

Article

Adolescents Are More than Twice as Likely to Consume Soft Drinks and Chips at Locations Away from Home and School: Correspondence Analysis and Logistic Regression Results from the UK National Diet and Nutrition Survey Rolling Programme

Luigi Palla ^{1,2*}, Andrew Chapman ¹, Eric Beh ³, Gerda Pot ^{4,5} and Eva Almiron-Roig ^{6,7}

¹ Department of Medical Statistics, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine; luigi.palla@lshtm.ac.uk

² Nagasaki University School of Tropical Medicine and Global Health;

³ School of Mathematical and Physical Sciences, University of Newcastle, Callaghan, Australia

⁴ Department Nutritional Sciences, Faculty of Life Sciences & Medicine, King's College London, UK

⁵ Louis Bolk Institute, Nutrition and Health Team, Bunnik, the Netherlands

⁶ Centre for Nutrition Research, University of Navarra, Pamplona, Spain

⁷ MRC Elsie Widdowson Laboratory, Cambridge, UK

* Correspondence: luigi.palla@lshtm.ac.uk; Tel. +44-2079275026

Abstract: Obesity is a global public health problem and the environment as its major determinant. To identify interventions an evidence base is warranted. To this aim we investigate the relationship between the consumption of foods and eating locations (like home, school/work and others) in British adolescents, using data from the UK National Diet and Nutrition Survey Rolling Program (2008–2012 and 2013–2016). Cross-sectional analysis of 62,523 food diary entries from this nationally representative sample then focused on foods contributing up to 80% total energy to the daily adolescent's diet. Correspondence Analysis (CA) was first used to generate food-location relationship hypotheses and Logistic Regression (LR) to quantify the evidence in terms of odds ratios and formally test those hypotheses. The less-healthy foods that emerged from CA were chips, soft drinks, chocolate and meat pies. Adjusted Odds Ratios (99% CI) for consuming specific foods at a location "Other" than home (H) or school/work (S) in the 2008–12 survey sample were: for soft drinks 2.8 (2.1 to 3.8) vs. H and 2.0 (1.4 to 2.8) vs. S; for chips 2.8 (2.2 to 3.7) vs. H and 3.4 (2.1 to 5.5) vs. S; for chocolates 2.6 (1.9 to 3.5) vs. H and 1.9 (1.2 to 2.9) vs. S; and for meat pies 2.7 (1.5 to 5.1) vs. H and 1.3 (0.5 to 3.1) vs. S. These trends were confirmed in the 2013–16 survey sample. Interactions between location and BMI were not significant in either sample.

In conclusion, our study showed that adolescents are more likely to consume specific less-healthy foods at locations away from home and school/work, irrespective of BMI. Such locations include leisure places, food outlets and "on the go", hence public health policies to discourage less-healthy food choices in these locations is warranted for all adolescents.

Keywords: obesity; eating context; nutrient-poor foods; nutritional surveillance; adolescents; survey data analysis; data-mining; correspondence analysis; biplots

1. Introduction

Obesity is a global public health problem, particularly in developed countries where the growing longevity of populations implies a steadily increasing burden of chronic diseases including obesity and its associated co-morbidities[1]. Beside raising health-care costs, obesity reduces the quality of life and impacts on economic activity. To counter these trends, several countries have devised policies to combat the development of poor eating habits especially amongst young people as overweight and obesity in teenage years tends to become established during adulthood[2]. In Britain, where the prevalence of adult obesity is higher than the OECD average[3], some policies were drafted as early as 2009[4] to promote a healthy lifestyle and discourage unhealthy habits associated with weight gain from an early age. Although obesity has a demonstrated heritable component[5], investigations conducted to date still point at the environment as a major determinant[6] and likely primary focus of intervention policies, in particular related to diet and physical activity[7, 8]. The environment comprises many elements, including all influences that can be regarded as the social, economic, psychological, physical, geographical and political context in which behaviour takes place and which need to be considered. A recent analysis of British children aged 1.5-18 years concluded that the home and school eating environments are associated with better food choices, while other locations including outlets selling foods to eat on the go are associated with poorer food choices[9]. As a further contribution to characterising the eating context in children, this paper investigates the relationship between the consumption of healthy and less-healthy food and eating location in British adolescents, specifically the likelihood of consuming foods of public health concern in out of home environments. For this, data from the United Kingdom National Diet and Nutrition Survey Rolling Programme (NDNS-RP) 2008-2012 database [10] and the NDNS RP 2013-2016 -when it subsequently became available- were explored focusing on 11 to 18 year old children. The aim of the study was to explore the association between foods (especially less healthy ones) and the location where they are eaten (by correspondence analysis) and then quantify the evidence that adolescents are more likely to eat such foods in certain locations than in others (by logistic regression). Additionally the effect of other potential factors known to affect eating patterns in the young (e.g. age, sex, ethnicity, BMI, smoking, alcohol drinking and SES, weekend/weekday)[11] was also considered and the possible effect modifications, especially of BMI, on consumption at different locations.

2. Materials and Methods

NDNS-RP 2008-2012 sample

Data for this analysis were collected as part of the NDNS-RP in the UK between 2008-2012.[10] The NDNS-RP sample was drawn from the UK Postcode Address File, a list of all the addresses in the UK. The addresses come from small geographical areas based on postcode sectors, randomly selected from across the UK. A list of 27 addresses was then randomly selected from each postcode sector. In total, 21,573 addresses from 799 postcodes in the UK were randomly selected for the survey between April 2008 and March 2011. The randomly selected individuals were asked to complete a detailed diary of their food and drink consumption over four consecutive days including, for most individuals, at least one weekend day. An interview was conducted to collect background information on dietary habits, socio-demographic status, lifestyle and physical activity. The response rate for completion of the diary and interview was 56%, which is around the expected response rate for this type of surveys[12].

A total of 884 adolescents aged 11 to 18 years completed a 4 day estimated food and drink diary, which also included data on where they ate, with whom, whether they were seated at a table and whether the TV was on or off[10, 13]. This sample also included a proportion of 1.7% (15/884) adolescents completing only 3 days of the diary. Strata based on age-group, sex and geographical region were used in the NDNS-RP to calibrate proportions in the sample with the whole population[14]. The weighting system used by NDNS-RP involved two steps designed to compensate for sampling selection probabilities and reduce bias resulting from differential non-response by age, sex and region.

Dietary data

Food diary entries were analysed considering each individual food entry as the unit of analysis. The food data were dis-aggregated and coded by the NDNS team using DINO (Diet In Nutrients Out) software[15] to obtain a nutritional analysis of each food entry. Each recorded item was assigned a suitable food and portion code using food composition data from the Department of Health's (DH) NDNS Nutrient Databank. Where standard portion sizes were recorded in the diary using pictures provided, portion sizes were assigned from the Food Standard Agency's (FSA) portion size book[16]. For composite items which can be split into their component parts, for example sandwiches, each individual component was separately coded. For validation of estimations of energy intake from the self-reported dietary records of food and drinks consumed, the NDNS RP included a doubly labelled water (DLW) sub-study of participants aged four years and over[17].

For the purpose of this study, all analyses were conducted purely on eating location instances, ignoring portion sizes (and consequently calories) and eating occasions (and consequently eating times), and concentrating on whether a food was consumed at a location or not. This likely reduced, but did not remove, the problem of under-reporting food consumption in dietary surveys[17].

Classification of food groups and locations

The NDNS database classifies the foods consumed and recodes them into 59 main food groups[18], many of which contribute very little to adolescents' diets. In order to focus on the major foods for this age group, the contributions to total calorie intake of NDNS food groups were ranked for the adolescent subsample. Analyses have focused on the food groups which contribute the top 80% of calories (25 food-groups), referred to here as P80. The 25th food-group (least contributor) contributes less than 1.5% of the total calories in the UK teenagers' diet in this sample.

The P80 food groups were subsequently classified as healthy, less-healthy and neutral based on an adaptation of the UK Food Standards Agency-Ofcom (FSA-Ofcom model) nutrient profiling system,[19, 20] as described in Pechey *et al*[21]. The FSA-Ofcom model is used in the UK to define less-healthy foods that cannot be advertised to children and calculates a score by adding points for greater presence of energy, saturated fat, total sugar, sodium and subtracting points from the score for presence of non-soluble fibre, protein, fruits, vegetables and nuts content[19]. The P80 food groups were assigned the three categories used by Pechey *et al*[21] as follows: healthy for scores below (-2), neutral between (-2) and (+4) inclusive, and less-healthy for scores above (+4) (**Table 1**).

Table 1: Top 25 "P80" food groups sorted by increasing cumulative % of total calories consumed by adolescents in the NDNS-RP (2008-2012) and by FSA-adapted nutrient profile score[21].

Main Food Group	Calories Cumul. %	Score	Healthiness Category		
			Healthy <-2	Neutral	Less-Healthy >4
Pasta & rice and other cereals	10.05	2.0		N	
White Bread	18.49	1.7		N	
Chips and potatoes	24.54	-0.3		N	
Soft drinks, not diet	29.86	2.2		N	
Biscuits	34.00	18.9			L
Crisps, savoury snacks	37.84	12.3			L
Chocolate (incl. confectionary)	41.50	25.2			L
Buns, cakes, sweet pastries, fruit pies	44.99	17.1			L
Chicken dishes and turkey	48.36	-0.5		N	
Miscellaneous unclassified foods	51.22	9.4			L
Cheese	53.88	22.0			L
Semi-skimmed milk	56.47	-0.5		N	
Vegetables (not raw)	58.93	-6.3	H		
Low-fibre breakfast cereals	61.20	11.8			L
Sausages	63.36	14.6			L
Coated chicken and turkey manuf.	65.37	5.6			L
Potatoes Other, potato salads & dishes	67.24	-1.7		N	
Beef, veal and dishes	69.10	0.5		N	
Fruit	70.93	-3.3	H		
High fibre breakfast cereals	72.76	2.1		N	
Fruit juice	74.53	1.5		N	
Spreads, less-fat	76.27	22.9			L
Meat pastries, rolls and pies (“meat pies”)	77.92	15.1			L
Brown Bread granary and wheat germ	79.42	-3.0	H		
Sugars, preserves and sweet spreads	80.91	15.1			L

Eating “location” was derived from the NDNS “where” codes as one of 7 categories: home, school, work, friend’s/carer’s/relative’s home, mobile, leisure or other. These categories were subsequently collapsed into three (home, school or work, other) based on results of the first exploratory analysis (see Results).

Statistical analysis

A two-step analysis was conducted for this study. In the first step (exploratory), data mining was applied by using multivariate techniques for hypothesis generation. This was followed (step 2) by a regression analysis to test in a separate sample the hypotheses generated in the first step regarding the association between foods and locations. For Step 1 a contingency table was created from the food diary entries specifying the frequency of consumption of each food group at each location. To identify potential associations between food groups and locations, simple correspondence analysis[22, 23] was applied, followed by visual inspection of correspondence analysis plots with confidence regions[24, 25]. In Step 2, the hypotheses thus generated were then taken forward and formally tested using logistic regression via Generalised Estimating Equations[26]. As more recent NDNS data became available for 4 additional years (2013-2016) since our first analyses, the hypotheses generated using the 2008-2012 survey sample were additionally tested by logistic regression in the 2013-2016 survey sample (n=1,090 adolescents), for confirmatory purposes. This was justified given that correspondence analysis plots derived for the 2013-2016 data indicated the same foods as for the 2008-2012 sample as potentially linked with specific locations (results not shown).

Analyses were conducted using SAS software version 9.4 and R package “CABOOTCRS”[24].

Step 1: Correspondence Analysis (CA)

CA is a method for investigating the relationships between categorical variables represented in a two-dimensional contingency table. It does this by analysing and plotting “profiles”, that is the relative frequency of consumption of one food across different locations (or, symmetrically, the relative frequency of consumption of different foods at one location). For example, if 71% of all foods consumed are eaten at home, but only 55% of all sweetened soft drinks are consumed at home, then sweetened soft drinks will have a location “profile” different from the average food profile. CA plots represent visually the chi squared deviation (inertia) of food (and location) profiles from their respective average profile [22, 23].

To plot these multi-dimensional deviations (inertia) reduced to the two most informative dimensions, biplots[27, 28] were used where row profiles are normalised (rescaled) but column profiles are not (or vice versa). The horizontal axis of the biplot represents the direction along which the contingency table rows and columns show their largest deviation. The vertical axis represents the direction, perpendicular to the first, having the second-largest deviations. The percentage label for each axis is a measure of how much of the total variation (inertia) in the data has been displayed along that axis. The sum of the variation shown by the two axes is not 100%: the remaining variation would require to display more dimensions, and so is lost when reducing to 2 dimensions. The origin in each plot represents the average profile of those points in the plot while the length of the vector

from the origin to any profile-point represents its deviation from the average-profile. In biplots, the distance between row (food) and column (location) profile points and the direction in which they lie away from the origin is an indication of their association (greater association if points are located in similar directions away from the origin).

For this exploratory analysis (Step 1) the whole survey design was not taken into account, because the statistical units analysed by CA were the food entries rather than the individuals sampled for the survey and the aim was to obtain a descriptive snapshot of the eating behaviour of British adolescents. However since omitting weights have the potential to bias the analyses, sensitivity analyses were performed to verify that the interpretation of the CA plots did not change when assigning to each food entry either the respective individual's weight or the individual weight divided by the total number of food entries for that individual.

Confidence Regions (CRs) based on the Ringrose bootstrap method[24] (with 95% confidence) were applied to identify if foods were not significantly different from the average profile, i.e. if the region contained the origin.

Step 2: Logistic regression with GEE

Logistic regression using Generalised Estimating Equations (GEE) was applied to estimate Odds Ratios (ORs) of eating foods at different locations and test the null hypotheses that they were different from 1 for selected foods. GEEs provide unbiased estimates of ORs and valid estimates of standard errors even when the true correlation structure in the data is unknown[26, 29-31]. To accommodate the potential variance inflating elements of the complex survey design (clusters and weights), a two level hierarchical weighted analysis was conducted accounting for the correlation within survey design clusters at the first level (geographical areas that constitute the survey primary sampling units) and within individuals at the second level. The empirical standard errors were estimated assuming an exchangeable correlation matrix. Both unadjusted odds ratios and fully adjusted (by potential confounders) odds ratio of eating foods at different locations were modelled to assess the stability of the estimates (although these are not directly comparable due to non-collapsibility of odds ratios). Statistical significance for all regression analyses was set at 0.01.

3. Results

Study sample

Data from 884 teenagers providing a total of 62,523 food entries were available. The mean number of food entries for an individual teenager was 71 (SD 8.5). The study sample consisted of 50.3% (445/884) boys and 49.7% (439/884) girls aged between 11 and 18 inclusive (**Table 2**). There were 20 (2.3%) missing values for the socio-economic classification and 32 (3.6%) for BMI which appeared to be randomly distributed across age and sex.

Table 2: Participant characteristics. Data are from the National Diet and Nutrition Survey Rolling Programme Years 1-4 (2008-2012) for all respondents aged 11 to 18 years[10].

		N	%	% (weighted sample)
Age (years)	11-15	543	61.4	60.8
	16-18	341	38.6	39.2
Sex	Male	445	50.3	51.3
	Female	439	49.7	48.7
Ethnicity (%)	White	778	88	86.2
	Non-white	106	12	13.8
Occupational group (SES)*	1 Higher managerial, administrative and professional occupations	126	14.3	14.6
	2 Lower managerial, administrative and professional occupations	236	26.7	24.6
	3 Intermediate occupations	73	8.3	7.4
	4 Small employers and own account workers	94	10.6	11.2
	5 Lower supervisory and technical occupations	90	10.2	9.7
	6 Semi-routine occupations	125	14.1	14.6
	7 Routine occupations	91	10.3	11.5
	8 Never worked and long-term unemployed	29	3.3	4.3
	Missing	20	2.3	2.2
BMI (%)	Normal-weight	553	62.6	62.7
	Over-weight	124	14.0	14.5
	Obese	175	19.8	19.8
	Missing	32	3.6	3
Drinking (%)	Yes**	132	14.9	13.8
	No (Once or twice a months or less)	752	85.1	86.2
Smoking (%)	Yes***	91	10.3	10.4
	No	793	89.7	89.6

* nssec8 social and economic status classification from the Office for National Statistics[32].

**Collapsed from the following original categories: Almost every day; twice a week; once a week; once a fortnight.

***Collapsed Smoking (Category: Current Smoker) and Smoking Frequency (Category: Smoke cigarettes once a week or more often) variables.

The majority (70.8%) of food diary entries were recorded as eaten at home, with 14.2% recorded as eaten at school or work and the remainder (15%) at other locations (**Table 3**). The percentage of food entries recorded as eaten at work was very low (<2%).

Table 3: Distribution of total adolescents' food diary entries by eating location in 2008-12 NDNS sample.

Location	Frequency	% of Total	Cumulative %
Home (all home locations)	44,271	70.8	
Home living room	15,552	24.9	24.9
Home kitchen	12,558	20.1	45.0
Home dining room	6,207	9.9	54.9
Home bedroom	4,100	6.6	61.5
Home not given	2,703	4.3	65.8
Home other	2,617	4.2	70.0
Home garden	534	0.9	70.8
School	7,683	12.3	83.1
Leisure clubs, cafes	3,190	5.1	88.2
Friend/Carer/Relative's home	2,769	4.4	92.6
Other locations	2,161	3.5	96.1
Mobile: car, bus, train, etc.	1,295	2.1	98.2
Work	1,154	1.9	100
All locations	62,523	100	

Using a random process to split the diaries dataset for the subset of P80 foods resulted in a hypothesis generating dataset of 20,567 food entries and a hypothesis testing dataset of 20,455 food entries. The percentages of food entries at home, school/work were respectively of 70.5% and 14.6% in the hypothesis generating random sample and of 71.2% and 14.1% in the hypothesis testing one.

Results from correspondence analysis (Step 1)

The initial CA plot (not shown) comprising all twentyfive P80 foods showed larger deviations from the average food profile for coated chicken, chips (french-fried potatoes) and sweetened soft drinks which appeared in the graph in the same direction as leisure locations, while chocolates and meat pies appeared in the direction of mobile locations and other locations, and finally crisps, brown-bread and biscuits close enough to the school location. The home location attracted breakfast foods, pasta/rice, and vegetables. When adding confidence regions the cluttered graph required creation of separate CA plots according to the healthiness classification presented in Table 1.

The CA Biplot for healthy food (which captured 100% inertia in the data) suggests that cooked vegetables tend to be associated with home, brown bread with school and fruit primarily with mobile locations (**Figure 1**). The three "healthy" foods have CRs not including the origin, meaning that across location consumption patterns of cooked vegetables, brown bread and fruit are significantly different from the average healthy food (average across these three healthy foods).




Figure 1. Biplot of locations showing Confidence Regions for healthy food-groups (using CABOOTCRS).
Legend: H-Home, S-School, W-Work, F-Friends/Carers Homes, L-Leisure, M-Mobile, X-Other.

The CA Biplot for neutral foods indicates that 94.1% of the inertia is captured in the plot (**Figure 2**), including 69.9% along the horizontal axis where there is a contrast between home and all other eating locations, with leisure and mobile the most dissimilar to home. The vertical axis contrasts chips and soft-drinks with white bread and fruit juice. The biplot for neutral foods suggests associations of school and work with chicken dishes, fruit juice and white bread and of leisure and mobile locations with chips and sweetened soft drinks. Beef and chicken dishes can be seen to have CRs which include the origin whereas the CRs for chips and non-diet soft drinks do not include it, meaning consumption location of these two categories are significantly different from those of the average neutral food.




Figure 2. Biplot of locations showing Confidence Regions for **neutral** food-groups (using CABOOTCRS).
Legend: H-Home, S-School, W-Work, F-Friends/Carers Homes, L-Leisure, M-Mobile, X-Other.

The CA biplot for less-healthy foods (**Figure 3**) indicates that 88.22% of the variation in location profiles is captured in this plot, with 66.82% along the horizontal axis where Home is contrasted with all other eating locations, and breakfast foods are contrasted with snack foods such as crisps, biscuits and cakes. The vertical axis again presents a contrast between fast foods and sandwich items.




Figure 3. Biplot of locations showing Confidence Regions for **less-healthy** food-groups (using CABOOTCRS).
Legend: H-Home, S-School, W-Work, F-Friends/Carers Homes, L-Leisure M-Mobile, X-Other.

The biplot for less-healthy foods suggests that 1) cheese, less-fat spreads and biscuits are associated with school (work); 2) crisps and cakes & sweet-pastries are associated with non-home locations; 3) coated chicken is associated with leisure locations; 4) meat-pies and chocolate appear associated with friend's & carer's homes, other and mobile locations. The chocolate CR appears entirely inside the CR for Meat-Pies, suggesting that the consumption of Chocolate and Meat Pies follows a very similar, almost indistinguishable pattern with regard to locations.

Overall summary of data mining for associations by correspondence analysis

In the CA biplots for neutral and less-healthy foods, the locations appear to have clustered in similar directions away from the origin in three main types (home, school/work, and other locations) which have been used to simplify the next analysis stage (hypothesis testing). The "other location" category includes leisure, mobile, other, friend's & carer's homes which were found in the same quadrant of either biplot. The latter collapse of location categories was not however suggested by the CA biplot of healthy foods which comprised only a small number of food groups and of food entries and therefore the healthy food category was not taken forward to the next stage of the analysis.

Results of logistic regression analyses (Step 2)

GEE logistic regression models were created to quantify the odds of consuming specific neutral/less-healthy foods emerged in Step 1 (meat pies, chocolate, chips, non-diet soft drinks) in Other Locations vs. the odds of their consumption at Home or at School/work.

Results of the logistic regression analysis (**Table 4**) applied to the second (random) half of the sample showed that the average adolescent is more likely to consume sweetened soft drinks, chips, chocolate and meat pies at “Other” locations rather than at Home or at School/Work. These results are statistically significant at the 1% level except for meat pies at other location versus school/work ($p=0.47$).

Table 4: Odds Ratio estimates of eating sweetened soft drinks, chips, chocolate and meat pies in Other Locations versus at Home or versus at School/Work, unadjusted and adjusted by age (continuous), sex, day of the week (weekdays vs weekend), socio-economic status (8 categories), BMI (continuous), ethnic group (white or non-white), smoking status (smoker or non-smoker) and alcohol status (drinker or non-drinker). The number of food entries per food out of total of 19,419 for complete case analysis are shown in brackets (N). Data are from the NDNS 2008-2012 RP survey sample ($n=884$ adolescents).

Food	Unadjusted Odds Ratio				Adjusted Odds Ratio			
	Other Location vs. <i>home</i>		Other Location vs. <i>school/work</i>		Other Location vs. <i>home</i>		Other Location vs. <i>school/work</i>	
	OR	99% CI p-value	OR	99% CI p-value	OR	99% CI p-value	OR	99% CI p-value
Sweetened soft drinks (N=1678)	2.78	(2.07, 3.73) $p<0.0001$	2.09	(1.50, 2.93) $p<0.0001$	2.79	(2.08, 3.75) $p<0.0001$	2.02	(1.43, 2.84) $p<0.0001$
Chips (N=664)	2.81	(2.17, 3.63) $p<0.0001$	3.42	(2.16, 5.40) $p<0.0001$	2.82	(2.17, 3.66) $p<0.0001$	3.42	(2.13, 5.50) $p<0.0001$
Chocolate (N=574)	2.49	(1.81, 3.42) $p<0.0001$	1.72	(1.14, 2.60) $p=0.0007$	2.56	(1.85, 3.51) $p<0.0001$	1.88	(1.22, 2.91) $p=0.0002$
Meat Pies (N=124)	2.61	(1.42, 4.81) $p<0.0001$	1.22	(0.55, 2.71) $p=0.53$	2.73	(1.48, 5.06) $p<0.0001$	1.28	(0.53, 3.07) $p=0.47$

The confirmatory analyses using the 2013-2016 NDNS RP survey sample indicate the same main findings remain standing although the odds ratio of Other Location vs. School/work is attenuated for chocolate and changed direction for meat pies (**Table 5**), compared to the 2008-12 results.

Furthermore, the odds of having soft drinks (2.79 to 3.06) and chips (2.82 to 2.91) at Other Locations vs. Home and of having soft drinks at Other Locations vs School/work (2.02 to 2.50) increased (adjusted analyses in Table 4 and 5).

Table 5: Confirmatory odds Ratio estimates based on NDNS 2013-2016 RP survey sample (n= 1090 adolescents) of eating sweetened soft drinks, chips, chocolate and meat pies in Other Locations versus at Home or versus at School/Work, unadjusted ORs and ORs fully adjusted by age (continuous), sex, day of the week (weekdays vs weekend), socio-economic status (8 categories), BMI (continuous), ethnic group (white or non-white), smoking status (smoker or non-smoker) and alcohol status (drinker or non-drinker). The number of food entries (including all foods)out of total of 80,926 for complete case analysis are shown in brackets (N).

Food	Unadjusted Odds Ratio				Adjusted Odds Ratio			
	Other Location vs. home		Other Location vs. school/work		Other Location vs. home		Other Location vs. school/work	
	OR	99% CI p-value	OR	99% CI p-value	OR	99% CI p-value	OR	99% CI p-value
Sweetened soft drinks (N=2999)	3.08	(2.56, 3.70) p<0.0001	2.59	(1.96, 3.42) p<0.0001	3.06	(2.53, 3.71) p<0.0001	2.50	(1.84, 3.39) p<0.0001
Chips (N=1546)	2.92	(2.39, 3.55) p<0.0001	2.94	(2.10, 4.12) p<0.0001	2.91	(2.36, 3.57) p<0.0001	2.75	(1.91, 3.95) p<0.0001
Chocolate (N=1440)	2.38	(1.84, 3.07) p<0.0001	1.30	(0.94, 1.81) p=0.0007	2.35	(1.82, 3.03) p<0.0001	1.31	(0.93, 1.83) p=0.04
Meat Pies (N=306)	1.96	(1.23, 3.10) P=0.0002	0.76	(0.40, 1.45) p=0.28	1.89	(1.19, 3.01) P=0.0004	0.74	(0.39, 1.39) p=0.21

The results further indicate that socioeconomic status (SES) significantly affects consumption of soft drinks and chips. In particular belonging to the third social class (intermediate occupations, SES3) results in 68% (99% CI: 6 to 264%) higher odds of consuming soft drinks compared to being in the baseline (modal) category SES2 (lower managerial, administrative and professional). Also, belonging to the fifth lower class (SES5, lower supervisory and technical) results in 47% (99% CI: 1 to 218%) higher odds of consuming soft drinks than for SES2. On the other hand belonging to SES1 (higher managerial) results in 37% (99% CI: 20 to 86%) lower odds of consuming chips than SES2. However there does not appear to be a linear trend in the effect of SES on consumption of any food. White adolescents were 96% more likely to consume chocolate (99% CI 12% to 333%) than non-whites. Significant interactions between any confounding variables and location were not detected, in particular adolescents' BMI was not modifying the odds ratio of consuming any of the selected foods in other locations compared to home and school; however there was a significant interaction between smoking and ethnicity (whose main effects were both very small and not significant) on consumption of soft drinks. In particular, smoking non-white adolescents had 67% lower odds (99% CI: 20 to 86%) to consume soft drinks than non-smoking whites. The comparison of crude to adjusted odds ratios showed remarkable stability of the estimates, which were virtually the same across models for soft drinks and chips.

The tendency of some social classes to significantly influence the consumption of chips and soft drinks and of ethnicity to influence the consumption of chocolate were found also in the 2013-2016 sample. The model estimates were also generally stable across crude and adjusted analyses in the 2013-2016 sample.

4. Discussion

This study provides strong evidence that British adolescents are considerably more likely to consume specific nutrient-poor foods when they are away from home, school or work than when they are at these locations. Adolescents in this sample were nearly 3 times as likely to consume high sugar and high fat food when they were away from home than when they were at home, in particular, sweetened soft drinks (279% increase), chocolate (256% increase), meat pies (273%) and chips (French fries) (282%). Similar results were found for the likelihood of eating such foods away from school or work (202% increase for soft drinks, 188% for chocolate and 342% for chips). Additionally belonging to some lower SES groups was associated with a higher likelihood of consuming soft drinks and chips; and for the white ethnic group with a higher likelihood of consuming chocolate..

Eating patterns for consumption of healthy foods at home/school vs. at other locations were not so apparent in the CA biplot and therefore were not followed up in the subsequent regression analysis. This was partly due to only a few foods being classified as healthy and to the fact that the comparisons in the biplot were made only within the small subset of healthy foods, with a consequent limited power of a follow-up regression analysis. However the healthy food exploratory analysis did suggest that fruit, cooked vegetables and brown bread tend to associate with mobile, home and school locations respectively, which may be worth exploring in future analyses.

Strengths and weaknesses of the study

This study used a nationally representative population of British adolescents for which food intake data were collected by means of an estimated food diary. This represents an advantage in regards to the use of proxy data for actual intake (e.g. purchase location or menu offerings), or the use of Food Frequency Questionnaires, which rely on memory, but as with all self-reported data it is prone to over or underestimation effects[33]. While misreporting generally applies to energy intake estimations, this analysis focused on the likelihood of consuming vs. not consuming specific foods at particular locations. Despite this still representing a limitation in that portion sizes of the same foods may vary both across individuals and brands[34-36], our approach has the advantage that underreporting effects are likely to be reduced as portion size estimation errors were omitted altogether[33, 37]. However there may be residual bias due to the impact of recording a diary on eating behaviour or due to differential reporting of different foods (i.e. in terms of reporting vs non-reporting rather than misreporting portion size).

The analysis included NDNS diary entries from the period 2008-2012. However the ongoing nature of the NDNS rolling programme with its regular data releases provided a key opportunity for these analyses to be repeated for assessment of trends over time. A confirmatory analysis in the 2013-2016 sample confirmed the earlier findings, providing initial evidence for a secular trend in the consumption habits of adolescents at out-of-home locations over an 8 year period.

The use of Correspondence Analysis with confidence regions facilitated mining the data in a preliminary broad exploration which lead to a reduced risk of type I error (i.e. obtaining significant results by chance should a multiplicity of tests be carried out). Interpretation should be careful though in that these are relative results which don't convey information on the absolute number of eating occasions in various locations. Confirmation of the presence of fast food and take-away

outlets by geo-coding with actual eating location may have provided complementary evidence of the effect of the food environment[38]. However presence of such outlets near the actual eating location does not guarantee adolescents are eating in such places. Equally adolescents may be obtaining the food in these outlets and consume it elsewhere [11].

Data on social facilitation (i.e. eating more in the presence of others) were not analysed, however this may be an important factor given the effects of peer pressure on food choices in adolescents[39]. Similarly to previous studies [9, 39], BMI did not appear to modify the association between eating location and fast food intake, however ignoring portion size effects may have masked such effect modification.

The use of the FSA-Ofcom model to classify food as less-healthy has recently been put into question based on its potential inconsistency to discriminate among foods with respect to their association with specific diet-related diseases [40]. One likely inconsistency in this system was the classification of chips and non-diet soft drinks in the neutral category and its comparison to other neutral rather than less-healthy foods in the CA exploratory analysis. However this did not affect the final results estimating the odds of these foods being consumed at other locations vs. at home. Using this system only three foods were classified as “healthy” in the present study which may reflect the system not being originally designed to identify healthy foods .[20] However the overall results strongly support findings from two parallel analyses in British children and adults using a different classification system[9, 41] indicating that the discriminatory capacity of the adapted FSA-Ofcom model in the context of this study is probably consistent with that of other systems currently in use.

Comparison with previous studies

To our knowledge this is the first study to specifically quantify the impact of the food environment on self-reported consumption of foods of concern in a nationally representative sample of the teenage population in the UK. Past studies with British adolescents have been mostly descriptive and included adults, younger children or smaller samples and focused on frequency of consumption in specific locations only [11, 42, 43]. Studies in other countries did not use direct food intake data[44] or examined consumption in specific locations only[45, 46] or from specific food groups [47, 43]. Only two studies to date in British adolescents have used direct food intake data to explore eating context influences on diet[9, 43], and our results fully support their findings. Ziaudeen et al.[9] reported that food outlets, leisure places, and “on the go” locations were the out-of-home food environments associated with the highest proportion of energy from noncore foods, which include sweetened soft drinks, chips, chocolates and pastries. Similarly, Tyrrell et al.[43] reported that amongst 16-22 year olds, the main sources of energy, fat and sugar were foods purchased at convenience and specialist shops, retail bakers, vending machines and take-away establishments. It can be concluded then that adolescents’ food choices are strongly influenced by the food environment, with the purchase and consumption of high sugar and saturated fat foods associated with away from home and from school locations while consumption of desirable nutrients and lower dietary energy density is linked with eating at home and school [9, 11, 43, 45, 46, 47].

Our results also confirm previous reports on the clustering of less-healthy eating behaviours at certain locations [39]. For example, the *Meat pie* group includes sausage rolls, Cornish pasties, and meat pastries which are all convenient foods to carry and eat at any location. The same applies to chocolate confectionery, all of which are available on every high street at a price-point below £1

alongside soft drinks, providing a favourable environment for adolescents to consume such foods. In support of these observations, Patterson *et al.*[39] reported that teenagers in a deprived London Borough spent a median of £2 and an upper quartile of £3 when buying fast food. Sausage rolls and meat-pastries are also available from school lunch counters, but chocolate at school will not be at a promotional price if available at all. This may explain why the odds of eating meat-pies at School/Work locations are comparable to Other locations, whereas for chocolate they are not.

In the present study, adolescents from families with a lower socio-economic class had higher odds of consuming chips and sweetened soft-drinks independently of location. This is consistent with numerous previous studies in adults and children showing a link between fast food outlets, diet quality and the social environment, as take away and fast food outlets tend to be relatively more present in more deprived areas [11, 39, 48, 49]. In general, lower socio-economic classes tend to purchase a greater proportion of their energy from less-healthy items[21], consume more takeaway food and live in areas with higher proportion of fast food outlets[11], which our findings would initially support.

Interpretation of the findings and implications for public health policy

Overall, our results agree with recent and previous work showing an association between the eating environment and food choices in adults, school-aged children and adolescents alike [9, 11, 43, 41] but further quantifies this association for foods commonly consumed by adolescents. Access to healthy food as part of school initiatives is probably an important factor to improve dietary choices, as shown in an analysis of children aged 1.5 to 18 using a related sample[9]. On the other hand, the lack of affordable healthy food in out of home and school environments may act as a prompt for less favourable eating choices in adolescents. As seen for younger children[9], this study still highlights the home environment as an important target for intervention given the high proportion of food entries recorded in this location. At the same time though it provides clear, strong evidence of the association between the food environment and the consumption of popular high energy density, nutrient poor foods in a nationally representative sample of adolescents, warranting the need to improve food choices for this age group in environments outside home and school.

The present results are particularly relevant for policy makers in the context of the current Childhood Obesity Strategy[50], as they allow gaining a broader understanding of the potential impact of the food environment in young people. In particular the role of food cost, advertising and choice architecture (i.e. altering the environment to make healthier choices easier)[51] need to be considered. Future research should explore these and other incentives to make more healthy choices available and attractive to teenagers when they are “grazing” for food away from adult supervision.

Author Contributions: LP designed the study with the help of EAR and GP and wrote the first draft. AC performed the statistical analyses under supervision of LP. EB advised on methodology and reviewed the article for content. EAR contributed to writing the manuscript. All authors approved the final version.

Funding: The National Diet and Nutrition Survey Rolling Program is jointly funded by Public Health England and the UK Food Standards Agency. EA-R was supported by the University of Navarra, Centre for Nutrition Research and the UK Medical Research Council (program U1059600384). EA-R acknowledges support also from

the Spanish Biomedical Research Centre in Physiopathology of Obesity and Nutrition (CIBERObn), Institute of Health Carlos III, Madrid, Spain; and the Navarra Institute for Health Research (IdiSNa), Pamplona, Spain.

Acknowledgments: We thank NDNS team at former MRC Elsie Widdowson Laboratory in Cambridge and NatCen Social Research in London for providing information about data collection and coding.

Conflicts of Interest: EAR has received a travel grant from Somaretec S.A. (Ferrero Group) in the past and is a member of an ILSI Eating Behaviour and Energy Balance Task Force Expert Group. The authors declare no other conflicts of interest for this work.

References

- 1 Collaborators TGO. Health Effects of Overweight and Obesity in 195 Countries over 25 Years. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2017;377:13-27.
- 2 Venn AJ, Thomson RJ, Schmidt MD, et al. Overweight and obesity from childhood to adulthood: a follow-up of participants in the 1985 Australian Schools Health and Fitness Survey. *Med J Aust*. 2007;186(9):458-60.
- 3 OECD. Obesity Update 2017. Available from: www.oecd.org/health/obesity-update.htm.
- 4 Healthy Lives, Healthy People
http://www.dh.gov.uk/en/Publicationsandstatistics/Publications/PublicationsPolicyAndGuidance/DH_1219412009. Available from:
https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/215911/dh_122238.pdf.
- 5 Yang W, Kelly T, He J. Genetic epidemiology of obesity. *Epidemiol Rev*. 2007;29(1):49-61.
- 6 Langenberg C, Sharp SJ, Franks PW, et al. Gene-lifestyle interaction and type 2 diabetes: the EPIC interact case-cohort study. *PLoS Med*. 2014;11(5):e1001647.
- 7 Brownson RC, Haire-Joshu D, Luke DA. Shaping the context of health: a review of environmental and policy approaches in the prevention of chronic diseases. *Annu Rev Public Health*. 2006;27:341-70.
- 8 Allender S. Policy change to create supportive environments for physical activity and healthy eating: which options are the most realistic for local government? *Health Promotion International*. 2012;27(2):261-74.
- 9 Ziauddeen N, Page P, Penney T, Nicholson S, Kirk S, Almiron-Roig E. Eating at food outlets and leisure places and "on the go" is associated with less-healthy food choices than eating at home and in school in children: cross-sectional data from the UK National Diet and Nutrition Survey Rolling Programme (2008-2014). *American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*. 2018;In Press.
- 10 NatCen Social Research. NDNS Report Y1 to Y4.
www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/310995/NDNS_Y1_to_4_UK_report.pdf.
- 11 Adams J, Goffe L, Brown T, et al. Frequency and socio-demographic correlates of eating meals out and take-away meals at home: cross-sectional analysis of the UK national diet and nutrition survey, waves 1-4 (2008-12). *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*. 2015;12.

- 12 Fincham JE. Response rates and responsiveness for surveys, standards, and the journal. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*. 2008;72(2):43.
- 13 Bates B, Lennox A, Prentice A, et al., editors. *National Diet and Nutrition Survey Results from Years 1, 2, 3 and 4 (Combined) of the Rolling Programme (2008/2009–2011/2012)*; London, UK, 2014. London2014.
- 14 NDNS_Appendix_B. Weighting the Core Sample.
www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/216487/dh_130786.pdf2011.
- 15 Fitt E, Mak TN, Stephen AM, et al. Disaggregating composite food codes in the UK National Diet and Nutrition Survey food composition databank. *European Journal of Clinical Nutrition*. 2010;64(Suppl 3):S32-6.
- 16 Food Standards Agency. *Food Portion Sizes*. 3rd ed. London: The Stationary Office; 2002.
- 17 NDNS_Appendix_X. Mis-reporting in the NDNS: DLW Study.
www.food.gov.uk/sites/default/files/ndns-appendix-x.pdf2011.
- 18 NDNS_Appendix_R. Main and Subsidiary Food Groups.
www.food.gov.uk/sites/default/files/ndns-appendix-r.pdf2011.
- 19 Scarborough P, Rayner M, Stockley L. Developing nutrient profile models: a systematic approach. *Public Health Nutrition*. 2007;10(4):330-6.
- 20 www.food.gov.uk. Nutrient Profiling Technical Guidance. In: Agency FSAFS.
<http://www.food.gov.uk/sites/default/files/multimedia/pdfs/techguidenutprofiling.pdf2011>.
- 21 Pechey R, Jebb SA, Kelly MP, et al. Socioeconomic differences in purchases of more vs. less healthy foods and beverages: Analysis of over 25,000 British households in 2010. *Social Science & Medicine*. 2013;92:22-6.
- 22 Greenacre MJ. *Correspondence Analysis in Practice*. London: Academic Press; 1993. 195 p.
- 23 Beh EJ, Lombardo R. *Correspondence Analysis: Theory, Practice and New Strategies*: Wiley; 2014.
- 24 Ringrose TJ. Bootstrap confidence regions for correspondence analysis. *Journal of Statistical Computation and Simulation*. 2012;82(10):1397-413.
- 25 Beh EJ, Lombardo R. Confidence Regions and Approximate p-values for Classical and Non Symmetric Correspondence Analysis. *Communications in Statistics-Theory and Methods*. 2015;44(1):95-114.
- 26 Liang KY, Zeger SL. Longitudinal Data-Analysis Using Generalized Linear-Models. *Biometrika*. 1986;73(1):13-22.
- 27 Gabriel KR, Odoroff CL. Biplots in biomedical research. *Stat Med*. 1990;9(5):469-85.
- 28 Gower JC, Gardner Lubbe S, Le Roux NJ. *Understanding Biplots*: Wiley; 2010.
- 29 Hanley JA, Negassa A, deB. Edwardes MB, Forrester JE. Statistical Analysis of Correlated Data Using Generalized Estimating Equations: An Orientation. *American Journal of Epidemiology*. 2003;157(4):364–75.
- 30 Fitzmaurice GM, Laird NM, Ware JH. *Applied Longitudinal Analysis*: Wiley; 2004.
- 31 Hardin JW, Hilbe JM. *Generalised Estimating Equations*: Chapman and Hall; 2013.
- 32 Office for National Statistics. The National Statistics Socio-economic classification (NS-SEC) 2010 [12/05/2018]. Available from:

<https://www.ons.gov.uk/methodology/classificationsandstandards/otherclassifications/thenationalstatistics socioeconomicclassificationsscrebaseonsoc2010#classes-and-collapses>.

- 33 Subar AF, Freedman LS, Tooze JA, et al. Addressing Current Criticism Regarding the Value of Self-Report Dietary Data. *Journal of Nutrition*. 2015;145(12):2639-45.
- 34 Kirwan L, Walsh MC, Brennan L, et al. Comparison of the portion size and frequency of consumption of 156 foods across seven European countries: insights from the Food4ME study. *Eur J Clin Nutr*. 2016;70(5):642-4.
- 35 Lewis HBA, A.L.; Jebb, S. How much should I eat? A comparison of suggested portion sizes in the UK. *Public Health Nutrition*. 2012;15(11):2110-7.
- 36 Haskelberg H, Neal B, Dunford E, et al. High variation in manufacturer-declared serving size of packaged discretionary foods in Australia. *Br J Nutr*. 2016;115(10):1810-8.
- 37 Steyn NPS, M.; Norris, S.A.; Whati, L.; Mackeown, J.M.; Nel, J.H. How well do adolescents determine portion sizes of foods and beverages? . *Asia Pac J Clin Nutr*. 2006;15(1):35-42.
- 38 Burgoine T, Forouhi NG, Griffin SJ, Wareham NJ, Monsivais P. Associations between exposure to takeaway food outlets, takeaway food consumption, and body weight in Cambridgeshire, UK: population based, cross sectional study. *Bmj-British Medical Journal*. 2014;348.
- 39 Patterson A, Chan MY. Consumption of takeaway and fast food in a deprived inner London Borough: are they associated with childhood obesity? *BMJ Open*. 2012;2(3).
- 40 Mytton OT, Forouhi NG, Scarborough P, et al. Association between intake of less-healthy foods defined by the United Kingdom's nutrient profile model and cardiovascular disease: A population-based cohort study. *PLoS Med* 2018;15(1):e1002484.
- 41 Ziauddeen N, Almiron-Roig E, Penney T, Nicholson S, Kirk S, Page P. Eating at food outlets and "on the go" is associated with less healthy food choices in adults: cross-sectional data from the UK National Diet and Nutrition Survey Rolling Programme (2008-2014). *Nutrients*. 2017;9(12):1315.
- 42 Mak TN, Prynne CJ, Cole D, et al. Assessing eating context and fruit and vegetable consumption in children: new methods using food diaries in the UK National Diet and Nutrition Survey Rolling Programme. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act*. 2012;9:126.
- 43 Tyrrell RL, Greenhalgh F, Hodgson S, et al. Food environments of young people: linking individual behaviour to environmental context. *J Public Health (Oxf)*. 2017;39(1):95-104.
- 44 Drewnowski A, Rehm CD. Energy intakes of US children and adults by food purchase location and by specific food source. *Nutr J*. 2013;12:59.
- 45 Powell LM, Nguyen BT. Fast-Food and Full-Service Restaurant Consumption Among Children and Adolescents Effect on Energy, Beverage, and Nutrient Intake. *Jama Pediatrics*. 2013;167(1):14-20.
- 46 Rehm CD, Drewnowski A. Trends in Consumption of Solid Fats, Added Sugars, Sodium, Sugar-Sweetened Beverages, and Fruit from Fast Food Restaurants and by Fast Food Restaurant Type among US Children, 2003-2010. *Nutrients*. 2016;8(12).
- 47 Poti JM, Slining MM, Popkin BM. Where are kids getting their empty calories? Stores, schools, and fast-food restaurants each played an important role in empty calorie intake among US children during 2009-2010. *J Acad Nutr Diet*. 2014;114(6):908-17.

48 Drewnowski A, Aggarwal A, Cook A, Stewart O, Moudon AV. Geographic disparities in Healthy Eating Index scores (HEI-2005 and 2010) by residential property values: Findings from Seattle Obesity Study (SOS). *Prev Med.* 2016;83:46-55.

49 Lake A, Townshend T. Obesogenic environments: exploring the built and food environments. *J R Soc Promot Health.* 2006;126(6):262-7.

50 Health; Do. Childhood Obesity: a plan for action 2016. Available from:
<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/childhood-obesity-a-plan-for-action>.

51 Hollands GJ, Shemilt I, Marteau TM, et al. Altering micro-environments to change population health behaviour: towards an evidence base for choice architecture interventions. *BMC Public Health.* 2013;13:1218.