and fish; and no or low
69 consumption of saturated fats, red meat, and all sweeteners.⁷ As such, the HRD generally
70 emphasizes the intake of plant-based foods and suggests to limit the intake of animal-sourced
71 foods and starchy vegetables.

72 There is still limited evidence directly linking the HRD to cardiovascular outcomes
73 and mortality. The EAT-Lancet report projected that 19.0-23.6% of premature adult deaths
74 could potentially be avoided by adopting the HRD, while remaining within acceptable
75 environmental boundaries.⁷ However, these projections were based on theoretical models. To
76 date, only one study empirically assessed the association between the HRD and the risk of
77 coronary heart disease (CHD) and all-cause mortality, showing that better adherence to the
78 HRD was associated with 28% lower risk for CHD, but not with risk of stroke or all-cause
79 mortality.⁸ Potentially, this may relate to the dichotomous scoring system that was applied,
80 which consequently did not allow for large variation in HRD-scores. Thus, evidence on the
81 potential cardiovascular benefits of the HRD coming from prospective cohort studies using a
82 refined diet-score to measure adherence is currently lacking. Additionally, the environmental
83 impact of the HRD has not been previously assessed empirically. Insight into the

84 cardiovascular and planetary consequences of adhering to the HRD would help to identify
85 win-win or win-lose aspects of the HRD.

86 Therefore, the present study aimed to construct a refined HRD-score allowing for
87 wide variation in adherence to the HRD. Second, we aimed to estimate the association of
88 adherence to the HRD with CHD and all-cause mortality risk in a population-based cohort
89 study. Third, we aimed to estimate the associated environmental impact of the HRD using a
90 wide range of environmental indicators relating to the planetary boundaries in the same
91 population-based cohort study.

92

93 **2. Methodology**

94

95 *Study population*

96 We used data from the Dutch contribution to the European Prospective Investigation into
97 Cancer and Nutrition (EPIC-NL).⁹ The EPIC study was designed to assess the associations
98 between diet, lifestyle, dietary intake, and the incidence of cancer and other chronic
99 conditions [9]. The EPIC-NL cohort combines the MORGEN cohort ($n = 22,654$) and the
100 Prospect cohort ($n = 17,357$), resulting in a total of 40,011 participants. The MORGEN
101 cohort included both men and women, aged 20-64 years, from three Dutch cities
102 (Amsterdam, Doetinchem, and Maastricht), recruited between 1993 and 1997. The Prospect
103 cohort included women participating in a breast screening program, aged 49-70 years,
104 recruited between 1993 and 1995 from Utrecht and its vicinity. At baseline, participants
105 completed a general questionnaire and a validated semi-quantitative food frequency
106 questionnaire (FFQ). During a physical examination a non-fasting blood sample was taken,
107 aliquoted and stored for future research. The EPIC-NL study was conducted according to the
108 guidelines in the Declaration of Helsinki and all procedures involving the participants were
109 approved by the institutional review board of the University Medical Center Utrecht
110 (Prospect-EPIC) and the medical ethical committee of TNO Nutrition and Food Research
111 (MORGEN-EPIC). All participants provided written informed consent.

112 For the current study, we excluded participants who withheld permission for linkage
113 with national disease registries ($n=1,666$), those who withdrew informed consent during
114 follow-up ($n=1$), participants with prevalent CHD at baseline ($n=377$), participants with
115 missing dietary intake data ($n=218$), and participants with implausible energy intake (defined
116 as those in the lowest and highest 0.5% of the ratio of energy intake over basal metabolic
117 rate) ($n=400$), leaving 37,349 persons for analysis (Supplementary Figure 1).

118 *Calculation of the HRD adherence score*

119 The FFQ included questions on the consumption of 178 food items in the year prior to
120 enrolment.^{9 10} For some food items, questions were accompanied by images of the food in
121 different portion sizes, to assist in portion size estimation. Frequency of consumption was
122 estimated in times per day, week, month, year or never. Average food intake (g/d) was
123 calculated by multiplying the consumption frequency with the consumed amounts and
124 nutrient intakes were calculated using the Dutch food composition table of 1996.¹¹

125 To assess adherence to the HRD, a Healthy Reference Diet score (HRD-score) was
126 constructed. To calculate the adherence scores, the dietary recommendations from the EAT-
127 Lancet report were recalculated on the basis of 2000 kcal/day for women, in line with the
128 recommended energy intake proposed by the Dutch dietary guidelines (Supplementary Table
129 1 and 2). Participants were assigned proportional scores ranging from 0-10 for each of the 14
130 dietary recommendations in the HRD (as proposed by EAT-Lancet), that were then summed,
131 resulting in a score ranging between 0 (no adherence) and 140 (complete adherence). Each
132 food group in the HRD-score was categorized into one of the following scoring components
133 adapted from Looman et al.¹²: adequacy, moderation, optimum or ratio. The allocation of
134 scoring components to the dietary recommendations in the HRD was informed by literature
135 investigating the associations of those food groups with chronic disease.¹³⁻³⁵ Adequacy
136 components are used to score foods generally considered healthy and for which a high intake
137 is recommended. In the HRD-score, foods assigned to this component were whole grains,
138 vegetables, fruits, legumes, and soy foods. Participants received 10 points for meeting the
139 recommended intake for these food groups, 0 points for no consumption, and a proportional
140 score for intakes between zero and the recommended level. Moderation components were
141 used to score foods that could increase the risk of chronic diseases. The moderation
142 component was used to score beef, lamb, pork, and sweeteners. For these foods, 0 points
143 were assigned if the intake was above the reference intake, 10 points were assigned for an
144 intake equal to or lower than the reference intake, and intermediate intakes were assigned a
145 proportional scoring.

146 Optimum components comprise foods which are nutritious yet potentially detrimental
147 if eaten in large quantities on a daily basis. The optimum component was used to score the
148 following food groups: potatoes, dairy, chicken, eggs, fish, and nuts. For these foods,
149 participants with intakes within the required optimum intake range would receive 10 points,
150 while those with intakes lower or higher than the optimum would be scored proportionally
151 and symmetrically from 0 to 10 and from 10 to 0. Finally, a ratio component was used to

152 describe the added fats food group. For the added fats, no consumption of unsaturated fats or
153 an unsaturated to saturated fats ratio lower than 0.6 was assigned 0 points, while no
154 consumption of saturated fats or an unsaturated to saturated fats ratio higher than 13 was
155 assigned 10 points. Ratios in between were scored proportionally. Cut-offs and threshold
156 values for the ratio component were derived from the 15th percentile and 85th percentile of
157 the intake distribution of the Dutch reference population, as described in Looman et al.¹²

158 Finally, the HRD-score was adjusted for energy intake (HRDea-score) using the
159 energy-adjusted nutrient residual model to remove the variance in dietary intake related to
160 total energy intake.³⁶

161

162 *CHD and all-cause mortality ascertainment*

163 CHD events included both fatal and non-fatal cases of CHD. Morbidity data were obtained
164 from the Dutch Center for Health Care Information, which holds a standardized computerized
165 registry of hospital discharge diagnoses. The hospital discharge diagnosis database was
166 linked to the cohort based on information of birthdate, sex, postal code, and general
167 practitioner with a validated probabilistic method.³⁷ Hospitalization for CHD was based on
168 the principal diagnoses (ICD 10: I20-I25).

169 Information on vital status was obtained through linkage with the Dutch municipal
170 registry. All-cause mortality was defined as death from any cause after study inclusion. For
171 deceased participants, information on the causes of death was ascertained through linkage
172 with the Causes of Death Registry of Statistics Netherlands. Death from CHD was based on
173 both primary and secondary causes of death. A primary cause of death was defined as death
174 due to a CHD event, while a secondary cause of death was defined as death due to
175 complications of the primary cause, or another disease which could have led to death. All
176 participants were followed until CHD event, death, emigration, or end of follow-up,
177 whichever came first. Follow-up was complete until December 31st, 2010.

178

179 *Environmental impact assessment*

180 The 'planetary boundaries' within the planetary boundaries framework provide the safe
181 operating space for the Earth's biophysical subsystems and or processes,³⁸ and also underlie
182 the EAT-Lancet's commission's environmental impact assessments. Within the planetary
183 boundaries framework, the main environmental systems and processes that are affected by
184 food production are climate change, biodiversity loss, land system change, freshwater use,
185 and nitrogen and phosphorus flows.⁷ Within this framework, the state of these systems is

186 further defined by so-called control variables. As the main environmental systems are
187 interlinked and interdependent, most control variables relate to multiple environmental
188 systems. For example, greenhouse gas emissions (GHGE) are an indicator of biodiversity loss
189 and climate change; land use is an indicator of biodiversity loss and land system change; blue
190 water use (e.g, irrigation water) is an indicator of biodiversity loss and freshwater use;
191 eutrophication (e.g., through application of fertilizer) is an indicator of nitrogen and
192 phosphorus cycles, biodiversity loss and climate change, and terrestrial acidification is an
193 indicator of biodiversity loss.^{7 38 39} Therefore, the assessment of a wide range of
194 environmental indicators provides a holistic assessment of the environmental impact of the
195 HRD. In the present study, we evaluate the effects of the HRD on GHGE (kg CO₂-eq per
196 day), land use (m² per year), blue water use (m³ per day), freshwater eutrophication (kg P-eq
197 per day), marine eutrophication (kg N-eq per day), and terrestrial acidification (kg SO₂-eq
198 day).

199 The associated environmental impact of the 178 foods and beverages were assessed
200 using the most recent Life Cycle Assessments (LCA) data from the Dutch LCA Food
201 database.⁴⁰ This database is established by the National Institute for Public Health and the
202 Environment (RIVM) and contains information on the environmental impact for
203 approximately 250 Dutch foods and beverages. A full description of the data and assumptions
204 can be found elsewhere.⁴¹ In short, the LCAs had an attributional approach and hierarchical
205 perspective. System boundaries were from cradle till plate, including primary production,
206 processing, primary packaging, distribution, retail, supermarket, storage, preparation by the
207 consumer (e.g., cooking), and incineration of packaging waste. Transport between all phases,
208 except from retail to the consumer was included. Economic allocation was applied for all
209 food items, except for milk, where physical allocation was used. In order to estimate daily
210 environmental impact, LCA data from the Dutch LCA Food database, referred to as primary
211 data, was linked via NEVO-codes to FFQ items. Extrapolations were carried out in case no
212 primary LCA data were available.

213

214 *Ascertainment of covariates*

215 Details on data collection on covariates are described elsewhere.⁹ In short, for age, sex,
216 educational level, smoking status and history, physical activity, and medication use data from
217 the baseline general questionnaire were used. Education was categorized into low (lower
218 vocational training and primary school), moderate (secondary school and intermediate
219 vocational training), and high educational level (higher vocational training and university).

220 Smoking status was categorized into never smoker, former smoker, or current smoker.
221 Alcohol intake was assessed from the FFQ, and measured in grams/day. Physical activity was
222 categorized into inactive, moderately inactive, moderately active, and active, according to the
223 Cambridge Physical Activity Index (CPAI).⁴² Total energy intake was also derived from the
224 FFQ, and expressed in kilocalories/day.

225 The baseline physical examination provided data on body weight and height, blood
226 pressure and cholesterol levels [10]. BMI was calculated as height divided by weight squared,
227 and participants were categorized as normal weight for a BMI ≤ 24.9 kg/m², overweight for a
228 BMI between 25 and 29.9 kg/m², and obese for a BMI ≥ 30 kg/m². Both systolic and diastolic
229 blood pressure were measured twice in supine position, from which the mean was taken.
230 Blood pressure measurements were performed on the left arm, using a Boso Oscillomat in the
231 MORGEN-EPIC cohort, and a random zero Sphygmomanometer in the Prospect-EPIC
232 cohort.⁹ Hypertension was defined as use of hypertensive medication, and/or systolic blood
233 pressure >140 and/or diastolic pressure >90 .⁹ Serum total cholesterol (mmol/l) was measured
234 using enzymatic methods.⁹

235

236 *Statistical analysis*

237 All baseline characteristics are reported by quartiles of the HRDea-score. Normally
238 distributed continuous variables are presented as means with standard deviations. Continuous
239 variables with a skewed distribution are presented as median with interquartile range (IQR).
240 Categorical variables are presented as counts and percentages. A Cox proportional hazard
241 model was used to obtain hazard ratios (HR) and 95% confidence intervals (CI) for the
242 association between quartiles of the HRDea-score and CHD risk and all-cause mortality. The
243 lowest quartile was used as reference. The underlying time variable was age from study entry
244 to either diagnosis, death, or end of follow-up (31-12-2010), whichever came first. The
245 proportional hazards assumption was checked using the Schoenfeld test, with no violations
246 observed.

247 For CHD and all-cause mortality outcomes, the analyses present first the unadjusted
248 model with crude estimates. Model 1 was adjusted for age and sex and model 2 was
249 additionally adjusted for educational level, smoking, alcohol consumption, physical activity,
250 and energy intake. A sensitivity analysis was conducted, where we added BMI, total
251 cholesterol, and hypertension to the multivariable-adjusted model (model 2), as these factors
252 may be potential mediators in the association between the HRDea-score and CHD. All
253 mediators were first added individually and then simultaneously.

254 All foods in the FFQ, expressed in grams/day, had an estimated environmental impact
255 calculated with LCA. We used linear regression models to estimate the association between
256 HRDea-score and each environmental indicator. In this linear regression the exposure was the
257 HRDea-score and the outcome was the environmental indicator, calculated as the sum of the
258 associated environmental impact of the food groups included in the HRD. The lowest quartile
259 was used as reference. The analyses present first the crude estimates, and then in model 1
260 estimates were adjusted for age, sex, and energy intake. No other variables were included,
261 based on current literature on the environmental impact of diets. The p-value for trend across
262 quartiles was estimated by modelling the median value of each quartile as a continuous
263 variable. Statistical significance was set at a two-tailed $P < 0.05$. All statistical analyses were
264 carried out using STATA 13.5E (StataCorp LP, College Station, TX, USA).

265

266 *Patient and public involvement*

267 No patients or participants were involved in formulating the research question, establishing
268 the outcome measures, or in the design of the study. No patients or participants were involved
269 in the interpretation of the results or writing of the manuscript. There are no plans to
270 disseminate the results of the research to participants or wider relevant communities.

271

272 **3. Results**

273

274 Table 1 shows the baseline characteristics of the study population across quartiles of the
275 HRDea-score. The average score was 73 (SD=10), and ranged between 32 and 116.
276 Participants most adherent to the HRD were more likely to be female, have a normal BMI,
277 be highly educated, have never smoked, and consume less calories per day compared to the
278 least adherent.

279

280 **Table 1.** Baseline characteristics of the EPIC-NL cohort by quartiles of the HRDea-score
281 ($n=37,349$)¹

	Quartiles of HRDea-scores (range)			
	Q1 (32-66)	Q2 (67-73)	Q3 (74-79)	Q4 (80-116)
	N=9340	N=9340	N=9340	N=9340
Sex				
Male	3773 (40.4)	2753 (29.5)	1799 (19.3)	1086 (11.6)
Female	5567 (59.6)	6587 (70.5)	7541 (80.7)	8254 (88.4)

Age	48.5 (36.8, 55.5)	51.0 (41.4, 57.3)	52.5 (44.9, 58.6)	52.7 (46.9, 58.9)
BMI				
Normal weight	4114 (44.7)	4391 (47.7)	4359 (47.4)	4848 (52.7)
Overweight	3731 (40.5)	3559 (38.6)	3640 (39.6)	3319 (36.1)
Obesity	1357 (14.7)	1261 (13.7)	1195 (13.0)	1035 (11.2)
Educational level				
Low	5912 (63.7)	5612 (60.4)	5375 (57.8)	4639 (49.9)
Moderate	2122 (22.9)	2036 (21.9)	1951 (21.0)	1976 (21.3)
High	1250 (13.5)	1645 (17.7)	1966 (21.2)	2681 (28.8)
Smoking				
Never	3152 (33.9)	3487 (37.5)	3751 (40.3)	3852 (41.3)
Former	2466 (26.5)	2860 (30.7)	3151 (33.9)	3397 (36.5)
Current	3687 (39.6)	2958 (31.8)	2403 (25.8)	2067 (22.2)
Physical activity				
Inactive	889 (9.5)	728 (7.8)	666 (7.1)	524 (5.6)
Moderately inactive	2259 (24.2)	2371 (25.4)	2348 (25.1)	2294 (24.6)
Moderately active	2260 (24.2)	2412 (25.8)	2442 (26.1)	2588 (27.7)
Active	3932 (42.1)	3829 (41.0)	3884 (41.6)	3934 (42.1)
Alcohol consumption, g/day	5.3 (0.7, 17.3)	4.9 (0.7, 15.6)	4.8 (0.7, 14.8)	5.0 (0.7, 14.8)
Energy intake, kcal/day	2269 (1872, 2738)	2020 (1704, 2424)	1860 (1568, 2199)	1736 (1473, 2046)
Food consumption, g/day				
Whole grains	20.7 (2.4, 85.2)	49.1 (6.4, 107.4)	72.1 (15.0, 127.4)	96.5 (46.8, 134.1)
Vegetables	89.5 (66.7, 117.0)	99.2 (74.7, 129.4)	105.9 (81.9, 136.9)	125.8 (95.4, 166.2)
Fruit	105.1 (49.8, 180.7)	136.9 (90.7, 250.2)	190.6 (122.4, 278.7)	241.4 (158.4, 323.5)
Potatoes and cassava	142.9 (105.1, 183.9)	106.8 (67.9, 156.9)	76.9 (49.6, 111.4)	60.1 (38.7, 81.0)
Dairy foods ²	538.6 (258.5, 722.6)	417.5 (232.4, 613.2)	381.0 (232.5, 543.5)	323.6 (207.8, 427.2)
Legumes ³	23.7 (14.7, 35.9)	26.9 (17.2, 40.2)	29.0 (18.8, 42.0)	33.8 (23.2, 46.4)
Soy	0.0 (0.0, 0.0)	0.0 (0.0, 0.0)	0.0 (0.0, 0.1)	0.0 (0.0, 4.8)
Beef, lamb, and pork	103.7 (70.8, 136.3)	93.5 (59.3, 123.9)	82.8 (51.9, 111.4)	64.0 (34.5, 97.5)
Chicken	10.3 (4.7, 17.3)	9.6 (4.3, 16.3)	9.4 (4.1, 15.9)	7.9 (2.9, 14.6)
Eggs	21.4 (10.5, 28.6)	14.3 (7.6, 21.4)	13.8 (7.1, 17.6)	10.5 (5.8, 15.7)
Fish	7.2 (2.8, 14.0)	7.4 (3.3, 14.0)	8.0 (3.3, 15.2)	8.4 (3.3, 15.9)
Nuts	4.3 (1.4, 11.7)	4.1 (1.4, 10.7)	3.8 (1.4, 9.7)	4.7 (1.7, 11.4)
Unsaturated fats	11.3 (4.9, 20.8)	10.9 (5.1, 19.6)	10.1 (5.0, 17.8)	9.9 (5.1, 16.9)
Saturated fats	33.5 (21.4, 49.2)	28.5 (17.6, 42.5)	24.7 (14.4, 37.8)	22.3 (12.3, 35.0)
Added sugars	193.7 (117.4, 305.9)	178.4 (108.9, 271.4)	170.1 (101.3, 251.0)	159.8 (93.3, 231.7)

282 ¹Estimates are presented as counts n and percentages (%) or as medians (p25, p75). ²Including whole milk,

283 derivate equivalents and cheese. ³Including beans, lentils, and peas.

284

285 *HRDea-score and CHD*

286 During a median follow-up of 15.1 years, a total of 2,543 CHD events occurred. High
 287 adherence to the HRD was associated with a lower risk of CHD (HR_{Q4vsQ1} 0.85; 95% CI 0.75
 288 – 0.96) in fully adjusted models (Table 2). Adding each potential mediator separately to the
 289 multivariable-adjusted model only slightly attenuated the results (Supplementary Table 3).
 290 The cumulative effect of all mediators also did not substantially alter the results (HR_{Q4vsQ1}
 291 0.88; 95% CI 0.77 – 0.99).

292

293 **Table 2.** Hazard ratios (HRs) and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) for the association between

	Quartiles of HRDea-scores (range)				
	Q1 (32-66)	Q2 (67-73)	Q3 (74-79)	Q4 (80-116)	P-trend
Cases, <i>n</i>	700	684	606	553	
Persons-years	135165	135188	135810	135745	
Unadjusted Model	1.00 [ref]	0.98 (0.88 – 1.09)	0.86 (0.77 - 0.96)	0.79 (0.70 – 0.88)	< 0.001
Model 1 ^a	1.00 [ref]	0.91 (0.82 – 1.01)	0.79 (0.71 - 0.88)	0.74 (0.66 – 0.83)	< 0.001
Model 2 ^b	1.00 [ref]	0.96 (0.86 – 1.07)	0.86 (0.77 – 0.96)	0.85 (0.75 – 0.96)	0.003

294 quartiles of the HRDea-score and incident of CHD (*n*=37,349).

295 ^a Adjusted for age and sex. ^b Adjusted for age, sex, educational level, smoking status, alcohol consumption,
 296 physical activity, and energy intake. Data was missing for smoking status *n*=129 (0.0034%) and educational
 297 level *n*=195 (0.0052%).

298

299 *HRDea-score and all-cause mortality*

300 During a median follow-up of 15.3 years, 5648 people died from all causes. High adherence
 301 to the HRD was associated with a lower risk of all-cause mortality (HR_{Q4vsQ1} 0.83; 95% CI
 302 0.77 – 0.90) in fully adjusted models (Table 3).

303 **Table 3.** Hazard ratios (HRs) and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) for the association between

	Q1 (32-66)	Q2 (67-73)	Q3 (74-79)	Q4 (80-116)	P-trend
Cases, <i>n</i>	1327	1470	1516	1335	
Persons-years	139528	139337	139473	139236	
Unadjusted Model	1.00 [ref]	1.12 (1.04 – 1.21)	1.18 (1.10 - 1.27)	1.05 (0.98 – 1.14)	0.079
Model 1 ^a	1.00 [ref]	0.92 (0.86 – 0.99)	0.86 (0.80 - 0.93)	0.74 (0.68 – 0.80)	< 0.001
Model 2 ^b	1.00 [ref]	0.97 (0.90 – 1.05)	0.94 (0.87 – 1.02)	0.83 (0.77 – 0.90)	< 0.001

304 quartiles of the HRDea-score and all-cause mortality (*n*=37,349).

305 ^a Adjusted for age and sex. ^b Adjusted for age, sex, educational level, smoking status, alcohol consumption,
 306 physical activity, and energy intake. Data was missing for smoking status n=129 (0.0034%) and educational
 307 level n=195 (0.0052%).

308

309

310

311 *HRDea-score and environmental impact*

312 Table 4 shows the baseline means of GHG emissions, land use, blue water use, freshwater
 313 eutrophication, marine eutrophication, and terrestrial acidification across quartiles of the
 314 HRDea-score. Participants most adherent to the HRD were more likely to consume diets that
 315 were associated with less GHGE, land use, freshwater eutrophication, marine eutrophication
 316 and terrestrial acidification compared to the least adherent. Yet, diets of those most adherent
 317 to the HRD have higher blue water use compared to diets of those least adhering to the HRD.

318

319 **Table 4.** Descriptive statistics of the environmental impact indicators by quartiles of the

	Quartiles of HRDea-score (range)			
	Q1 (32-66)	Q2 (67-73)	Q3 (74-79)	Q4 (80-116)
	N=9340	N=9340	N=9340	N=9340
Greenhouse gases (Kg CO ₂ -eq)	6.07 (1.72)	5.61 (1.51)	5.32 (1.41)	5.03 (1.32)
Land use (m ² per year)	3.47 (0.95)	3.19 (0.85)	3.00 (0.79)	2.82 (0.74)
Blue water use (m ³ per day)	0.14 (0.05)	0.15 (0.05)	0.16 (0.05)	0.17 (0.05)
Freshwater eutrophication (Kg P-eq)	0.00043 (0.00012)	0.00039 (0.00011)	0.00037 (0.00010)	0.00035 (0.00009)
Marine eutrophication (Kg N-eq)	0.010 (0.003)	0.010 (0.003)	0.009 (0.003)	0.009 (0.003)
Terrestrial acidification (Kg SO ₂ -eq)	0.064 (0.021)	0.059 (0.018)	0.055 (0.017)	0.051 (0.017)

320 HRDea-score (n=37,393)¹

321 ¹All values are presented as means (SD).

322

323 In multivariable adjusted models, high adherence to the HRD was associated with lower
 324 GHGE ($\beta = -0.10$ kg CO₂-eq; 95%CI: -0.13, -0.07), less land use ($\beta = -0.11$ m² per year; 95%
 325 CI: -0.12, -0.09), less freshwater eutrophication ($\beta = -0.000002$ kg P-eq; 95%CI: -0.000004, -
 326 0.000001), less marine eutrophication ($\beta = -0.00035$ kg N-eq; 95%CI: -0.00042, -0.00029)
 327 and less terrestrial acidification ($\beta = -0.004$ kg SO₂-eq; 95% CI: -0.004, -0.003) and with
 328 higher blue water use ($\beta = 0.044$; 95% CI; 95%CI: 0.043, 0.045) when comparing extreme
 329 quartiles (Table 5). These beta-coefficients correspond to 1.7% lower GHGE, 3.2% less land
 330 use, 0.5% less freshwater eutrophication, 3.5% less marine eutrophication, 6.3% less

331 terrestrial acidification, but with 31.43% higher blue water use, when comparing extreme
332 quartiles.
333
334

335 **Table 5.** Regression coefficients and 95% confidence intervals (CI) for the association
 336 between quartiles of the HRDea-score and environmental indicators (n=37,393).

	HRDea-score (range)				P-trend
	Q1 (29-67)	Q2 (68-73)	Q3 (74-79)	Q4 (80-114)	
GHGE (kg CO2-eq)					
Unadjusted model	0 [ref]	-0.46 (-0.5, -0.42)	-0.75 (-0.79, -0.71)	-1.04 (-1.08, -0.99)	< 0.001
Model 1 ^a	0 [ref]	-0.05 (-0.07, -0.02)	-0.05 (-0.08, -0.3)	-0.10 (-0.13, -0.07)	< 0.001
Land Use (m ² /y)					
Unadjusted model	0 [ref]	-0.28 (-0.31, -0.26)	-0.47 (-0.49, -0.45)	-0.66 (-0.68, -0.63)	< 0.001
Model 1 ^a	0 [ref]	-0.04 (-0.06, -0.03)	-0.07 (-0.08, -0.05)	-0.11 (-0.12, -0.09)	< 0.001
Blue water use (m ³ /d)					
Unadjusted model	0 [ref]	0.01 (0.009, 0.012)	0.018 (0.017, 0.02)	0.031 (0.030, 0.032)	< 0.001
Model 1 ^a	0 [ref]	0.017 (0.016, 0.018)	0.029 (0.027, 0.03)	0.044 (0.043, 0.045)	< 0.001
Freshwater eutrophication (Kg P-eq)					
Unadjusted model	0 [ref]	-0.000034 (-0.000036, -0.000031)	-0.000056 (-0.000058, -0.000053)	-0.000074 (-0.000077, -0.000071)	< 0.001
Model 1 ^a	0 [ref]	-0.000002 (-0.000004, -0.000001)	-0.000003 (-0.000004, -0.000001)	-0.000002 (-0.000004, -0.000001)	< 0.001
Marine eutrophication (Kg N-eq)					
Unadjusted model	0 [ref]	-0.0008 (-0.0008, -0.0007)	-0.0013 (-0.0014, -0.0012)	-0.0019 (-0.0020, -0.0018)	< 0.001
Model 1 ^a	0 [ref]	-0.00009 (-0.00015, -0.00002)	-0.00014 (-0.00021, -0.00008)	-0.00035 (-0.00042, -0.00029)	< 0.001
Terrestrial acidification (Kg SO2-eq)					
Unadjusted model	0 [ref]	-0.005 (-0.006, -0.005)	-0.008 (-0.009, -0.008)	-0.012 (-0.013, -0.012)	< 0.001
Model 1 ^a	0 [ref]	-0.001 (-0.001, -0.001)	-0.002 (-0.002, -0.001)	-0.004 (-0.004, -0.003)	< 0.001

337 ^a Adjusted for age, sex, and energy intake.

338

339 Discussion

340 In the present study among 37,349 Dutch adults, we found that higher adherence to
 341 the HRD as proposed by the EAT-Lancet Commission was associated with 15% lower risk of
 342 CHD, and with 17% lower risk of all-cause mortality. Higher adherence to the diet was also
 343 associated with 1.7% lower GHGE, 3.2% less land use, 0.5% less freshwater eutrophication,
 344 3.5% less marine eutrophication, 6.3% less terrestrial acidification, but with 31.4% higher
 345 blue water use.

346 Before we can interpret our results, we need to address the limitations of the present
 347 study. Even though overall the FFQ was considered adequate to assess food intake of the

348 EPIC-NL population, the validity of vegetable and fish intakes was found to be quite poor.¹⁰
349 This would suggest possible measurement error in the present study for vegetable and fish
350 intake as well. As misclassification of these food groups is likely to be random given the
351 prospective design of the present study, and considering that these food groups are generally
352 associated with lower risk for CHD, misclassification of the intake of these foods could
353 indicate an attenuation of the inverse association with CHD and mortality risk. Similarly,
354 there may be underestimation of the effects on environmental impact indicators. Moreover,
355 dietary assessment was conducted only at baseline and dietary intake might have changed
356 during follow-up. However, a previous study in EPIC-NL showed dietary changes between
357 baseline and 20 years follow-up to be relatively modest.⁴³ Finally, the current study used the
358 Dutch LCA Database to calculate environmental indicators. It should be noted that, although
359 the LCA database is a comprehensive source of LCA indicators, there is also some
360 uncertainty in the data since they are modelled and not actually measured.⁴¹ Furthermore,
361 LCA estimates for the Netherlands will likely not be fully generalizable to other contexts.

362 The main strength of this study is the use of a prospective design, based on a large
363 population cohort, and a long follow-up period. Moreover, we used a proportional scoring
364 from 0 to 10 for each component of the HRD-score, which is likely to capture the variability
365 in dietary intake. Additionally, the current study created a refined diet score which could be
366 used or adapted by other studies who wish to study the HRD in other settings. Another
367 strength is the linkage with national registries to ascertain health outcomes which is
368 considered a valid method to reach near-complete follow-up and to reduce possible outcome
369 misclassification.⁴⁴ Finally, the present study included a wide range of environmental
370 indicators, which appeals to the need for an integrated analysis of the core environmental
371 impact dimensions of food systems.⁷

372 The EAT-Lancet report leaves some space for definition of the HRD, so that
373 recommendations can be tailored to different populations. Thus, for the construction of the
374 HRD-score, several choices were made in assigning foods to each scoring component, such
375 as the inclusion of dairy and starchy vegetables in the optimum component. Depending on the
376 population and cultural context, some might prefer assigning these food groups to an
377 adherence or moderation component. Additionally, intake recommendations in grams per day
378 from the EAT-Lancet report were energy-adjusted for women, to account for their generally
379 lower energy requirements. Since these choices were mostly based on the baseline
380 characteristics of this study population, they might not be entirely appropriate when
381 replicating this study in a different setting.

382 Findings from the present study are largely in line with the study from Knuppel et al.
383 which used a more simple score to reflect HRD-adherence, and found similar inverse
384 associations for CHD risk and all-cause mortality, although the latter did not reach statistical
385 significance.⁸ Even though the HRD-score is unique to this study, other studies investigating
386 dietary indices focusing on plant-based diets, show inverse associations with either CHD or
387 all-cause mortality.^{45 46} Differences in the magnitude of risk reductions between the present
388 study and available literature are likely related to the scoring methods, the baseline
389 characteristics of the populations, and/or to residual confounding.

390 With regard to the environmental impact of the HRD, the indicators used in this study
391 are largely in line with the planetary boundaries framework,^{38 39} which is also applied by the
392 EAT-Lancet Commission to model the environmental effects of the HRD. Although there
393 was a significant increase in blue water use, the observed percentage reductions for GHGE,
394 land use, freshwater eutrophication, marine eutrophication and terrestrial acidification in fully
395 adjusted models seem modest. These findings are in line with findings from the EAT-Lancet
396 Commission, showing that dietary changes alone are not sufficient to stay within most
397 planetary boundaries, except for GHGE, for which a reduction of 49% was observed when
398 comparing current diets with the HRD.⁷ The discrepancy in GHGE reductions between the
399 EAT-Lancet report and the current study could be due to the fact that in the EPIC-NL
400 population the maximum HRD-score reached was only 116, while complete adherence would
401 yield 140 points. Thus, observed diets may still be suboptimal, and further improvements
402 towards the HRD may have larger effects on environmental impact indicators. Also, other
403 measures such as improved production practices and less food waste and loss are needed as
404 well.⁷

405 The Dutch Healthy Diet index 2015 (DHD15-index) – a diet-score reflecting
406 adherence to the Dutch national dietary guidelines – has in EPIC-NL previously been related
407 to environmental sustainability. In line with our findings, these studies also observed
408 adherence to the DHD15 to be associated with lower GHGE and less land use, but with
409 higher use of blue water.^{47 48} Indeed, several plant-based foods – which are emphasized in
410 both the DHD15 and the HRD - do have a relatively high blue water use per kg product, such
411 as several fruits and nuts.⁴⁹ Plant-based foods with a relatively high blue water use are often
412 imported into The Netherlands from areas with a high water scarcity, such as citrus fruits
413 from Spain or almonds from the USA. In order to reduce the blue water footprint of the HRD
414 diet in a Dutch context, choosing locally-grown and seasonal fruits and vegetables may be
415 recommended.⁴⁹ Thus, it is plausible that with small changes in the choice for type of fruits,

416 and when choosing for seasonal and locally grown fruits and vegetables, the high blue water
417 use associated with high HRD-adherence could be diminished.

418

419 **Conclusion**

420 This study provides evidence from a prospective cohort study in The Netherlands for an
421 inverse association of adherence to the HRD with CHD and all-cause mortality. This research
422 also found that increasing adherence to the HRD could lower some aspects of the
423 environmental impact of diets, but attention is needed for the associated increase in blue
424 water use.

Contributor and guarantor information

Contributors: CC, MCH, and YTvdS designed the study. CC performed the statistical analyses. REV and EHMT contributed to the linkage of dietary data with environmental data. CC drafted the manuscript. MCH, REV, WMMV, JMAB, EHMT, YTvdS reviewed and revised the manuscript. YTvdS is the guarantor. The corresponding author attests that all listed authors meet authorship criteria and that no others meeting the criteria have been omitted.

Copyright/license for publication

The corresponding author has the right to grant on behalf of all authors and does grant on behalf of all authors, a worldwide licence to the Publishers and its licensees in perpetuity, in all forms, formats and media (whether known now or created in the future), to i) publish, reproduce, distribute, display and store the Contribution, ii) translate the Contribution into other languages, create adaptations, reprints, include within collections and create summaries, extracts and/or, abstracts of the Contribution, iii) create any other derivative work(s) based on the Contribution, iv) to exploit all subsidiary rights in the Contribution, v) the inclusion of electronic links from the Contribution to third party material wherever it may be located; and, vi) licence any third party to do any or all of the above.

Data availability statement

Data are available upon reasonable request from the PI of the EPIC-NL study (YTvdS).

Competing interests

All authors have completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure form at www.icmje.org/coi_disclosure.pdf and declare: no support from any organisation for the submitted work; no financial relationships with any organisations that might have an interest in the submitted work in the previous three years; no other relationships or activities that could appear to have influenced the submitted work.

Ethical approval

The study complied with the Declaration of Helsinki and was approved by the Institutional Review Board of the University Medical Center Utrecht (Prospect) and the Medical Ethical Committee of the Netherlands Organization for Applied Scientific Research (TNO) (MORGEN). All participants proved written informed consent.

Transparency statement

YTvdS affirms that the manuscript is an honest, accurate, and transparent account of the study being reported; that no important aspects of the study have been omitted; and that any discrepancies from the study as originally planned (and, if relevant, registered) have been explained.

Funding

MCH was supported by the Netherlands Cardiovascular Research Initiative, an initiative with support of the Dutch Heart Foundation (CVON2016-04) and The Netherlands Organisation for Health Research and Development (531003001) in the context of the Supreme Nudge project. Funders had no role in the design of the study and collection, analysis, and interpretation of data and in writing the manuscript, nor have they authority on the decision to submit the manuscript for publication.

Section 1: What is already known on this topic

- The EAT-Lancet Healthy Reference Diet (HRD) was suggested to co-benefit public and planetary health.
- Only one study empirically assessed the association between the HRD and the risk of coronary heart disease and all-cause mortality, showing that better adherence to the HRD was associated with 28% lower risk for coronary heart disease, but not with risk of all-cause mortality.
- No study has yet empirically evaluated the environmental impact of the HRD.

Section 2: What this study adds

- The present study suggests that adhering to the HRD is associated with lower risk of coronary heart disease and all-cause mortality, and is associated with lower environmental impact for the majority of environmental impact indicators studied.
- Adherence to the HRD was, however, associated with increase blue water use, which warrants further attention.

Word count (excluding title page, abstract, references, figures and tables): 4093

References

1. Tilman D, Clark M. Global diets link environmental sustainability and human health. *Nature*: Nature, 2014:518-22.
2. Afshin A, Sur PJ, Fay KA, et al. Health effects of dietary risks in 195 countries, 1990–2017: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2017. *The Lancet*: Lancet Publishing Group, 2019:1958-72.
3. Arnett DK, Blumenthal RS, Albert MA, et al. 2019 ACC/AHA Guideline on the Primary Prevention of Cardiovascular Disease: A Report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Clinical Practice Guidelines. *Circulation* 2019;140(11):e596-e646. doi: 10.1161/cir.0000000000000678 [published Online First: 2019/03/19]
4. de Vries M, de Boer IJM. Comparing environmental impacts for livestock products: A review of life cycle assessments. *Livestock Science*: Elsevier, 2010:1-11.
5. Tukker A, Goldbohm RA, de Koning A, et al. Environmental impacts of changes to healthier diets in Europe. *Ecological Economics*: Elsevier, 2011:1776-88.
6. Hedenus F, Wirsenius S, Johansson DJA. The importance of reduced meat and dairy consumption for meeting stringent climate change targets. *Climatic Change*: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2014:79-91.
7. Willett W, Rockström J, Loken B, et al. Food in the Anthropocene: the EAT–Lancet Commission on healthy diets from sustainable food systems. *The Lancet*: Lancet Publishing Group, 2019:447-92.
8. Knuppel A, Papier K, Key TJ, et al. EAT-Lancet score and major health outcomes: the EPIC-Oxford study. *The Lancet*: Lancet Publishing Group, 2019:213-14.
9. Beulens JWJ, Monninkhof EM, Monique Verschuren WM, et al. Cohort profile: The EPIC-NL study. *International Journal of Epidemiology*: Int J Epidemiol, 2010:1170-78.
10. Ocké MC, Bueno-De-Mesquita HB, Goddijn HE, et al. The Dutch EPIC Food Frequency Questionnaire. I. Description of the questionnaire, and relative validity and reproducibility for food groups. *International Journal of Epidemiology*: Int J Epidemiol, 1997.
11. NEVO-table. Nederlands Voedingsstoffen-tabel (NEVO-tabel) 2011 (Dutch Food Composition Table 2011) version 3. Bilthoven, the Netherlands: RIVM/Dutch Nutrition Centre, 1996.
12. Looman M, Feskens EJM, De Rijk M, et al. Development and evaluation of the Dutch Healthy Diet index 2015. *Public Health Nutrition*: Cambridge University Press, 2017:2289-99.
13. Wang X, Ouyang Y, Liu J, et al. Fruit and vegetable consumption and mortality from all causes, cardiovascular disease, and cancer: Systematic review and dose-response meta-analysis of prospective cohort studies. *BMJ (Online)*: BMJ Publishing Group, 2014.

14. Aune D, Giovannucci E, Boffetta P, et al. Fruit and vegetable intake and the risk of cardiovascular disease, total cancer and all-cause mortality-A systematic review and dose-response meta-analysis of prospective studies. *International Journal of Epidemiology*: Oxford University Press, 2017:1029-56.
15. Yip CSC, Chan W, Fielding R. The Associations of Fruit and Vegetable Intakes with Burden of Diseases: A Systematic Review of Meta-Analyses. *Journal of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics*: Elsevier B.V., 2019:464-81.
16. Micha R, Shulkin ML, Peñalvo JL, et al. Etiologic effects and optimal intakes of foods and nutrients for risk of cardiovascular diseases and diabetes: Systematic reviews and meta-analyses from the nutrition and chronic diseases expert group (NutriCoDE). *PLoS ONE*: Public Library of Science, 2017.
17. Lea B, Eric B, Walter C, et al. Potato intake and incidence of hypertension: Results from three prospective US cohort studies. *BMJ (Online)*: BMJ Publishing Group, 2016.
18. Bertola ML, Mukamal KJ, Cahill LE, et al. Changes in Intake of Fruits and Vegetables and Weight Change in United States Men and Women Followed for Up to 24 Years: Analysis from Three Prospective Cohort Studies. *PLoS Medicine*: Public Library of Science, 2015.
19. Guo J, Astrup A, Lovegrove JA, et al. Milk and dairy consumption and risk of cardiovascular diseases and all-cause mortality: dose-response meta-analysis of prospective cohort studies. *European Journal of Epidemiology*: Springer Netherlands, 2017:269-87.
20. Aune D, Navarro Rosenblatt DA, Chan DSM, et al. Dairy products, calcium, and prostate cancer risk: A systematic review and meta-analysis of cohort studies. *American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*: American Society for Nutrition, 2015:87-117.
21. Chen M, Sun Q, Giovannucci E, et al. Dairy consumption and risk of type 2 diabetes: 3 cohorts of US adults and an updated meta-analysis. *BMC Medicine*: BioMed Central, 2014:215.
22. Song M, Fung TT, Hu FB, et al. Association of animal and plant protein intake with all-cause and cause-specific mortality. *JAMA Internal Medicine*: American Medical Association, 2016:1453-63.
23. Pan A, Sun Q, Bernstein AM, et al. Red meat consumption and mortality: Results from 2 prospective cohort studies. *Archives of Internal Medicine*: Arch Intern Med, 2012:555-63.
24. Del Gobbo LC, Imamura F, Aslibekyan S, et al. ω -3 Polyunsaturated fatty acid biomarkers and coronary heart disease: Pooling project of 19 cohort studies. *JAMA Internal Medicine*: American Medical Association, 2016:1155-66.
25. Rong Y, Chen L, Zhu T, et al. Egg consumption and risk of coronary heart disease and stroke: Dose-response meta-analysis of prospective cohort studies. *BMJ (Online)*: British Medical Journal Publishing Group, 2013.
26. Viguioliouk E, Glenn AJ, Nishi SK, et al. Associations between Dietary Pulses Alone or with Other Legumes and Cardiometabolic Disease Outcomes: An Umbrella Review and Updated

- Systematic Review and Meta-analysis of Prospective Cohort Studies. *Advances in Nutrition: Oxford University Press*, 2019:S308-S19.
27. Nöthlings U, Schulze MB, Weikert C, et al. Intake of vegetables, legumes, and fruit, and risk for all-cause, cardiovascular, and cancer mortality in a European diabetic population. *Journal of Nutrition: American Society for Nutrition*, 2008:775-81.
 28. Grosso G, Marventano S, Yang J, et al. A comprehensive meta-analysis on evidence of Mediterranean diet and cardiovascular disease: Are individual components equal? *Critical Reviews in Food Science and Nutrition: Taylor and Francis Inc.*, 2017:3218-32.
 29. Nagata C, Wada K, Tamura T, et al. Dietary soy and natto intake and cardiovascular disease mortality in Japanese adults: The Takayama study. *American Journal of Clinical Nutrition: American Society for Nutrition*, 2017:426-31.
 30. Talaei M, Koh WP, van Dam RM, et al. Dietary soy intake is not associated with risk of cardiovascular disease mortality in Singapore Chinese adults. *Journal of Nutrition: American Society for Nutrition*, 2014:921-28.
 31. Grosso G, Micek A, Godos J, et al. Dietary Flavonoid and Lignan Intake and Mortality in Prospective Cohort Studies: Systematic Review and Dose-Response Meta-Analysis. *American Journal of Epidemiology: Oxford University Press*, 2017:1304-16.
 32. Aune D, Keum NN, Giovannucci E, et al. Nut consumption and risk of cardiovascular disease, total cancer, all-cause and cause-specific mortality: A systematic review and dose-response meta-analysis of prospective studies. *BMC Medicine: BioMed Central Ltd.*, 2016:1-14.
 33. Morenga LT, Mallard S, Mann J. Dietary sugars and body weight: Systematic review and meta-analyses of randomised controlled trials and cohort studies. *BMJ (Online): British Medical Journal Publishing Group*, 2013.
 34. Malik VS, Popkin BM, Bray GA, et al. Sugar-sweetened beverages and risk of metabolic syndrome and type 2 diabetes: A meta-analysis. *Diabetes Care: Diabetes Care*, 2010:2477-83.
 35. Yang Q, Zhang Z, Gregg EW, et al. Added sugar intake and cardiovascular diseases mortality among us adults. *JAMA Internal Medicine: American Medical Association*, 2014:516-24.
 36. Willett WC, Howe GR, Kushi LH. Adjustment for total energy intake in epidemiologic studies: *American Society for Nutrition*, 1997.
 37. Herings RMC, Bakker A, Stricker BHC, et al. Pharmaco-morbidity linkage: a feasibility study comparing morbidity in two pharmacy based exposure cohorts. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health: J Epidemiol Community Health*, 1992:136-40.
 38. Rockström J, Steffen W, Noone K, et al. A safe operating space for humanity. *Nature* 2009;461(7263):472-75. doi: 10.1038/461472a
 39. Steffen W, Richardson K, Rockström J, et al. Planetary boundaries: Guiding human development on a changing planet. *Science* 2015;347(6223):1259855. doi: 10.1126/science.1259855
 40. Environmental impact of food | RIVM.

41. Vellinga RE, van de Kamp M, Toxopeus IB, et al. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and blue water use of dutch diets and its association with health. *Sustainability* (Switzerland): MDPI AG, 2019:6027.
42. Wareham NJ, Jakes RW, Rennie KL, et al. Validity and repeatability of a simple index derived from the short physical activity questionnaire used in the European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition (EPIC) study. *Public Health Nutrition: Cambridge University Press (CUP)*, 2003:407-13.
43. Biesbroek S, Verschuren WM, Boer JM, et al. Are our diets getting healthier and more sustainable? Insights from the European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition - Netherlands (EPIC-NL) cohort. *Public Health Nutr* 2019;22(16):2931-40. doi: 10.1017/s1368980019001824 [published Online First: 2019/08/01]
44. Merry AHH, Boer JMA, Schouten LJ, et al. Validity of coronary heart diseases and heart failure based on hospital discharge and mortality data in the Netherlands using the cardiovascular registry Maastricht cohort study. *European Journal of Epidemiology: Eur J Epidemiol*, 2009:237-47.
45. Satija A, Bhupathiraju SN, Spiegelman D, et al. Healthful and Unhealthful Plant-Based Diets and the Risk of Coronary Heart Disease in U.S. Adults. *Journal of the American College of Cardiology: Elsevier USA*, 2017:411-22.
46. Martínez-González MA, Sánchez-Tainta A, Corella D, et al. A provegetarian food pattern and reduction in total mortality in the Prevención con Dieta Mediterránea (PREDIMED) study: *American Society for Nutrition*, 2014.
47. Biesbroek S, Verschuren WMM, Boer JMA, et al. Does a better adherence to dietary guidelines reduce mortality risk and environmental impact in the Dutch sub-cohort of the European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition? *British Journal of Nutrition: Cambridge University Press*, 2017:69-80.
48. Biesbroek S, Monique Verschuren WM, van der Schouw YT, et al. Identification of data-driven Dutch dietary patterns that benefit the environment and are healthy. *Climatic Change: Springer Netherlands*, 2018:571-83.
49. Hollander A, Vellinga R, De V, et al. The Global Blue Water Use for the Dutch Diet and Associated Environmental Impact on Water Scarcity. *World Journal of Food Science and Technology* 2021;5:10-18. doi: 10.11648/j.wjfst.20210501.13