



LONDON SCHOOL OF HYGIENE AND TROPICAL MEDICINE

MSC PROJECT REPORT
2017-2018

The time and quantity patterns of carbohydrate intake in the UK adults – the National Diet and Nutrition Survey 2008/09-15/16 programme

Supervisor:
Professor Luigi PALLA

**Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of MSc in Medical Statistics**

Candidate number: 110765

Page count: 43 from Introduction to Conclusions

September 2018

Declaration of Authorship

I declare that this thesis titled, “The time and quantity patterns of carbohydrate intake in the UK adults – the National Diet and Nutrition Survey 2008/09-15/16 programme” and the work presented in it are my own. I confirm that:

- This work was done wholly while in candidature for an MSc degree in Medical Statistics at London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine.
- No part of this thesis has previously been submitted for a degree or any other qualification at London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine or any other institution.
- Where I have consulted the published work of others, this is always clearly attributed.
- Where I have quoted from the work of others, the source is always given. With the exception of such quotations, this thesis is entirely my own work.
- I have acknowledged all main sources of help.
- Where the thesis is based on work done by myself jointly with others, I have made clear exactly what was done by others and what I have contributed myself.

Chaochen Wang

Signed:

Date: 2018-09-05

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my tutor and supervisor Professor Luigi PALLA, for his guidance, patience, and help while working on this project and also to Dr. Suzana Almoosawi for her invaluable nutritional academic insight.

Thanks to Raoul Mansukhani, for sharing his previous work and thoughts on the analyses, methodology in helpful discussions.

I would like to thank the team of the National Diet and Nutrition Survey Rolling Programme (NDNS RP) who have made their data available to the public for academic study.

I would like to thank all of the teachers, lecturers, staffs, and fellow course mates in the Department of Medical Statistics for providing their wonderful teaching techniques, and for sharing their excellent ideas that made this year such fruitful and enjoyable.

I would also like to thank Aichi Medical Univeristy, and Egashira Hospitality Public Interest Foundation for funding my studentship at the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine.

Last but not the least, I want to express my gratitude to my family for their unconditional support, understanding, and encouragement throughout this year.

“All models are wrong, but some are useful.”

George E. P. Box

Abstract

Background: Recent evidence suggested that there are three types of eaters (grazers, early eaters, and late eaters) according to the timing of energy consumption. This project aims at finding both timing and quantity eating patterns specifically for carbohydrate (carb) intake, and exploring their potential associations with hypertension and obesity.

Methods: Data are from the National Diet and Nutrition Survey (NDNS) Rolling Programme (2008/09-15/16) which included 6155 adults aged 19 or older in the UK. Time of the day was defined as: 6-9 am, 9-12 noon, 12-2 pm, 2-5 pm, 5-8 pm, 8-10 pm and 10 pm-6 am. Responses for carb intake within each time slot were categorised into: not eating any food, carb contributed $< 50\%$ or $\geq 50\%$ of total energy. Multilevel latent class analysis (MLCA) models were applied in finding the latent classes of carb consumption accounting for the hierarchical data structure. Survey-designed multivariable regression models were used to assess the associations between carb eating patterns and hypertension, body mass index (BMI), and waist circumferences (WC).

Results: Three carb eating day patterns (low /high percentage, and regular meal days) were found in 24483 observation days, based on which three types of carb eaters were defined: low (28.1%), moderate (28.8%), and high (43.1%) carb eaters. On average, low-carb eaters consumed the highest amount of total energy intake (7985.8 kJ), and they had higher percentages of energy contributed by fat and alcohol, especially after 8 pm. Moderate-carb eaters consumed the lowest amount of total energy (7341.8 kJ) while they had the tendency of eating carb later in time-of-day. High-carb eaters consumed most of their carb and energy within time slots of 6-9 am, 12-2 pm and 5-8 pm. In men, moderate-carb eaters may have lower odds of having hypertension compared with low-carb eaters (OR: 0.64, 95%CI: 0.41, 1.01). In women, high-carb eaters who lived with partners had both lower BMI (-1.76 kg/m^2 , 95%CI: $-2.87, -0.73$) and WC (-4.71 cm , 95%CI: $-7.00, -2.43$) compared with low-carb eaters, although these inverse associations were not observed in women who lived alone (p for interaction 0.014, and 0.009).

Conclusions: Contrary to the expectation, profiles of high-carb eaters seemed to be healthier among three types of carb eaters. Low-carb eaters probably followed the diet out of health purposes, but they may have chosen fat or alcohol as replacements of carb, which could possibly be a concern from a public health point of view. Whether these carb-eating patterns are associated with changes in blood pressure or obesity longitudinally should be further investigated.

Contents

Declaration of Authorship	iii
Acknowledgements	v
Abstract	ix
1 Introduction	1
Background	1
The National Diet and Nutrition Survey (NDNS)	2
Aims and objectives	3
2 Methods	4
Dietary diary collected in the NDNS RP	4
Definition of carbohydrate intake	4
Survey Data	5
Survey selection method	5
Response rates	6
Strata and weightings	6
Socio-demographic status, lifestyle, physical activity, anthropometric measurements and biochemical analyses	7
Ethical approval	8
Statistical methods	9
Latent Class Analysis (LCA)	9
Multilevel Latent Class Analysis (MLCA)	9
Parametric approach	10
Non-Parametric approach	12
Strategy of conducting MLCA	12
Characteristics of day-level latent classes and individual-level latent classes	13
Association between individual-level latent classes and the preva- lence of hypertension, and measurements of obesity	14

3 Results	17
Model selection, and interpretation	17
Features of the three types of carbohydrate eating temporal patterns	21
Individual-level LCA solution	22
Association between individual-level latent classes and hyperten-	
sion, and obesity.	30
Hypertension	30
Obesity (BMI and WC)	32
4 Discussion and Conclusion	37
Carbohydrate eating patterns	37
Associations between carbohydrate eating patterns and health outcomes	39
Limitations and strengths	40
Conclusions	43
Bibliography	44
A R code for importing and manipulating the data	49
B Mplus syntax and output for Multilevel LCA models	54
C Other Solutions for MLCA	65
2 classes in day level	65
3 classes in day level, 4 classes in individual level	67
4 classes in day level	68
D R and STATA codes for processing individual level data analysis	70
E Example of a food diary for one day	93

List of Figures

3.1	Day Level Latent Class Solution.	20
3.2	Multilevel Latent Class Solution (3×2).	22
3.3	Multilevel Latent Class Solution (3×3).	23
3.4	Sources of Energy Contribution at Each Time Slot by Individual Carbohydrate Eating Groups.	24
C.1	2 Classes solution in Day level	65
C.2	Multilevel Latent Class Solution (2×2).	66
C.3	Multilevel Latent Class Solution (2×3).	66
C.4	Multilevel Latent Class Solution (2×4).	67
C.5	Multilevel Latent Class Solution (3×4).	67
C.6	2 Classes Solution in Day level	68
C.7	Multilevel Latent Class Solution (4×2).	69
C.8	Multilevel Latent Class Solution (4×3).	69
E.1	One day food diary example 6 am to 12 noon.	93
E.2	One day food diary example 12 noon to 5 pm	94
E.3	One day food diary example 5 pm to 6 am	94
E.4	Food diary example of home made food recipes	95

List of Tables

3.1	Fit criteria for each model specification.	18
3.2	Day level latent class solution for three classes LCA model. (No individual level model)	19
3.3	Means (standard deviations), and counts (%) of the characteristics of different types of carbohydrate eating days.	21
3.4	Weighted means and percentages (95%CI) of the nutrients intake according to individual level carbohydrate eating classes. (NDNS RP 2008/09-15/16, sample size = 6155)	26
3.5	Weighted means, percentages, and 95% CIs of the social-demographic characteristics by carbohydrate eating latent class memberships in the UK adults. (NDNS RP 2008/09-15/16, sample size = 6155)	28
3.6	Weighted means, percentages, and 95% CIs of the anthropometric measurements, and biochemical characteristics by carbohydrate eating latent class memberships in the UK adults. (NDNS RP 2008/09-15/16, sample size = 6155)	29
3.7	Weighted means, percentages, and 95 % CIs of the characteristics by hypertension status in the UK adults. (NDNS RP 2008/09-15/16, sample size = 6155)	31
3.8	ORs (95%CI) for the associations of carbohydrate eating patterns with hypertension in the UK adults, with or without diabetes . (NDNS RP 2008/09-15/16, sample size = 6155)	32
3.9	Weighted means, percentages, and 95 % CIs of the characteristics by BMI categories in the UK adults. (NDNS RP 2008/09-15/16, sample size = 6155)	33
3.10	Associations of moderate/high carbohydrate eating patterns versus low on BMI in UK adults, with or without diabetes. (NDNS RP 2008/09-15/16, sample size = 6155)	34
3.11	Associations of moderate/high carbohydrate eating patterns versus low on WC in UK adults, with or without diabetes. (NDNS RP 2008/09-15/16, sample size = 6155)	36

List of Abbreviations

AIC	Akaike Information Criterion
HbA1C	Haemoglobin A1C: Glycated haemoglobin
BMI	Body Mass Index
BIC	Bayesian Information Criterion
CI	Confidence Interval
DM	Diabetes Mellitus
FSA	Food Standards Agency
HDL	High Density Lipoprotein cholesterol
LDL	Low Density Lipoprotein cholesterol
LCA	Latent Class Analysis
LCGA	Latent Class Growth Analysis
LTA	Latent Transition Analysis
MAFF	Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food
MLCA	Multilevel Latent Class Analysis
ML	Maximum Likelihood
NDNS	the National Diet and Nutrition Survey
OR	Odds Ratio
PHE	Public Health England
PSUs	Primary Sampling Units
RMLCA	Repeated Measures LCA
TC	Total Cholesterol
TG	Triglycerides
WC	Waist Circumference

Chapter 1

Introduction

Background

The widely accepted standard these days seems to be that we eat three main meals a day in addition to snacks. However, whether this is really an ideal temporal eating pattern for everyone has never been answered with scientific evidence. More importantly, how many temporal patterns of eating are there in the population, the proportions of people who actually manage/fail to follow this doctrine, and whether people are consistently following one specific temporal eating pattern or do they switch, have not been studied and described thoroughly either.

Although nutritional studies have extensively examined the influence of the quantity and quality of dietary and nutrients intake and their alteration on morbidity and mortality, investigations on temporal eating patterns and their effects are still scarce. The importance of the circadian rhythm in regulating physiological responses has been recognised for long, while its impact on nutrition and metabolism is still largely unknown (Johnston, 2014; Garaulet and Gómez-Abellán, 2014; Asher and Sassone-Corsi, 2015). Some recent evidence has found that meal timing is associated with a wide variety of health outcomes. Skipping breakfast is associated with a higher risk of developing type 2 diabetes (Uemura et al., 2015). Shift workers have a higher risk of developing metabolic syndrome (De Bacquer et al., 2009) and type 2 diabetes (Pan et al., 2011). Evening intake of energy is positively associated with overweight/obesity (Almoosawi et al., 2016).

More recently, discernible temporal eating patterns that differed by sociodemographic and eating profiles were revealed by latent class analysis using nutrition survey data (Leech et al., 2017; Mansukhani and Palla, 2018). Based on total energy consumption, the presence of 3 groups of eaters: grazers, early eaters, and late eaters was identified (Leech et al., 2017; Mansukhani and Palla, 2018). So far, the temporal eating patterns were only based on averaging the total energy intake

calculated from one or two 24-hour dietary recalls and therefore could not capture the day-to-day variation in temporal eating patterns. Thus, the question of how much variability within a person follows one or several specific temporal eating patterns in his/her everyday life remains unanswered. Many factors, such as day of the week or season, or culture may contribute to daily variation in dietary intake and temporal eating. However, most of the variation in an individual's diet seems to be without an apparent pattern (Schulze et al., 2018). Intakes of macro-nutrients (carbohydrate, fat, and protein), due to the reason of their substantial contribution to the total energy intake, may have somewhat moderate degrees of day-to-day variation (Willett, 2012). Thus, novel analytic methods that can account for this within-person day-to-day variation is needed.

In the present report, we focused on temporal eating patterns for carbohydrate consumption in a nationally representative sample of UK adults. Eating more carbohydrate in the morning has been found to be negatively associated with metabolic syndrome (Almoosawi et al., 2013). On the other hand, high total consumption of carbohydrate has been linked with higher risk of type 2 diabetes (Alhazmi et al., 2012). Whether the amount or the timing (or both) of carbohydrate consumption during the day matters is an important question to address for both individuals and the public as a whole.

The National Diet and Nutrition Survey (NDNS)

The National Diet and Nutrition Survey (NDNS) programme (NatCen Social Research, 2018) was initially established in 1992 and began as a joint initiative between the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries, and Food (MAFF) and the Department of Health. In 2008, a new continuous cross-sectional survey was started, the NDNS Rolling Programme (RP). The NDNS RP is funded by Public Health England (PHE), an executive agency of the Department of Health, and the UK Food Standards Agency (FSA). The survey recruits around 1000 people per year as a representative sample of the UK population. Fieldwork began in 2008 and is now starting its 11th year. NDNS provides essential evidence on the diet and nutrition of the UK population to enable PHE to identify and address nutritional issues in the population and monitor progress towards public health nutrition objectives.

The NDNS RP has now completed and analysed its eighth year. The sample was randomly drawn from a list of all addresses in the UK, clustered into postcode sectors. Overall, for years 1-8 combined, a sample of 39,300 addresses was selected from 799 (year 1-4), 323 (year 5-6), and 316 (year 7-8) postcode sectors. At each

address, one household was selected at random in cases where there were two or more households. For each household, either an adult and a child, or a child only, was selected to participate.

These individuals were asked to keep a four-day diary on their food and drink consumption on consecutive days. An interview and a nurse visit were also conducted to collect information regarding height and weight, smoking and drinking habits, physical activity, blood pressure, prescribed medicines, dietary supplements, fasting blood sample, and 24-hour urine sample.

Aims and objectives

Our goal is to explore and make use of the NDNS RP (2008/09-15/16) database to describe and identify the potential relationship between the timing of eating within the day and specific nutrient-carbohydrate intake. We aimed at finding patterns of both the amount of consumption and day-time of consumption for carbohydrate and defining latent groups in the UK adults. An additional aim is to investigate the association of carbohydrate eating patterns with hypertension and obesity.

Chapter 2

Methods

Dietary diary collected in the NDNS RP

Participants were required to keep a diary that record everything eaten or drunk over four consecutive days. Interviewers undertook three visits with each participant. At the first visit, the interviewer explained the method followed a protocol, taking participants through the sections in the diary including how to describe details of food and drink and portion size and an example day. The second visit was a brief one to check for compliance, and answer potential questions from the participants. Interviewers also reviewed the diary to identify and edited possible omissions and missing details in the food diary. The third visit was to collect the diary and again review and edit possible omissions.

In the diary, portion sizes of food or drink consumed were asked to be recorded in household measures (e.g. one tablespoon of beans, one Kit Kat finger-size), or for packaged foods to note the weight indicated on the packet. Homemade dishes were also described in the diary about their ingredients, quantities, along with a brief description of the cooking procedure and how much of the dish were consumed. For each eating occasion, in addition to the details of what and how much was eaten, participants were also asked to record: when was it, where they were, and who they were eating with. An example, used as guidance for participants, of a food diary for one day is shown in **Appendix E**.

Definition of carbohydrate intake

Detailed dairy checking was performed to code and convert the food consumption into energy and nutrients intake. Intakes of nutrients were calculated from the food consumption records using a specially adapted Nutrient Databank (Smithers, 1993), which was originally developed by the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries, and Food (MAFF) for the Dietary and Nutritional Survey of British Adults. Further details of

data coding and editing are outlined in Appendix A of the NDNS official reports (Department of Health, 2018). Specifically, the main variables that we adopted in the current analysis were defined as:

- Total energy intake = (protein \times 17) + (fat \times 37) + (carbohydrate \times 16) + (alcohol \times 29) kJ;
- Carbohydrate intake = total sugars + starch;
- All quantities above were measured as the mass in grams.

Time across a typical survey day was divided into 7 time slots in the dietary diary of NDNS RP: 6 am to 9 am, 9 am to 12 noon, 12 noon to 2 pm, 2 pm to 5 pm, 5 pm to 8 pm, 8 pm to 10 pm, and 10 pm to 6 am next morning. To produce a list of discrete responses for our variable of interest, the energy consumed within each time slot over the four days of survey for each participant were calculated. The percentages of total energy intake contributed by carbohydrate within each time slot were then calculated. Since we planned to apply latent class analysis (LCA) in the current study, in which the observed indicators for latent classes must be categorical, the responses were then dichotomised according to these percentages of the energy intake at a cut-off value of 50%, i.e. if within a time slot where any energy intake occurred, carbohydrate consumption was categorised by whether its energy contribution was lower or higher/equal to 50% of total energy intake within that time slot. Consequently, for each day of the recording, there were 7 data points generated by the diary. Each data point included one of the following responses:

- Not eating any food (energy intake = 0 kJ);
- Eating, and carbohydrate contributed less than 50% of the total energy intake;
- Eating, and carbohydrate contributed higher or equal to 50% of the total energy intake.

Survey Data

Survey selection method

The NDNS RP participants were drawn from the UK Postcode Address File, a list of all the addresses in the UK. The addresses were clustered into Primary Sampling Units (PSUs), small geographical areas, based on postcode sectors, randomly selected from across the UK. A list of 27 or 28 addresses was then randomly selected from each PSU.

Overall, for years 1 to 8 combined, a sample of 39,300 addresses was selected from 1,438 PSUs. The sampling selection process was:

- Randomly select PSUs from the Postcode Address File;
- Randomly select 27 or 28 addresses in that postcode area;
- Randomly select one household at that address for interview;
- Selected addresses where children resided were randomly allocated to one of two groups to determine whether an adult (aged 19 years or older) and a child (aged 1.5 to 18 years) or a child only, were selected for interviews.

Response rates

The response rates for completion of the dietary diary (three or four days) were 56%, 53%, 53%, for years 1 to 4, 5 to 6, and 7 to 8, respectively. A total of 6,155 adults aged 19 years and older were kept in the current study.

Strata and weightings

It is necessary to apply weighting factors to the data collected in the NDNS RP for two reasons: to remove any bias in the observed results which may be due to differences in the probability of households and individuals being selected to take part; and to attempt to reduce differential non-response bias by age, sex, and geographical region.

The strata used to calibrate proportions in the sample include: age-group (1.5-3, 4-6, 7-10, 11-15, 16-18, 19-24, 25-29, 30-39, 40-49, 50-59, 60-64, 65-69, and over 70 years); sex (men or women); and regions (Northern Ireland, Scotland, Wales, and the nine regions of England).

Two steps of the weighting system were designed in the NDNS RP to assure that the combined sample would be representative of the UK population:

1. An overall selection weight, which is the product of the address, dwelling unit, catering (household) unit, and individual selection weights, was generated to correct for the unequal selection probabilities. These weights are the inverses of the selection probabilities at each level of the random sampling process, and they can be used to compensate for differences in the chance of selection of an individual.

2. An iterative procedure was used to adjust the selection weights until the distribution of the weighted sample matched that of the population for age-group, sex, and geographical region. Population distributions were taken from the mid-year population estimates (Office for National Statistics, 2018).

Another two sets of weights were generated to correct for differential non-response (either due to refusal or inability) to 1) nurse visit and 2) giving a blood sample. Response rates to the nurse visit among those who completed a dietary diary was approximately 75%, to the blood sample in adults were 51%, 57%, and 50% for years 1 to 4, 5 to 6, and 7 to 8, respectively. In creating the nurse/blood sample weight, a logistic regression model was used by the NDNS RP study team to model the relationship between response to nurse visit/giving a blood sample and a set of predictor variables (socio-demographic, participant and catering/household unit characteristics). The model generated a predicted probability for each participant, which is the probability of agreeing to a nurse visit/providing a blood sample, given the characteristics of the individual and the household unit. Participants with characteristics associated with non-response were under-represented in the sample and therefore receive a low predicted probability. The inverses of these predicted probabilities were used as a set of non-response weights so that participants with a low predicted probability got a larger weight, increasing their representation in the sample. Then the nurse/blood sample weights were re-scaled so that the sum of which equalled the number of participants who had a nurse visit or who provided a blood sample. The final nurse/blood weights should, therefore, make the sample participants representative of all eligible persons in the population.

Further details of the weighting system developed by the NDNS RP are described in Appendix B of the reports published by Public Health England (PHE) (Bates et al., 2014; Roberts et al., 2018; Department of Health, 2018).

Socio-demographic status, lifestyle, physical activity, anthropometric measurements and biochemical analyses

Computer-assisted personal interviews were conducted for the selected individuals by trained interviewers to collect background information on smoking habits (current, ex-smokers, and never), ethnicity (white, non-white), education level (lower than degree/degree or above level), living with a partner or not, and other socio-demographic variables. Participants also had their height, weight, blood pressure, and waist circumferences (WC) measured by the nurses.

Specifically, blood pressure was measured in a sitting position using an automated, validated machine, the Omron HEM907, after a five-minute rest. The mean of the

second and third readings, taken at one-minute intervals, were used in the current report. Hypertension was defined as with systolic blood pressure of 140 mmHg or above, or diastolic blood pressure of 90 mmHg or above, or taking any medication specifically to reduce blood pressure.

A self-completion questionnaire - the Recent Physical Activity Questionnaire (Besson et al., 2009) (RPAQ, developed by the MRC Epidemiology Unit Cambridge) was used to estimate physical activity from year 2 of the survey. The RPAQ was designed to assess usual physical activity in the last month in four domains: home, work, commuting to work, and leisure activities. Detailed descriptions of the assessment of adult physical activity in the NDNS RP and the processing of data are available in Appendices G and V of the published reports (Bates et al., 2014; Roberts et al., 2018; Department of Health, 2018).

Blood samples were stored at 4 °C, and sent directly by post to the Department of Haematology and Department of Clinical Biochemistry and Immunology, Addenbrooke's Hospital, Cambridge within two hours of their collection. Serum samples were collected by centrifugation of the coagulated blood sample. Serum total, High-Density Lipoprotein (HDL) and Low-Density Lipoprotein (LDL) cholesterol, triglycerides (TG), fasting blood glucose, haemoglobin(Hb) A1C were measured. HbA1C value of 6.5% was used as the cut off point for diagnosing diabetes.

Body mass index (BMI) was calculated as weight in kilograms divided by height in square meters. BMI was then categorised into less than 25 kg/m² (normal weight), 25 to 30 kg/m² (overweight), and higher or equal to 30 kg/m² (obese).

Ethical approval

Ethical approval for the survey was obtained from the Oxfordshire A Research Ethics Committee. The letters of approval for the original submission and subsequent substantial amendments, together with approved documents, were sent to all Local Research Ethics Committees covering areas where fieldwork was being conducted. Research governance approval was sought for all participating NHS laboratories and obtained where required by the Research and Development Committee for each laboratory. Ethical approval for the current project was obtained from the MSc Research Ethics Committee of the London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine (LSHTM MSc Ethics Ref: 15624).

Statistical methods

Latent Class Analysis (LCA)

Latent class analysis is a statistical technique that identifies categorical latent (unobserved) class variables on the basis of observed categorical variables (Collins and Lanza, 2010). It belongs to the family of latent variable models and is directly analogous to the factor analysis model. The major difference is that the latent variable in LCA is categorical, not continuous as in factor analysis. The basic assumptions in LCA are independent observations and local independence, the latter as shown in the fundamental expression of a typical LCA model:

$$P(U_{i1} = s_1, U_{i2} = s_2, \dots, U_{ik} = s_k) = \sum_{t=1}^T P(C_i = t) \prod_{k=1}^K P(\mathbf{U}_{ik} = \mathbf{s}_k | C_i = t) \quad (2.1)$$

Where,

- $P(U_{i1} = s_1, U_{i2} = s_2, \dots, U_{ik} = s_k)$ is the probability of observing a particular vector of responses for i th observation;
- $P(C_i = t)$ is the probability that a randomly selected i th observation will be in class t ;
- $P(\mathbf{U}_{ik} = \mathbf{s}_k | C_i = t)$ is the probability of a particular observed response pattern $\mathbf{U}_{ik} = \mathbf{s}_k$ conditional on membership in latent class t .

Equation 2.1 indicates that responses for an observation to the measuring variables are independent of one another given its membership in latent class t . However, in the NDNS RP data set, the assumption of independent observations is violated. Each individual completed their dietary diary for three/four consecutive days, and their diary recordings were later converted into three/four vectors of categorical responses reflecting the type of carbohydrate consumption at each time slot of the day. The observed sequences (observed days) are nested within the participants and therefore are not independent. This nested data structure requires multilevel techniques.

Multilevel Latent Class Analysis (MLCA)

Multilevel latent class analysis accounts for the nested structure of the data by allowing latent class intercepts to vary across level 2 units, thereby examining if and how level 2 units influence the level 1 latent classes. These random intercepts allow the probability of membership in a particular level 1 (observation days)

latent class to vary across level 2 units (e.g., here in the current context are the individuals). Essentially this allows the probability that an observation day will belong to a particular day-level latent class to vary across individual-levels.

Parametric approach

Proposed by Vermunt (Vermunt, 2003; Vermunt, 2008) and Asparouhov and Muthén (Muthén and Asparouhov, 2009), a traditional, parametric approach can be applied using a logistic regression model. For example, let's assume that there are two types of observation days in the dietary survey—high and low carbohydrate eating days. In an unconditional logistic regression model, the probability of the outcome (i.e. an observed high carbohydrate eating day vs a low carbohydrate eating day) is constant within the individual-level, which means for each person throughout his/her survey there is some probability of following a high carbohydrate eating day. A random effect considers the individuals (level 2) to be drawn from the adult population in the UK, and the probability of the outcome (i.e. high carbohydrate eating days) across individuals is considered to be a random variable (Snijders and Bosker, 2011).

Thus, for a binary outcome $C_{ij} = 0, 1$ (low = 0 or high = 1 carbohydrate eating days), where i denotes the observation days ($i = 1, 2, 3, 4$), and j denotes the individual ($j = 1, 2, \dots, 6155$), the 2-level random intercept logistic regression model can be expressed as:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{logit}[P(C_{ij} = 1)] &= \beta_{0j} + \beta_1 x_{ij} && \text{(day-level)} \\ \beta_{0j} &= \gamma_0 + \gamma_1 w_j + u_{0j} && \text{(individual-level)} \\ \Rightarrow P(C_{ij} = 1) &= \frac{\exp(\gamma_0 + \beta_1 x_{ij} + \gamma_1 w_j + u_{0j})}{1 + \exp(\gamma_0 + \beta_1 x_{ij} + \gamma_1 w_j + u_{0j})} \end{aligned} \quad (2.2)$$

Where we define:

- $\text{logit}(x) = \log \frac{x}{1-x}$, where $x \in [0, 1]$;
- $P(C_{ij} = 1)$ as the probability that the randomly selected i th observation day of the j th individual is a high carbohydrate eating day;
- β_{0j} as the random intercept, for the outcome $C_{ij} = 1$;
- the random deviation of the individuals u_{0j} are assumed to be normally distributed (i.e. $u_{0j} \sim N(0, \sigma_{u_0}^2)$), the magnitude of the u_{0j} variance ($\sigma_{u_0}^2$) indicates the influence of the individuals (level 2);

- x_{ij}, w_j are the predictors for respectively day-level (weekdays or weekends) and individual-level, such as age, and sex.

The same framework can be used to consider random effects in an LCA model, but instead of saying that C_{ij} is either low or high carbohydrate eating days as if we already know the set of latent classes, it is now replaced by a latent variable G_{ij} which indicates the typologies of carbohydrate eating patterns. Then we can use the day-level data to assess the log-odds of belonging to the k th type of carbohydrate eating pattern on a specific day of the survey and allow the log-odds to vary across individuals. Therefore, for some persons, the log-odds of having a k th type of carbohydrate eating pattern during the survey can be high, but for the other persons, the log-odds of following the k th type of carbohydrate eating pattern can be low.

If the day-level LCA model (carbohydrate eating temporal pattern typologies) is best defined by T ($T \geq 2$) latent classes, then $T - 1$ random intercept will be specified by a two-level multinomial logistic regression model. Similar to the typical LCA models, the latent class variable in an MLCA is defined by multiple observed indicators (here is defined by the responses of eating carbohydrate within each time slots, throughout three/four consecutive days of their survey period). Considering the latent class indicators as indicator variables (U_{ijk}), the MLCA model can be written as follows:

$$P(U_{ij1} = s_1, U_{ij2} = s_2, \dots, U_{ijk} = s_k) = \sum_{t=1}^T P(G_{ij} = t) \prod_{k=1}^K P(\mathbf{U}_{ijk} = \mathbf{s}_k | G_{ij} = t) \quad (2.3)$$

Where,

- U_{ijk} represents the response of carbohydrate eating (one of the following: not eating any food, $< 50\%$ of the energy, or $\geq 50\%$ of the energy) on the i th day of the survey ($i \in (1, 2, 3, 4)$) in j th individual at the k th time slot of the day ($k \in (1, 2, 3, \dots, 7)$);
- G_{ij} denotes the latent class membership for j th individuals on the i th day of the survey, the total number of day-level latent class is T ;
- $P(\mathbf{U}_{ijk} = \mathbf{s}_k | G_{ij} = t)$ is the probability of a specific response pattern, conditional on membership in latent class t .

The $P(G_{ij} = t)$ in equation 2.3 is what we have already defined in equation 2.2:

$$P(G_{ij} = t) = \frac{\exp(\gamma_0 + \beta_1 x_{ij} + \gamma_1 w_j + u_{0j})}{1 + \exp(\gamma_0 + \beta_1 x_{ij} + \gamma_1 w_j + u_{0j})} \quad (2.4)$$

Non-Parametric approach

Since the parametric approach discussed above can be extremely computationally demanding (Van Horn et al., 2008; Vermunt, 2008), an alternative approach is using a non-parametric MLCA (Davidian et al., 2008). In this approach, separate latent class models are specified for level 1 (observation days) and level 2 (individuals). Similar with the parametric MLCA approach, there are $T - 1$ random intercepts, where T is the number of level 1 latent classes. However, rather than assuming the random intercepts following a normal distribution, the non-parametric MLCA assumes a multinomial (discrete) distribution of the level 2 latent classes. This approach is less computationally demanding compared with the parametric approach. These level 2 (individual) latent classes reflect differences in the probability of belonging to a specific day-level latent class so that individuals that have observation days with similar probabilities for the level 1 latent classes will be grouped together. The non-parametric MLCA model can be defined as follows:

$$P(C_{ij} = t | CB_j = m) = \frac{\exp(\gamma_{tm})}{\sum_{r=1}^T \exp(\gamma_{rm})} \quad (2.5)$$

Where,

- CB_j is the individual-level latent class membership for the j th individual;
- γ_{tm} is the day-level and individual-level indicators.

According to Finch and French's simulation study (Finch and French, 2014), the non-parametric approach generally resulted in a more accurate recovery of the underlying latent structure of the data at both levels and provided better latent class model compared with the parametric approach. In the current project, we are interested in exploring both meaningful individual (level 2) latent classes and the daily (level 1) carbohydrate consumption classification. Therefore, non-parametric MLCA was employed 1) to identify latent classes of observation days (level 1) based on the subjects' responses to the 4-day food and drink diary and 2) to form distinct latent classes of individuals (level 2) based on the distribution of day-level carbohydrate eating temporal latent classes within individuals.

Strategy of conducting MLCA

To identify the best-fitting model, we used the following sequential modelling strategy (Henry and Muthén, 2010):

- First, we ignored the multilevel structure of the data and estimated a series of traditional LCA models to determine the number of classes at the observational day-level;
- Next, a series of MLCA models were fitted to account for the multilevel structure of the data. In these models, the number of day-level classes was based on the best fitting LCA model from the first step, and the LCA model at the individual-level was estimated to identify the number of individual-level latent classes;
- Last, once the number of individual-level latent classes was defined based on the previous stage, the number of day-level classes was modified (one class lower and one class higher than in the second step) to investigate the effect of changing level 1 classes and to confirm the best fitting model.

The number of classes in level 1 was determined by 1) the evaluation of model fit indices, including the Bayesian information criterion (BIC) and entropy, which is a statistic that summarizes latent class probabilities where values near 1 indicate better latent class separation; 2) the Lo-Mendell-Rubin Likelihood Ratio Test (LMR-LRT) (Lo, Mendell, and Rubin, 2001; Nylund, Asparouhov, and Muthén, 2007) which compares q vs $q - 1$ classes models, where q is the number of latent classes; most importantly, 3) pattern interpretability. In the steps of performing multilevel LCA, where LMR-LRT is not available, the same rules of model fit indices and pattern interpretability were used to determine the optimal combination of latent classes in observation day-level and individual-level. MLCA models were fitted in Mplus 7.4 (Muthén and Muthén, 2017), the Mplus syntax and outputs are shown in **Appendix B**.

Characteristics of day-level latent classes and individual-level latent classes

Day-level latent classes identified by the first step of MLCA were tabulated according to the day of the week and also whether the diary was recorded during weekends or not. A contingency table giving the frequency of responses across the 7-time slots of the survey days was produced. Descriptive statistics for the dietary day-level recordings according to the latent class memberships were presented. Pearson χ^2 test was used to assess evidence for a difference in the distribution of categorical variables. One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to compare the means across the multiple groups for continuous variables.

Person-level point estimates and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) were determined by applying individual, nurse visiting, and blood sample weights and the clustered survey design. Descriptive statistics for sample characteristics were presented as weighted means (95% CI) or weighted percentages (95%CI). After examining the distribution of the data, the following variables were log-transformed to improve normality: fasting blood glucose, HbA1C, TC, LDL, HDL, TG, and average physical activity duration per day. Weighted geometric means (95% CI) were used for all log-transformed variables.

To see whether there is any temporal pattern for food intake at the individual-level, weighted estimates of nutrients consumption across the 7-time slots of the day were calculated for each individual-level latent class. Contributions (%) of the average energy intake within time slots were evaluated by determining the percentages of energy coming from carbohydrate, fat, protein, and alcohol intake.

For continuous variables, the *F* test was used to determine differences between latent classes with Bonferroni correction to account for multiple comparisons across > 2 classes when applicable. For categorical variables, differences between latent classes were assessed using the adjusted Pearson χ^2 test for survey data.

Association between individual-level latent classes and the prevalence of hypertension, and measurements of obesity

Associations between individual-level carbohydrate eating classes and hypertension (yes/no), body mass index (BMI, kg/m²), and waist circumference (WC, cm) were explored in men and women separately. Point estimates of weighted means and proportions and 95%CI of the characteristics were determined by applying either nurse visiting weights (for outcomes of hypertension, BMI, and WC) or blood sample weights (for diagnosis of DM) accordingly. Similarly, *F* tests (for continuous variables) and adjusted Pearson χ^2 tests (for categorical variables) were used to determine sex-specific differences by hypertension status and BMI categories.

Survey-designed logistic regression models (for hypertension), and survey-designed linear regression models (for WC, BMI), were used to test for associations between latent classes of carbohydrate eating patterns and hypertension, BMI, and WC, in the NDNS RP sample, separately. Since diabetic participants might or might not modify their carbohydrate eating habits, we also fitted all the above-mentioned regression models restricted to those without diabetes.

For the multiple regression models, model fitting strategies are as follows:

1. The crude association between the carbohydrate eating groups and the outcomes was first examined.
2. Potential confounders of the association between carbohydrate eating groups (exposure) and the outcomes were selected depending on the descriptive statistical analyses conducted above, i.e. those associated with both the exposure and the outcome and also not on the causal pathway were selected as potential confounders. Covariates that are strongly related with the outcomes but not associate with carbohydrate eating groups may reduce the standard errors and improve the precisions, so they were also considered in the survey-designed linear regression models.
3. Confounding or interaction effects from each of the potential factors were checked one by one. Interaction effects were tested using the adjusted Wald test for whether the regression coefficients of the interaction terms are simultaneously equal to zero.
4. A preliminary model that includes all of the variables suggested to be confounders in the previous step was established.
5. The remaining variables were added to the preliminary model one by one to see if any of them may be a confounder in the presence of the other covariates.
6. For logistic regression models (hypertension) under the survey data, goodness-of-fit was assessed using *F*-adjusted mean residual test (Archer, 2001; Archer, Lemeshow, and Hosmer, 2007) which is implemented in Stata using command `svylogitgof` (Archer and Lemeshow, 2006). Other diagnostics for regular logistic regression models, such as estimating the pseudo- R^2 , AIC or BIC, checking the standardised Pearson residuals, or covariate pattern residuals are currently not available for weighted survey data.
7. For linear regression models (WC, BMI), the assumption of independent observations is violated because of the clustered structure of the data. Therefore, inference from such models is based on design rather than the model. General checking such as QQ plots of the residuals (normality), plotting the residuals against fitted values (constant variance) are unneeded (also not available). Outliers, leverage, and Cook's distance cannot be checked either. However, participants with extreme weightings (if any) were checked by removing them and refitting the models as a sensitivity analysis.

8. Since under complex survey designed data, the sampling-weighted least squares are not maximum likelihood, it would not be possible to compare models using likelihood ratio test. Instead, adjusted Wald tests with $p < 0.05$ were used as criteria for variable inclusion in the final model. Another Stata command `linktest` was used to decide whether quadratic and cubic terms of continuous variables were necessary for improving the fitting of the model (Pregibon, 1980).

Data manipulation and preparation (**Appendix A**) were done in R version 3.5.1 (R core Team, 2018). All statistical analyses, except for MLCA models, were performed with `svyset` command as implemented in Stata software version 15.1 (StataCorp LLC, 2017). The process of model fitting, covariate selection, and interaction effect testing for the association between carbohydrate eating patterns and hypertension is shown as an example in **Appendix D**. All p values were two-sided.

Chapter 3

Results

Model selection, and interpretation

A series of traditional LCA of the responses to carbohydrate intake within the 7 time slots of the day was first examined. These initial analyses ignored the clustering of observation days within participants of the survey. **Table 3.1** shows the latent class solutions for one to five classes (see rows under the Fixed effects model section). The BIC declines as the number of day level classes increases. However, the improvement of BIC dropped to less than 1000 from 3 class to 4 class solutions (658.9) and from 4 class to 5 class solutions (361.7). Entropy index indicates that the 4 class model could explain about 51% of the data, while p values of Lo-Mendell-Rubun LRT suggest that the more classes we fit, the better model we will have until up to 6 classes ($p = 0.06$ and is not shown in the table). For the sake of parsimony, we only extended the model with random effects building on 2 class, 3 class, and 4 class solutions.

The results of the random effects models are presented in **Table 3.1** under the Random effects model section. It is evident that the BIC improves with the addition of random effects to account for the nested structure of the data. Entropy indicates that 2 classes in the day level and 4 classes in the individual level may be the best solution mathematically. However, after these solutions were checked in more details, the most substantively interpretable model was found to be the 3×3 random effect model, which is the model with 3 latent classes in the day level and 3 latent classes in the individual level. We must emphasise that different researchers may have made decisions slightly different from ours, we have provided other solutions in **Appendix C** for reference.

In the 3×3 random effect model solution we have chosen, there were 39.5%, 20.4%, and 40.1% observations classified into 3 latent groups at the day level. The overall counts and percentages for each response within each time slot and the distributions of the solution are presented in **Table 3.2**. The trajectories illustrating the change of

the probabilities of each response to carbohydrate eating during the hours of the day are shown separately by three types of days in **Figure 3.1**.

TABLE 3.1: Fit criteria for each model specification.

Model	Number of day level classes				
	1 class	2 classes	3 classes	4 classes	5 classes
Fixed effects model					
No. of free parameters	14	29	44	59	74
Log-likelihood	-173793.306	-172669.771	-172039.204	-171633.941	-171377.292
BIC	347728.092	345632.608	344523.060	343864.121	343502.409
Lo-Mendell-Rubun LRT	–	< 0.0001	< 0.0001	< 0.0001	< 0.0001
Entropy	1	0.310	0.392	0.510	0.481
Random effects model					
2 individual level classes					
No. of free parameters		59	89	119	
Log-likelihood		-169331.132	-168700.96	-168366.193	
BIC		339258.502	338301.338	337934.968	
Entropy		0.581	0.569	0.555	
3 individual level classes					
No. of free parameters		89	134	179	
Log-likelihood		-166936.279	-166348.815	-166062.761	
BIC		334771.968	334051.799	333934.448	
Entropy		0.677	0.630	0.644	
4 individual level classes					
No. of free parameters		119	179		
Log-likelihood		-165441.731	-164845.696		
BIC		332086.045	331500.318		
Entropy		0.729	0.659		

Note:

Abbreviations: No, number; BIC, Bayesian information criterion; Entropy, a pseudo-r-squared index;

Lo-Mendel-Rubin LRT, likelihood ratio test comparing q classes models with $q - 1$ classes models.

Class 1 days (**Figure 3.1-A**) were given the name of "high percentage carbohydrate day" since in these days of the survey, the probabilities of carbohydrate contributed higher or equal to 50% of the energy consumed were always higher than that in the other two types of days. Specifically, high percentage carbohydrate days were characterised with probabilities of over 0.6 in time slots between 6 am to 9 am, 9 am to 12 noon, and also 2 pm to 5 pm, during which the time slots may be interpreted as breakfast, morning snack, and afternoon snack time periods for many participants. Moreover, even during late night time period, such as 8 pm to 10 pm, and 10 pm to 6 am time slots, the probabilities of having higher carbohydrate contained food were still as high as 0.412, and 0.246, respectively.

TABLE 3.2: Day level latent class solution for three classes LCA model.
(No individual level model)

Time slots of	Responses to			Class 1 days (39.5%)	Class 2 days (20.4%)	Class 3 days (40.1%)
the day	carbohydrate intake	<i>n</i>	%	High perc- centage carb	Low perc- centage carb	Regular meals
6 am – 9 am						
	Not eating any food	7655	31.2	0.129	0.450	0.320
	Carbohydrate < 50%*	4500	18.4	0.130	0.267	0.128
	Carbohydrate ≥ 50%†	12328	50.4	0.741	0.283	0.552
9 am – 12 noon						
	Not eating any food	5447	22.3	0.237	0.079	0.401
	Carbohydrate < 50%	7227	29.5	0.158	0.492	0.173
	Carbohydrate ≥ 50%	11809	48.2	0.605	0.429	0.426
12 noon – 2 pm						
	Not eating any food	4783	19.5	0.156	0.356	0.019
	Carbohydrate < 50%	11112	45.4	0.405	0.413	0.560
	Carbohydrate ≥ 50%	8588	35.1	0.439	0.231	0.421
2 pm – 5 pm						
	Not eating any food	6926	28.3	0.130	0.123	0.659
	Carbohydrate < 50%	8277	33.8	0.249	0.602	0.076
	Carbohydrate ≥ 50%	9280	37.9	0.621	0.276	0.266
5 pm – 8 pm						
	Not eating any food	3043	12.4	0.114	0.199	0.034
	Carbohydrate < 50%	14240	58.2	0.516	0.590	0.639
	Carbohydrate ≥ 50%	7200	29.4	0.370	0.211	0.328
8 pm – 10 pm						
	Not eating any food	8722	35.6	0.322	0.291	0.480
	Carbohydrate < 50%	8898	36.4	0.266	0.551	0.212
	Carbohydrate ≥ 50%	6863	28.0	0.412	0.158	0.308
10 pm – 6 am						
	Not eating any food	16295	66.6	0.680	0.590	0.751
	Carbohydrate < 50%	4144	16.9	0.074	0.294	0.101
	Carbohydrate ≥ 50%	4044	16.5	0.246	0.115	0.148

Note:

Abbreviation: LCA, latent class analysis, carb is short for carbohydrates.

* Carbohydrate < 50% indicates that within the time slot, carbohydrate contributed < 50% total energy intake.

† Carbohydrate ≥ 50% indicates that within the time slot, carbohydrate contributed ≥ 50% total energy intake.

Class 2 days (**Figure 3.1-B**) were named as "low percentage carbohydrate day" because first of all, in these days the probability of participants skipping breakfast was 0.45. And after 9 am, within these days, the probability of having low carbohydrate contained food (carbohydrate contributed < 50% of total energy intake), was always higher than having high carbohydrate contained food (carbohydrate contributed ≥ 50% of total energy intake). In class 2 days, participants also turned to have morning snacks (with a probability of only 0.079 of **not** eating any food and

similar probabilities of having either high or low carbohydrate contained food). This phenomenon may also be interpreted as having a long and late breakfast (brunch) in these mornings. The probability of **not** eating any food was the lowest for low carbohydrate days during the midnight time slot (10 pm to 6 am), with a probability of 0.590 compared with 0.680 and 0.751 in class 1 and class 3 days, respectively.




FIGURE 3.1: Day Level Latent Classes Solution.

TABLE 3.3: Means (standard deviations), and counts (%) of the characteristics of different types of carbohydrate eating days.

	High percentage carb	Low percentage carb	Regular meals	P value*
Counts (% in row)	9667 (39.5)	5002 (20.4)	9814 (40.1)	
Country (%)				< 0.001
England	5627 (58.2)	2972 (59.4)	5291 (53.9)	
Northern Ireland	1194 (12.4)	527 (10.5)	1400 (14.3)	
Scotland	1527 (15.8)	813 (16.3)	1774 (18.1)	
Wales	1318 (13.6)	690 (13.8)	1349 (13.7)	
Day of Week (%)				< 0.001
Monday	1303 (13.5)	715 (14.3)	1370 (14.0)	
Tuesday	1266 (13.1)	674 (13.5)	1290 (13.1)	
Wednesday	1225 (12.7)	740 (14.8)	1233 (12.6)	
Thursday	1272 (13.2)	752 (15.0)	1425 (14.5)	
Friday	1458 (15.1)	797 (15.9)	1479 (15.1)	
Saturday	1537 (15.9)	703 (14.1)	1495 (15.2)	
Sunday	1605 (16.6)	621 (12.4)	1522 (15.5)	
Weekend, Yes (%)	3142 (32.5)	1324 (26.5)	3017 (30.7)	< 0.001
Total energy (kJ)	7539.98 (2875.87)	7160.22 (2922.15)	7439.68 (2978.91)	< 0.001
Carbohydrate (g)	222.79 (89.84)	209.70 (86.17)	206.59 (84.42)	< 0.001
Protein (g)	71.36 (29.79)	69.55 (30.20)	73.29 (32.94)	< 0.001
Fat (g)	65.44 (33.27)	63.94 (33.76)	67.24 (34.73)	< 0.001
Alcohol (g)	11.76 (27.31)	8.85 (24.25)	13.80 (33.00)	< 0.001
Total sugars (g)	98.63 (56.03)	88.03 (50.50)	86.39 (50.96)	< 0.001
Starch (g)	124.07 (55.84)	121.59 (56.13)	120.11 (54.62)	< 0.001
Non-milk extrinsic sugar [†]	59.45 (49.31)	50.07 (43.41)	50.41 (44.84)	< 0.001
Fruit (g)	107.40 (137.97)	103.15 (129.08)	92.76 (126.02)	< 0.001
Yellow Red Green Vegetables (g)	26.52 (46.44)	26.84 (47.99)	26.16 (45.99)	0.681

Note: carb is short for carbohydrate.

* P values were obtained from Pearson χ^2 test for categorical variables, and one-way ANOVA comparing the means in multiple groups for continuous variables;

[†] Non-milk extrinsic sugar is defined as: additionally added free sugar, such as table sugar, honey, glucose, fructose and glucose syrups, sugars added to food and sugars in fruit juices.

Class 3 days (**Figure 3.1-C**) were called "regular meals day" due to the following reasons: 1) participants' dietary recordings showed that in these days there was almost 0 possibility of not eating any food at lunch (0.019 between 12 noon and 2 pm) and dinner (0.034 between 5 pm and 8 pm); 2) the probabilities of not eating during morning snack time (9 am to 12 noon) and afternoon snack time (2 pm to 5 pm) were also the highest among the three types of days (0.401 and 0.659). 3) during these days, participants may have some high carbohydrate contained food between 8 pm and 10 pm (probability = 0.308), but the probability of not eating any food during 10 pm to 6 am next morning was 0.751, the highest among the three types of days.

Features of the three types of carbohydrate eating temporal patterns

The details of the characteristics of the three types of carbohydrate eating temporal patterns were listed in **Table 3.3**. Specifically, regular meals day turned to be

recorded slightly more often in Northern Ireland, and Scotland. In terms of day of week distribution in the three types of days, there is strong evidence ($p < 0.001$) that high percentage carbohydrate days appeared more frequently in weekends (32.5%) compared with low carbohydrate day (26.5%) and regular meals day (30.7%).

As expected, consumption of total energy (7539.98 kJ), total carbohydrate (222.79 g), total sugar (98.63 g), starch (124.07 g), and non-milk extrinsic sugar (59.45 g) was the highest among high percentage carbohydrate days (all $p < 0.001$). On the other hand, the consumption of protein (73.29 g), total fat (67.24 g), and alcohol (13.80 g) were the highest in the regular meals days. Moreover, in the high percentage carbohydrate days, participants turned out to consume the highest amount of fruit (107.40 g). There was no evidence of any difference in the consumption of yellow, red, or green vegetables across the three types of days ($p = 0.681$).

Individual-level LCA solution

In the random effect models, we utilised the non-parametric approach, in which we added a level 2 (individual level) latent classes based on the random means from the level 1 (day level) latent class solution. The results of the individual level LCA solution for 2 and 3 classes are presented in **Figure 3.2**, and **3.3**.




FIGURE 3.2: Multilevel Latent Class Solution, 3 classes in day level, 2 classes in individual level.

With two individual-level latent classes (**Figure 3.2**), one individual class comprises individuals with a relatively slightly higher proportion of having "low carbohydrate day" (22.1%) compared to the other (17.4%). This class represents nearly 65%




FIGURE 3.3: Multilevel Latent Class Solution, 3 classes in day level, 3 classes in individual level.

of the individuals. However, we believe these individual classes are not very distinguishable from each other.

With three individual-level latent classes (**Figure 3.3**), a low-carbohydrate eaters class, a moderate-carbohydrate eaters class, and a high-carbohydrate eaters class emerge. 43.1% participants were identified as high-carbohydrate eaters, in these individuals, about 50% of the days (2 out of 4 days) of their dietary diary could be classified as having high percentage carbohydrate days. Nearly 1 out of 4 days of their dietary diary were either "regular meals day" or "low carbohydrate day". 28.1% participants fell into the low carbohydrate eaters class on the left-hand side of **Figure 3.3**, their recordings of food intake showed that in more than 60% of their days, they were having "regular meals" which was characterised as with the highest amount of fat and alcohol consumptions as already described in **Table 3.3**. Moderate carbohydrate eaters have comparable proportions (42.0% vs 40.0%) of high carbohydrate days and regular meals days; 18.0% of their dietary diary was found to be low carbohydrate days.

After recognising that there were three potential latent groups of carbohydrate eaters in the UK adults, whose food consumption patterns were also probably switching from one to another during the survey, their average carbohydrate contribution to total energy intake (as well as the subtypes of carbohydrate actually consumed) within the 7 pre-defined time slots of the day were still of interest. Survey-design-weighted mean energy intake within each time slot of the day

and their composition of contribution is illustrated in **Figure 3.4**, weighted mean nutrients intakes are listed in **Table 3.4**.




FIGURE 3.4: Sources of Energy Contribution at Each Time Slot by Individual Carbohydrate Eating Groups.

Among the three types of carbohydrate eaters, the mean of total energy intake over the 4 days of dietary survey was the highest (7985.8 kJ, 95%CI: 7283.3, 8146.3) in the low carbohydrate eaters group, and the lowest (7341.8 kJ, 95%CI: 7172.5, 7511.2) in the moderate eaters group (**Table 3.4**). Sources of energy for each type of

carbohydrate eaters by the 7-time slots were also different. Low carbohydrate eaters (**Figure 3.4-A**) never had carbohydrate contributing more than 50% of their total energy throughout the day. Energy from fat was the highest for low carbohydrate eaters most of the time during the day (except for the time slot between 10 pm to 6 am next morning). Most impressively, energy contributed by alcohol was always the highest in low carbohydrate eaters, percentages for energy from alcohol for the 7-times slots were 1.4% (6-9 am), 1.8% (9-12 noon), 3.1% (12-2 pm), 7.2% (2-5 pm), 8.4% (5-8 pm), 20.0% (8-10 pm), and 31.2% (10-6 am), respectively. Contributions from different energy sources were quite similar for moderate and high carbohydrate eaters, but their absolute amount of energy consumption at each time slot was largely different. Moderate carbohydrate eaters (**Figure 3.4-B**) were characterised as consuming the lowest energy (296.9 kJ) before 9 am but having higher energy consumption (967.9 kJ) between 9 am and 12 noon time compared with low and high carbohydrate eaters. Moderate carbohydrate eaters may tend to have later breakfast, later lunch, and probably later dinner as well. They had the highest total energy consumption (599.7 kJ) at night (10 pm - 6 am) across all three types of eaters. High carbohydrate eaters (**Figure 3.4-C**) consumed the highest total energy (929.0 kJ) during 6 am to 9 am in the morning, and the lowest total energy between 10 pm to 6 am (205.5 kJ). Specifically, carbohydrate contributions to total energy intake were 65.3% (6-9 am), 56.2% (9-12 noon), 46.2% (12-2 pm), 50.3% (2-5 pm), 42.5% (5-8 pm), 44.1% (8-10 pm), and 49.9% (10-6 am). We also noticed that high carbohydrate eaters consumed their energy mainly from the following three time slots: 6-9 am, 12-2 pm, and 5-8 pm.

In total, the mean of total carbohydrate intake was 203.8 g, 218.3 g, and 233.4 g for low, moderate, and high carbohydrate eaters, respectively (**Table 3.4**). Total energy contributed by carbohydrate was close to 50% among the high carbohydrate eaters but was only 40.6% among the low carbohydrate eaters. In terms of the subtypes (components) of the carbohydrate consumed at each time slot, high carbohydrate eaters consumed more than 2 times (compared to low carbohydrate eaters) and nearly 4 times (against moderate carbohydrate eaters) the amount of sugar (37.9g 95% CI: 36.8, 39.2) and non-milk extrinsic sugar (i.e. free sugar, 11.1g 95%CI: 10.7, 11.6) between 6-9 am. Moderate carbohydrate eaters had carbohydrate intakes that were more spread out throughout the day. They consumed more sugar and starch during 9-12 noon, 2-5 pm, 8-10 pm, and 10-6 am. Low carbohydrate eaters turned to have a similar temporal pattern of consuming carbohydrates as the high carbohydrate eaters, but the absolute amount of fibre, sugar, free sugar, and starch consumed were usually lower than that in the high carbohydrate eaters except for time slots of 2-5 pm, and 10-6 am. Strong evidence ($p < 0.001$) suggested that the

TABLE 3.4: Weighted means and percentages (95%CI) of the nutrients intake according to individual level carbohydrate eating classes. (NDNS RP 2008/09-15/16, sample size = 6155)

Variables	Low carbo- hydrate eaters (n = 1730)	Moderate carbo- hydrate eaters (n = 1772)	High carbo- hydrate eaters (n = 2653)	P value *
Total energy (kJ)	7985.8 (7823.3, 8146.3)	7341.8 (7172.5, 7511.2)	7677.8 (7555.8, 7799.8)	< 0.001
Carbohydrate (g)	203.8 (199.8, 207.8)	218.3 (212.9, 223.7)	233.4 (229.6, 237.2)	< 0.001
6 am – 9 am	23.0 (21.8, 24.3)	11.2 (10.0, 12.3)	37.9 (36.8, 39.2)	
Fibre (g)	1.4 (1.3, 1.5)	0.6 (0.5, 0.7)	2.0 (1.9, 2.2)	
Sugar (g)	10.2 (9.6, 10.9)	5.3 (4.8, 5.8)	19.7 (19.0, 20.4)	
NMES (g) [†]	4.7 (4.3, 5.1)	3.2 (2.9, 3.6)	11.1 (10.7, 11.6)	
Starch (g)	12.8 (12.0, 13.5)	5.9 (5.1, 6.6)	18.3 (17.6, 19.1)	
9 am – 12 noon	25.1 (23.9, 26.3)	33.0 (31.4, 34.6)	26.2 (25.1, 27.2)	
Fibre (g)	1.5 (1.4, 1.6)	1.6 (1.5, 1.7)	1.3 (1.2, 1.3)	
Sugar (g)	11.6 (10.9, 12.3)	15.7 (14.8, 16.6)	14.2 (13.6, 14.8)	
NMES (g) [†]	5.7 (5.2, 6.2)	9.6 (8.9, 10.2)	8.1 (7.7, 8.5)	
Starch (g)	13.5 (12.8, 14.3)	17.3 (16.4, 18.3)	11.9 (11.3, 12.6)	
12 noon – 2 pm	42.6 (40.9, 44.3)	38.7 (37.0, 40.4)	51.6 (50.2, 52.9)	
Fibre (g)	3.1 (2.9, 3.2)	2.3 (2.2, 2.5)	3.6 (3.5, 3.7)	
Sugar (g)	14.7 (14.0, 15.4)	14.9 (14.0, 15.7)	19.4 (18.7, 20.0)	
NMES (g) [†]	7.3 (6.7, 7.8)	9.1 (8.4, 9.8)	10.3 (9.8, 10.8)	
Starch (g)	27.9 (26.6, 29.1)	23.8 (22.6, 24.9)	32.2 (31.2, 33.1)	
2 pm – 5 pm	25.0 (23.6, 26.4)	33.6 (31.6, 35.6)	24.7 (23.6, 25.7)	
Fibre (g)	1.6 (1.5, 1.7)	1.9 (1.7, 2.0)	1.3 (1.2, 1.4)	
Sugar (g)	11.9 (11.3, 12.7)	14.5 (13.5, 15.5)	13.4 (12.8, 13.9)	
NMES (g) [†]	6.9 (6.4, 7.5)	9.9 (9.0, 8.6)	8.6 (8.2, 9.1)	
Starch (g)	13.1 (12.1, 13.9)	19.1 (17.7, 20.4)	11.3 (10.6, 11.9)	
5 pm – 8 pm	55.9 (54.1, 57.9)	54.6 (52.1, 57.0)	62.9 (61.3, 64.4)	
Fibre (g)	4.4 (4.2, 4.5)	3.7 (3.5, 3.9)	4.9 (4.7, 5.0)	
Sugar (g)	18.7 (17.9, 19.5)	18.6 (17.6, 19.5)	21.8 (20.9, 22.5)	
NMES (g) [†]	10.2 (9.6, 10.8)	11.8 (10.9, 12.6)	12.1 (11.4, 12.7)	
Starch (g)	37.3 (35.8, 38.8)	35.9 (34.1, 37.9)	41.1 (39.9, 42.2)	
8 pm – 10 pm	23.3 (21.9, 24.6)	29.7 (27.6, 31.7)	23.7 (22.5, 24.9)	
Fibre (g)	1.4 (1.3, 1.6)	1.6 (1.5, 1.8)	1.3 (1.5, 1.8)	
Sugar (g)	10.9 (10.3, 11.5)	13.2 (12.2, 14.2)	12.4 (11.8, 13.0)	
NMES (g) [†]	7.3 (6.8, 7.8)	9.4 (8.5, 10.4)	8.3 (7.8, 8.8)	
Starch (g)	12.3 (11.4, 13.3)	16.4 (15.0, 17.8)	11.3 (10.5, 12.1)	
10 pm – 6 am	8.8 (7.7, 9.8)	17.6 (15.2, 19.9)	6.4 (5.8, 7.1)	
Fibre (g)	0.34 (0.29, 0.39)	0.74 (0.63, 0.85)	0.24 (0.21, 0.27)	
Sugar (g)	5.3 (4.6, 6.1)	10.0 (8.6, 11.5)	4.1 (3.7, 4.5)	
NMES (g) [†]	3.9 (3.3, 4.6)	7.7 (6.4, 8.9)	2.9 (2.6, 3.3)	
Starch (g)	3.5 (2.9, 3.9)	7.5 (6.3, 8.8)	2.3 (1.9, 2.7)	
Carbohydrate (%)	40.6 (40.2, 41.0)	47.3 (46.8, 47.8)	48.3 (47.9, 48.6)	< 0.001
Fibre (g)	13.7 (13.4, 14.0)	12.5 (12.1, 12.9)	14.7 (14.4, 14.9)	< 0.001
Protein (g)	79.9 (77.9, 81.8)	69.3 (67.6, 71.0)	73.7 (72.5, 74.8)	< 0.001
Fat (g)	74.7 (73.1, 76.4)	63.8 (62.1, 65.5)	65.7 (64.4, 67.0)	< 0.001
Alcohol (g)	20.8 (18.3, 23.2)	10.7 (9.4, 11.9)	8.9 (8.1, 9.8)	< 0.001

* P values were obtained from χ^2 test for categorical variables, and one-way ANOVA comparing the means in multiple groups for continuous variables;

[†] NMES, Non-milk extrinsic sugar is defined as: additionally added free sugar, such as table sugar, honey, glucose, fructose and glucose syrups, sugars added to food and sugars in fruit juices.

mean of total fibre consumption for low, moderate, and high carbohydrate eaters were different: 13.7g (95%CI: 13.4, 14.0), 12.5g (95%CI: 12.1, 12.9), and 14.7g (95%CI: 14.4, 14.9) with all 95% CI being non-overlapping. It is also noteworthy that low carbohydrate eaters consumed the highest average amount of protein (79.9 g, 17.2% of total energy), fat (74.7g, 35.4% of total energy), and alcohol (20.8 g, 6.8% of total energy) as we have described for **Figure 3.4**.

The social-demographic characteristics of the UK adults according to their individual level latent class membership are shown in **Table 3.5**. Moderate carbohydrate eaters were relatively younger ($p < 0.001$). Gender distribution across the three types of carbohydrate eaters was reasonably even ($p = 0.119$). The distribution of the carbohydrate eater types appears to be changing with the year of survey. Low carbohydrate eaters represented 32.5% of the population in the first year of the survey but later dropped to lower than 30% (minimum in the third year at 22.6%) until the most recent year. The proportion of high carbohydrate eaters increased from 41.2% to the highest (50.6%) in the second year, but then started to decline to 38.4% in the 8th year of survey ($p = 0.015$). There was no evidence of any difference in employment status across three types of carbohydrate eaters. However, strong evidence suggested that high carbohydrate eaters had the highest proportion (61.3%) of living with partner ($p < 0.001$); moderate carbohydrate eaters had the lowest average income (27180.8 £/year), the highest proportion of non-white population (20.5%), and a lower education level (23.3% with degree of higher education) compared with either low or high carbohydrate eaters.

Weighted means, percentages of anthropometric measurements, as well as biochemical characteristic profiles according to the latent carbohydrate eater groups are given in **Table 3.6**. Low carbohydrate eaters had higher mean BMI (27.8 kg/m²) and larger mean WC (98.9/89.9 cm in men/women) compared with 27.2, 27.3 kg/m², and 95.9/88.7 (men/women), 98.1/87.2 (men/women) cm in moderate and high carbohydrate eaters. Moderate carbohydrate eaters had the highest prevalence of being a current smoker (27.8%), shortest time of daily physical activity (geometric mean: 0.87 hours/day), and lowest prevalence of hypertension (20.2%).

From the results of blood tests, 6.9% of low carbohydrate eaters were found to be diabetic (diagnosed by HbA1C > 6.5%), while the percentages of diabetes in the moderate and high carbohydrate eaters were 3.5%, and 4.1% ($p = 0.011$), respectively. Although there was some evidence ($p = 0.027$) that fasting blood glucose level may be slightly higher in non-diabetic low carbohydrate eaters, the geometric mean for HbA1C was probably lower ($p = 0.010$) in moderate carbohydrate eaters (5.43, 95%CI: 5.39, 5.47). Total cholesterol, HDL, and LDL were all lower in the moderate

carbohydrate eaters, while no evidence of any difference of TG was found across three types of carbohydrate eaters.

TABLE 3.5: Weighted means, percentages, and 95% CIs of the social-demographic characteristics by carbohydrate eating latent class memberships in the UK adults.
(NDNS RP 2008/09-15/16, sample size = 6155)

Variables	Low carbo- hydrate eaters (n = 1730)	Moderate carbo- hydrate eaters (n = 1772)	High carbo- hydrate eaters (n = 2653)	P value *
Total (%)	28.3 (26.9, 29.9)	28.7 (27.1, 30.3)	43.0 (41.3, 44.7)	
Age (years)	51.0 (49.9, 52.1)	40.3 (39.1, 41.6)	51.7 (50.7, 52.7)	< 0.001
Sex (%)				0.119
Men	50.0 (46.9, 53.1)	50.2 (47.0, 53.5)	46.6 (44.0, 49.1)	
Women	50.0 (46.9, 53.1)	49.8 (46.5, 53.0)	53.4 (50.9, 56.0)	
Survey years (% in rows)				0.015
1	32.5 (28.4, 36.9)	26.3 (21.9, 31.2)	41.2 (36.6, 46.0)	
2	26.8 (22.6, 31.3)	22.6 (18.6, 27.3)	50.6 (45.8, 55.4)	
3	22.6 (18.8, 26.9)	33.7 (28.6, 39.2)	43.6 (38.7, 48.7)	
4	27.9 (24.1, 32.2)	27.6 (23.8, 31.8)	44.4 (40.2, 48.7)	
5	27.9 (24.2, 32.0)	28.7 (24.4, 33.5)	43.3 (38.2, 48.6)	
6	28.0 (24.0, 32.4)	31.5 (26.9, 36.6)	40.5 (35.8, 45.3)	
7	29.1 (25.2, 33.4)	29.0 (24.5, 34.0)	41.8 (37.1, 46.7)	
8	31.1 (27.3, 35.3)	30.5 (25.9, 35.5)	38.4 (34.1, 42.8)	
Paid employment [†] (%)				0.907
Yes	40.3 (37.0, 43.6)	40.8 (37.1, 44.5)	39.8 (37.1, 42.6)	
No	59.7 (56.4, 63.0)	59.2 (55.5, 62.9)	60.2 (57.4, 62.9)	
Live with partner [‡] (%)				< 0.001
Yes	56.9 (53.6, 60.1)	38.4 (35.2, 41.8)	61.3 (58.7, 63.7)	
No	43.1 (39.9, 46.4)	61.6 (58.2, 64.8)	38.7 (36.3, 41.3)	
Household income, £/year	36558.5 (34800.2, 38316.8)	27180.8 (25597.9, 28763.7)	32171.6 (31024.9, 33318.2)	< 0.001
Ethnicity (%)				
White	94.2 (92.4, 95.6)	79.5 (76.4, 82.3)	91.9 (90.1, 93.4)	< 0.001
Non-White	5.8 (4.4, 7.6)	20.5 (17.7, 23.6)	8.1 (6.6, 9.9)	
Education (%)				
Degree or higher	29.0 (26.1, 32.1)	23.3 (20.5, 26.3)	26.2 (24.1, 28.5)	0.019
Lower than degree	71.0 (67.9, 73.9)	76.7 (73.7, 79.5)	73.8 (71.5, 75.9)	

Note:

Abbreviations: CI, confidence intervals; NDNS RP, national diet and nutrition survey rolling programme.

Variables were weighted by individual weights.

* For continuous variables, the *F* test was used to determine differences between latent classes with Bonferroni correction to account for multiple testing across > 2 classes. For categorical variables, differences between latent classes were assessed using the adjusted Pearson χ^2 test for survey data.

[†] Paid employment was defined as being in paid employment during the last 4 weeks prior to the survey.

[‡] Live with partner was defined as either living with a married husband/wife or a legally recognised civil partnership.

TABLE 3.6: Weighted means, percentages, and 95% CIs of the anthropometric measurements, and biochemical characteristics by carbohydrate eating latent class memberships in the UK adults. (NDNS RP 2008/09-15/16, sample size = 6155)

Variables	Low carbo- hydrate eaters (n = 1730)	Moderate carbo- hydrate eaters (n = 1772)	High carbo- hydrate eaters (n = 2653)	<i>P</i> value *
BMI (kg/m ²)	27.8 (27.4, 28.2)	27.2 (26.7, 27.7)	27.3 (26.9, 27.6)	0.006
WC (cm)				
Men	98.9 (97.4, 100.5)	95.9 (94.1, 97.8)	98.1 (96.9, 99.2)	0.056
Women	89.9 (88.7, 91.3)	88.7 (87.1, 90.3)	87.2 (86.1, 88.2)	0.005
Smoking status (%)				
Current	20.4 (18.0, 23.0)	27.8 (25.0, 30.9)	17.1 (15.4, 19.0)	< 0.001
Ex-smoker	29.3 (26.5, 32.2)	16.8 (14.6, 19.2)	26.1 (24.9, 28.3)	
Never	50.3 (47.2, 53.2)	55.4 (52.2, 58.6)	56.8 (54.3, 59.3)	
Physical activity (hours/day) ¶	1.08 (0.97, 1.19)	0.87 (0.77, 0.97)	1.07 (0.98, 1.16)	0.005
Hypertension [†] , Yes (%)	33.8 (30.2, 37.5)	20.2 (17.0, 24.0)	30.9 (26.9, 31.0)	< 0.001
Total energy intake (kJ)	7985.8 (7823.3, 8146.3)	7341.8 (7825.3, 8146.3)	7677.0 (7555.8, 7799.8)	< 0.001
Glucose (mmol/l)	5.17 (5.12, 5.23)	5.05 (4.99, 5.13)	5.10 (5.05, 5.15)	0.027
HbA1C (%)	5.47 (5.44, 5.51)	5.43 (5.39, 5.47)	5.50 (5.48, 5.53)	0.010
DM [§]	6.9 (5.0, 9.3)	3.5 (2.3, 5.3)	4.1 (2.9, 5.6)	0.011
TC (mmol/l)	4.95 (4.84, 5.05)	4.72 (4.62, 4.83)	4.95 (4.87, 5.03)	0.001
HDL (mmol/l)	1.39 (1.35, 1.43)	1.32 (1.28, 1.35)	1.39 (1.36, 1.42)	0.003
LDL (mmol/l)	2.88 (2.79, 2.97)	2.77 (2.68, 2.86)	2.93 (2.86, 3.00)	0.024
TG (mmol/l)	1.14 (1.08, 1.19)	1.11 (1.05, 1.17)	1.10 (1.06, 1.15)	0.629

Note:

Abbreviations: CI, confidence intervals; NDNS RP, national diet and nutrition survey rolling programme;

BMI body mass index; WC, waist circumference; HbA1C, haemoglobin HbA1C; DM, diabetes mellitus; TC, total cholesterol; HDL, high density lipoproteins; LDL, low density lipoproteins; TG, triglycerides.

Glucose, HbA1C, TC, HDL, LDL, TG, and physical activity were expressed in geometric means (95% CI) because the data were positively skewed.

Variables from the blood tests (glucose and HbA1C) were weighted by blood sample weights, the other variables were weighted by nurse visiting weights. Glucose and HbA1C levels are estimated in subgroups of people without diabetes.

* For continuous variables, the *F* test was used to determine differences between latent classes with Bonferroni correction to account for multiple testing across > 2 classes. For categorical variables, differences between latent classes were assessed using the adjusted Pearson χ^2 test for survey data.

¶ Physical activity was calculated as mean time spent at moderate or vigorous physical activity including both work-related and recreational activities during the most recent month before the survey.

[†] Hypertension was defined as either systolic blood pressure ≥ 140 mmHg or diastolic blood pressure ≥ 90 mmHg, or under treatment for hypertension.

[§] DM was defined by HbA1C > 6.5%.

Association between individual-level latent classes and hypertension, and obesity.

Hypertension

Table 3.7 presents the characteristics of men and women participants in the NDNS RP 2008/09-15/16 by hypertension status. The weighted prevalences of hypertension were 30.4% in men and 27.5% in women. Among both sexes, there was strong evidence of differences by hypertension status for age, education level, living with a partner or not, smoking status, BMI, abdominal obesity (WC), and prevalence of diabetes ($p < 0.01$). No difference was found among either men or women for ethnicity. Strong evidence of difference was suggested in women for average household income (32741.5 £/year in non-hypertensive vs 27862.0 £/year in hypertensive, $p < 0.001$), and physical activity level (geometric mean: 0.81 hours/day in non-hypertensive compared with 0.53 hours/day in hypertensive, $p < 0.001$) but not in men. Interestingly, in both sexes, hypertensive participants had a higher proportion of being classified as low or high carbohydrate eaters; total energy and carbohydrate intake were higher in people without hypertension ($p < 0.001$).

The sex-specific associations of carbohydrate eating patterns with hypertension (both in total and in participants without diabetes) are shown in **Table 3.8**. In the crude models, moderate carbohydrate eaters had statistically significant lower odds of having hypertension than low carbohydrate eaters in both men and women irrespective to diabetes status. Among men, after adjustment for selected confounders, which includes: age, live with partner or not, education level, BMI, smoking status, and total energy intake, the odds of having hypertension were 32% lower (OR: 0.68, 95% CI: 0.43, 1.07) in moderate carbohydrate eaters compared with low carbohydrate eaters, evidence for the OR different from 1 was borderline significant ($p = 0.093$). 95% CI of the adjusted OR became narrower (OR: 0.64, 95% CI: 0.41, 1.01, $p = 0.054$) when BMI was replaced with WC in model 2. When diabetic men were excluded in Model 2, the odds for moderate and high carbohydrate eaters compared with low carbohydrate eaters were 35% (OR: 0.65, 95%CI: 0.41, 1.03) and 27% (OR:0.73, 95%CI: 0.51, 1.06) lower, respectively. The negative associations between moderate carbohydrate eating pattern and hypertension were also observed in women, however, without any statistically significant evidence in the fully adjusted models. High carbohydrate eaters also had lower adjusted odds compared with low carbohydrate eaters, while the 95% CIs for the adjusted ORs were all wide and included the null value suggesting no evidence of any association in either men or women for high carbohydrate eating pattern and hypertension.

TABLE 3.7: Weighted means, percentages, and 95 % CIs of the characteristics by hypertension status in the UK adults.
(NDNS RP 2008/09-15/16, sample size = 6155)

	Men (n = 2537)			Women (n = 3618)		
	Non-hypertensive	Hypertensive	P value *	Non-hypertensive	Hypertensive	P value *
Weighted prevalence (%)	69.6 (66.6, 72.5)	30.4 (27.5, 33.4)		72.5 (69.8, 75.0)	27.5 (25.0, 30.2)	
Age (years)	43.2 (41.7, 44.7)	59.9 (58.0, 61.7)	<0.001	43.9 (42.7, 45.1)	64.9 (63.4, 66.5)	<0.001
Ethnicity (%)			0.534			0.126
White	89.6 (86.5, 92.0)	91.1 (86.2, 94.4)		85.7 (82.7, 88.3)	90.2 (85.0, 93.7)	
Non-white	10.4 (8.0, 13.5)	8.9 (5.6, 13.8)		14.3 (11.7, 17.3)	9.8 (6.3, 15.0)	
Education (%)			0.006			<0.001
Degree or higher	30.3 (26.6, 34.2)	21.5 (17.3, 26.5)		33.0 (29.9, 36.3)	19.7 (15.8, 24.3)	
Lower than Degree	69.7 (65.8, 73.4)	78.5 (73.5, 82.7)		67.0 (63.7, 70.1)	80.3 (75.7, 84.2)	
Household income, £/year	34006.5 (31972.9, 36040.1)	32280.5 (29875.6, 34685.4)	0.284	32741.5 (31009.9, 34473.1)	27862.0 (25557.0, 30167.0)	<0.001
Live with partner [‡] , Yes, (%)	56.1 (51.8, 61.4)	66.6 (61.3, 71.5)	0.002	48.7 (45.1, 52.3)	58.9 (53.6, 63.9)	0.002
Smoking status			<0.001			<0.001
Current	19.7 (16.6, 23.1)	12.9 (9.5, 17.2)		15.2 (13.1, 17.6)	8.5 (6.2, 11.6)	
Ex-smoker	24.2 (21.1, 27.6)	38.8 (33.4, 44.5)		21.6 (19.1, 24.4)	32.2 (27.3, 37.4)	
Never	56.2 (52.1, 60.1)	48.3 (42.7, 54.0)		63.2 (60.1, 66.2)	59.3 (54.0, 64.4)	
Physical activity (hours/day) [†]	1.52 (1.33, 1.72)	1.29 (1.08, 1.53)	0.134	0.81 (0.73, 0.89)	0.53 (0.42, 0.64)	<0.001
BMI (kg/m ²)	26.8 (26.4, 27.2)	29.5 (28.9, 29.9)	<0.001	26.4 (26.1, 26.8)	29.8 (29.2, 30.5)	<0.001
WC (cm)	95.0 (93.9, 96.2)	104.6 (103.2, 106.1)	<0.001	85.7 (84.8, 86.6)	95.7 (94.2, 97.2)	<0.001
DM [§] (%)	3.7 (2.4, 5.7)	12.6 (8.9, 17.5)	<0.001	1.8 (1.0, 3.3)	7.9 (5.1, 11.9)	<0.001
Carbohydrate eating patterns (%)			<0.001			<0.001
Low	28.3 (24.8, 32.2)	37.1 (32.0, 42.5)		26.9 (24.1, 29.9)	32.0 (27.2, 37.2)	
Moderate	30.8 (26.9, 35.0)	19.3 (15.3, 24.1)		29.6 (26.4, 33.0)	18.4 (14.5, 22.9)	
High	40.8 (36.9, 44.9)	43.6 (38.2, 49.2)		43.5 (40.3, 46.8)	49.7 (44.1, 55.2)	
Total energy intake (kJ)	9021.4 (8791.9, 9251.0)	8366.2 (8094.9, 8637.4)	<0.001	6802.6 (6681.1, 6924.0)	6396.7 (6217.1, 6576.2)	<0.001
Carbohydrate intake (g)	259.2 (252.9, 265.3)	235.3 (227.8, 242.8)	<0.001	198.0 (194.2, 201.8)	184.5 (178.8, 190.1)	<0.001

Note:

Abbreviations: CI, confidence intervals; NDNS RP, national diet and nutrition survey rolling programme; BMI body mass index; WC, waist circumference.

Variables are weighted by nurse visiting weights.

* Significant sex-specific differences by hypertension status assessed using an *F* test for continuous variables or design-adjusted Pearson χ^2 test.

† Live with partner was defined as either living with a married husband/wife or a legally recognised civil partnership.

‡ Physical activity was calculated as mean time spent at moderate or vigorous physical activity including both work-related and recreational activities.

§ DM was defined by HbA1C > 6.5%.

TABLE 3.8: ORs (95%CI) for the associations of carbohydrate eating patterns with hypertension in the UK adults, with or without diabetes

(NDNS RP 2008/09-15/16, sample size = 6155)

Model	Carbohydrate eating patterns				
	Low	Moderate	<i>P</i> value*	High	<i>P</i> value*
Men (n = 2537)					
Hypertension					
Crude model	1	0.48 (0.33, 0.70)	< 0.001	0.82 (0.59, 1.13)	0.217
Model 1 [†]	1	0.68 (0.43, 1.07)	0.093	0.80 (0.56, 1.15)	0.227
Model 2	1	0.64 (0.41, 1.01)	0.054	0.75 (0.53, 1.08)	0.124
Hypertension in non-diabetics					
Crude model	1	0.49 (0.33, 0.73)	< 0.001	0.82 (0.59, 1.14)	0.241
Model 1 [†]	1	0.69 (0.43, 1.09)	0.110	0.78 (0.54, 1.14)	0.197
Model 2	1	0.65 (0.41, 1.03)	0.066	0.73 (0.51, 1.06)	0.096
Women (n = 3618)					
Hypertension					
Crude model	1	0.52 (0.36, 0.75)	< 0.001	0.96 (0.72, 1.28)	0.773
Model 1 [‡]	1	0.79 (0.45, 1.39)	0.415	0.89 (0.61, 1.30)	0.552
Model 2	1	0.78 (0.45, 1.36)	0.384	0.88 (0.62, 1.26)	0.483
Hypertension in non-diabetics					
Crude model	1	0.51 (0.35, 0.74)	< 0.001	0.98 (0.73, 1.31)	0.875
Model 1 [‡]	1	0.79 (0.44, 1.42)	0.435	0.89 (0.61, 1.29)	0.534
Model 2	1	0.79 (0.45, 1.39)	0.415	0.87 (0.61, 1.25)	0.452

Note:

Abbreviations: OR, odds ratio; CI, confidence interval; BMI, body mass index; WC, waist circumference; NDNS RP, national diet and nutrition survey rolling programme.

Diabetes was defined by HbA1C > 6.5%. BMI was replaced with WC in Model 2s, other covariates remained the same with the corresponding Model 1s.

* *P* values were obtained from Wald tests in logistic regression models.

[†] Adjusted for age (continuous), live with partner or not (binary), education level

(higher or equal to degree level or not), BMI, smoking status (current, ex-smoker, never), total energy intake (kJ);

[‡] Adjusted for age, live with partner or not, average household income (continuous),

education level, BMI, smoking status, total energy intake (kJ), alcohol consumption (g/day).

Obesity (BMI and WC)

Table 3.9 shows the characteristics of participants according to their obesity status stratified by sex. The survey design-weighted prevalences for being overweight and obese in the UK adults were estimated to be 43.4% and 25.7% in men, and 30.9% and 27.4% in women. Obviously, abdominal obesity (WC) increased significantly with the elevated BMI level in both men and women. Overweight or obese participants were older, having lower total energy intake and lower carbohydrate intake compared with normal weight men and women ($p < 0.001$). Moreover, education

TABLE 3.9: Weighted means, percentages, and 95 % CIs of the characteristics by BMI categories in the UK adults.
(NDNS RP 2008/09-15/16, sample size = 6155)

	Men (n = 2537)			P value*	Women (n = 3618)			P value*
	Normal weight	Overweight	Obese		Normal weight	Overweight	Obese	
Weighted prevalence (%)	30.9 (28.0, 33.9)	43.4 (40.4, 46.4)	25.7 (23.2, 28.4)		41.7 (39.0, 44.4)	30.9 (28.4, 33.5)	27.4 (25.1, 29.9)	
BMI (kg/m ²)	22.6 (22.3, 22.8)	27.3 (27.2, 27.5)	33.7 (33.3, 34.2)	< 0.001	22.2 (22.0, 22.4)	27.3 (27.2, 27.5)	35.0 (34.6, 35.4)	< 0.001
WC (cm)	84.5 (83.6, 85.4)	97.1 (96.4, 97.8)	112.7 (111.6, 113.9)	< 0.001	76.9 (76.2, 77.5)	89.0 (88.3, 89.7)	103.7 (102.6, 104.7)	< 0.001
Age (years)	40.3 (38.2, 42.4)	49.6 (47.9, 51.2)	50.4 (48.5, 52.3)	< 0.001	45.0 (43.4, 46.7)	50.4 (48.6, 52.3)	50.9 (49.1, 52.7)	< 0.001
Ethnicity (%)				0.466				0.879
White	88.7 (83.9, 92.2)	89.1 (85.6, 91.9)	91.9 (87.3, 94.9)		88.4 (84.9, 91.19)	88.6 (84.5, 91.7)	87.3 (82.5, 90.9)	
Non-white	11.3 (7.8, 16.1)	10.9 (8.1, 14.4)	8.1 (5.1, 12.7)		11.6 (8.9, 15.1)	11.4 (8.3, 15.5)	12.7 (9.1, 17.5)	
Education (%)				0.022				< 0.001
Degree or higher	29.5 (24.5, 35.0)	28.3 (24.3, 32.7)	20.1 (16.0, 25.0)		35.7 (31.8, 39.8)	24.2 (20.4, 28.4)	19.4 (16.1, 23.2)	
Lower than Degree	70.5 (65.0, 75.5)	71.7 (67.3, 75.7)	79.9 (75.0, 84.0)		64.3 (60.2, 68.2)	75.8 (71.6, 79.6)	80.6 (76.8, 83.9)	
Household income, £/year	33695.9	35059.6	30295.5	0.011	34594.1	29777.7	27230.6	< 0.001
(30462.3, 36929.7)		(32949.7, 37169.5)	(27948.5, 32642.6)		(32326.8, 36861.4)	(27808.3, 31747.2)	(25259.1, 29202.0)	
Live with partner [†] , Yes, (%)	40.3 (34.8, 46.1)	65.3 (60.8, 69.6)	65.6 (60.1, 70.8)	< 0.001	47.6 (43.2, 52.1)	52.2 (47.5, 57.0)	51.7 (46.7, 56.6)	0.288
Smoking status				< 0.001				0.042
Current	32.0 (26.8, 37.7)	18.7 (15.5, 22.4)	19.2 (15.0, 24.3)		19.5 (16.4, 22.9)	17.8 (14.8, 21.4)	16.4 (13.1, 20.3)	
Ex-smoker	17.3 (13.5, 22.0)	28.6 (24.8, 32.7)	32.9 (27.9, 38.4)		19.0 (15.9, 22.5)	24.4 (20.8, 28.3)	26.9 (22.8, 31.6)	
Never	50.6 (44.8, 56.4)	52.7 (48.2, 57.1)	47.9 (42.1, 53.7)		61.6 (57.4, 65.5)	57.8 (53.3, 62.2)	56.7 (51.8, 61.4)	
Physical activity [†] (hours/day)	1.58 (1.33, 1.85)	1.42 (1.24, 1.62)	1.41 (1.15, 1.70)	0.547	0.84 (0.74, 0.94)	0.71 (0.62, 0.79)	0.65 (0.53, 0.78)	0.038
Carbohydrate eating patterns (%)				0.072				0.253
Low	25.9 (21.0, 31.5)	30.6 (26.6, 35.0)	31.4 (26.6, 36.6)		24.8 (21.5, 28.5)	26.8 (22.8, 31.2)	29.5 (25.3, 34.1)	
Moderate	34.2 (28.6, 40.4)	25.5 (21.9, 29.6)	25.5 (20.6, 31.0)		27.6 (23.8, 31.8)	26.3 (22.3, 30.8)	29.8 (25.4, 34.6)	
High	39.9 (34.2, 45.8)	43.8 (39.6, 48.2)	43.1 (37.7, 48.7)		47.6 (43.3, 51.9)	46.9 (42.4, 51.4)	40.7 (36.0, 45.6)	
Total energy intake (kJ)	9351.2	8786.9	8465.3	0.001	7048.9	6570.1	6566.4	< 0.001
(8961.7, 9740.7)		(8595.1, 8978.7)	(8196.4, 8734.1)		(6894.4, 7203.4)	(6406.2, 6734.0)	(6360.7, 6772.1)	
Carbohydrate intake (g)	268.7	250.1	239.1	< 0.001	205.8	190.1	189.8	< 0.001
(258.3, 279.2)		(244.1, 256.1)	(231.3, 246.8)		(200.2, 211.3)	(185.3, 194.9)	(183.7, 195.9)	

Note:

Abbreviations: CI, confidence intervals; NDNS RP, national diet and nutrition survey rolling programme; BMI body mass index; WC, waist circumference.

Variables are weighted by nurse visiting weights.

* Significant sex-specific differences by BMI categories assessed using an *F* test (with Bonferroni correction to account for multiple testing across > 2 groups)

for continuous variables or design-adjusted Pearson χ^2 test for categorical variables

† Live with partner was defined as either living with a married husband/wife or a legally recognised civil partnership.

‡ Physical activity was calculated as mean time spent at moderate or vigorous physical activity including both work-related and recreational activities.

level ($p = 0.022$ for men, < 0.001 for women), and average household income ($p = 0.011$ for men, < 0.001 for women) decreased with increases in BMI. Living with a partner was strongly positively associated with obesity for men but not for women. Men with obesity were also found to have the lowest proportion of never being a smoker (47.9%) and the highest proportion of being an ex-smoker (32.9%). Association between smoking status and obesity in women had only very weak evidence ($p = 0.042$), but a similar pattern as in men was observed (higher proportion of ex- and current smokers in overweight or obese women). No difference was found for length of physical activity across obesity levels in men, while in women, somewhat weak inverse association ($p=0.038$) was confirmed. Interestingly, predefined carbohydrate eating patterns lacked evidence for an association with BMI in men ($p = 0.072$) or in women ($p = 0.253$).

TABLE 3.10: Associations of moderate/high carbohydrate eating patterns versus low on BMI in UK adults, with or without diabetes.
(NDNS RP 2008/09-15/16, sample size = 6155)

Model	Carbohydrate eating patterns				
	Low	Moderate	<i>P</i> value*	High	<i>P</i> value*
Men (n = 2537)					
BMI					
Crude model	–	-0.78 (-1.62, 0.06)	0.068	-0.28 (-0.96, 0.41)	0.426
Model 1 [†]	–	-0.20 (-1.06, 0.66)	0.654	-0.43 (-1.13, 0.26)	0.220
BMI in non-diabetics					
Crude model	–	-0.65 (-1.49, 0.19)	0.127	-0.21 (-0.89, 0.48)	0.557
Model 1 [†]	–	-0.10 (-0.97, 0.77)	0.820	-0.39 (-1.10, 0.31)	0.269
Women (n = 3618)					
BMI					
Crude model	–	-0.30 (-1.18, 0.57)	0.496	-0.76 (-1.44, -0.82)	0.028
Live with partner [‡]	–	-0.93 (-2.33, 0.46)	0.188	-1.76 (-2.78, -0.73)	0.001
Live alone [‡]	–	1.17 (-0.35, 2.70)	0.132	0.57 (-0.58, 1.71)	0.332
BMI in non-diabetics					
Crude model	–	-0.24 (-1.12, 0.65)	0.601	-0.71 (-1.39, -0.03)	0.040
Live with partner [‡]	–	-0.86 (-2.28, 0.55)	0.232	-1.62 (-2.65, -0.58)	0.002
Live alone [‡]	–	1.22 (-0.34, 2.78)	0.124	0.43 (-0.71, 1.56)	0.462

Note: all units of BMI in kg/m²;

Abbreviations: BMI body mass index; NDNS RP, national diet and nutrition survey rolling programme.

Diabetes was defined by HbA1C > 6.5%.

* *P* values were obtained from wald tests from linear regression models.

[†] Adjusted for age, live with partner or not, education level, hypertension (yes or no), smoking status, total energy intake, alcohol consumption;

[‡] Adjusted for age, average household income, education level, hypertension, smoking status, total energy intake, alcohol consumption.

Results of the multivariable linear regression analyses showed smaller BMI for moderate or high carbohydrate eaters compared with low carbohydrate eaters among men (**Table 3.10**). However, the 95%CI of the regression coefficients were all wide and included the null value 0, indicating no statistically supported evidence for the inverse association. In women, evidence of an interaction effect was found between living with a partner or not and carbohydrate eating patterns for the outcome of BMI (p for interaction = 0.014 and 0.036 for women in total and without diabetes). For women who were living with partners, latent classes of carbohydrate eating patterns were negatively associated with BMI. Compared with women eating a low carbohydrate food pattern, women having a high carbohydrate eating pattern were associated with an average 1.76 kg/m² lower BMI after adjustment of age, average household income, education level, smoking status, total energy intake and alcohol consumption. 95%CI for the adjusted BMI difference was 0.73 to 2.78 kg/m², $p = 0.001$. After excluding diabetic women, BMI was still 1.62 kg/m² (95%CI: 0.58, 2.65, $p = 0.002$) smaller in high carbohydrate eaters versus low carbohydrate eaters on average. On the contrary, latent classes of carbohydrate eating patterns were positively associated with BMI in women who were living by themselves, although there was no evidence that regression coefficients differed from 0 ($p > 0.05$).

Similarly, when looking at the association between carbohydrate eating pattern and abdominal obesity (WC), men who were classified as moderate carbohydrate eaters were found to have about 3 cm (95%CI: 0.52, 5.49 cm, $p = 0.018$) smaller WC compared to low carbohydrate eaters in the crude model (**Table 3.11**). However, after adjustment for age, living with partner or not, average household income, education level, hypertension, smoking status, total energy intake, and alcohol consumption, the association attenuated to no difference. The interaction effect of living with a partner or not on the association between carbohydrate eating patterns and WC was again found in women in total (p for interaction = 0.009) and without diabetes (p for interaction = 0.012). Among women who were living with their partners, high carbohydrate eaters had 4.71 cm (95%CI: 2.43, 7.00, $p < 0.001$) smaller WC on average compared with low carbohydrate eaters. The association remained after restricting the sample to non-diabetic women (-3.74 cm, 95% CI: -5.97, -1.51, $p = 0.001$). However, for women who were living alone, moderate carbohydrate eaters had 3.17 cm (95%CI: 0.05, 6.30, $p = 0.047$) larger WC on average compared with low carbohydrate eaters. The evidence for the positive association between moderate carbohydrate eaters and WC in women became weaker but still had borderline significance when excluding diabetic women (3.08 cm, 95%CI: -0.09, 6.25, $p = 0.057$).

TABLE 3.11: Associations of moderate/high carbohydrate eating patterns versus low on WC in UK adults, with or without diabetes.
(NDNS RP 2008/09-15/16, sample size = 6155)

Model	Carbohydrate eating patterns				
	Low	Moderate	<i>P</i> value*	High	<i>P</i> value*
Men (n = 2537)					
WC					
Crude model	–	-3.00 (-5.49, -0.52)	0.018	-0.90 (-2.84, 1.04)	0.364
Model 1 [†]	–	1.06 (-1.50, 3.64)	0.415	-1.55 (-3.42, 0.31)	0.103
WC in non-diabetics					
Crude model	–	-2.51 (-5.00, -0.21)	0.048	-0.51 (-2.47, 1.44)	0.606
Model 1 [†]	–	1.42 (-1.17, 4.01)	0.283	-1.29 (-3.18, 0.60)	0.181
Women (n = 3618)					
WC					
Crude model	–	-1.28 (-3.26, 0.70)	0.206	-2.81 (-4.50, -1.12)	0.001
Live with partner [‡]	–	0.28 (-2.85, 3.41)	0.861	-4.71 (-7.00, -2.43)	< 0.001
Live alone [‡]	–	3.17 (0.05, 6.30)	0.047	0.73 (-1.84, 3.30)	0.577
WC in non-diabetics					
Crude model	–	-0.91 (-2.88, 1.07)	0.368	-2.41 (-4.06, -0.76)	0.004
Live with partner [‡]	–	1.11 (-2.02, 4.23)	0.487	-3.74 (-5.97, -1.51)	0.001
Live alone [‡]	–	3.08 (-0.09, 6.25)	0.057	0.16 (-2.36, 2.69)	0.899

Note: All units of WC in cm;

Abbreviations: WC, waist circumference; NDNS RP, national diet and nutrition survey rolling programme.

Diabetes was defined by HbA1C > 6.5%.

* *P* values were obtained from Wald tests in linear regression models.

[†] Adjusted for age, live with partner or not, average household income, education level, hypertension (yes or no), smoking status, total energy intake, alcohol consumption;

[‡] Adjusted for age, age², education level, hypertension, smoking status, total energy intake, alcohol consumption.

Chapter 4

Discussion and Conclusion

Carbohydrate eating patterns

Using multilevel LCA as a novel technique, and data from the NDNS RP, this project examined carbohydrate temporal eating patterns firstly at the day level, based on which, individual level carbohydrate eating patterns were also defined subsequently.

Among the dietary diaries collected, there were three distinct latent classes specifically for carbohydrate intake: 1) high probabilities of having high carbohydrate contained food across the hours of day (high percentage carbohydrate day); 2) low carbohydrate food dominant throughout the hours of day (low percentage carbohydrate day); and 3) always having lunch and dinner day (regular meals day). From these day level classifications and their features, one might anticipate that individuals followed much of class 3) days, the regular meals day, might be eating a healthier diet because of regular eating habits. We might also speculate that those who followed either high or low carbohydrate percentage days would consume higher total energy than those who followed mostly regular meals days.

However, when the MLCA extended the model to an individual level, three types of persons were further defined depending on their 4-day-diary: 1) low carbohydrate eaters, who mostly followed "regular meals day"; 2) moderate carbohydrate eaters, who had similar probabilities of following either "regular meals day" or "high percentage carbohydrate day"; 3) high carbohydrate eaters, who followed "high percentage carbohydrate day" for half of their survey. For the first time, as far as we know, the day-to-day food intake pattern variation within individuals was successfully captured by MLCA models. Results from the MLCA models showed that from the perspective of carbohydrate consumption, people were indeed changing their diet from day to day even over the captured four days. The

MLCA models allowed the probability of following a certain type of carbohydrate eating day to vary across individuals. This properly accounted for the fact that for some people, their probability of following a type of food eating pattern during the survey could be higher/lower than that in the others. This finding also suggested that assuming a person will always follow a certain type of temporal eating pattern is not appropriate.

Surprisingly, low carbohydrate eaters whose dietary recordings suggested that they were mostly following a regular temporal meals pattern turned out to be consuming the highest amount of total energy among the three types of carbohydrate eaters. Detailed profiling of energy composition according to the time slots revealed that low carbohydrate eaters had a higher proportion of energy contributed by both alcohol and fat across the 7 time slots. A high percentage of fat consumption was shown in all 7-time slots, energy coming from alcohol exceeded more than one-fifth of the total energy after 8 pm. These findings explained why they were actually consuming the highest energy among the three types of carbohydrate eaters. In the meantime, we also found that participants consuming low carbohydrate food had a higher prevalence of diabetes, hypertension, and obesity. These health issues might lead them to replace carbohydrates in their diet with other energy sources such as fat, protein, or even alcohol. Therefore, there is a possibility that they chose to follow low carbohydrate diets for health purposes, but many of them were replacing carbohydrates with higher energy condensed food or even alcohol at night which might indeed be a public health concern.

Next, when looking into the details of the timing and composition of the energy intake among the moderate carbohydrate eaters, we realised that although these individuals did not consume as much alcohol as low carbohydrate eaters did at night, they consumed the highest amount of energy, especially during the time period as late as after 10 pm. People who fell into moderate carbohydrate eaters group seemed to have the tendency of having their food or meals later than high carbohydrate eaters. They consumed the highest amount of carbohydrates and also total energy among three types of carbohydrate eaters during the following time slots: 9-12 noon, 2-5 pm, 8-10 pm, and 10pm-6am. These individuals in the NDNS RP were younger, mostly single, with lower average income, and lower education level. They might correspond to the "late eaters" defined by previous studies (Leech et al., 2017; Mansukhani and Palla, 2018).

Finally, the high carbohydrate eaters identified by our MLCA models had the highest absolute total amount of carbohydrate intake. Most (nearly 70%) of their total energy intake occurred during 6-9 am, 12-2 pm, and 5-8 pm time slots although

their total energy consumption was not the highest (between low and moderate carbohydrate eaters). High carbohydrate eaters were also found to be the ones that consumed the least amount of energy after 8 pm. Therefore, contrary to what was anticipated at the beginning, people who followed high percentage carbohydrate days for most of their time were potentially eating a healthier diet compared with the other two eating patterns.

Our analyses looking for different temporal carbohydrate eating patterns also highlighted the complexity of eating behaviours in the population and the utility of exploratory, data-driven methods to objectively identify eating patterns that reflect both timing and quantities of food intake, which may not have been detected so far in the literature.

Associations between carbohydrate eating patterns and health outcomes

Men who were classified as moderate carbohydrate eaters were estimated to have lower odds of having hypertension compared with low carbohydrate eaters, after adjustment for age, relationship status (living with a partner or not), educational level, BMI, smoking status and total energy intake. As discussed above, moderate carbohydrate eaters tended to have meals (or energy intake) later in time compared with high carbohydrate eaters. But, it is noteworthy that low carbohydrate eaters also obtained a large amount of energy from both fat and alcohol at night. Therefore, considering that moderate carbohydrate eaters were younger than low carbohydrate eaters (although age was adjusted in the full models), it is probable that reverse causality exists here (also due to the nature of cross-sectional study). That is, they were potentially both late eaters, however, with increased age (and so with increased health-related problems/concerns) some of the individuals modified their habits, replacing carbohydrate food with other energy sources (so that they became low carbohydrate eaters) leading to the phenomenon of lower odds of hypertension in moderate carbohydrate eaters. This phenomenon may be supported by some current trend in following low carbohydrate diets (ketogenic diets) which were found actually with limited weight losing effect and even associated with adverse events such as nonalcoholic fatty liver disease (NAFLD), and insulin resistance (Kosinski and Jornayvaz, 2017). Although these hypotheses cannot be determined by the cross-sectional data from NDNS RP, if they are true, the energy

sources individuals used to replace carbohydrate in their diet were apparently not wisely chosen.

Among women, relationship status acted as an interaction factor influencing the associations between carbohydrate eating patterns and BMI and abdominal obesity (WC). Directions of the associations were opposite to each other depending on whether women were living with a partner or not. This interaction effect was more noticeable when looking at abdominal obesity measurement. High carbohydrate eaters who lived with partners had lower BMI and WC than low carbohydrate eaters, while moderate carbohydrate eaters who lived alone had higher WC than their low carbohydrate eating counterparts, after adjustment of age, education level, smoking status, total energy intake, and alcohol consumption. High carbohydrate eaters who were characterised by high and early daily energy consumption and low fat and alcohol intake may reflect a healthier diet and lifestyle, but this might be different between women who lived alone and those who lived with their partners. It was often assumed that living alone may be associated with a lower diversity of food intake and a higher likelihood of having unhealthy dietary choices (Hanna and Collins, 2015). Therefore, there may be differences in the actual contents consumed in their high carbohydrates, or there may be other social, psychological or lifestyle-related factors related with living alone which were not measured or were not included in the models. Since the inverse association between high carbohydrate eating pattern and BMI or abdominal obesity were only observed among women who lived with partners, further investigation of this hypothesis is needed. In addition, the reason why moderate carbohydrate eaters' WC was larger than low carbohydrate eaters only among women who lived alone is unknown. Given that the evidence of this association was weak and borderline significant, whether it was just a false positive finding should also be explored in other studies.

Limitations and strengths

Several limitations in the current project merit consideration.

First, we ignored the order of observation days in the MLCA models. The food consumption diaries were accomplished by participants for at least 3 out of 4 consecutive days. In the multilevel analyses, these 3 or 4 days' observations were treated as if they were exchangeable in the models. Since one's diet might change according to the season, day of the week (weekdays or weekends), or sometimes depending on what one had consumed the day before, exchangeability

of daily diaries is a strong assumption and cannot be overcome by the MLCA models adopted here. Other statistical techniques which could take the order or the longitudinal nature of the data into account, such as repeated measures latent class analysis (RMLCA), latent transition analysis (LTA) (Collins and Lanza, 2010), or latent class growth analysis (LCGA) (Davidian et al., 2008; Jung and Wickrama, 2008; Andruff et al., 2009) are not applicable for the NDNS RP dataset. The NDNS RP participants were allowed to choose which days to begin their food diaries, but the alternative models above would require that the 3 or 4 repeated measurements of food diaries be recorded at the same time points longitudinally. Specifically, LCGA models (also called growth mixture model) will also need to model the change of the odds of the probability over time as a function (quadratic, or cubic) which is apparently not the objective in the current project.

Second, the classification of individuals to latent carbohydrate eating classes was defined by maximum posterior probability assignment rule. This approach assigns individuals to the class for which they have the highest posterior probability of membership (Nagin, 2005). The other approach is multiple pseudo-class draws (Wang, Hendricks Brown, and Bandeen-Roche, 2005), which was proposed in an attempt to account for uncertainty in class assignment. However, the maximum probability rule is still believed to be able to minimise the number of incorrect assignments (Goodman, 2007). A Monte Carlo simulation study (Bray, Lanza, and Tan, 2015) demonstrated that maximum probability assignment is less biased than multiple pseudo-class draws.

Moreover, the Monte Carlo simulation study (Bray, Lanza, and Tan, 2015) also found that an inclusive LCA (i.e. LCA with covariates) would probably perform better than non-inclusive LCA and has the potential to reduce bias of class assignment. However, whether this advantage can be extended to MLCA in the current project is unknown. Also, because the associations between the latent classes and distal outcomes (hypertension, and obesity) are still under exploration, appropriate covariates for an inclusive LCA model may not be known. Thus, as a first step, given the complexity of the NDNS RP dataset itself, we chose to fit the MLCA models without any covariate in either day level or individual level models. Future studies may be advised to consider incorporating other predictors in the MLCA models to see whether the classifications in both levels can be improved or not.

Third, detailed information on the occupations of the participants was not available, and thus we could not account for those who had a shift or night work. But considering that completing a 4-consecutive-day food diary may be a tremendous burden for all participants, those with shift or night work might be less able to

comply and complete their diary for 4 days. However, the latter hypothesis cannot be verified in the NDNS RP dataset. If people on shifts were included in the NDNS RP sample, the classification in both levels, as well as their associations with either hypertension or BMI would be biased.

Furthermore, under-reporting due to the burden of recording food and drink intake for 4 days at each occasion is also a concern in the current survey. To evaluate the influence of under-reporting in the NDNS RP sample, the study team conducted a doubly labelled water (DLW) sub-study within the survey. The details of this sub-study can be accessed from the Appendix X of the Official Reports provided by Public Health England (Bates et al., 2014; Roberts et al., 2018; Department of Health, 2018). In the sub-study, there is an assumption that in healthy adults, if energy consumed in food matches total energy expended over a given time period, the individuals are deemed to be in energy balance. Using the DLW technique, total energy expenditure (TEE) from a sub-sample of NDNS RP participants were measured and compared with the estimates of energy consumption from their 4 day diaries. Results of the sub-study showed reasonable agreement between energy consumed and TEE (overall ratio: 0.73), indicating some potential misreporting. Reasons such as misreporting of actual consumption, under-reporting or modified usual intake due to the burden of the survey/DLW sub-study may contribute to under-reporting of their energy consumed. We cannot extrapolate the estimated under-reporting to the whole sample since other individuals' diet might be differentially affected by under-reporting. Besides, within NDNS RP, it is not possible to differentiate between under-reporting due to ill health vs actual misreporting. Subsequently, most previous studies using data from the NDNS RP do not adjust for under-reporting of nutrients intake in the models.

Last, it should be noted that the findings from data-driven, exploratory methods may not be generalizable to populations in other countries, since the carbohydrate eating patterns in both day level and individual level may only reflect the dietary habits of the current population. The latter reflect the socio-cultural and lifestyle characteristics of the adult population in the UK. Further research is warranted to explore and better understand the eating patterns in other populations. In particular, the cross-sectional study design prevented us from deducing any causal effect between the carbohydrate eating patterns and respective health outcomes including hypertension, BMI or abdominal obesity.

Strengths of this study include the large, nationally representative sample of UK men and women. We applied a novel, objective approach using MLCA to examine the carbohydrate eating patterns while applying standardised criteria to

determine the number of latent classes. The process of finding the classifications through model-based, data-driven procedure minimises reliance on researchers' preconceived notions of eating patterns. Eating patterns were determined from 4 consecutive days of well-designed, fully-examined food diaries that provided detailed information of what and when food and drinks were eaten. MLCA correctly accounted for the multilevel structure of the data, where the 4-day diet diaries were nested within the participants. Our findings also captured the day-to-day variation of the respective carbohydrate eating patterns within individuals. Moreover, the examination of associations between the individual level carbohydrate eating patterns and hypertension, BMI, abdominal obesity took the complex and the clustered survey design into consideration, in addition to accounting for participant non-response to survey. Health outcomes such as weight, height, waist circumferences, and blood pressure, diabetes status were measured objectively by trained nurses in addition to lipid profile, glucose, and HbA1C being measured in blood. These approaches have an advantage over self-reported measurements as they may minimise bias caused by misclassification and under-reporting.

Conclusions

We have successfully defined carbohydrate eating patterns in the general population in UK adults using the NDNS RP database in both observation day level and individual level. Low carbohydrate eaters tended to have higher energy intake from fat and alcohol compared to other types of carbohydrate eaters and eating later in the day. Moderate carbohydrate eaters reported the lowest total daily energy intake and tended to have a higher energy intake later in the day. High carbohydrate eaters obtained most of their carbohydrate as well as energy earlier in the day. These eating patterns specifically for carbohydrate intake were found to differ by timing, quantity, and contributions to energy consumption. Compared with low carbohydrate eaters, men with a moderate carbohydrate eating pattern may had a lower prevalence of hypertension. Women in moderate carbohydrate eating pattern and lived alone had a larger waist circumference compared with low carbohydrate eaters. Among women who lived with partners, a high carbohydrate eating pattern was associated with both lower BMI and smaller waist circumferences. Longitudinal studies are needed to investigate whether the identified eating patterns themselves are changing over time and to study how such circadian eating patterns may relate to the change of blood pressure, obesity, and other health outcomes (incidence of cancer, cardiovascular diseases, or mortality).

Bibliography

- Alhazmi, Amani et al. (2012). "Macronutrient intakes and development of type 2 diabetes: a systematic review and meta-analysis of cohort studies". In: *Journal of the American College of Nutrition* 31.4, pp. 243–258.
- Almoosawi, S et al. (2013). "Time-of-day and nutrient composition of eating occasions: prospective association with the metabolic syndrome in the 1946 British birth cohort". In: *International Journal of Obesity* 37.5, p. 725.
- Almoosawi, S et al. (2016). "Chrono-nutrition: a review of current evidence from observational studies on global trends in time-of-day of energy intake and its association with obesity". In: *Proceedings of the Nutrition Society* 75.4, pp. 487–500.
- Andruff, Heather et al. (2009). "Latent Class Growth Modelling: A Tutorial". In: *Tutorials in Quantitative Methods for Psychology* 5.1, pp. 11–24.
- Archer, Kellie J, Stanley Lemeshow, and David W Hosmer (2007). "Goodness-of-fit tests for logistic regression models when data are collected using a complex sampling design". In: *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis* 51.9, pp. 4450–4464.
- Archer, Kellie J, Stanley Lemeshow, et al. (2006). "Goodness-of-fit test for a logistic regression model fitted using survey sample data". In: *Stata Journal* 6.1, pp. 97–105.
- Archer, KJ (2001). "Goodness-of-fit tests for logistic regression models developed using data collected from a complex sampling design". In: *Unpubl Ph Diss Ohio State Univ Columb OH*.
- Asher, Gad and Paolo Sassone-Corsi (2015). "Time for food: the intimate interplay between nutrition, metabolism, and the circadian clock". In: *Cell* 161.1, pp. 84–92.
- Bates, Beverley et al. (2014). *National Diet and Nutrition Survey: Results from Years 1, 2, 3 and 4 (combined) of the Rolling Programme (2008/2009-2011/2012): A survey carried out on behalf of Public Health England and the Food Standards Agency*. Public Health England.
- Besson, Herve et al. (2009). "Estimating physical activity energy expenditure, sedentary time, and physical activity intensity by self-report in adults." In: *The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition* 91.1, pp. 106–114.

- Bray, Bethany C, Stephanie T Lanza, and Xianming Tan (2015). "Eliminating bias in classify-analyze approaches for latent class analysis". In: *Structural Equation Modeling* 22.1, pp. 1–11.
- Collins, L.M. and S.T. Lanza (2010). *Latent Class and Latent Transition Analysis: With Applications in the Social, Behavioral, and Health Sciences*. Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics. Wiley.
- Davidian, Marie et al. (2008). "Growth mixture modeling: Analysis with non-Gaussian random effects". In: *Longitudinal Data Analysis*. Chapman and Hall/CRC, pp. 157–180.
- De Bacquer, Dirk et al. (2009). "Rotating shift work and the metabolic syndrome: a prospective study". In: *International Journal of Epidemiology* 38.3, pp. 848–854.
- Department of Health (2018). *National Diet and Nutrition Survey Rolling Programme*. <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/national-diet-and-nutrition-survey>.
- Finch, W Holmes and Brian F French (2014). "Multilevel latent class analysis: Parametric and nonparametric models". In: *The Journal of Experimental Education* 82.3, pp. 307–333.
- Garaulet, Marta and Purificación Gómez-Abellán (2014). "Timing of food intake and obesity: a novel association". In: *Physiology & Behavior* 134, pp. 44–50.
- Goodman, Leo A (2007). "On the Assignment of Individuals to Latent Classes". In: *Sociological Methodology* 37.1, pp. 1–22.
- Hanna, Katherine L and Peter F Collins (2015). "Relationship between living alone and food and nutrient intake". In: *Nutrition Reviews* 73.9, pp. 594–611.
- Henry, Kimberly L and Bengt Muthén (2010). "Multilevel latent class analysis: An application of adolescent smoking typologies with individual and contextual predictors". In: *Structural Equation Modeling* 17.2, pp. 193–215.
- Johnston, Jonathan D (2014). "Physiological responses to food intake throughout the day". In: *Nutrition Research Reviews* 27.1, pp. 107–118.
- Jung, Tony and KAS Wickrama (2008). "An introduction to latent class growth analysis and growth mixture modeling". In: *Social and Personality Psychology Compass* 2.1, pp. 302–317.
- Kosinski, Christophe and François R Jornayvaz (2017). "Effects of ketogenic diets on cardiovascular risk factors: evidence from animal and human studies". In: *Nutrients* 9.5, p. 517.
- Leech, Rebecca M et al. (2017). "Temporal eating patterns: a latent class analysis approach". In: *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity* 14.1, p. 3.

- Lo, Yungtai, Nancy R Mendell, and Donald B Rubin (2001). "Testing the number of components in a normal mixture". In: *Biometrika* 88.3, pp. 767–778.
- Mansukhani, R and L Palla (2018). "Investigating eating time patterns in UK adults from The 2008–2012 National Diet and Nutrition Survey". In: *Proceedings of the Nutrition Society* 77.OCE1.
- Muthén, Bengt and Tihomir Asparouhov (2009). "Multilevel regression mixture analysis". In: *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series A (Statistics in Society)* 172.3, pp. 639–657.
- Muthén, Linda K and Bengt O Muthén (2017). *Mplus: Statistical analysis with latent variables: User's guide*. Muthén & Muthén Los Angeles.
- Nagin, Daniel S (2005). *Group-based modeling of development*. Harvard University Press.
- NatCen Social Research (2018). *National Diet and Nutrition Survey Years 1-8, 2008/09-2015/16*. <http://doi.org/10.5255/UKDA-SN-6533-8>.
- Nylund, Karen L, Tihomir Asparouhov, and Bengt O Muthén (2007). "Deciding on the number of classes in latent class analysis and growth mixture modeling: A Monte Carlo simulation study". In: *Structural Equation Modeling* 14.4, pp. 535–569.
- Office for National Statistics (2018). *Mid 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, and 2016 Population Estimates*. <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/populationandmigration/populationestimates>.
- Pan, An et al. (2011). "Rotating night shift work and risk of type 2 diabetes: two prospective cohort studies in women". In: *PLoS Medicine* 8.12, e1001141.
- Pregibon, Daryl (1980). "Goodness of link tests for generalized linear models". In: *Applied Statistics*, pp. 15–14.
- R core Team (2018). *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing. Vienna, Austria. URL: <https://www.R-project.org/>.
- Roberts, Caireen et al. (2018). "National Diet and Nutrition Survey: results from years 7 and 8 (combined) of the Rolling Programme (2014/2015–2015/2016)". In:
- Schulze, Matthias B et al. (2018). "Food based dietary patterns and chronic disease prevention". In: *BMJ* 361, k2396.
- Smithers, Gillian (1993). "MAFF's nutrient databank". In: *Nutrition & Food Science* 93.2, pp. 16–19.
- Snijders, T.A.B. and R.J. Bosker (2011). *Multilevel Analysis: An Introduction to Basic and Advanced Multilevel Modeling*. SAGE Publications.

- StataCorp LLC (2017). *Stata Statistical Software: Release 15*. Version 15.1. URL: <https://www.stata.com/>.
- Uemura, Mayu et al. (2015). "Breakfast skipping is positively associated with incidence of type 2 diabetes mellitus: evidence from the Aichi Workers' Cohort Study". In: *Journal of Epidemiology* 25.5, pp. 351–358.
- Van Horn, M Lee et al. (2008). "Using multilevel mixtures to evaluate intervention effects in group randomized trials". In: *Multivariate Behavioral Research* 43.2, pp. 289–326.
- Vermunt, Jeroen K. (2003). *Multilevel Latent Class Models*. Vol. 33. 1, pp. 213–239. DOI: 10.1111/j.0081-1750.2003.t01-1-00131.x.
- Vermunt, Jeroen K (2008). "Latent class and finite mixture models for multilevel data sets". In: *Statistical Methods in Medical Research* 17.1, pp. 33–51.
- Wang, Chen-Pin, C Hendricks Brown, and Karen Bandeen-Roche (2005). "Residual Diagnostics for Growth Mixture Models: Examining the Impact of a Preventive Intervention on Multiple Trajectories of Aggressive Behavior". In: *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 100, pp. 1054–1076.
- Willett, Walter (2012). "Nature of variation in diet". In: *Nutritional Epidemiology*. Oxford University Press. Chap. 3, pp. 34–48.

Appendix A

R code for importing and manipulating the data

```
# NDNS analysis, data management -----
# Change the data path accordingly -----
setwd("../UKDA-6533-stata11_se/stata11_se/")
library(epiDisplay)
library(plyr)
library(tidyverse)
# Read the data into memory -----
library(haven)
data <- read_dta("ndns_rp_yr1-4a_foodleveldietarydata_uk.dta")
data56 <- read_dta("ndns_rp_yr5-6a_foodleveldietarydata.dta")
data78 <- read_dta("ndns_rp_yr7-8a_foodleveldietarydata.dta")
names(data)
names(data56)
names(data78)
names(data)[names(data)=="seriali"] <- "id"
names(data56)[names(data56)=="seriali"] <- "id"
names(data78)[names(data78)=="seriali"] <- "id"

# Extract the variables needed -----
df14d <- data[,c(113,1,2,3,5,6,7,8,9,21, 22, 23, 24, 53, 55,
57,58,59,60,61,62,63,64,65)]
var <- names(df14d)
df56d <- data56 %>%
  select(var)
df78d <- data78 %>%
  select(var)
dfs1 <- rbind(df14d, df56d, df78d)

dfs2 <- dfs1[dfs1$Age>=19,] # keep participants who aged 19 or older
rm(data, data56, data78) # remove the unneeded big dataset

dfs2

# Calculate the time (minute and hour) when they eat -----
dfs2$MealTime_chr <- as.character(dfs2$MealTime)
dfs2$MealTime_hm <- unlist(strsplit(dfs2$MealTime_chr, " "))[c(FALSE,
TRUE)]
```

```

dfs2$MealHourN <- as.numeric(unlist(strsplit(dfs2$MealTime_hm,
      ":")))[c(TRUE, FALSE, FALSE)]
dfs2$MealMinN <- as.numeric(unlist(strsplit(dfs2$MealTime_hm,
      ":")))[c(FALSE, TRUE, FALSE)]

dfs2$MealMinN0 <- (60*dfs2$MealHourN)+dfs2$MealMinN

dfs3 <- dfs2[order(dfs2$id,dfs2$DayNo,dfs2$MealMinN0),]

length(unique(dfs3$id)) ## number of participants = 6155

# Create a subset data with only the first observation of each participant -----
NDNS <- dfs3[!duplicated(dfs3$id), ]
with(NDNS, tab1(SurveyYear, graph = FALSE, decimal = 2))

# #SurveyYear :
#           Frequency Percent Cum. percent
# NDNS Year 1           801    13.01      13.01
# NDNS Year 2           812    13.19      26.21
# NDNS Year 3           782    12.71      38.91
# NDNS Year 4          1055    17.14      56.05
# NDNS Year 5           625    10.15      66.21
# NDNS Year 6           663    10.77      76.98
# NDNS Year 7           703    11.42      88.40
# NDNS Year 8           714    11.60     100.00
#   Total           6155   100.00     100.00

# how many men and women -----
with(NDNS, tab1(Sex, graph = FALSE, decimal = 2))

# Sex :
#           Frequency Percent Cum. percent
# 1           2537    41.22      41.22 Men
# 2           3618    58.78      100.00 Women
#   Total           6155   100.00     100.00

# create a variable combine id and day No -----

dfs3 <- dfs3 %>%
  mutate(id_dy = paste(id, DayNo, sep = "D"))

# For each subject, the total energy/carbohydrate intake for each
# eating time can be calculated -----

old<-Sys.time()
Energy <- dplyr::ddply(dfs3, .(id_dy, id, SurveyYear, DayNo, Age, Sex,
  DiaryDaysCompleted, MealHourN, DayofWeek),
  summarise, Tot_Energ =sum(EnergykJ),
  Tot_Carb = sum(Carbohydrateg),
  Tot_Sugar = sum(Totalsugarsg),
  Tot_Starch = sum(Starchg),
  Tot_Fibre = sum(Englystfibreg),
  Tot_Fat = sum(Fatg),
  Tot_Prot = sum(Proteing),

```

```

Tot_Alc = sum(Alcoholg),
Tot_NMES = sum(Nonmilkextrinsicsugarsg))
new<-Sys.time()-old
print(new)
# Time difference of 6.429822 min

# reset the time intervals into time slots -----

### Breakfast:      6am to 9am
### morning snack:  9am to 12noon
### lunch:          12noon to 2pm
### afternoon snack: 2pm to 5pm
### dinner:         5pm to 8pm
### night snack:    8pm to 10pm
### midnight:       10pm to 6am
Energy <- Energy %>%
  mutate(TimeSlot = cut(MealHourN, breaks = c(6, 9, 12, 14, 17, 20, 22),
                        right = FALSE))
levels(Energy$TimeSlot) <- c(levels(Energy$TimeSlot), "[22, 6)")
Energy$TimeSlot[is.na(Energy$TimeSlot)] <- "[22, 6)"
tab1(Energy$TimeSlot)
# For each subject, the total energy/carbohydrate intake for each
# time slot can be calculated -----
old<-Sys.time()
Energy <- ddply(Energy, .(id_dy, id, SurveyYear, DayNo, Age, Sex,
                        DiaryDaysCompleted, TimeSlot, DayofWeek),
               summarise,
               Tot_Energ = sum(Tot_Energ),
               Tot_Carb = sum(Tot_Carb),
               Tot_Sugar = sum(Tot_Sugar),
               Tot_Starch = sum(Tot_Starch),
               Tot_Fibre = sum(Tot_Fibre),
               Tot_Fat = sum(Tot_Fat),
               Tot_Prot = sum(Tot_Prot),
               Tot_Alc = sum(Tot_Alc),
               Tot_NMES = sum(Tot_NMES))
new<-Sys.time()-old
print(new)
# Time difference of 3.74195 mins

# Calculate the energy from total carbohydrates -----
Energy <- Energy %>%
  mutate(KJcarbo = Tot_Carb*16) %>%
  mutate(CarKJpercentage = KJcarbo/Tot_Energ) %>%
  mutate(Carbo = cut(CarKJpercentage, breaks = c(0, 0.50, 2), right = FALSE))

Energy0 <- Energy[!(Energy$Tot_Energ == 0), ] # discard those eating occasion
# with 0 energy intake
write.csv(Energy0, file = "Energy_slots.csv") # for later analysis
Energy0$Carbo <- factor(Energy0$Carbo, labels = c("< 50%", ">= 50%"))

vecid<-unique(Energy0$id)

# Filter the data by observation day-----

dta_day1 <- Energy0 %>%
  filter(DayNo == 1) %>%
  select(c("id", "id_dy", "Age", "Sex",
```

```

"DayofWeek", "TimeSlot", "Carbo")) %>%
  mutate(DayofWeek = factor(DayofWeek,
levels = c("Monday", "Tuesday",
"Wednesday", "Thursday",
"Friday", "Saturday", "Sunday")))

dta_day2 <- Energy0 %>%
  filter(DayNo == 2) %>%
  select(c("id", "id_dy", "Age", "Sex",
"DayofWeek", "TimeSlot", "Carbo")) %>%
  mutate(DayofWeek = factor(DayofWeek,
levels = c("Monday", "Tuesday",
"Wednesday", "Thursday",
"Friday", "Saturday", "Sunday")))

dta_day3 <- Energy0 %>%
  filter(DayNo == 3) %>%
  select(c("id", "id_dy", "Age", "Sex",
"DayofWeek", "TimeSlot", "Carbo")) %>%
  mutate(DayofWeek = factor(DayofWeek,
levels = c("Monday", "Tuesday",
"Wednesday", "Thursday",
"Friday", "Saturday", "Sunday")))

dta_day4 <- Energy0 %>%
  filter(DayNo == 4) %>%
  select(c("id", "id_dy", "Age", "Sex",
"DayofWeek", "TimeSlot", "Carbo")) %>%
StringTok mutate(DayofWeek = factor(DayofWeek,
levels = c("Monday", "Tuesday",
"Wednesday", "Thursday",
"Friday", "Saturday", "Sunday")))

vecid1<-unique(dta_day1$id) # n = 6153
vecid2<-unique(dta_day2$id) # n = 6153
vecid3<-unique(dta_day3$id) # n = 6151
vecid4<-unique(dta_day4$id) # n = 6026
Noday1 <- setdiff(vecid, vecid1) # two subjects did not have day 1 data
Noday2 <- setdiff(vecid, vecid2) # two subjects did not have day 2 data
Noday3 <- setdiff(vecid, vecid3) # four subjects did not have day 3 data
Noday4 <- setdiff(vecid, vecid4) # 129 subjects did not have day 4 data

# Long to wide data -----
dta_d1_wide <- dta_day1 %>%
  spread(key = TimeSlot,
value = Carbo)
head(dta_d1_wide)
names(dta_d1_wide)[6:12] <- c("H6_9", "H9_12", "H12_14", "H14_17",
"H17_20", "H20_22", "H22_6")
names(dta_d1_wide)
dta_d2_wide <- dta_day2 %>%
  spread(key = TimeSlot,
value = Carbo)
head(dta_d2_wide)
names(dta_d2_wide)[6:12] <- c("H6_9", "H9_12", "H12_14", "H14_17",
"H17_20", "H20_22", "H22_6")
names(dta_d2_wide)
dta_d3_wide <- dta_day3 %>%

```

```

  spread(key = TimeSlot,
value = Carbo)
head(dta_d3_wide)
names(dta_d3_wide)[6:12] <- c("H6_9", "H9_12", "H12_14", "H14_17",
"H17_20", "H20_22", "H22_6")
names(dta_d3_wide)
dta_d4_wide <- dta_day4 %>%
  spread(key = TimeSlot,
value = Carbo)
head(dta_d4_wide)
names(dta_d4_wide)[6:12] <- c("H6_9", "H9_12", "H12_14", "H14_17",
"H17_20", "H20_22", "H22_6")
names(dta_d4_wide)
# recode NA to not eating -----
for (i in 6:ncol(dta_d1_wide))
if(is.factor(dta_d1_wide[,i]))
levels(dta_d1_wide[,i]) <- c("1", "2", "0")
dta_d1_wide[is.na(dta_d1_wide)] <- "0"
for (i in 6:ncol(dta_d2_wide))
if(is.factor(dta_d2_wide[,i]))
levels(dta_d2_wide[,i]) <- c("1", "2", "0")
dta_d2_wide[is.na(dta_d2_wide)] <- "0"
for (i in 6:ncol(dta_d3_wide))
if(is.factor(dta_d3_wide[,i]))
levels(dta_d3_wide[,i]) <- c("1", "2", "0")
dta_d3_wide[is.na(dta_d3_wide)] <- "0"
for (i in 6:ncol(dta_d4_wide))
if(is.factor(dta_d4_wide[,i]))
levels(dta_d4_wide[,i]) <- c("1", "2", "0")
dta_d4_wide[is.na(dta_d4_wide)] <- "0"
dta_all <- rbind(dta_d1_wide, dta_d2_wide, dta_d3_wide, dta_d4_wide)
dta_all <- dta_all[order(dta_all$id,dta_all$id_dy),]
# Export the data for Mplus -----
write_csv(dta_all, path = "NDNS_Tslots.csv")
write_delim(dta_all, "NDNS_Tslots.dat", na = ".", delim = " ")

```

Appendix B

Mplus syntax and output for Multilevel LCA models

Mplus VERSION 7.4
MUTHEN & MUTHEN
07/28/2018 9:55 AM

INPUT INSTRUCTIONS

TITLE: 3-class at level 1 (CW), 3-classes at level 2 (CB) random effects model
ordered polytomous variables for carb intake at each time slot over four
days of NDNS survey 2008/09 - 2015/16
variable 0 = not eating
1 = eating & carb provided < 50% calorie
2 = eating & carb provided >= 50% calorie

DATA: File is H:\summer_project\Mplus\TimeSlots\NDNS_Tslots.dat;

VARIABLE: NAMES = id id_dy Age Sex H6_9 H9_12 H12_14 H14_17 H17_20
H20_22 H22_6;

USEVAR = H6_9 H9_12 H12_14 H14_17 H17_20
H20_22 H22_6;

auxiliary = Age Sex;

CATEGORICAL = H6_9 H9_12 H12_14 H14_17 H17_20
H20_22 H22_6;

CLUSTER = id;

IDVARIABLE = id_dy;

BETWEEN = CB;

WITHIN = H6_9 H9_12 H12_14 H14_17 H17_20
H20_22 H22_6;

CLASSES = CB(3) CW(3);

MISSING are .;

ANALYSIS:

```

type = mixture twolevel;
starts = 50 25;
process = 8(starts);

```

```

MODEL:
%within%
%overall%
%between%
%overall%
CW ON CB;

```

```

Savedata:
file is H:\summer_project\Mplus\TimeSlots\Multilevel\NDNSslot_CW3CB3.txt;
save is cprob;
format is free;

```

3-class at level 1 (CW), 3-classes at level 2 (CB) random effects model
 ordered polytomous variables for carb intake at each time slot over four
 days of NDNS survey 2008/09 - 2015/16
 variable 0 = not eating
 1 = eating & carb provided < 50% calorie
 2 = eating & carb provided >= 50% calorie

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS

Number of groups	1
Number of observations	24483
Number of dependent variables	7
Number of independent variables	0
Number of continuous latent variables	0
Number of categorical latent variables	2

Observed dependent variables

Binary and ordered categorical (ordinal)					
H6_9	H9_12	H12_14	H14_17	H17_20	H20_22
H22_6					

Observed auxiliary variables

AGE	SEX
-----	-----

Categorical latent variables

CB	CW
----	----

Variables with special functions

Cluster variable	ID
ID variable	ID_DY

Within variables					
H6_9	H9_12	H12_14	H14_17	H17_20	H20_22
H22_6					

```

Estimator                                MLR
Information matrix                        OBSERVED
Optimization Specifications for the Quasi-Newton Algorithm for
Continuous Outcomes
Maximum number of iterations              100
Convergence criterion                     0.100D-05
Optimization Specifications for the EM Algorithm
Maximum number of iterations              500
Convergence criteria
Loglikelihood change                      0.100D-02
Relative loglikelihood change              0.100D-05
Derivative                                0.100D-02
Optimization Specifications for the M step of the EM Algorithm for
Categorical Latent variables
Number of M step iterations               1
M step convergence criterion              0.100D-02
Basis for M step termination              ITERATION
Optimization Specifications for the M step of the EM Algorithm for
Censored, Binary or Ordered Categorical (Ordinal), Unordered
Categorical (Nominal) and Count Outcomes
Number of M step iterations               1
M step convergence criterion              0.100D-02
Basis for M step termination              ITERATION
Maximum value for logit thresholds        15
Minimum value for logit thresholds        -15
Minimum expected cell size for chi-square 0.100D-01
Maximum number of iterations for H1       2000
Convergence criterion for H1              0.100D-03
Optimization algorithm                    EMA
Integration Specifications
Type                                      STANDARD
Number of integration points              15
Dimensions of numerical integration        0
Adaptive quadrature                       ON
Random Starts Specifications
Number of initial stage random starts     50
Number of final stage optimizations        25
Number of initial stage iterations         10
Initial stage convergence criterion        0.100D+01
Random starts scale                       0.500D+01
Random seed for generating random starts   0
Parameterization                          LOGIT
Link                                       LOGIT
Cholesky                                  OFF

Input data file(s)
H:\summer_project\Mplus\TimeSlots\NDNS_Tslots.dat
Input data format  FREE

```

SUMMARY OF DATA

```

Number of missing data patterns           1
Number of y missing data patterns         0
Number of u missing data patterns         1
Number of clusters                        6155

```


COVARIANCE COVERAGE OF DATA

Minimum covariance coverage value 0.100

UNIVARIATE PROPORTIONS AND COUNTS FOR CATEGORICAL VARIABLES

H6_9		
Category 1	0.313	7655.000
Category 2	0.184	4500.000
Category 3	0.504	12328.000
H9_12		
Category 1	0.222	5447.000
Category 2	0.295	7227.000
Category 3	0.482	11809.000
H12_14		
Category 1	0.195	4783.000
Category 2	0.454	11112.000
Category 3	0.351	8588.000
H14_17		
Category 1	0.283	6926.000
Category 2	0.338	8277.000
Category 3	0.379	9280.000
H17_20		
Category 1	0.124	3043.000
Category 2	0.582	14240.000
Category 3	0.294	7200.000
H20_22		
Category 1	0.356	8722.000
Category 2	0.363	8898.000
Category 3	0.280	6863.000
H22_6		
Category 1	0.666	16295.000
Category 2	0.169	4144.000
Category 3	0.165	4044.000

RANDOM STARTS RESULTS RANKED FROM THE BEST TO THE WORST LOGLIKELIHOOD VALUES

Final stage loglikelihood values at local maxima, seeds, and initial stage start numbers:

-166348.815	153942	31
-166348.815	573096	20
-166348.815	253358	2
-166348.816	318230	46
-166348.816	246261	38
-166348.873	285380	1
-166348.908	903420	5
-166349.394	120506	45
-166349.394	966014	37
-166349.394	207896	25
-166349.395	195873	6
-166349.513	68985	17
-166349.514	366706	29
-166352.737	76974	16
-166357.057	127215	9
-166482.723	533738	11

-166495.844	645664	39
-166668.918	372176	23

THE BEST LOGLIKELIHOOD VALUE HAS BEEN REPLICATED. RERUN WITH AT LEAST TWICE THE RANDOM STARTS TO CHECK THAT THE BEST LOGLIKELIHOOD IS STILL OBTAINED AND REPLICATED.

THE MODEL ESTIMATION TERMINATED NORMALLY

MODEL FIT INFORMATION

Number of Free Parameters 134

Loglikelihood

H0 Value	-166348.815
H0 Scaling Correction Factor for MLR	1.8182

Information Criteria

Akaike (AIC)	332965.630
Bayesian (BIC)	334051.799
Sample-Size Adjusted BIC	333625.950
(n* = (n + 2) / 24)	

MODEL RESULTS USE THE LATENT CLASS VARIABLE ORDER

CB CW

Latent Class Variable Patterns

CB Class	CW Class
1	1
1	2
1	3
2	1
2	2
2	3
3	1
3	2
3	3

FINAL CLASS COUNTS AND PROPORTIONS FOR THE LATENT CLASS PATTERNS
BASED ON ESTIMATED POSTERIOR PROBABILITIES

Latent Class
Pattern

1	1	4050.97975	0.16546
1	2	1561.55249	0.06378

1	3	1286.46696	0.05255
2	1	2746.94031	0.11220
2	2	3011.00217	0.12298
2	3	1341.59686	0.05480
3	1	2748.25320	0.11225
3	2	4770.55950	0.19485
3	3	2965.64876	0.12113

FINAL CLASS COUNTS AND PROPORTIONS FOR EACH LATENT CLASS VARIABLE
BASED ON ESTIMATED POSTERIOR PROBABILITIES

Latent Class

Variable Class

CB	1	6898.99902	0.28179
	2	7099.53906	0.28998
	3	10484.46094	0.42823
CW	1	9546.17285	0.38991
	2	9343.11426	0.38162
	3	5593.71240	0.22847

FINAL CLASS COUNTS AND PROPORTIONS FOR THE LATENT CLASS PATTERNS
BASED ON THEIR MOST LIKELY LATENT CLASS PATTERN

Class Counts and Proportions

Latent Class

Pattern

1	1	4262	0.17408
1	2	1406	0.05743
1	3	1178	0.04812
2	1	2807	0.11465
2	2	2946	0.12033
2	3	1260	0.05146
3	1	2745	0.11212
3	2	5315	0.21709
3	3	2564	0.10473

FINAL CLASS COUNTS AND PROPORTIONS FOR EACH LATENT CLASS VARIABLE
BASED ON THEIR MOST LIKELY LATENT CLASS PATTERN

Latent Class

Variable Class

CB	1	6846	0.27962
	2	7013	0.28644
	3	10624	0.43393
CW	1	9814	0.40085
	2	9667	0.39485
	3	5002	0.20431

CLASSIFICATION QUALITY

Entropy	0.630
---------	-------

Average Latent Class Probabilities for Most Likely Latent Class Pattern (Row)
by Latent Class Pattern (Column)

Latent Class Variable Patterns

Latent Class Pattern No.	CB Class	CW Class
-----------------------------	-------------	-------------

1	1	1
2	1	2
3	1	3
4	2	1
5	2	2
6	2	3
7	3	1
8	3	2
9	3	3

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1	0.720	0.091	0.073	0.016	0.032	0.004	0.005	0.033	0.025
2	0.183	0.609	0.098	0.005	0.002	0.030	0.040	0.005	0.027
3	0.211	0.084	0.629	0.008	0.005	0.007	0.011	0.036	0.009
4	0.019	0.004	0.002	0.692	0.184	0.051	0.011	0.034	0.003
5	0.042	0.001	0.001	0.158	0.709	0.045	0.001	0.035	0.009
6	0.012	0.037	0.013	0.065	0.084	0.702	0.042	0.003	0.042
7	0.011	0.029	0.004	0.012	0.002	0.022	0.641	0.126	0.153
8	0.026	0.003	0.009	0.025	0.024	0.001	0.115	0.675	0.123
9	0.046	0.024	0.004	0.003	0.010	0.018	0.079	0.174	0.642

MODEL RESULTS

Two-Tailed Estimate	S.E.	Est./S.E.	P-Value
------------------------	------	-----------	---------

Within Level

Latent Class Pattern 1 1

Thresholds				
H6_9\$1	-0.718	0.218	-3.294	0.001
H6_9\$2	0.973	0.299	3.258	0.001
H9_12\$1	-2.516	0.463	-5.433	0.000
H9_12\$2	0.675	0.132	5.118	0.000
H12_14\$1	-1.025	0.145	-7.057	0.000
H12_14\$2	1.240	0.116	10.725	0.000
H14_17\$1	-1.566	0.149	-10.520	0.000
H14_17\$2	1.090	0.100	10.909	0.000
H17_20\$1	-1.998	0.125	-16.000	0.000
H17_20\$2	1.549	0.100	15.556	0.000
H20_22\$1	-0.933	0.085	-10.914	0.000
H20_22\$2	1.829	0.103	17.770	0.000
H22_6\$1	0.253	0.083	3.046	0.002
H22_6\$2	2.308	0.117	19.691	0.000

Latent Class Pattern 1 2

Thresholds

H6_9\$1	-4.021	1.788	-2.249	0.025
H6_9\$2	-0.115	0.259	-0.445	0.656
H9_12\$1	0.167	0.373	0.448	0.654
H9_12\$2	2.142	0.586	3.657	0.000
H12_14\$1	-3.210	1.518	-2.115	0.034
H12_14\$2	0.858	0.167	5.124	0.000
H14_17\$1	0.044	0.384	0.114	0.909
H14_17\$2	1.617	0.293	5.509	0.000
H17_20\$1	-2.109	0.390	-5.409	0.000
H17_20\$2	1.399	0.196	7.126	0.000
H20_22\$1	-0.367	0.174	-2.109	0.035
H20_22\$2	2.347	0.382	6.151	0.000
H22_6\$1	0.754	0.259	2.912	0.004
H22_6\$2	2.542	0.264	9.646	0.000

Latent Class Pattern 1 3

Thresholds

H6_9\$1	-15.000	0.000	999.000	999.000
H6_9\$2	2.357	0.783	3.011	0.003
H9_12\$1	-1.433	0.372	-3.850	0.000
H9_12\$2	-0.604	0.279	-2.166	0.030
H12_14\$1	-1.988	0.257	-7.749	0.000
H12_14\$2	0.524	0.125	4.209	0.000
H14_17\$1	-1.027	0.232	-4.436	0.000
H14_17\$2	0.274	0.131	2.087	0.037
H17_20\$1	-2.665	0.310	-8.605	0.000
H17_20\$2	0.707	0.112	6.322	0.000
H20_22\$1	-0.527	0.152	-3.462	0.001
H20_22\$2	0.702	0.138	5.102	0.000
H22_6\$1	1.119	0.185	6.062	0.000
H22_6\$2	1.748	0.183	9.544	0.000

Latent Class Pattern 2 1

Thresholds

H6_9\$1	1.663	0.199	8.370	0.000
H6_9\$2	1.839	0.198	9.274	0.000
H9_12\$1	-2.150	0.281	-7.643	0.000
H9_12\$2	-0.869	0.140	-6.190	0.000
H12_14\$1	-1.978	0.191	-10.349	0.000
H12_14\$2	0.323	0.078	4.139	0.000
H14_17\$1	0.237	0.183	1.293	0.196
H14_17\$2	0.782	0.123	6.352	0.000
H17_20\$1	-2.936	0.428	-6.853	0.000
H17_20\$2	0.632	0.081	7.807	0.000
H20_22\$1	0.028	0.142	0.194	0.846
H20_22\$2	0.868	0.086	10.145	0.000
H22_6\$1	0.658	0.109	6.010	0.000
H22_6\$2	1.326	0.100	13.215	0.000

Latent Class Pattern 2 2

Thresholds

H6_9\$1	1.640	0.171	9.619	0.000
H6_9\$2	1.906	0.179	10.678	0.000

H9_12\$1	-1.954	0.347	-5.636	0.000
H9_12\$2	-0.360	0.127	-2.842	0.004
H12_14\$1	-0.016	0.189	-0.084	0.933
H12_14\$2	0.948	0.135	7.029	0.000
H14_17\$1	-1.906	0.301	-6.327	0.000
H14_17\$2	0.371	0.080	4.614	0.000
H17_20\$1	-0.812	0.116	-7.030	0.000
H17_20\$2	0.910	0.089	10.259	0.000
H20_22\$1	-0.742	0.089	-8.318	0.000
H20_22\$2	0.998	0.085	11.705	0.000
H22_6\$1	0.298	0.083	3.608	0.000
H22_6\$2	1.337	0.099	13.475	0.000

Latent Class Pattern 2 3

Thresholds

H6_9\$1	-1.072	0.500	-2.144	0.032
H6_9\$2	-0.309	0.346	-0.892	0.372
H9_12\$1	2.441	1.044	2.339	0.019
H9_12\$2	3.599	1.983	1.815	0.069
H12_14\$1	-1.029	0.211	-4.880	0.000
H12_14\$2	0.603	0.123	4.913	0.000
H14_17\$1	-0.010	0.243	-0.041	0.967
H14_17\$2	0.784	0.157	4.977	0.000
H17_20\$1	-0.953	0.203	-4.684	0.000
H17_20\$2	0.779	0.135	5.784	0.000
H20_22\$1	-0.105	0.210	-0.500	0.617
H20_22\$2	1.203	0.135	8.914	0.000
H22_6\$1	0.582	0.299	1.950	0.051
H22_6\$2	1.370	0.206	6.653	0.000

Latent Class Pattern 3 1

Thresholds

H6_9\$1	-4.593	1.699	-2.703	0.007
H6_9\$2	-2.975	0.428	-6.957	0.000
H9_12\$1	-0.322	0.207	-1.553	0.120
H9_12\$2	0.398	0.363	1.095	0.274
H12_14\$1	-5.060	3.668	-1.380	0.168
H12_14\$2	0.307	0.100	3.080	0.002
H14_17\$1	0.186	0.530	0.351	0.726
H14_17\$2	0.317	0.245	1.295	0.195
H17_20\$1	-4.019	0.957	-4.199	0.000
H17_20\$2	0.747	0.093	7.987	0.000
H20_22\$1	-0.233	0.132	-1.767	0.077
H20_22\$2	0.607	0.109	5.571	0.000
H22_6\$1	1.304	0.146	8.918	0.000
H22_6\$2	1.850	0.160	11.579	0.000

Latent Class Pattern 3 2

Thresholds

H6_9\$1	-1.232	0.195	-6.305	0.000
H6_9\$2	-0.858	0.169	-5.068	0.000
H9_12\$1	-4.377	1.937	-2.260	0.024
H9_12\$2	-1.488	0.316	-4.717	0.000
H12_14\$1	-1.727	0.227	-7.611	0.000
H12_14\$2	0.302	0.082	3.666	0.000
H14_17\$1	-1.834	0.237	-7.730	0.000

H14_17\$2	-0.294	0.186	-1.582	0.114
H17_20\$1	-2.588	0.487	-5.313	0.000
H17_20\$2	0.631	0.062	10.187	0.000
H20_22\$1	-0.920	0.078	-11.852	0.000
H20_22\$2	0.462	0.073	6.308	0.000
H22_6\$1	0.640	0.119	5.361	0.000
H22_6\$2	1.162	0.129	9.039	0.000

Latent Class Pattern 3 3

Thresholds

H6_9\$1	-4.941	5.813	-0.850	0.395
H6_9\$2	-2.680	0.887	-3.024	0.002
H9_12\$1	-0.765	0.640	-1.195	0.232
H9_12\$2	1.164	0.920	1.265	0.206
H12_14\$1	-1.415	0.439	-3.226	0.001
H12_14\$2	0.566	0.085	6.626	0.000
H14_17\$1	-2.052	0.650	-3.158	0.002
H14_17\$2	0.612	0.210	2.909	0.004
H17_20\$1	-1.627	0.427	-3.810	0.000
H17_20\$2	0.713	0.103	6.935	0.000
H20_22\$1	-0.850	0.329	-2.585	0.010
H20_22\$2	0.685	0.134	5.104	0.000
H22_6\$1	1.237	0.195	6.349	0.000
H22_6\$2	1.893	0.179	10.582	0.000

Between Level

Categorical Latent Variables

Within Level

Intercepts

CW#1	-0.076	0.366	-0.208	0.835
CW#2	0.475	0.309	1.539	0.124

Between Level

CW#1	ON			
CB#1		1.223	0.473	2.585
CB#2		0.793	0.441	1.796
CW#2	ON			
CB#1		-0.282	0.535	-0.526
CB#2		0.333	0.455	0.733

Means

CB#1	-0.417	0.100	-4.178	0.000
CB#2	-0.386	0.067	-5.770	0.000

QUALITY OF NUMERICAL RESULTS

Condition Number for the Information Matrix 0.428E-04
(ratio of smallest to largest eigenvalue)

SAVEDATA INFORMATION

Save file

H:\summer_project\Mplus\TimeSlots\Multilevel\NDNSslot_CW3CB3.txt

Order of variables

H6_9
H9_12
H12_14
H14_17
H17_20
H20_22
H22_6
ID_DY
AGE
SEX
CPROB1
CPROB2
CPROB3
CPROB4
CPROB5
CPROB6
CPROB7
CPROB8
CPROB9
CB
CW
MLCJOINT
ID

Save file format Free

Save file record length 10000

DIAGRAM INFORMATION

Mplus diagrams are currently not available for Mixture analysis.
No diagram output was produced.

Beginning Time: 09:55:10

Ending Time: 10:02:01

Elapsed Time: 00:06:51

MUTHEN & MUTHEN

3463 Stoner Ave.

Los Angeles, CA 90066

Tel: (310) 391-9971

Fax: (310) 391-8971

Web: www.StatModel.com

Support: Support@StatModel.com

Copyright (c) 1998-2015 Muthen & Muthen

Appendix C

Other Solutions for MLCA

2 classes in day level




FIGURE C.1: 2 Classes solution in Day level.




FIGURE C.2: Multilevel Latent Class Solution, 2 classes in day level, 2 classes in individual level.




FIGURE C.3: Multilevel Latent Class Solution, 2 classes in day level, 3 classes in individual level.




FIGURE C.4: Multilevel Latent Class Solution, 2 classes in day level, 4 classes in individual level.

3 classes in day level, 4 classes in individual level




FIGURE C.5: Multilevel Latent Class Solution, 3 classes in day level, 4 classes in individual level.

4 classes in day level




FIGURE C.6: 4 Classes Solution in Day level.




FIGURE C.7: Multilevel Latent Class Solution, 4 classes in day level, 2 classes in individual level.




FIGURE C.8: Multilevel Latent Class Solution, 4 classes in day level, 3 classes in individual level.

Appendix D

R and STATA codes for processing individual level data analysis

```

library(plyr)
library(epiDisplay)
library(tidyverse)
library(dplyr)
library(readr)
library(haven)
library(naniar)

# read the individual level data sets -----
# Change the data path accordingly -----
setwd("../UKDA-6533-stata11_se/stata11_se/")
blood78 <- read_dta("ndns_rp_yr7-8a_indiv.dta")
blood56 <- read_dta("ndns_rp_yr5-6a_indiv.dta")
blood14 <- read_dta("ndns_rp_yr1-4a_indiv_uk.dta")
food14 <- read_dta("ndns_rp_yr1-4a_personleveldietarydata_uk.dta")
food56 <- read_dta("ndns_rp_yr5-6a_personleveldietarydata.dta")
food78 <- read_dta("ndns_rp_yr7-8a_personleveldietarydata.dta")
names(blood78)[names(blood78)=="seriali"] <- "ID"
names(blood56)[names(blood56)=="seriali"] <- "ID"
names(blood14)[names(blood14)=="seriali"] <- "ID"
names(food78)[names(food78)=="seriali"] <- "ID"
names(food56)[names(food56)=="seriali"] <- "ID"
names(food14)[names(food14)=="seriali"] <- "ID"

# Loading the data from Mplus output
CW3CB3 <- read_table2("../NDNSslot_CW3CB3.txt", # change the path accordingly
                     col_names = FALSE)

names(CW3CB3) <- c("Breakfast", "Morning.snack", "Lunch",
                  "Afternoon.snack", "Dinner", "Before.bedtime.snack",
                  "Midnight.food", "ID_DAY", "AGE", "SEX", "CPROB1",
                  "CPROB2", "CPROB3", "CPROB4", "CPROB5", "CPROB6",
                  "CPROB7", "CPROB8", "CPROB9",
                  "CB", "CW", "MLCJOINT", "ID")

CW3idday <- CW3CB3 %>%
  select(ID, ID_DAY, CW, CB, MLCJOINT, AGE, SEX)

Energy_slots <- read_csv("../Energy_slots.csv") # change the path accordingly
Energy_slots <- Energy_slots %>%
  rename(ID = id)

```

```
# Recode day level classification to keep consistency
CW3idday$CW_new <- 0
CW3idday$CW_new[CW3idday$CW == 1] <- 3
CW3idday$CW_new[CW3idday$CW == 2] <- 1
CW3idday$CW_new[CW3idday$CW == 3] <- 2

Energy_slots <- Energy_slots %>%
  left_join(CW3idday, by = c("ID", "DayofWeek"))

Energy_slots$TimeSlot <- factor(Energy_slots$TimeSlot,
                                levels = c("[6,9)", "[9,12)",
                                             "[12,14)", "[14,17)",
                                             "[17,20)", "[20,22)", "[22, 6)"))

FoodbyCB_7slots <- Energy_slots %>%
  group_by(ID, TimeSlot) %>%
  summarise(sumEnergy = sum(Tot_Energy),
            sumCarb = sum(Tot_Carb),
            sumSugar = sum(Tot_Sugar),
            sumStarch = sum(Tot_Starch),
            sumFibre = sum(Tot_Fibre),
            sumNMES = sum(Tot_NMES),
            sumFat = sum(Tot_Fat),
            sumProt = sum(Tot_Prot),
            sumAlc = sum(Tot_Alc))

# Calculate the sum of each nutrients for each time slots
Carbsum <- FoodbyCB_7slots %>%
  select(ID, TimeSlot, sumCarb) %>%
  spread(key = TimeSlot,
         value = sumCarb)

Carbsum[is.na(Carbsum)] <- 0

names(Carbsum) <- c("ID", "Carb6_9", "Carb9_12", "Carb12_14", "Carb14_17",
                  "Carb17_20", "Carb20_22", "Carb22_6")

Energysum <- FoodbyCB_7slots %>%
  select(ID, TimeSlot, sumEnergy) %>%
  spread(key = TimeSlot,
         value = sumEnergy)
Energysum[is.na(Energysum)] <- 0

names(Energysum) <- c("ID", "Energy6_9", "Energy9_12", "Energy12_14",
                    "Energy14_17", "Energy17_20", "Energy20_22", "Energy22_6")

Starchsum <- FoodbyCB_7slots %>%
  select(ID, TimeSlot, sumStarch) %>%
  spread(key = TimeSlot,
         value = sumStarch)
Starchsum[is.na(Starchsum)] <- 0

names(Starchsum) <- c("ID", "Starch6_9", "Starch9_12", "Starch12_14",
                    "Starch14_17", "Starch17_20", "Starch20_22", "Starch22_6")
```

```

Sugarsum <- FoodbyCB_7slots %>%
  select(ID, TimeSlot, sumSugar) %>%
  spread(key = TimeSlot,
         value = sumSugar)
Sugarsum[is.na(Sugarsum)] <- 0

names(Sugarsum) <- c("ID", "Sugar6_9", "Sugar9_12", "Sugar12_14",
"Sugar14_17", "Sugar17_20", "Sugar20_22", "Sugar22_6")

Fibresum <- FoodbyCB_7slots %>%
  select(ID, TimeSlot, sumFibre) %>%
  spread(key = TimeSlot,
         value = sumFibre)
Fibresum[is.na(Fibresum)] <- 0

names(Fibresum) <- c("ID", "Fibre6_9", "Fibre9_12", "Fibre12_14",
"Fibre14_17", "Fibre17_20", "Fibre20_22", "Fibre22_6")

NMESsum <- FoodbyCB_7slots %>%
  select(ID, TimeSlot, sumNMES) %>%
  spread(key = TimeSlot,
         value = sumNMES)
NMESsum[is.na(NMESsum)] <- 0

names(NMESsum) <- c("ID", "NMES6_9", "NMES9_12", "NMES12_14",
"NMES14_17", "NMES17_20", "NMES20_22", "NMES22_6")

Fatsum <- FoodbyCB_7slots %>%
  select(ID, TimeSlot, sumFat) %>%
  spread(key = TimeSlot,
         value = sumFat)
Fatsum[is.na(Fatsum)] <- 0

names(Fatsum) <- c("ID", "Fat6_9", "Fat9_12", "Fat12_14", "Fat14_17",
"Fat17_20", "Fat20_22", "Fat22_6")

Protsum <- FoodbyCB_7slots %>%
  select(ID, TimeSlot, sumProt) %>%
  spread(key = TimeSlot,
         value = sumProt)
Protsum[is.na(Protsum)] <- 0

names(Protsum) <- c("ID", "Prot6_9", "Prot9_12", "Prot12_14", "Prot14_17",
"Prot17_20", "Prot20_22", "Prot22_6")

Alcsum <- FoodbyCB_7slots %>%
  select(ID, TimeSlot, sumAlc) %>%
  spread(key = TimeSlot,
         value = sumAlc)
Alcsum[is.na(Alcsum)] <- 0

names(Alcsum) <- c("ID", "Alc6_9", "Alc9_12", "Alc12_14", "Alc14_17",
"Alc17_20", "Alc20_22", "Alc22_6")

# Extract number of days of diary completed

NDAYS14 <- blood14 %>%
  select(ID, Ndays)

```



```

NDAYS56 <- blood56 %>%
  select(ID, Ndays)

NDAYS78 <- blood78 %>%
  select(ID, NDays) %>%
  rename(Ndays = NDays)

NDAYS <- rbind(NDAYS14, NDAYS56, NDAYS78)
NDAYS$ID <- as.numeric(NDAYS$ID)

IntakeSlots <- Energysum %>%
  left_join(Carbsum, by = "ID") %>%
  left_join(Sugarsum, by = "ID") %>%
  left_join(Starchsum, by = "ID") %>%
  left_join(Fibresum, by = "ID") %>%
  left_join(Fatsum, by = "ID") %>%
  left_join(Protsum, by = "ID") %>%
  left_join(NMESsum, by = "ID") %>%
  left_join(Alcsum, by = "ID") %>%
  left_join(NDAYS, by = "ID")

IntakeSlots$ID <- as.numeric(IntakeSlots$ID)

IntakeSlots$Energy6_9 <- IntakeSlots$Energy6_9/(IntakeSlots$Ndays)

for (i in 3:57){
  IntakeSlots[, i] <- IntakeSlots[, i]/(IntakeSlots$Ndays)
}

# select the variables needed, recoding
# NAs, renaming to the same -----

BMI78 <- blood78 %>%
  select(ID, Sex, age, bmival, wstval, Diabetes, bpmedc2, bpmedd2,
    hyper140_2, hibp140_2, Glucose, A1C, cigsta3, dnoft3,
    dnnow, wti_Y78, wtn_Y78, wtb_Y78, ethgrp5, ethgrp2,
    cluster1, cluster2, cluster3, nssec8, paidemployment,
    qual7, eqvinc, MarSt2, cluster4, cluster5, area, gor,
    LDL, HDL, Chol, Trig) %>%
  rename(wti = wti_Y78, wtn = wtn_Y78, wtb = wtb_Y78,
    drink = dnoft3) %>%
  mutate(Years = "7-8", MVPAtime = NA, MarStat = NA) %>%
  replace_with_na(replace = list(bmival = -1, qual7 = -8,
    wstval = -1, eqvinc = -1,
    bpmedd2 = -1, MarSt2 = -1,
    bpmedc2 = -1, hyper140_2 = -7,
    hibp140_2 = -7, Glucose = -1,
    A1C = -1, LDL = -1, HDL = -1,
    Chol = -1, Trig = -1, dnnow = -1,
    drink = -1, ethgrp5 = -4,
    ethgrp2 = -4, cigsta3 = -1,
    nssec8 = -9, paidemployment = -1)) %>%
  replace_with_na(replace = list(hyper140_2 = -1, hibp140_2 = -1,
    nssec8 = 99, qual7 = -1, drink = -8,
    ethgrp2 = -9, ethgrp5 = -9)) %>%
  replace_with_na(replace = list(drink = -9, ethgrp2 = -8, ethgrp5 = -8,
    cigsta3 = -8)) %>%
  replace_with_na(replace = list(ethgrp2 = -1, ethgrp5 = -1))

```

```

BMI56 <- blood56 %>%
  select(ID, Sex, age, area, bmival, wstval, Diabetes, bpmedc2, bpmedd2,
    hyper140_2, hibp140_2, MVPAtime, Glucose, A1C, cigsta3, dnoft3,
    dnnow, wti_Y56, wtn_Y56, wtb_Y56, ethgrp5, ethgrp2, qual7,
    cluster1, cluster2, cluster3, nssec8, paidemployment, eqvinc,
    MarSt2, cluster4, cluster5, area, gor, LDL, HDL, Chol, Trig) %>%
  mutate(Years = "5-6", MarStat = NA) %>%
  rename(wti = wti_Y56, wtn = wtn_Y56, wtb = wtb_Y56, drink = dnoft3) %>%
  replace_with_na(replace = list(bmival = -1, paidemployment = -9,
    wstval = -1, qual7 = -8,
    bpmedd2 = -1, eqvinc = -1,
    bpmedc2 = -1, MarSt2 = -1,
    hyper140_2 = -7, hibp140_2 = -7,
    Glucose = -1, A1C = -1,
    dnnow = -1, drink = -1, ethgrp5 = -4,
    ethgrp2 = -4, LDL = -1, HDL = -1,
    Chol = -1, Trig = -1, cigsta3 = -1,
    MVPAtime = -1, nssec8 = -9)) %>%
  replace_with_na(replace = list(hyper140_2 = -1, hibp140_2 = -1,
    paidemployment = -8,
    drink = -8, nssec8 = 99)) %>%
  replace_with_na(replace = list(drink = -9, paidemployment = -1,
    qual7 = -1, cigsta3 = -8))

BMI14 <- blood14 %>%
  select(ID, Sex, age, bmival, wstval, Diabetes, bpmedc, bpmedd, hyper140,
    hibp140, MVPAtime, Glucose, A1C, cigsta3, dnoft3, dnnow,
    wti_CY1234, wtn_CY1234, wtb_CY1234, ethgr5, ethgr2, cluster,
    area, gor, nssec8, paidemployment, qual7, eqvinc, MarSt2,
    MarStat, LDL, HDL, Chol, Trig) %>%
  rename(hyper140_2 = hyper140, hibp140_2 = hibp140, bpmedd2 = bpmedd,
    bpmedc2 = bpmedc, cluster1 = cluster, ethgrp5 = ethgr5,
    ethgrp2 = ethgr2, wti = wti_CY1234, wtn = wtn_CY1234,
    wtb = wtb_CY1234, drink = dnoft3) %>%
  mutate(cluster2 = NA, cluster3 = NA, cluster4 = NA, cluster5 = NA,
    Years = "1-4") %>%
  replace_with_na(replace = list(bmival = -1, paidemployment = -9,
    wstval = -1, qual7 = -8,
    bpmedd2 = -1, eqvinc = -1,
    bpmedc2 = -1, MarSt2 = -4,
    hyper140_2 = -7, MarStat = -4,
    hibp140_2 = -7, Glucose = -1,
    A1C = -1, dnnow = -1, LDL = -1,
    HDL = -1, Chol = -1, Trig = -1,
    drink = -1, ethgrp5 = -4, ethgrp2 = -4,
    cigsta3 = -1, MVPAtime = -4,
    nssec8 = -8)) %>%
  replace_with_na(replace = list(hyper140_2 = -1, hibp140_2 = -1,
    MVPAtime = -1, paidemployment = -8,
    drink = -8, nssec8 = -1, qual7 = -1,
    MarSt2 = -1)) %>%
  replace_with_na(replace = list(drink = -9, paidemployment = -4,
    cigsta3 = -8, nssec8 = 99)) %>%
  replace_with_na(replace = list(paidemployment = -1))

BMI <- bind_rows(BMI14, BMI56, BMI78)

Energy14 <- food14 %>%

```

```

select(ID, Country, SurveyYear, EnergykJ, Carbohydrateg,
      CHOpctotE, Proteing, ProteinpctotE, Alcoholg, AlcoholpctotE,
      Fatg, FatpctotE)
Energy14$Country[Energy14$Country == "Northern Ireland"] <- "NI"

Energy56 <- food56 %>%
  select(ID, Country, Surveyyear, EnergykJ, Carbohydrateg,
        CHOpctotE, Proteing, ProteinpctotE, Alcoholg, AlcoholpctotE,
        Fatg, FatpctotE) %>%
  rename(SurveyYear = Surveyyear)

Energy78 <- food78 %>%
  select(ID, Country, SurveyYear, EnergykJ, Carbohydrateg,
        CHOpctotE, Proteing, ProteinpctotE, Alcoholg, AlcoholpctotE,
        Fatg, FatpctotE)

Energy <- bind_rows(Energy14, Energy56, Energy78)

dta_NDNS <- read_csv("dta_NDNS_Tslots.csv") # extract the day of week data

CW3idday$DayNo <- ave(CW3idday$ID_DAY, CW3idday$ID,
                     FUN = seq_along) # adding the day no

dta_DayofWeek <- dta_NDNS %>%
  select(id, id_dy, DayofWeek)

dta_DayofWeek$DayNo <- unlist(strsplit(dta_DayofWeek$id_dy,
                                     "D"))[c(FALSE, TRUE)] # creating a day No

names(dta_DayofWeek)[1] <- "ID"
dta_DayofWeek$DayNo <- as.numeric(dta_DayofWeek$DayNo)

CW3idday <- CW3idday %>%
  left_join(dta_DayofWeek, by= c("ID", "DayNo"))

## Manually check the day of week
CW3idday$DayofWeek[CW3idday$ID_DAY == 40714261000] <- "Saturday"
CW3idday$DayofWeek[CW3idday$ID_DAY == 112050710000] <- "Tuesday"
CW3idday$DayofWeek[CW3idday$ID_DAY == 310122510000] <- "Wednesday"
CW3idday$DayofWeek[CW3idday$ID_DAY == 5050616100] <- "Monday"
CW3idday$DayofWeek[CW3idday$ID_DAY == 50506161000] <- "Tuesday"
CW3idday$DayofWeek[CW3idday$ID_DAY == 505061610000] <- "Wednesday"
CW3idday$DayofWeek[CW3idday$ID_DAY == 7090824100] <- "Monday"
CW3idday$DayofWeek[CW3idday$ID_DAY == 70908241000] <- "Tuesday"
CW3idday$DayofWeek[CW3idday$ID_DAY == 709082410000] <- "Wednesday"
CW3idday$DayofWeek[CW3idday$ID_DAY == 807021910000] <- "Monday"
CW3idday$DayofWeek[CW3idday$ID_DAY == 812101310000] <- "Sunday"

CW3CB3_reg <- CW3CB3[!duplicated(CW3CB3$ID), ]

# extract only the CB variable (Between individual classes == 1 or 2)
CW3CB3_reg <- CW3CB3_reg %>%
  select(ID, AGE, SEX, CB)

tab1(CW3CB3_reg$CB, graph = FALSE)

## dataset for 3by3 multilevel latent classes

```

```

CW3CB3_regss <- CW3CB3_reg %>%
  left_join(BMI, by = "ID") %>%
  left_join(Energy, by = "ID")

# Rescale the weighting values
# individual weighting

a <- sum(CW3CB3_regss[CW3CB3_regss$Years == "1-4",]$wti)
b <- sum(CW3CB3_regss[CW3CB3_regss$Years == "5-6",]$wti)
c <- sum(CW3CB3_regss[CW3CB3_regss$Years == "7-8",]$wti)

CW3CB3_regss$wti1to8 <- CW3CB3_regss$wti

CW3CB3_regss[CW3CB3_regss$Years == "1-4",]$wti1to8 <-
  CW3CB3_regss[CW3CB3_regss$Years == "1-4",]$wti*(a+b+c)*(1/2)/a
CW3CB3_regss[CW3CB3_regss$Years == "5-6",]$wti1to8 <-
  CW3CB3_regss[CW3CB3_regss$Years == "5-6",]$wti*(a+b+c)*(1/4)/b
CW3CB3_regss[CW3CB3_regss$Years == "7-8",]$wti1to8 <-
  CW3CB3_regss[CW3CB3_regss$Years == "7-8",]$wti*(a+b+c)*(1/4)/c
mean(CW3CB3_regss$wti1to8)

CW3CB3_regss$wti1to8 <- CW3CB3_regss$wti1to8/1.209816814
summ(CW3CB3_regss$wti1to8, graph = FALSE)
#Check if the weighting sum up to the sample size we have
sum(CW3CB3_regss$wti1to8, graph = FALSE)

# Nurse weights

a <- sum(CW3CB3_regss[CW3CB3_regss$Years == "1-4",]$wti)
b <- sum(CW3CB3_regss[CW3CB3_regss$Years == "5-6",]$wti)
c <- sum(CW3CB3_regss[CW3CB3_regss$Years == "7-8",]$wti)

CW3CB3_regss$wti1to8 <- CW3CB3_regss$wti

CW3CB3_regss[CW3CB3_regss$Years == "1-4",]$wti1to8 <-
  CW3CB3_regss[CW3CB3_regss$Years == "1-4",]$wti*(a+b+c)*(1/2)/a
CW3CB3_regss[CW3CB3_regss$Years == "5-6",]$wti1to8 <-
  CW3CB3_regss[CW3CB3_regss$Years == "5-6",]$wti*(a+b+c)*(1/4)/b
CW3CB3_regss[CW3CB3_regss$Years == "7-8",]$wti1to8 <-
  CW3CB3_regss[CW3CB3_regss$Years == "7-8",]$wti*(a+b+c)*(1/4)/c
mean(CW3CB3_regss$wti1to8)

CW3CB3_regss$wti1to8 <- CW3CB3_regss$wti1to8/0.907003577
summ(CW3CB3_regss$wti1to8, graph = FALSE)
#Check if the weighting sum up to the sample size we have
sum(CW3CB3_regss$wti1to8, graph = FALSE)

# Blood weights

a <- sum(CW3CB3_regss[CW3CB3_regss$Years == "1-4",]$wtb)
b <- sum(CW3CB3_regss[CW3CB3_regss$Years == "5-6",]$wtb)
c <- sum(CW3CB3_regss[CW3CB3_regss$Years == "7-8",]$wtb)

CW3CB3_regss$wtb1to8 <- CW3CB3_regss$wtb

CW3CB3_regss[CW3CB3_regss$Years == "1-4",]$wtb1to8 <-
  CW3CB3_regss[CW3CB3_regss$Years == "1-4",]$wtb*(a+b+c)*(1/2)/a
CW3CB3_regss[CW3CB3_regss$Years == "5-6",]$wtb1to8 <-
  CW3CB3_regss[CW3CB3_regss$Years == "5-6",]$wtb*(a+b+c)*(1/4)/b

```

```
CW3CB3_regss[CW3CB3_regss$Years == "7-8",]$wtb1to8 <-
  CW3CB3_regss[CW3CB3_regss$Years == "7-8",]$wtb*(a+b+c)*(1/4)/c
  mean(CW3CB3_regss$wtb1to8)

CW3CB3_regss$wtb1to8 <- CW3CB3_regss$wtb1to8/0.4817444505
summ(CW3CB3_regss$wtb1to8, graph = FALSE)
#Check if the weighting sum up to the sample size we have
sum(CW3CB3_regss$wtb1to8, graph = FALSE)

weightings <- CW3CB3_regss %>% select(ID, wtil1to8, wtn1to8, wtb1to8)

# Combine the data from nutrient intake at each time slot
CW3CB3_7regss <- CW3CB3_7regss %>%
  left_join(IntakeSlots, by = "ID")

## dta ready to be analysed in STATA
# change the path accordingly
write_dta(CW3CB3_7regss, "../CW3CB3_7regss.dta")

*****
// Analysing NDNS survey data in stata
// for CW3CB3 survey data analysis
// date created: 2018-08-01
// manipulation of the data was done in R
// import data from CW3CB3_7sregss.dta
// change the path accordingly
*****

use "../CW3CB3_7regss.dta", clear

label define smoking 1 "current" 2 "ex-smoker" 3 "Never"
label values cigsta3 smoking
label define gender 1 "Men" 2 "Women"
label values Sex gender
label define paid 1 "No" 2 "Yes"
label values paidemployment paid
label define ethnicity5 1 "White" 2 "Mixed" 3 "Black" 4 "Asian" 5 "Other"
label values ethgrp5 ethnicity5
label define ethnicity2 1 "White" 2 "non-White"
label values ethgrp2 ethnicity2

gen Married = 1 if MarStat == 2 | MarSt2 == 2
replace Married = 1 if MarSt2 == 3
replace Married = 0 if Married !=1
tab Married
tab MarSt2
tab MarStat

label define Partner 0 "No" 1 "Yes"
label values Married Partner

gen Education = qual7 == 1
label define Ed 0 "lower than Degree" 1 "Degree or higher"
label values Education Ed

replace Education = . if qual7 >100
tab Educ
```

```

egen BMicat = cut(bmival), at(10, 25, 30, 40, 60)
tab BMicat

*****
// variables need to be log transformed //
*****

gen logalc = ln(Alcoholg+1)
summ logalc, detail
gen logMVP = ln(MVPAtime+1)
summ logMVP, detail
gen logGlu = ln(Glucose)
summ logGlu, detail
gen logA1C = ln(A1C)
summ logA1C, detail
gen logChol = ln(Chol)
summ logChol, detail
gen logLDL = ln(LDL)
gen logHDL = ln(HDL)
gen logTG = ln(Trig)

*****
// weighting use wti to see the individual results //
// //
*****

// weighting with individual weights, area is primary sampling unit,
// gor is the cluster variable

svyset area [pweight = wt1to8], strata(gor)

svydescribe wti // describe the weighted data set

svy: tabulate Sex CB, row se ci format(%7.3f)
svy: tabulate Sex CB, col se ci format(%7.3f)
svy: tabulate Country CB, col se ci format(%7.3f)
svy: tabulate Country CB, row se ci format(%7.3f)
svy: tabulate SurveyYear CB, col se ci format(%7.3f)
svy: tabulate SurveyYear CB, row se ci format(%7.3f)
svy: tabulate paid CB, col se ci format(%7.3f)

svy: tabulate MarSt2 CB
svy: tabulate MarStat CB
svy: tabulate Married CB, row se ci format(%7.3f)
svy: tabulate Married CB, col se ci format(%7.3f)
svy: mean eqvinc, over(CB)
test [eqvinc]1 = [eqvinc]2 = [eqvinc]3, mtest(b)
// bonferroni-adjusted p-values for multiple groups using the mtest(b) option

svy: tabulate ethgrp2 CB, row se ci format(%7.3f)
svy: tabulate ethgrp2 CB, col se ci format(%7.3f)
svy: tabulate Education CB, row se ci format(%7.3f)
svy: tabulate Education CB, col se ci format(%7.3f)

```

```
*****
// nutritional distribution //
// //
*****

svy: mean EnergykJ, over(CB)
test [EnergykJ]1 = [EnergykJ]2 = [EnergykJ]3, mtest(b)

svy: mean Energy6, over(CB)
test [Energy6_9]1 = [Energy6_9]2 = [Energy6_9]3, mtest(b)

svy: mean Energy9, over(CB)
test [Energy9_12]1 = [Energy9_12]2 = [Energy9_12]3, mtest(b)

svy: mean Energy12, over(CB)
test [Energy12_14]1 = [Energy12_14]2 = [Energy12_14]3, mtest(b)

svy: mean Energy14, over(CB)
test [Energy14_17]1 = [Energy14_17]2 = [Energy14_17]3, mtest(b)

svy: mean Energy17, over(CB)
test [Energy17_20]1 = [Energy17_20]2 = [Energy17_20]3, mtest(b)

svy: mean Energy20, over(CB)
test [Energy20_22]1 = [Energy20_22]2 = [Energy20_22]3, mtest(b)

svy: mean Energy22, over(CB)
test [Energy22_6]1 = [Energy22_6]2 = [Energy22_6]3, mtest(b)

svy: mean Carbohydrateg, over(CB)
test [Carbohydrateg]1 = [Carbohydrateg]2 = [Carbohydrateg]3, mtest(b)

svy: mean Carb6, over(CB)
test [Carb6_9]1 = [Carb6_9]2 = [Carb6_9]3, mtest(b)

svy: mean Carb9, over(CB)
test [Carb9_12]1 = [Carb9_12]2 = [Carb9_12]3, mtest(b)

svy: mean Carb12, over(CB)
test [Carb12_14]1 = [Carb12_14]2 = [Carb12_14]3, mtest(b)

svy: mean Carb14, over(CB)
test [Carb14_17]1 = [Carb14_17]2 = [Carb14_17]3, mtest(b)

svy: mean Carb17, over(CB)
test [Carb17_20]1 = [Carb17_20]2 = [Carb17_20]3, mtest(b)

svy: mean Carb20, over(CB)
test [Carb20_22]1 = [Carb20_22]2 = [Carb20_22]3, mtest(b)

svy: mean Carb22, over(CB)
test [Carb22_6]1 = [Carb22_6]2 = [Carb22_6]3, mtest(b)

svy: mean Sugar6, over(CB)
test [Sugar6_9]1 = [Sugar6_9]2 = [Sugar6_9]3, mtest(b)
```

```

svy: mean Sugar9, over(CB)
test [Sugar9_12]1 = [Sugar9_12]2 = [Sugar9_12]3, mtest(b)

svy: mean Sugar12, over(CB)
test [Sugar9_12]1 = [Sugar9_12]2 = [Sugar9_12]3, mtest(b)

svy: mean Sugar14, over(CB)
test [Sugar14_17]1 = [Sugar14_17]2 = [Sugar14_17]3, mtest(b)

svy: mean Sugar17, over(CB)
test [Sugar17_20]1 = [Sugar17_20]2 = [Sugar17_20]3, mtest(b)

svy: mean Sugar20, over(CB)
test [Sugar20_22]1 = [Sugar20_22]2 = [Sugar20_22]3, mtest(b)

svy: mean Sugar22, over(CB)
test [Sugar22_6]1 = [Sugar22_6]2 = [Sugar22_6]3, mtest(b)

svy: mean Starch6, over(CB)
test [Starch6_9]1 = [Starch6_9]2 = [Starch6_9]3, mtest(b)

svy: mean Starch9, over(CB)
test [Sugar12_14]1 = [Sugar12_14]2 = [Sugar12_14]3, mtest(b)

svy: mean Starch12, over(CB)
test [Starch12_14]1 = [Starch12_14]2 = [Starch12_14]3, mtest(b)

svy: mean Starch14, over(CB)
test [Starch14_17]1 = [Starch14_17]2 = [Starch14_17]3, mtest(b)

svy: mean Starch17, over(CB)
test [Starch17_20]1 = [Starch17_20]2 = [Starch17_20]3, mtest(b)

svy: mean Starch20, over(CB)
test [Starch20_22]1 = [Starch20_22]2 = [Starch20_22]3, mtest(b)

svy: mean Starch22, over(CB)
test [Starch20_22]1 = [Starch20_22]2 = [Starch20_22]3, mtest(b)

svy: mean Fibre6, over(CB)
test [Starch22_6]1 = [Starch22_6]2 = [Starch22_6]3, mtest(b)

gen Fibreg = Fibre6 + Fibre9 + Fibre12 + Fibre14 + Fibre17 + Fibre20 + Fibre22
svy: mean Fibreg, over(CB)
test [Fibreg]1 = [Fibreg]2 = [Fibreg]3, mtest(b)

svy: mean Fibre9, over(CB)
test [Fibre9_12]1 = [Fibre9_12]2 = [Fibre9_12]3, mtest(b)

svy: mean Fibre12, over(CB)
test [Fibre12_14]1 = [Fibre12_14]2 = [Fibre12_14]3, mtest(b)

svy: mean Fibre14, over(CB)
test [Fibre14_17]1 = [Fibre14_17]2 = [Fibre14_17]3, mtest(b)

```



```
svy: mean Fibre17, over(CB)
test [Fibre17_20]1 = [Fibre17_20]2 = [Fibre17_20]3, mtest(b)

svy: mean Fibre20, over(CB)
test [Fibre20_22]1 = [Fibre20_22]2 = [Fibre20_22]3, mtest(b)

svy: mean Fibre22, over(CB)
test [Fibre22_6]1 = [Fibre22_6]2 = [Fibre22_6]3, mtest(b)

svy: mean NMES6, over(CB)
test [NMES6_9]1 = [NMES6_9]2 = [NMES6_9]3, mtest(b)

svy: mean NMES9, over(CB)
test [NMES9_12]1 = [NMES9_12]2 = [NMES9_12]3, mtest(b)

svy: mean NMES12, over(CB)
test [NMES12_14]1 = [NMES12_14]2 = [NMES12_14]3, mtest(b)

svy: mean NMES14, over(CB)
test [NMES14_17]1 = [NMES14_17]2 = [NMES14_17]3, mtest(b)

svy: mean NMES17, over(CB)
test [NMES17_20]1 = [NMES17_20]2 = [NMES17_20]3, mtest(b)

svy: mean NMES20, over(CB)
test [NMES20_22]1 = [NMES20_22]2 = [NMES20_22]3, mtest(b)

svy: mean NMES22, over(CB)

svy: mean CHO, over(CB)
test [CHOpctotE]1 = [CHOpctotE]2 = [CHOpctotE]3, mtest(b)

svy: mean Proteing, over(CB)
test [Proteing]1 = [Proteing]2 = [Proteing]3, mtest(b)

svy: mean Prot6, over(CB)
test [Prot6_9]1 = [Prot6_9]2 = [Prot6_9]3, mtest(b)

svy: mean Prot9, over(CB)
test [Prot9_12]1 = [Prot9_12]2 = [Prot9_12]3, mtest(b)

svy: mean Prot12, over(CB)
test [Prot12_14]1 = [Prot12_14]2 = [Prot12_14]3, mtest(b)

svy: mean Prot14, over(CB)
test [Prot14_17]1 = [Prot14_17]2 = [Prot14_17]3, mtest(b)

svy: mean Prot17, over(CB)
test [Prot17_20]1 = [Prot17_20]2 = [Prot17_20]3, mtest(b)

svy: mean Prot20, over(CB)
test [Prot20_22]1 = [Prot20_22]2 = [Prot20_22]3, mtest(b)

svy: mean Prot22, over(CB)
test [Prot22_6]1 = [Prot22_6]2 = [Prot22_6]3, mtest(b)
```

```
svy: mean Proteinp, over(CB)
test [ProteinpctotE]1 = [ProteinpctotE]2 = [ProteinpctotE]3, mtest(b)
```

```
svy: mean Fatg, over(CB)
test [Fatg]1 = [Fatg]2 = [Fatg]3, mtest(b)
```

```
svy: mean Fat6, over(CB)
test [Fat6_9]1 = [Fat6_9]2 = [Fat6_9]3, mtest(b)
```

```
svy: mean Fat9, over(CB)
test [Fat9_12]1 = [Fat9_12]2 = [Fat9_12]3, mtest(b)
```

```
svy: mean Fat12, over(CB)
test [Fat12_14]1 = [Fat12_14]2 = [Fat12_14]3, mtest(b)
```

```
svy: mean Fat14, over(CB)
test [Fat14_17]1 = [Fat14_17]2 = [Fat14_17]3, mtest(b)
```

```
svy: mean Fat17, over(CB)
test [Fat17_20]1 = [Fat17_20]2 = [Fat17_20]3, mtest(b)
```

```
svy: mean Fat20, over(CB)
test [Fat20_22]1 = [Fat20_22]2 = [Fat20_22]3, mtest(b)
```

```
svy: mean Fat22, over(CB)
test [Fat22_6]1 = [Fat22_6]2 = [Fat22_6]3, mtest(b)
```

```
svy: mean Fatp, over(CB)
test [FatpctotE]1 = [FatpctotE]2 = [FatpctotE]3, mtest(b)
```

```
svy: mean Alcoholg, over(CB)
test [Alcoholg]1 = [Alcoholg]2 = [Alcoholg]3, mtest(b)
```

```
svy: mean Alc6, over(CB)
test [Alc6_9]1 = [Alc6_9]2 = [Alc6_9]3, mtest(b)
```

```
svy: mean Alc9, over(CB)
test [Alc9_12]1 = [Alc9_12]2 = [Alc9_12]3, mtest(b)
```

```
svy: mean Alc12, over(CB)
test [Alc12_14]1 = [Alc12_14]2 = [Alc12_14]3, mtest(b)
```

```
svy: mean Alc14, over(CB)
test [Alc14_17]1 = [Alc14_17]2 = [Alc14_17]3, mtest(b)
```

```
svy: mean Alc17, over(CB)
test [Alc14_17]1 = [Alc14_17]2 = [Alc14_17]3, mtest(b)
```

```
svy: mean Alc20, over(CB)
test [Alc14_17]1 = [Alc14_17]2 = [Alc14_17]3, mtest(b)
```

```
svy: mean Alcoholp, over(CB)
test [AlcoholpctotE]1 = [AlcoholpctotE]2 = [AlcoholpctotE]3, mtest(b)
```

```
svy: tabulate cigsta3 CB, col se ci format(%7.3f)
```

```

svy: tabulate dnnw CB, col se ci format(%7.3f)
svy: tabulate hibp CB, col se ci format(%7.3f)

sum MVP [weight=wtilto8] if CB ==1 , det
sum MVP [weight=wtilto8] if CB ==2 , det
sum MVP [weight=wtilto8] if CB ==3 , det
svy: mean MVP, over(CB)

svy: mean logMVP, over(CB) eform
test [logMVP]1 = [logMVP]2 = [logMVP]3, mtest(b)

disp exp(.731059) - 1
dis exp(.6768489) -1
dis exp(.7852691) -1

disp exp(.6239265) - 1
dis exp(.571165) -1
dis exp(.6766879) -1

disp exp(.7273621) - 1
dis exp(.684545) -1
dis exp(.7701791) -1

svy: mean logalc, over(CB)

disp exp( 2.035795) - 1
dis exp(1.933326) -1
dis exp(2.138264) -1

*****
// re-weighting use wtn to see the BMI,wc measurements //
//
*****

svyset area [pweight = wtn1to8], strata(gor)
svy: mean wst, over(CB)
test [wstval]1 = [wstval]2 = [wstval]3, mtest(b)

gen Men = Sex == 1
svy, subpop(Men): mean wst, over(CB)
test [wstval]1 = [wstval]2 = [wstval]3, mtest(b)

gen Women = Sex == 2
svy, subpop(Women): mean wst, over(CB)
test [wstval]1 = [wstval]2 = [wstval]3, mtest(b)

svy: mean bmi, over(CB)

test [bmival]1 = [bmival]2 = [bmival]3, mtest(b)

*****
// re-weighting use wtb to see the blood test results //
//
*****

svyset area [pweight = wtb1to8], strata(gor)

```

```
svy: mean HDL, over(CB)
test [HDL]1 = [HDL]2 = [HDL]3, mtest(b)

svy: mean Chol, over(CB)
test [Chol]1 = [Chol]2 = [Chol]3, mtest(b)

svy: mean LDL, over(CB)
test [LDL]1 = [LDL]2 = [LDL]3, mtest(b)

svy: mean Trig, over(CB)
test [Trig]1 = [Trig]2 = [Trig]3, mtest(b)

gen DM = A1C <= 6.5 if !missing(A1C)

svy, subpop(DM): mean Glucose, over(CB)
test [Glucose]1 = [Glucose]2
test [Glucose]1 = [Glucose]2 = [Glucose]3, mtest(b)

svy, subpop(DM): mean A1C, over(CB)
test [A1C]1 = [A1C]2
test [A1C]1 = [A1C]2 = [A1C]3, mtest(b)

svy: tabulate DM CB, col se ci format(%7.3f)

svy, subpop(DM): mean Glucose, over(CB)
test [Glucose]1 = [Glucose]2
test [Glucose]1 = [Glucose]2 = [Glucose]3, mtest(b)
svy, subpop(DM): mean A1C, over(C)
test [A1C]1 = [A1C]2
test [A1C]1 = [A1C]2 = [A1C]3, mtest(b)

svy: tabulate DM C, col se ci format(%7.3f)

svy, subpop(DM): mean logGlu, over(CB)
test [logGlu]1 = [logGlu]2 = [logGlu]3, mtest(b)

dis exp(1.642848)
dis exp(1.632226)
dis exp(1.653471)

dis exp(1.620347)
dis exp(1.606447)
dis exp(1.634246)

dis exp(1.629356)
dis exp(1.620271)
dis exp(1.63844)

svy, subpop(DM): mean logA1C, over(CB)
test [logA1C]1 = [logA1C]2 = [logA1C]3, mtest(b)

dis exp(1.699581)
dis exp(1.69296)
dis exp(1.706203)

dis exp(1.691608)
dis exp(1.683897)
dis exp(1.699318)
```

```
dis exp(1.705623)
dis exp(1.700665)
dis exp(1.710581)

svy: mean logChol, over(CB)
dis exp(1.598818)
dis exp(1.577698)
dis exp(1.619939)

dis exp(1.55251)
dis exp(1.530408)
dis exp(1.574613)

dis exp(1.599389)
dis exp(1.583391)
dis exp(1.615388)

test [logChol]1 = [logChol]2 = [logChol]3, mtest(b)

svy: mean logHDL, over(CB)
dis exp(.3293169)
dis exp(.3026793)
dis exp(.3559545)

dis exp(.2749379)
dis exp(.2476816)
dis exp(.3021941)

dis exp(.3269002)
dis exp(.3062623)
dis exp(.3475381)

test [logHDL]1 = [logHDL]2 = [logHDL]3, mtest(b)

svy: mean logLDL, over(CB)
dis exp(1.058635)
dis exp(1.028391)
dis exp(1.08888)

dis exp(1.018181)
dis exp(.984431)
dis exp(1.051931)

dis exp(1.075229)
dis exp(1.051369)
dis exp(1.09909)

test [logLDL]1 = [logLDL]2 = [logLDL]3, mtest(b)

svy: mean logTG, over(CB)
dis exp(.1273876)
dis exp(.0777152)
dis exp(.17706)

dis exp(.1012169)
dis exp(.0460972)
dis exp(.1563366)

dis exp(.0983298)
```

```

dis exp(.0607423)
dis exp(.1359172)

test [logTG]1 = [logTG]2 = [logTG]3, mtest(b)

*****
// Analysing NDNS survey data in stata
// for CW3CB3 survey data analysis on hypertension
// date created: 2018-08-06
// manipulation of the data was done in R
// import data from CW3CB3_7sregss.dta
// change the path accordingly
*****

use "../CW3CB3_7regss.dta", clear

label define smoking 1 "current" 2 "ex-smoker" 3 "Never"
label values cigsta3 smoking
label define gender 1 "Men" 2 "Women"
label values Sex gender
label define paid 1 "No" 2 "Yes"
label values paidemployment paid
label define ethnicity5 1 "White" 2 "Mixed" 3 "Black" 4 "Asian" 5 "Other"
label values ethgrp5 ethnicity5
label define ethnicity2 1 "White" 2 "non-White"
label values ethgrp2 ethnicity2

gen Married = 1 if MarStat == 2 | MarSt2 == 2
replace Married = 1 if MarSt2 == 3
replace Married = 0 if Married !=1
tab Married
tab MarSt2
tab MarStat

label define Partner 0 "No" 1 "Yes"
label values Married Partner

gen Education = qual7 == 1
label define Ed 0 "lower than Degree" 1 "Degree or higher"
label values Education Ed

replace Education = . if qual7 >100
tab Educ

egen BMICat = cut(bmival), at(10, 25, 30, 40, 60)
tab BMICat

*****
// variables need to be log transformed
*****

gen logalc = ln(Alcoholg+1)
summ logalc, detail
gen logMVP = ln(MVPAtime+1)
summ logMVP, detail
gen logGlu = ln(Glucose)
summ logGlu, detail
gen logA1C = ln(A1C)

```

```
summ logA1C, detail
gen logChol = ln(Chol)
summ logChol, detail
gen logLDL = ln(LDL)
gen logHDL = ln(HDL)
gen logTG = ln(Trig)

*****
// weighting use wti to see the individual results //
*****

// weighting with individual weights, area is primary sampling unit,
// gor is the cluster variable
svyset area [pweight = wtilto8], strata(gor)

svydescribe wti // describe the weighted data set

*****
// re-weighting use wtn to see the BMI,wc measurements //
*****
svyset area [pweight = wtn1to8], strata(gor)

gen Men = Sex == 1 // n of men = 2537
gen Women = Sex == 2 // n of women = 3618

svy, subpop(Men): tab hibp, se ci format(%7.3f)
svy, subpop(Women): tab hibp, se ci format(%7.3f)

svy, subpop(Men): mean age, over(hibp)
test [age]1 = [age]0
svy, subpop(Women): mean age, over(hibp)
test [age]1 = [age]0

svy, subpop(Men): mean wst, over(hibp)
test [wstval]1 = [wstval]0
svy, subpop(Women): mean wst, over(hibp)
test [wstval]1 = [wstval]0

svy, subpop(Men): tabulate CB hibp, col se ci format(%7.3f)
svy, subpop(Women): tabulate CB hibp, col se ci format(%7.3f)
svy, subpop(Men): tabulate Country hibp, col se ci format(%7.3f)
svy, subpop(Women): tabulate Country hibp, col se ci format(%7.3f)
svy, subpop(Men): tabulate SurveyYear hibp, col se ci format(%7.3f)
svy, subpop(Women): tabulate SurveyYear hibp, col se ci format(%7.3f)
svy, subpop(Men): tabulate ethgrp2 hibp, col se ci format(%7.3f)
svy, subpop(Women): tabulate ethgrp2 hibp, col se ci format(%7.3f)
svy, subpop(Men): tabulate Edu hibp, col se ci format(%7.3f)
```

```

svy, subpop(Women): tabulate Edu hibp, col se ci format(%7.3f)

svy, subpop(Men): tabulate cigsta3 hibp, col se ci format(%7.3f)

svy, subpop(Women): tabulate cigsta3 hibp, col se ci format(%7.3f)

svy, subpop(Men): tabulate Married hibp, col se ci format(%7.3f)

svy, subpop(Men): mean logMVP, over(hibp)
test [logMVP]1 = [logMVP]0

disp exp(.9234363) - 1
dis exp(.8457101) -1
dis exp(1.001163) -1

disp exp(.828635) - 1
dis exp(.730244) -1
dis exp(.9270261) -1

svy, subpop(Women): mean logMVP, over(hibp)
test [logMVP]1 = [logMVP]0

disp exp(.5916676) - 1
dis exp(.5473043) -1
dis exp(.6360309) -1

disp exp(.4231103) - 1
dis exp(.3536885) -1
dis exp(.4925322) -1

svy: mean logalc, over(CB)

disp exp(2.035795) - 1
dis exp(1.933326) -1
dis exp(2.138264) -1

svy, subpop(Men): mean bmi, over(hibp)
test [bmival]1 = [bmival]0
svy, subpop(Women): mean bmi, over(hibp)
test [bmival]1 = [bmival]0

svy, subpop(Men): mean EnergykJ, over(hibp)
test [EnergykJ]1 = [EnergykJ]0
svy, subpop(Women): mean EnergykJ, over(hibp)
test [EnergykJ]1 = [EnergykJ]0

svy, subpop(Men): mean Carbo, over(hibp)
test [Carbohydrateg]1 = [Carbohydrateg]0

svy, subpop(Women): mean Carbohydrateg, over(hibp)
test [Carbohydrateg]1 = [Carbohydrateg]0

svy, subpop(Men): mean Proteing, over(hibp)
test [Proteing]1 = [Proteing]0

svy, subpop(Women): mean Carbohydrateg, over(hibp)
test [Carbohydrateg]1 = [Carbohydrateg]0

```



```
svy: tabulate Sex hibp, col se ci format(%7.3f)
svy: tabulate paid hibp, col se ci format(%7.3f)
gen DM = A1C > 6.5 if !missing(A1C)

svy, subpop(Men): tabulate Married hibp, col se ci format(%7.3f)
svy, subpop(Women): tabulate Married hibp, col se ci format(%7.3f)

svy, subpop(Men): mean eqvinc, over(hibp)
test [eqvinc]1 = [eqvinc]0

svy, subpop(Women): mean eqvinc, over(hibp)
test [eqvinc]1 = [eqvinc]0

*****
** Building the GLM model
** date: 07/08/2018
*****

svyset area [pweight = wtn1to8], strata(gor)

// crude association between CB and hypertension
svy, subpop(Men): logistic hibp i.CB
svy, subpop(Women): logistic hibp i.CB

// in non DM
svy, subpop(Men if DM != 1): logistic hibp i.CB
svy, subpop(Women if DM != 1): logistic hibp i.CB

// looking for confounders one by one
// Age: -> confounder
svy, subpop(Men): logistic hibp i.CB age
test age
svy, subpop(Women): logistic hibp i.CB age
test age

svy, subpop(Men): logistic hibp i.CB##c.age
svy, subpop(Women): logistic hibp i.CB##c.age
test 2.CB#c.age 3.CB#c.age // no interaction

// Partner -> confounder
svy, subpop(Men): logistic hibp i.CB i.Married
test 1.Married
svy, subpop(Women): logistic hibp i.CB i.Married
test 1.Married

svy, subpop(Men): logistic hibp i.CB##i.Married
svy, subpop(Women): logistic hibp i.CB##i.Married

test 2.CB#1.Married 3.CB#1.Married // -> no interaction

// Income -> not confounder for men but confounder for women
svy, subpop(Men): logistic hibp i.CB eqvinc
test eqvinc
svy, subpop(Women): logistic hibp i.CB eqvinc
test eqvinc
```

```

svy, subpop(Men): logistic hibp i.CB##c.eqvinc
svy, subpop(Women): logistic hibp i.CB##c.eqvinc

test 2.CB#c.eqvinc 3.CB#c.eqvinc // -> (probably) no interaction

// Education -> confounder
svy, subpop(Men): logistic hibp i.CB i.Edu
test 1.Edu
svy, subpop(Women): logistic hibp i.CB i.Edu
test 1.Edu

svy, subpop(Men): logistic hibp i.CB##i.Edu
svy, subpop(Women): logistic hibp i.CB##i.Edu

test 2.CB#1.Edu 3.CB#1.Edu // no interaction

// BMI -> confounder
svy, subpop(Men): logistic hibp i.CB bmi
test bmi
svy, subpop(Women): logistic hibp i.CB bmi
test bmi

svy, subpop(Men): logistic hibp i.CB##c.bmi
svy, subpop(Women): logistic hibp i.CB##c.bmi

test 2.CB#c.bmival 3.CB#c.bmival // no interaction

// paid employment -> not confounder
svy, subpop(Men): logistic hibp i.CB i.paid
test 2.paid
svy, subpop(Women): logistic hibp i.CB i.paid
test 2.paid

svy, subpop(Men): logistic hibp i.CB##i.paid
svy, subpop(Women): logistic hibp i.CB##i.paid

test 2.CB#2.paid 3.CB#2.paid

// Smoking -> confounder
svy, subpop(Men): logistic hibp i.CB i.cigsta3
test 2.cigsta3 3.cigsta3
svy, subpop(Women): logistic hibp i.CB i.cigsta3
test 2.cigsta3 3.cigsta3

svy, subpop(Men): logistic hibp i.CB##i.cigsta3
svy, subpop(Women): logistic hibp i.CB##i.cigsta3

test 2.CB#2.cigsta3 2.CB#3.cigsta3 3.CB#2.cigsta3 3.CB#3.cigsta3 // no interaction

// Total energy intake -> confounder
svy, subpop(Men): logistic hibp i.CB EnergykJ
test EnergykJ
svy, subpop(Women): logistic hibp i.CB EnergykJ
test EnergykJ

svy, subpop(Men): logistic hibp i.CB##c.EnergykJ
svy, subpop(Women): logistic hibp i.CB##c.EnergykJ
test 2.CB#c.EnergykJ 3.CB#c.EnergykJ // no interaction

```

```
// ethnicity -> not confounder
svy, subpop(Men): logistic hibp i.CB i.ethgrp2
test 2.eth
svy, subpop(Women): logistic hibp i.CB i.ethgrp2
test 2.eth

svy, subpop(Men): logistic hibp i.CB##i.ethgrp2
svy, subpop(Women): logistic hibp i.CB##i.ethgrp2
test 2.CB#2.ethgrp2 // no interaction

// Alcohol -> not confounder for men but confounder for women
svy, subpop(Men): logistic hibp i.CB Alcoholg
test Alcoholg
svy, subpop(Women): logistic hibp i.CB Alcoholg
test Alcoholg

svy, subpop(Men): logistic hibp i.CB##c.Alcoholg
svy, subpop(Women): logistic hibp i.CB##c.Alcoholg
test 2.CB#c.Alcoholg 3.CB#c.Alcoholg // no interaction

// logMVP -> not confounder
svy, subpop(Men): logistic hibp i.CB logMVP
test logMVP
svy, subpop(Women): logistic hibp i.CB logMVP
test logMVP

svy, subpop(Men): logistic hibp i.CB##c.logMVP
svy, subpop(Women): logistic hibp i.CB##c.logMVP
test 2.CB#c.logMVP 3.CB#c.logMVP // no interaction

// Model includes all possible confounders in Men
svy, subpop(Men): logistic hibp i.CB age i.Married i.Edu bmi i.cig EnergykJ
linktest
svy, subpop(Men): logistic hibp i.CB age i.Married i.Edu wst i.cig EnergykJ
linktest
svy, subpop(if Men & DM != 1): logistic hibp i.CB age i.Married ///
  i.Edu bmi i.cig EnergykJ
linktest
svy, subpop(if Men & DM != 1): logistic hibp i.CB age i.Married ///
  i.Edu wst i.cig EnergykJ
linktest

// use the model above to see whether any other factors are confounders
// conditional on the other variables

// income -> not confounder
svy, subpop(Men): logistic hibp i.CB age i.Married i.Edu bmi i.cig ///
  EnergykJ eqvinc
test eqvinc

// ethnicity -> not confounder
svy, subpop(Men): logistic hibp i.CB age i.Married i.Edu bmi i.cig ///
  EnergykJ i.ethgrp2
test 2.ethgrp2

// alcohol -> not confounder
svy, subpop(Men): logistic hibp i.CB age i.Married i.Edu bmi i.cig ///
  EnergykJ Alcoholg
```

92 Appendix D. R and STATA codes for processing individual level data analysis

```
test Alcoholg

// MVP(physical activity) -> not confounder
svy, subpop(Men): logistic hibp i.CB age i.Married i.Edu bmi i.cig ///
  EnergykJ logMVP
test logMVP

// Model includes all possible confounders in Women
svy, subpop(Women): logistic hibp i.CB age i.Married eqvinc i.Edu ///
  bmi i.cig EnergykJ Alcoholg
linktest
svy, subpop(Women): logistic hibp i.CB age i.Married eqvinc i.Edu ///
  wst i.cig EnergykJ Alcoholg
linktest

// use the model above to see whether any other factors are confounders
// conditional on the other variables

// ethnicity -> not confounder
svy, subpop(Women): logistic hibp i.CB age i.Married eqvinc i.Edu ///
  bmi i.cig EnergykJ Alcoholg i.ethgrp2
test 2.ethgrp2

// MVP (physical activity) -> not confounder
svy, subpop(Women): logistic hibp i.CB age i.Married eqvinc i.Edu ///
  bmi i.cig EnergykJ Alcoholg logMVP
test logMVP

svy, subpop(if Women & DM != 1): logistic hibp i.CB age i.Married ///
  eqvinc i.Edu bmi i.cig EnergykJ Alcoholg
linktest

svy, subpop(if Women & DM != 1): logistic hibp i.CB age i.Married ///
  eqvinc i.Edu wst i.cig EnergykJ Alcoholg
linktest
```

Appendix E

Example of a food diary for one day

Day: Thurs		Date: 31st March		
Time	Where? With Whom? TV on? At table?	Food/Drink description & preparation	Brand Name	Portion size or quantity <u>eaten</u>
How to describe what you had and how much you had can be found on pages 16 - 21				
6am to 9am				
6.30 am	Kitchen Alone No TV Not at table	Filter coffee, decaffeinated milk (fresh, semi-skimmed) Sugar white	Douwe Egberts Silverspoon	Mug A little 1 level tsp
7.30 am	Kitchen Partner TV on At table	Filter coffee with milk and sugar Cornflakes Milk (fresh, semi-skimmed) Toast, granary medium sliced Light spread Marmalade	As above Tesco's own Hovis Flora Hartleys	As above 1b drowned 1 slice med spread 1 heaped tsp
9am to 12 noon				
10.15 am	Office desk Alone No TV Not at table	Instant coffee, not decaffeinated Milk (fresh, whole) Sugar brown	Kenco	Mug A little 1 level tsp
11 am	Office desk Alone No TV Not at table	Digestive biscuit – chocolate coated on one side	McVities	2

FIGURE E.1: NATIONAL DIET AND NUTRITION SURVEY – Food and Drink Diary Example, from 6 am to 12 noon.

Time	Where? With Whom? TV on? At table?	Food/Drink description & preparation	Brand Name	Portion size or quantity <u>eaten</u>
12 noon to 2pm				
12.30 pm	Tea room at work Colleagues No TV At table	Ham salad sandwich from home Bread, wholemeal, thick sliced Light spread Low fat Mayonnaise Smoked ham thinly sliced Lettuce, iceberg Cucumber with skin Unsweetened orange juice from canteen Apple with skin from home, Braeburn	Tesco's own Flora Hellmans Tesco's own Tropicana	2 slices thin spread on 1 slice 2 teaspoons 2 slices 1 leaf 4 thin slices 250ml carton medium size, core left
2pm to 5pm				
3 pm	Meeting room at work With supervisor No TV Not at table	Tea, decaffeinated Milk (fresh, whole) Jaffa cake – mini variety	Twinings Tesco's own McVities	Mug Some 6

FIGURE E.2: NATIONAL DIET AND NUTRITION SURVEY – Food and Drink Diary Example, from 12 noon to 5 pm.

Time	Where? With Whom? TV on? At table?	Food/Drink description & preparation	Brand Name	Portion size or quantity <u>eaten</u>
5pm to 8pm				
6.30 pm	Pub Partner TV on At table	Gin Tonic water diet Lager 3.8% alcohol Salted peanuts	Gordon's Schweppes Draught, Carlsberg KP	Single measure 1/2 small glass 1 pint 1 handful
8 pm	Dining room Family No TV At table	Spaghetti, wholemeal Bolognese sauce (see recipe) Courgettes (fried in butter) Tinned peaches in juice (juice drained) Single cream UHT Orange squash No Added Sugar	Tesco's own Prince's Sainsbury's own	3b 6 tablespoons 4 tablespoons 3 halves 1 tablespoon 200ml glass, 1 part squash, 3 parts tap water
8pm to 10pm				
9 pm	Sitting room Alone TV on Not at table	Grapes, green, seedless Chocolates, chocolate creams Potato crisps, Prawn Cocktail	Bendicks Walkers	15 2 25g bag (from multipack)
10pm to 6am				
10.30 pm	Bed room Partner No TV Not at table	Camomile tea (no milk or sugar)	Twinings	1 mug

FIGURE E.3: NATIONAL DIET AND NUTRITION SURVEY – Food and Drink Diary Example, from 5 pm to 6 am.

Write in recipes or ingredients of made up dishes or take-away dishes			
NAME OF DISH: <i>Bolognese sauce</i>		SERVES: <i>4</i>	
Ingredients	Amount	Ingredients	Amount
<i>Co-op low fat beef mince</i>	<i>500g</i>	<i>Lea & Perrins worcester sauce</i>	<i>dash</i>
<i>garlic</i>	<i>3 cloves</i>		
<i>onion</i>	<i>1 medium</i>		
<i>sweet red pepper</i>	<i>1 medium</i>		
<i>Napoli chopped tomatoes</i>	<i>400g tin</i>		
<i>Tesco tomato puree</i>	<i>1 tablespoon</i>		
<i>Tesco olive oil</i>	<i>1 tablespoon</i>		
<i>mixed herbs</i>	<i>1 dessertspoon</i>		
Brief description of cooking method <i>Fry onion & garlic in oil, add mince and fry till brown.</i> <i>Add pepper, tomatoes, puree, Worcester sauce & herbs. Simmer for 30 mins</i>			

FIGURE E.4: NATIONAL DIET AND NUTRITION SURVEY – Food and Drink Diary Example, home made food recipes.