Supplementary Table 1 Daily reference values and recommended intake values for individual nutrients used in the nutritional adequacy score calculation

			Daily reference value		
	Unit	**Sex**	**30–49 years**	**50–64 years**	**≥65 years**
Energy	kcal	Men	2700	2600	2400
		Women	2050	1950	1850
Protein	g	Men	65	65	60
		Women	50	50	50
Fiber	g	Men	≥21	≥21	≥20
		Women	≥18	≥18	≥17
Vitamin A	μg	Men	900	900	850
		Women	700	700	700
Vitamin C	mg	Men	100	100	100
		Women	100	100	100
Vitamin E	mg	Men	6.0	7.0	7.0
		Women	5.5	6	6.5
Calcium	mg	Men	750	750	750
		Women	650	650	650
Iron	mg	Men	7.5	7.5	7.5
		Women	10.5	11.0	6.0
Potassium	mg	Men	≥3000	≥3000	≥3000
		Women	≥2600	≥2600	≥2600
Sodium	mg	Men	≤3000	≤3000	≤3000
		Women	≤2600	≤2600	≤2600
Saturated fat	g	Men	<21.0	<20.2	<18.7
		Women	<15.9	<15.2	<14.4

Supplementary Table 2 Association between nutritional adequacy score and all-cause, cancer, and cardiovascular disease mortality after excluding early deaths (within 3 years from baseline) among Japanese adults: The J-MICC Study (n=27,052 men and 37,690 women)

	Nutritional adequacy score quartile					
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	p-trend
Men						
All-cause motality						
Model 1 [a]	1.00 (ref)	0.92 (0.78, 1.1)	0.77 (0.64, 0.92)	0.72 (0.6, 0.87)	0.67 (0.56, 0.81)	<0.001
Model 2 [b]	1.00 (ref)	0.93 (0.78, 1.1)	0.77 (0.64, 0.92)	0.72 (0.6, 0.87)	0.68 (0.56, 0.81)	<0.001
Cancer						
Model 1 [a]	1.00 (ref)	0.94 (0.74, 1.18)	0.79 (0.62, 1.01)	0.74 (0.58, 0.95)	0.67 (0.52, 0.85)	<0.001
Model 2 [b]	1.00 (ref)	0.96 (0.75, 1.22)	0.82 (0.64, 1.05)	0.77 (0.60, 1.00)	0.70 (0.55, 0.90)	<0.001
Cardiovascular disease						
Model 1 [a]	1.00 (ref)	0.92 (0.59, 1.43)	0.80 (0.51, 1.26)	0.84 (0.54, 1.31)	0.61 (0.38, 0.97)	0.046
Model 2 [b]	1.00 (ref)	0.95 (0.61, 1.48)	0.81 (0.51, 1.30)	0.86 (0.54, 1.36)	0.60 (0.37, 0.98)	0.06
Women						
All-cause motality						
Model 1 [a]	1.00 (ref)	0.97 (0.76, 1.23)	0.91 (0.71, 1.16)	0.76 (0.60, 0.98)	0.89 (0.70, 1.12)	0.86
Model 2 [b]	1.00 (ref)	1.00 (0.78, 1.27)	0.95 (0.74, 1.22)	0.79 (0.61, 1.01)	0.92 (0.73, 1.17)	0.99
Cancer						
Model 1 [a]	1.00 (ref)	0.99 (0.71, 1.39)	0.97 (0.69, 1.36)	0.93 (0.67, 1.30)	0.89 (0.64, 1.24)	0.51
Model 2 [b]	1.00 (ref)	1.01 (0.72, 1.42)	1.00 (0.71, 1.40)	0.95 (0.68, 1.33)	0.91 (0.65, 1.27)	0.53
Cardiovascular disease						
Model 1 [a]	1.00 (ref)	1.11 (0.61, 2.01)	0.95 (0.52, 1.75)	0.72 (0.38, 1.35)	0.96 (0.54, 1.71)	0.88
Model 2 [b]	1.00 (ref)	1.13 (0.62, 2.06)	1.02 (0.55, 1.87)	0.73 (0.39, 1.39)	1.04 (0.58, 1.87)	0.71

The Cox proportional hazards model was used, and values were expressed as the hazard ratios (95% CI) in Models 1–2.

a Model 1 was adjusted for age, sex, and data collection site.
b In addition to the variables in Model 1, Model 2 was adjusted for BMI, smoking status, physical activity, alcohol consumption status, stroke, hypertension, diabetes, dyslipidemia, educational attainment, vitamin supplement intake, and total energy intake

Supplementary Table 3 Association between nutritional adequacy score and all-cause, cancer, and cardiovascular disease mortality after excluding participants with baseline disease among Japanese adults: The J-MICC Study (n=17,101 men and 26,990 women)

	Nutritional adequacy score quartile					
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	p-trend
Men						
All-cause motality						
Model 1 [a]	1.00 (ref)	0.81 (0.65, 1.01)	0.82 (0.66, 1.03)	0.70 (0.56, 0.88)	0.61 (0.48, 0.77)	<0.001
Model 2 [b]	1.00 (ref)	0.83 (0.66, 1.04)	0.86 (0.66, 1.07)	0.73 (0.58, 0.93)	0.64 (0.51, 0.81)	<0.001
Cancer						
Model 1 [a]	1.00 (ref)	0.77 (0.57, 1.04)	0.85 (0.64, 1.14)	0.77 (0.57, 1.04)	0.62 (0.46, 0.84)	0.005
Model 2 [b]	1.00 (ref)	0.79 (0.59, 1.08)	0.88 (0.65, 1.19)	0.80 (0.59, 1.09)	0.66 (0.48, 0.91)	0.009
Cardiovascular disease						
Model 1 [a]	1.00 (ref)	0.76 (0.41, 1.42)	0.60 (0.30, 1.18)	0.81 (0.44, 1.51)	0.49 (0.25, 0.99)	0.07
Model 2 [b]	1.00 (ref)	0.82 (0.43, 1.54)	0.67 (0.34, 1.33)	0.94 (0.49, 1.79)	0.55 (0.27, 1.13)	0.19
Women						
All-cause motality						
Model 1 [a]	1.00 (ref)	1.00 (0.74, 1.34)	0.93 (0.70, 1.26)	0.69 (0.50, 0.94)	0.85 (0.63, 1.14)	0.69
Model 2 [b]	1.00 (ref)	0.97 (0.72, 1.31)	0.92 (0.68, 1.24)	0.67 (0.48, 0.92)	0.84 (0.63, 1.14)	0.75
Cancer						
Model 1 [a]	1.00 (ref)	1.17 (0.79, 1.72)	1.07 (0.72, 1.59)	0.85 (0.57, 1.29)	0.96 (0.65, 1.43)	0.70
Model 2 [b]	1.00 (ref)	1.14 (0.77, 1.70)	1.05 (0.71, 1.57)	0.84 (0.55, 1.27)	0.94 (0.63, 1.41)	0.72
Cardiovascular disease						
Model 1 [a]	1.00 (ref)	1.15 (0.51, 2.57)	1.17 (0.53, 2.58)	0.78 (0.33, 1.84)	0.93 (0.41, 2.09)	0.77
Model 2 [b]	1.00 (ref)	1.13 (0.50, 2.55)	1.16 (0.52, 2.60)	0.76 (0.32, 1.83)	0.94 (0.41, 2.14)	0.80

The Cox proportional hazards model was used, and values were expressed as the hazard ratios (95% CI) in Models 1–2.

a Model 1 was adjusted for age, sex, and data collection site.
b In addition to the variables in Model 1, Model 2 was adjusted for BMI, smoking status, physical activity, alcohol consumption status, educational attainment, vitamin supplement intake, and total energy intake.