

1 Total Added Sugar Consumption is not Significantly Associated with Risk for Prediabetes  
2 Among U.S. adults: National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey, 2013-2018

3  
4 Nadia Markie Sneed PhD, APRN, FNP-BC  
5 Andres Azuero, PhD, MBA  
6 Jacqueline Moss PhD, RN, FAAN  
7 Amy M. Goss, PhD, RD  
8 Shannon A Morrison PhD, CRNP, FNP-BC  
9

10 Nadia Markie Sneed\* is currently a postdoctoral scholar at Vanderbilt University in the School  
11 of Nursing and is a research fellow in the Vanderbilt Patient/ pRactice Outcomes Research in  
12 Effectiveness and Systems Science (PROGRESS) T32 Program supported by Agency for  
13 Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ). Andres Azuero is a Professor and the Director of  
14 Statistics in the Office of Research and Scholarship at the University of Alabama School of  
15 Nursing; Jacqueline Moss is a Professor and the Associate Dean for Technology and Innovation  
16 in the Department of Family, Community, and Health Systems at the University of Alabama  
17 School of Nursing; Amy M. Goss is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Nutrition  
18 Sciences at the University of Alabama School of Health Professions; Shannon A. Morrison was  
19 an Associate Professor in the Department of Family, Community, and Health Systems at  
20 University of Alabama School of Nursing when this work was completed.

21  
22 **\*Corresponding author and current address:** Nadia M. Sneed, PhD, APRN, FNP-BC  
23 ([nadia.sneed@vanderbilt.edu](mailto:nadia.sneed@vanderbilt.edu)). Vanderbilt University, School of Nursing, 319E Godchaux Hall,  
24 Nashville, TN 37240, USA. Tel +1 205.996.0092. ORCID ID: [https://orcid.org/0000-0001-](https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9973-6672)  
25 [9973-6672](https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9973-6672)

26  
27 Previous Address Where Research was Conducted: Nadia M. Sneed, PhD, APRN, FNP-BC.  
28 Office of Research and Scholarship, University of Alabama Birmingham, School of Nursing,  
29 University Boulevard, 1720 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue South, NB 480, Birmingham, AL 35294-1210, USA. Tel  
30 +1 205.996.0092, Fax +1 205.975.6194.

31  
32 **Co-Author(s):**

33 Andres Azuero, PhD, MBA ([andreo@uab.edu](mailto:andreo@uab.edu)). Office of Research and Scholarship, University  
34 of Alabama Birmingham, School of Nursing, University Boulevard, 1720 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue South, NB  
35 485H, Birmingham, AL 35294-1210, USA. Tel +1 205.996.9441, Fax +1 205.996.9441.

36 Jacqueline Moss, PhD, RN, FANN ([mossja@uab.edu](mailto:mossja@uab.edu)). Department of Family, Community, and  
37 Health Systems, University of Alabama Birmingham, School of Nursing, University Boulevard,  
38 1720 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue South, NB 1013, Birmingham, AL 35294-1210, USA. Tel +1 205.934.0657,  
39 Fax +1 205.996.9165

40 Amy M. Goss, PhD, RD ([amymiski@uab.edu](mailto:amymiski@uab.edu)). Department of Nutrition Sciences, University of  
41 Alabama Birmingham, School of Health Professions, 1675 University Boulevard, WEBB 640,  
42 Birmingham, AL 35294, USA. Tel +1 205.975.9671

43 Shannon A. Morrison, PhD, CRNP, FNP-BC ([samorris@uab.edu](mailto:samorris@uab.edu)). Department of Family,  
44 Community Health, and Systems, University of Alabama Birmingham, School of Nursing,  
45 University Boulevard, 1720 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue South, NB 573-J, Birmingham, AL 35294-1210, USA.  
46 Tel +1 205.996.7841, Fax +1 205.975.6194

47 AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS: NMS, AA, JM, AG, and SM designed research; NMS and AA  
48 analyzed data; and NMS wrote the first draft with contributions from AA and SM. NMS had  
49 primary responsibility for final content. All authors reviewed and approved the final manuscript.

50

51 FUNDING/FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE: This project was supported by grant number T32  
52 HS026122 from the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality. The content is solely the  
53 responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the Agency  
54 for Healthcare Research and Quality. NMS also received doctoral funding through the University  
55 of Alabama Birmingham Graduate School and University of Alabama Birmingham School of  
56 Nursing Doctoral Scholarship.

57

58 CONFLICT OF INTEREST:

59 Nadia Markie Sneed: there are no conflicts of interest to report.

60 Andres Azuero: there are no conflicts of interest to report.

61 Jaqueline Moss: there are no conflicts of interest to report.

62 Amy M. Goss: there are no conflicts of interest to report.

63 Shannon A. Morrison: there are no conflicts of interest to report.

64

65 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS: The authors sincerely thank Dr. Greg Pavela for his conceptual,  
66 methodological, and statistical expertise required for completion of this manuscript and for his  
67 critical manuscript review. (I have received permission from those named in the  
68 acknowledgement.)

69

70 **Keywords:** added sugar, prediabetes, national health and nutrition examination survey,  
71 prediabetes risk

72

73

74

75

76

77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99

## Abstract

**Background:** Prediabetes affects 34.1% U.S. adults and is primarily linked to added sugars consumed from sugar-sweetened beverages. It is unclear if total dietary intake of added sugar also increases the risk for prediabetes.

**Objective:** This study examined if total (g/day) and percent intakes of <10%, 10-15%, or >15% added sugar increase the odds for prediabetes in U.S. adults.

**Design:** A cross-sectional, secondary analysis using 2013-2018 NHANES data was conducted.

**Participants/setting:** This study included data from U.S. adults  $\geq 20$  years with normoglycemia (N= 2,154) and prediabetes (N= 3,152) with 1-2 days of dietary recall information.

**Main outcome measures:** Prediabetes, defined as a Hemoglobin A1c of 5.7%-6.4% or a fasting plasma glucose of 100-125 mg/dL.

**Statistical analysis:** Survey-weighted logistic regression was used to estimate odds ratios of prediabetes based on usual intakes of added sugar (total and percent intakes) using the National Cancer Institute Method. Differences in prediabetes risk and total and percent intakes of added sugar were compared by race/ethnicity.

**Results:** The sample's total energy intake from added sugar was 13.9%. Total (unadjusted: OR: 1.01, 95% CI: .99 - 1.00,  $p = .26$ ; adjusted: OR: 1.00, 95% CI: .99 - 1.00,  $p = .91$ ) and percent intakes of added sugar (unadjusted [ $<10\%$ : (ref); 10-15%: OR: .93, 95% CI: .77 - 1.12,  $p = .44$ ;  $>15\%$ : OR: 1.03, 95% CI: .82 - 1.28,  $p = .82$ ] and adjusted [ $<10\%$ : (ref); 10 - 15%: OR: .82, 95% CI: .65 - 1.04,  $p = .09$ ;  $>15\%$ : OR: .96, 95% CI: .74 - 1.24,  $p = .73$ ]) were not significantly associated with an increased odds of prediabetes. Prediabetes risk did not differ by race/ethnicity for total (unadjusted model [ $p = .65$ ]; adjusted model [ $p = .51$ ]) or percent (unadjusted model [ $p = .21$ ]; adjusted model [ $p = .11$ ]) added sugar intakes.

100 **Conclusions:** In adults  $\geq 20$  years with normoglycemia and prediabetes, total added sugar  
101 consumption did not significantly increase one's risk for prediabetes and risk estimates did not  
102 differ by race/ethnicity. Experimental studies should expand upon this work to confirm these  
103 findings.

104

105

106

107

108

109

110

111

112

113

114

115

116

117

118

119

120

121

122

123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145

## Introduction

Prediabetes is a relatively asymptomatic, but serious medical condition characterized by insulin resistance and intermittent hyperglycemia<sup>1</sup> that affects approximately 88 million U.S. adults.<sup>2</sup> Prediabetes is a precursor to type 2 diabetes (T2D)<sup>1</sup> and is associated with chronic kidney disease<sup>3</sup> and cardiovascular disease risks (i.e., hypertension, dyslipidemia),<sup>4</sup> independent of T2D progression.<sup>3,4</sup> Significant disparities in the prevalence of prediabetes are observed among minority populations, particularly for non-Hispanic Black and Hispanic adults, in comparison to non-Hispanic White adults (32%, 35.3%, 31%, respectively).<sup>5</sup> Due to the slow but progressive nature of prediabetes pathology, roughly 85% of adults are unaware of their condition<sup>2,6</sup> and often remain unaware until after the condition has progressed to T2D.<sup>7</sup> Diabetes is considered a preventable diet-related disease,<sup>8</sup> yet, about 5-10% of adults with prediabetes progress to T2D annually and 70% of adults with prediabetes develop T2D within their lifetime.<sup>7,9</sup> Whether factors such as diet, genetics, advancing age, other lifestyle choices (e.g., physical activity) or a combination of these factors increase the risk for prediabetes is not fully known. However, longitudinal, observational studies examining the role of nutrition on metabolic conditions suggest diet is a primary predictor of a plethora of cardiac and metabolic health conditions, including prediabetes.<sup>10-14</sup>

In the 1950s and 1960s cardiovascular disease was hypothesized to be a consequence of excessive fat consumption and subsequently hyperlipidemia.<sup>15</sup> Thus, a change in the recommended intake of dietary fats and carbohydrates occurred in the late 1970s<sup>16</sup> and the first published U.S. Dietary Guidelines recommended decreasing dietary fat from 40% to 30% and increasing carbohydrate intake to approximately 55% - 60% of total daily energy intake.<sup>15</sup> Unfortunately, this shift paralleled a drastic rise in obesity and diabetes rates across the 1980s

146 and 1990s and had little influence on cardiovascular disease prevalence.<sup>2,17</sup> Concurrent with the  
147 shift in diet trends, food manufacturers increased production of carbohydrate rich, low-fat foods.  
148 In short, food manufacturers substituted carbohydrates in lieu of fats, largely in the form of  
149 added sugars across a multitude of foods and beverages,<sup>18</sup> and these ultra-processed, sugary  
150 foods became a mainstay in the U.S. diet.<sup>19</sup>

151 Added sugars are caloric sweeteners added to foods and beverages during processing,  
152 preparation, or prior to consumption<sup>18</sup> and the most common types are sucrose, used  
153 predominately in solid foods, and high-fructose corn (HFCS), used predominately in sugar-  
154 sweetened beverages (SSBs).<sup>20</sup> Evidence linking obesity and metabolic disease to added sugar  
155 prompted an additional modification to the U.S. Dietary Guidelines.<sup>21</sup> In 2015, total dietary  
156 intake of added sugar was recommended to not exceed 10% of an individual's daily caloric  
157 intake,<sup>21</sup> a recommendation that persists today.<sup>22</sup> Nonetheless, an average of 270 calories (more  
158 than 13% total energy intake) from added sugar is consumed by U.S. adults daily and  
159 exacerbates the issue of overconsumption.<sup>22</sup>

160 Both natural sugars (found in fruits/vegetables) and added sugars contain the  
161 monosaccharide sugars glucose and fructose.<sup>18</sup> Yet, evidence suggests that chronic consumption  
162 of high added sugar diets (i.e., ~15-25% total energy intake)<sup>23</sup> containing fructose are primarily  
163 responsible for T2D risk<sup>24,25</sup> and are independent of total energy intake or body mass index  
164 (BMI).<sup>25-28</sup> Directly, fructose metabolism increases hepatic lipid synthesis (i.e., de novo  
165 lipogenesis) and promotes a reduction in hepatic fatty acid oxidation resulting in fatty liver and  
166 subsequent hepatic insulin resistance.<sup>20,29</sup> The correlation between added sugar and prediabetes is  
167 strongly linked to dysregulated fructose metabolism,<sup>30</sup> yet studies assessing the direct effects of  
168 added sugar on prediabetes have been limited with most examining added sugar proxies such as

169 SSBs, HFCS, and fructose-sweetened beverages and not total added sugar from all dietary  
170 sources.<sup>25,31-40</sup> Thus, the potential mechanisms and metabolic effects of total added sugar  
171 consumption on prediabetes risk are still under debate by scientists and warrant further  
172 investigation.<sup>23</sup>

173 Also of concern is that minority populations demonstrate significant health disparities in  
174 obesity and T2D prevalence in comparison to non-Hispanic White individuals.<sup>5,41</sup> Moreover,  
175 consumption of a high carbohydrate diet in minority populations (i.e., non-Hispanic Black  
176 adults) has been shown to promote an exaggerated insulin response that occurs independent of  
177 overweight/obesity status.<sup>42</sup> Non-Hispanic Black adults consume the greatest quantities of added  
178 sugar followed by non-Hispanic White adults, Hispanic adults, and non-Hispanic Asian adults  
179 (19 teaspoons (tsp), 17 tsp, 16 tsp, and 10 tsp respectively)<sup>43</sup> raising the question as to whether  
180 differences in dietary intake from added sugar may contribute to these health disparities.

181 No studies have examined if *total* dietary intake of added sugar increases the risk for  
182 prediabetes and if so, how much (e.g., >15% total caloric intake) may be responsible for the  
183 increased risk observed. Also, it is unclear whether added sugar uniquely influences the risk for  
184 prediabetes by race/ethnicity, particularly among those that consume high quantities of added  
185 sugar (i.e., non-Hispanic Black adults).

186 The main objective of this study was to examine whether total added sugar consumption  
187 was associated with prediabetes in a large nationally representative sample of U.S. adults  $\geq 20$   
188 years. Second, this study examined if total added sugar consumption, as a percentage of total  
189 energy intake (<10%, 10-15%, >15%), was associated with differing risk probabilities for  
190 prediabetes. Last, this study assessed if the associations between total and percent intakes of  
191 added sugar and prediabetes risk differed by race/ethnicity. The study's guiding a priori

192 hypothesis was that positive associations between total and percent added sugar intakes and  
193 prediabetes risk would be observed, including greater risk at higher added sugar intakes (e.g.,  
194 >15% total energy), and that significant risk differences would be observed by race/ethnicity  
195 with increased risk among high T2D risk groups (e.g., non-Hispanic Black, Hispanic adults).

## 196 **Materials and Methods**

### 197 **Study Design**

198 This study used data from the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey  
199 (NHANES) which is a repeated cross-sectional survey that employs a complex, multistage,  
200 probability sampling design to collect health and nutrition information from ~5,000  
201 noninstitutionalized U.S. civilians (age 0 years and older) annually.<sup>44,45</sup> NHANES is supported  
202 by the National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS) and Centers for Disease Control and  
203 Prevention.<sup>46</sup> Specific details about the design and operations of NHANES, including sampling  
204 and data collection procedures, have been previously described elsewhere.<sup>45,47</sup> A cross-sectional  
205 analysis was conducted and included data collected from NHANES respondents  $\geq 20$  years  
206 during the 2013-2014, 2015-2016, and 2017-2018 NHANES cycles. NHANES study protocols  
207 are approved by the NCHS Research Ethics Review Board<sup>48</sup> and are compliant with the Health  
208 and Human Services Policy for Protection of Human Research Subjects (45 CFR part 46).<sup>45,49</sup>  
209 Only de-identified, publicly-available data were analyzed, therefore the study was designated as  
210 'Not Human Subjects Research' by the University of Alabama at Birmingham.<sup>50</sup>

### 211 **Analytic Sample**

212 The analytic sample included respondents  $\geq 20$  years of age with fasting plasma glucose  
213 (FPG) or Hemoglobin A1c (HbA1c) defined prediabetes or normoglycemia. Respondents  
214 represented the following NHANES racial and Hispanic origin groups: Hispanic (including



215 Mexican American and other Latino populations), non-Hispanic Black, non-Hispanic White,  
216 Asian American, and Other Race which included persons not self-identifying with any of the  
217 prior categories. The initial weighted sample (taken from the fasting subsample)<sup>47</sup> included a  
218 total of 5,888 respondents  $\geq 20$  years of age that excluded pregnant and lactating women (n=115)  
219 and those taking insulin or diabetic medications (n=963). An additional 167 respondents with  
220 T2D having either a HbA1c  $\geq 6.5\%$  (48 mmol/mol) or a FPG  $\geq 126$  mg/dL (7.0 mmol/L) were  
221 excluded resulting in 5,721 adults. Next, 415 adults were excluded due to not having at least 1  
222 day of dietary recall information that contained a value for added sugar. The final sample  
223 included 5,306 adults with 3,152 respondents identified as having prediabetes (HbA1c 5.7% -  
224 6.4% [39-47 mmol/mol] and FPG 100-125 mg/dL [5.6-6.9 mmol/L]) and 2,154 identified as  
225 having normoglycemia (HbA1c  $< 5.7\%$  [ $< 39$  mmol/mol] and FPG  $< 100$  mg/dL [ $< 5.6$  mmol/L]).<sup>1</sup>

## 226 **Prediabetes Assessment**

227 The outcome variable for this study was prediabetes which has been previously defined  
228 and was based on the American Diabetes Association “Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes -  
229 2021” classification.<sup>1</sup> As part of the NHANES data collection process, physical measurements  
230 and laboratory tests are collected during the mobile examination center visit from participants  
231 ages  $\geq 12$  years.<sup>45</sup> Data files of whole blood specimens of glycohemoglobin (i.e., HbA1c) and  
232 FPG were included for analysis in this study to define prediabetes.<sup>51,52</sup> NHANES collects  
233 samples at the examination center using a Tosoh G8 Automated Glycohemoglobin (HbA1c) and  
234 Cobas c311 Analyzer (FPG). Detailed NHANES laboratory procedures are reported  
235 elsewhere.<sup>51,52</sup>

## 236 **Dietary Intake Assessment**

237 Dietary intake data, including added sugars and total calories, were collected for the  
238 dietary assessment component of NHANES which uses the 24-hour dietary recall method.<sup>53</sup> Diet  
239 recalls are pre-announced and performed by trained interviewers using the validated U.S.  
240 Department of Agriculture's Automated Multiple-Pass Method (AMPM) previously described  
241 elsewhere.<sup>45,53</sup> The first diet recall is administered in-person during the mobile examination  
242 center visit (on either weekdays or weekends) and the second is administered over the phone 3-  
243 10 days later.<sup>45</sup>

244 Added sugars are defined as sugars, syrups, fruit juice concentrates, or caloric sweeteners  
245 added during processing, preparation, or prior to food and beverage consumption that exclude  
246 natural sugars present in dairy and fruit (including whole fruit and 100% fruit juice).<sup>54</sup> Estimates  
247 for added sugar were obtained from the Food Patterns Equivalents Database (FPED) of the Food  
248 and Nutrient Database for Dietary Studies.<sup>55</sup> Added sugars were reported in teaspoon equivalents  
249 consumed per subject, per day calculated from foods/beverages.<sup>54</sup> Total calories from day 1 and  
250 day 2 dietary recalls were obtained from the NHANES nutrient intake files and were reported in  
251 kilocalories (kcal). The FPED files were merged with NHANES total nutrient intake files to  
252 combine estimates for added sugar and total calories. For this study, to reflect updates to  
253 nutrition facts labeling,<sup>56</sup> added sugar was converted from teaspoon equivalents to grams (1  
254 teaspoon equivalent = 4.2 grams) and from grams to calories (1 gram = 4 kilocalories) for day 1  
255 and day 2 dietary recalls before the final dataset merge.<sup>56,57</sup> Once all 2013-2018 data files were  
256 merged, three percent intake groups for added sugar (<10%, 10-15%, and >15%) were  
257 calculated by dividing grams of added sugar by total calories. The groups represent dietary  
258 guideline recommendations (<10%), average U.S. intake (~13%), and above average intake  
259 (>15%) respectively.<sup>22</sup>

260 **Covariates**

261 Regression models included the following covariate categories: age, gender,  
262 race/ethnicity, BMI ( $\text{kg}/\text{m}^2$ ), usual intake for total calories (kcal), physical activity, smoking  
263 status, educational attainment, and income.

264 Demographic variables collected during the NHANES in-home interview included age,  
265 gender, and race/ethnicity which were self-report.<sup>58,59</sup> Age was reported in years and calculated  
266 using participant's dates of birth. Participants  $\geq 80$  years were coded as '80' to prevent risk of  
267 participant disclosure. Gender was classified as either "male" or "female".<sup>58</sup> Race and Hispanic  
268 origin was categorized into non-Hispanic White, non-Hispanic Black, Hispanic (including  
269 Mexican Americans and Latinos), Asian Americans, or Other Race (including persons not  
270 identifying with the previously reported categories).<sup>47,59</sup> BMI was categorized using the  
271 following CDC classifications for adults: underweight ( $18.5 \text{ kg}/\text{m}^2$ ), healthy weight ( $18.5\text{-}24.9$   
272  $\text{kg}/\text{m}^2$ ), overweight ( $25\text{-}29.9 \text{ kg}/\text{m}^2$ ), or obese ( $\geq 30 \text{ kg}/\text{m}^2$ ).<sup>60</sup> Health behaviors and  
273 sociodemographic factors (physical activity, smoking status, education, and ratio of family  
274 income to poverty) were based on self-reported questionnaire data. Physical activity was  
275 classified using the NHANES physical activity questionnaire (PAQ650 and PAQ665) and was  
276 defined as (yes/no) engagement in  $\geq 10$  minutes of moderate and/or vigorous recreational activity  
277 during a typical week.<sup>61</sup> Smoking status was defined as either current smoker (tobacco use within  
278 the last 5 days) or non-smoker (no reported use within last 5 days).<sup>62</sup> Education level was defined  
279 as having either less than a high school degree, having a high school degree or GED, or having  
280 more than a high school degree.<sup>59</sup> Ratio of family income to poverty was taken from the  
281 NHANES demographic questionnaire and was categorized using the family monthly poverty

282 level index categories calculated by NHANES ( $\leq 1.30$ ,  $>1.30$  to  $1.85$ , and  $>1.85$ ) which  
283 represents common poverty guideline percentages.<sup>63</sup>

## 284 **Statistical Analysis**

285 All analyses were performed using SAS Studio version 3.8, Enterprise Edition.<sup>64</sup>  
286 NHANES analytic guidelines<sup>47</sup> were followed using SAS procedures<sup>65</sup> appropriate for complex  
287 survey designs. Survey data from 2013-2014, 2015-2016, and 2017-2018 were combined and  
288 appropriate sampling weights (from the fasting subsample WTSAF2YR) were created for the  
289 combined dataset and applied to all models prior to analyses to account for differential  
290 nonresponse and planned oversampling of certain subgroups.<sup>47</sup> Data on characteristics were  
291 reported using means and standard errors for continuous variables and percentages and standard  
292 errors for categorical variables. Characteristics were reported for the overall sample and by  
293 normoglycemia or prediabetes status. Rao Scott chi square tests were used to examine  
294 differences in sample characteristics for categorical variables by normoglycemia and prediabetes  
295 status. Ordinary least squares regression was used to examine differences in sample  
296 characteristics for continuous variables by normoglycemia and prediabetes status.

297 The National Cancer Institute (NCI) method<sup>66,67</sup> was used to estimate usual intake of  
298 added sugar and total caloric intake using day one and day two 24-hour dietary recall data. The  
299 NCI method requires two or more dietary recalls on nonconsecutive days for a random subset of  
300 the population to account for between- and within-person variation in intake and can be used to  
301 correct for measurement error when estimating usual intake of nutrients.<sup>66</sup> A 2-step process was  
302 used to estimate usual intake of added sugar and total daily calories using the MIXTRAN and  
303 INDIVIT macros provided by the NCI.<sup>66,68</sup> In step 1, the MIXTRAN macro was used to generate  
304 an "amount-only" model of daily consumed nutrients (i.e., added sugar) using 24 hour dietary

305 recall data on a transformed scale.<sup>68</sup> Intake day of the week<sup>69</sup> was included as a covariate in the  
306 MIXTRAN model to account for possible weekday or weekend day effects on dietary intake.<sup>70</sup>  
307 In step 2, INDIVINT was used to estimate usual intake for total calories and added sugar with  
308 parameters estimated from step 1. The INDIVINT macro was selected because it can be used to  
309 predict individual nutrient intakes for use as predictors in a disease model.<sup>66,68</sup>

310 Survey weighted logistic regression was used to test whether usual intake of total and  
311 percent added sugar intakes were associated with an increased odds of prediabetes relative to  
312 normoglycemia. Usual intake of added sugar was modeled as a continuous variable (g/day) and  
313 non-linear associations for added sugar as a percentage of total energy intake were examined  
314 (<10%, 10-15%, >15% kcal/day). A dichotomous indicator for prediabetes was constructed from  
315 HbA1c and FPG values. To aid in interpretation, estimated risks for prediabetes by total added  
316 sugar (g/day) were reported for mean and tertial intakes. Additionally, estimated risks for  
317 prediabetes by percent intakes of added sugar were reported as <10%, 10-15%, and >15% total  
318 energy from added sugar in kcals/day. Adjusted models included the following covariates: age in  
319 years, gender, race/ethnicity, BMI (kg/m<sup>2</sup>), total energy intake (kcal/day), engagement in  
320 physical activity, smoking status, education level, and PIR. Interaction terms between added  
321 sugar and race/ethnicity were used to examine differences in the relationship between  
322 prediabetes risk and total and percent added sugar intakes by race/ethnicity for non-Hispanic  
323 White, non-Hispanic Black, Hispanic, Asian American and Other Race respondents. All tests  
324 were two-sided and a *p* value <.05 was considered statistically significant.

## 325 **Results**

### 326 **Sample Characteristics**

327 A total of 5,306 adults with normoglycemia (41% of the sample) and prediabetes (59%)  
328 were included in the weighted sample and reported consuming 13.9% of their total daily calories  
329 from added sugar. There were no statistically significant differences in consumption of added  
330 sugar between groups (normoglycemia vs. prediabetes). Table 1 shows the overall characteristics  
331 of adults  $\geq 20$  years and by normoglycemia and prediabetes status.

332 In the overall sample, the average age was 47 years and included more females (51.1%)  
333 than males (48.9%) and mostly non-Hispanic White adults (65.7%), followed by Hispanic  
334 including Mexican American and Latino (14.9%), non-Hispanic Black (10.8%), Asian American  
335 (4.8%), or Other Race (3.8%) adults. The majority of the sample had obesity (36.8%), reported  
336 engaging in moderate and/or vigorous physical activity (54.7%), reported being non-smokers  
337 (77.5%), had more than a high school degree (63.2%), and reported a family income that  
338 represented a PIR  $> 1.85$  (67.8%). The average HbA1c was 5.4% and the average FPG was 101  
339 mg/dL. Usual intakes for total calories were 2,067 kcal/day and usual intakes of total added  
340 sugar were 72 grams (290 kcal/day).

341 Comparing between participants (normoglycemia vs prediabetes), those with prediabetes  
342 were more likely to be older (51 years), to be male (54.2%), to identify as being of Hispanic  
343 including Mexican American (15.6%), Asian American (4.9%), or Other Race (4.3%), have  
344 overweight (34.9%) or obesity (43.7%), be less likely to engage in moderate and/or vigorous  
345 activity (50.1%), identify as a non-smoker (78.2%), report having a high school (26.2%) or less  
346 than high school degree (13.9%) and report a family income that represented a PIR  $> 1.85$   
347 (68.4%). Those with prediabetes had an average HbA1c of 5.6% and a FPG of 107 mg/dL  
348 compared to an average HbA1c of 5.2% and FPG of 93 mg/dL among adults with  
349 normoglycemia. Between the normoglycemia and prediabetes groups, total calories per day and

350 added sugar intake was similar (2,084 vs 2,046 total kcal/day [ $p = .07$ ]; 71 vs. 73 g/day added  
351 sugar [ $p = .26$ ]; 285 vs. 293 kcal/day of added sugar [ $p = .26$ ]). Total energy intake from added  
352 sugar for both groups was 13.9% ( $p = .92$ ). Percent intakes of added sugar were also similar  
353 between groups (Table 1).

## 354 **Added Sugar Intake and Prediabetes Risk**

### 355 *Total Added Sugar Intakes*

356 Findings from both unadjusted and adjusted models (Table 2) indicated that total added  
357 sugar (g/day) intake did not significantly increase the odds of having prediabetes (unadjusted:  
358 OR: 1.01, 95% CI: .99 - 1.00,  $p = .26$ ; adjusted: OR: 1.00, 95% CI: .99 - 1.00,  $p = .91$ ).  
359 Differences in the odds for having prediabetes were observed for some covariates in the adjusted  
360 model. For example, being older, being Hispanic, Asian American or Other Race, and having  
361 obesity was associated with a greater odds of having prediabetes, whereas being a non-smoker or  
362 having an education beyond a high school degree (relative to no high school degree) was  
363 associated with a lower odds of having prediabetes (Table 2).

364 Table 3 reports the estimated probability (i.e., risk) for prediabetes at mean (73 g/day)  
365 and tertial intakes (43 g/day, 64 g/day, 93 g/day) for total added sugar estimated from unadjusted  
366 and adjusted models. In both unadjusted and adjusted models, differences in the estimated risk  
367 for prediabetes and total added sugar intake were not statistically significant (unadjusted:  $p = .26$ ;  
368 adjusted:  $p = .91$ ). For example, in the unadjusted model, the estimated risk for prediabetes at  
369 mean and tertial intakes for total added sugar ranged from 55.8% (mean) and from 55% to 55.6%  
370 to 56.4% (tertil). Estimated risk percentages were converted from the 'estimates' reported in  
371 Table 3 (e.g., .550 equates to 55%). Similarly, in the adjusted models, the estimated risk for  
372 prediabetes at mean and tertial intakes for total added sugar ranged from 60.7% (mean) and from

373 60.6% to 60.6% to 60.8% (tertil) indicating very little difference in estimated risk of prediabetes  
374 between varying amounts of total added sugar.

### 375 ***Percent Intakes of Added Sugar***

376 In both unadjusted and adjusted models (Table 4), consumption of different percent  
377 intakes of added sugar (<10%, 10-15%, >15%) did not significantly increase the odds of having  
378 prediabetes (unadjusted [<10%: (ref); 10-15%: OR: .93, 95% CI: .77 - 1.12,  $p = .44$ ; >15%: OR:  
379 1.03, 95% CI: .82 - 1.28,  $p = .82$ ] and adjusted [ <10%: (ref); 10 - 15%: OR: .82, 95% CI: .65 -  
380 1.04,  $p = .09$ ; >15%: OR: .96, 95% CI: .74 - 1.24,  $p = .73$ ]). In the adjusted model, significant  
381 differences in the odds for prediabetes were noted for certain covariates including age,  
382 race/ethnicity, BMI, smoking status, and education (Table 4). Findings were similar to what was  
383 previously reported for the total added sugar adjusted model in Table 2.

384 The estimated risk of prediabetes by percent intakes of added sugar (<10%, 10-15%,  
385 >15%) was reported in unadjusted and adjusted models (Table 5). Similar to the findings for the  
386 total added sugar intake models (Table 3), differences in the estimated risk for prediabetes in the  
387 percent intake models were relatively small and not statistically significant (unadjusted:  $p = .51$ ;  
388 adjusted:  $p = .22$ ). For example, in the unadjusted model, the estimated risk for prediabetes by  
389 percent intakes ranged from 54.3% to 56.1% to 56.7% and in the adjusted model ranged from  
390 57.7% to 61.4% to 62.5% (Table 5).

### 391 ***Total and Percent Intake of Added Sugar by Race and Ethnicity***

392 Results from the sensitivity analyses (Table 6 and 7) indicated that the association  
393 between total and percent intakes of added sugar and risk for prediabetes did not differ by  
394 race/ethnicity (Type 3 tests for interaction of race/ethnicity by total added sugar: unadjusted  
395 model [ $p = .27$ ]; adjusted model [ $p = .33$ ] and percent intake of added sugar: unadjusted model [ $p$



396 = .21]; adjusted model [  $p = .11$ ]). Irrespective of added sugar, it was observed that some  
397 racial/ethnic groups had higher odds for prediabetes. In Table 6, adjusted models indicated that  
398 the risk for prediabetes was high among those who identified as being Hispanic, Asian  
399 American, or Other Race with Asian Americans having the highest risk estimates (69% to 73%).  
400 Results were similar in Table 7 with adjusted risk estimates for Asian Americans between 71%  
401 to 76%.

## 402 Discussion

403 This is the first known study to examine associations between usual intake of *total* added  
404 sugar and prediabetes risk in a large nationally representative sample of 5,306 U.S. adults  $\geq 20$   
405 years. In the study, added sugar accounted for 13.9% of the sample's total energy intake.  
406 Similarly, total energy intake from added sugar in adults with normoglycemia and prediabetes  
407 was 13.9%. The findings of this study suggest that even after controlling for total calorie intake,  
408 BMI, and pertinent health behaviors/sociodemographic factors, all sources (i.e., total) of added  
409 sugar consumed as part of a usual diet, do not appear to significantly increase an individual's  
410 odds for having prediabetes. Average intakes for added sugar in this study exceeded current  
411 dietary guideline recommendations and were very close to average intake estimates reported for  
412 the total U.S. population (13.9% total energy intake/290 calories per day vs. 13% total energy  
413 intake/270 calories per day respectively).<sup>22</sup>

414 The main hypothesis of this study, that total added sugar consumption would be  
415 associated with and increase the risk of prediabetes, was not supported by the findings from this  
416 study. Nonetheless, the results are not in complete contrast to what has previously been reported  
417 in the literature. Evidence from both observational and experimental findings on this topic have  
418 been mixed with many studies suggesting that added sugar increases the risk for prediabetes<sup>24,31-</sup>

419 <sup>33,36-39</sup> and fewer studies reporting no such relationship.<sup>71-77</sup> Yet, differences between study  
420 designs (observational vs experimental), characterization of prediabetes risk, inclusion of  
421 representative minority groups, and operationalization of added sugar (i.e., proxies such as SSB  
422 or fructose-only beverages used to represent total added sugar intake) lend themselves to the  
423 inconsistent findings between many studies.

424 For example, experimental and observational studies have used a wide range of glycemic  
425 variables to assess prediabetes risk. In experimental studies, insulin sensitivity has been  
426 measured using the hyperinsulinemic clamp,<sup>25,37,73,75,78</sup> the hepatic insulin sensitivity index,<sup>39</sup> or a  
427 75 g oral-glucose tolerance test (OGTT)<sup>40</sup> whereas insulin resistance has been measured via the  
428 homeostatic model assessment of insulin resistance (HOMA-IR).<sup>72,74,76,79</sup> In observational  
429 studies, HOMA-IR has commonly been used to assess insulin resistance.<sup>31-33,36</sup> Interestingly,  
430 only a single, prospective cohort study has reported a significant association between added  
431 sugar and incident prediabetes measured via FPG and OGTT.<sup>36</sup> In contrast, prediabetes risk in  
432 this study was defined using HbA1c and FPG. Because OGTT was not collected in the 2017-  
433 2018 NHANES dataset, it was not used to identify prediabetes. It is possible that including all  
434 prediabetes measurements (HbA1c, FPG, and OGTT) may have resulted in a significant  
435 association between added sugar and prediabetes risk.

436 Sample characteristics have also varied widely between studies with experimental studies  
437 predominately using a homogenous sample of either male-only<sup>25,37-39,73,74</sup> or female-only  
438 participants<sup>72</sup> whereas observational studies have mainly included heterogeneous samples.<sup>31-33,36</sup>  
439 Most of the studies failed to consider differences in added sugar intake by race/ethnicity status  
440 which limits the generalizability of past findings. In this study, a diverse and heterogeneous  
441 sample was included to test whether the associations between added sugar consumption and

442 prediabetes differed by race/ethnicity. The findings of this study do not indicate prediabetes risk  
443 differs by race/ethnicity status for total or percent added sugar intakes. However, one notable  
444 finding from this study was that the highest risk estimates for prediabetes (irrespective of added  
445 sugar intake) was observed among Asian American adults. This is of interest since national  
446 estimates indicate that Asian American adults have the lowest incidence of prediabetes in the  
447 U.S. compared to other racial/ethnic groups (i.e., 32.8% compared to 35.4% for Hispanic, 36.9%  
448 for non-Hispanic Black, and 33.9% for non-Hispanic White adults). Research suggests Asian  
449 American adults often have higher rates of prediabetes at lower BMIs (underweight to obese  
450 class I).<sup>5</sup> Participants in this study were predominately overweight or obesity; however,  
451 differences in BMI status by race/ethnicity were not estimated. Future studies should specifically  
452 include Asian Americans to better characterize their prediabetes risk.

453         Operationalization of added sugar has also varied widely between studies. For example, a  
454 plethora of observational studies have primarily relied on added sugar proxies (e.g., SSB  
455 sweetened with HFCS) to approximate total added sugar intake which has been shown to be  
456 strongly correlated with risk for prediabetes and T2D.<sup>31-36</sup> Other studies have used fructose to  
457 represent added sugar and have found that greater concentrations of fructose (15% to  $\geq 25\%$  of  
458 total calories) promote insulin resistance,<sup>37-39</sup> increase fasting plasma glucose concentrations,<sup>40</sup>  
459 and impair insulin sensitivity.<sup>38-40</sup> Yet, in the U.S., a typical ad libitum diet consists of different  
460 types (e.g., sucrose, glucose, fructose, HFCS) of added sugar that are consumed in both solid and  
461 liquid form (e.g., baked goods or beverages like sodas and fruit drinks).<sup>18,22,80</sup> Aware of this  
462 knowledge, the objective of this study was to examine the relationship between *all* (i.e., total)  
463 added sugars (consumed as part of a usual diet) and risk for prediabetes among U.S. adults.  
464 Because this was a cross-sectional study, causal inferences could not be made to determine why

465 total added sugar intake did not increase the risk for prediabetes in the study sample. With much  
466 of the literature pointing to SSBs as a driving factor for diabetes risk,<sup>31-36</sup> it may be that liquid  
467 sources (e.g., SSBs) of added sugar compared to solid sources (e.g., baked goods,  
468 confectionaries) pose a greater risk for prediabetes. This was beyond this scope of this study;  
469 however, a few studies have found that added sugar consumed from liquids are responsible for  
470 impaired glucose homeostasis and insulin resistance in children (8-10 years)<sup>81</sup> and positively  
471 correlated with HOMA-IR in adults whereas similar correlations have not observed for solid  
472 food consumption.<sup>82</sup> Experimental research is needed to explore these differences in the context  
473 of prediabetes.

474 Lastly, it should be noted that the findings from this study are not in complete contrast to  
475 what has been previously reported in the literature. In a study by Lowndes et al.,<sup>76</sup> added sugar  
476 represented ~18% of the sample's total energy intake and did not impair fasting glucose  
477 concentrations in adults without diabetes (pre- or type 2). In comparison, consumption of added  
478 sugar in this study was slightly lower than what was used in the study by Lowndes et al. It is  
479 possible that average intakes of ~14% to ~18% added sugar may not pose a significant risk for  
480 prediabetes in adults. However, experimental studies assessing varying intakes of total added  
481 sugar as part of an ad libitum diet are needed since Lowndes et al. supplemented sucrose to  
482 participants in liquid form (via unsweetened milk), which as previously mentioned, may have  
483 differing effects on risk for prediabetes.<sup>81,82</sup>

#### 484 **Strengths and Limitations**

485 This study has some major strengths. This is the first, known study to assess the  
486 associations between total and percent intakes of added sugar and risk for prediabetes in a  
487 nationally representative sample of U.S. adults. Differences by race and ethnicity status were

488 also examined to improve the generalizability of the study results. Additionally, the NCI method  
489 was used to estimate usual individual intakes for added sugar for use in a disease model which  
490 helps account for between- and within-person variation in intake.<sup>66,83</sup>

491 This study also has limitations. First, the cross-sectional nature of this study did not allow  
492 for the assessment of causal or temporal inferences between added sugar and risk for prediabetes.  
493 Second, self-reported 24-hour dietary recalls were used to estimate usual intake of added sugars  
494 and total calories which may be subject to under- or overreporting due to concerns of social  
495 desirability.<sup>84</sup> However, use of the AMPM method, which has been found to accurately estimate  
496 usual nutrient intake, may have reduced this concern.<sup>85,86</sup> Third, HbA1c is reported to have a  
497 lower sensitivity at cut-points of 5.7-6.4% and is associated with greater diagnostic inaccuracy  
498 in the presence of certain medical conditions that increase red blood cell turnover (e.g., sickle  
499 cell disease, pregnancy, erythropoietin therapy)<sup>1</sup> and are not reported in NHANES. Differences  
500 by race and ethnicity status have also been reported with HbA1c levels registering higher in non-  
501 Hispanic Black adults compared to non-Hispanic White adults who had similar fasting glucose  
502 levels.<sup>1</sup> It is possible some individuals were incorrectly classified as having prediabetes (or  
503 T2D); however, including both FPG and HbA1c likely improved identification of prediabetes  
504 among the study sample.<sup>87</sup>

## 505 **Conclusions**

506 This study found that added sugar averaged 13.9% of the sample's total energy intake and  
507 was the same for adults with normoglycemia and prediabetes. Total and percent intakes of added  
508 sugar did not increase the risk for prediabetes in this nationally representative study of U.S.  
509 adults  $\geq 20$  years, including no significant differences in risk by race/ethnicity status. As this  
510 topic continues to evolve, additional experimental studies are needed to determine if there are

511 any direct effects from consuming *total* added sugar, as part of a usual diet, on prediabetes risk.  
512 As rates of prediabetes and T2D continue to rise, evidence-based research should determine what  
513 role added sugar plays in diabetes management and prevention to help advance the field of  
514 precision health and nutrition.

515

516

517

518

519

520

521

522

523

524

525

526

527

528

529

530

531

532

533

534

## References

- 535 1. American Diabetes A. 2. Classification and diagnosis of diabetes: Standards of medical  
536 care in diabetes—2021. *Diabetes Care*. 2021;44(Supplement 1):S15. doi:10.2337/dc21-S002
- 537 2. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. National diabetes statistics report, 2020.  
538 *Atlanta, GA: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, US Department of Health and Human*  
539 *Services*. 2020:12-15.
- 540 3. Plantinga LC, Crews DC, Coresh J, et al. Prevalence of chronic kidney disease in US  
541 adults with undiagnosed diabetes or prediabetes. *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol*. 2010;5(4):673-682.
- 542 4. Ali MK, Bullard KM, Saydah S, Imperatore G, Gregg EW. Cardiovascular and renal  
543 burdens of prediabetes in the USA: Analysis of data from serial cross-sectional surveys, 1988-  
544 2014. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol*. 2018;6(5):392-403. doi:10.1016/S2213-8587(18)30027-5
- 545 5. Zhu Y, Sidell MA, Arterburn D, et al. Racial/Ethnic disparities in the prevalence of  
546 diabetes and prediabetes by BMI: Patient Outcomes Research To Advance Learning (PORTAL)  
547 multisite cohort of adults in the U.S. *Diabetes Care*. 2019;42(12):2211. doi:10.2337/dc19-0532
- 548 6. World Health Organization. *Global Report on Diabetes*. World Health Organization;  
549 2016. Accessed April, 3, 2021.
- 550 7. Tabak AG, Herder C, Rathmann W, Brunner EJ, Kivimaki M. Prediabetes: A high-risk  
551 state for diabetes development. *Lancet*. Jun 16 2012;379(9833):2279-90. doi:10.1016/s0140-  
552 6736(12)60283-9
- 553 8. Neuhouser ML. The importance of healthy dietary patterns in chronic disease prevention.  
554 *Nutr Res*. Jul 10 2018;doi:10.1016/j.nutres.2018.06.002

- 555 9. Teng A, Blakely T, Scott N, et al. What protects against pre-diabetes progressing to  
556 diabetes? Observational study of integrated health and social data. *Diabetes Res Clin Pract.* Feb  
557 2019;148:119-129. doi:10.1016/j.diabres.2018.12.003
- 558 10. Glechner A, Keuchel L, Affengruber L, et al. Effects of lifestyle changes on adults with  
559 prediabetes: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Prim. Care Diabetes.* 2018;12(5):393-408.
- 560 11. Esposito K, Kastorini C-M, Panagiotakos DB, Giugliano D. Prevention of type 2 diabetes  
561 by dietary patterns: A systematic review of prospective studies and meta-analysis. *Metab Syndr*  
562 *Relat Disord.* 2010;8(6):471-476.
- 563 12. Chen GC, Koh WP, Neelakantan N, Yuan JM, Qin LQ, van Dam RM. Diet quality indices  
564 and risk of type 2 diabetes mellitus: The Singapore Chinese health study. *Am J Epidemiol.* Dec 1  
565 2018;187(12):2651-2661. doi:10.1093/aje/kwy183
- 566 13. Basiak A, Róžańska D, Połtyn–Zaradna K, Wołyniec M, Szuba A, Zatońska K.  
567 Comparison of intake of food groups between participants with normoglycemia, impaired fasting  
568 glucose, and type 2 diabetes in PURE Poland population. Article. *Int J Diabetes Dev Ctries.*  
569 2019;39(2):315-324. doi:10.1007/s13410-018-0675-5
- 570 14. Bauer F, Beulens JWJ, Van Der ADL, et al. Dietary patterns and the risk of type 2  
571 diabetes in overweight and obese individuals. Article. *Eur J Nutr.* 2013;52(3):1127-1134.  
572 doi:10.1007/s00394-012-0423-4
- 573 15. Kritchevsky D. History of recommendations to the public about dietary fat. *J Nutr.*  
574 1998;128(2):449S-452S. doi:10.1093/jn/128.2.449S
- 575 16. United States. Congress. Senate. Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs.  
576 *Dietary goals for the United States. 2d ed.* 2d ed. ed. 1977. Accessed April 1, 2021.



- 577 17. Hales CM, Carroll MD, Fryar CD, Ogden CL. Prevalence of obesity and severe obesity  
578 among adults: United States, 2017–2018. 2020; *NCHS Data Brief No. 360*. Accessed March 17,  
579 2022.
- 580 18. Fitch C, Keim KS. Position of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics: Use of Nutritive  
581 and nonnutritive sweeteners. *J Acad Nutr Diet*. 2012;112(5):739-758.  
582 doi:10.1016/j.jand.2012.03.009
- 583 19. Johnson RJ, Sanchez-Lozada LG, Andrews P, Lanaspa MA. Perspective: A Historical and  
584 scientific perspective of sugar and its relation with obesity and diabetes. *Adv Nutr*. May  
585 2017;8(3):412-422. doi:10.3945/an.116.014654
- 586 20. Malik VS, Hu FB. Fructose and Cardiometabolic health: What the Evidence from sugar-  
587 sweetened beverages tells us. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. Oct 06 2015;66(14):1615-1624.  
588 doi:10.1016/j.jacc.2015.08.025
- 589 21. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services and U.S. Department of Agriculture.  
590 *2015 - 2020 Dietary Guidelines for Americans*. 8th ed. 2015. Accessed April 1, 2021.  
591 <https://health.gov/our-work/food-nutrition/previous-dietary-guidelines/2015>
- 592 22. U.S. Department of Agriculture and U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.  
593 *Dietary Guidelines for Americans, 2020-2025*. Accessed January 18, 2021.  
594 DietaryGuidelines.gov
- 595 23. Stanhope KL. Sugar consumption, metabolic disease and obesity: The state of the  
596 controversy. *Crit Rev Clin Lab Sci*. 2016;53(1):52-67. doi:10.3109/10408363.2015.1084990
- 597 24. Weber KS, Simon M-C, Markgraf DF, et al. Habitual fructose intake relates to insulin  
598 sensitivity and fatty liver index in recent-onset type 2 diabetes patients and individuals without  
599 diabetes. *Nutrients*. 2018;10(6):774. doi:10.3390/nu10060774

- 600 25. Aeberli I, Hochuli M, Gerber PA, et al. Moderate amounts of fructose consumption  
601 impair insulin sensitivity in healthy young men: A randomized controlled trial. *Diabetes Care*.  
602 Jan 2013;36(1):150-6. doi:10.2337/dc12-0540
- 603 26. Stanhope KL, Medici V, Bremer AA, et al. A dose-response study of consuming high-  
604 fructose corn syrup-sweetened beverages on lipid/lipoprotein risk factors for cardiovascular  
605 disease in young adults. *Am J Clin Nutr*. Jun 2015;101(6):1144-54. doi:10.3945/ajcn.114.100461
- 606 27. Aeberli I, Gerber PA, Hochuli M, et al. Low to moderate sugar-sweetened beverage  
607 consumption impairs glucose and lipid metabolism and promotes inflammation in healthy young  
608 men: a randomized controlled trial. *Am J Clin Nutr*. Aug 2011;94(2):479-85.  
609 doi:10.3945/ajcn.111.013540
- 610 28. Maersk M, Belza A, Stødkilde-Jørgensen H, et al. Sucrose-sweetened beverages increase  
611 fat storage in the liver, muscle, and visceral fat depot: A 6-mo randomized intervention study.  
612 *Am. J. Clin. Nutr*. 2011;95(2):283-289. doi:10.3945/ajcn.111.022533
- 613 29. DiNicolantonio JJ, O'Keefe JH, Lucan SC. Added fructose: A principal driver of type 2  
614 diabetes mellitus and its consequences. *Mayo Clin Proc*. Mar 2015;90(3):372-81.  
615 doi:10.1016/j.mayocp.2014.12.019
- 616 30. Choo VL, Vigiouliouk E, Blanco Mejia S, et al. Food sources of fructose-containing sugars  
617 and glycaemic control: Systematic review and meta-analysis of controlled intervention studies.  
618 *BMJ*. Nov 21 2018;363:k4644. doi:10.1136/bmj.k4644
- 619 31. Lana A, Rodríguez-Artalejo F, Lopez-Garcia E. Consumption of sugar-sweetened  
620 beverages is positively related to insulin resistance and higher plasma leptin concentrations in  
621 men and nonoverweight women. *J Nutr*. 2014;144(7):1099-1105. doi:10.3945/jn.114.195230

- 622 32. Teshima N, Shimo M, Miyazawa K, et al. Effects of sugar-sweetened beverage intake on  
623 the development of type 2 diabetes mellitus in subjects with impaired glucose tolerance: The  
624 Mihama diabetes prevention study. Article. *J Nutr Sci Vitaminol (Tokyo)*. 2015;61(1):14-19.  
625 doi:10.3177/jnsv.61.14
- 626 33. Green AK, Jacques PF, Rogers G, Fox CS, Meigs JB, McKeown NM. Sugar-sweetened  
627 beverages and prevalence of the metabolically abnormal phenotype in the Framingham Heart  
628 Study. *Obesity*. 2014;22(5):E157-E163. doi:10.1002/oby.20724
- 629 34. Dhingra R, Sullivan L, Jacques PF, et al. Soft drink consumption and risk of developing  
630 cardiometabolic risk factors and the metabolic syndrome in middle-aged adults in the  
631 community. *Circulation*. 2007;116(5):480-488.
- 632 35. Barrio-Lopez MT, Martinez-Gonzalez MA, Fernandez-Montero A, Beunza JJ, Zazpe I,  
633 Bes-Rastrollo M. Prospective study of changes in sugar-sweetened beverage consumption and  
634 the incidence of the metabolic syndrome and its components: The SUN cohort. *Br J Nutr*.  
635 2013;110(9):1722-1731. doi:10.1017/S0007114513000822
- 636 36. Ma J, Jacques PF, Meigs JB, et al. Sugar-sweetened beverage but not diet soda  
637 consumption is positively associated with progression of insulin resistance and prediabetes. *J*  
638 *Nutr*. Dec 2016;146(12):2544-2550. doi:10.3945/jn.116.234047
- 639 37. Faeh D, Minehira K, Schwarz JM, Periasamy R, Park S, Tappy L. Effect of fructose  
640 overfeeding and fish oil administration on hepatic de novo lipogenesis and insulin sensitivity in  
641 healthy men. *Diabetes*. Jul 2005;54(7):1907-13. doi:10.2337/diabetes.54.7.1907
- 642 38. Lê KA, Ith M, Kreis R, et al. Fructose overconsumption causes dyslipidemia and ectopic  
643 lipid deposition in healthy subjects with and without a family history of type 2 diabetes. *Am J*  
644 *Clin Nutr*. 2009;89(6):1760-1765. doi:10.3945/ajcn.2008.27336

- 645 39. Lecoultre V, Egli L, Carrel G, et al. Effects of fructose and glucose overfeeding on  
646 hepatic insulin sensitivity and intrahepatic lipids in healthy humans. *Obesity (Silver Spring)*. Apr  
647 2013;21(4):782-5. doi:10.1002/oby.20377
- 648 40. Stanhope KL, Schwarz JM, Keim NL, et al. Consuming fructose-sweetened, not glucose-  
649 sweetened, beverages increases visceral adiposity and lipids and decreases insulin sensitivity in  
650 overweight/obese humans. *J Clin Invest*. 2009;119(5):1322-1334. doi:10.1172/JCI37385
- 651 41. Ward ZJ, Bleich SN, Cradock AL, et al. Projected U.S. State-level prevalence of adult  
652 obesity and severe obesity. *N Engl J Med*. 2019;381(25):2440-2450.  
653 doi:10.1056/NEJMsa1909301
- 654 42. Gower BA, Pearson K, Bush N, et al. Diet pattern may affect fasting insulin in a large  
655 sample of black and white adults. *Eur J Clin Nutr*. Oct 6 2020;doi:10.1038/s41430-020-00762-9
- 656 43. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Get the facts: Added sugars. Updated  
657 November 28, 2021. Accessed February, 1, 2022. [https://www.cdc.gov/nutrition/data-](https://www.cdc.gov/nutrition/data-statistics/added-sugars.html)  
658 [statistics/added-sugars.html](https://www.cdc.gov/nutrition/data-statistics/added-sugars.html)
- 659 44. Johnson CL, Dohrmann SM, Burt VL, Mohadjer LK. National Health and Nutrition  
660 Examination Survey: Sample design, 2011-2014. *Vital Health Stat 2*. Mar 2014;(162):1-33.
- 661 45. Zipf G, Chiappa M, Porter KS, Ostchega Y, Lewis BG, Dostal J. National Health and  
662 Nutrition Examination Survey plan and operations, 1999-2010. *Vital and Health Statistics*.  
663 2013;1(56)
- 664 46. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. National Center for Health Statistics.  
665 National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey: NHANES Questionnaires, Datasets, and  
666 Related Documentation. Accessed September 1, 2021.  
667 <https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/nhanes/default.aspx>

- 668 47. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. National Center for Health Statistics.  
669 National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES): Analytic guidelines, 2011-2016.  
670 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Accessed February 22, 2019.  
671 <https://wwwn.cdc.gov/nchs/nhanes/analyticguidelines.aspx#analytic-guidelines>
- 672 48. National Center for Health Statistics. NCHS Research Ethics Review Board (ERB)  
673 approval. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and National Center for Health Statistics.  
674 Updated November 29, 2017. Accessed April 17, 2019.  
675 <https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/nhanes/irba98.htm>
- 676 49. Office for Human Research Protections. Revised Common Rule regulatory text. Office  
677 for Human Research Protections. Updated April 2, 2019. Accessed April 17, 2019.  
678 [https://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/regulations-and-policy/regulations/revised-common-rule-regulatory-](https://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/regulations-and-policy/regulations/revised-common-rule-regulatory-text/index.html)  
679 [text/index.html](https://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/regulations-and-policy/regulations/revised-common-rule-regulatory-text/index.html)
- 680 50. University of Alabama at Birmingham: Institutional Review Board (IRB). Is IRB review  
681 required for use of public datasets? Accessed October 30, 2019.  
682 <https://www.uab.edu/research/administration/offices/IRB/FAQs/Pages/PublicDatasets.aspx>
- 683 51. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. National Center for Health Statistics.  
684 NHANES 2013-2014 Laboratory Methods- Laboratory Procedure Manual: Glycohemoglobin.  
685 Accessed March 28, 2019. [https://wwwn.cdc.gov/nchs/data/nhanes/2013-](https://wwwn.cdc.gov/nchs/data/nhanes/2013-2014/labmethods/GHB_H_MET_GLYCOHEMOGLOBIN.pdf)  
686 [2014/labmethods/GHB\\_H\\_MET\\_GLYCOHEMOGLOBIN.pdf](https://wwwn.cdc.gov/nchs/data/nhanes/2013-2014/labmethods/GHB_H_MET_GLYCOHEMOGLOBIN.pdf)
- 687 52. National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey. Plasma Fasting Glucose Laboratory  
688 Procedure Manual. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Accessed February 23, 2022.  
689 <https://wwwn.cdc.gov/nchs/data/nhanes/2017-2018/labmethods/GLU-J-MET-508.pdf>

- 690 53. Ahluwalia N, Dwyer J, Terry A, Moshfegh A, Johnson C. Update on NHANES dietary  
691 data: focus on collection, release, analytical considerations, and uses to inform public policy. *Adv*  
692 *Nutr.* Jan 2016;7(1):121-34. doi:10.3945/an.115.009258
- 693 54. Bowman S. Added sugars: Definition and estimation in the USDA Food Patterns  
694 Equivalents Databases. *J Food Compost Anal.* 2017;doi:10.1016/j.jfca.2017.07.013
- 695 55. U.S. Department of Agriculture. Food Patterns Equivalents Database. Databases and SAS  
696 data sets. Accessed September 1, 2021. [https://www.ars.usda.gov/northeast-area/beltsville-md-  
697 bhnrc/beltsville-human-nutrition-research-center/food-surveys-research-group/docs/fped-  
698 databases/](https://www.ars.usda.gov/northeast-area/beltsville-md-bhnrc/beltsville-human-nutrition-research-center/food-surveys-research-group/docs/fped-databases/)
- 699 56. United States Food and Drug Administration. Added sugars on the new nutrition facts  
700 label. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. Accessed November 3, 2020.  
701 <https://www.fda.gov/food/new-nutrition-facts-label/added-sugars-new-nutrition-facts-label>
- 702 57. Bowman S, Clemens J, Friday J, Lynch K, Moshfegh A. Food Patterns Equivalents  
703 Database 2013-14: Methodology and User Guide. U.S. Department of Agriculture. Accessed  
704 March 28, 2019. <http://www.ars.usda.gov/nea/bhnrc/fsrg>
- 705 58. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. National Center for Health Statistics. 2013-  
706 2014 demographics variable list. Accessed January 5, 2022.  
707 [https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/nhanes/search/variablelist.aspx?Component=Demographics&Cycle=  
708 2013-2014](https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/nhanes/search/variablelist.aspx?Component=Demographics&Cycle=2013-2014)
- 709 59. National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey. 2017-2018 Demographic Variables  
710 and sample weights (DEMO\_J). February, 2020. Accessed January 1, 2021.  
711 [https://www.cdc.gov/Nchs/Nhanes/2017-2018/DEMO\\_J.htm](https://www.cdc.gov/Nchs/Nhanes/2017-2018/DEMO_J.htm)

- 712 60. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. About adult BMI. U.S. Department of Health  
713 and Human Services. Accessed August 27, 2020.  
714 [https://www.cdc.gov/healthyweight/assessing/bmi/adult\\_bmi/index.html](https://www.cdc.gov/healthyweight/assessing/bmi/adult_bmi/index.html)
- 715 61. National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey. 2017-2018 physical activity (PAQ\_J).  
716 2020. Accessed January 2021. [https://wwwn.cdc.gov/Nchs/Nhanes/2017-  
717 2018/PAQ\\_J.htm#PAQ650](https://wwwn.cdc.gov/Nchs/Nhanes/2017-2018/PAQ_J.htm#PAQ650)
- 718 62. National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey. 2017-2018 smoking- cigarette use  
719 (SMQ\_J). February, 2020. Accessed January 1, 2021. [https://wwwn.cdc.gov/Nchs/Nhanes/2017-  
720 2018/SMQ\\_J.htm](https://wwwn.cdc.gov/Nchs/Nhanes/2017-2018/SMQ_J.htm)
- 721 63. National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey. 2017-2018 Income (INQ\_J). 2021.  
722 Accessed February 1, 2022. [https://wwwn.cdc.gov/Nchs/Nhanes/2017-2018/INQ\\_J.htm](https://wwwn.cdc.gov/Nchs/Nhanes/2017-2018/INQ_J.htm)
- 723 64. *SAS Studio*. Version 3.8 Enterprise Edition. Cary, NC, USA: SAS Institute Inc; 2021;
- 724 65. SAS Institute. SAS/STAT software survey analysis. Accessed February 23, 2022.  
725 <https://support.sas.com/rnd/app/stat/procedures/SurveyAnalysis.html>
- 726 66. National Cancer Institute. Usual dietary intakes: The NCI method. Updated July 24.  
727 Accessed February 22, 2021. <https://epi.grants.cancer.gov/diet/usualintakes/method.html>
- 728 67. Herrick KA, Rossen LM, Parsons R, Dodd KW. Estimating usual dietary intake from  
729 National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey data using the National Cancer Institute  
730 method. *National Center for Health Statistics*. Vital Health Stat 2(178). 2018.
- 731 68. National Cancer Institute. Usual dietary intakes: Details of the method. Updated  
732 December 14, 2021. Accessed February 23, 2022.  
733 <https://epi.grants.cancer.gov/diet/usualintakes/details.html>

- 734 69. National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey. Dietary Interview- Total Nutrient  
735 Intakes, First Day (DR1TOT\_J) 2017-2018. June, 2020. Accessed February 21, 2022.  
736 [https://www.cdc.gov/Nchs/Nhanes/2017-2018/DR1TOT\\_J.htm#DR1DAY](https://www.cdc.gov/Nchs/Nhanes/2017-2018/DR1TOT_J.htm#DR1DAY)
- 737 70. Tooze JA. Estimating usual intakes from dietary surveys: Methodologic challenges,  
738 analysis approaches, and recommendations for low-and middle-income countries. 2020.  
739 Washington, DC: *Intake – Center for Dietary Assessment/FHI Solutions*. January 2022.
- 740 71. Matikainen N, Söderlund S, Björnson E, et al. Fructose intervention for 12 weeks does  
741 not impair glycemic control or incretin hormone responses during oral glucose or mixed meal  
742 tests in obese men. *Nutr. Metab. Cardiovasc. Dis.* 2017;27(6):534-542.  
743 doi:10.1016/j.numecd.2017.03.003
- 744 72. Raben A, Holst JJ, Madsen J, Astrup A. Diurnal metabolic profiles after 14 d of an ad  
745 libitum high-starch, high-sucrose, or high-fat diet in normal-weight never-obese and postobese  
746 women. *Am J Clin Nutr.* 2001;73(2):177-189.
- 747 73. Black RN, Spence M, McMahon RO, et al. Effect of eucaloric high- and low-sucrose  
748 diets with identical macronutrient profile on insulin resistance and vascular risk: A randomized  
749 controlled trial. *Diabetes.* Dec 2006;55(12):3566-72. doi:10.2337/db06-0220
- 750 74. Brynes AE, Mark Edwards C, Ghatei MA, et al. A randomised four-intervention  
751 crossover study investigating the effect of carbohydrates on daytime profiles of insulin, glucose,  
752 non-esterified fatty acids and triacylglycerols in middle-aged men. *Br J Nutr.* Feb  
753 2003;89(2):207-18. doi:10.1079/bjn2002769
- 754 75. Lewis AS, McCourt HJ, Ennis CN, et al. Comparison of 5% versus 15% sucrose intakes  
755 as part of a eucaloric diet in overweight and obese subjects: effects on insulin sensitivity, glucose



- 756 metabolism, vascular compliance, body composition and lipid profile. A randomised controlled  
757 trial. *Metabolism*. May 2013;62(5):694-702. doi:10.1016/j.metabol.2012.11.008
- 758 76. Lowndes J, Sinnott SS, Rippe JM. No effect of added sugar consumed at median  
759 american intake level on glucose tolerance or insulin resistance. *Nutrients*. Oct 23  
760 2015;7(10):8830-45. doi:10.3390/nu7105430
- 761 77. Biggelaar LJ, Eussen SJ, Sep SJ, et al. Associations of dietary glucose, fructose, and  
762 sucrose with beta-cell function, insulin sensitivity, and type 2 diabetes in the Maastricht Study.  
763 *Nutrients*. Apr 2017;9(4)doi:10.3390/nu9040380
- 764 78. DeFronzo RA, Tobin JD, Andres R. Glucose clamp technique: A method for quantifying  
765 insulin secretion and resistance. *Am. J. Physiol. Endocrinol.* 1979;237(3):E214.
- 766 79. Matthews DR, Hosker JP, Rudenski AS, Naylor BA, Treacher DF, Turner RC.  
767 Homeostasis model assessment: Insulin resistance and beta-cell function from fasting plasma  
768 glucose and insulin concentrations in man. *Diabetologia*. Jul 1985;28(7):412-9.  
769 doi:10.1007/bf00280883
- 770 80. Allister PC, Stanhope KL. Understanding the impact of added sugar consumption on risk  
771 for type 2 diabetes. *J Calif Dent Assoc*. Oct 2016;44(10):619-26.
- 772 81. Wang J, Light K, Henderson M, et al. Consumption of added sugars from liquid but not  
773 solid sources predicts impaired glucose homeostasis and insulin resistance among youth at risk  
774 of obesity. *J Nutr*. 2013;144(1):81-86. doi:10.3945/jn.113.182519
- 775 82. O'Connor L, Imamura F, Brage S, Griffin SJ, Wareham NJ, Forouhi NG. Intakes and  
776 sources of dietary sugars and their association with metabolic and inflammatory markers. *Clin*  
777 *Nutr*. Aug 2018;37(4):1313-1322. doi:10.1016/j.clnu.2017.05.030

- 778 83. Tooze JA, Kipnis V, Buckman DW, et al. A mixed-effects model approach for estimating  
779 the distribution of usual intake of nutrients: The NCI method. *Stat Med.* Nov 30  
780 2010;29(27):2857-68. doi:10.1002/sim.4063
- 781 84. Baranowski T. 24-hour recall and diet record methods. *Nutritional epidemiology.*  
782 2012;40:49-69.
- 783 85. Moshfegh AJ, Rhodes DG, Baer DJ, et al. The US Department of Agriculture Automated  
784 Multiple-Pass Method reduces bias in the collection of energy intakes. *Am. J. Clin. Nutr.*  
785 2008;88(2):324-332. doi: 10.1093/ajcn/88.2.324
- 786 86. Rhodes DG, Murayi T, Sebastian RS, Clemens JC, Baer DJ, Moshfegh AJ. The USDA  
787 Automated Multiple-Pass Method accurately assesses population sodium intakes. *Am. J. Clin.*  
788 *Nutr.* 2013;97(5):958-964. doi:10.3945/ajcn.112.044982
- 789 87. Menke A, Casagrande S, Cowie CC. Contributions of A1c, fasting plasma glucose, and 2-  
790 hour plasma glucose to prediabetes prevalence: NHANES 2011–2014. *Ann Epidemiol.*  
791 2018;28(10):681-685. e2.  
792

**Table 1.** Overall characteristics of adults  $\geq 20$  years and by normoglycemia and prediabetes status, the NHANES<sup>a</sup> 2013- 2018

<b>Characteristics</b>	<b>Overall, (SE)<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>Normoglycemia, (SE)</b>	<b>Prediabetes (SE)</b>	<b>p value=</b>
<b>Age (years)</b>		N = 2,154	N = 3,152	<.05
	47 (.38)	41 (.55)	51 (.38)	
<b>Gender</b>		N = 2,154	N = 3,152	<.05
Female	51.1% (.71)	57.8% (1.51)	45.8% (1.12)	
Male	48.9% (.71)	42.2% (1.51)	54.2% (1.12)	
<b>Race/ethnicity</b>		N = 2,154	N = 3,152	.03
Non-Hispanic White	65.7% (1.97)	66.8% (2.35)	64.8% (1.94)	
Non-Hispanic Black	10.8% (1.08)	11.3% (1.31)	10.3% (1.02)	
Hispanic (including Mexican American and Latino)	14.9% (1.49)	14.3% (1.65)	15.6% (1.50)	
Asian American	4.8% (.47)	4.6% (.46)	4.9% (.55)	
Other Race	3.8% (.45)	3.0% (.39)	4.3% (.64)	
<b>BMI status<sup>c</sup></b>		N = 2,136	N = 3,131	<.05
Underweight $\leq 18.49$ kg/m <sup>2</sup>	1.7% (.22)	2.6% (.37)	1.9% (.21)	
Normal 18.5-24.99 kg/m <sup>2</sup>	28.4% (.98)	38.6% (1.61)	20.3% (1.15)	
Overweight 25-29.99 kg/m <sup>2</sup>	33.1% (.79)	30.7% (1.28)	34.9% (1.10)	
Obese $\geq 30$ kg/m <sup>2</sup>	36.8% (1.04)	28.1% (1.46)	43.7% (1.42)	
<b>Moderate and/or vigorous physical activity<sup>d</sup></b>		N = 2,154	N = 3,152	<.05
No	45.3% (1.37)	39.1% (2.01)	50.1% (1.35)	
Yes	54.7% (1.37)	60.9% (2.01)	49.9% (1.35)	
<b>Smoking status<sup>e</sup></b>		N = 2,067	N = 3,029	.40
Smoker	22.5% (1.03)	23.4% (1.62)	21.8% (1.19)	
Non-smoker	77.5% (1.03)	76.6% (1.62)	78.2% (1.19)	
<b>Education<sup>f</sup></b>		N = 2,153	N = 3,150	<.05
< High school degree	12.9% (.95)	11.7% (1.31)	13.9% (.92)	
High school degree	23.9% (1.19)	20.9% (1.46)	26.2% (1.30)	
> High school degree	63.2% (1.78)	67.4% (2.36)	59.9% (1.66)	
<b>Family Poverty to Income Ratio (PIR)<sup>g</sup></b>		N = 1,978	N = 2,857	.49
< 1.3	21.5% (1.38)	22.5% (2.13)	20.7% (1.17)	
1.3-1.85	10.7% (.81)	10.5% (.94)	10.9% (.93)	
>1.85	67.8% (1.75)	67.0% (2.51)	68.4% (1.60)	

<b>HbA1c (%)<sup>h</sup></b>		N = 2,150	N = 3,151	<.05
	5.4% (.01)	5.2% (.01)	5.6% (.01)	
<b>Fasting Plasma Glucose (mg/dL)<sup>i</sup></b>		N = 2,154	N = 3,151	<.05
	101mg/dL (.30)	93mg/dL (.27)	107 mg/dL (.24)	
<b>Percent intakes of total added sugar<sup>j</sup></b>		N = 2,154	N = 3,152	.62
% of participants with <10% calories from added sugars	31.1% (1.03)	30.9% (1.56)	31.3% (1.27)	
% of participants with 10-15% calories from added sugars	31.5% (.95)	32.5% (1.47)	30.6% (1.11)	
% of participants with >15% calories from added sugars	37.5% (1.20)	36.7% (1.84)	38.1% (1.44)	
<b>Usual intakes for total calories and total added sugar<sup>k</sup></b>		N = 2,154	N = 3,152	
Total calories (kcal/day)	2,067 (8.93)	2,046 (13.70)	2,084 (13.34)	.07
Added sugars (g <sup>l</sup> /day)	72 (.88)	71 (1.39)	73 (1.11)	.26
Added sugars (kcal/day)	290 (3.52)	285 (5.57)	293 (4.43)	.26
Added sugar calories (%)	13.9% (.16)	13.9% (.27)	13.9% (.20)	.92

<sup>a</sup>NHANES = National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey

<sup>b</sup>SE = standard error

<sup>c</sup>BMI = body mass index and was based on standard weight status categories using CDC criteria for underweight, normal weight, overweight, obese.

<sup>d</sup>Physical activity was based on self-reported data of participant engagement in  $\geq 10$  minutes of moderate or vigorous recreational activity during a typical week (yes/no)

<sup>e</sup>Smoking status was based on self-reported data about the use of tobacco products within the last 5 days (yes/no). Smoker was defined as using products within the last 5 days. Non-smoker was defined as no use of tobacco products within the last 5 days.

<sup>f</sup>Education was based on self-reported data asking participants their highest grade or level of school completed/received. < High school includes less than high school degree or no high school diploma. High school includes being a graduate or having a GED or equivalent. > High school includes some college/ associate degree or greater.

<sup>g</sup>PIR = family poverty to income ratio. <1.3 indicates below PIR, 1.3-1.85 indicates at or above PIR, and > 1.85 indicates above PIR.

<sup>h</sup>HbA1c = hemoglobin a1c and was laboratory collected from NHANES during the medical examination center visits. Diagnostic criteria is based on the American Diabetes Association classification guidelines for prediabetes defined as HgbA1c of 5.7% - 6.4%.

<sup>i</sup>To convert mg/dL fasting plasma glucose to mmol/L, multiply mg/dL by 0.0555. To convert mmol/L fasting plasma glucose to mg/dL, multiply mmol/L by 18.02. Fasting plasma glucose of 70.0 mg/dL= 43.9 mmol/L.

<sup>j</sup>Percent intakes of total added sugar were based on a percent estimate of added sugar (g) converted into kcals and divided by

---

total daily calories (kcal)

<sup>k</sup>usual intake was estimated using the National Cancer Institute Method for total calories and total added sugar and were based on at least 1 day of dietary recall information that contained a value for added sugar.

<sup>l</sup>g = grams

**Table 2.** Unadjusted and adjusted odds of prediabetes for total added sugar (g<sup>a</sup>) in U.S. adults ≥20 years with normoglycemia and prediabetes, the NHANES<sup>b</sup> 2013-2018

		<b>Estimate<sup>c</sup></b>	<b>SE<sup>d</sup></b>	<b>p value</b>	<b>OR<sup>e</sup></b>	<b>95% CI<sup>f</sup></b>
<b>Unadjusted</b> (N=5,306) <sup>g</sup>	Intercept	.155	.08	.07	-	-
	Total added sugar (g)	.001	.001	.26	1.01	.99-1.00
<b>Adjusted</b> (N=4,617) <sup>h,i</sup>	Intercept	-2.78	.37	<.01	-	-
	Total added sugar (g)	.0002	.001	.91	1.00	.99-1.00
Age (years)		.04	.003	<.01	1.04	1.04-1.05
Gender	Female (Ref. <sup>j</sup> )	-	-	-	-	-
	Male	.647	.118	<.01	1.91	1.51-2.42
Race and ethnicity	Non-Hispanic White (Ref.)	-	-	-	-	-
	Non-Hispanic Black	.088	.105	.41	1.09	.89-1.35
	Hispanic (including Mexican American and Latino)	.364	.122	<.01	1.44	1.13-1.84
	Asian American	.779	.128	<.01	2.18	1.69-2.82
	Other Race	.737	.208	<.01	2.09	1.37-3.18
BMI <sup>k</sup>	Underweight ≤ 18.49 kg/m2 (Ref.)	-	-	-	-	-
	Normal 18.5-24.99 kg/m2	.004	.213	.99	1.00	.65-1.54
	Overweight 25-29.99 kg/m2	.617	.255	.02	1.85	1.11-3.10
	Obese ≥30 kg/m2	1.14	.241	<.01	3.11	1.92-5.06
Total calorie intake (kcal <sup>l</sup> /day)		.00005	.0001	.67	1.00	1.00-1.00
Moderate and/or vigorous physical activity <sup>m</sup>	No (Ref.)	-	-	-	-	-
	Yes	-.174	.10	.09	.84	.69-1.03
Smoking status <sup>n</sup>	Smoker (Ref.)	-	-	-	-	-
	Non-smoker	-.034	.130	.8	.97	.74-1.26
Education <sup>o</sup>	< High school degree (Ref.)	-	-	-	-	-
	High school degree	.26	.150	.09	1.30	.96-1.76

PIR <sup>p</sup>	> High school degree	-0.052	.151	.73	.95	.70-1.29
	<1.3 (Ref.)	-	-	-	-	-
	1.3-1.85	.124	.127	.33	1.13	.88-1.46
	>1.85	.0007	.137	.99	1.00	.76-1.32

<sup>a</sup>g = grams

<sup>b</sup>NHANES = National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey

<sup>c</sup>Estimate ( $\beta$  Coefficient) for usual intake of added sugar (g) represents a change in the odds of having prediabetes for every 1-gram increase in added sugar.

<sup>d</sup>SE = standard error

<sup>e</sup>OR = odds ratio

<sup>f</sup>CI = confidence interval

<sup>g</sup>Model fit- C statistic: .497

<sup>h</sup>Model fit- C statistic: .733. Ns between unadjusted and adjusted models differ due to missing covariates included in the adjusted model.

<sup>i</sup>Covariates included in the adjusted models are age, gender, race/ethnicity, BMI, total calorie intake (kcal/day), moderate and/or vigorous physical activity, smoking status, education, family income to poverty ratio (PIR).

<sup>j</sup>Ref = reference category

<sup>k</sup>BMI = body mass index and was based on standard weight status categories using CDC criteria for underweight, normal weight, overweight, obese.

<sup>l</sup>kcal = kilocalories NHANES

<sup>m</sup>Physical activity was based on self-reported data of participant engagement in  $\geq 10$  minutes of moderate or vigorous recreational activity during a typical week (yes/no)

<sup>n</sup>Smoking status was based on self-reported data about the use of tobacco products within the last 5 days (yes/no). Smoker was defined as using products within the last 5 days. Non-smoker was defined as no use of tobacco products within the last 5 days.

<sup>o</sup>Education was based on self-reported data asking participants their highest grade or level of school completed/received. < High school includes less than high school degree or no high school diploma. High school includes being a graduate or having a GED or equivalent. > High school includes some college/ associate degree or greater.

<sup>p</sup>PIR = family poverty to income ratio. <1.3 indicates below PIR, 1.3-1.85 indicates at or above PIR, and > 1.85 indicates above PIR.

**Table 3.** Estimated risk of prediabetes at mean and tertials of total added sugar (g<sup>a</sup>) in U.S. adults ≥20 years, the NHANES<sup>b</sup> 2013-2018

	<b>Total Added Sugar</b>	<b>Estimate<sup>c</sup></b>	<b>SE<sup>d</sup></b>
<b>Unadjusted<sup>e</sup></b>	Mean (73g)	.558	.012
Prediabetes (N=3,152)	1st Q <sup>f</sup> (43g)	.550	.014
	Median Q (64g)	.556	.012
	3rd Q (93g)	.564	.013
<b>Adjusted<sup>g,h</sup></b>	Mean (73g)	.607	.018
Prediabetes (N=2,735)	1st Q (43g)	.606	.020
	Median Q (64g)	.606	.018
	3rd Q (93g)	.608	.020

<sup>a</sup>g = grams

<sup>b</sup>NHANES = National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey

<sup>c</sup>Estimates represent the risk probability for prediabetes based on mean and tertial intakes of total added sugar (g/day).

<sup>d</sup>SE = standard error

<sup>e</sup>Model fit- C statistic: .497 and p-value = .26

<sup>f</sup>Q = quartiles

<sup>g</sup>Model fit- C statistic: .733 and p-value = .91. Ns between unadjusted and adjusted models differ due to missing covariates included in the adjusted model.

<sup>h</sup>Adjusted for age, gender, race/ethnicity, BMI, total calorie intake (kcal/day), moderate and/or vigorous physical activity, smoking status, education, family poverty to income ratio (PIR).



**Table 4.** Unadjusted and adjusted odds of prediabetes for percent intakes of total added sugar<sup>a</sup> in U.S. adults  $\geq 20$  years with normoglycemia and prediabetes, the NHANES<sup>b</sup> 2013-2018

		Estimate <sup>c</sup>	SE <sup>d</sup>	<i>P</i> value	OR <sup>e</sup>	95% CI <sup>f</sup>
<b>Unadjusted</b> (N=5,306) <sup>g</sup>	Intercept	.246	.083	.57	-	-
	<10% (Ref. <sup>h</sup> )	-	-	-	-	-
	10-15%	-.072	.094	.44	.93	.77-1.12
	>15%	.025	.112	.82	1.03	.82-1.28
<b>Adjusted</b> (N=4,617) <sup>ij</sup>	Intercept	-2.74	.378	.21	-	-
	<10% (Ref.)	-	-	-	-	-
	10-15%	-.197	.115	.09	.82	.65-1.04
	>15%	-.044	.129	.73	.96	.74-1.24
Age (yr)		.042	.003	<.01	1.04	1.04-1.05
Gender	Female (Ref.)	-	-	-	-	-
	Male	.637	.120	<.01	1.89	1.49-2.41
Race/ethnicity	Non-Hispanic White (Ref.)	-	-	-	-	-
	Non-Hispanic Black	.089	.104	.40	1.09	.89-1.35
	Hispanic (including Mexican American and Latino)	.373	.124	<.01	1.45	1.13-1.86
	Asian American	.762	.124	<.01	2.14	1.67-2.75
	Other Race	.736	.208	<.01	2.09	1.37-3.17
BMI <sup>k</sup>	Underweight $\leq 18.49$ kg/m <sup>2</sup> (Ref.)	-	-	-	-	-
	Normal 18.5-24.99 kg/m <sup>2</sup>	.006	.215	.98	1.01	.65-1.55
	Overweight 25-29.99 kg/m <sup>2</sup>	.615	.257	.02	1.85	1.10-3.10
	Obese $\geq 30$ kg/m <sup>2</sup>	1.14	.246	<.01	3.12	1.90-5.12
Total energy intake (kcal <sup>l</sup> /day)		.00006	.0001	.51	1.00	1.00-1.00
Moderate and/or vigorous physical						

activity <sup>m</sup>	No (Ref.)	-	-	-	-	-
	Yes	-.173	.099	.09	.84	.69-1.03
Smoking status <sup>n</sup>	Smoker (Ref.)	-	-	-	-	-
	Non-smoker	-.034	.131	.79	.97	.74-1.26
Education <sup>o</sup>	<High school degree (Ref.)	-	-	-	-	-
	High School Degree	.266	.149	.08	1.31	.97-1.76
	>High School Degree	-.041	.152	.79	.96	.71-1.30
PIR <sup>p</sup>	<1.3 (Ref.)	-	-	-	-	-
	1.3-1.85	.135	.128	.30	1.14	.89-1.48
	>1.85	-.002	.139	.99	1.00	.76-1.32

<sup>a</sup>Percent intakes of total added sugar were based on a percent estimate of usual intake of added sugar (g) converted into kcals and divided by total daily calories (kcals)

<sup>b</sup>NHANES = National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey

<sup>c</sup>Estimate ( $\beta$  Coefficient) for added sugar (g) intake represents a change in the odds of having prediabetes for every 1-gram increase in added sugar.

<sup>d</sup>SE = standard error

<sup>e</sup>OR = odds ratio

<sup>f</sup>CI = confidence interval

<sup>g</sup>Model fit- C statistic: .501

<sup>h</sup>Ref = reference category

<sup>i</sup>Model fit- C statistic: .733. N's between unadjusted and adjusted models differ due to missing covariates included in the adjusted model

<sup>j</sup>Covariates included in the adjusted models are age, gender, race/ethnicity, BMI, total calorie intake (kcal/day), moderate and/or vigorous physical activity, smoking status, education, family poverty to income ratio (PIR).

<sup>k</sup>BMI = body mass index and was based on standard weight status categories using CDC criteria for underweight, normal weight, overweight, obese.

<sup>l</sup>kcal = kilocalories NHANES

<sup>m</sup>Physical activity was based on self-reported data of participant engagement in  $\geq 10$  minutes of moderate or vigorous recreational activity during a typical week (yes/no)

<sup>n</sup>Smoking status was based on self-reported data about the use of tobacco products within the last 5 days (yes/no).

---

Smoker was defined as using products within the last 5 days. Non-smoker was defined as no use of tobacco products within the last 5 days.

<sup>o</sup>Education was based on self-reported data asking participants their highest grade or level of school completed/received. < High school includes less than high school degree or no high school diploma. High school includes being a graduate or having a GED or equivalent. > High school includes some college/ associate degree or greater.

<sup>p</sup>PIR = family poverty to income ratio. <1.0 indicates below PIR, 1.0-2.9 indicates at or above PIR, and  $\geq 3.0$  indicates above PIR.

**Table 5.** Estimated risk of prediabetes for percent intake of total added sugar<sup>a</sup> in U.S. adults  $\geq 20$  years, the NHANES<sup>b</sup> 2013-2018

	<b>% Added Sugar</b>	<b>Estimate<sup>c</sup></b>	<b>SE<sup>d</sup></b>
<b>Unadjusted<sup>e</sup></b> Prediabetes (N=3,152)	<10%	.561	.020
	10-15%	.543	.018
	>15%	.567	.019
<b>Adjusted<sup>f,g</sup></b> Prediabetes (N=2,735)	<10%	.625	.021
	10-15%	.577	.029
	>15%	.614	.025

<sup>a</sup>Percent intakes of total added sugar were based on a percent estimate of usual intake of added sugar (g) converted into kcals and divided by total daily calories (kcals)

<sup>b</sup>NHANES = National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey

<sup>c</sup>Estimate represents the risk probability for prediabetes based on mean and quartile intakes of added sugar in grams per day.

<sup>d</sup>SE = standard error

<sup>e</sup>Model fit- C statistic: .501 and p-value = .51

<sup>f</sup>Model fit- C statistic: .733 and p-value = .22. Ns between unadjusted and adjusted models differ due to missing covariates included in the adjusted model.

<sup>g</sup>Adjusted for age, gender, race/ethnicity, BMI, total calorie intake (kcal/day), moderate and/or vigorous physical activity, smoking status, education, family poverty to income ratio (PIR).

**Table 6.** Estimated risk of prediabetes at mean and tertials of total added sugar (g<sup>a</sup>) by race/ethnicity status for U.S. adults ≥20 years, the NHANES<sup>b</sup> 2013-2018

	Unadjusted <sup>c</sup>			Adjusted <sup>d,e</sup>		
	Total Added Sugar	Estimate <sup>f</sup>	SE <sup>g</sup>	Total Added Sugar	Estimate	SE
Non-Hispanic White	Mean (72.45 g)	.55	.016	Mean (72.68 g)	.51	.026
	1st Q <sup>h</sup> (42.67 g)	.54	.019	1st Q <sup>h</sup> (42.67 g)	.51	.030
	Median Q (64.17 g)	.55	.017	Median Q (64.17 g)	.51	.027
	3rd Q (93.95 g)	.55	.017	3rd Q (93.95 g)	.51	.026
Non-Hispanic Black	Mean (72.45 g)	.54	.018	Mean (72.68 g)	.53	.027
	1st Q <sup>h</sup> (42.67 g)	.54	.023	1st Q <sup>h</sup> (42.67 g)	.52	.034
	Median Q (64.17 g)	.54	.019	Median Q (64.17 g)	.53	.028
	3rd Q (93.95 g)	.53	.020	3rd Q (93.95 g)	.54	.028
Hispanic (including Mexican American and Latino)	Mean (72.45 g)	.58	.017	Mean (72.68 g)	.60	.023
	1st Q <sup>h</sup> (42.67 g)	.56	.022	1st Q <sup>h</sup> (42.67 g)	.59	.028
	Median Q (64.17 g)	.58	.018	Median Q (64.17 g)	.60	.024
	3rd Q (93.95 g)	.60	.019	3rd Q (93.95 g)	.61	.025
Asian American <sup>i</sup>	Mean (72.45 g)	-	-	Mean (72.68 g)	.71	.027
	1st Q (42.67 g)	-	-	1st Q (42.67 g)	.69	.025
	Median Q (64.17 g)	-	-	Median Q (64.17 g)	.71	.025
	3rd Q (93.95 g)	-	-	3rd Q (93.95 g)	.73	.037
Other Race	Mean (72.45 g)	.64	.037	Mean (72.68 g)	.68	.040
	1st Q (42.67 g)	.60	.051	1st Q (42.67 g)	.66	.050
	Median Q (64.17 g)	.63	.039	Median Q (64.17 g)	.68	.040
	3rd Q (93.95 g)	.67	.04	3rd Q (93.95 g)	.70	.048

<sup>a</sup>g = grams

<sup>b</sup>NHANES = National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey

<sup>c</sup>Model fit- C statistic: .515 and p-value = .27. Total sample N=5,306; prediabetes N=3,152

<sup>d</sup>Model fit- C statistic: .734 and p-value = .33. Total sample N=4,617; prediabetes N=2,735. Ns

---

between unadjusted and adjusted models differ due to missing covariates included in the adjusted model.

<sup>e</sup>Adjusted for age, gender, race/ethnicity, BMI, total calorie intake (kcal/day), moderate and/or vigorous physical activity, smoking status, education, family poverty to income ratio (PIR).

<sup>f</sup>Estimate represents the risk probability for prediabetes based on mean and tertial intakes of added sugar (g/day).

<sup>g</sup>SE = standard error

<sup>h</sup>Q = quartiles

<sup>i</sup>Estimates for unadjusted intakes not reported in SAS output file.

**Table 7.** Estimated risk of prediabetes by percent intakes of total added sugar<sup>a</sup> consumed by race/ethnicity status for U.S. adults  $\geq 20$  years, the NHANES<sup>b</sup> 2013-2018

	% Added Sugar	Unadjusted <sup>c</sup>		Adjusted <sup>d,e</sup>	
		Estimate <sup>f</sup>	SE <sup>g</sup>	Estimate	SE
Non-Hispanic White	<10%	.56	.026	.56	.035
	10-15%	.53	.025	.48	.040
	>15%	.56	.025	.54	.034
Non-Hispanic Black	<10%	.55	.038	.56	.048
	10-15%	.55	.030	.55	.035
	>15%	.52	.027	.55	.036
Hispanic (including Mexican American and Latino)	<10%	.55	.029	.60	.032
	10-15%	.60	.031	.65	.041
	>15%	.59	.024	.62	.032
Asian American	<10%	.58	.027	.71	.030
	10-15%	.56	0.38	.71	.040
	>15%	.61	.49	.76	.043
Other Race	<10%	.67	.087	.71	.071
	10-15%	.55	.056	.56	.082
	>15%	.68	.058	.73	.062

<sup>a</sup>Percent intakes of total added sugar were based on a percent estimate of usual intake of added sugar (g) converted into kcals and divided by total daily calories (kcals)

<sup>b</sup>NHANES = National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey

<sup>c</sup>Model fit- C statistic: .522 and p-value = .21. Total sample N=5,306; prediabetes N=3,152

<sup>d</sup>Model fit- C statistic: .335 and p-value = .11. Total sample N=4,617; prediabetes N=2,735. Ns between unadjusted and adjusted models differ due to missing covariates included in the adjusted model.

<sup>e</sup>Adjusted for age, gender, race/ethnicity, BMI, total calorie intake (kcal/day), moderate and/or vigorous physical activity, smoking status, education, family poverty to income ratio (PIR).

<sup>f</sup>Estimate represents the risk probability for prediabetes based on mean and quartile

---

intakes of added sugar in grams per day.

<sup>g</sup>SE = standard error