

# **Trends in the association between Ultra-processed foods, salt intake and Blood Pressure using the National Dietary and Nutritional Survey (NDNS) in England 2008-2019**

**David O'Hagan**

200299857

**Dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Public Health, The University of Liverpool**

**August 2023**

## Dedication

To Julie Andrew and Sophie

## Acknowledgments

To Zoe and Martn

To Paul

## Table of Contents

David O'Hagan.....	1
Dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Public Health, The University of Liverpool.....	1
August 2023.....	1
Dedication.....	2
Acknowledgments.....	3
Abstract.....	8
Introduction.....	10
Public Health Impact.....	10
Epistemology.....	11
Positionality.....	11
Literature Review.....	13
Introduction.....	13
Search Strategy.....	13
Search results.....	14
Overview of literature.....	14
Na, BP, NCD and Public Health.....	15
Approach to change.....	16
UPF and BP.....	17
UPF.....	17
Increasing UPF.....	18
UPF and increased intake.....	18
UPF and Ill Health.....	19
obesity.....	19
diabetes and cardmetabolic syndromes.....	19
cancer.....	19

ckd.....	19
UPF BP and Salt.....	20
Literature review Conclusion.....	21
Method.....	22
Introduction.....	22
Research Question.....	22
National Dietary and Nutritional Survey.....	23
Study design.....	23
NDNS Dataset.....	24
University Research Governance and Ethical Review.....	24
Data Processing.....	24
Exclusions.....	25
The data.....	25
Analysis of Change over Survey Years.....	26
Univariable Regression of key variables.....	26
Multiple Regression on Systolic BP (?age, ?Epcnt_4).....	26
AIC and sensitivty Anaylsis.....	27
Method Conclusion.....	27
Results.....	28
Results Introduction.....	28
The Data.....	28
Analysis of Change across cohorts.....	29
other variables compared across cohorts.....	31
Analysis of Key variables by Sex.....	32
Analysis of Key Variables by Age.....	34
Analysis of Key Variables by Place.....	37
Paired Regression of key variables on each other.....	39

Complex Modelling using Multi variable regression.....	44
Regression on BP.....	44
simple set Regression on BP.....	47
Regression on Na.....	48
Regression on UPF.....	51
Summary of Results.....	54
Discussion.....	55
Introduction to Discussion.....	55
Data.....	55
Discussion of change across cohorts.....	55
of other variables compared across cohorts.....	55
Discussion of Key variables by Sex.....	55
Discussion of Key variables by Age.....	56
Discussion of Key variables by Place.....	56
Discussion Paired Regression of key variables on each other.....	56
Complex Modelling using Multi variable regression.....	56
analysis for BP.....	56
simple set BP.....	56
analysis for Sodium.....	56
analysis for UPF.....	56
Limitations of Study.....	56
The study.....	56
The data.....	56
The analysis.....	56
Ideas for further research.....	56
Quantitative.....	57
Mixed and Qualitative.....	57

Ideas for policy.....	57
Conclusion.....	58
Bibliography.....	58
Appendix.....	58
Appendix 1 Approved Proposal.....	58
Appendix 2 Ethics Certificate.....	58
Appendix 3 Software used.....	58

## Abstract

The study showed that there is a correlation between UPF intake and BP, which disappears when Age is a covariable. It also showed that sodium intake has no correlation with BP as an isolated variable, but that it is important within multivariable models.

The study shows a complex relationship between UPF intake and population risk of BP and CVD. It also shows that reduction of the sodium content may be effective at reducing the overall risk.

This is a secondary data study the national dietary and nutrition survey (1) of looked at BP and the effects of UPF and Na.BP is clinical, and a proxy measure for CVD.

Policy should aim to reduce percentage intake of UPF and increase percentage intake of unprocessed foods.


## Table of Figures



## **Index of Tables**

## Introduction

There is thought to be an association between blood pressure (BP) and intake of Ultra-processed Foods (UPF) and Salt intake. This study looks at this association in the data set of the National dietary and nutrition survey ((1)). The study gives data from 2008 to 2019. There have been changes in the intake of UPF, of salt and BP over that time. This study will describe those changes. As part of this description, I will identify how BP is affected by these key dietary factors. I will attempt to identify the role salt intake plays in the effect of ultraprocessed food on BP.



*DAG of relationships explored by analysis*

(**fig-dag?**) shows a possible arrangement of the relationships between UPF, Na and BP highlighting the onward relationship to non-contagious disease, and the underlying importance of age and sex. This paper will seek to explore this complex web by pulling out strands within it.

## Public Health Impact

Public Health intends to reduce the burden of ill health across the population. BP is an indicator of the health of the population, in that it is a risk factor for a number of non-communicable diseases (NCD) (2).

Dietary approaches to improving public health are able to deliver proportionate and universal interventions to populations to reduce the incidence of NCD. These can be delivered up stream at the policy level. This is effective and efficient and minimises cost.

Dietary approaches can also be used by individuals. This approach risks the development of a culture of blame of individuals whose choices are limited by systems outside of their control. The commercial and social determinants of health play out a significant role in research, and delivery of public health improvements around food (3) .

### Epistemology

The epistemological approach of this study is positivist. I use a quantitative approach in a mechanistic and deterministic model. However, I am aware that this model is an incomplete description of the whole of reality. So that whilst I work within this positivist framework, I am aware that the model is limited by the isolation which defines the parameters of the study.

In particular I am aware that real world application to dietary change requires interaction with social and economic factors. These factors are often much better understood within critical realist and social constructionist models. The commercial and social determinants of health are both constructionist models which have a great deal of impact on the reality of dietary effects on BP and on the availability of UPF and on their nutritional constituents.

### Positionality

In a positivist paradigm the observer is external to the model. Acknowledging that there are constructivist aspects to this study allows that the observer is closer to the model. My positionality is therefore of interest to interpretation of the derived model, but also to understand reasons for decisions about the approach to the data. I share with Jafar (4) an intention to lead in describing my positionality in this quantitative study.

I am from a biomedical background, which brings an attachment to positivist ideals. However, as a practising physician I am aware of the interaction of any number of social factors on the health of participants as Evans and Trotter (5) discuss . These impact on food 'choices', which might be determined by social expectations as much as by income, or geography. They also impact on 'hard' clinical measurements such as BP. This can be affected by position and room temperature as well as by the relationship between the observer and the participant.

This work is primarily to complete requirements for an MPH degree which means that it is influenced by factors around health equity and classic epidemiology as taught on the course. It is produced in collaboration with a research group with a long established reputation in food research in public health, which may steer the results in a conservative direction.

Positivist 'grand isolation' may reduce the influence of these factors, but they remain as influences.

I accept that to proceed, whilst I need to be aware of the limitations of the positivist approach and the necessity of making pragmatic selections that there is some degree of validity to the resulting dataset. Otherwise, analysis of it would be of no purpose.

# Literature Review

## Introduction

This section will describe the search strategy and techniques used to identify articles to make up the review. Then there will be a review of separate sections of the literature, before developing a synthesis of the literature at present and explanation on how it relates to the research question.

## Search Strategy

The search strategy has a core systematic approach but is augmented with additional items from a range of sources. The success of the search is that it identifies a wide variety of articles which help to outline and augment the argument developed.

My search aims to identify most of the related articles. Starting with a broad search strategy, the results are narrowed identifying those of particular relevance, by reading abstracts and cross referencing with other papers. Also, after discussion colleagues passed on further relevant literature.

In addition, I identify papers from the bibliographies of identified papers. Reviews and meta-analyses are good at presenting search strategies and identifying high value studies.

These identify search terms not initially included. Despite limiting the search to high blood pressure many of these searches consider broader clinical endpoints, using metabolic syndrome, diabetes and cerebrovascular and cardiovascular disease.

My search terms are included in the table below. They were searched through a meta database which includes Medline, and Ovid and Scopus. This meta database enables an ongoing search which is able to send messages about new articles as they are published.

### Search Terms Used

---

“ultra-processed food” OR “ultra-processed foods” OR “ultraprocessed food” OR “ultraprocessed foods” OR “ultra-processed product” OR “ultra-processed products” OR “ultra-processing” OR “food processing” OR “processed food” OR “processed foods” OR “NOVA” OR “NOVA system” OR “NOVA food classification” OR “NOVA classification system”) AND (hypertension OR “high blood pressure” OR “high blood pressures” OR “blood pressure” OR “systolic pressure” OR “diastolic pressure” OR “systolic blood pressure” OR “diastolic blood pressure”) AND (adult OR adults OR aged OR “middle aged” OR elderly OR “older adult”

Table 2.1: Table of search terms used

## Search results

This search produced 1328 results the search allowed medical, public health, nursing articles to be prioritised and engineering, chemical, and technology articles to be deprioritised.

There were no time limits, language limits or availability limits in the initial search. These 1328 were reduced down by reading titles and abstracts to identify relevant articles.

Papers were excluded which related to technology including food technology. They were also excluded if the primary purpose of the paper was unrelated to dietary or nutritional causes of clinical outcomes.


## Overview of literature

The literature has developed over some time. The results arrange themselves therefore into several groups. Firstly there are those which describe the development of the argument that salt relates to BP and so to NCD. UPF is a recent phrase developed within the Nova framework which was described in 2009 so the arguments around UPF and its relation to BP and so NCD are more recent. This later group build on the earlier work, but importantly they only superficially analyse the way that UPF and salt interact.

In addition papers may be categorised as primary research, systematic reviews with meta analysis, model analysis, and papers which use the other categories to consider public health policy approaches.

- 1 describe literature
- 2 synthesise literature
- 3 critique literature
- 4 explain role of study within context

## Na, BP, NCD and Public Health



### *DAG of relationships between BP and Salt*

Non-communicable disease is an increasing burden on public health. (2) layout the charges against salt most clearly. They identify comprehensively the connection between changes in salt intake and changes in blood pressure and changes in cardiovascular (CVD) and cerebrovascular diseases. They link the nutritional effect of salt but they also identify the way this is affected by social and commercial determinants of health. These are branches from different epistemological backgrounds, nutrition from positivism, and the social determinants from a more constructivist approach.

(6), (7), and (8) describe how risk factor medicine came about. They describe raised blood pressure as a 'prominent member' of a group of risks in cardiovascular disease. A disease which is the outcome of 'multiple forces'. Their description sees this as part of the march of progress in understanding cardiovascular disease in particular, but also non-communicable disease. Kannel identifies that cardiologists alone cannot conquer cardiovascular disease. Since then BP has come to feature more and more in NCD, following studies showing that reducing BP reduced the risk of CVD. This placed Blood pressure detection, management, and control at the centre of reducing CVD ( (9), (10), (11), (12), (13) ).

The causes of BP, as Kannel explains, are divided into secondary BP where there is an identified pathological cause and 'essential' or idiopathic BP where no cause is identifiable. Contributors to and partial causes of this essential BP have been sought, at individual and societal levels, using medical and epidemiological approaches ( (14), (15), (16) ). Key factors are often separated into lifestyle causes ( (17) ), and social determinants( (18), (19) ).

, (20) , (21) , (22) , (23) ). Commerce also has a role to play in a causation model which embraces an understanding of causation on a population scale.

Salt is a contributor to the physiology of BP. Its role in pathology is less clear. There are increasing levels of intake. This is correlated with increasing BP readings. Other nutrients have also been correlated. The role of salt in normal and abnormal BP control is established ( (2) , (24) , (25) , ). However there remain areas of contention( (26) ). There may be individuals with higher sensitivity to salt ( (27) ). Understanding the best approaches to reducing salt is difficult.

Is it best to get individuals to reduce intake( (28), (29) , (30) , (31) , (32) ), or for all of the food industry to reduce salt levels( (33) , (34) ).

### *Approach to change*

Lifestyle factors are contented. Whilst individual choice is involved. The range of choices available to individuals is limited by the nature of their society. A misapplication of lifestyle results in blaming individuals for the poor choices determined by their social and commercial environment. Iso (35) looks at how education may be effective in delivering change.

Instead of trying to change activity of millions of people can be more effective to change laws and policies once ( (36) , (37) , (38) , (39) , (40) ). These 'upstream' changes are relatively simple, and are much more effective though they can also be reversed ( (2) ). Cost is one of the causes of change as shown by Jones (21) using NDNS to identify the cost premium of a good diet as defined by UK dietary recommendation . Opposition sometimes comes from industry.

(37) and (23) showed that an analytical model can effectively demonstrate the effects of different policies on population health. They identify that reducing the effectiveness of a policy on salt in food leads to changes in BP and so on to NCD.

(41) identify the benefits of their strategy. They discuss the range of nation level approaches to reducing salt intake.


6. National Food Strategy, editor. National Food Strategy: part one.

*Internet*

. London: National Food Strategy,; 2020. Available from:  
<https://www.nationalfoodstrategy.org/partone/>



## UPF and BP



### *DAG of relationships of UPF*

## UPF

Nova classification looks at food beyond the nutrient level. It incorporates ideas relating to 'processing of food' But also includes availability and intake which are all affected. Increasing Category four or UPF is associated with increasing BP. Other approaches to food classification try to address more than the nutritional content. There is always conflict between commercial interests and restriction to the freedom to exploitation

Food classification has traditionally concentrated on nutritional analysis eg Nutriscore ( (42) , (43) , (44) , (45) ). The social aspect of food has been studied famously by Bourdieu ( (46) , (47) ). The effect of the social and commercial nature of food is partly accounted for in Monteiro's Nova classification. Dickie et al ( (48) , (43) ) tried to develop a system which took this idea further, but struggled to build a model which was any more effective.

Monteiro's initial explanation uses the concept of 'processing' ( (49) , (50) , (51) , (52) ). In a recent debate (53) and (54) discuss the concept of UPF and if it is valid or useful. This idea separates foods into categories based on the amount of processing that occurs before the food is consumed. Group one are foods which are in a natural state, as plucked from the tree. Group two is foods which are used in processes to modify group one foods. Group three initially was all other foods, but was soon separated into minimally processed foods, and group four the ultra-processed foods.

Explanations for the differential effect of these foods have developed as quickly as new ultra-processed foods have been developed. Is it due to nutritional content (55)? They are high in salt and sugar on average. Is it due to effects on satiety, or changes to appetite (56)? Do they taste better (57)? Is it due to being easy to buy, and easy to eat (58)? Is it because they don't require time and effort in the home to process? Is it because these processes are industrial? Is it because these foods contain 'chemicals' or new ingredients? These explanations move from nutritional through into social and commercial.

All these critiques are possible because of the social element to the classification. Colombaet (18) identifies that the intake of UPF has an inequality dimension and then (59) use modeling to describe a 'nutrition transition'.

Nutrition based classifications appear less socially divisive due to scientific isolation. They still contain elements of social factors. In particular, the way that foods are analysed can change their reported nutritional content. Eg a 'standard' food may be compared to a 'traditionally prepared' food. The first is prepared in a factory with control of its nutrition, the second by a home cook with limited access to nutrition modification technology.

Statements about the scheme often discuss the high salt and sugar content. Papers discussing the effect on physiology, and pathology in particular highlight these, but they do not back their statements with analysis. They do not show that the sodium, and UPF together increase the risk of CVD, or BP rise. This dissertation intends to address this gap

(60) show an approach between individual action and changing laws. This approach would target those most at risk due to negative social determinants. It does move into the realm of coercion of those 'making the wrong choices' into making better choices.

### Increasing UPF

Many studies show the increasing role of UPF within the diet. Mertens (61) and ni Mhurchu (62) show how UPF are being eaten in ever greater quantities across Europe but especially across the UK.

Wang (58) identifies increasing consumption in US youths, D'Avila (63) also identifies that increasingly upf are the key source of energy in adolescents. Gupta (64) explores the role of youth, identifying the peculiar age distribution of UPF intake.

Rauber (56) look instead at free sugar intake.

### UPF and increased intake

Webster (65) and niMurchu (62) identify the amount of salt in ultraprocessed foods. Vargas (66) concentrates on sodium and potassium using the Mexican national health and nutrition survey.

Sugars are the focus for Rauber (56), particularly free sugar intake.

Armendariz (67) look at how the retail food environment in Mexican cities has changed and how it affects BP.

## UPF and Ill Health

(61), (68), (69), (55), and (70) explore how UPF are associated with poor health. Whilst this is primarily metabolic pathology they do often mention BP. (71) comprehensively reviews UPF and metabolic health.

(72) try to identify ill health in young people associated with the increasing use of UPF.

Hodge (73) dedicated an edition of 'Public Health Nutrition' to this question

(25)

## *obesity*

The link to obesity is perhaps more direct. Munoz (74) looked at Mexican school age children. Li (75) looked at adults in China. Rauber (70) used the NDNS study to look at obesity in the UK.

## *diabetes and cardiometabolic syndromes*

Given the effects on obesity and the increase of energy intake the connection to diabetes and cardiometabolic syndromes has been the subject of more papers.

Aguiar (76) concentrates on diabetes only. Li (77) uses a national study to link UPF with diabetes in China.

de Miranda Renata Costa (78) identifies the effect on metabolic health. Martinez (79) connects the dietary share of UPF in the US population. Tavares (80) doing the same in Brazilian adolescents.

dos Santos (81) identifies this as cardiometabolic health and provides a systematic review (69). Goodman et al (82) explore this in Venezuelan adults. Vilela (83) give a '...prospective approach to childhood'.

Some authors look how these metabolic effects lead to other conditions. For example Weinstein (84) with dementia. Gomez-Smith (85) identify a possible pathological explanation. Ivancovsky (86) connects NAFLD. Lee (87) connects these to CVD.

Colombet (19) connects these changes in metabolic syndrome with changes in socioeconomic inequalities again linking the nutritional identity of diet with its social aspects.


## *cancer*

(88) and separately (89) have identified a risk of colorectal cancer.

## *ckd*

Kityo (90) identifies the effect on the kidneys. Identifying the diverse effects of UPF and possibly also another contributory cause of BP changes.

## UPF BP and Salt



### *DAG of relationships explored by analysis*

What is not known is how UPF cause BP. Suter (91) asked Is it nutrient based? In which case is this mediated by Salt? Is it other factors such as the food sales environment as explored by Goncalves (92) ? This study looks only at if Na is part of the causal pathway The thesis is that UPF is more of a risk than the salt it contains

Many studies use quite carefully constructed categories to achieve significant results.

The role of UPF in BP is described in a number of papers. Wang (93) delivers a meta analysis and systematic review. This identifies the best primary research and gives an odds ratio. Scaranni (94) and de Deus Mendonca (95) deliver key primary studies in specific populations with Shim (96) providing a Korean perspective. Oliveira (72) looks at the effect in children, Rezende (97) with adolescents.

Lima (98) reviewed already hypertensive individuals.

These papers answer to a connection between UPF and Hypertension. They leave the next obvious question to brief speculation and future research. Their offer is that UPF are high in Salt and sugars. The question is dropped, the focus elsewhere.

smiljenac (99) and tzelfa (100) both look at how UPF affect the vasculature which may be part of the pathway to BP.

## Literature review Conclusion

The literature review identified and analysed a range of literature across the field. Key points being that CVD is a significant NCD, and has links with Na and UPF. These links are often described in different paradigms. This study aims to cross link these paradigms looking at how Na and UPF interact and looking to understand from a positivist approach what effects UPF have within the positivist paradigm. At the same time knowing and accepting that effects of UPF in this paradigm are a subset of the total effect. Whilst also understanding that Na in its nutritional paradigm similarly projects into the other paradigm.

## Method

### Introduction

This section takes the research question and explains how the data is used to answer the question.

There will be a description of the study and data collection. Then a section on governance and ethics in this project.


Data analysis starts with the relevant variables being identified and extracted. Some data may need to be recalculated or to be processed to make a more useable form. The population will be reviewed. Then there is consideration of groups to be excluded.

There is a description of the data. The second analysis section compares the data across the annual cohorts. The next analysis section involves using linear regression to identify correlations. Firstly, between the BP and each of the key variables. Then between other pairs of key variables.

Multivariable regression models are then generated. These models are examined to identify the relative importance of the different variables in developing an optimal model and what these models tell us about the relationship between our variables. A summary and conclusion will bring all these together.

### Research Question

What proportion of the association between blood pressure (SBP) and UPF intake can be explained by the changes in salt intake in England between 2008 and 2019?



The question can be split into parts, What was intake of salt between 2008 and 2019? What was intake of UPF between 2008 and 2019? What was BP between 2008 and 2019? Did each of these change over that time and how? Did the changes in any one affect any other? What are the sizes of the changes? Which element was most important in these changes?

All of these questions look for numbers as answers.

Answering the question starts with collecting a sample of participants. Measurements are taken, and then collated. The collected numbers are then compared in different ways to answer each part of the question.

## National Dietary and Nutritional Survey

This survey is a collaboration between government departments responsible for health and for food production. They have engaged academic partners to deliver reports on diet and nutrition across the United Kingdom. The study is designed to be representative across the whole area.

### Study design

This is a rolling cohort study which each year selects a new cohort of participants. The sample is approximately 1000 per year with 50% adults. The design has a random selection across postal units (psu). This is stratified to ensure a representative sample across the four nations and across regions within those countries. The sample is also representative for age and sex.

Having taken up the study, participants complete a 4 day food diary, and have an interview with a nurse which includes taking several measurements. Weighting is given for each annual survey to enable comparison across the years taking account for alterations in uptake and response completion.

### NDNS Dataset

The data from the NDNS study contains items about each individual, and their household. It contains a table with each item of food as recorded in their diary. There is a table with the overall intake of each of a large range of nutrients for the whole period. This is calculated from the diary using nutritional tables which are published as part of the dataset. The dataset is available via the UK national Data service for research purposes.

NDNS began before Monteiro's processing based classification, Nova, was developed. There is no record of Nova food type in NDNS. This has been calculated from the food descriptions. I have used a table from Rauber et al (70) for Nova values in NDNS.

### University Research Governance and Ethical Review

The research has been carried out under the University governance. A proposal was discussed and agreed within the public health department. The need for ethical review was considered using the university research tool. The fact that the data is anonymised and there was no contact with participants means that there is minimal risk of harm to research participants. The initial proposal and a certificate from the ethics department are in the appendices.

Other ethical issues include data custodianship ensuring that the rights of the owners of the data and of the participants are still considered as part of the process of analysis and dissemination of the research.

Issues around the power structures which lead to privilege one research project or proposal over another are considered more in the positionality section.

### Data Processing

The storage of the data is in keeping with the research governance agreements of the University and the Data set owners. The data is read from its files using 'r-studio' with the processing being carried out using packages available from CRAN (101). I have used files which had been amalgamated into four batches. These are 2008-2012, 2013-2014, 2015-2016, 2017-2019.

Once the data labels are made consistent across the batches, weighting recalculation is done. This generates values which account for differences in population balance across the annual cohorts. These result from differences in compliance and uptake within and across the years.

The years are amalgamated and the nature of the variables is specified.



## Exclusions

The relationship between salt and systolic blood pressure may be different in individuals with pathologically high BP. Those taking BP controlling medications may have a different relationship to sodium and UPF. These patients were excluded from the main analysis, however this affected the sample size and skewed the male female ratio. Analysis was done with exclusion and this produced results in line with those presented, but of smaller magnitude. This additional analysis is not presented here.

## The data

The data is summarised for the key continuous variables by survey year cohort. The key variables are systolic BP (omsysval), UPF intake (Epcnt\_4) and Sodium intake (sodiummg). These variables are the ones which most relate to the research question. (**tbl-keydata?**) shows the data which has been balanced using the weightings provided by the NDNS research team.

There are a number of related variables in the dataset. A wider set of variables will be included in the background and tested to ensure they have no effect on the results to be demonstrated. These were chosen for relevance, reliability and practicality. These variables are ones which can also influence BP. They include Age, Sex, BMI, height and weight. Age at completion of education (educfinh), and IMD are also used.

The omsysval is a validated measurement with significant quality assessment within the dataset. Raw systolic BP values are present in the dataset but are made up of data with issues around quality. In particular the systolic BP values are assessed for the effects of exercise, temperature and ill health. The variable omsysval is a quality assured mean value which is reliable across the dataset.

The sodium value is one calculated from intake based on food diaries and standard food nutrient values. This only reflects standard foods and is the result of assumptions about the content being consistent. Serum sodium values are available for the early dataset, but not the later one. There are also values for 24 urinary sodium which is probably a better indicator of dietary sodium for parts of the dataset, but again these are not found in both time periods. Though they were part of a supplementary study.

The food diaries need processing to identify the UPF intake. Each person's food diary entries are assessed against the Nova food classification from Rauber. Then the weight and energy content of the day's food is calculated by Nova group. This is added to the intake for the other 3 days and the total intake by Nova group established.

The percentage of the total intake of energy (Epcnt\_4) is then calculated for each of the 4 Nova categories. Nova group 4 or UPF intake is used for the study.

Mean values for the data are displayed with a comparison for weighted values. The exposure variables are sodium intake (Sodiummg), and ultra processed food intake (Epcnt\_4). The outcome variable, the mean systolic blood pressure (omsysval, BP).

## Analysis of Change over Survey Years

The second phase of analysis shows how the key variables have changed over the survey years cohorts. This will show separately how the inputs and outputs have changed.

These are not the same participants so matched analysis, or time series analysis is not directly applicable.

Plots will be given to show the values in each of the available cohorts.

Other variables in the data are compared across to assess how the data changes. Statistical significance of changes in the data are shown by p.values with continuous data, and categorical data analysed using chi squared tables.

## Univariable Regression of key variables

Analysis of the correlation between BP and sodium intake, and then BP and UPF intake is done using linear regression. This will give an indicator of the direction, and strength of any relationship between the variables. There is also anova analysis to understand the statistical significance of these results. Comparison is also made with Age, and between each of the variables. This will show where significant relationships are present.

## Multiple Regression on Systolic BP (?age, ?Epcnt\_4)

Multivariable regression models are then developed to understand the interactions between variables and to develop a mathematical model of the relationship. The optimal model is one which best explains the pattern of data, but which also makes practical sense for the wider understanding of relationships. Assessment techniques try to understand the importance of including particular variables, and the form in which they are best included. Anova analysis here identifies how the addition of different variables changes the significance of other variables. This can suggest causative relationships. The resultant p.values help to establish the statistical significance of the results.

```
## The total effect of Age on UPF is identifiable controlling for:
## * {}
## The total effect of Age on Na is identifiable controlling for:
## * {}
## The total effect of Age on BP is identifiable controlling for:
## * {}
## The total effect of Age on NCD is identifiable controlling for:
## * {}
## The total effect of BP on NCD is identifiable controlling for:
## * {}
## The total effect of Na on BP is identifiable controlling for:
## { Age, UPF }
## The total effect of Na on NCD is identifiable controlling for:
## { Age, UPF }
## The total effect of Sex on UPF is identifiable controlling for:
## * {}
## The total effect of Sex on Na is identifiable controlling for:
```

```
## * {}  
## The total effect of Sex on BP is identifiable controlling for:  
## * {}  
## The total effect of Sex on NCD is identifiable controlling for:  
## * {}  
## The total effect of UPF on Na is identifiable controlling for:  
## { Age }  
## The total effect of UPF on BP is identifiable controlling for:  
## { Age, Sex }  
## The total effect of UPF on NCD is identifiable controlling for:  
## { Age, Sex }  
  
## BP NCD  
## * Age  
## * Na  
## * Sex  
## * UPF  
## UPF Na  
## * Sex
```

### AIC and sensitivity Analysis

This section compares models side by side using assessment techniques to identify the best way of describing the data. The 'best' in part is determined by whether a model is needed to predict more data, or just to understand the data available. Here it is about how best to describe the relationship between Na, UPF, and BP.

### Method Conclusion

This section has highlighted how the material for the study is brought together and how the governance and ethics fit with the data collection, processing and analysis to help us to derive the results which will be presented in the next section.

## Results

### Results Introduction

Analysing the data from NDNS involves following the method. The presented results are arranged to support explaining how the research question is answered by the data.

The data used is described, explaining how it is structured. The data analysis is then presented using tables and graphs to support the argument. These most frequently present details of the statistical significance of the proposed regression model.

The results section will be further interpreted in the discussion section.

### The Data

This first table (**tbl-keydata?**) highlights the variables which most relate to the research question from the years 2008-2019. These are weighted values analysed using a software package called 'survey' (102) . Other software is also used and a complete list included in appendix 3.

The tables presented by NDNS have been amalgamated and new weighting values calculated which enable comparison of data from separate tables.

There are several variables chosen. The number of participants in each year, 'N', is presented. The mean sodium intake in milligrams (Sodiummg) is next. 'Epcnt\_4' is the percent value of energy derived from Nova category 4 foods, or UPF, out of the whole daily energy intake. The mean Systolic BP value is one which has been validated within the NDNS study it is given in mmHg.

These values are normally distributed continuous variables. The mean is representative.

The numbers seem to be smaller towards the end of the series, for Sodium intake, UPF intake (Epcnt\_4) and for systolic BP. Each cohort has been adjusted to be comparable using weighting values given by the study coordinators. However they are separate cohorts of separate participants with no linear association between them. It can be seen that there are lower values for all of the variables in the later groups.

Characteristic	1, N = 1,45 9 <sup>1</sup>	2, N = 1,42 9 <sup>1</sup>	3, N = 1,37 2 <sup>1</sup>	4, N = 1,43 2 <sup>1</sup>	5, N = 1,48 5 <sup>1</sup>	6, N = 1,36 2 <sup>1</sup>	7, N = 1,44 2 <sup>1</sup>	8, N = 1,40 5 <sup>1</sup>	9, N = 1,44 4 <sup>1</sup>	10, N = 1,48 1 <sup>1</sup>	11, N = 1,34 5 <sup>1</sup>
Sodium (mg) diet only	2,25 7 (87 8)	2,20 8 (82 7)	2,18 4 (83 0)	2,07 7 (79 9)	2,01 0 (74 2)	1,98 8 (76 5)	1,98 7 (79 8)	1,94 5 (82 2)	1,92 4 (77 5)	1,89 2 (724 )	1,92 9 (762 )
Epcnt_4	49 (14)	50 (15)	49 (15)	49 (15)	48 (15)	50 (16)	47 (15)	45 (16)	45 (16)	45 (15)	47 (16)


Characteristic	1, N = 1,459 <sup>1</sup>	2, N = 1,429 <sup>1</sup>	3, N = 1,372 <sup>1</sup>	4, N = 1,432 <sup>1</sup>	5, N = 1,485 <sup>1</sup>	6, N = 1,362 <sup>1</sup>	7, N = 1,442 <sup>1</sup>	8, N = 1,405 <sup>1</sup>	9, N = 1,444 <sup>1</sup>	10, N = 1,481 <sup>1</sup>	11, N = 1,345 <sup>1</sup>
(D) Omron valid mean systolic BP	125 (19)	124 (16)	124 (18)	124 (16)	122 (17)	120 (18)	124 (19)	121 (18)	121 (17)	122 (16)	0 (0)
Unknown	609	639	604	654	551	574	588	541	562	529	1,345

<sup>1</sup>Mean (SD)


### Analysis of Change across cohorts

These key variables are now compared between the cohorts.


(fig-upf-and-survey-year?) shows the energy from UPF in percent (Epcnt\_4) against cohort number. This plot shows that the ranges largely overlap. No visible difference is clear on this plot.



*Plot of the percentage of energy from UPF in each annual cohort showing an apparent overlap*



*Plot of the intake of Na in mg in each annual cohort showing an apparent overlap*



*Plot of the BP in mmHg in each annual cohort showing an apparent overlap*

The sodium intake (**fig-Na-and-survey-year?**), and the Systolic BP (**fig-BP-and-survey-year?**) do not show an obvious change across the cohorts.

Group	Characteristic	Beta	95% CI <sup>1</sup>	p-value
Sodium in mg	NDNS Survey year	-36	-43, -30	<0.001
Percent Energy UPF	NDNS Survey year	-0.41	-0.53, -0.29	<0.001
Systolic BP	NDNS Survey year	-0.37	-0.56, -0.19	<0.001

<sup>1</sup>CI = Confidence Interval

(**tbl-Key-Variables-by-Survey-year?**) compares mean sodium, UPF and systolic BP values across the individual cohorts. This uses general linear regression modelling, with cohort 1 as a comparator for the other cohorts. The differences and the beta variable do not depend on there being a linear or ordinal arrangement between the cohorts.

This shows that for sodium there is a beta of -36.2767894 with confidence limits of -43, -30; For UPF beta is -0.4068208 and confidence limits -0.53, -0.29; and for BP -0.3743859 and -0.56, -0.19. Each beta value is negative which means that these values in each cohort is largely below that of the first reference year. The confidence intervals do not pass unity and so these results are statistically significant.

These corresponding negative beta values do not mean that there is a correlation between these variables. This will be examined later.

#### other variables compared across cohorts

This section shows how variables are distributed between the survey annual cohorts. The NDNS dataset was weighted to keep many of these, but not all, the same between datasets. Continuous variables are assessed using linear regression and categorical variables using chi squared tests to give p.values.

This table (**tbl-continuous-data?**) suggests that there is a significant difference in the bmi of the cohorts.

Group	Characteristic	Beta	95% CI <sup>1</sup>	p-value
Age	NDNS Survey year	0.10	-0.06, 0.25	0.2
BMI	NDNS Survey year	-0.09	-0.13, -0.04	<0.001

<sup>1</sup>CI = Confidence Interval

There is a difference in the age of finishing education.


The differences in qimd, are not statistically significant.

These values identify a significant difference in the number of vegetarians


Variable	p.value <sup>1</sup>
Sex	0.5921
Education	0.0000
IMD	0.2208
Vegetarian	0.0245

<sup>1</sup>Chi Squared for categorical data

### Analysis of Key variables by Sex







*The difference in Systolic BP in mmHg between male and female showing a slightly lower value in the female cohort*

In each graph there is little difference apparent, though perhaps the female plot is slightly lower.


Group	Characteristic	Beta	95% CI <sup>1</sup>	p-value
Sodium in mg	Sex			
	Male	—	—	
	Female	-485	-523, -446	<0.001
Percent Energy UPF	Sex			
	Male	—	—	
	Female	-2.0	-2.7, -1.3	<0.001
Systolic BP	Sex			
	Male	—	—	

Group	Characteristic	Beta	95% CI <sup>1</sup>	p-value
	Female	-5.5	-6.6, -4.5	<0.001


<sup>1</sup>CI = Confidence Interval

(tbl-Key-Variables-by-Sex?) shows that for all these variables there is a lower beta coefficient for females. In each case the lower gradient of the relationship between the variable and Sex is statistically significant as the confidence intervals do not cross one.


### Analysis of Key Variables by Age



*The difference in Systolic BP in mmHg between Age groups showing a sttrong overlap*



*The difference in UPF intake in % between Age groups showing a sttrong overlap*



*The difference in Sodium intake in mg between Age groups showing a sttrong overlap*

Group	Characteristic	Beta	95% CI <sup>1</sup>	p-value
Sodium in mg	agegad2			
	16-18	—	—	
	19-34	151	70, 232	<0.001
	35-49	21	-53, 96	0.6
	50-64	-110	-181, -39	0.002
	65+ years	-263	-331, -195	<0.001
Percent Energy UPF	agegad2			
	16-18	—	—	
	19-34	-8.1	-9.6, -6.6	<0.001
	35-49	-13	-14, -12	<0.001
	50-64	-16	-18, -15	<0.001
	65+ years	-15	-17, -14	<0.001
Systolic BP	agegad2			
	16-18	—	—	
	19-34	2.9	1.4, 4.4	<0.001
	35-49	6.7	5.2, 8.2	<0.001
	50-64	14	12, 16	<0.001
	65+ years	20	18, 22	<0.001

<sup>1</sup>CI = Confidence Interval

(tbl-Key-Variables-by-age?) is interesting in that it shows that whilst the BP goes up across the age categories, the UPF intake decreases. The changes in sodium content are

particularly interesting as they show that the older age groups have much lower sodium intake, but the highest sodium intake in in the second group, with the first and third being statistically no different.

### Analysis of Key Variables by Place

Group	Characteristic	Beta	95% CI <sup>1</sup>	p-value
Sodium in mg	relevel(gor, ref = "North West")			
	North West	—	—	
	North East	-91	-208, 27	0.13
	Yorkshire & The Humber	-61	-150, 28	0.2
	East Midlands	28	-70, 125	0.6
	West Midlands	4.0	-93, 101	>0.9
	East of England	-14	-107, 79	0.8
	London	-143	-237, -49	0.003
	South East	-65	-148, 18	0.13
	South West	-31	-117, 56	0.5
	Wales	-66	-156, 23	0.15
	Scotland	39	-45, 122	0.4
	Northern Ireland	-19	-100, 62	0.6
Percent Energy UPF	relevel(gor, ref = "North West")			
	North West	—	—	
	North East	1.2	-0.61, 3.1	0.2
	Yorkshire & The Humber	0.93	-0.87, 2.7	0.3
	East Midlands	0.36	-1.6, 2.3	0.7


Group	Characteristic	Beta	95% CI <sup>1</sup>	p-value
Systolic BP	West Midlands	1.6	0.02, 3.3	0.047
	East of England	-0.23	-2.0, 1.5	0.8
	London	-4.7	-6.5, -2.9	<0.001
	South East	-1.1	-2.7, 0.47	0.2
	South West	-1.6	-3.4, 0.15	0.074
	Wales	0.26	-1.4, 1.9	0.8
	Scotland	1.5	-0.20, 3.1	0.084
	Northern Ireland	2.8	1.3, 4.3	<0.001
	relevel(gor, ref = "North West")			
	North West	—	—	
	North East	1.6	-1.4, 4.5	0.3
	Yorkshire & The Humber	0.14	-2.4, 2.7	>0.9
	East Midlands	0.61	-2.2, 3.5	0.7
	West Midlands	-1.1	-3.7, 1.6	0.4
	East of England	-1.3	-3.9, 1.4	0.3
	London	-5.5	-8.0, -3.1	<0.001
	South East	-2.1	-4.6, 0.40	0.10
	South West	0.28	-2.5, 3.1	0.8
	Wales	1.0	-1.4, 3.5	0.4
	Scotland	-1.3	-3.9, 1.2	0.3

Group	Characteristic	Beta	95% CI <sup>1</sup>	p-value
	Northern Ireland	-0.86	-3.1, 1.4	0.5

<sup>1</sup>CI = Confidence Interval


(tbl-Key-Variables-by-place?) shows that in comparison to the North West only London has a statistically significant negative gradient in salt intake. The UPF intake is higher in Northern Ireland and the West Midlands, and lower in London. The BP is lower in London only.

### Paired Regression of key variables on each other




### DAG of relationships explored by analysis

Simple linear regression equations look for the relationship between the BP, and the independent variable. For these I am looking at the whole dataset. First (**fig-Na-by-BP?**)




Then (**fig-BP-and-UPF?**)



and lastly (**fig-UPF-and-Na-plot?**)





The plots appear to show limited correlation. First, omsysval is compared to EnergykJ, then sodiummg.

Group	Characteristic	Beta	95% CI <sup>1</sup>	p-value
BP/Na	Sodium (mg) diet only	0.00	0.00, 0.00	<0.001
UPF/Na	Sodium (mg) diet only	0.00	0.00, 0.00	<0.001
UPF/bp	Epcnt_4	-0.21	-0.24, -0.17	<0.001
UPF/Age	Epcnt_4	-0.46	-0.49, -0.44	<0.001
Age/BP	Age	0.43	0.40, 0.45	<0.001
Age/Na	Age	0.75	0.08, 1.4	0.028

<sup>1</sup>CI = Confidence Interval

The regression model for Sodium against BP shows that there is no linear relationship between Sodium and BP in this table (**tbl-univariable-regressions?**). UPF compared to Na also shows a zero beta value indicating no linear relationship.

UPF does show a negative relationship with age, which is statistically significant. There is also a negative relationship with Age, again statistically significant.

Age has a relationship with BP with a statistically significant positive gradient. There is also a positive relationship with Na, which is also statistically significant to the 95% level.

<b>Group</b>	<b>Characteristic</b>	<b>Beta</b>	<b>95% CI<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>p-value</b>
BP/bmi	(D) Valid BMI	0.95	0.83, 1.1	<0.001
BP/Agg1	agegad1			
	16-24	—	—	
	25-49	3.5	2.0, 4.9	<0.001
	50-64	12	10, 14	<0.001
	65+ years	18	16, 20	<0.001
BP/ed	educfinh			
	1	—	—	
	2	15	6.8, 23	<0.001
	3	21	17, 25	<0.001
	4	16	14, 19	<0.001
	5	8.8	6.4, 11	<0.001
	6	9.7	6.8, 13	<0.001
	7	7.4	4.9, 10	<0.001
	8	6.7	4.5, 8.9	<0.001
UPF/bmi	(D) Valid BMI	-0.26	-0.31, -0.21	<0.001
UPF/age	agegad1			
	16-24	—	—	

<b>Group</b>	<b>Characteristic</b>	<b>Beta</b>	<b>95% CI<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>p-value</b>
UPF/ed	25-49	-7.4	-8.9, -6.0	<0.001
	50-64	-12	-14, -11	<0.001
	65+ years	-11	-13, -9.7	<0.001
	educfinh			
	1	—	—	
	2	-19	-29, -8.4	<0.001
	3	-8.1	-11, -5.2	<0.001
	4	-7.3	-10, -4.6	<0.001
	5	-5.3	-7.9, -2.8	<0.001
	6	-6.7	-9.4, -3.9	<0.001
Na/bmi	7	-7.7	-10, -5.0	<0.001
	8	-11	-13, -8.3	<0.001
Na/bmi	(D) Valid BMI	15	13, 18	<0.001
Na/Agg	agegad1			
	16-24	—	—	
	25-49	27	-60, 113	0.5
	50-64	-169	-254, -83	<0.001
	65+ years	-322	-406, -237	<0.001
Na/ed	educfinh			
	1	—	—	

Group	Characteristic	Beta	95% CI <sup>1</sup>	p-value
2		-697	-1,168, -226	0.004
3		-333	-479, -187	<0.001
4		-222	-357, -87	0.001
5		-129	-262, 4.5	0.058
6		-181	-327, -36	0.014
7		-138	-280, 5.0	0.059
8		-143	-277, -8.5	0.037

<sup>1</sup>CI = Confidence Interval

In conclusion the linear regression models show that there are correlations between the systolic BP and energy intake only. The next section will examine how this situation changes as variables interact in more complex models.

### Complex Modelling using Multi variable regression

This section uses models of several variables to try to highlight the contributions of each variable. The complexity in these models is much less than that of reality. The intention is to work towards an optimal model. This ideally mathematically describes the situation. In reality there may be a set of models with no single one predominating.

In particular the research question asks about the relationship between Sodium and UPF intake with BP. The models will reflect this question by looking to include or exclude particular variables. Comparisons between these models are then made using sensitivity analysis, identifying how sensitive the model is to sodium, or other factors

#### Regression on BP

Characteristic	No sodium or UPF			Sodium only			Epcnt only			Sodium and UPF		
	Beta	95% CI <sup>1</sup>	p-value	Beta	95% CI <sup>1</sup>	p-value	Beta	95% CI <sup>1</sup>	p-value	Beta	95% CI <sup>1</sup>	p-value
Sex												
Male	—	—		—	—		—	—		—	—	
Female	-	-8.0,	<0.	-	-7.8,	<0.	-	-8.0,	<0.	-	-7.7,	<0.

	No sodium or UPF			Sodium only			Epcnt only			Sodium and UPF		
Characteristic	Beta	95% CI <sup>1</sup>	p-value	Beta	95% CI <sup>1</sup>	p-value	Beta	95% CI <sup>1</sup>	p-value	Beta	95% CI <sup>1</sup>	p-value
	6.6	-5.3	001	6.3	-4.9	001	6.7	-5.3	001	6.3	-4.9	001
(D) Valid BMI	0.36	0.19, 0.54	<0.001	0.36	0.19, 0.54	<0.001	0.36	0.19, 0.54	<0.001	0.36	0.19, 0.54	<0.001
agead2												
16-18	—	—		—	—		—	—		—	—	
19-34	1.8	-0.09, 3.6	0.062	1.7	-0.20, 3.5	0.081	1.6	-0.28, 3.5	0.095	1.4	-0.47, 3.3	0.14
35-49	5.2	3.1, 7.2	<0.001	5.2	3.1, 7.2	<0.001	4.9	2.7, 7.0	<0.001	4.8	2.6, 6.9	<0.001
50-64	11	8.4, 13	<0.001	11	8.4, 13	<0.001	10	7.8, 13	<0.001	10	7.8, 13	<0.001
65+ years	18	15, 20	<0.001	18	15, 21	<0.001	17	14, 20	<0.001	17	14, 20	<0.001
educfinh												
1	—	—		—	—		—	—		—	—	
2	4.8	-1.9, 12	0.2	5.1	-1.4, 12	0.13	4.5	-2.3, 11	0.2	4.7	-1.9, 11	0.2
3	6.2	1.1, 11	0.017	6.3	1.3, 11	0.014	6.2	1.1, 11	0.017	6.3	1.3, 11	0.014
4	2.3	-1.2, 5.9	0.2	2.4	-1.2, 5.9	0.2	2.3	-1.2, 5.9	0.2	2.4	-1.2, 5.9	0.2
5	0.81	-2.0, 3.6	0.6	0.84	-2.0, 3.6	0.6	0.76	-2.1, 3.6	0.6	0.77	-2.0, 3.6	0.6
6	0.99	-2.5, 4.5	0.6	1.1	-2.4, 4.6	0.6	0.90	-2.6, 4.4	0.6	0.95	-2.6, 4.5	0.6
7	2.2	-0.77, 5.2	0.15	2.2	-0.78, 5.2	0.15	2.1	-0.91, 5.1	0.2	2.0	-0.96, 5.0	0.2
8	0.	-2.4,	0.8	0.	-2.3,	0.8	0.	-2.6,	>0.	0.	-2.6,	>0.

	No sodium or UPF			Sodium only			Epcnt only			Sodium and UPF		
Characteristic	Beta	95% CI <sup>1</sup>	p-value	Beta	95% CI <sup>1</sup>	p-value	Beta	95% CI <sup>1</sup>	p-value	Beta	95% CI <sup>1</sup>	p-value
EIMD_2010 _quintile	34	3.1		37	3.1		14	2.9	9	12	2.9	9
1	—	—		—	—		—	—		—	—	
2	0.30	-1.7, 2.3	0.8	0.29	-1.7, 2.3	0.8	0.29	-1.7, 2.3	0.8	0.27	-1.7, 2.3	0.8
3	0.49	-1.6, 2.6	0.6	0.42	-1.7, 2.5	0.7	0.49	-1.6, 2.6	0.6	0.41	-1.7, 2.5	0.7
4	0.24	-2.1, 2.6	0.8	0.24	-2.1, 2.6	0.8	0.26	-2.1, 2.6	0.8	0.25	-2.1, 2.6	0.8
5	-0.34	-2.5, 1.8	0.8	-0.33	-2.5, 1.8	0.8	-0.30	-2.5, 1.9	0.8	-0.27	-2.4, 1.9	0.8
Sodium (mg) diet only				0.00	0.00, 0.00	0.3				0.00	0.00, 0.00	0.2
Epcnt_4							-0.02	-0.07, 0.02	0.3	-0.03	-0.08, 0.01	0.2

<sup>1</sup>CI = Confidence Interval

This first set of models are in (**tbl-multivariable-outputs-bp?**) and look at what happens when regression against BP is used.

The first model, labelled “No sodium or UPF” of this set looks at the relationships between BP and some of the background variables (Age and Sex, education and IMD) all of which may have an effect on BP. This model excludes UPF and Na.

The second model, “Sodium Only”, shows that sodium has a zero beta coefficient, but that this is not statistically significant. It also shows minimal effects on the other variables in the model.

The model, “UPF only”, is in the third set of columns. Here there is a negative beta coefficient, but the confidence intervals cross one. This indicates that the effect is statistically uncertain. Again there are minimal effects on the other variables.

The last set of columns, “Sodium and UPF”, shows that when combined there is still little effect identified statistically, on each other or on the other variables.

Using the AIC statistic for each model gives another way of understanding the comparative effects. The subsequent (**tbl-AIC-comparison-bp?**) shows the size of the effect relating to sodium. The lowest scored model is the optimal model. Here that is “UPF only”. Though the size of the difference is tiny.

Model	AIC
No sodium or UPF	21,982.14
Sodium only	21,982.31
Epcnt only	21,982.75
Sodium and UPF	21,982.10

#### simple set Regression on BP

	Sodium only			UPF only			Sodium and UPF		
Characteristic	Beta	95% CI <sup>1</sup>	P-value	Beta	95% CI <sup>1</sup>	P-value	Beta	95% CI <sup>1</sup>	P-value
Sodium (mg) diet only	0.00	0.00, 0.00	<0.001				0.00	0.00, 0.00	<0.001
agead2									
16-18	—	—		—	—		—	—	
19-34	2.6	1.1, 4.1	<0.001	3.0	1.4, 4.5	<0.001	2.4	0.91, 3.9	0.002
35-49	6.7	5.2, 8.2	<0.001	6.8	5.2, 8.4	<0.001	6.5	4.9, 8.0	<0.001
50-64	14	12, 16	<0.001	14	12, 16	<0.001	14	12, 16	<0.001
65+ years	20	18, 22	<0.001	20	18, 22	<0.001	20	18, 22	<0.001
Epcnt_4				0.01	-0.03, 0.05	0.7	-0.02	-0.06, 0.02	0.4

<sup>1</sup>CI = Confidence Interval

	Sodium only			UPF only			Sodium and UPF		
Characteristic	Beta	95% CI <sup>1</sup>	p-value	Beta	95% CI <sup>1</sup>	p-value	Beta	95% CI <sup>1</sup>	p-value
Model									AIC
Sodium only									44,383.55
UPF only									44,442.17
Sodium and UPF									44,384.23

This set of regressions (**tbl-multivariable-output-BPs?**) follows the pattern but omits the baseline as those variables are all excluded.

The AIC values (**tbl-AIC-comparison-AS?**) are all significantly higher, which may indicate that these models are actually less close to an accurate description of the source data.

The ‘best’ of these models is that with only sodium included. The UPF models both being further away from the lowest value.

#### Regression on Na

	No bp or UPF			BP only			Epcnt only			BP and UPF		
Characteristic	Beta	95% CI <sup>1</sup>	p-value	Beta	95% CI <sup>1</sup>	p-value	Beta	95% CI <sup>1</sup>	p-value	Beta	95% CI <sup>1</sup>	p-value
Sex												
Male	—	—		—	—		—	—		—	—	
Female	-558	-613, -502	<0.001	-570	-637, -503	<0.001	-537	-591, -483	<0.001	-50	-615, -486	<0.001
(D) Valid BMI	3.1	-1.1, 7.3	0.15	1.1	-5.1, 7.2	0.7	2.4	-1.7, 6.5	0.3	-0.15	-6.2, 5.9	>0.9
agead2												
16-18	—	—		—	—		—	—		—	—	



	No bp or UPF			BP only			Epcnt only			BP and UPF		
Characteristic	B et a	95% CI <sup>1</sup>	p- val ue	B et a	95% CI <sup>1</sup>	p- val ue	B et a	95% CI <sup>1</sup>	p- val ue	B et a	95% CI <sup>1</sup>	p- val ue
19-34	1 9 0	85, 294	<0. 001	1 9 6	52, 340	0.0 08	2 7 0	165, 376	<0. 001	2 7 5	128, 422	<0. 001
35-49	2 5	-77, 128	0.6	7. 8	- 131, 147	>0. 9	1 6 2	59, 265	0.0 02	1 4 1	2.2, 279	0.0 47
50-64	- 1 1 0	- 211, -8.5	0.0 34	- 1 0 4	- 240, 31	0.1 3	7 2	-32, 176	0.2	7 5	-66, 216	0.3
65+ years	- 2 2 4	- 326, -122	<0. 001	- 2 1 4	- 364, -63	0.0 05	- 3 8	- 145, 69	0.5	- 2 8	- 182, 127	0.7
educfinh												
1	—	—		—	—		—	—		—	—	
2	- 5 7 4	- 1,08 9, - 60	0.0 29	- 5 7 1	- 1,13 0, - 12	0.0 45	- 4 5 9	- 921, 3.6	0.0 52	- 4 1 6	- 878, 46	0.0 78
3	- 8 4	- 274, 106	0.4	- 2 2 0	- 477, 38	0.0 94	- 1 2 1	- 305, 63	0.2	- 2 0 8	- 462, 47	0.1 1
4	- 0. 2 9	- 165, 165	>0. 9	- 3 3	- 249, 182	0.8	- 3 4	- 191, 124	0.7	- 3 1	- 236, 173	0.8
5	1 3	- 146, 172	0.9	- 4 3	- 245, 159	0.7	- 1. 0	- 153, 151	>0. 9	- 2 0	- 213, 173	0.8
6	- 1 4	- 187, 159	0.9	- 1 2 7	- 361, 108	0.3	- 2 6	- 192, 140	0.8	- 8 7	- 308, 135	0.4
7	2	- 139,	0.7	1 2	- 198,	>0. 9	3 8	- 120,	0.6	6 5	- 135,	0.5

	No bp or UPF			BP only			Epcnt only			BP and UPF		
Characteristic	B et a	95% CI <sup>1</sup>	p- val ue	B et a	95% CI <sup>1</sup>	p- val ue	B et a	95% CI <sup>1</sup>	p- val ue	B et a	95% CI <sup>1</sup>	p- val ue
	8	194			222			196			265	
8	- 2 1	- 182, 140	0.8	- 5 8	- 272, 156	0.6	2 2	- 131, 175	0.8	2 9	- 176, 234	0.8
EIMD_2010_qui ntile												
1	—	—		—	—		—	—		—	—	
2	0. 7 2	-68, 70	>0. 9	1 7	-69, 103	0.7	3. 9	-65, 73	>0. 9	2 1	-64, 105	0.6
3	7 1	-13, 156	0.1 0	1 1 9	21, 217	0.0 17	7 1	-13, 154	0.1 0	1 1 9	22, 216	0.0 17
4	2 2	-56, 100	0.6	6. 0	-96, 107	>0. 9	6. 6	-69, 82	0.9	- 0. 2 9	- 100, 100	>0. 9
5	- 3 9	- 131, 53	0.4	- 1 9	- 152, 113	0.8	- 5 7	- 148, 35	0.2	- 3 8	- 171, 96	0.6
(D) Omron valid mean systolic BP				1. 3	-1.1, 3.7	0.3				1. 6	- 0.73 , 3.8	0.2
Epcnt_4							1 0	8.4, 13	<0. 001	1 1	8.3, 14	<0. 001

<sup>1</sup>CI = Confidence Interval

Model	AIC
No bp or UPF	75,042.64
bp only	42,457.62
UPF only	74,872.48
bp and UPF	42,347.00

This set of models (**tbl-na-multivariable-outputs?**) follows the established pattern. Baseline, add variable one to baseline, add add variable two to baseline, and both variables.

This time variable one is BP, and variable two is UPF.

The baseline regression shows some changes from the previous baseline. The sex coefficient is still statistically significant. The bmi coefficient is not. The age pattern shows an increase in the second age group, but then clear reduction in subsequent ones . That with education and IMD is similar.

Introducing BP doesn't change the structure of the beta values, or the statistical significance, but the AIC value (**tbl-AIC-comparison-Na?**) changes significantly. There is clearly a strong effect of BP on the nature of the regressions. This is shown again when BP and UPF are included.

UPF now has a clear positive effect on the Na intake. When BP is included, despite its effect not being statistically significant, the model drops its AIC value again.

#### Regression on UPF

	No BP or Na			BP only			Na only			Na and BP		
Characteristic	B et a	95% CI <sup>1</sup>	p- val ue	B et a	95% CI <sup>1</sup>	p- val ue	B et a	95% CI <sup>1</sup>	p- val ue	B et a	95% CI <sup>1</sup>	p- val ue
Sex												
Male	—	—		—	—		—	—		—	—	
Female	- 2. 0	-3.0, -1.0	<0. 001	- 1. 8	-3.0, -0.55	0.0 05	- 0. 0	-1.1, 1.0	>0. 9	0. 3	- 0.98, 1.8	0.6
(D) Valid BMI	0. 0 7	0.00 , 0.14	0.0 56	0. 1 1	0.01, 0.21	0.0 29	0. 0 6	- 0.01, 0.13	0.1 0	0. 1 1	0.01, 0.20	0.0 30
agegad2												
16-18	—	—		—	—		—	—		—	—	
19-34	- 7. 7	-9.7, -5.6	<0. 001	- 7. 2	-9.8, -4.5	<0. 001	- 8. 3	-10, -6.3	<0. 001	- 7. 9	-11, -5.3	<0. 001
35-49	- 1 3	-15, -11	<0. 001	- 1 2	-15, -9.5	<0. 001	- 1 3	-15, -11	<0. 001	- 1 2	-15, -9.6	<0. 001
50-64	-	-19,	<0.	-	-19,	<0.	-	-19,	<0.	-	-18,	<0.

	No BP or Na			BP only			Na only			Na and BP		
Characteristic	B et a	95% CI <sup>1</sup>	p- val ue	B et a	95% CI <sup>1</sup>	p- val ue	B et a	95% CI <sup>1</sup>	p- val ue	B et a	95% CI <sup>1</sup>	p- val ue
	1 7	-15	001	1 6	-14	001	1 7	-15	001	1 6	-13	001
65+ years	- 1 8	-20, -16	<0. 001	- 1 7	-20, -14	<0. 001	- 1 7	-19, -15	<0. 001	- 1 6	-19, -13	<0. 001
educfinh												
1	—	—		—	—		—	—		—	—	
2	- 1 1	-21, - 0.91	0.0 33	- 1 4	-27, - 0.84	0.0 37	- 9. 0	-18, 0.20	0.0 55	- 1 2	-24, - 0.13	0.0 47
3	3. 6	- 0.38 , 7.5	0.0 76	- 1. 1	-6.3, 4.1	0.7	3. 8	0.03, 7.7	0.0 48	- 0. 2 6	-5.4, 4.8	>0. 9
4	3. 2	- 0.22 , 6.6	0.0 67	- 0. 1 8	-4.3, 4.0	>0. 9	3. 2	- 0.08, 6.4	0.0 56	- 0. 0 6	-4.0, 3.9	>0. 9
5	1. 3	-1.9, 4.5	0.4	- 2. 1	-5.9, 1.8	0.3	1. 3	-1.8, 4.4	0.4	- 1. 9	-5.6, 1.8	0.3
6	1. 1	-2.4, 4.6	0.5	- 3. 6	-7.9, 0.59	0.0 91	1. 2	-2.2, 4.5	0.5	- 3. 2	-7.1, 0.82	0.1 2
7	- 0. 9 6	-4.3, 2.4	0.6	- 4. 8	-8.8, - 0.82	0.0 18	- 1. 1	-4.3, 2.1	0.5	- 4. 8	-8.6, -1.1	0.0 12
8	- 4. 1	-7.4, - 0.84	0.0 14	- 7. 9	-12, -3.9	<0. 001	- 4. 0	-7.2, - 0.92	0.0 11	- 7. 6	-11, -3.9	<0. 001
EIMD_2010_qui ntile												
1	—	—		—	—		—	—		—	—	

	No BP or Na			BP only			Na only			Na and BP		
Characteristic	B et a	95% CI <sup>1</sup>	p- val ue	B et a	95% CI <sup>1</sup>	p- val ue	B et a	95% CI <sup>1</sup>	p- val ue	B et a	95% CI <sup>1</sup>	p- val ue
2	- 0. 3 0	-1.6, 0.97	0.6	- 0. 3 3	-1.9, 1.3	0.7	- 0. 3 1	-1.6, 0.98	0.6	- 0. 4 0	-2.0, 1.2	0.6
3	0. 0 7	-1.3, 1.5	>0. 9	0. 0 0	-1.9, 1.9	>0. 9	- 0. 1 8	-1.6, 1.2	0.8	- 0. 4 6	-2.3, 1.4	0.6
4	1. 5	- 0.04 , 3.0	0.0 57	0. 5 7	-1.4, 2.5	0.6	1. 4	- 0.07, 2.8	0.0 63	0. 5 5	-1.3, 2.4	0.6
5	1. 7	0.15 , 3.2	0.0 32	1. 7	- 0.38, 3.7	0.1 1	1. 8	0.28, 3.4	0.0 20	1. 7	- 0.36, 3.8	0.1 0
(D) Omron valid mean systolic BP				- 0. 0 2	- 0.06, 0.02	0.3				- 0. 0 3	- 0.06, 0.01	0.2
Sodium (mg) diet only							0. 0 0	0.00, 0.00	<0. 001	0. 0 0	0.00, 0.00	<0. 001

<sup>1</sup>CI = Confidence Interval

Model	AIC
No bp or Na	38,183.62
bp only	21,623.66
Na only	38,013.45
bp and Na	21,513.04

This fourth set of models (**tbl-upf-multivariable-outputs?**) regresses on UPF intake. Variable one is BP, and variable two is sodium (Na).

Again the baseline differs from that regressed on BP with the bmi in particular affected. There is also a stronger effect relating to age. All age categories are statistically different to the reference, previously only the older ones have been.

BP and Na are not statistically significant independently or together in themselves. However together they affect reduce the sex difference to loose statistical significance.

On its own introducing BP affects the effect of bmi.

The AIC values (**tbl-AIC-comparison-upf?**) in models with BP are the lowest of all the models presented. This identifies the regression against UPF including Na and BP as the best model. This also identifies the model regressed against Na without BP or UPF as the least good model for the dataset.

The difference between the two values as a proportion of the larger is 71.3322424 %. There is a significant sensitivity of the data set to improved modelling. Though the set of models around the same values includes the four regressed against BP, and two of those against UPF which include BP.

## Summary of Results

(**tbl-keydata?**) with means for the key variables across the dataset showing a reduction across the cohorts. This is less evident in the plots, but the (**tbl-Key-Variables-by-Survey-year?**) shows statistical analysis of the key variables shows the reduction.

(**tbl-continuous-data?**) and (**tbl-Categorical-variables-year?**) show the other variables analysed and show that there has been change in the balance of the populations.

Analysis by Sex shows that female sex always reduces BP. When analysed by age, UPF reduces, BP increases, as does Na though with a more complex relationship. Analysis by place shows that most areas are similar, but with London as an outlier.

Paired regression, (**tbl-univariable-regressions?**), shows that sodium intake has no relationship with BP or UPF with Na. It shows that UPF intake decreases with age, and UPF decreases with BP. It also shows that the change of BP with age and with Na are positive

The sets of models of multivariable regressions show that the model regressed on UPF including Na and BP has the lowest AIC. The highest AIC statistic is for the model regressed against Na without BP or UPF.

## Discussion

### Introduction to Discussion

This section will consider what the results mean. That will include how the context of the literature influences understanding of the values. The limitations of the study will be considered. Opportunities for further research, and ways to influence policy will be considered.

### Data

NDNS data is well collected and comprehensive. There have been several changes over the course of the study. These changes have meant that collating the data was more than just bringing all the numbers together.

In addition the differing take up rates between different groups in each of the cohorts meant that the numbers from each cohort are not comparable. This is overcome by using weighting factors to balance the datasets. This needs adjusting every time there is a new group added to the collected data set.

### Discussion of change across cohorts

The analysis using these weighted datasets is performed using “survey” which is a software package used in R studio.

The change in intake of sodium and UPF over time could be; 1 real 2 sample error 3 increasing social desirability of low sodium, low UPF

#### *of other variables compared across cohorts*

Age seems to be related to UPF having a similar effect on BP. This would mean that the relationship of different aged participants and their UPF habit is affecting the comparisons within the multivariable models.

### Discussion of Key variables by Sex

The populations do change over time as some of the added variables do show statistical significant changes. In particular the number of vegetarians increases, which perhaps is one indicator of social desirability affecting the study.

In populations with exclusions the careful sample selection and weighting are overcome by the biasing effect of different selections. When this is on BP there is a change between cohort sex balance. This is possibly as a result of changing/ increasing acceptance of BP results of all people whereas in earlier cohorts there were less women with raised BP levels.

This effect is perhaps greater when medication exclusions are made. Treatment of women and younger men has increased over the 10 years of the study.

### **Discussion of Key variables by Age**

Comparison of pairs of variables identifies the degree of correlation between them. The key comparisons are between UPF and BP, and Na and BP. These highlight that there is an effect of UPF on BP, though there is no effect of Na.

The third side of this triangle is the relationship between Na and UPF which confirms that UPF is high in Sodium.

### **Discussion of Key variables by Place**

The results here show that there is regional variation in key variables with consistently better values in London.

### **Discussion Paired Regression of key variables on each other**

### **Complex Modelling using Multi variable regression**

#### **analysis for BP**

The multivariable regression is made of four models. These show the change from excluding Na and UPf to adding each individually and then together. They are all statistically significant when Age is excluded.

This means that the all have effects on the systolic blood pressure, but the effect of UPF and that of Age is closely intertwined.

#### **simple set BP**

#### **analysis for Sodium**

#### **analysis for UPF**

### **Limitations of Study**

#### **The study**

#### **The data**

#### **The analysis**

### **Ideas for further research**

I will divide these suggestions into quantitative and qualitative. Within the quantitative there are biomedical



## Quantitative

There is scope for more research based on this data set. Within this same biomedical paradigm there are whole range of variables which can be compared against the clinical and biochemical outcomes.

## Mixed and Qualitative

The richness of the quantitative data in this survey calls for its use within an approach allowing more detailed description and in depth assessment with participants.

It could also be used as a template for studies smaller in geographical scope, but more in depth as cross over studies collecting both quantitative and qualitative data.

Modelling research has allowed projections to be made using

## Ideas for policy

Policy is an 'upstream' approach.

Ideas include legislation to reduce UPF use, this might be by pricing, or other approaches.

Health promotion policy needs to match policy activity. People who know that UPF is bad, are more likely to accept policy limiting availability.

## Conclusion

In conclusion there is a complex interaction between fixed factors and societal factors at work. Nova encompasses more than nutrition alone and whilst UPF has harmful elements these are not simply nutritional factors, but are complex social factors. These factors are omitted and ignored by a rigid nutritional approach to what is primarily a social function.

## Bibliography

::: {#refs} :::

## Appendix

### Appendix 1 Approved Proposal

The approved proposal

### Appendix 2 Ethics Certificate

The ethics cert.

### Appendix 3 Software used

The software used

##	[1]	"base"	"dagitty"	"datatable"	"flextable"
##	[5]	"gtsummary"	"knitr2023"	"knitr2015"	"knitr2014"
##	[9]	"labelled"	"officer"	"rmarkdown2023"	"rmarkdown2018"
##	[13]	"rmarkdown2020"	"sensemakr"	"srvyr"	"stargazer"
##	[17]	"survey2020"	"survey2004"	"survey2010"	"tidyverse"

1. University Of Cambridge MEU, NatCen Social Research. NDNS RPNational diet and nutrition SurveysNational diet and nutrition survey years 1-11, 2008-2019. 2022; Available from: <https://beta.ukdataservice.ac.uk/datacatalogue/doi/?id=6533#19>
2. Cappuccio FP, Capewell S. Facts, Issues, and Controversies in Salt Reduction for the Prevention of Cardiovascular Disease. 2015;7(1):21.

3. Marmot M. Fair society, healthy lives: The marmot review. [Internet]. London: UCL; 2010. Available from: <https://www.instituteofhealthequity.org/resources-reports/fair-society-healthy-lives-the-marmot-review>
4. Jafar AJN. What is positionality and should it be expressed in quantitative studies? Emergency Medicine Journal [Internet]. 2018 Jan 11; Available from: <https://emj.bmj.com/lookup/doi/10.1136/emered-2017-207158>
5. Evans L, Trotter DRM. Epistemology and Uncertainty in Primary Care: An Exploratory Study. Family Medicine. 41(5):8.
6. Kannel WB. Hypertension: Reflections on risks and prognostication. The Medical clinics of North America [Internet]. 2009 May;93(3):541–Contents. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3719976/>
7. Kannel WB, Garrison RJ, Dannenberg AL. Secular blood pressure trends in normotensive persons: The Framingham Study. American Heart Journal [Internet]. 1993 Apr 1;125(4):1154–8. Available from: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/000287039390129W>
8. Mahmood SS, Levy D, Vasan RS, Wang TJ. The Framingham Heart Study and the epidemiology of cardiovascular disease: a historical perspective. The Lancet [Internet]. 2014 Mar 15;383(9921):999–1008. Available from: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0140673613617523>
9. Bress AP, Cohen JB, Anstey DE, Conroy MB, Ferdinand KC, Fontil V, et al. Inequities in hypertension control in the united states exposed and exacerbated by COVID-19 and the role of home blood pressure and virtual health care during and after the COVID-19 pandemic. Journal of the American Heart Association [Internet]. 2021 Jun 1;10(11):e020997. Available from: <http://www.ahajournals.org/doi/10.1161/JAHA.121.020997>
10. Debon R, Bellei EA, Biduski D, Volpi SS, Alves ALS, Portella MR, et al. Effects of using a mobile health application on the health conditions of patients with arterial hypertension: A pilot trial in the context of Brazil's Family Health Strategy. Scientific reports. 2020;10(1):6009–9.
11. Ettehad D, Emdin CA, Kiran A, Anderson SG, Callender T, Emberson J, et al. Blood pressure lowering for prevention of cardiovascular disease and death: a systematic review and meta-analysis. The Lancet [Internet]. 2016 Mar 5;387(10022):957–67. Available from: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0140673615012258>
12. Pringle E, Phillips C, Thijs L, Davidson C, Staessen JA, Leeuw PW de, et al. Systolic blood pressure variability as a risk factor for stroke and cardiovascular mortality in the elderly hypertensive population. Journal of Hypertension [Internet]. 2003 Dec;21(12):2251–2257. Available from: [http://journals.lww.com/jhypertension/Fulltext/2003/12000/Systolic\\_blood\\_pressure\\_variability\\_as\\_a\\_risk.12.aspx](http://journals.lww.com/jhypertension/Fulltext/2003/12000/Systolic_blood_pressure_variability_as_a_risk.12.aspx)

13. Roche M, Onyia I. A quality improvement package for high blood pressure (BP) management in general practice, part of a systems leadership approach to tackling high BP in Cheshire and Merseyside [Internet]. 2018. Available from: <https://www.nice.org.uk/sharedlearning/a-quality-improvement-package-for-high-blood-pressure-bp-management-in-general-practice-part-of-a-systems-leadership-approach-to-tackling-high-bp-in-cheshire-and-merseyside>
14. WHO. High blood pressure: A public health problem [Internet]. Available from: <http://www.emro.who.int/media/world-health-day/public-health-problem-factsheet-2013.html>
15. Blood pressure in the normotensive segment of the population has been quite stable.
16. Blood pressure test [Internet]. 2018. Available from: <https://www.nhs.uk/conditions/blood-pressure-test/>
17. Boutain DM. Discourses of worry, stress, and high blood pressure in rural south louisiana. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship* [Internet]. 2001;33(3):225–30. Available from: <https://www.proquest.com/docview/236433731/abstract/F0777DA87E374D2EPQ/1>
18. Colombet Z, Schwaller E, Head A, Kypridemos C, Capewell S, O’Flaherty M. OP12 Social inequalities in ultra-processed food intakes in the United Kingdom: A time trend analysis (20082018). *J Epidemiol Community Health* [Internet]. 2022 Aug 1;76(Suppl 1):A6–7. Available from: [https://jech.bmj.com/content/76/Suppl\\_1/A6.2](https://jech.bmj.com/content/76/Suppl_1/A6.2)
19. Colombet Z, Perignon M, Salanave B, Landais E, Martin-Prevel Y, Allès B, et al. Socioeconomic inequalities in metabolic syndrome in the french west indies. *BMC Public Health* [Internet]. 2019 Dec 3;19(1):1620. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-019-7970-z>
20. Ji C, Cappuccio FP. Socioeconomic inequality in salt intake in Britain 10 years after a national salt reduction programme. *BMJ Open* [Internet]. 2014 Aug 1;4(8):e005683. Available from: <http://bmjopen.bmj.com/content/4/8/e005683>
21. Jones NR, Tong TY, Monsivais P. Meeting UK dietary recommendations is associated with higher estimated consumer food costs: an analysis using the National Diet and Nutrition Survey and consumer expenditure data, 20082012. *Public Health Nutrition* [Internet]. 2018 Apr;21(5):948–56. Available from: <http://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/public-health-nutrition/article/meeting-uk-dietary-recommendations-is-associated-with-higher-estimated-consumer-food-costs-an-analysis-using-the-national-diet-and-nutrition-survey-and-consumer-expenditure-data-20082012/EAB3C4470D82264844C22F225772F908>
22. Leeuw E de de, Simos J, editors. *Healthy cities: the theory, policy, and practice of value-based urban planning*. New York, NY: Springer; 2017.

23. MacGregor GA, He FJ, Pombo-Rodrigues S. Food and the responsibility deal: how the salt reduction strategy was derailed. *BMJ* [Internet]. 2015 Apr 28;350:h1936. Available from: <http://www.bmj.com/content/350/bmj.h1936>
24. Intersalt: An international study of electrolyte excretion and blood pressure. Results for 24 hour urinary sodium and potassium excretion. Intersalt cooperative research group. *BMJ : British Medical Journal* [Internet]. 1988 Jul 30;297(6644):319–28. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1834069/>
25. Elliott P, Stamler J, Nichols R, Dyer AR, Stamler R, Kesteloot H, et al. Intersalt revisited: further analyses of 24 hour sodium excretion and blood pressure within and across populations. *BMJ* [Internet]. 1996 May 18;312(7041):1249–53. Available from: <https://www.bmj.com/content/312/7041/1249>
26. Newman T. High blood pressure: Sodium may not be the culprit [Internet]. 2017. Available from: <https://www.medicalnewstoday.com/articles/317099>
27. Elijovich F. Salt sensitivity of blood pressure | hypertension. *Hypertension* [Internet]. 2016 Sep;68(3). Available from: [https://www-ahajournals-org.liverpool.idm.oclc.org/doi/10.1161/HYP.0000000000000047?url\\_ver=Z39.88-2003&rfr\\_id=ori:rid:crossref.org&rfr\\_dat=cr\\_pub%20%20pubmed](https://www-ahajournals-org.liverpool.idm.oclc.org/doi/10.1161/HYP.0000000000000047?url_ver=Z39.88-2003&rfr_id=ori:rid:crossref.org&rfr_dat=cr_pub%20%20pubmed)
28. Your Guide to Lowering Your Blood Pressure with DASH. 1998 p. 64.
29. Reports Outline Obesity, Fitness and Wellness Findings from Federal University Vicosia (Effects of Minimally and Ultra-processed Foods On Blood Pressure In Brazilian Adults: a Two-year Follow Up of the Cume Project). Obesity, fitness, & wellness week. 2023;3265–5.
30. Vollmer WM, Sacks FM, Ard J, Appel LJ, Bray GA, Simons-Morton DG, et al. Effects of Diet and Sodium Intake on Blood Pressure: Subgroup Analysis of the DASH-Sodium Trial. *Annals of Internal Medicine* [Internet]. 2001 Dec 18;135(12):1019. Available from: <http://annals.org/article.aspx?doi=10.7326/0003-4819-135-12-200112180-00005>
31. Sacks FM, Svetkey LP, Vollmer WM, Appel LJ, Bray GA, Harsha D, et al. Effects on blood pressure of reduced dietary sodium and the dietary approaches to stop hypertension (DASH) diet. *New England Journal of Medicine* [Internet]. 2001 Jan 4;344(1):3–10. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJM200101043440101>
32. Nilson EAF, Spaniol AM, Santin R da C, Silva SA. Estratégias para redução do consumo de nutrientes críticos para a saúde: o caso do sódio. *Cadernos de saúde pública*. 2021;37(suppl 1).
33. Cappuccio FP, Capewell S, Lincoln P, McPherson K. Policy options to reduce population salt intake. *BMJ* [Internet]. 2011 Aug 11;343:d4995. Available from: <https://www.bmj.com/content/343/bmj.d4995>

34. He FJ, MacGregor GA. Reducing Population Salt Intake Worldwide: From Evidence to Implementation. *Progress in Cardiovascular Diseases* [Internet]. 2010 Mar 1;52(5):363–82. Available from: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0033062009001273>
35. Iso H, Shimamoto T, Yokota K, Ohki M, Sankai T, Kudo M, et al. [Changes in 24-hour urinary excretion of sodium and potassium in a community-based health education program on salt reduction]. [*Nihon Koshu Eisei Zasshi*] *Japanese Journal of Public Health*. 1999 Oct;46(10):894–903.
36. Institute of Medicine, Food, Nutrition Board, Committee on Strategies to Reduce Sodium Intake, Boon CS, Taylor CL, et al. Strategies to reduce sodium intake in the united states [Internet]. Washington, D.C., UNITED STATES: National Academies Press; 2010. Available from: <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/liverpool/detail.action?docID=3378676>
37. Lavery AA, Link to external site this link will open in a new window, Kypridemos C, Seferidi P, Vamos EP, Pearson-Stuttard J, et al. Quantifying the impact of the public health responsibility deal on salt intake, cardiovascular disease and gastric cancer burdens: Interrupted time series and microsimulation study. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health* [Internet]. 2019 Sep;73(9):881. Available from: <http://www.proquest.com/docview/2351440363/abstract/CODFC73837B348F7PQ/1>
38. Millett C, Lavery AA, Stylianou N, Bibbins-Domingo K, Pape UJ. Impacts of a national strategy to reduce population salt intake in england: Serial cross sectional study. *PLoS ONE* [Internet]. 2012 Jan 4;7(1):e29836. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3251604/>
39. Moreira PVL, Baraldi LG, Moubarac JC, Monteiro CA, Newton A, Capewell S, et al. Comparing Different Policy Scenarios to Reduce the Consumption of Ultra-Processed Foods in UK: Impact on Cardiovascular Disease Mortality Using a Modelling Approach. Hernandez AV, editor. *PLOS ONE* [Internet]. 2015 Feb 13;10(2):e0118353. Available from: <https://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0118353>
40. Institute of Medicine, Population Health Board, Public Health Practice, Food, Nutrition Board, Committee on the Consequences of Sodium Reduction in Populations, et al. Sodium intake in populations: Assessment of evidence [Internet]. Washington, D.C., UNITED STATES: National Academies Press; 2013. Available from: <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/liverpool/detail.action?docID=3379068>
41. Campos-Nonato I, Vargas Meza J, Nieto C, Ariza AC, Barquera S. Reducing sodium consumption in mexico: A strategy to decrease the morbidity and mortality of cardiovascular diseases. *Frontiers in Public Health* [Internet]. 2022 Mar 22;10:857818. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8980680/>
42. Cuj M, Grabinsky L, Yates-Doerr E. Cultures of nutrition: Classification, food policy, and health. *Medical Anthropology* [Internet]. 2021 Jan 2;40(1):79–97. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1080/01459740.2020.1826475>

43. Dickie S, Woods J, Machado P, Lawrence M. Nutrition classification schemes for informing nutrition policy in australia: Nutrient-based, food-based, or dietary-based? *Current Developments in Nutrition* [Internet]. 2022 Jul 4;6(8):nzac112. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC9429971/>
44. Romero Ferreiro C, Lora Pablos D, Gómez de la Cámara A. Two dimensions of nutritional value: Nutri-score and NOVA. *Nutrients* [Internet]. 2021 Aug 13;13(8):2783. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8399905/>
45. A. A, Gan HJ, M. Y. H, K. KS, Zainudin AA. Food classification system based on food processing and its relationship with nutritional status of adults in Terengganu, Malaysia. *Food Research*. 2019;4(2):539–46.
46. Bourdieu P, Bourdieu P. *Distinction: a social critique of the judgement of taste*. 11. print. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard Univ. Press; 2002.
47. A Bourdieu'dian Analysis for the Construction of an Education in Tea [Internet]. 2021. Available from: <https://www.teatechnique.org/a-bourdieu-dian-analysis-for-the-construction-of-an-education-in-tea/>
48. Dickie S, Woods J, Machado P, Lawrence M. A novel food processing-based nutrition classification scheme for guiding policy actions applied to the Australian food supply. *Frontiers in Nutrition* [Internet]. 2023;10. Available from: <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fnut.2023.1071356>
49. Monteiro CA. Nutrition and health. The issue is not food, nor nutrients, so much as processing. *Public Health Nutrition* [Internet]. 2009 May;12(5):729–31. Available from: <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/public-health-nutrition/article/nutrition-and-health-the-issue-is-not-food-nor-nutrients-so-much-as-processing/0C514FC9DB264538F83D5D34A81BB10A>
50. Monteiro CA, Cannon G, Levy R, Moubarac JC, Jaime P, Martins AP, et al. NOVA. The star shines bright. *World Nutrition* [Internet]. 2016 Jan 7;7(1-3):28–38. Available from: <https://worldnutritionjournal.org/index.php/wn/article/view/5>
51. Monteiro CA, Levy RB, Claro RM, Castro IRR de, Cannon G. A new classification of foods based on the extent and purpose of their processing. *Cadernos de Saúde Pública* [Internet]. 2010 Nov;26:2039–49. Available from: <http://www.scielo.br/j/csp/a/fQWy8tBbJkMFhGq6gPzsGkb/?lang=en>
52. Monteiro CA, Moubarac J-C, Cannon G, Ng SW, Popkin B. Ultra-processed products are becoming dominant in the global food system. *Obesity Reviews* [Internet]. 2013;14(S2):21–8. Available from: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/obr.12107>
53. Monteiro CA, Astrup A. Does the concept of “ultra-processed foods” help inform dietary guidelines, beyond conventional classification systems? YES. *The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition* [Internet]. 2022 Dec 1;116(6):1476–81. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1093/ajcn/nqac122>



54. Astrup A, Monteiro CA. Does the concept of “ultra-processed foods” help inform dietary guidelines, beyond conventional classification systems? Debate consensus. The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition [Internet]. 2022 Dec 1;116(6):1489–91. Available from: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0002916523036845>
55. Aceves-Martins M, Link to external site this link will open in a new window, Bates RL, Link to external site this link will open in a new window, Craig LCA, Chalmers N, et al. Nutritional quality, environmental impact and cost of ultra-processed foods: A UK food-based analysis. International journal of environmental research and public health [Internet]. 2022;19(6). Available from: <http://www.proquest.com/publiccontent/docview/2644005015?pq-origsite=primo>
56. Rauber F, Louzada ML da C, Steele EM, Rezende LFM de, Millett C, Monteiro CA, et al. Ultra-processed foods and excessive free sugar intake in the UK: a nationally representative cross-sectional study. BMJ Open [Internet]. 2019 Oct 1;9(10):e027546. Available from: <https://bmjopen.bmj.com/content/9/10/e027546>
57. Bawajeeh A, Zulyniak M, Evans C, Cade J. P21taste classification of foods consumed in the national diet and nutrition survey. Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health [Internet]. 2021 Sep 1;75(Suppl 1):A52. Available from: [http://jech.bmj.com/content/75/Suppl\\_1/A52.1.abstract](http://jech.bmj.com/content/75/Suppl_1/A52.1.abstract)
58. Wang L, Martínez Steele E, Du M, Pomeranz JL, O'Connor LE, Herrick KA, et al. Trends in Consumption of Ultraprocessed Foods Among US Youths Aged 2-19 Years, 1999-2018. JAMA. 2021 Aug 10;326(6):519–30.
59. Colombet Z, Simioni M, Drogue S, Lamani V, Perignon M, Martin-Prevel Y, et al. Demographic and socio-economic shifts partly explain the Martinican nutrition transition: an analysis of 10-year health and dietary changes (2003-2013) using decomposition models. Public health nutrition. 2021;24(18):6323–34.
60. Byker Shanks C, Vanderwood K, Grocke M, Johnson N, Larison L, Wytcherley B, et al. The UnProcessed pantry project (UP3): A community-based intervention aimed to reduce ultra-processed food intake among food pantry clients. Family & Community Health [Internet]. 2022 Mar;45(1):23. Available from: [https://journals.lww.com/familyandcommunityhealth/Abstract/2022/01000/The\\_UnProcessed\\_Pantry\\_Project\\_UP3\\_\\_A.3.aspx](https://journals.lww.com/familyandcommunityhealth/Abstract/2022/01000/The_UnProcessed_Pantry_Project_UP3__A.3.aspx)
61. Mertens E, Colizzi C, Peñalvo JL. Ultra-processed food consumption in adults across europe. European Journal of Nutrition [Internet]. 2022;61(3):1521–39. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8921104/>
62. Ni Mhurchu C, Capelin C, Dunford EK, Webster JL, Neal BC, Jebb SA. Sodium content of processed foods in the United Kingdom: analysis of 44,000 foods purchased by 21,000 households. The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition. 2011 Mar;93(3):594–600.
63. D'avila HF, Kirsten VR. Energy intake from ultra-processed foods among adolescents. Revista paulista de pediatria. 2017;35(1):54–60.



64. Gupta D, Khanal P, Khan M. Sustainability and ultra-processed foods: role of youth. Sustainability, agri, food and environmental research. 2021;
65. Webster JL, Dunford EK, Neal BC. [A systematic survey of the sodium contents of processed foods](#). Am J Clin Nutr. 2010 Feb;91(2):413–20.
66. Vargas-Meza J, Cervantes-Armenta MA, Campos-Nonato I, Nieto C, Marrón-Ponce JA, Barquera S, et al. Dietary sodium and potassium intake: Data from the mexican national health and nutrition survey 2016. Nutrients. 2022;14(2):281–1.
67. Armendariz M, Pérez-Ferrer C, Basto-Abreu A, Lovasi GS, Bilal U, Barrientos-Gutiérrez T. Changes in the retail food environment in mexican cities and their association with blood pressure outcomes. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health [Internet]. 2022 Jan 26;19(3):1353. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8834862/>
68. Barbosa SS, Sousa LCM, Oliveira Silva DF de, Pimentel JB, Evangelista KCM de S, Lyra C de O, et al. A systematic review on processed/ultra-processed foods and arterial hypertension in adults and older people. Nutrients [Internet]. 2022 Mar 13;14(6):1215. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8955286/>
69. Santos FSD, Dias M da S, Mintem GC, Oliveira IO de, Gigante DP. Food processing and cardiometabolic risk factors: a systematic review. Revista de saúde pública. 2020;54:70–0.
70. Rauber F, Steele EM, Louzada ML da C, Millett C, Monteiro CA, Levy RB. Ultra-processed food consumption and indicators of obesity in the United Kingdom population (2008-2016). PLOS ONE [Internet]. 2020 May 1;15(5):e0232676. Available from: <https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0232676>
71. Schulze K. UPF and cardiometabolic health [Internet] [PhD thesis]. 2019. Available from: [https://www.repository.cam.ac.uk/bitstream/handle/1810/306587/Kai%20Schulze%20Thesis%202020\\_final.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y](https://www.repository.cam.ac.uk/bitstream/handle/1810/306587/Kai%20Schulze%20Thesis%202020_final.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y)
72. Oliveira T, Ribeiro I, Jurema-Santos G, Nobre I, Santos R, Rodrigues C, et al. Can the consumption of ultra-processed food be associated with anthropometric indicators of obesity and blood pressure in children 7 to 10 years old? Foods (Basel, Switzerland). 2020;9(11):1567–7.
73. Hodge A. In this issue: Ultra-processed food and health. Public health nutrition. 2021;24(11):3177–8.
74. Muñoz-Lara A, Moncada-Patiño J, Tovar-Vega A, Aguilar-Zavala H. THE CONSUMPTION OF ULTRA-PROCESSED FOODS, ANTHROPOMORPHIC MEASUREMENTS AND BLOOD CHEMISTRY IN MEXICAN SCHOOL-AGE CHILDREN. Annals of nutrition and metabolism. 2020;76:212–2.
75. Li M, Shi Z. Ultra-processed food consumption associated with overweight/obesity among Chinese adults Results from China health and nutrition survey 19972011. Nutrients. 2021;13(8):2796–6.

76. Aguiar Sarmiento R, Peçanha Antonio J, Lamas de Miranda I, Bellicanta Nicoletto B, Carnevale de Almeida J. Eating patterns and health outcomes in patients with type 2 diabetes. *Journal of the Endocrine Society*. 2018;2(1):42–52.
77. Li M, Shi Z. Association between ultra-processed food consumption and diabetes in chinese Adults Results from the china health and nutrition survey. *Nutrients*. 2022;14(20):4241–1.
78. Miranda RC de, Rauber F, Levy RB. Impact of ultra-processed food consumption on metabolic health. *Current opinion in lipidology*. 2021;32(1):24–37.
79. Martinez-Perez C, San-Cristobal R, Guallar-Castillon P, Martínez-González MÁ, Salas-Salvadó J, Corella D, et al. Use of different food classification systems to assess the association between ultra-processed food consumption and cardiometabolic health in an elderly population with metabolic syndrome (Predimed-plus cohort). *Nutrients*. 2021;13(7):2471–1.
80. Tavares LF, Fonseca SC, Garcia Rosa ML, Yokoo EM. Relationship between ultra-processed foods and metabolic syndrome in adolescents from a Brazilian Family Doctor Program. *Public health nutrition*. 2012;15(1):82–7.
81. Santos FS dos, Dias M da S, Mintem GC, Oliveira IO de, Gigante DP. Food processing and cardiometabolic risk factors: A systematic review. *Revista de Saúde Pública* [Internet]. 54:70. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7371411/>
82. Goodman D, González-Rivas JP, Jaacks LM, Duran M, Marulanda MI, Ugel E, et al. Dietary intake and cardiometabolic risk factors among Venezuelan adults: a nationally representative analysis. *BMC nutrition*. 2020;6(1):61–1.
83. Vilela S, Magalhães V, Severo M, Oliveira A, Torres D, Lopes C. Effect of the food processing degree on cardiometabolic health outcomes: A prospective approach in childhood. *Clinical nutrition (Edinburgh, Scotland)*. 2022;41(10):2235–43.
84. Weinstein G, Vered S, Ivancovsky-Wajcman D, Zelber-Sagi S, Ravona-Springer R, Heymann A, et al. Consumption of ultra-processed food and cognitive decline among older adults with type-2 diabetes. *Alzheimer's & dementia*. 2021;17(S10).
85. Gomez-Smith M, Janik R, Adams C, Lake EM, Thomason LAM, Jeffers MS, et al. Reduced cerebrovascular reactivity and increased resting cerebral perfusion in rats exposed to a cafeteria diet. *Neuroscience*. 2018;371:166–77.
86. Ivancovsky-Wajcman D, Fliss-Isakov N, Webb M, Bentov I, Shibolet O, Kariv R, et al. Ultra-processed food is associated with features of metabolic syndrome and non-alcoholic fatty liver disease. *Liver international*. 2021;41(11):2635–45.
87. Lee HY. Ultra-processed foods as a less-known risk factor in cardiovascular diseases. *Korean circulation journal*. 2022;52(1):71–3.

88. Southall JR. Ultra-processed food consumption linked to risk for colorectal cancer among men. HEM/ONC Today [Internet]. 2022 Oct 25;23(14):13. Available from: <https://www.proquest.com/docview/2731818689/abstract/A52B93105882470BPQ/1>
89. Wang L, Du M, Wang K, Khandpur N, Rossato SL, Drouin-Chartier JP, et al. Association of ultra-processed food consumption with colorectal cancer risk among men and women: Results from three prospective US cohort studies. BMJ [Internet]. 2022 Aug 31 [cited 2022 Dec 1];378:e068921. Available from: <https://www.bmj.com/content/378/bmj-2021-068921>
90. Kityo A, Lee SA. The intake of ultra-processed foods and prevalence of chronic kidney disease: The health examinees study. Nutrients. 2022;14(17):3548–8.
91. Suter PM, Sierro C, Vetter W. Nutritional Factors in the Control of Blood Pressure and Hypertension. Nutrition in Clinical Care [Internet]. 2002 [cited 2023 Feb 1];5(1):9–19. Available from: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1046/j.1523-5408.2002.00513.x>
92. Gonçalves VS, Duarte EC, Dutra ES, Barufaldi LA, Carvalho KM. Characteristics of the school food environment associated with hypertension and obesity in Brazilian adolescents: a multilevel analysis of the Study of Cardiovascular Risks in Adolescents (ERICA). Public health nutrition. 2019;22(14):2625–34.
93. Wang M, Du X, Huang W, Xu Y. Ultra-processed foods consumption increases the risk of hypertension in adults: A systematic review and meta-analysis. American journal of hypertension. 2022;35(10):892–901.
94. Scaranni P de O da S, Cardoso L de O, Chor D, Melo ECP, Matos SMA, Giatti L, et al. Ultra-processed foods, changes in blood pressure and incidence of hypertension: The Brazilian Longitudinal Study of Adult Health (ELSA-Brasil). Public Health Nutrition [Internet]. 2021 Aug [cited 2022 Nov 9];24(11):3352–60. Available from: <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/public-health-nutrition/article/ultraprocessed-foods-changes-in-blood-pressure-and-incidence-of-hypertension-the-brazilian-longitudinal-study-of-adult-health-elsabrasil/1A120EFBE6785C030961E19B94977D9B>
95. De Deus Mendonça R, Souza Lopes AC, Pimenta AM, Gea A, Martinez-Gonzalez MA, Bes-Rastrollo M. Ultra-processed food consumption and the incidence of hypertension in a mediterranean cohort: The seguimiento universidad de navarra project. American journal of hypertension. 2017;30(4):358–66.
96. Shim SY, Kim HC, Shim JS. [Consumption of Ultra-Processed Food and Blood Pressure in Korean Adults](#). Korean Circ J. 2022 Jan;52(1):60–70.
97. Rezende-Alves K, Hermsdorff HHM, Miranda AE da S, Lopes ACS, Bressan J, Pimenta AM. Food processing and risk of hypertension: Cohort of universities of minas gerais, brazil (CUME project). Public health nutrition. 2021;24(13):4071–9.

98. Lima R, Moreira L, Rossato S, Silva R, Fuchs S. P2-155 Consumption of ultra-processed food is associated with blood pressure in hypertensive individuals. *Journal of epidemiology and community health* (1979). 2011;65(Suppl 1):A263–3.
99. Smiljanec K, Mbakwe AU, Ramos-Gonzalez M, Mesbah C, Lennon SL. Associations of Ultra-Processed and Unprocessed/Minimally Processed Food Consumption with Peripheral and Central Hemodynamics and Arterial Stiffness in Young Healthy Adults. *Nutrients* [Internet]. 2020 Nov;12(11). Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7690393/>
100. Tzelefa V, Tsirimiagkou C, Argyris A, Moschonis G, Perogiannakis G, Yannakoulia M, et al. Associations of dietary patterns with blood pressure and markers of subclinical arterial damage in adults with risk factors for CVD. *Public health nutrition*. 2021;24(18):6075–84.
101. Team RC. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. [Internet]. Vienna,Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing; 2021. Available from: <https://www.R-project.org/>
102. Lumley T. Analysis of complex survey samples. *Journal of Statistical Software*. 2004;9(1):1–19.