

1 **Manuscript Type:** Original Research

2 **Title:** Assessing knowledge, attitudes, and behaviours toward salt and sugar consumption in the
3 Central Division of Fiji

4

5 Gade Waqa^{1*}, Colin Bell², Joseph Alvin Santos^{3, 4}, Kris Rogers^{3, 5}, Anasaini Moala Silatolu¹,
6 Erica Reeve², Aliyah Palu³, Alvina Deo⁶, Jacqui Webster³, Briar McKenzie³

7 **Author affiliations:**

8 1. Pacific Research Centre for the Prevention of Obesity and Non-communicable
9 Diseases (C-POND), Fiji Institute of Pacific Health Research, Fiji National
10 University, Suva, Fiji.

11 2. Institute for Health Transformation, Global Centre for Preventive Health and
12 Nutrition, Deakin University, Geelong, Australia

13 3. The George Institute for Global Health, University of New South Wales, Australia

14 4. Department of Business Economics, Health and Social Care (DEASS); University of
15 Applied Sciences and Arts of Southern Switzerland; Manno, Ticino, Switzerland

16 5. Faculty of Health, The University of Technology Sydney, Australia.

17 6. Ministry of Health, Suva, Fiji

18

19 * Corresponding author Email: gade.waqa@fnu.ac.fj

20

21 **Abstract**

22 **Background**

23 Excessive salt and sugar intake influence the global burden of non-communicable diseases.
24 This study aimed to describe the knowledge, attitudes and behaviours (KAB) of Fijian adults
25 relating to salt and sugar consumption to inform policy interventions in Fiji.

26

27 **Methods**

28 A randomised stratified sample of 700 adults in the Central Division of Fiji were selected.

29 ~~Questions on salt-related KAB were adapted from the World Health Organization~~

30 Noncommunicable Disease Risk Factor survey, and questions on sugar were developed
31 following a similar structure. Locally trained research assistants collected data. For analyses,
32 population and sample weights were applied, and difference between predefined subgroups
33 (sex, age, ethnicity and area of residence) were compared using weighted chi-square tests.

34

35 **Results**

36 534 adults participated (response rate,76%). Over 80% of participants (82% (95% CI 78.5 to
37 84.9%)) identified that consuming too much salt or salty sauce can lead to hypertension. More
38 than 90% recognized that consuming too much sugar can lead to diabetes (92.3% (89.7 to
39 94.3%)). Approximately 80% of participants thought it was somewhat or very important to
40 lower salt and sugar intake in their diet (79.8% (95%CI, 76.1 to 83.0) and 84.2% (80.8 to
41 87.1%), respectively). However, self-reported behaviours did not align, with almost 40%
42 adding salt or salty sauces as standard practice when cooking (37.3% (32.7 to 42.2%)) and 65%
43 (60.6 to 68.5%) reporting that they add sugar to drinks daily. Younger compared to older
44 individuals (18 to 44 years vs 45 years and older) and men compared to women, had lower
45 levels of KAB.

46

47 **Conclusion**

48 Despite having knowledge of the health impacts of consuming excess salt and sugar and
49 positive attitudes towards reducing consumption, many people reported behaviours likely to
50 contribute to high salt and sugar intake. These findings highlight the need for interventions that
51 incentivise healthier choices, through behaviour change communications and the creation of
52 supportive food environments.

53

54 **Introduction**

55 Non-communicable diseases (NCDs) account for approximately 74% of all deaths globally,¹
56 with cardiovascular disease accounting for most NCD deaths. The global burden of NCDs is
57 influenced by dietary factors, particularly excessive salt and sugar intake^{2 3}. High salt
58 consumption is linked to elevated blood pressure and increased risks of CVDs such as heart

59 disease and stroke^{4 5}. Excessive sugar intake, especially from sugar-sweetened beverages
60 (SSBs), is associated with various health issues, including obesity and diabetes⁶⁻¹⁰.

61

62 The shift from traditional diets based on locally sourced foods to diets dominated by imported
63 and processed foods has exacerbated the problem of diet-related diseases in the Pacific
64 Islands¹¹⁻¹³. Evidence suggests an association between the dietary transition to a higher
65 population intake of salt and sugar with the rising prevalence of NCDs^{13 14}. In 2017, WHO
66 identified reducing sugar and salt among the best ways to prevent and control NCDs³. In
67 response, Pacific countries proposed maximum acceptable regional targets for salt in eight
68 selected food categories¹⁵. However, this initiative was voluntary, and coordinated efforts to
69 reduce salt intake at the population level have been limited^{15 16} leading to ineffective
70 interventions¹⁷. While the Pacific region, including Fiji, has implemented fiscal policy
71 interventions for SSBs^{18 19} in line with WHO recommendations on “best buys”³ these policies
72 have not been fully aligned with WHO guidelines and require strengthening to achieve health
73 benefits¹⁸.

74

75 We have previously identified that salt intake was almost double the maximum amount and
76 sugar intake three times the ideal amount, as recommended by the WHO, highlighting the need
77 for interventions to reduce intake in Fiji²⁰. To better understand what interventions are needed,
78 it is essential to assess people's knowledge, attitudes, and behaviours (KAB) toward salt and
79 sugar consumption. Therefore, this study aimed to describe the knowledge, attitudes and
80 behaviours, relating to salt and sugar consumption, of a representative sample of adults in the
81 Central Division of Fiji.

82

83 **Materials and methods**

84 This cross-sectional survey was part of a broader study to strengthen food policies in Fiji²¹.
85 The objective of the larger project was to identify factors needed to achieve effective food
86 policy implementation for healthier food environments in the Pacific. The survey aimed to
87 assess salt and sugar intake, salt and sugar-related KABs, food security, and the impact of
88 COVID-19. Findings on salt and sugar intake, food security, and the effects of COVID-19 have
89 been published, with methods for these survey components explained in respective papers^{20 22}.
90 Ethics approval for this survey was obtained from the University of New South Wales

91 (HC200469) and the Fiji National University College of Human Health Research Ethical
92 Committee (CHHREC264.20).

93

94 ***Sample size and recruitment***

95 Two enumeration areas within the Central Division of Fiji were randomly selected for the
96 survey: Waidamudamu Medical Zone (an urban area) and Deuba Medical Zone (a rural area).
97 A randomized stratified sampling approach was employed, considering age, sex, and ethnicity
98 to ensure representation from demographic groups. The sample size was calculated based on
99 the primary objective of the survey, which was to act as a baseline measure for monitoring
100 changes in salt and sugar intake. Based on an estimated 16% non-response rate, 700 individuals
101 (350 for each area) were sampled²⁰. This sample size was determined to achieve at least 80%
102 power to detect specific changes in salt intake (0.6g/day with a standard deviation of 3.6) and
103 sugar intake (0.9 absolute percent change with a standard deviation of 5.4) following the
104 intervention with a precision (95% confidence interval) of 7.8%.

105 Permission to enter villages and conduct the study was gained through the Ministry of iTaukei
106 Affairs of the Fiji government, with relevant approvals obtained from the Provincial Council
107 office and the Nasinu and Nausori Municipalities under the Ministry of Local Government.
108 Traditional Fijian customs, such as the “i sevusevu” kava ceremony, were performed to seek
109 approval from local village chiefs, leaders of faith-based organizations and selected community
110 members. Information sessions were conducted at neutral locations such as village meeting
111 halls, within each village, to inform residents about the survey and address any questions or
112 concerns. Research assistants visited the homes of selected participants, invited them to
113 participate in the survey, and provided them with information about the study. If no one aged
114 18 or above was at home, then a repeat visit was made at a later stage. Participant information
115 sheets and consent forms were available in English, Hindi, and Fijian, and oral translations
116 were provided as needed. Eligibility was based on age (aged 18 years or older), and the ability
117 to provide written informed consent. Surveys were predominantly conducted on weekdays
118 (Monday – Friday), with arrangements made for weekend data collection as necessary to
119 accommodate participants’ schedules. Repeat visits were made to households if initial attempts
120 to contact residents were unsuccessful or only individuals under 18 were present. The surveys
121 took place from the first week of March to the last week of June 2022.

122

123 ***Survey instrument, salt and sugar-related knowledge, attitudes and behaviours***

124 The salt and sugar questions used were based on the WHO STEPS survey for salt, with a similar
125 structure followed to develop a set of sugar-specific questions²³. Prior to implementation, the
126 research team piloted the tool to ensure its comprehensiveness and clarity within the research
127 team. See **supplementary material** for the KAB questionnaire.

128 Dietary salt, according to the WHO STEPS survey questionnaire, was defined as ordinary table
129 salt, unrefined salts such as sea salt, iodized salt, and salty sauces such as soy sauce or ketchup.
130 Dietary sugar was defined as raw and white sugar (including sugar lumps), brown sugar, cane
131 sugar, caster, and icing sugar.

132 ***Knowledge:*** Participants were assessed on their knowledge of salt and sugar through three
133 questions each, including knowledge of the recommended daily intake amount, recognition of
134 teaspoon equivalents for the recommended intake, and understanding of the health implications
135 of excessive salt or sugar consumption, with response options indicating various health
136 conditions (e.g. hypertension, diabetes) or “don’t know”.

137 ***Attitudes:*** Attitudes towards salt and sugar intake were evaluated using single questions each,
138 asking participants to rate the importance of reducing intake in their diet on a 5-point Likert
139 scale ranging from “very important” to “not at all important” or “don’t know.”

140 ***Behaviours:*** Salt and sugar-related behaviours were assessed through six questions each. For
141 salt-related behaviours, inquiries included discretionary salt use during cooking and meal
142 consumption; frequency of consuming processed foods high in salt (such as packaged salty
143 snacks, canned salty food including pickles and preserves, salty food prepared at a fast-food
144 restaurant, cheese, and processed meat); efforts to reduce salt intake, and specific actions taken
145 to achieve this reduction (e.g., limit consumption of packaged processed foods, limit
146 consumption of takeaways/fast food, look at the salt/sodium content on food labels, buy low
147 salt alternatives, use spices other than salt when cooking or other).

148 For sugar-related behaviours, questions addressed the frequency of consuming drinks with
149 added sugar (hot or cold e.g. coffee, tea, milo/hot chocolate, water, juice); the amount of sugar
150 added to drinks; consumption of sugar-sweetened beverages (e.g. fizzy drinks, sodas, juice,
151 raro/concentrate); efforts to reduce sugar intake, and specific actions taken to achieve this
152 reduction (e.g., limit consumption of packaged processed foods, limit consumption of sugar-
153 sweetened beverages, limit the addition of sugar to hot or cold drinks, limit the use of instant
154 drink mixes (e.g., coffee mixers), limit consumption of confectionary, limit consumption of

155 baked goods, like cakes and sweet biscuits, sweet pastries, and ice cream, buy low sugar
156 alternatives, other).

157

158 Responses for all behaviour -related questions ranged from specific frequency options (e.g,
159 "always" to "never") to categorical choices regarding efforts to reduce intake and specific
160 behavioural actions undertaken.

161 ***Data collection***

162 The data collection process involved conducting interviews with participants in their
163 homes or other convenient spaces, each lasting approximately an hour. Locally trained
164 research assistants collected data using a mobile Android Package Kit (APK) containing
165 the 19 multiple-choice questions designed to assess salt and sugar-related KAB. In addition
166 to the KAB, demographics, health status, and physical measurements were collected.
167 Participant demographic data included sex, age, ethnicity, highest education level, and
168 household living arrangement (living alone vs sharing/living with others). Physical
169 measurements, including height, weight, waist circumference, and three blood pressure
170 readings, were taken. Further information on collecting demographics and physical
171 measurements have been published previously ^{20 22}.

172 ***Data analysis***

173 All data were analyzed using STATA BE V17.0 for Windows (Stata Corp LP, College
174 Station, TX, USA). Analyses were weighted to reflect the probability based on the random
175 selection of individuals (sample weight) and to match the appropriate estimates of the
176 population in Deuba and Waidamudamu (population weight). The differences between
177 subgroups (by sex (female, male), age (18-44, 45 years and older), ethnicity (iTaukei or
178 Indigenous Fijians, Fijian of Indian descent or other), and area (Waidamudamu Medical
179 Zone, Medical Zone) were compared using weighted chi-square tests. For all analyses, the
180 svy command in Stata accounted for strata effects, and the Taylor linearization method was
181 employed for variance estimation. Results were reported as mean (for continuous variables)
182 or proportion (for categorical variables) with standard error (SE) or 95% confidence interval
183 (CI) as appropriate.

184

185 **Results**

186 **Demographics and health status**

187 A total of 534 people completed the survey (response rate 76%). Half of the population were
188 female (50.4%), and the mean age of the study population was 42 years. Most participants had
189 secondary education (69.4%) and lived with others (95.8%). Just under half of the population
190 stated they were iTaukei (Indigenous) Fijians (46.3%).

191

192

193 Most respondents (approximately 90%) reported that their health was either good, very good,
194 or excellent. However, a third reported being current smokers (28.7% (95% CI, 25.4 to 32.3)),
195 28% reported they had been diagnosed with high blood pressure (28.0% (24.5 to 31.7)) and
196 10% reported having a history of diabetes (9.7% (7.7 to 12.2)). Additionally, more than half of
197 the participants were classified as hypertensive based on blood pressure measures taken during
198 the survey 50.8% (46.8 to 54.8%). Mean body mass index was 28.8 kg/m² (28.2 to 29.3), with
199 a higher prevalence of obesity observed among women (50.2% (44.6 to 55.8)) compared to
200 men (32.5% ((27.2 to 38.3)). Characteristics of nutrition survey participants, anthropometric
201 measurements and self-reported health status have been previously published²⁰.

202

203

204 **Salt**

205 *Salt-related knowledge*

206 Most participants were aware of the relationship between high salt intakes and the increased
207 risk of hypertension (82% (95% CI, 78.5 to 84.9)), however just over a quarter (27%
208 (95%CI,23.8 to 31.4)) were aware of the relationship between high salt intake and the risk of
209 having a stroke. Only 16% of participants knew that the maximum recommended amount of
210 salt per day is 5g or less (16.2% (13.4 to 19.5%)), of which 25% (25.1% (21.7 to 28.8%)) knew
211 that this looked like one teaspoon of salt. Knowledge differed by age, area, and ethnicity. For
212 example, in regard to knowledge of the recommended daily intake of salt, significantly more
213 Fijians of Indian descent and other ethnicities compared to iTaukei Fijians were aware of the
214 recommendations (21.3% (16.7% vs 25.9%) vs. 10.3% (6.4% vs 14.2%)). There was a similar
215 difference in awareness between those in a rural setting (Deuba) compared to urban
216 (Waidamudamu) (21.4% (16.6 to 26.1%) vs 12.8% (8.8 to 16.7%)), **table 1**.

| | OVERALL | BY SEX | | BY AGE GROUP | | BY AREA | | BY ETHNICITY | |
|---|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| | | Female | Male | 18 to 44 years | 45 years and up | Deuba | Waidamudamu | ITaukei | FID and FOD* |
| Knowledge | | | | | | | | | |
| What do you think is the recommended amount of salt that you should eat each day? Less than 5g^{3,4} | 16.2 (13.4 to 19.5) | 14.8 (10.8 to 18.7) | 17.7 (13.0 to 22.3) | 14.3 (10.3 to 18.2) | 19.6 (14.8 to 24.4) | 12.8 (8.8 to 16.7) | 21.4 (16.6 to 26.1) | 10.3 (6.4 to 14.2) | 21.3 (16.7 to 25.9) |
| Based on your answer to the previous question, what does this look like? One teaspoon of salt³ | 25.1 (21.7 to 28.8) | 26.5 (21.6 to 31.5) | 23.6 (18.5 to 28.7) | 26.0 (21.3 to 30.7) | 23.5 (18.2 to 28.7) | 18.3 (13.7 to 22.9) | 35.2 (29.5 to 40.9) | 21.6 (16.6 to 26.7) | 28.0 (23.0 to 33.1) |
| Do you think that consuming too much salt or salty sauce can lead to any of the following health conditions? | | | | | | | | | |
| Hypertension ^{2,4} | 82.0 (78.5 to 84.9) | 83.6 (79.2 to 88.0) | 80.3 (75.6 to 84.9) | 79.5 (75.1 to 83.9) | 86.3 (82.0 to 90.6) | 82.0 (77.5 to 86.5) | 81.9 (77.5 to 86.2) | 74.9 (69.5 to 80.3) | 88.0 (84.3 to 91.7) |
| Stroke | 27.4 (23.8 to 31.4) | 25.0 (20.0 to 30.1) | 29.9 (24.2 to 35.5) | 26.5 (21.5 to 31.5) | 29.1 (23.4 to 34.8) | 28.2 (22.9 to 33.5) | 26.3 (21.3 to 31.4) | 24.6 (19.1 to 30.1) | 29.8 (24.6 to 35.0) |
| Osteoporosis | 11.3 (8.9 to 14.2) | 9.5 (6.0 to 13.0) | 13.0 (9.0 to 17.1) | 10.3 (6.9 to 13.7) | 12.9 (8.7 to 17.1) | 11.0 (7.4 to 14.6) | 11.7 (7.9 to 15.5) | 12.2 (8.1 to 16.3) | 10.5 (7.0 to 13.9) |
| Diabetes ⁴ | 9.1 (7.0 to 11.8) | 8.9 (5.5 to 12.3) | 9.3 (6.0 to 12.7) | 9.3 (6.1 to 12.4) | 8.8 (5.3 to 12.3) | 9.7 (6.4 to 13.0) | 8.3 (4.9 to 11.6) | 14.0 (9.5 to 18.5) | 4.9 (2.7 to 7.0) |
| Don't know ⁴ | 15.1 (12.4 to 18.3) | 13.3 (9.2 to 17.3) | 17.0 (12.6 to 21.3) | 16.3 (12.3 to 20.3) | 13.0 (8.8 to 17.2) | 14.9 (10.7 to 19.0) | 15.5 (11.4 to 19.5) | 21.5 (16.4 to 26.7) | 9.6 (6.3 to 12.9) |
| Attitudes | | | | | | | | | |
| How important to you is lowering the salt in your diet? Very/somewhat important^{1,2} | 79.8 (76.1 to 83.0) | 84.6 (80.2 to 88.9) | 74.9 (69.5 to 80.2) | 76.7 (71.9 to 81.5) | 85.0 (80.7 to 89.4) | 78.7 (73.8 to 83.5) | 81.4 (76.8 to 85.9) | 81.4 (76.4 to 86.3) | 78.4 (73.6 to 83.2) |
| Behaviours | | | | | | | | | |
| In your household, do you normally do the cooking? Yes^{1,3,4} | 73.6 (70.0 to 76.8) | 92.5 (89.3 to 95.6) | 54.4 (48.3 to 60.5) | 74.4 (69.9 to 78.9) | 72.2 (67.2 to 77.2) | 70.7 (65.8 to 75.6) | 77.8 (73.6 to 82.1) | 77.6 (72.9 to 82.4) | 70.1 (65.3 to 74.9) |
| When you are cooking, how much salt or salty sauces such as soy sauce do you | 37.3 (32.7 to 42.2) | 35.8 (29.9 to 41.6) | 40.1 (32.0 to 48.1) | 40.6 (34.4 to 46.9) | 31.4 (24.4 to 38.4) | 40.9 (34.2 to 47.7) | 32.5 (26.0 to 38.9) | 46.4 (39.2 to 53.5) | 28.7 (22.4 to 35.0) |

| | OVERALL | BY SEX | | BY AGE GROUP | | BY AREA | | BY ETHNICITY | |
|---|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| | | Female | Male | 18 to 44 years | 45 years and up | Deuba | Waidamudamu | ITaukei | FID and FOD* |
| normally add? At least a teaspoon of salt/a tablespoon of salty sauces ⁴ | | | | | | | | | |
| How much salt or salty sauces such as soy sauce do you add to your meal before eating? At least a teaspoon of salt/a tablespoon of salty sauces ⁴ | 20.3 (17.1 to 23.9) | 21.6 (16.8 to 26.5) | 18.9 (14.1 to 23.7) | 22.6 (18.0 to 27.3) | 16.2 (11.6 to 20.8) | 21.0 (16.3 to 25.8) | 19.2 (14.5 to 23.9) | 27.6 (21.9 to 33.3) | 14.0 (10.0 to 18.0) |
| How often do you add salt or salty sauce such as soy sauce to your food right before you eat it or as you are eating it? Always/often ⁴ | 9.6 (7.4 to 12.4) | 7.8 (4.7 to 10.9) | 11.4 (7.6 to 15.3) | 9.8 (6.5 to 13.1) | 9.2 (5.6 to 12.8) | 8.3 (5.0 to 11.5) | 11.6 (7.8 to 15.3) | 12.6 (8.4 to 16.9) | 7.0 (4.1 to 9.8) |
| How often do you eat processed food high in salt? Always/often ^{2,4} | 18.2 (15.1 to 21.8) | 19.3 (14.6 to 23.9) | 17.1 (12.3 to 21.9) | 20.9 (16.2 to 25.5) | 13.5 (9.3 to 17.7) | 19.9 (15.2 to 24.6) | 15.7 (11.3 to 20.0) | 23.9 (18.4 to 29.4) | 13.3 (9.3 to 17.3) |
| Do you try to reduce your salt intake? Yes ^{1,2,3} | 58.6 (54.7 to 62.4) | 70.4 (65.0 to 75.8) | 46.6 (41.1 to 52.1) | 52.8 (47.6 to 57.9) | 68.7 (63.2 to 74.2) | 51.7 (46.4 to 57.0) | 68.9 (63.5 to 74.3) | 60.8 (54.7 to 67.0) | 56.6 (51.8 to 61.4) |
| Can you indicate how you try to reduce your salt intake? | | | | | | | | | |
| Limit consumption of packaged foods ^{1,2,4} | 39.6 (35.8 to 43.6) | 45.6 (39.9 to 51.4) | 33.5 (28.3 to 38.8) | 33.9 (28.9 to 38.9) | 49.6 (43.4 to 55.8) | 36.6 (31.4 to 41.8) | 44.1 (38.2 to 50.0) | 44.1 (38.0 to 50.3) | 35.7 (30.7 to 40.7) |
| Limit consumption of take-aways/fast food ^{1,2,3} | 33.4 (29.7 to 37.3) | 38.9 (33.2 to 44.6) | 27.8 (22.8 to 32.8) | 29.6 (24.8 to 34.4) | 40.0 (33.8 to 46.1) | 29.2 (24.2 to 34.2) | 39.7 (33.9 to 45.5) | 34.0 (28.1 to 39.9) | 32.8 (27.9 to 37.8) |
| Look at the salt/sodium content on food labels | 16.2 (13.4 to 19.4) | 18.3 (13.7 to 22.8) | 14.1 (10.2 to 18.0) | 14.3 (10.5 to 18.0) | 19.6 (14.6 to 24.5) | 16.4 (12.3 to 20.5) | 16.0 (11.7 to 20.2) | 18.9 (14.1 to 23.8) | 13.8 (10.1 to 17.5) |
| Buy low salt alternatives ^{1,3} | 11.5 (9.2 to 14.3) | 14.0 (10.0 to 18.1) | 8.9 (5.9 to 12.0) | 10.0 (6.9 to 13.1) | 14.2 (9.7 to 18.6) | 8.9 (5.7 to 12.0) | 15.5 (11.2 to 19.8) | 11.5 (7.5 to 15.5) | 11.5 (8.2 to 14.8) |
| Use spices other than salt when cooking ^{1,2} | 12.1 (9.7 to 14.9) | 15.0 (10.8 to 19.2) | 9.1 (5.9 to 12.2) | 10.0 (6.8 to 13.2) | 15.6 (11.1 to 20.2) | 10.7 (7.3 to 14.1) | 14.1 (9.9 to 18.3) | 14.3 (9.9 to 18.6) | 10.1 (7.0 to 13.2) |

220

221 **Salt-related attitudes**

222 Seventy-nine percent of participants (79.8% (95%CI, 76.1 to 83.0)) said it was very or
223 somewhat important to lower the salt in their diet differing by sex and age, with higher
224 importance reported by females than males (84.6% (80.2 to 88.9) vs 74.9% (69.5 to 80.2%))
225 and for those in the older age range vs younger (85% (80.7 to 89.4) vs 76.7% (71.9 to 81.5%)),
226 **table 1**.

227 **Salt-related behaviours**

228 Almost three-quarters (73.6% (70.0 to 76.8%)) of respondents said they were the main cook at
229 home, with 93% of surveyed women reporting that they were the main cook (92.5% (89.3 to
230 95.6%)). Just over a third reported that they add at least a teaspoon of salt or a tablespoon of
231 salty sauces normally when they are cooking (37.3% (32.7 to 42.2%)), and almost 10%
232 reported adding salt or salty sauce either always or often right before eating (9.6% (7.4 to
233 12.4%)). More than half of the study population (58.6% (54.7 to 62.4%)) reported trying to
234 reduce their salt intake, with the most common behaviours to reduce salt intake being limiting
235 the consumption of packaged foods (reported by 39.6% (35.8 to 43.6%)), **table 1**.

236 There were key differences in salt-related behaviours by subgroups (**table 1**), for example, a
237 higher proportion of iTaukei Fijians reported adding a teaspoon of salt or a tablespoon of salty
238 sauces when cooking (46.4 (39.2 to 53.5%) vs. 28.7% (22.4 to 35.0%)) and always or often
239 adding salt or soy sauce when they eat (12.6% (8.4 to 16.9%) vs. 7.0% (4.1 to 9.8%)), compared
240 to Fijians with Indian descent and other. Further, significantly more women compared to men
241 reported trying to reduce their salt intake (70.4% (65.0 to 75.8%) vs 46.6% (41.1 to 52.1%)),
242 similarly a higher proportion of older people reported trying to reduce their salt intake (68.7%
243 (63.2 to 74.2%) vs 52.8% (47.6 to 57.9%) in the younger age group), and more people from
244 the urban area compared to rural (68.9% (63.5 to 74.3) vs. 51.7% (46.4 to 57.0%)).

245

246 ***Sugar***

247 **Sugar-related knowledge**

248 Most participants were aware of the relationship between high intakes of sugar and diabetes
249 (92.3% (95% CI 89.7 to 94.3%)); however, the relationship between high sugar intake and the
250 risk of poor dental health (36% (26.9 to 34.6%)), and obesity (27.9% (24.2 to 31.8%)) were

251 less well known. Only 22% (18.6 to 25.7%) of participants knew the recommended daily sugar
252 intake of less than 10% of total energy intake (**Table 2**). The level of sugar-related knowledge
253 was similar across subgroups, except for awareness around the relationship between sugar
254 intake and poor dental health, which differed by area (35.8% (30.2 to 41.3%) urban vs 27.2%
255 (22.0 to 32.4%) rural) and ethnicity (35.7% (30.3 to 41.1%) Fijian of Indian or other descent,
256 vs 24.7% (19.3 to 30.1%) for iTaukei Fijians).

257

| | OVERALL | BY SEX | | BY AGE GROUP | | BY AREA | | BY ETHNICITY | |
|--|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| | | Female | Male | 18 to 44 years | 45 years and up | Deuba | Waidamudamu | ITaukei | FID and FOD* |
| Knowledge | | | | | | | | | |
| What do you think is the recommended amount of sugar that you should eat each day? Less than 10% of total energy intake | 22.0 (18.6 to 25.7) | 19.5 (14.9 to 24.1) | 24.4 (19.1 to 29.8) | 22.2 (17.5 to 26.9) | 21.5 (16.3 to 26.7) | 19.6 (14.8 to 24.3) | 25.5 (20.3 to 30.7) | 19.8 (14.7 to 24.9) | 23.8 (18.9 to 28.7) |
| Do you think that consuming too much sugar or sugar sweetened beverage can lead to any of the following health conditions? | | | | | | | | | |
| Diabetes | 92.3 (89.7 to 94.3) | 92.0 (88.7 to 95.2) | 92.6 (89.4 to 95.8) | 92.1 (89.1 to 95.1) | 92.6 (89.2 to 96.0) | 91.9 (88.7 to 95.1) | 92.9 (89.8 to 96.0) | 90.6 (87.0 to 94.2) | 93.7 (90.8 to 96.6) |
| Obesity | 27.9 (24.2 to 31.8) | 30.6 (25.2 to 36.1) | 25.1 (19.8 to 30.3) | 29.6 (24.6 to 34.7) | 24.8 (19.3 to 30.3) | 28.1 (22.8 to 33.4) | 27.5 (22.2 to 32.7) | 27.9 (22.1 to 33.6) | 27.8 (22.8 to 32.9) |
| Heart disease | 20.8 (17.6 to 24.5) | 20.8 (16.1 to 25.6) | 20.8 (15.9 to 25.8) | 19.5 (15.1 to 24.0) | 23.1 (17.7 to 28.5) | 21.9 (17.1 to 26.6) | 19.3 (14.6 to 24.1) | 22.4 (17.2 to 27.7) | 19.5 (15.0 to 24.0) |
| High cholesterol | 15.9 (13.1 to 19.2) | 16.3 (12.0 to 20.6) | 15.4 (11.1 to 19.8) | 14.8 (10.9 to 18.7) | 17.8 (12.8 to 22.7) | 14.4 (10.4 to 18.5) | 18.1 (13.5 to 22.7) | 14.7 (10.2 to 19.1) | 16.9 (12.7 to 21.1) |
| Poor dental health ^{3,4} | 30.6 (26.9 to 34.6) | 29.4 (24.2 to 34.5) | 31.9 (26.2 to 37.6) | 28.6 (23.6 to 33.6) | 34.1 (28.3 to 40.0) | 27.2 (22.0 to 32.4) | 35.8 (30.2 to 41.3) | 24.7 (19.3 to 30.1) | 35.7 (30.3 to 41.1) |
| Don't know | 4.8 (3.2 to 7.0) | 5.4 (2.6 to 8.2) | 4.1 (1.7 to 6.6) | 5.1 (2.7 to 7.5) | 4.2 (1.4 to 7.0) | 4.6 (2.1 to 7.1) | 5.0 (2.4 to 7.7) | 4.8 (2.1 to 7.6) | 4.8 (2.3 to 7.3) |
| Attitudes | | | | | | | | | |
| How important to you is lowering the sugar in your diet? Very/somewhat important ^{1,2} | 84.2 (80.8 to 87.1) | 89.4 (85.8 to 93.0) | 78.9 (73.8 to 84.0) | 81.6 (77.2 to 85.9) | 88.8 (84.9 to 92.8) | 82.4 (77.9 to 86.9) | 87.0 (83.0 to 90.9) | 85.1 (80.6 to 89.6) | 83.5 (79.2 to 87.8) |
| Behaviours | | | | | | | | | |
| How often do you drink drinks that you add sugar to? Daily/5-6 days per week ^{1,4} | 64.6 (60.6 to 68.5) | 60.1 (54.4 to 65.8) | 69.3 (63.9 to 74.7) | 66.1 (61.0 to 71.3) | 62.1 (56.0 to 68.1) | 66.0 (60.6 to 71.4) | 62.6 (57.0 to 68.2) | 71.0 (65.5 to 76.5) | 59.2 (53.5 to 64.8) |
| How often do you drink sugar sweetened beverages? Daily/5-6 days per week ^{1,2} | 19.9 (16.8 to 23.5) | 16.5 (12.2 to 20.7) | 23.5 (18.3 to 28.7) | 24.8 (19.9 to 29.6) | 11.5 (7.9 to 15.0) | 17.8 (13.2 to 22.3) | 23.2 (18.4 to 28.0) | 19.2 (14.2 to 24.2) | 20.6 (16.1 to 25.1) |

| | OVERALL | BY SEX | | BY AGE GROUP | | BY AREA | | BY ETHNICITY | |
|--|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| | | Female | Male | 18 to 44 years | 45 years and up | Deuba | Waidamudamu | ITaukei | FID and FOD* |
| Do you try to reduce your sugar intake? Yes ^{1,2,3} | 65.1 (61.0 to 69.0) | 73.5 (68.2 to 78.8) | 56.6 (50.6 to 62.5) | 59.7 (54.3 to 65.1) | 74.5 (69.0 to 80.0) | 60.2 (54.6 to 65.8) | 72.4 (67.2 to 77.7) | 64.8 (58.8 to 70.8) | 65.3 (60.1 to 70.6) |
| Can you please indicate how you try to reduce your sugar intake? | | | | | | | | | |
| Limit consumption of packaged processed foods ² | 31.9 (28.1 to 35.9) | 33.9 (28.5 to 39.3) | 29.8 (24.3 to 35.4) | 27.6 (22.6 to 32.6) | 39.5 (33.3 to 45.6) | 31.2 (25.9 to 36.5) | 32.9 (27.3 to 38.4) | 31.6 (25.8 to 37.4) | 32.1 (26.9 to 37.4) |
| Limit consumption of sugar sweetened beverages ^{1,2} | 47.8 (43.7 to 51.9) | 56.0 (50.1 to 61.8) | 39.4 (33.7 to 45.1) | 44.1 (38.7 to 49.4) | 54.2 (47.9 to 60.5) | 45.4 (39.8 to 51.0) | 51.3 (45.3 to 57.2) | 48.7 (42.5 to 54.8) | 46.9 (41.5 to 52.4) |
| Limit the addition of sugar to hot or cold drinks ¹ | 34.2 (30.4 to 38.2) | 39.0 (33.3 to 44.7) | 29.2 (23.9 to 34.6) | 31.5 (26.4 to 36.5) | 38.9 (32.8 to 45.0) | 31.3 (26.0 to 36.6) | 38.4 (32.7 to 44.2) | 35.5 (29.5 to 41.5) | 33.0 (27.9 to 38.1) |
| Limit use of instant drink mixes ³ | 13.0 (10.5 to 16.0) | 13.2 (9.3 to 17.2) | 12.8 (9.1 to 16.5) | 11.7 (8.3 to 15.0) | 15.4 (10.8 to 19.9) | 9.5 (6.2 to 12.9) | 18.2 (13.6 to 22.8) | 12.3 (8.2 to 16.4) | 13.6 (9.9 to 17.2) |
| Limit consumption of confectionery ³ | 8.5 (6.5 to 11.1) | 9.7 (6.1 to 13.2) | 7.4 (4.6 to 10.1) | 7.8 (5.0 to 10.6) | 9.8 (6.0 to 13.6) | 6.1 (3.5 to 8.8) | 12.1 (8.2 to 16.1) | 10.1 (6.4 to 13.9) | 7.2 (4.5 to 9.8) |
| Limit consumption of baked goods | 15.7 (12.9 to 18.9) | 16.2 (11.9 to 20.6) | 15.1 (10.9 to 19.2) | 13.7 (9.9 to 17.4) | 19.1 (14.1 to 24.2) | 14.7 (10.7 to 18.6) | 17.2 (12.7 to 21.7) | 18.6 (13.8 to 23.4) | 13.1 (9.4 to 16.9) |
| Buy low sugar alternatives ^{2,3} | 4.3 (3.0 to 6.1) | 4.8 (2.4 to 7.1) | 3.9 (2.0 to 5.8) | 2.5 (1.1 to 3.9) | 7.5 (4.2 to 10.9) | 1.3 (0.2 to 2.5) | 8.8 (5.4 to 12.2) | 5.1 (2.6 to 7.6) | 3.7 (1.8 to 5.5) |

260 * Fijian of Indian descent or other category. ¹ Significant difference by sex, ² Significant difference by age, ³ Significant difference by area, ⁴ Significant difference by ethnicity.

262

263 **Sugar-related attitudes**

264 The majority (84.2% (80.8 to 87.1%)) felt it was very or somewhat important for them to lower
265 sugar in their diet. A higher proportion of women compared to men (89.4% (85.8 to 93%) vs
266 78.9% (73.8 to 84.0%)) and older compared to younger people (88.8% (84.9 to 92.8%) vs 81.6
267 (77.2 to 85.9%)) reported that it was very or somewhat important to lower sugar intake, **table**
268 **2**.

269

270 **Sugar-related behaviors**

271 Almost two-thirds of the study population (65% (61.0 to 69.0%)) reported trying to reduce
272 their sugar intake, with just under half (47.8% (43.7 to 51.9%)) trying to limit their
273 consumption of sugar-sweetened beverages. However, 64.6% (60.6 to 68.5%) of participants
274 reported adding sugar to drinks, and 20% (16.8 to 23.5%) were drinking sugar-sweetened
275 beverages at least 5 days a week.

276

277 Sugar-related behaviors differed by population subgroups. Significantly more women than men
278 (73.5% (68.2 to 78.8%) vs. 56.6% (50.6 to 62.5%)) and older adults compared to younger
279 adults (74.5% (69.0 to 80.0%) vs. 59.7% (54.3 to 65.1%)) reported trying to reduce their sugar
280 intake. More women than men (56% (50.1 to 61.8%) vs. 39.4% (33.7 to 45.1%)) and older
281 compared to younger people (54.2% (47.9 to 60.5%) vs 44.1% (38.7 to 49.4%)) were limiting
282 their intake of sugar-sweetened beverages, reflected in lower numbers of women and older
283 people who reported drinking sugar-sweetened beverages daily. A higher proportion of older
284 people were also limiting their consumption of processed foods (39.5% (33.3 to 45.6%) vs
285 27.6% (22.6 to 32.6%)).

286

287 **Discussion**

288 From this representative survey of adults in the central division of Fiji, of which a high
289 proportion were living with overweight or obesity and hypertension, we generally found good
290 knowledge of the relationship between excess salt or sugar consumption and key related risk
291 factors such as hypertension and diabetes. Participants reported positive attitudes towards
292 reducing salt and sugar in diets. However, knowledge of recommended salt and sugar intakes
293 was low and reported behaviours did not match positive attitudes towards reduction,

294 particularly regarding processed food consumption, adding salt when cooking, and adding
295 sugar to drinks. Younger participants and men generally had more negative attitudes and
296 reported less healthy behaviours. These findings have implications for designing interventions
297 in Fiji but also other Pacific Island Countries. Multi-strategy interventions, including
298 awareness raising campaigns on how to reduce salt and sugar and supportive changes to the
299 food environment are needed to help Fijians make food choices that align with the desire to eat
300 healthier foods.

301

302 While knowledge of diseases linked to excess salt or sugar intake was high, knowledge of salt
303 and sugar recommendations were low, and individual behaviours were not conducive to
304 lowering salt and sugar intake. These findings highlight a need for behaviour change campaigns
305 that raise awareness of the sugar and salt intake recommendations in parallel with supporting
306 people to change specific behaviours. Examples of successful behaviour change campaigns
307 have common features of building on existing knowledge, focusing on context-specific
308 messages and, engaging with communities to understand how to portray certain behaviours,
309 with messages communicated through context specific media channels (to achieve the most
310 reach to the target audiences)²⁴. Evidence also suggests messaging that follows a behaviour
311 change framework can be more effective. For example, a systematic review of diet
312 interventions with messaging facilitated by the Social Cognition Model found improvements
313 in consumption of at least one health promoting food group²⁵. Examples from NCD reduction
314 interventions more broadly have found theory informed text messaging, providing health care
315 information directly to participants, have been effective among racially and socioeconomically
316 diverse groups^{26 27}. From our findings, campaigns in Fiji should target younger people and
317 men in particular.

318 The WHO recommendation for salt intake (a maximum of 5g a day) can be easily depicted,
319 given this is roughly a maximum of 1 teaspoon of salt daily, albeit salt intake can still be hard
320 to identify when it is in the form of salt already in processed foods or meals. Similarly
321 understanding, and benchmarking sugar intake can be difficult for individuals, with WHO
322 recommending a maximum of 10% of total energy intake coming from “free” sugars, yet
323 ideally 5% of energy intake or less²⁸. It is hard to know what this looks like in terms of food
324 consumed, and the reference to “free” sugars also requires a level of nutrition knowledge, as
325 the recommendation refers to sugar intake, excluding sugar from fruit, vegetables, and milk²⁹.

326 An alternative approach is to raise awareness of common sources of salt and sugar and promote
327 a “less is best” message. The reported behaviours of adding salt to cooking and sugar to drinks
328 were verified in our previously published findings, where we found that salt in mixed cooked
329 dishes and sugar from hot drinks were key contributors to intake²⁰. Therefore, there is a need
330 for behaviour change campaigns to target these behaviours specifically.

331 Previous studies have demonstrated that the food environment in Fiji and other Pacific Island
332 Countries largely promote unhealthy rather than healthy food choices with respect to salt and
333 sugar^{12 30 31}. Impactful behaviour change depends on personal beliefs and a supportive social,
334 environmental, and political context.³² Therefore, behaviour change campaigns are most
335 successful when also supported by political and social will to change the environment so that
336 the healthiest (lower in salt and lower in sugar) options are also the most accessible options.
337 This study suggests the food environment in Fiji largely promotes unhealthy rather than
338 healthy food choices with respect to salt and sugar. This is in line with the quantitative
339 evidence of excess consumption of salt and sugar from the 24-hour diet survey²⁰ and supports
340 our earlier research which found that processed packaged foods available for sale in Fiji are
341 high in salt and sugar^{15 16}. As such targeting interventions at processed packaged foods is
342 warranted to support behaviour change. Multiple “best buy” interventions have been
343 recommended by the World Health Organisation³. For example, through salt and sugar
344 targets where maximum levels of salt and sugar in processed packaged foods are set,
345 requiring the food industry to reformulate. Fiji has experience setting voluntary salt targets,
346 however, change to salt levels in the food supply were limited¹⁵. As such, this experience
347 highlights the need for mandatory targets with stronger governance mechanisms. Fiji also has
348 a sugar-sweetened beverage tax; however, previous research has shown that this tax needs to
349 be higher to achieve health impacts^{18 19 33}. Applying a tax to processed packaged foods high in
350 sugar and salt would complement the beverage tax and revenue could be used to subsidise
351 healthier food options such as fruit and vegetables. Our findings suggest such interventions
352 would particularly benefit younger men²⁰. Encouragingly, since the completion of the survey,
353 the Fijian government have announced increased taxes on sugary drinks, other processed
354 foods, alcohol, and tobacco in their budget,³⁴ and there are supportive actions in the 2024
355 National NCD strategic plan.

356

357 ***Strengths and limitations***

358 We used the WHO STEPs survey for salt and followed a similar structure of questions for
359 sugar; this will allow for similar questions to be followed in the future, including in WHO
360 STEPs surveys and in national nutrition surveys. Local trained researchers used culturally
361 sensitive procedures for data collection, including obtaining the endorsement of the
362 government and the community leaders and informed consent from participants, with research
363 assistants who could speak and conduct the survey in languages preferred by participants. We
364 gathered representative data from a rural and an urban community in Fiji. Finally, results have
365 been disseminated to members of the Provincial Council, including the Turaganikoro (village
366 headman), raising awareness of the findings even at the preliminary stage, further increasing
367 the translation and impact of this work. Researchers are currently working with the Ministry
368 of Health to develop and disseminate an animation targeting sugar consumption and the
369 behaviours of adding sugar to hot drinks, with plans to develop further communication
370 materials based on the present findings.

371 It is also important to consider these findings in light of the study limitations. This was a cross-
372 sectional survey, and as such only captures KAB at a single time point. Two enumeration areas
373 in the Central Division of Fiji were selected, which means findings may not be generalisable
374 to other areas, particularly people living on other islands in Fiji. As with any self-reported
375 information, it is possible that social desirability bias influenced the results³⁵, as people may
376 have been more likely to report positive attitudes and behaviours. We also limited our focus to
377 adults (aged 18 years or older) and as such do not have findings for younger populations.

378

379 **Conclusion**

380 In conclusion, this study revealed that adults living with multiple NCD risk factors in Fiji have
381 high levels of knowledge regarding the health implications of salt and sugar consumption and
382 are aware of the need to reduce their intake. However, awareness of recommended intake levels
383 was low, and certain behaviours, such as adding salt during cooking and adding sugar to drinks,
384 were barriers to salt and sugar reduction.

385 To address these challenges, it is imperative for the Fijian government to help bridge the gap
386 between knowledge and practice regarding dietary salt and sugar behaviour. Support is needed
387 to empower individuals to make healthier choices both through individual behaviour change

388 and a supportive food environment. Given the ongoing diet related burden of disease in Fiji,
389 actions to improve salt and sugar knowledge and behaviours are urgently needed.

390 **Acknowledgments**

391 The authors wish to thank all participants for contributing to the research. The authors would
392 specifically like to thank Fiji's Ministry of iTaukei Affairs, the village chiefs, and the
393 Ministry Local Governments for their endorsement of working with the communities in
394 Waidamudamu and Deuba, and all the research assistants who worked tirelessly, braving bad
395 weather and ensuring respect for participants, national health, and the research process.

396 **Author Contributions**

397 **Conceptualization:** Jacqui Webster, Colin Bell, Joseph Alvin Santos, Mark Woodward, Kris
398 Rogers, Briar McKenzie, Gade Waqa

399 **Data curation:** Gade Waqa, Anasaini Moala Silatolu, Joseph Alvin Santos, Kris Rogers,
400 Briar McKenzie, Colin Bell, Jacqui Webster

401 **Formal analysis:** Joseph Alvin Santos, Briar McKenzie, Anasaini Moala Silatolu and Gade
402 Waqa

403 **Investigation:** Joseph Alvin Santos, Briar McKenzie, Anasaini Moala Silatolu, Gade Waqa

404 **Methodology:** Colin Bell, Jacqui Webster, Joseph Alvin Santos, Briar McKenzie, Gade
405 Waqa

406 **Project administration:** Briar McKenzie, Anasaini Moala Silatolu, Gade Waqa

407 **Writing – original draft:** Gade Waqa, Briar McKenzie, Colin Bell, Jacqui Webster

408 **Writing – review & editing:** Gade Waqa, Briar McKenzie, Colin Bell, Jacqui Webster,
409 Aliyah Palu, Alvina Deo, Joseph Alvin Santos, Kris Rogers, Erica Reeve

410 **Funding:** This study was obtained through the National Health and Medical Research
411 Council as part of the Global Alliance for Chronic Diseases program on Scaling up Policy to
412 reduce hypertension and diabetes (APP1169322). BLM is supported by a National Heart
413 Foundation of Australia Postdoctoral Fellowship (APP106651). JW is supported by an
414 NHMRC Investigator grant L2 (#2018015)

415 **Competing interests:** None declared.

416

417 **References**

- 418 1. Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation. Global Burden of Disease Collaborative Network.
419 Global Burden of Disease Study 2019. Results. 2020 [Available from:
420 <https://vizhub.healthdata.org/gbd-results/>.
421
- 422 2. Afshin A, Sur PJ, Fay KA, et al. Health effects of dietary risks in 195 countries, 1990–2017: a
423 systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2017. *The Lancet*
424 2019;393(10184):1958-72. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(19\)30041-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(19)30041-8)
425
- 426 3. WHO. ‘Best buys’ and other recommended interventions for the prevention and control of
427 noncommunicable diseases. [https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/259232/WHO-](https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/259232/WHO-NMH-NVI-17.9-eng.pdf)
428 [NMH-NVI-17.9-eng.pdf](https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/259232/WHO-NMH-NVI-17.9-eng.pdf), 2017.
429
- 430 4. World Health Organisation. Fact Sheet. [https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-](https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/hypertension)
431 [sheets/detail/hypertension](https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/hypertension) 2021 [
432
- 433 5. He FJ, Li J, MacGregor GA. Effect of longer term modest salt reduction on blood pressure:
434 Cochrane systematic review and meta-analysis of randomised trials. *BMJ : British Medical*
435 *Journal* 2013;346:f1325. doi: 10.1136/bmj.f1325
436
- 437 6. Hayden C, Bowler JO, Chambers S, et al. Obesity and dental caries in children: a systematic review
438 and meta-analysis. *Community dentistry and oral epidemiology* 2013;41(4):289-308.
439
- 440 7. Te Morenga L, Mallard S, Mann J. Dietary sugars and body weight: systematic review and meta-
441 analyses of randomised controlled trials and cohort studies. *BMJ (Clinical research ed)*
442 2013;346
443
- 444 8. Barrington G, Khan S, Kent K, et al. Obesity, dietary sugar and dental caries in Australian adults.
445 *International dental journal* 2019;69(5):383-91. doi: 10.1111/idj.12480 [published Online
446 First: 2019/06/04]
447
- 448 9. Ong KL, Stafford LK, McLaughlin SA, et al. Global, regional, and national burden of diabetes
449 from 1990 to 2021, with projections of prevalence to 2050: a systematic analysis for the
450 Global Burden of Disease Study 2021. *The Lancet* 2023;402(10397):203-34. doi:
451 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(23\)01301-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(23)01301-6)
452
- 453 10. Johnson RJ, Segal MS, Sautin Y, et al. Potential role of sugar (fructose) in the epidemic of
454 hypertension, obesity and the metabolic syndrome, diabetes, kidney disease, and
455 cardiovascular disease. *The American journal of clinical nutrition* 2007;86(4):899-906.
456
- 457 11. WHO. Pacific islanders pay heavy price for abandoning traditional diet. *Bulletin of the World*
458 *Health Organization* 2010;88(7):484-5. doi: 10.2471/blt.10.010710 [published Online First:
459 2010/07/10]
460
- 461 12. Sievert K, Lawrence M, Naika A, et al. Processed Foods and Nutrition Transition in the Pacific:
462 Regional Trends, Patterns and Food System Drivers. *Nutrients* 2019;11(6) doi:
463 10.3390/nu11061328 [published Online First: 2019/06/16]
464
- 465 13. Santos JA, McKenzie B, Trieu K, et al. Contribution of fat, sugar and salt to diets in the Pacific
466 Islands: a systematic review. *Public Health Nutr* 2019;22(10):1858-71. doi:
467 10.1017/s1368980018003609 [published Online First: 2019/01/08]
468
- 469 14. Itoh N, Tsuya A, Togashi H, et al. Increased salt intake is associated with diabetes and
470 characteristic dietary habits: a community-based cross-sectional study in Japan. *Journal of*
471 *clinical biochemistry and nutrition* 2022;71(2):143-50. doi: 10.3164/jcbtn.21-153 [published
Online First: 2022/10/11]
472
- 473 15. Shahid M, Waqa G, Pillay A, et al. Packaged food supply in Fiji: nutrient levels, compliance with
474 sodium targets and adherence to labelling regulations. *Public Health Nutr* 2021;24(13):4358-
475 68. doi: 10.1017/s136898002100224x [published Online First: 2021/05/20]
476
- 477 16. Palu A, Santos JA, Silatolu AM, et al. Energy, nutrient and overall healthiness of processed
478 packaged foods in Fiji, a comparison between 2018 and 2020. *BMC Public Health*
479 2024;24(1):1383. doi: 10.1186/s12889-024-18787-1
480
- 481 17. Bell C, Latu C, Na’ati E, et al. Barriers and facilitators to the introduction of import duties
482 designed to prevent noncommunicable disease in Tonga: a case study. *Globalization and*
483 *health* 2021;17(1):136. doi: 10.1186/s12992-021-00788-z
484
- 485 18. Mounsey S, Vaka A, Cama T, et al. Strengthening Sugar-Sweetened Beverage Taxation for Non-
486 Communicable Disease Prevention: A Comparative Political Economy Analysis Case Study
487 of Fiji and Tonga. *Nutrients* 2022;14:1212. doi: 10.3390/nu14061212
488

- 472 19. Teng A, Snowdon W, Win Tin ST, et al. Progress in the Pacific on sugar-sweetened beverage
473 taxes: a systematic review of policy changes from 2000 to 2019. *Australian and New Zealand*
474 *journal of public health* 2021;45(4):376-84. doi: 10.1111/1753-6405.13123 [published Online
475 First: 2021/06/08]
- 476 20. Silatolu AM, Santos JA, Palu A, et al. Salt and sugar intakes of adults in the central division of
477 Fiji: findings from a nutrition survey in 2022 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lanwpc.2024.101074>.
478 *THE LANCET, Regional Health Western Pacific* 2024;46 doi:
479 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lanwpc.2024.101074>
- 480 21. Webster J, Waqa G, Thow A-M, et al. Scaling-up food policies in the Pacific Islands: protocol for
481 policy engagement and mixed methods evaluation of intervention implementation. *Nutrition*
482 *Journal* 2022;21(1):8. doi: 10.1186/s12937-022-00761-5
- 483 22. Webster J, Moala A, McKenzie B, et al. Food insecurity, COVID-19 and diets in Fiji - a cross-
484 sectional survey of over 500 adults. *Globalization and health* 2023;19(1):99. doi:
485 10.1186/s12992-023-01004-w [published Online First: 2023/12/12]
- 486 23. WHO. WHO STEPS Manual [Available from: [https://www.who.int/teams/noncommunicable-](https://www.who.int/teams/noncommunicable-diseases/surveillance/systems-tools/steps/manuals)
487 [diseases/surveillance/systems-tools/steps/manuals](https://www.who.int/teams/noncommunicable-diseases/surveillance/systems-tools/steps/manuals)].
- 488 24. Trieu K, McMahon E, Santos JA, et al. Review of behaviour change interventions to reduce
489 population salt intake. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*
490 2017;14(1):17. doi: 10.1186/s12966-017-0467-1
- 491 25. Timlin D, McCormack JM, Kerr M, et al. Are dietary interventions with a behaviour change
492 theoretical framework effective in changing dietary patterns? A systematic review. *BMC*
493 *Public Health* 2020;20(1):1857. doi: 10.1186/s12889-020-09985-8
- 494 26. Nelson LA, Spieker A, Greevy R, et al. User Engagement Among Diverse Adults in a 12-Month
495 Text Message-Delivered Diabetes Support Intervention: Results from a Randomized
496 Controlled Trial. *JMIR mHealth and uHealth* 2020;8(7):e17534. doi: 10.2196/17534
497 [published Online First: 2020/07/25]
- 498 27. Mbuagbaw L, Mursleen S, Lytvyn L, et al. Mobile phone text messaging interventions for HIV
499 and other chronic diseases: an overview of systematic reviews and framework for evidence
500 transfer. *BMC health services research* 2015;15:33. doi: 10.1186/s12913-014-0654-6
501 [published Online First: 2015/01/23]
- 502 28. WHO. WHO calls on countries to reduce sugars intake among adults and children 2015 [cited 26
503 September 2023. Available from: [https://www.who.int/news/item/04-03-2015-who-calls-on-](https://www.who.int/news/item/04-03-2015-who-calls-on-countries-to-reduce-sugars-intake-among-adults-and-children)
504 [countries-to-reduce-sugars-intake-among-adults-and-children](https://www.who.int/news/item/04-03-2015-who-calls-on-countries-to-reduce-sugars-intake-among-adults-and-children)].
- 505 29. World Health Organisation. Guideline: Sugars intake for adults and children. Geneva: World
506 Health Organization 2015 [cited June 2024. Available from:
507 [https://iris.who.int/bitstream/handle/10665/149782/9789241549028_](https://iris.who.int/bitstream/handle/10665/149782/9789241549028_eng.pdf?sequence=1)
508 [eng.pdf?sequence=1](https://iris.who.int/bitstream/handle/10665/149782/9789241549028_eng.pdf?sequence=1)].
- 509 30. Win Tin ST, Kubuabola I, Ravuvu A, et al. Baseline status of policy and legislation actions to
510 address non communicable diseases crisis in the Pacific. *BMC Public Health* 2020;20(1):660.
511 doi: 10.1186/s12889-020-08795-2
- 512 31. Medina Hidalgo D, Witten I, Nunn PD, et al. Sustaining healthy diets in times of change: linking
513 climate hazards, food systems and nutrition security in rural communities of the Fiji Islands.
514 *Regional Environmental Change* 2020;20:1-13.
- 515 32. Swinburn B, Sacks G, Hall KD, et al. The global obesity pandemic: shaped by global drivers and
516 local environments. *Lancet* 2011;378(9793):804-14.
- 517 33. Reeve E, Ravuvu A, Johnson E, et al. Scaling up food pricing policies in the Pacific: a guide to
518 action. *BMJ global health* 2023;8(Suppl 8):e012041. doi: 10.1136/bmjgh-2023-012041
- 519 34. NCD Alliance. Fiji hikes health taxes and adopts guidelines to tackle NCDs, which consume 40%
520 of healthcare cost 2023 [Accessed 29 August 2023]. Available from:
521 <https://ncdalliance.org/taxonomy/term/37> accessed 29 August 2023.
- 522 35. Latkin CA, Edwards C, Davey-Rothwell MA, et al. The relationship between social desirability
523 bias and self-reports of health, substance use, and social network factors among urban
524 substance users in Baltimore, Maryland. *Addictive behaviors* 2017;73:133-36. doi:
525 10.1016/j.addbeh.2017.05.005 [published Online First: 2017/05/17]