

This manuscript has been accepted by the editors of *Psychosomatic Medicine*, but it has not yet been copy edited; information within these pages is therefore subject to change. During the copy-editing and production phases, language usage and any textual errors will be corrected, and pages will be composed into their final format.

Please visit the journal's website (www.psychosomaticmedicine.org) to check for a final version of the article.

When citing this article, please use the following: *Psychosomatic Medicine* (in press) and include the article's digital object identifier (DOI).

The effects of dietary improvement on symptoms of depression and anxiety: a metaanalysis of randomized controlled trials

Joseph Firth, PhD^{1,2}, Wolfgang Marx, PhD³, Sarah Dash, PhD^{3,4}, Rebekah Carney, PhD^{2,5}, Scott B Teasdale,

PhD^{6,7}, Marco Solmi, MD^{8,9}, Brendon Stubbs, PhD^{10,11}, Felipe B. Schuch, PhD^{12,13}, André F. Carvalho,

MD^{14,15}, Felice Jacka, PhD^{3,16,17}, Jerome Sarris, PhD^{1,18}

¹ NICM Health Research Institute, Western Sydney University, Australia;

² Division of Psychology and Mental Health, Faculty of Biology, Medicine and Health, University of Manchester, UK;

³ Deakin University, Food & Mood Centre, IMPACT Strategic Research Centre, School of Medicine, Barwon Health, Geelong, Australia

⁴Baker Heart and Diabetes Institute, Metabolic and Vascular Physiology, Australia

⁵ Youth Mental Health Research Unit, Greater Manchester Mental Health NHS Foundation Trust,

Manchester, UK

⁶ School of Psychiatry, Faculty of Medicine, UNSW Sydney, Australia;

⁷ Keeping the Body in Mind Program, South Eastern Sydney Local Health District, Sydney, Australia;

⁸ University of Padua, Neurosciences Department, Padua, Italy

⁹ Padua University Hospital, Psychiatry Unit, Padua, Italy

¹⁰ Physiotherapy Department, South London and Maudsley NHS Foundation Trust, London, United

Kingdom

¹¹ Department of Psychological Medicine, Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology and Neuroscience, King's

College London, London, United Kingdom

¹² Post Graduate Program in Health and Human Development, La Salle University, Canoas, Brazil;

¹³ Hospital de Clínicas de Porto Alegre, Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre, Brazil;

¹⁴ Department of Psychiatry, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON, Canada;

¹⁵ Centre for Addiction and Mental Health (CAMH), Toronto, ON, Canada;

¹⁶ Black Dog Institute, Sydney, Australia

¹⁷Murdoch Childrens Research Institute, Centre for Adolescent Health, Melbourne, Australia

¹⁸Department of Psychiatry, University of Melbourne, Professorial Unit, The Melbourne Clinic, Melbourne,

Australia.

Corresponding author:

Joseph Firth

NICM Health Research Unit, University of Western Sydney, Penrith, NSW 2750, Australia

Tel: +44 (0)161 306 7914

Email: j.firth@westernsydney.edu.au

Co-final author (Felice Jacka and Jerome Sarris)

Funding and Conflict of Interests

JF is supported by a Blackmores Institute Fellowship. WM is funded by a Deakin University Dean's Postdoctoral Research Fellowship. FNJ is supported by an NHMRC Career Development Fellowship (2) (APP1108125). JS is funded by an NHMRC Research Fellowship (APP1125000). ST is funded by the South Eastern Sydney Local Health District in a clinical position. BS is supported by the Health Education England and the National Institute for Health Research HEE/ NIHR ICA Programme Clinical Lectureship (ICA-CL-2017-03-001). The views expressed in this publication are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the NHS, the National Institute for Health Research or the Department of Health and Social Care. Felice Jacka has received Grant/Research support from the Brain and Behaviour Research Institute, the National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC), Australian Rotary Health, the Geelong Medical Research Foundation, the Ian Potter Foundation, Eli Lilly, Meat and Livestock Australia, Woolworths Limited, The Fernwood Foundation, The Wilson Foundation, GMHBA and The University of Melbourne and has received speakers honoraria from Sanofi-Synthelabo, Janssen Cilag, Servier, Pfizer, Health Ed, Network Nutrition, Angelini Farmaceutica, Eli Lilly and Metagenics.. J.Sarris has received either presentation honoraria, travel support, clinical trial grants, book royalties, or independent consultancy payments from: Integria Healthcare & MediHerb, Pfizer, Scius Health, Key Pharmaceuticals, Taki Mai, Bioceuticals & Blackmores, Soho-Flordis, Healthworld, HealthEd, HealthMasters, Kantar Consulting, Research Reviews, Elsevier, Chaminade University, International Society for Affective Disorders, Complementary Medicines Australia, SPRIM, Terry White Chemists, ANS, Society for Medicinal Plant and Natural Product Research, Sanofi-Aventis, Omega-3 Centre, the National Health and Medical Research Council, CR Roper Fellowship.

Registration: PROSPERO online protocol: CRD42018091256.

Funding: None

Copyright © 2019 the Author(s). Published by Wolters Kluwer Health on behalf of the American College of Sports Medicine. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial-No Derivatives License 4.0 (CCBY-NC-ND), where it is permissible to download and share the work provided it is properly cited. The work cannot be changed in any way or used commercially without permission from the journal.

Abstract

Objective: Poor diet can be detrimental to mental health. However, the overall evidence for the effects of dietary interventions on mood and mental well-being has yet to be assessed. We conducted a systematic review and meta-analysis examining effects of dietary interventions on symptoms of depression and anxiety.

Method: Major electronic databases were searched through March 2018 for all randomized controlled trials (RCTs) of dietary interventions reporting changes in symptoms of depression and/or anxiety in clinical and non-clinical populations. Random-effects meta-analyses were conducted to determine effect sizes (Hedges' *g* with 95% confidence intervals) for dietary interventions compared to control conditions. Potential sources of heterogeneity were explored using subgroups and meta-regression analyses.

Results: Sixteen eligible RCTs with outcome data for 45,826 participants were included; the majority of which examined samples with non-clinical depression (N=15 studies). Nonetheless, dietary interventions significantly reduced depressive symptoms (g=0.275, 95% C.I.=0.10-0.45, p=0.002). Similar effects were observed among high-quality trials (g=0.321, 95% C.I.=0.12-0.53, p=0.002), and when compared to both inactive (g=0.308, 95% C.I.=0.02-0.60, p=0.038) and active controls (g=0.174, 95% C.I.=0.01-0.34, p=0.035). No effect of dietary interventions was observed for anxiety (k=11, n=2,270, g=0.100, 95% C.I.=0.04-0.24, p=0.148). Studies with female samples observed significantly greater benefits from dietary interventions, for symptoms of both depression and anxiety.

Conclusions: Dietary interventions hold promise as a novel intervention for reducing symptoms of depression across the population. Future research is required to determine the specific components of dietary interventions that improve mental health, explore underlying mechanisms, and establish effective schemes for delivering these interventions in clinical and public health settings.

Keywords: mental illness; nutrition; nutrients; mood; affective disorders.

Introduction

Depressive disorders affect over 300 million people around the world and are associated with unemployment, poor physical health, impaired social functioning and, in its most severe forms, suicide (1). Thus, depressive disorders incur considerable burden not only for individuals, but also for society due to the high economic cost from lost productivity and demand on healthcare services (2). The same can be said for anxiety disorders, which, along with depression, are also classified as 'common mental disorders' (CMDs) due to their prevalence across the globe, with approximately 1 in 5 people experiencing one of these conditions over any given year (3). Standard treatments for CMDs comprise psychopharmacological and psychotherapeutic interventions. Whilst these have established efficacy in depression, a substantial proportion of people do not achieve remission using such strategies (4).

Furthermore, sub-clinical symptoms of depression and anxiety are also highly prevalent across the general population, among those without clinically-diagnosed CMDs. These symptoms, although falling short of diagnostic thresholds, still impede upon quality of life and socio-occupational functioning, incurring even further personal and economic burden on a population-scale (5). Therefore, new primary and/or adjunctive methods to address symptoms of depression and anxiety across the population are urgently needed.

Emerging evidence suggests that diet may influence the onset of mood disorders and specifically depression. For instance, many studies described in recent systematic reviews have demonstrated associations between measures of diet quality and the probability of and risk for depression (6, 7). Moreover, pro-inflammatory dietary patterns are also associated with a significantly higher incidence of depressive symptoms, even among those without diagnosed mental disorders (8-10). A previous systematic review examined the benefits of various dietary interventions for depressive symptoms and anxiety, but using only narrative synthesis (11). Results generally suggested positive effects of dietary interventions on sub-clinical depression and anxiety, measured as secondary outcomes (11). However, the previous review did not apply meta-analytic techniques to quantify the findings and the results did not include recent interventions in clinical populations, Thus, it remains unclear if dietary interventions can improve symptoms of depressive

and anxiety (in either clinical or non-psychiatric samples) and the magnitude of any effects. Moreover, the potential influence of moderators such as sex, professional delivery, or the quality of studies on treatment outcomes, are uncertain. Therefore, we aimed to determine the efficacy of dietary interventions for symptoms of depression and anxiety by conducting a meta-analysis of all RCTs examining this therapeutic strategy to date. We also employed sub-group analyses to examine effects of dietary interventions on depression/anxiety in both clinical and non-clinical populations, and to explore which aspects of these are associated with any potential greater efficacy. The findings of this meta-analysis will provide the first overall estimate of the efficacy of dietary interventions for reducing symptoms of depression and anxiety, along with informing self-management strategies for people with these conditions, and suggest directions for future research.

Methods

This meta-analysis followed the PRISMA statement for transparent, comprehensive reporting of methodology and results (12). To eliminate researcher bias, the search strategy, inclusion criteria and data-extraction, overall and pre-specified subgroup analyses used in this meta-analysis were prospectively registered with PROSPERO (CRD42018091256).

Search Strategy

The primary search was performed using OVID Medline on 12/03/2018, in line with the pre-registered protocol, using the keyword terms "Diet" with "Mediterranean" or "Therapy" or "Educat*" or "Counsel*" or "Intervention*" or "Treatment*" AND "Randomized Controlled Trial" or "Random Allocation" or "Clinical Trial" or "Control Groups" AND "Depression" or "Anxiety" or "Depressive Disorder". We performed additional searches of Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials, Health Technology Assessment Database, Allied and Complementary Medicine (AMED), Embase, Health Management Information Consortium (HMIC) and PsycINFO, using the same keywords, along with a further general

search of 'Google Scholar' in order to capture any articles not captured by the main search. The full search details are presented in Supplemental Digital Content 1, http://links.lww.com/PSYMED/A537.

Eligibility Criteria

Only English-language articles published in peer-reviewed journals were included. We aimed to determine effects of dietary interventions on symptoms of depression and anxiety in all clinical and non-clinical populations, including depression (e.g. major depressive disorder (MDD)) or anxiety, co-morbid depression and anxiety, and in samples with depressive/anxiety symptoms that did not reach clinical thresholds. No restrictions were placed on diagnosis or any other clinical or demographic characteristics of eligible samples.

Eligible studies were randomized controlled trials (RCTs) comparing the effect of dietary interventions to non-dietary control conditions. All 'whole of diet' dietary interventions were eligible, delivered via any format, including individualised dietary counselling, group dietary classes, and standardised dietary prescription. Also, all 'types' of diet were eligible, including those primarily aiming to decrease the intake of unhealthy foods, improve nutrient intake, and/or those designed to restrict calorie intake to order induce weight-loss. As we aimed to establish the effects of 'whole of diet' interventions for depression and anxiety, rather than examining only individual foods/nutrients, interventions focusing only on a single food component (e.g. eating more fish) were not included. Multi-component lifestyle interventions were only eligible where comparator conditions had adequately controlled for active non-dietary aspects of the intervention. For instance, multicomponent interventions such as 'exercise with diet' would only be eligible if compared to an 'exercise alone' control condition, so that the effects of the dietary component could be accurately determined. Cross-over trials were only included where between-group differences from the 'first leg' of the cross-over trial were reported (so that parallel groups comparisons could be performed from the data).

Studies using both 'inactive control groups' and 'active control groups' were eligible for inclusion. 'Inactive control groups' were classified as those in which participants maintained their habitual diets and received no

additional active intervention during the trial period (or put onto a 'waitlist' until pre-and-post measures had been collected from both groups). Conversely, 'active control groups' were categorised as any which compared diet to other active interventions or used comparator conditions designed to control for general 'intervention effects' using either (a) benign interventions not aiming to treat depression/anxiety, (b) psychosocial interventions, e.g. social support, counselling, or exercise, or (c) other forms of activities, such as 'time and attention' matched patient contact.

All studies matching the above criteria and reporting changes in at least one quantitative measure of depression or anxiety with sufficient detail for meta-analysis were included. Two independent investigators judged article eligibility (JF and RC) with any disagreements resolved through discussion. Where study design matched eligibly criteria, but data were insufficiently reported, study authors were contacted twice over the period of two months to request the necessary data.

Data Extraction

A systematic extraction form was used to extract the following data from each eligible study:

(*i*) *Sample information:* sample size (n), sex (% females), mean age of participants (years), population sampled health status (diagnostic information or relevant inclusion criteria),

(*ii*) *Intervention:* primary aim of dietary change (e.g. weight-loss or increasing nutritional intake), dietary program summary, individual delivering the intervention (e.g. dietitian or researcher), any additional intervention components (e.g. in-person or remotely-delivered non-dietary additions), control condition, intervention length (in weeks).

(iii) Effects on depressive or anxiety symptoms: changes in total depressive/anxiety symptoms before-andafter dietary and control conditions, using any clinically validated rating scale. For studies which used >1 measure of depression, a mean total change was calculated by pooling outcomes from each measure. Study quality was determined through applying the quality criteria from the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics (formerly the American Dietetic Association; 'ADA') in the ADA quality assessment tool (13). This applies set criteria for examining allocation bias, selection bias, blinding, data collection, trial retention (along with methods of handling dropouts), and interventional adherence. Each study was categorised as positive, negative or neutral using the standardised 'quality consideration questions' described in the ADA Evidence Analysis Manual (13). All studies were included in the meta-analysis, regardless of ADA rating.

Statistical Analyses

Meta-analyses were conducted using Comprehensive Meta-Analysis 2.0 (14), using a random-effects model (15) to account for the expected heterogeneity between studies. The total difference in changes in symptoms of depression and anxiety from dietary interventions vs control conditions were pooled to compute the overall effect size of dietary interventions (as Hedges g), with 95% confidence intervals (CI). For RCTs reporting comparisons of dietary interventions with more than one control group, we pooled comparisons with each control group to generate an overall estimated effect of dietary interventions, in order to make use of all available data. For the one study reporting sex groups separately (16), a combined estimate across both sexes was calculated as Hedges g effect size, and used for primary analyses. After computing main effects, a sensitivity analysis was applied to investigate effects of dietary interventions in RCTs that had a 'positive' ADA rating.

The degree of statistical heterogeneity in the meta-analyses was quantified using Cochran's Q and I² values. Risk of publication bias was examined by applying Eggers' regression to all aforementioned analyses. Furthermore, a Duval and Tweedie's 'trim-and-fill' analysis was applied to the random-effects models, in order to re-calculate the pooled effect size after statistically accounting for any studies which may introduce publication bias (e.g. small studies with large effect sizes). Additionally, a funnel plot of study effect sizes was generated from primary analyses, for a visual inspection of publication bias. Pre-specified subgroup analyses were conducted to examine how effects of dietary interventions differed when (i) comparing diet to either waitlist/inactive control conditions, or active control conditions, (ii) in 'clinical' (i.e. patients with diagnosed depressive/anxiety disorder) and 'non clinical' (i.e. people without diagnoses of depression or anxiety), or (iii) comparing interventions that had combined 'diet with exercise' to control groups using 'exercise alone'. Additionally, we conducted a range of post-hoc analyses, in order to examine putative factors that may influence the effects of dietary interventions. Specifically, we examined how changes in depressive symptoms were influenced the following factors: Studies' sex distribution, mean sample age, type of diet used, how the intervention was delivered, intervention length (in weeks), and study quality (measured with ADA scale).

Results

Included studies and participant details

The screening process is shown in full search and Supplemental Digital Content 1. http://links.lww.com/PSYMED/A537. Following the removal of duplicate articles from the systematic search of electronic databases, 26 papers were identified as potentially eligible after the title-and-abstract screening stage. Screening of the full text versions resulted in 10 of these being excluded, and 16 identified as eligible for inclusion. The additional search of Google Scholar identified a further 2 possible trials, although these were deemed ineligible after full-text screening. Details on the ineligible articles, and reasons for exclusion. are displayed in Supplement 1. Supplemental Digital Content 1. http://links.lww.com/PSYMED/A537.

Therefore, a total of 16 RCTs were included in the analyses; reporting outcome data from 45,826 individuals (median average age= 55 years, range= 21 to 85 years). The results from the ADA Quality Assessments for each study are displayed in Supplemental Digital Content 2, http://links.lww.com/PSYMED/A538. This showed that only one study scored 12/12 for study quality (17), 10 others met the criteria for 'positive' on

ADA scale by scoring 9 or above (categorised as 'high quality') (18-27), and five studies scored below 9 (categorised as low/neutral quality) (16, 28-31). One reported outcome data in a format not-suited for meta-analysis, but the corresponding authors provided the required data for inclusion (23).

Depressive symptoms were measured by all 16 studies, whereas anxiety outcomes were measured by only 11 of the 16 eligible trials. Changes in symptoms were assessed using the total scores from the following measures: 'Centre for Epidemiological Studies Depression' (CES-D)(32)scale(19, 22); the 'Beck Depression' Inventory'(33)(BDI)(16, 21, 27, 28); the 'Hamilton Rating Scale for Depression'(34)(HAM-D)(28); the Depression Rating Scale'(35)(MADRS)(36); the Geriatric 'Montgomery Åsberg Depression Scale(37)(GDS)(23, 29), the Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale(38)(TMAS)(16), and the subscale scores for depression/anxiety from the following measures: the 'Hospital Anxiety Depression Scale'(39)(HADS)(17, 20, 26); the Short-Form Health Survey(40)(SF-36)(18, 27); the Brief Symptom Inventory(41)(BSI)(24, 25, 28); the Profile Of Mood States(42)(POMS)(17Wardle, 2000 #10083, 30, 31) and the General Well-Being Schedule(43)(GWBS)(31). However, only one study examined the effects of a dietary intervention in a sample with primary diagnosis of clinical depression (17), with all the remaining studies examining effects on comorbid, subclinical or secondary symptoms of depression/anxiety (see Table 1 for details). Across the different types of diets used by the studies, nine interventions were primarily aimed at improving nutrient intake (N=9), four aimed to decrease fat intake (N=4) and four were designed to reduce bodyweight (N=4). The specifics of dietary interventions differed substantially across studies, and summaries for each are displayed in Table 1. Interventions ranged from 10 days to 3 years in length.

Overall effects of dietary interventions on depression

Figure 1 displays the pooled effect size from dietary interventions on depressive symptoms, along with individual effects from each study. Table 2 displays the full results of all meta-analyses. A random-effects meta-analysis of 16 RCTs, reporting outcome data from 45,826 individuals, revealed that dietary interventions significantly reduced depressive symptoms in comparison to control conditions, with a small pooled effect (g=0.275, 95% C.I.=0.10 to 0.45, p=0.002). There was significant heterogeneity across the

study data (O=141.4, p<0.01, I²=89.4%), and some indication of publication bias (Egger's regression funnel Supplemental Digital intercept=1.67, p=0.025; see plot in Content 3. http://links.lww.com/PSYMED/A539). Nonetheless, the random-effects trim-and-fill analysis found the estimated effect size to be larger, and still statistically significant, when accounting for publication bias (recalculated at g=0.408, 95% C.I.=0.22 to 0.60, p<0.01). Furthermore, significant effects from dietary interventions on depression were also observed in the sensitivity analysis including only the RCTs with high-quality ratings from the ADA Quality Assessment (N=11, n=45,469, g=0.321, 95% C.I.=0.12 to 0.53, $p=0.002, Q=131.1, I^2=92.4\%$).

Pre-Specified Subgroup Analyses for Depression

Table 2 displays full results of all meta-analyses on depression outcomes in primary and subgroup analyses. The pooled effect size on depressive symptoms across 10 dietary interventions that compared to habitual diet alone (or 'inactive' control conditions) was g=0.308 (n=44,319, 95% C.I.=0.02 to 0.6, p=0.038), indicating a small-to-moderate significant effect. Effects were slightly smaller, but still statistically significant, when compared to 'active' control conditions (N=10, n=1,948, g=0.174, 95% C.I.=0.01 to 0.34, p<0.001). Both waitlist-controlled and active-controlled subgroups had high heterogeneity among included studies, with no evidence of publication bias significantly altering the findings (see Table 2).

For pre-specified subgroup analyses on clinical vs. non-clinical populations, only one study used a clinically depressed sample (n=67), showing significantly greater reduction in depressive symptoms from a 12-week modified Mediterranean diet intervention in comparison to 'social support' (17). Dietary interventions reduced depressive symptoms significantly more than control conditions among the remaining 15 trials in non-clinically depressed individuals (n=45,770, g=0.246, 95% C.I.=0.07-0.423, p=0.006). Additionally, preplanned subgroup analyses comparing 'diet plus exercise' combination interventions to 'exercise alone' found a small positive effect on depressive symptoms from the interventions that had the dietary component (g=0.265, 95% C.I.=0.03 to 0.50, p=0.027) although this was based only on two studies (n=276).

Post-Hoc Analyses of Factors Influencing Dietary Intervention Effects on Depression

Post-hoc subgroup analyses were applied to explore, where possible, how interventional and participant characteristics may affect study findings. Full results are shown in Table 2. Regarding the design of dietary interventions, significant reductions in depression were observed from those primarily aiming to induce bodyweight loss (N=4, n=1,068, g=0.212, 95% C.I.=0.09 to 0.34, p=0.001) and those aiming to reduce fat intake (N=4, n=43,638, g=0.477, 95% C.I.=0.07 to 0.89, p=0.022). Similar sized effects were observed from interventions primarily aiming to improve nutritional intake (N=9, n=1170, g=0.365, 95% C.I.=-0.02 to 0.75), although this subgroup fell short of statistical significance (p=0.066). Studies specifying the involvement of a nutritional professional (e.g. dietitians or nutritionists) in the delivery of dietary interventions observed a significant effect on depressive symptoms (N=12, n=45,508, g=0.329, 95% CI=0.12 to 0.54, p=0.002), whereas those that were delivered without dietitian/nutritionist professional involvement had no greater effects than control conditions (N=4, n=318, g=0.124, 95% CI=-0.12 to 0.37, p=0.328).

Finally, as shown in Figure 2, studies with mostly female samples (i.e. >75% female; eight studies) observed significant positive effects on depressive symptoms from dietary interventions (g=0.195, 95% CI=0.06 to 0.37, p=0.007) whereas those with mostly male samples (>75% male, four studies) observed a slight worsening of depressive symptoms from dietary interventions, which approached statistical significance (g=-0.208, 95% CI=-0.45 to 0.03 p=0.091). This finding persisted when examining only the studies with 100% female samples (six studies, g=0.164, 95% CI=0.02 to 0.31, p=0.027) or 100% male samples (three studies, g=-0.176, 95% CI=-0.43 to 0.07, p=0.17), with significantly greater effects from dietary interventions on depression observed in female sample studies (p=0.021 between subgroups). Exploratory meta-regression analyses examining intervention length (in weeks), study quality (ADA scale) and sample age (mean average, in years) found no relationships between these variables and observed effects of diet on depression (full results presented in Supplemental Digital Content 4, http://links.lww.com/PSYMED/A540).

As shown in Figure 3, random-effects meta-analysis of 11 RCTs reporting outcome data from 2,270 individuals found no overall effect of dietary interventions on anxiety compared to control conditions (g=0.100, 95% C.I.=-0.036 to 0.235, p=0.148, Q=18.5, 1^2 =46.1). A sensitivity analysis including only studies with high-quality ADA ratings also found no effect of dietary interventions on anxiety (N=8, n=2,005, g=0.105, 95% C.I.=-0.06 to 0.27, p=0.219, Q=17.9, 1^2 =60.92). Furthermore, there were no effects from dietary interventions on anxiety when compared to either active control conditions (N=6, n=1,292, g=0.046, 95% CI=-0.13 to 0.22, p=0.602) or habitual diet/inactive controls (N=7, n=984, g=0.137, 95% C.I.=-0.08 to 0.36, p=0.216), and no additional effect of diet on anxiety were observed from studies comparing diet and exercise combinations to exercise alone (N=2, n=175, g=0.05, 95% CI=-0.19 to 0.29, p=0.676). Full meta-analytic results are displayed in Table 3. Moderate heterogeneity was present across all of the analyses (1^2 =45.22% – 48.2%), and there was some indication of publication bias (Eggers regression intercept=1.19, p=0.093) although recalculating the results with trim-and-fill analyses did not change the findings (i.e. no significant benefits from dietary interventions for anxiety outcomes, all p>0.05). No studies examined effects of dietary interventions in 'clinical' anxiety disorder samples.

Post-Hoc Analyses of Factors Influencing Dietary Intervention Effects on Anxiety

No significant effects on anxiety were observed from the subgroups of dietary interventions that primarily aimed to improve nutrition (N=6, n=869, g=0.397, 95% CI=-0.17 to 0.97 p=0.174) or those aiming to reduce bodyweight (N=4, n=1,068, g=0.058, 95% CI=-0.07 to 0.18, p=0.366). A significant reduction in anxiety was observed from those aiming to reducing fat intake (g=0.349, 95% CI=0.15 to 0.55, p=0.001) but the result must be interpreted with caution given the small number of studies in this subgroup (N=2, n=383). Studies specifying the involvement of a nutritional professional in dietary interventions did observe a significant, small positive effect on symptoms of anxiety (N=9, n=2,235, g=0.273, 95% CI=0.0.02 to 0.53, p=0.034), whereas those which did not report dietitian/nutritionist involvement had no effects (N=2, n=85, g=0.242, 95% CI=-0.17 to 0.67, p=0.247).

As with the depression outcomes, subgroups of studies using mostly (>75%) female samples observed significant positive effects on anxiety from dietary interventions (N=6, n=965, g=0.211, 95% CI=0.09 to 0.34, p=0.001) whereas those in mostly male samples observed non-significant negative effects (g=-0.19, 95% CI=-0.42 to 0.04, p=0.107). Inspection of both individual and pooled study effects revealed that dietary interventions in mostly/entirely female samples consistently had a positive direction of effect on both symptoms of depression (Figure 2a) and anxiety (Figure 2b). Conversely, effects of dietary interventions in the mostly (or entirely) male samples were consistently negative for both depression and anxiety (Figure 2a) and anxiety (Figure 2b).

Discussion

To our knowledge, this is the first meta-analysis to examine the efficacy of dietary interventions for depression and anxiety. Our systematic search identified 16 independent studies, reporting outcomes of dietary intervention RCTs across 45,826 participants. The main analysis found that dietary interventions had a small positive effect on depressive symptoms (g=0.275, 95% C.I.=0.10 to 0.45), which remained significant even after adjusting for study quality and publication bias. However, only one of the 16 trials used a sample with primary diagnosis of clinical depression (17), with all the remaining 15 studies investigating effects of dietary interventions on symptoms of depression in non-clinical depression samples. A further limitation to this is the publication bias found in the primary analysis. However, the effects of dietary interventions were still statistically significant after correcting for this. Additionally, our sub-group analyses found that positive effects of dietary interventions for depressive symptoms were observed in both studies using inactive control conditions (g=0.308, p=0.038) and 'active' control conditions (g=0.174, p=0.035), indicating the beneficial effects of dietary interventions on mood extend beyond just general intervention effects.

A final limitation is the significant heterogeneity in the meta-analyses, likely stemming from the broad inclusion criteria. As substantial heterogeneity was also present in the subgroup analyses, this indicates that significant between-study differences in dietary effect sizes also existed when grouping by specific

intervention types. Thus, it was difficult to establish the most effective components of dietary interventions for depression, as we found no significant differences between dietary interventions primarily aimed at (i) reducing bodyweight, (ii) improving nutrition, or (iii) decreasing dietary fat intake. However, this is perhaps unsurprising, as even though the primary aims of the interventions did vary, the actual content of the all dietary intervention generally hold some common features; such as aiming to reduce the intake of 'junk' foods (e.g. high-fat, high-sugar discretionary foods and takeaways), while replacing these with high-fibre, nutrient-dense alternatives, such as vegetables.

Implications and Recommendations for Future Research

The mechanisms through which these dietary changes can benefit mental health have yet to be fully established. However, diet may act via several pathways that are implicated in mental health. These include pathways related to oxidative stress, inflammation and mitochrondial dysfunction, which are disrupted in people with mental disorders (44). Gut microbiota dysbiosis has also been implicated due to emerging research demonstrating involvement of the microbiome in the modulation of stress response, immune function, neurotransmission, and neurogenesis (45). A healthy diet typically contains a wide variety of bioactive compounds that can beneficially interact with these pathways. For example, vegetables and fruits contain, in addition to beneficial vitamins, minerals and fibre, a high concentration of various polyphenols which appear to be associated with reduced rates of depression in limited observational studies, potentially due to their anti-inflammatory, neuroprotective and prebiotic properties (46, 47). Furthermore, vitamins (e.g. B vitamins), fatty acids (e.g. omega 3 fatty acids), minerals (e.g. zinc, magnesium), and fibre (e.g. resistant starch) as well as other bioactive components (e.g. probiotics), that are typically abundant in healthy dietary patterns, may also be protective from mental illness (45). Along with increasing the intake of beneficial nutrients, dietary interventions may also impact on mental well-being by reducing the consumption of unhealthy food associated with increased risk for depression, such as processed meats, refined carbohydrates and other inflammatory foods (8, 9). Unhealthy diets are also high in other compounds that may negatively affect these pathways. For example, elements commonly found in processed foods such as saturated fatty acids, artificial sweeteners, and emulsifiers may alter the gut microbiome which may activate inflammatory pathways (48).

Our results showed that dietary interventions which primarily targeted weight loss also significantly reduced symptoms of depression. The psychological benefits of weight loss diets observed in our meta-analysis could be linked with reductions in obesity, as there is robust evidence from epidemiological data that overweight status is consistently associated with an elevated risk of depression (49, 50). Indeed, all four of the weight loss interventions included in our meta-analysis were conducted in overweight/obese samples. Although only three of these trials examined the correlations between mental health and weight loss, these consistently found that individuals' who lost most weight over the trial also had the greatest improvements in measures of psychological well-being (16, 25, 31). Previous trials of multi-component weight-loss interventions (which were ineligible for our meta-analysis) have also shown that reductions in depressive symptoms following health behaviour programs are significantly correlated with reductions in bodyweight (51). The leading hypothesis for why obesity is associated with depression is through inflammation, as this is a core feature of depressive illness(52) and excessive adipose tissue increases the production of proinflammatory cytokines (53). Indeed, recent pre-clinical research has shed further light on pathways through which obesogenic diets impacts on mental health; demonstrating that dietary-induced obesity reduces insulin signalling in the brain and increases neuroinflammation - resulting in depressive-like behaviours in rodent models (54). This is supported by recent research in human adolescent samples, which has demonstrated that the protective effects of healthy diet on depression risk is conferred through reduced BMI and associated inflammation (10). However, it is important to note that the significant effects of weight loss diets on symptoms of depression in this meta-analysis were all observed in non-clinical samples (i.e. individuals with mostly subthreshold depression). In those with clinical depression, the recent SMILES trial showed large positive effects of a dietary intervention in MDD without altering the weight of participants (17). Instead, the trial found that changes in diet quality over the 12-week period correlated closely with changes in depressive symptoms. This is in accordance with the weight of evidence in the extensive observational literature showing that the association between diet quality and major depression exists even

independently of body weight (7) and the emerging evidence from pre-clinical studies indicating poor diet can also influence brain health and function in absence of obesity(55).

None of our pre-specified analyses found notable effects from dietary interventions on symptoms of anxiety. This could be due to a 'floor effect', whereby the low levels of anxiety in the non-clinical samples examined to date make it difficult to observe any notable effects of dietary interventions. Indeed, in the single trial to use a sample of individuals with diagnosed affective disorders (although of major depression), the participants also had borderline clinical levels of anxiety at baseline, and these symptoms were significantly reduced by the dietary intervention (17). Future RCTs are required to confirm or refute the effects of dietary interventions on those with clinically-diagnosed anxiety disorders.

Clinical Implications

A key issue in clinical-applicability of our findings is the lack of studies in clinically-depressed samples meaning that the majority of evidence of dietary interventions reducing depressive symptoms only applies to non-clinical depression to date. Although the SMILES trial was the first to examine the efficacy of dietary interventions in a clinically-depressed sample, another more recent RCT (the HELFIMED trial) has also indicated the efficacy of a Mediterranean diet for treating depression (56). However, this study was ineligible for our meta-analysis due to the intervention also including fish oil supplements (an active treatment for depression) (57), thus making it impossible to determine if reductions in depression were due to dietary changes or fish oil treatment. Furthermore, a recent economic evaluation of the SMILES trial provides support for the cost-effectiveness of such an approach to treating depression, with participants in the dietary support condition (58). However, it is important to consider that, to date, no trials have yet compared the efficacy of dietary interventions to antidepressant medications. Thus, dietary intervention can only be considered an adjunctive strategy for managing depressive symptoms at this point.

Nonetheless, the significant benefits observed for subclinical/secondary depression are also of considerable value. The benign nature of dietary interventions, along with the established benefits of diet for physical

health, suggests that dietary improvement could be an ideal option for low-intensity treatment, or for individuals to adopt themselves as a self-management approach for reducing subclinical depressive symptoms. Furthermore, diet appears to improve depression even when used alongside other more established self-management strategies, such as physical activity (51), as pooled data from studies examining 'diet plus exercise' combinations showed significant additional benefits compared to 'exercise alone'. However, this result should be interpreted with caution due to the low number of studies included in the subgroup analysis (N=2, n=276). Our subgroup analyses also indicated that interventions delivered by registered dietitians and professional nutritionists have significant benefits for both depression and anxiety, whereas those delivered by other individuals (e.g. research staff) did not. Although preliminary, the finding from this subgroup analysis is in line with a previous research showing that interventions which use dietitians have significantly better effects on weight-management in SMI compared to those which use other types of health professionals (59, 60).

Our meta-analysis also found that studies using primarily female samples observed significant mental health benefits from dietary interventions (for depression and anxiety), whereas those with male samples did not, even indicating a trend towards a negative effect (see Figure 2). Again, as these subgroup-analyses consisted of only few studies for each sex (N=8 studies in females, N=4 studies in males), definitive conclusions cannot be drawn from this data. However, these findings could be potentially be explained by three sexspecific factors. First, since females have a higher presence of mood disorders across the population, this may create greater scope for a significant benefit from dietary interventions (61). Second, differences in dietary effects on mood could be linked to sex differences in metabolism and body composition, whereby women may be more responsive to diets that alter glucose or fat metabolism (62). Third, sociocultural sex differences in expectations surrounding diet and health beliefs may influence outcomes of dietary interventions. For example, men rate certain health behaviours, including diet, as less important than women, have lower nutrition knowledge, and women seek nutrition counselling more frequently than men (63, 64). Thus, women may be more likely than males to adopt health behaviours as recommended. Future

research should examine the extent to which sex differences in adherence to dietary interventions explain the differential effects between sexes.

Beyond sex differences, future research should also aim to determine the influence of several other confounding factors which have so far been overlooked. One key factor for future research to examine is the interaction between dietary interventions with psychotropic medications. As depressive symptoms were used as as secondary outcomes in the majority of studies here, and conducted in non-clinical samples, few studies have examined this to date. However, preliminary insights on this issue can be gained by comparing trials which excluded individuals taking antidepressants, to those studies which included high proportions of antidepressant users. For instance, the single trial of an MDD sample (in which >75% of the intervention group were taking antidepressants) observed large, significant benefits of dietary intervention compared to the counselling control group (17), whereas the two trials which specifically excluded individuals taking antidepression (27, 28). Other important confounding factors to be examined in future research include medical comorbidities (particularly cardio-metabolic complications) and substance abuse, both of which could modify the impact of dietary interventions on mental well-being.

Summary and Conclusions

In conclusion, the consistently significant and positive effects of dietary interventions on depressive symptoms observed across all random-effects meta-analyses, even in high quality studies, strongly suggests that diet can play a role in the treatment and also self-management of depressive symptoms across the population. As pooled effect sizes were mostly classified as 'small', further research is warranted to distil both the key components and mechanistic actions of diet for mental health in order to develop more refined, targeted and thus perhaps more effective interventions. Additionally, given the potentially accumulative effects of diet and exercise together, future research should explore the modification of diet in concert with multiple other lifestyle modifications to provide a more integrated approach (65). Finally, further research

should also be directed towards determining cost-effective and sustainable methods for providing dietary interventions within mental healthcare services, along with developing and evaluating public health schemes for dietary improvement across the population.

Acknowledgments

We would like to acknowledge Dr. Elizabeth Williams (Human Nutrition Unit, University of Sheffield) for kindly providing additional data required for the analyses.

Authors' contributions: All authors contributed substantially towards the writing of the manuscript and interpretation of the findings. JF conducted statistical analyses. WM, SD, RC, ST conducted searches and data extraction. MS, BS, FS, FJ, JS contributed to the intellectual conception of the manuscript and the interpretation of results.

References

1. Hawton K, i Comabella CC, Haw C, Saunders K. Risk factors for suicide in individuals with depression: a systematic review. *J Affect Disord* 2013; **147**(1): 17-28.

2. McCrone PR, Dhanasiri S, Patel A, Knapp M, Lawton-Smith S. Paying the price: the cost of mental health care in England to 2026. King's Fund, 2008.

3. Steel Z, Marnane C, Iranpour C, Chey T, Jackson JW, Patel V, Silove D. The global prevalence of common mental disorders: a systematic review and meta-analysis 1980–2013. *Int J Epidemiol* 2014; **43**(2): 476-93.

4. Casacalenda N, Perry JC, Looper K. Remission in major depressive disorder: a comparison of pharmacotherapy, psychotherapy, and control conditions. *Am J Psychiatry* 2002; **159**(8): 1354-60.

5. Johnson J, Weissman MM, Klerman GL. Service utilization and social morbidity associated with depressive symptoms in the community. *JAMA* 1992; **267**(11): 1478-83.

6. Li Y, Lv M-R, Wei Y-J, Sun L, Zhang J-X, Zhang H-G, Li B. Dietary patterns and depression risk: A meta-analysis. *Psychiatry Res* 2017; **253**: 373-82.

7. Lassale C, Batty GD, Baghdadli A, Jacka F, Sánchez-Villegas A, Kivimäki M, Akbaraly T. Healthy dietary indices and risk of depressive outcomes: a systematic review and meta-analysis of observational studies. *Mol Psychiatry* 2018: 1.

8. Phillips CM, Shivappa N, Hébert JR, Perry IJ. Dietary inflammatory index and mental health: A cross-sectional analysis of the relationship with depressive symptoms, anxiety and well-being in adults. *Clin Nutr* 2017.

9. Shivappa N, Hébert JR, Veronese N, Caruso MG, Notarnicola M, Maggi S, Stubbs B, Firth J, Fornaro M, Solmi M. The relationship between the dietary inflammatory index (DII®) and incident depressive symptoms: A longitudinal cohort study. *J Affect Disord* 2018; **235**: 39-44.

10. Oddy WH, Allen KL, Trapp GS, Ambrosini GL, Black LJ, Huang R-C, Rzehak P, Runions KC, Pan F, Beilin LJ. Dietary patterns, body mass index and inflammation: pathways to depression and mental health problems in adolescents. *Brain Behav Immun* 2018.

11. Opie RS, O'Neil A, Itsiopoulos C, Jacka FN. The impact of whole-of-diet interventions on depression and anxiety: a systematic review of randomised controlled trials. *Public Health Nutr* 2015; **18**(11): 2074-93.

12. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, Group P. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *PLoS Med* 2009; **6**(7): e1000097.

13. Association AD. Evidence analysis manual: Steps in the ADA evidence analysis process. *American Dietetic Association: Chicago, IL, USA* 2008.

14. Borenstein M, Hedges L, Higgins J, Rothstein H. Comprehensive meta-analysis version 2. Englewood, NJ: Biostat 2005; 104.

15. DerSimonian R, Kacker R. Random-effects model for meta-analysis of clinical trials: an update. *Contemp Clin Trials* 2007; **28**(2): 105-14.

16. Kiernan M, King AC, Stefanick ML, Killen JD. Men gain additional psychological benefits by adding exercise to a weight-loss program. *Obesity* 2001; **9**(12): 770-7.

17. Jacka FN, O'Neil A, Opie R, Itsiopoulos C, Cotton S, Mohebbi M, Castle D, Dash S, Mihalopoulos C, Chatterton ML. A randomised controlled trial of dietary improvement for adults with major depression (the 'SMILES'trial). *BMC Med* 2017; **15**(1): 23.

18. Agarwal U, Mishra S, Xu J, Levin S, Gonzales J, Barnard ND. A multicenter randomized controlled trial of a nutrition intervention program in a multiethnic adult population in the corporate setting reduces depression and anxiety and improves quality of life: the GEICO study. *Am J Health Promot* 2015; **29**(4): 245-54.

19. Assaf AR, Beresford SA, Risica PM, Aragaki A, Brunner RL, Bowen DJ, Naughton M, Rosal MC, Snetselaar L, Wenger N. Low-Fat Dietary Pattern Intervention and Health-Related Quality of Life: The Women's Health Initiative Randomized Controlled Dietary Modification Trial. *J Acad Nutr Diet* 2016; **116**(2): 259-71.

20. Einvik G, Ekeberg O, Lavik JG, Ellingsen I, Klemsdal TO, Hjerkinn EM. The influence of long-term awareness of hyperlipidemia and of 3 years of dietary counseling on depression, anxiety, and quality of life. *J Psychosom Res* 2010; **68**(6): 567-72.

21. Wardle J, Rogers P, Judd P, Taylor MA, Rapoport L, Green M, Perry KN. Randomized trial of the effects of cholesterol-lowering dietary treatment on psychological function* . *The American journal of medicine* 2000; **108**(7): 547-53.

22. Scheier MF, Helgeson VS, Schulz R, Colvin S, Berga S, Bridges MW, Knapp J, Gerszten K, Pappert WS. Interventions to enhance physical and psychological functioning among younger women who are ending nonhormonal adjuvant treatment for early-stage breast cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 2005; **23**(19): 4298.

23. Forster SE, Powers HJ, Foulds GA, Flower DJ, Hopkinson K, Parker SG, Young TA, Saxton J, Pockley AG, Williams EA. Improvement in nutritional status reduces the clinical impact of infections in older adults. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2012; **60**(9): 1645-54.

24. Hyyppä MT, Kronholm E, Virtanen A, Leino A, Jula A. Does simvastatin affect mood and steroid hormone levels in hypercholesterolemic men? A randomized double-blind trial. *Psychoneuroendocrinology* 2003; **28**(2): 181-94.

25. Imayama I, Alfano CM, Kong A, Foster-Schubert KE, Bain CE, Xiao L, Duggan C, Wang C-Y, Campbell KL, Blackburn GL. Dietary weight loss and exercise interventions effects on quality of life in overweight/obese postmenopausal women: a randomized controlled trial. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act* 2011; **8**(1): 118.

26. Jenkinson CM, Doherty M, Avery AJ, Read A, Taylor MA, Sach TH, Silcocks P, Muir KR. Effects of dietary intervention and quadriceps strengthening exercises on pain and function in overweight people with knee pain: randomised controlled trial. *BMJ* 2009; **339**: b3170.

27. Kasckow J, Klaus J, Morse J, Oslin D, Luther J, Fox L, Reynolds C, Haas GL. Using problem solving therapy to treat veterans with subsyndromal depression: a pilot study. *Int J Geriatr Psychiatry* 2014; **29**(12): 1255-61.

28. Kasckow J, Morse J, Begley A, Anderson S, Bensasi S, Thomas S, Quinn SC, Reynolds CF, 3rd. Treatment of post traumatic stress disorder symptoms in emotionally distressed individuals. *Psychiatry Res* 2014; **220**(1-2): 370-5.

29. Endevelt R, Lemberger J, Bregman J, Kowen G, Berger-Fecht I, Lander H, Karpati T, Shahar D. Intensive dietary intervention by a dietitian as a case manager among community dwelling older adults: the EDIT study. *J Nutr Health Aging* 2011; **15**(8): 624-30.

30. McMillan L, Owen L, Kras M, Scholey A. Behavioural effects of a 10-day Mediterranean diet. Results from a pilot study evaluating mood and cognitive performance. *Appetite* 2011; **56**(1): 143-7.

31. Nieman DC, Custer WF, Butterworth DE, Utter AC, Henson DA. Psychological response to exercise training and/or energy restriction in obese women. *J Psychosom Res* 2000; **48**(1): 23-9.

32. Radloff LS. The CES-D scale: A self-report depression scale for research in the general population. *Appl Psychol Meas* 1977; **1**(3): 385-401.

33. Beck AT, Steer RA, Brown GK. Beck depression inventory-II. San Antonio 1996; **78**(2): 490-8.

34. Hamilton M. A rating scale for depression. *Journal of neurology, neurosurgery, and psychiatry* 1960; **23**(1): 56.

35. Montgomery SA, Asberg M. A new depression scale designed to be sensitive to change. *The British journal of psychiatry* 1979; **134**(4): 382-9.

36. Jacka FN, O'Neil A, Opie R, Itsiopoulos C, Cotton S, Mohebbi M, Castle D, Dash S, Mihalopoulos C, Chatterton ML, Brazionis L, Dean OM, Hodge AM, Berk M. A randomised controlled trial of dietary improvement for adults with major depression (the 'SMILES' trial). *BMC Med* 2017; **15**(1): 23.

37. Sheikh JI, Yesavage JA. Geriatric Depression Scale (GDS): recent evidence and development of a shorter version. *Clinical Gerontologist: The Journal of Aging and Mental Health* 1986.

38. Taylor JA. Manifest anxiety scale. American Psychological Association, 1953.

39. Zigmond AS, Snaith RP. The hospital anxiety and depression scale. *Acta Psychiatr Scand* 1983;67(6): 361-70.

40. Ware Jr JE, Sherbourne CD. The MOS 36-item short-form health survey (SF-36): I. Conceptual framework and item selection. *Med Care* 1992: 473-83.

41. Derogatis LR, Spencer P. Brief symptom inventory: BSI. Pearson Upper Saddle River, NJ, 1993.

42. McNair DM, Droppleman LF, Lorr M. Edits manual for the profile of mood states: POMS. Edits, 1992.

43. Fazio AF. A concurrent validational study of the NCHS General Well-Being Schedule. 1977.

44. Morris G, Walder K, McGee SL, Dean OM, Tye SJ, Maes M, Berk M. A model of the mitochondrial basis of bipolar disorder. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev* 2017; **74**: 1-20.

45. Marx W, Moseley G, Berk M, Jacka F. Nutritional psychiatry: the present state of the evidence. *Proc Nutr Soc* 2017; **76**(4): 427-36.

46. González R, Ballester I, López-Posadas R, Suárez M, Zarzuelo A, Martinez-Augustin O, Medina
FSD. Effects of flavonoids and other polyphenols on inflammation. *Crit Rev Food Sci Nutr* 2011; **51**(4): 331-62.

47. Chang S-C, Cassidy A, Willett WC, Rimm EB, O'Reilly EJ, Okereke OI. Dietary flavonoid intake and risk of incident depression in midlife and older women–3. *The American journal of clinical nutrition* 2016; **104**(3): 704-14.

48. Jacka FN. Nutritional psychiatry: where to next? *EBioMedicine* 2017; **17**: 24-9.

49. Luppino FS, de Wit LM, Bouvy PF, Stijnen T, Cuijpers P, Penninx BW, Zitman FG. Overweight, obesity, and depression: a systematic review and meta-analysis of longitudinal studies. *Arch Gen Psychiatry* 2010; **67**(3): 220-9.

50. Solmi M, Köhler CA, Stubbs B, Koyanagi A, Bortolato B, Monaco F, Vancampfort D, Machado MO, Maes M, Tzoulaki I, Firth J, Ioannidis JP, Carvalho AF. Environmental risk factors and non-pharmacological interventions for obesity: an umbrella review of meta-analyses of cohort studies and controlled trials. *In Press* 2018.

51. Swencionis C, Wylie-Rosett J, Lent MR, Ginsberg M, Cimino C, Wassertheil-Smoller S, Caban A, Segal-Isaacson C-J. Weight change, psychological well-being, and vitality in adults participating in a cognitive–behavioral weight loss program. *Health Psychol* 2013; **32**(4): 439.

52. Köhler C, Freitas T, Maes M, Andrade N, Liu C, Fernandes B, Stubbs B, Solmi M, Veronese N, Herrmann N. Peripheral cytokine and chemokine alterations in depression: a meta- analysis of 82 studies. *Acta Psychiatr Scand* 2017; **135**(5): 373-87.

53. Tilg H, Moschen AR. Adipocytokines: mediators linking adipose tissue, inflammation and immunity. *Nature Reviews Immunology* 2006; **6**(10): 772.

54. Soto M, Herzog C, Pacheco JA, Fujisaka S, Bullock K, Clish CB, Kahn CR. Gut microbiota modulate neurobehavior through changes in brain insulin sensitivity and metabolism. *Mol Psychiatry* 2018:
1.

55. Bruce-Keller AJ, Salbaum JM, Luo M, Blanchard E, Taylor CM, Welsh DA, Berthoud H-R. Obesetype gut microbiota induce neurobehavioral changes in the absence of obesity. *Biol Psychiatry* 2015; **77**(7): 607-15.

56. Parletta N, Zarnowiecki D, Cho J, Wilson A, Bogomolova S, Villani A, Itsiopoulos C, Niyonsenga T, Blunden S, Meyer B. A Mediterranean-style dietary intervention supplemented with fish oil improves diet quality and mental health in people with depression: A randomized controlled trial (HELFIMED). *Nutr Neurosci* 2017: 1-14.

57. Sarris J, Murphy J, Mischoulon D, Papakostas GI, Fava M, Berk M, Ng CH. Adjunctive nutraceuticals for depression: a systematic review and meta-analyses. *Am J Psychiatry* 2016; **173**(6): 575-87.

58. Chatterton ML, Mihalopoulos C, O'Neil A, Itsiopoulos C, Opie RS, Castle D, Dash S, Brazionis L, Berk M, Jacka FN. Economic evaluation of a dietary intervention for adults with major depression (the "SMILES" trial). *BMC Public Health* 2018: doi: 10.1186/s12889-018-5504-8.

59. Teasdale SB, Ward PB, Rosenbaum S, Samaras K, Stubbs B. Solving a weighty problem: systematic review and meta-analysis of nutrition interventions in severe mental illness. *The British Journal of Psychiatry* 2016: bjp. bp. 115.177139.

60. Teasdale SB, Latimer G, Byron A, Schuldt V, Pizzinga J, Plain J, Buttenshaw K, Forsyth A, Parker E, Soh N. Expanding collaborative care: integrating the role of dietitians and nutrition interventions in services for people with mental illness. *Australas Psychiatry* 2018; **26**(1): 47-9.

61. Parker G, Brotchie H. Gender differences in depression. *Int Rev Psychiatry* 2010; 22(5): 429-36.

62. Power ML, Schulkin J. Sex differences in fat storage, fat metabolism, and the health risks from obesity: possible evolutionary origins. *Br J Nutr* 2008; **99**(5): 931-40.

63. Kiefer I, Rathmanner T, Kunze M. Eating and dieting differences in men and women. *The Journal of Men's Health & Gender* 2005; **2**(2): 194-201.

64. Wardle J, Haase AM, Steptoe A, Nillapun M, Jonwutiwes K, Bellisie F. Gender differences in food choice: the contribution of health beliefs and dieting. *Ann Behav Med* 2004; **27**(2): 107-16.

65. Sarris J, O'Neil A, Coulson CE, Schweitzer I, Berk M. Lifestyle medicine for depression. *BMC Psychiatry* 2014; **14**(1): 107.

Figure Legends

Figure 1. Meta-analysis of the effects of dietary interventions on depressive symptoms. Box size represents study weighting. Diamond represents overall effect size and 95% confidence intervals.

Figure 2. Meta-analysis showing differential effects of dietary interventions in male vs. female samples, on (a) a symptoms of depression, and (b) symptoms of anxiety. Box size represents study weighting. Diamond represents overall effect size and 95% confidence intervals.

Figure 3. Meta-analysis of the effects of dietary interventions on symptoms of anxiety. Box size represents study weighting. Diamond represents overall effect size and 95% confidence intervals.

	Sample	N=	А	Study aims	Design	Dietary intervention	Other	Rele
	details	Die	ge			details	intervent	vant
		t/					ion	Outc
		Co					aspects	ome
		ntr						Meas
		ol						ures
Aga	BMI >	142	43	Assess the	2-arm cluster	Participants were asked	Participa	
rwal	25	/15	.8	benefits of	randomized	to follow a low-fat	nts also	SF-
et	and/or	0		workplace	trial,	vegan diet.	advised	36
al.	previous			dietary	comparing 18	Encouragement was	to take a	(Dep
201	diagnosi			intervention	weeks of	provided for the	multivita	ressi
5	s of type			on mental	workplace	throughout the study in	min	on
	2			health.	dietary	weekly lunch-hour		and
	diabetes				intervention vs.	group sessions at work.		Anxi
					control	Group sessions included		ety
					settings.	nutrition education		subs
						lectures, cooking		cales
						demonstrations and).
						discussion. Ongoing		
						support was provided by		
						an interactive online		
						message board.		

Table 1. Details of included studies

Workplace cafeterias also provided foods suitable for the low-fat vegan diet.

Ass	Healthy		n/r	Assess the	2-arm	During 18 sessions,	None	CES-			
af et	postmen	17,		effect of a	randomized	delivered in a group		D			
al.	opausal	335		low-fat diet	controlled	setting by nutritionists,		(Mo			
201	women	/		intervention	cross-over	dietary education was		difie			
5	aged 50-	25,		on HRQoL,	study	provided to reduce fat		d 6-			
	79y	698		depressive	comparing low-	intake to 20% of daily		item			
				symptoms,	fat diet to no	energy while increasing					
				and	dietary	fruit, vegetable, and					
				cognition.	intervention.	grain intake.					
Ein	Men		70	Examine	3-year	Dietary counselling	Half of	HAI			
vik	with	253		whether	prospective	from a clinical	subjects	S			
et	hyperlip	/25		dietary	follow-up of a	nutritionist to increase	in both				
al.	idemia	2		counselling	lifestyle	use of vegetable	diet and				
201	who had					influences	intervention	oils/margarine, fruit and	control		
0	participa				health	using a 2x2	vegetables, and fish, and	conditio			
	ted in			behaviours	RCT	decrease use of meat and	ns also				
	Oslo						and	comparing	animal fats. Overweight	randomi	
	Diet and			psychological	dietary advice	subjects encouraged to	sed to				
	Antismo						health in high	combined with	reduce calories.	receive	
	king			risk males	a placebo/n-3	Participants met with	n-3				

	Study			25y after	PUFA	nutritionist every 6	PUFA,	
				taking part in	supplement vs.	months.	the other	
				a lifestyle	no dietary		half	
				program.	advice with		placebo	
					placebo/n-3		capsules.	
					PUFA			
					supplement.			
End	Older,	35/	84	Determine	3-arm, clinical	The dietary intensive	None	GDS
evel	commun	33/	.5	the impact of	trial comparing	treatment group received		
t et	ity	59		intensive,	effectiveness of	five meetings, providing		
al.	dwelling			dietitian-led	an intensive	individualised treatment		
201	adults			nutritional	dietary	from a dietitian, with		
0	(75y+)			intervention	intervention vs.	intensity based on		
	at			on health and	medical	severity of under-		
	nutrition			nutritional	treatment with	nutrition. The medical		
	al risk			status of	only	treatment group received		
	accordin			malnourished	educational	a booklet on nutrition		
	g to the			community	materials on	education for older		
	Mini-			dwelling	nutritional vs a	adults from a primary		
	Nutritio			older adults.	non-	care physician.		
	nal				randomized			
	Assessm				untreated group			
	ent-sf				(which was not			
	(MNA-				included in the			
	sf)				meta-analyses).			
	81)				meta-analyses).			

Fors	Older	72/		Determine	A randomized,	Dietary intervention	Dietary	GDS
ter	adults in	70/		the effect of a	placebo-	group asked to consume	intervent	
et	South	67		dietary	controlled	at least five portions of	ion was	
al.	Yorkshi			intervention	intervention	fruits and vegetables per	tailored	
201	re, UK			and	trial comparing	day, consume whole-	to	
2	living in			micronutrient	effects of	grain bread, consume	participa	
	the			supplementat	dietary	fish twice per week,	nts	
	commun			ion on	intervention,	consume nuts at least	based on	
	ity			clinical	daily	once a week. Pre-	preferen	
				impact of	micronutrient	prepared salads,	ces,	
				infections,	supplement and	vegetables, fruits were	intention	
				depression,	placebo.	provided when	of	
				quality of		available, and menu	increasin	
				life.		suggests and portion	g intake	
						size information was	of	
						provided, and a	certain	
						supermarket home	vitamins	
						delivery service	and	
						delivered food directly	minerals	
						to participants.		
								DCI
Нуу	Untreate	60/	48	Assess the	Randomised	Instructed to adhere to a	Random	BSI
ppa	d	60	.4/	effect on	double-blind	Mediterranean diet for	ised to	
et	hyperch		48	mood of both	placebo-	12 weeks. Max 10%	receive	
al.	olesterol			separate and	controlled cross	kcal from saturated fat	either	
200	aemic			combined	over trial	and trans fats, less than	simvasta	

3	men;			effects of a	comparing	250mg/d cholesterol,	tin or	
	35-64y;			Mediterranea	Mediterranean	4g/d n-3 fatty acids,	placebo.	
	BMI			n diet	diet	increased fruit,		
	<32;			intervention	intervention (+	vegetables and fibre		
	otherwis			and treatment	simvastatin/pla	intake and advised to		
	e			with	cebo) and	consume lean meat, low-		
	healthy			simvastatin.	habitual diet (+	fat dairy, fish twice per		
					simvastatin/pla	week. Free food		
					cebo).	exchanges supplied (eg		
						margarine).		
Ima	Obese	118	58	Examine the	12-month RCT	Calorie restriction diet	Exercise	BSI-
yam	females;	/11		individual	comparing	modified from the	intervent	18
a et	50-75y;	7/1		and	dietary weight	Diabetes Prevention	ion	
al.	BMI	17/		combined	loss (D),	Program (DPP) lifestyle	45min/d	
201	>25	87		effects of	aerobic	and Look AHEAD	ay of	
1	(>23			dietary	exercise (E),	(Action for Health in	mod-vig	
	asian-			weight loss	combined diet	Diabetes) trial, with	aerobic	
	america			and exercise	and exercise	goals of: calorie intake	exercise,	
	n);			interventions	(DE) and	1200-2000 kcal/day	5	
	<100mi			on mental	inactive	based on weight, <30%	days/wk	
	n/wk			health and	controls (C)	calories from fat, 10%	includin	
	physical			quality of	using a pre-	weight loss within	g 3	
	activity;			life.	post repeated	24wks, and maintenance	supervis	
	post-				measures	for the remainder. Small	ed	
	menopa				design.	group sessions 2x/wk	sessions	

	usal not	and communication with	by an
	on HRT;	dietitians 2x per month	exercise
	no	via email/phone.	physiolo
	serious	Sessions include	gist.
	medical	strategies and skills to	
	conditio	achieve caloric and	
	ns or	weight loss goals	
	adverse	including self-	
	health	monitoring, goal setting,	
	behavio	coping strategies and	
	urs.	problem solving.	
_			

Jack	Adults	33/	40	Assess the	2-arm	Personalised nutrition	Participa	MA
a et	18y+	34	.3	effect of a	randomized	intervention delivered	nts	DRS,
al.	with			dietary	controlled	by a dietitian based on a	provided	HAD
201	moderat			intervention	cross-over	modified Mediterranean	with	S,
7	e to			as a treatment	study	diet. Intervention	food	POM
	severe			for major	comparing	included motivational	hampers.	S
	depressi			depression.	Mediterranean	interviewing, goal		
	on				diet to social	setting, and the increase		
	accordin				support over 12	of common		
	g to				weeks.	Mediterranean foods		
	DSM-					(fruits, nuts, oily fish,		
	IV,					olive oil).		
	MADR							
	$S \geq 18$,							

screenin

g tool

Jenk	Adults	122	61	Determine if	2-year RCT	Individualised dietary	Exercise	HAD
inso	45y+;	/10		individualise	comparing a	advice following review	arm	S
n et	BMI	9/8		d	diet	of a 7-day food diary to	included	
al.	>28;	2/7		interventions	intervention	create a deficit of	strength	
200	knee	6		of diet and/or	(D), exercise	2.5MJ/600kcal per day	ening,	
9	pain but			exercise	intervention	in line with healthy	function	
	otherwis			reduces knee	(E), combined	eating principles	al and	
	e			pain in	diet and	(reduced salt/sugar,	aerobic	
	healthy			overweight	exercise (DE)	increased	exercise	
				adults.	and advice	fruit/vegetables/fibre,	S	
					alone (C).	smaller portion size) to	demonst	
						achieve weight loss of	rated by	
						0.5-1kg per week.	the	
						Advice and newsletters	dietitian	
						provided and home	to be	
						visits 1x per month for	conducte	
						6m, then every other	d at	
						month for the remainder.	home.	
Kas	Adults	31/	62	Assess the	2-arm RCT	Coaching in healthy	None	HA

ł	Kas	Adults	31/	62	Assess the	2-arm RCT	Coaching in healthy	None	HA
C	cko	50y+,	29	.7	benefits of	comparing	eating based on general		M-D,
V	v et	with		4/	Problem	PST-PC vs.	nutrition guidelines e.g		BDI,
8	ıl.	≥ 11 on		65	Solving	dietary	US Department of		BSI-

201	the	.6	Therapy-	education	Agriculture Food	А
4a	Center	6	Primary Care	(DIET) and	Pyramid. Help with	
	for		(PST-PC)	followed up	weekly menus, shopping	
	Epidemi		compared to	over 2 years.	lists, food coupons, and	
	ologic		a dietary		discussions around	
	Studies		education		access, cost and	
	Depressi		intervention		culturally specific foods.	
	on		in people		Initial 1 hour session	
	(CES-		with		followed by 30 mins	
	D) scale		subsyndroma		across 6-8 sessions and	
	and		l depression		semi-annual boosters	
	experien		and		over 15 months.	
	ced a		psychological			
	significa		trauma.			
	nt					
	traumati					
	c event,					
	recruite					
	d from					
	larger					
	'Prevent					
	ion of					
	Depressi					
	on in					
	Older					

African

America

ns'

Kas	Veteran	11/	63	Assess the	2-arm RCT	Over 6-8 sessions,	None	HA
cko	s 50y+	12	.1	benefits of	comparing	participants were		M-D,
w et	with			Problem	problem	provided coaching in		BDI,
al.	≥ 11 on			solving	solving therapy	healthy eating practices		SF-
201	the			therapy	vs dietary	using general nutrition		36
4b	Center			compared to	education	guidelines and practical		(Dep
	for			an attention-	intervention.	advice. Topics covered		ressi
	Epidemi			only dietary		cost of food, meal		on
	ologic			education		preparation, cultural		and
	Studies			intervention.		factors for healthy food,		Anxi
	Depressi					and preparing grocery		ety
	on					lists.		subs
	(CES-							cales
	D) scale)
Kier	Adults	71/	38	Examine the	12m RCT	Dietary changes as	Addition	ТМ
nan	25-49y;	79	.5	effect of a	comparing	recommended by the	al diet	AS,
et	men			dietary	dietary	National Cholesterol	and	BDI
al.	BMI 28-			weight loss	intervention, to	Education Program Step	exercise	
200	34;			programme	controls and a	1(low saturated fat, low	arm	
1	women			on	diet+exercsise	cholesterol diet).	which	
	BMI 24-			psychological	programme	Participants attended	containe	
	30 but			health.	using pre-post	weekly classes with a	d	

	otherwis				repeated	dietician for 3m, then	supervis	
	e				measures	every other week for 3m	ed	
	healthy				design.	and monthly for last 6m.	aerobic	
							exercise	
							3x/wk.	
Mc	Young	12/	21	Examine the	Randomised,	Diet change group	Calorie	POM
Mill	female	13	.1	effects of a	single-blind,	participants were	intake	S
an	adults			10-day,	parallel group	required to increase	was not	(Dep
et	18-30,			nutrient rich	trial.	intake of fruits,	restricte	ressi
al.	recruite			diet on mood		vegetables, fatty fish,	d.	on
201	d from			and		nuts, seeds, low fat		and
1	general			cognition.		dairy, wholegrain		Anxi
	populati					cereals, to combine		ety
	on					protein, healthy fats and		subs
						carbohydrates at each		cales
						meals and reduce)
						refined foods (i.e.		
						refined sugars, soft		
						drinks, pre-packed		
						foods). Participants		
						completed a daily food		
						fairy to support		
						compliance.		

Nie	Obese		45	Compare	4-arm RCT	Calorie restriction diet	Also an	GW
		22/		-				BS
man	females;	26/	.6	mood in	comparing	consisting of 4.19- to	exercise	and
et	25-70y;			obese v non-	effect of 12	5.44-MJ/day (1200-1300	(E) and	
al.	BMI 25-	21/		obese women	weeks exercise	kcal). Diet based on	combine	POM
200	50; good	22		and assess	(E), energy	dietary exchanges (two	d	S
0	health			the impact of	restriction diet	fruit, three vegetable,	exercise	(Dep
	with no			12 week	(D), both E&D	two milk, six bread, two	and diet	ressi
	known			moderate	interventions	fat, five lean protein and	arm	on,A
	diseases			energy	and control (C)	0.42MJ/100kcal of	(E&D),	nxiet
	and not			restriction	using a pre-	optional food). Taught	with	y and
	on a diet			and/or	post repeated	about portion size, food	participa	Well
	or			exercise on	measures	exchange, recording diet	nts	bein
	exercise			mood state.	design.	intake using a daily	required	g
	program					exchange checklist.	to walk	meas
	me; no					Compliance measured	five	ure)
	current					by random, 24-hour	times	
	emotion					recall.	per week	
	al/ mood						for	
	problem						45mins	
	s						at 60-	
							80%	
							max HR.	
							Four	
							sessions	
							_	

per week

were had supervisi on and one

without.

Sch	Younger	85/	44	Examine	3-arm clinical	Participants completed None	CES
eier	women	83/	.2	whether	trial comparing	four monthly two-hour	D
et	within 2	84		education/nut	16-week	sessions. Participants in	(10-
al.	months			rition	educational,	the education arm	item
200	of			intervention	illness-related	received illness and	
5	completi			could	intervention,	treatment related	
	ng			enhance	nutritional	information. The	
	breast			physical/psyc	intervention vs.	nutrition group received	
	cancer			hological	standard	information on how to	
	treatmen			functioning	medical care.	follow an eating pattern	
	t			among young		low in fat and high in	
				women		fruits and vegetables. A	
				completing		nutrition quiz was	
				breast-cancer		administered to assess	
				treatment.		knowledge of presented	
						material.	
Wan	A .114 -	50/	52	A against	2	Desting and a second start O. No.	

War	Adults	59/	53	Assess	3-arm	Participants completed 8	None	BDI,
dle	with	61/		whether	randomized	individual and group		POM
et	mild-	56		cholesterol-	trial comparing	sessions with a dietician		S
al.	moderat			lowering	12 weeks of	and psychologist. The		(Dep

200	e levels	diets	low-fat or	low-fat diet was asked to	ressi
0	of	adversely	Mediterranean	reduce energy from fats,	on
	elevated	affect mood	diet	particularly saturated	and
	serum	and cognitive	intervention vs	fats. The Mediterranean	Anxi
	choleste	functioning.	wait list	diet group were asked to	ety
	rol		controls.	increase fruit,	subs
	(>2.5m			vegetables, oily fish, fat	cales
	M)			as 30% of energy,)
				substituting saturated	
				fats for	
				monounsaturated.	
				Individualised and	
				group-based support was	
				provided. Participants	
				were given free-	
				spreading fats and oils to	
				encourage compliance	

ACT, acceptance and commitment therapy; ADHD, attention deficit hyperactivity disorder; BA, behavioural activation; BDI-II, beck depression inventory II; BMI, Body Mass Index; BSI, Brief Symptom Inventory; CBM, cognitive bias modification; CBT, cognitive behavioural therapy ; CES-D, Center for Epidemiological Studies – Depression; DASS, Depression Anxiety Stress Scale; DSM-IV, Diagnostic and Statistical Manual 4th ed.; GDS, Geriatric Depression Scale; GWBS, General Well-Being Schedule; HADS, hospital anxiety depression scale; HAM-D, hamilton rating scale for depression; HR, Heart Rate; HRT, Hormone Replacement Therapy; HRQoL, Health Related Quality of

Life; MADRS, Montgomery Asberg Depression Rating Scale; PHQ, patient health questionnaire; POMS, Profile of Mood States; PTSD, post-traumatic stress disorder; PUFA, Polyunsaturated Fatty Acid; RCT, Randomised Controlled Trial; SF-36, Short Form Health Survey; SR, self-reported; TMAS, Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale.

	Sample		_	Meta-			Heterogeneity			
	Studies	Diet/	analysis Hedge's		95%	Р	Q-	Р	\mathbf{I}^2	
	Studies	Control n=	g g	CI	95%	r value	Q- value	P value	1	
Main Analysis	16	18746/27080	0.275	0.100	0.450	0.002	141.4	<0.01	89.39	
High Quality Studies	11	18567/26902	0.321	0.116	0.526	0.002	131.08	<0.01	92.37	
Diet vs. Active Control	10	1027/921	0.174	0.012	0.335	0.035	22.8	0.007	60.56	
Diet vs. Inactive Control	10	18022/26297	0.308	0.017	0.599	0.038	115.9	<0.01	92.24	
Non-clinical depression	15	18715/27055	0.246	0.070	0.423	0.006	132.69	<0.01	89.4	
Diet + Exercise vs Exercise alone	2	139/137	0.265	0.030	0.500	0.027	0.008	0.928	0.000	
Comparative Subgr	oup Analy	vses for Depress	sion Out	comes						
Aim: Improving Nutrition	9	560/610	0.365	- 0.024	0.753	.066	71.9	< 0.01	88.9	
Aim: Reducing % Fat Intake	4	17601/26307	0.477	0.069	0.884	.022	53.1	< 0.01	94.35	
Aim: Inducing Weight Loss	4	585/483	0.212	0.087	0.338	.001	2.21	0.529	0.00	
Nutrition Professional	12	18618/26890	0.329	0.124	0.535	.002	136.83	< 0.01	91.96	
No nutrition professional	4	128/190	0.124	- 0.124	0.371	0.328	3.487	0.322	13.961	
>75% female sample	8	17706/26314	0.195	0.055	.336	.007	18.97	0.008	63.10	
>75% male sample	4	366/362	- 0.208	449	.033	.091	5.17	0.160	41.93	
100% female sample	6	17739/26141	0.164	0.019	.310	.027	18.97	0.008	63.10	
100% male sample	3	353/352	- 0.176	427	.074	.168	5.17	0.16	41.93	

 Table 2. Effects of dietary interventions on symptoms of depression

	Sample				Meta-a	analysis	Hetero	geneity		
	Studies	Diet/ Control n=	Hedge's g	CI	95%	P value	Q- value	P value	I ²	
Main Analysis	11	1213/1057	0.100	- 0.036	0.235	0.148	18.5	0.046	46.07	
High Quality Studies	8	1083/922	0.105	- 0.062	0.271	0.219	17.9	0.012	60.92	
Diet vs. Active Control	6	690/602	0.046	0.128	0.220	0.602	9.653	0.086	48.2	
Diet vs. Inactive Control	7	528/456	0.137	- 0.080	0.355	0.216	10.95	0.090	45.22	
Diet + Exercise vs Exercise alone	2	139/137	0.050	- 0.185	.285	0.676	0.045	0.833	0.000	
Comparative Subgroup	Analyses	for Anxiety	Outcomes							
Aim: Improving Nutrition	6	440/429	0.397	173	0.967	.173	61.8	<0.01	91.9	
Aim: Reducing % Fat Intake	2	188/195	0.349	0.148	0.550	0.001	0.401	0.526	0.00	
Aim: Inducing Weight Loss	4	585/483	0.058	- 0.067	0.183	0.366	1.60	0.659	0.00	
Nutrition Professional	9	1170/1065	0.273	0.020	0.526	0.034	69.37	0.000	87.0	
No nutrition professional	2	43/42	0.248	- 0.171		0.247	0.123	0.726	0.00	
>75% female	6	493/472	0.211	0.085	0.337	0.001	2.64	.755	0.000	
>75% male	3	353/352	-0.190	- 0.420	0.041	.107	3.43	.180	41.68	
100% female	4	326/298	0.158	0.001	0.315	.048	1.41	.703	0.000	
100% male	3	353/352	-0.190	- 0.420	0.041	.107	3.43	.180	41.68	

Table 3. Effects of dietary interventions on symptoms of anxiety

OVID MEDLINE SEARCH STRATEGY (ADAPTED FROM OPIE ET AL., 2015) PERFORMED ON 12TH MARCH 2018


Diet Interventions	
Diet/	
Diet, Mediterranean/	
Diet Therapy/	
(diet\$ adj1 (educat\$ or counsel\$ or intervention\$ or treatment\$)).mp	

	Intervention Style
Randomized Controlled Trial/	
randomised controlled trial.mp.	
Random Allocation/	
Clinical Trial/	
Control Groups/	

Outcomes
Depression/
Anxiety/
Depressive Disorder, Major/ or Depressive Disorder/

Note: Additional searches were conducted of Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials, Health Technology Assessment Database, Allied and Complementary Medicine (AMED), Embase, Health Management Information Consortium (HMIC) and PsycINFO using identical keywords.

PRISMA Diagram Search of OVID Medline




Ineligible studies excluded from full-text screening

Name	Identified from	Title	Reason for Exclusion
Toobert 2007	oobert 2007Opie et al. (2015)'s reviewLong-term effects of the Me program: a randomized clini postmenopausal women with		Not controlling for active, non-dietary components of intervention
Ghroubi 2009	Opie et al. (2015)'s review	Physical training combined with dietary measures in the treatment of adult obesity. A comparison of two protocols	Not controlling for active, non-dietary components of intervention
Glasgow 2006	Opie et al. (2015)'s review	Effects of a brief computer-assisted diabetes self- management intervention on dietary, biological and quality-of-life outcomes	Not controlling for active, non-dietary components of intervention
Andersen 2004	Opie et al. (2015)'s review	Psychological, Behavioral, and Immune Changes After a Psychological Intervention: A Clinical Trial	Not controlling for active, non-dietary components of intervention
Merrill 2008	Opie et al. (2015)'s review	Coronary Health Improvement Project (CHIP) is associated with improved nutrient intake and decreased depression	Not controlling for active, non-dietary components of intervention
Garcia-Toro 2012	Opie et al. (2015)'s review	Four hygienic-dietary recommendations as add-on treatment in depression A randomized-controlled trial	Not controlling for active, non-dietary components of intervention
Nam 2016	Updated Search	Lifestyle Intervention for Sleep Disturbances among Overweight or Obese Individuals	Not controlling for active, non-dietary components of intervention

Jimenez 2015	Updated Search	Improving Health-Related Quality of Life in Older African American and Non-Latino White Patients	No eligible outcome data (did not report changes in depression / anxiety)
Perez-Cornago 2014	Updated Search	A decline in inflammation is associated with less depressive symptoms after a dietary intervention in metabolic syndrome patients: a longitudinal study	Lack of non-diet/habitual diet control condition
Breymeyer 2016	Updated Search	Subjective mood and energy levels of healthy weight and overweight/obese healthy adults on high-and low-glycemic load experimental diets	Lack of non-diet/habitual diet control condition
Parletta 2017	Not in main search; identified from google scholar	A Mediterranean-style dietary intervention supplemented with fish oil improves diet quality and mental health in people with depression: A randomized controlled trial (HELFIMED).	Not controlling for active, non-dietary components of intervention
Lee 2015	Not in main search; identified from google scholar	Switching to a 10-day Mediterranean-style diet improves mood and cardiovascular function in a controlled crossover study	No eligible outcome data (crossover study not reporting data from parallel comparisons (i.e. first leg) between diet and control conditions)


Author, year	2.1	2.3	3.1	3.2	4.3	5.1 & 5.2	6.1	6.3	6.4	6.4	6.5	7.4	TOTAL "Y"
COUNTRY	Inclusion/ exclusion criteria specified	health & demographics described	Method of randomisation described (and unbiased)	Distribution of disease e.g. similar across groups	Enrolled subjects accounted for?	Blinding?	Protocols described?	Intensity / duration sufficient?	Study retention measured?	Dietary adherence measured?	Co- interventions described?	Measurements based on valid tests?	(out of 12) Rating (+, -, φ)
Agarwal, 2015 USA	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA	Y	9 (out of 11) +
Assaf, 2016 USA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	10 +
Einvik, 2010 NORWAY	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	11 +
Endevelt, 2011 ISRAEL	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	NA	Y	7 (out of 11) φ
Forster, 2012 UK	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA	Y	11 (out of 11) +
Hyyppa, 2003 FINLAND	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	10 +
Imayama, 2011 USA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	11 +
Jacka, 2017 AUSTRALIA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	12 +
Jenkinson, 2009 UK	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	10 +
Kasckow, 2014a USA	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	7 Ф
Kasckow, 2014b USA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	11 +
Kiernan, 2001 USA	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	8 ф
McMillan, 2011 AUSTRALIA	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Ν	Y	Y	Y	Y	7 Ф
Nieman, 2000 USA	Y	N	N	Ý	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	8 Ф
Scheier, 2005 USA	Y	Y	N	Y	Ν	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	9 +
Wardle, 2000 UK	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	11 +



Supplement 3. Funnel Plot demonstrating the significant risk of publication bias for effect sizes of dietary interventions on symptoms of depression.

Note: Findings remained significant after Duval and Tweedie 'trim-and-fill' correction.


Regression of Hedges's g on Weeks



S4a. Meta-regression of effect size for depressive symptoms (Hedge's G) by study length (weeks)

Coeff= -0.003, S.E.=0.002, p=0.126


Regression of Hedges's g on Age exc



S4b. Meta-regression of effect size for depressive symptoms (Hedge's G) by mean age (years)

Coeff= -0.0007, S.E.=0.0065, p=0.919

Regression of Hedges's g on ADA Score



S4c. Meta-regression of effect size for depressive symptoms (Hedge's G) by study quality (ADA Score)

Coeff=-0.0885, S.E.=0.0624, p=0.156