

1 **Section No 01- Beginning Section**

2 **Title - Exploring the relationship between food environment**

3 **and preferences among school children in a low socio-**

4 **economic community in Sri Lanka: A GIS based assessment.**

5 Authors :

6 Chamil Senevirathne¹, Prasad Katulanda², Padmal de Silva³, Dilini Prashadika⁴ and
7 Lalith Senarathne.

8 ¹Department of Health Promotion, Faculty of Applied Sciences, Rajarata
9 University of Sri Lanka

10 ²Department of Clinical Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, University of Colombo

11 ³Department of Statistics, National Institute of Health Sciences, Kaluthara, Sri
12 Lanka

13 ⁴Department of Computing Sciences, Faculty of Applied Sciences, Rajarata
14 University of Sri Lanka

15

16 Corresponding Author,

17 chamil@as.art.ac.lk

18

19

20

21

22

23 **Abstract**

24 *Food environment in school neighborhood plays a crucial role in manipulating food choices of*
25 *school children. This study investigated the relationship between food environment in*
26 *neighborhood and dietary practices of government school students in a low socio-economic*
27 *setting, Sri Lanka. This cross-sectional study surveyed the neighborhood food environment of*
28 *selected schools (n=30) in Monaragala District, Sri Lanka, using Geographical Information*
29 *System (GIS) data, and collected dietary information from a representative sample of school*
30 *children (n=603). Chi-square and spearman correlation tests were performed using SPSS version*
31 *23.0 to estimate the associations between food environment and BMI of students, while ArcGIS*
32 *10.4.1 was used to analyze GIS data of the study.*

33 *Majority of students (35.5%) were 15 years old and approximately 51% were females. Mean BMI*
34 *of study participants was 18.14 (\pm 3.28). More than 90% of outlets within close proximity sold*
35 *unhealthy foods. Consumption of confectionaries was 72.3% of students whereas healthy foods*
36 *choices was ranged from 5% to 12%. A positive correlation between consuming unhealthy food*
37 *and distance to the outlets from the school was observed ($p < 0.05$). Risk of consuming low nutrition*
38 *food found to be doubled (OR = 2.47, 95% CI: 1.52- 3.89) among students studied in schools*
39 *where larger proportion of energy dense food sold in closer proximity. In conclusion, density and*
40 *the proximity of the outlets that sold food in low nutrients in school neighborhood environment*
41 *were positively associated with choosing unhealthy food items by students.*

42

43

44

45 **Introduction**

46 Neighborhood food environment in school contains the physical infrastructure and overall
47 surroundings within adjacent to school premises where food is both sold and consumed. This
48 encompasses the spectrum of food items available in these locations, considering not only their
49 availability but also the nutritional composition they offer [1]. The presence of unhealthy food
50 options in close proximity to schools significantly shapes the dietary choices of school children,
51 particularly during their adolescence. This phase of life pivotal for the development of both
52 cognitive and physiological aspects that impact an individual's overall well-being across the
53 lifespan [2-3]. Positive lifestyle and behavior practices during this period reduce the risk of chronic
54 diseases in early adulthood [4]. Marketing strategies of the food industry influence school children
55 to reach food destinations such as fast food huts, grocery outlets and cafeteria to fulfill their day
56 to day dietary requirements [5]. A positive association between availability of food outlets in closer
57 proximity and eating habits, nutritional status of people across different settings and populations
58 is already established [6-7]. A recent study demonstrated that neighborhood food destinations
59 fulfill significant amount of daily caloric intake of school children in USA [8]. However, presence
60 of energy dense foods which are promoted through child focused marketing, substantially
61 influence food choices of school children [9]. Several studies have shown that children and
62 adolescents who have easy access to unhealthy food outlets near their schools tend to have a higher
63 consumption of fast food, sugary beverages and snacks. This is often associated with an increased
64 risk of obesity and related health issues [10-13]. The presence of healthy food on the other hand,
65 has been linked to better dietary choices as well. Therefore, school neighborhood food
66 environment plays a crucial role in influencing on eating pattern, food preference and further

67 school children as they are exposed to wide range of unhealthy food and beverage items during
68 the school hours.

69 Sri Lanka is a middle income country with diverse socio-economic background across different
70 communities. Approximately 20% of the population represents school age children and
71 adolescents [14]. Majority (57.3%) of school children are provided free education through 10,165
72 government schools, while others attend private (37.2%) aided (8.5%) and other schools (3.3%)
73 [15], and all the provincial schools are categorized in to four types namely AB, 1C, type 2 and
74 type 3 based on the infrastructure facilities. Sri Lankan government introduced a school canteen
75 policy in 2006 to ensure the access to nutritional food within school premises. This policy is
76 mainly focused on changing the food environment within school premises. Although, having a
77 policy to regulate the food availability in the school premises is a vital part in improving nutritional
78 practices of children, school neighborhood should also be taken in to consideration when changing
79 the school food environment. Comprehending the food environment, encompassing the nutritional
80 value of accessible food items both within and their surrounding neighborhoods, holds significant
81 sway over the nutrition wellbeing of school children. While handful of studies have probed in to
82 the school nutritional environment and its correlated factors in urban settings in Sri Lanka [16],
83 there remains a notable dearth of evidence concerning economically disadvantaged communities.
84 Consequently, there exists discernible gap in the body of evidence pertaining to the research on
85 school food environment in Sri Lanka. Addressing this gap holds paramount importance in
86 generating the essential additional evidence required for the efficacious implementation of food
87 environment policies aimed at schools. The objective of this study was to explore the association
88 between neighborhood food environment and dietary practices of school children within a low-

89 socioeconomic community in Sri Lanka. This exploration was conducted through the lens of
90 geographical accessibility, utilizing Geographic Information System (GIS) as a fundamental tool.

91

92 **Section No : 02 – Middle Section**

93 **Methodology**

94 **Study Design**

95 A cross-sectional study was conducted in government schools under the provincial department of
96 education in Moneragala Education zones of Moneragala District of Sri Lanka. Poverty
97 indicators in Sri Lanka [17] was used to define economic status of the study.

98 **Study Population**

99 **Primary target population**

100 School children from grade eight to eleven (age from 13 to 16 years) of government schools in
101 Moneragala education division in the Uva province of Sri Lanka were selected as study population.
102 Students with cognitive disability and living with chronic diseases requiring long term drug
103 treatments and follow-up were excluded from the study.

104

105 **Secondary target population**

106 outlets which sold ready to eat food items, process food, confectionaries and other type of snacks
107 were considered for the data collection. All the outlets that sold food items (except mobile carts
108 and mobile food sellers), located within 300 meters from the school border were selected for the
109 assessment. Other outlets that did not sell any type of food were excluded from the survey.

110 **Sample size calculation**

111 In low socio-economic groups, proportion of students who access neighborhood food outlets were
112 considered for the sample size calculation. Since there were no previous studies to report the
113 prevalence, sample size was calculated to detect at least 50% prevalence within the population.
114 Sample size was calculated using the formula for cross sectional studies from $N = z^2 p (1-p) / d^2$ [18].
115 Together with the hypothesized prevalence of accessing neighborhood food outlets among school
116 children (50%), 0.05 level of significance (precision $d = 5\%$), $Z = 1.96$ standard normal deviation
117 at 95% CI was included for the calculation.

118 Previous studies suggested including the designed effect 1.5 to ensure the statistical validity of the
119 sample selection procedure. In order to minimize the error due to clustering, the calculated sample
120 size was multiplied by the design effect (D) which was taken as 1.516 [19]. Then the sample size
121 was 576 and to compensate for the non-response rate of 10% another 58 were added to the sample,
122 and Final sample size was 630. Multistage stratified cluster sampling was used to select the
123 required number of clusters ($n=30$). Describing selecting the secondary sample, all the outlets that
124 sold food, located within 300 meters' radius from the school main gate was considered for the data
125 collection.

126

127 **Data collection procedure and Study instruments**

128

129 The validated version of Global School Health Survey (GSHS) questionnaire was used to collect
130 demographic and dietary information of the participants [20]. This interviewer-administered
131 questionnaire collected two types of information, the first part investigated socio-demographic
132 data including age, gender, parent's education and family income while second part collected

133 information in relation to nutrition related practices such as consumption of deep-fried food,
134 confectionaries, sweets, fruits and vegetables, etc. in the previous 30 days. The questionnaire was
135 translated to Sinhala and Tamil languages and then back-translated to English to ensure the
136 accuracy of the content. The same one was pre-tested with a sample in order to observe
137 understandability and accuracy of responses.

138 An observation check list which was developed based on the recommendations of the school
139 canteen policy [21] was utilized to determine the availability of different food types in school
140 proximity. Each shop was visited by the investigator to identify the availability of healthy and
141 unhealthy food, and recorded under selected category of the check list. Healthy and unhealthy food
142 was defined according to the recommendations of the school canteen policy [21]. Food
143 environment was defined as the all the outlets selling food within 300 meters from the school. A
144 sample geographical analysis was done by the investigator prior to determine the buffer distance.
145 Since the majority of students resided in walking distance from their schools, maximum radius for
146 the data collection was decided as 300 meters. In addition to determining food context of the
147 outlets, coordinates of the outlets and schools captured by using Garmin ETrex 10 GPS device and
148 then tabulated in Microsoft Excel 2010.

149 In order to establish physical measurements of study participants, height and weight were
150 measured to the nearest 0.1 cm and 0.1 kg by trained data collectors. Standardized procedures for
151 anthropometric measurements were used to obtain both measurements [22].

152 **Data Analysis**

153 During the analysis phase, descriptive methods were employed in alignment with the study
154 objective. The examination of relationships between chosen variables and dietary preference of

155 the study participants was conducted through the Chi-square & Spearman Correlation tests. These
156 statistical tests were utilized to ascertain the degree of association between the variables and the
157 dietary choices of the participants. Statistical significance was assessed at (95%, CI) $p < 0.05$ level.
158 Statistical Package on Social Studies (SPSS 23.0) was used to analyze the data.

159

160 In order to analyze GIS data, the present study used ArcGIS 10.4.1 software to analyze spatial
161 neighborhood information. GPS coordinates of outlets and schools were used to create point layer
162 on ArcMap and using these two layers could be analyzed distance from each school to outlets.
163 Based on every school location created multiple buffer zones and these buffer zones clearly show
164 surrounding food outlets of the school environment. Shop density and proximity were defined as
165 the operational variables for the number of outlets located within given buffer zones and distance
166 from the school respectively.

167

168 **Ethical Clearance**

169 The study made necessary measures to ensure ethical validity of the study. All the participants
170 were provided an information sheet about the study procedure, and obtained the written consent
171 after providing opportunity to ask questions. In addition, ascent consent was taken from parents
172 and guardians of school children Steps were taken to maintain the confidentiality of data and
173 privacy of the study participants. Study protocol was reviewed under and approved by the Ethical
174 Review Committee of Faculty of Medicine, University of Colombo; **Approval number EC-14-**
175 **105.**

176

177 Results

178 With response rate of 95.7%, the study recruited a cohort of 603 students, selected from 30 schools
179 to ensure representation across all three education zones within Moneragala District in Sri Lanka.
180 Among the selected sample, a predominant proportion (35.5%) comprised 15 years old, while
181 approximately 51% were females. Notably, more than half (56.4%) of the enrolled students hailed
182 from low-income families as evidence by data presented in table 1.

183 **Table 1: Socio-demographic characteristics of participating students**

Characteristic	Frequency	%
Gender		
• Female	311	51.6
Age group		
• 13 years	95	15.8
• 14 years	188	32.2
• 15 years	214	35.5
• 16 years	106	17.5
Mother's education level		
• No education	112	18.6
• Primary education	246	40.8
• Secondary education	245	40.6
Father's education level		
• No education	145	24.0

• Primary education	289	48.0
• Secondary education	169	28.0
Monthly income		
• Low	340	56.4
• Middle	160	26.5
• High	103	17.1
Total	603	100.0

184

185 As presented in table 2, the mean BMI for males were $17.6 \text{ Kg m}^{-2} (\pm 3.4)$ while for females it
 186 was $18.5 \text{ Kg m}^{-2} (\pm 3.1)$. Remarkably, a substantial majority of the study participants (65.7%)
 187 were classified as underweight, in contrast to a modest 8.3% who fell into the overweight category.
 188 The prevalence of underweight conditions was notably elevated among male students (74.7%),
 189 indicating a significant disparity ($p < 0.001$) in comparison to their female counterpart (57.1%).

190 **Table 2: Distribution of students according to their weigh status**

	Nutritional status								
	Underweight	%	Normal weight	%	Over weight	%	Total	%	
Male	219	74.7	56	19.1	18	5.2	293	100	df=2 X ² =19.9 P=.001
Female	177	57.1	101	32.5	32	10.4	310	100	
Total	396	65.7	157	26.0	50	8.3	603	100	

191

192 The table 3 displays the distribution of food outlets across the individual buffer zones. The analysis
193 incorporated a total of 97 outlets situated within 300 meters' radius. It is notable that a significant
194 proportion of these outlets were concentrated within 100 meters' buffer zone, with comparatively
195 lower count observed within broader 300 meters' buffer zone. Further, Fig 1 visualize the physical
196 characteristics of the school neighborhood food environment.

197 **Table 3: Shop distribution in given buffer zones in each educational zone**

Zone	Number of schools	Number of outlets			
		100 meters	200 meters	300 meters	Total
Moneragala	10	15 (50%)	09 (30%)	06 (20%)	30 (100%)
Bibila	10	12 (44%)	08 (29%)	07 (27%)	27 (100%)
Wellawaya	10	23 (58%)	08 (20%)	09 (22%)	40 (100%)
Total	30	50 (52%)	25 (26%)	22 (22%)	97 (100%)

198

199 Over 90% of the outlets located in the immediate vicinity of the school included in the study were
200 observed to primarily offer ready to eat deep fried snacks (such as bites, short-eats), processed
201 food items, bakery products such as bread and buns, as well as sugary treats such as sweetmeats,
202 toffee and chocolates. Surprisingly a mere 12 out of total 97 outlets surveyed (12.8%) were found
203 to have fruits available for sale. Interestingly none of the assessed food outlets offered any healthy
204 beverage options such as fresh milk or freshly squeezed fruit juice (Fig 2).

205 This study indicated that approximately two third (58.1%) students consumed snacks from food
206 outlets in the school premises. Notably, there was a discernible gender-based distinction, with a
207 higher prevalence of food consumption from these outlets observed among male students
208 compared to their female counterpart. The findings also indicated a noteworthy dietary trend, with
209 carbonated drink consumption (38.5%) significantly outweighing the intake of healthier beverage
210 alternatives (8.8%), showcasing nearly fourfold difference. Furthermore, an overwhelming 72.3%
211 of students reported the consumption of confectionaries, while 37.5% reported their consumption
212 of starch-rich food (Table 4).

213 **Table 4: Classification of food outlets offerings based on availability of diverse food items**

Food items	Number of outlets	%
<i>Unhealthy food</i>		
Deep fried food	90	92.8
Short-eats	90	92.8
Confectionaries	97	100
Bakery products	97	98.9
Carbonated beverages	80	82.5
<i>Healthy food</i>		
Pulses	00	00
Fruits	12	12.3
Dairy products (yoghurt/curd)	68	70.1
Healthy beverages (Herbal drinks/fresh milk/fruit juice)	00	00

214

215 When considering food outlets with unhealthy food available within 100 meters' radius, the
216 estimated odds of consuming unhealthy food among school students significantly increased to 2.47
217 (OR = 2.47, 95% CI: 1.52- 3.89), compared to schools situated amidst fewer outlets energy dense
218 food. Similarly, the presence of an increased number of outlets selling unhealthy food within a 200
219 meters' buffer zone doubled the likelihood of selecting unhealthy food items. (OR=1.99 95% CI
220 1.44-2.93) when compared to schools with a lesser availability of outlets with unhealthy food
221 (Table 5).

222 **Table 5: The correlation between the presence of unhealthy food within the school local**
223 **surrounding and the dietary habits of school children**

Availability of unhealthy food	Consuming energy dense food from outlets Yes vs No OR (95% CI)	p
Within 100 meters (Yes vs No)	2.47 (1.52-3.89)***	0.000
Within 200 meters	1.99 (0.46-2.9)**	0.036
Within 100 meters	1.63 (0.5- 4.75)	0.092

224
225 As presented in table 6. a statistically significant correlation has been established between
226 consumption of unhealthy food among school children and the average distance separating the
227 outlets from the respective schools within each buffer zone. Specifically, the analysis indicates a
228 positive relationship between the prevalence of unhealthy food consumption among the study
229 participants and the proximity of outlets located within 100 meters' and 200 meters' buffer zones.

230

231 **Table 6 : correlation between consumption of unhealthy food among study participants**
232 **and proximity of outlets**

Density and proximity	(Coefficient 95% CI)	P
Number of outlets within 100 meters boundary	0.344*	0.031
Number of outlets within 200 meters boundary	0.358*	0.033
Number of outlets within 300 meters boundary	0.032	0.292
Distance to the nearest shop from the school	-0.312*	0.034

233

234 **Discussion**

235 Our study revealed that nearly all food outlets situated within a 300-meter proximity were engaged
236 in selling unhealthy food, whereas only a limited number of outlets adhered to the healthy item
237 criteria defined by the school canteen policy in Sri Lanka. On the other hand, this study observed
238 that larger proportion of children (58.1%) consumed food from outlets located in school
239 neighborhood environment, and discretionary snacks, and most types of food consumed by the
240 were unhealthy. Moreover, this study indicates that the food environment of school settings has a
241 significant relationship with the dietary choices of children in those schools. This relationship is
242 reinforced as the density and proximity of food outlets in the school neighborhood increased.

243 In this study, higher percentage of unhealthy food availability in the school proximity was
244 observed. These findings are in line with the previous studies that reported a higher availability of
245 unhealthy food items in the school environment [23-24]. In agreement with existing literature
246 [25-26] our study also found males were more in to consuming food from the nearest food outlets.
247 Further, sugary beverages, bakery items and deep-fried foods were the most popular food items
248 whereas less demand for healthy food options were observed among school children. Although
249 present study did not explore the reasons for higher availability of unhealthy food in the school
250 food environment, a recent study further suggested that students may be culturally influenced for
251 consuming such energy dense foods [27]. On the other hand, recent studies had demonstrated that
252 higher fast food consumption among school children may be due to the availability of such food
253 items in the school environment [26-28]. Hence, it is possible to argue that increasing availability
254 of unhealthy food increases the demand for such food by school children. Our study re-affirmed
255 this fact as higher consumption of energy dense food from the closer proximity was observed
256 among participants.

257 This study uncovered a significant correlation between opting for unhealthy choices and the
258 proximity of unhealthy food options within a 100 meters' radius from the school premises. This
259 association is in line with the findings from previous studies conducted in the United Kingdom
260 [29] and South Korea [30] These findings underscore the powerful influence of the local food
261 environment 's density and immediate availability on the dietary preference exhibited by students.
262 Such insight holds the potential inform targeted interventions aimed at promoting their healthier
263 food options within close proximity to schools. Although, the present study involved school
264 children from low and middle income country, findings are comparable with the studies from high
265 income countries [31]. Therefore, this study re-emphasizes the need of considering evidence from

266 settings with varied socio-economic status in developing polices on the impact of school food
267 environment.

268 Existing evidence claim that solidity of food outlets coupled with availability of unhealthy food
269 options influences dietary choices of school children [32]. In contrast, this study found that
270 availability of unhealthy foods within 100 meters and 200 meters buffer zones doubled the risk of
271 consuming energy dense food by school children. This finding is in agreement with a previous
272 study that established an interaction between the availability of unhealthy food in walk shed food
273 outlets and the dietary behaviour of school going adolescents [33]. In consistent with recent
274 findings, this study indicates that outlets density in first and second buffer zones was positively
275 associated with the food consumption of the students [31-33]. Hence, present study re-emphasizes
276 that proximity can be attributed to increase the unhealthy food choices of the school children.
277 However, several studies have found no relationship between school environment and the
278 consuming energy dense food by school children [34-36]. This disparity may be due to the factor
279 that most of the studies being compared, had framed to urban communities in developed countries,
280 and assessed mostly the super-market, convinient stores as well as fast food restuerents where
281 students may not have access for purchasing food. On the other hand, this study examined only
282 the food destinatoins located within walking distance, whereas most of the studies from
283 highincome settings considered comparatively extended buffer zones for the analysis based on
284 available commuting facilities. The findings of our study demonstrated the importance of
285 enhancing current nutrition related policies through the incoorporation of regional factors which
286 encompass demographic, socio-economic and cultural factors as well as individual characteristics.
287 This approach ensures equatable distribution of policy benefits across the entire country.

288 In this study, substantial proportion of study participants were found to be underweight, and it can
289 be contented that consumption of energy-dense food is significance in attaining their ideal weight.
290 Nevertheless , empirical evidence demonstrates that consumption nutrients-deficient food serves
291 as pivotal factor in the nutritional shift from underweight to overweight or obese[37]. In addition
292 to that, recent evidence affirm that exposure to junk food options during the childhood severely
293 influence on their dietary cuture, food preference and attitudes towards unhealthy dietary practices
294 [38]. Further, frequent fast food consumers likely to decrease odds of sufficient dietary habits
295 such as lower intake of fruits and vegetables [38-39]. Our study confirms this reality by
296 highlighting a reduced inclination towards healthier food options ad advised by the school canteen
297 policy in Sri Lank .

298 The key strength of our study lies in its pioneering use of Geographical Information System (GIS)
299 to offer a comprehensive evaluation of how the school neighborhood food environment influences
300 dietary preference of school children in rural Sri Lanka. In addition to that this study introduced a
301 mechanism to define, characterize and quantify the school food environment through the
302 application of Geographical Information System. Moreover, the study investigated the influence
303 of proximity and density of food outlets on nutritional practices of school children in low income
304 community. Therefore, our findings address the knowledge gap of the impact of school food
305 environment on eating habits of school children in low income communities in Sri Lanka

306 One of the limitations is that this study examined all food outlets within the defined buffer zone,
307 in contrast to many other studies that classified these food selling establishments based on criteria
308 such as range of food choices, geographical placement and consumer oriented amenities [40-41].
309 Consequently, this approach potentially constrains our ability to fully explore how the food
310 preference of school children are influenced by physical attributes of these food outlets. Present

311 study also did not consider factors such as purchasing power of students, affordability of food,
312 quantity of consuming snacks and other motivation of consuming food from the neighborhood
313 outlets. Another limitation of the study pertains to the method used in defining the food preference
314 of school children, which relied on assessing the frequency of consumption of unhealthy food
315 items without considering quantitative analysis of food consumption pattern. Therefore, future
316 studies are encouraged to employ methods such as 24 hours' dietary recall and food frequency
317 questionnaire that could provide more detailed understanding of the dietary habits and preference
318 of the study population.

319

320 **Conclusion**

321 The present study delved into the dynamics of food availability within defined buffer zone
322 surrounding the school environment, examining the variety of food options presented in the
323 immediate vicinity. Furthermore, it aimed to establish connections between the density and
324 proximity of food outlets and the dietary choices made by students. The results emphasized a
325 concerning trend: a pronounced prevalence of unhealthy food choices within the food outlets
326 adjacent to schools. Strikingly, more than half of the surveyed population opted to obtain their
327 food from these nearby school neighborhood food outlets. The study findings also revealed a
328 notable preference for energy dense food items among the study participants. In essence, this study
329 emphasized the substantial influence wielded by the characteristics of the neighborhood food
330 environment, specifically their density and proximity.

331

332

333

334 **Recommendations**

335
336 Findings of the present study highlight that healthy food environment around the school premises
337 is important to ensure the nutritional behaviour of school children in low income community.
338 Therefore, measures to create and sustain healthy food environment should be undertaken at school
339 level as well as policy level. school canteen policy which is the only available policy for schools
340 covers merely the food environment within school premises in Sri Lanka. However, it does not
341 address the influence of crucial neighborhood food environment as highlighted by this study.
342 Therefore it is recommended to expand existing policies regarding school food environment
343 beyond school premises to include school neighborhood. Such initiatives can be based on the
344 existing similar policies to address other public health issues related to adolescents; National
345 Alcohol and Tobacco Act (NATA) [42] which prevent selling cigarette within the premises and
346 close proximity of schools. In addition to establishing policies and mechanism to monitor policy ,
347 encouraging health promotion initiatives for behavioural changes among students may contribute
348 to address issues revealed in this study.

349

350

351

352

353

354

355

356

357

358 **Section No 03- Ending Section**

359

360 **Acknowledgement**

361 The authors of the study express their heartfelt gratitude to all participants of the study, including
362 school children and shopkeepers, whose enthusiastic participation was invaluable. Special
363 recognition is extended to school staff for generously granting permission to access the school
364 premises for the purpose of data collection. Lastly, our sincere appreciation goes to the
365 administrative body of the Department of Educaiton, Uva Province Sri Lanka, for their kind
366 authorization, enabling the study to be conducted across three division.

367

368 **References**

369

- 370 1. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nation . "Healthy food environment and school food".
371 United Nation. Available from: <https://www.fao.org/school-food/areas-work/food-environment/en/#:~:text=The%20school%20food%20environment%20refers,the%20nutritional%20content%20of%20these> . (Accessed 20/03/2022).
- 374 2. Fox MK, Dodd AH, Wilson A, Gleason P. Association between School Food Environment and
375 Practices and Body Mass Index of US Public School Children. American Dietetic Association. 2009;
376 109.
- 377 3. Chaudhary A, Sudzina F, Mikkelsen BE. Promoting Healthy Eating among Young People—A Review
378 of the Evidence of the Impact of School-Based Interventions. Nutrients. 2020; 12.
- 379 4. Lytle LA, Kubik MY. Nutritional issues for adolescents. Best Pract. Res. Clin. Endocrinol. Metab.
380 2009; 17: 177-189.

- 381 5. Buck C, Bornhorst C, Pohlabein H, Huybrechts I, Pala V, Reisch L, Pigeot I. Clustering of unhealthy
382 food around German schools and its influence on dietary behavior in school children: a pilot study.
383 International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity. 2013;10.
- 384 6. Caspi CE, Sorensen G, Subramanian SV, Kawachi I. The local food environment and diet: a systematic
385 review. Health Place. 2012; 18: 1172–1187.
- 386 7. Feng J, Glass TA, Curriero FC, Stewart WF, Schwartz BS. The built environment and obesity: a
387 systematic review of the epidemiologic evidence. Health Place. 2010; 16: 175–190.
- 388 8. Jia P, Xue H, Cheng X. et al. Effects of school neighborhood food environments on childhood obesity
389 at multiple scales: a longitudinal kindergarten cohort study in the USA. BMC Med. 2019; **17**: 99.
- 390 9. Harris J, Bargh JA, Brownell D. Priming Effects of Television Food Advertising on Eating Behavior.
391 Health Psychology. 2009; 28: 404-413.
- 392 10. Sanchez BN, Vaznaugh EV, Uscilka A, Baek J, Zhang L. Differential Associations Between the
393 Food Environment Near Schools and Childhood Overweight Across Race/Ethnicity, Gender, and
394 Grade. American Journal of Epidemiology. 2012; 175: 1284-1293.
- 395 11. Nollen N, Befort C, Snow P, Daly CM, Ellerbeck F, Alhuwalia J. The school food environment and
396 adolescent obesity: Qualitative insight from highschool principals and food service personals.
397 International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activit. 2007; 4: 279-281.
- 398 12. An R, Sturm R. School and Residential Neighborhood Food Environment and Dietary Intake among
399 California Children and Adolescents. American Journal of Preventive Medicine. 2012; 42:129-135.
- 400 13. Williams J, Scarborough, P, Matthews A, Cowburn G, Roberts N, Rayner M. A systematic review of
401 the influence of the retail food environment around schools on obesity-related outcomes. Obesity
402 reviews. 2008; 15: 359-374.
- 403 14. Sri Lanka Demographic and Health Survey, Department of Senses and Statistics, Ministry of National
404 Policies and Economic Affairs. (Accessed 22/03/2022).
405 <http://www.statistics.gov.lk/Resource/en/Health/DemographicAndHealthSurveyReport-2016->
406 [Contents.pdf](http://www.statistics.gov.lk/Resource/en/Health/DemographicAndHealthSurveyReport-2016-Contents.pdf). 2016.

- 407 15. Ministry of Education, Sri Lanka (MoE). Sri Lanka Education information, Ministry of Education
408 [Online]. Nutrition Coordination Division. (Accessed 17/02/2022).
409 http://www.moe.gov.lk/web/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=300&Itemid=114&lang=env 2012.
410
- 411 16. Sirasa F, Mitchell L, Harris N. Dietary diversity and food intake of urban preschool children in North-
412 Western Sri Lanka. *Maternal & child nutrition*. 2020; 16(4): e13006.
- 413 17. Department of Census and Statistics (DSC). Poverty Indicators-2019. Ministry of Economic Policies
414 and Plan Implementation. April 2022(online). [PovertyIndicators-2019.pdf \(statistics.gov.lk\)](#).
415 [Accessed 22/03/2022].
- 416 18. Lawanga SK, Lemeshow S. Sample size determination in health studies : a practical manual. In: World
417 Health Organization (ed.). 1991. Geneva World Health Organization.
- 418 19. Gabler S, Hader S, Lynn P. Design Effects for Multiple Design Samples In: ESSEX, U. O. (ed.). United
419 Kingdom Institute for Social and Economic Research. 2005.
- 420 20. Ministry of Education, Sri Lanka (MoE), Global School-Based Students Health Survey. Ministry of
421 Health, Sri Lanka. ,(Accessed23/03/2022).
422 <https://extranet.who.int/ncdsmicrodata/index.php/catalog/30>. 2008
- 423 21. Ministry of Education, Sri Lanka (MoE). School Canteen Policy, Sri Lanka. Ministry of Education Sri
424 lanka. 2006.
- 425 22. WHO, Measuring change in nutritional status. Annex 1: Standardization procedures for the collection
426 of weight and height data in the field. Geneva: World Health Organization, 2008..
427 https://www.who.int/childgrowth/standards/Reliability_anthro.pdf?ua=1 1983.(Accessed 22/03/2022)
- 428 23. Liese A, Weis KE, Pluto D, Smith E, Lawson A. Food Store Types, Availability, and Cost of Foods in
429 a Rural Environment. *Journal of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics*. 2007; **107**: 1916-1923.
- 430 24. Rathi N, Riddle L, Worsley A. Parents' and Teachers' Views of Food Environments and Policies in
431 Indian Private Secondary Schools. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*.
432 2017; 15: 1532.

- 433 25. Datar A, Nicosia N. Junk Food in Schools and Childhood Obesity. *Journal of policy analysis and*
434 *managemen.* 2012; 31: 312-337.
- 435 26. Virtanen M, Kivimäki H, Ervasti J, Oksanen T, Pentti J, Kouvonen A. J. et al. Fast-food outlets and
436 *grocery stores near school and adolescents' eating habits and overweight in Finland. European Journal*
437 *of Public Health.* 2015; 25.
- 438 27. Roudsari HA, Vedadhir A, Amiri P, Kalantari N, Omidvar N, Eini-zinab H, Hani SM. Psycho-Socio-
439 *Cultural Determinants of Food Choice: A Qualitative Study on Adults in Social and Cultural Context*
440 *of Iran. Iranian journal of psychiatry.* 2017; 12: 241-250.
- 441 28. Jayasinghe JM, Silva LP. Fast Food Consumption and Health Status of Students of a University in Sri
442 *Lanka. Journal of Food and Agriculture,* 2014; 7: 38-50.
- 443 29. Skidmore ML, Welch AA, Sluijs EV, Jones PA, Griffin S, Cassidy A. Impact of neighbourhood food
444 *environment on food consumption in children aged 9-10 years in the UK SPEEDY (Sport, Physical*
445 *Activity and Eating behaviour: Environmental Determinants in Young People) Study". Public Health*
446 *Nurition.* 2010; 13: 1022-1030
- 447 30. Park S, Choi Y, Wang Y, Colantuoni E, Gittelsohn J. School and Neighborhood Nutrition Environment
448 *and Their Association With Students' Nutrition Behaviors and Weight Status in Seoul, South Korea.*
449 *Journal of Adolescent Health.* 2013; 53: 655-662
- 450 31. Tang X, Ohri-vachaspati P, Abbott JK, Aggarwal R, Tulloch DL, Lloyd K, Yedidia M.J.
451 *Associations between food environment around schools and professionally measured weight status for*
452 *middle and high school students. Childhood obesity.* 2014; 10 : 511-517.
- 453 32. Mheroux M, Iannotti RJ, Currie D, Pickett W, Janssen I. The food retail environment in school
454 *neighborhoods and its relation to lunchtime eating behaviors in youth from three countries. Health and*
455 *Place.* 2010; 18: 1240-1247.
- 456 33. Burgoine T, Jones AP, Namemek RJ, Benjamin SE. Associations between BMI and home, school and
457 *route environmental exposures estimated using GPS and GIS: do we see evidence of selective daily*
458 *mobility bias in children?. Int J Health Geogr.* 2015; 14.

- 459 34. García O, Tenorio Y, Ronquillo D, Ponce M. et al. Use of GIS to Measure Food Environment and Its
460 Relationship with Obesity in School-aged Children in Mexico. *Current Developments in Nutrition*.
461 2019; P04-142-19.
- 462 35. Horst K, Timperio A, Crawford D, Roberts R, Brug J, Oenema A. The school food environment:
463 associations with adolescent soft drink and snack consumption. *American Journal of Preventive*
464 *Medicine*. 2008; **35**(3), 217-223.
- 465 36. Buck C, Bornhorst C, Pohlabein H, Huybrechts I, Pala V, Reisch L, Pigeot I. Clustering of unhealthy
466 food around German schools and its influence on dietary behavior in school children: a pilot study.
467 *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*. 2013;10.
- 468 37. Ekanayake ULN. and Wijesinghe DGNG. Junk food consumption, physical activity and nutritional
469 status of adolescent school children: A case study in Rathnapura District of Sri Lanka. *Tropical*
470 *Agricultural Research*. 2021; 32(1): 105-113
- 471 38. Poti JM, Duffey KJ and Popkin BM. The association of fast food consumption with poor dietary
472 outcomes and obesity among children: is it the fast food or the remainder of the diet?. *Am J Clin Nutr*.
473 2014; 99:162–171.
- 474 39. Tambalis K, Panagoitakos D, Psarra G, and Sidossis L. Association between fast-food consumption
475 and lifestyle characteristics in Greek Children and Adolescents; Results from the EYZHN (National
476 Action for Children’s Health) programme. *Public Health Nutrition*. 2018; 21(18): 3386-339).
- 477 40. Shier V, Nicosia N, Datar A. Neighborhood and home food environment and children's diet and obesity:
478 Evidence from military personnel's installation assignment. *Soc Sci Med*. 2016 Jun;158:122-31.
- 479 41. Smagge BA, Velde LA, and Jong JC. The food environment surrounding primary schools in a diverse
480 urban area in Netherland: Linking fastfood density and proximity to neighborhood disadvantage and
481 Childhood overweight prevalence. *Front Public health*. 2022; 10:
- 482 42. NDDCB, National Authority of Tobacco and Alcohol (NATA act no; 27 of 2006), (Accessed
483 14/02/2022). <http://www.nddcb.gov.lk/Docs/acts/NATA%20Act%20English.pdf>.

Distribution of shops and schools in three education zones




Figure 1

Figure 01: Different types of snacks consumed by the study participants




Figure 2