1	Validity and reproducibility of a culturally tailored dietary screening tool for hypertension
2	risk in Nigerian healthcare
3	
4	
5	
6	Nimisoere P. Batubo ¹ , Carolyn I. Auma ¹ , J. Bernadette Moore ¹ , and Michael A.
7	Zulyniak ^{1*}
8	
9	
10	¹ Nutritional Epidemiology Group, School of Food Science and Nutrition, University of
11	Leeds, LS2 9JT.
12	
13	
14	*Corresponding author:
15	m.a.zulyniak@leeds.ac.uk (MAZ)
16	
17	Author Contributions:
18	NPB and MAZ collaborated on the research methodology design.
19	NPB led the trial, and NMN and CAA provided technical support.
20	NPB led the analysis and prepared the first draft.
21	MAZ and JBM provided analytical expertise. MAZ, JBM, and CIA provided critical feedback.
22	NPB revised the manuscript. All authors approved the final manuscript.
23	
24	
25	
26	NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

27 Abstract

28 Food frequency questionnaires (FFQ) are commonly used tools in dietary assessment 29 but require validation. This study aimed to assess the relative validity and reproducibility of a culturally tailored FFQ for estimating food intake among Nigerian adults in clinical settings. 30 31 The FFO was administered to 58 patients at the Rivers State University Teaching Hospital, 32 Nigeria, on two occasions, two weeks apart. Three repeat non-consecutive 24-hour dietary recalls (24DR) were also conducted as a reference method to evaluate the validity of the FFO. 33 Spearman's rank correlations, Wilcoxon signed-rank tests, cross-classification agreement, 34 intraclass correlation coefficients (ICC), and Bland-Altman analysis were performed in R to 35 36 evaluate the relative validity and reproducibility. The trial was registered with 37 *ClinicalTrials.gov:* NCT05973760. The correlation coefficient (r_s) between the FFQ and 24DR 38 ranged from 0.20 for 'fats and oils' to 0.78 for vegetables, with an average r_s of 0.60 (p < 0.05). 39 The Wilcoxon signed-rank tests indicated no significant differences in the 19 food groups 40 queried (p>0.05), except for fats and oils (p<0.05). The exact agreement between FFQ and 24DR for classifying individuals into quartiles ranged from 17% for salt to 88% for processed 41 meats and alcoholic drinks, with 90% of individuals classified into the same or neighbouring 42 quartile. Additionally, the Bland-Altman analysis demonstrated acceptable agreement, with > 43 44 96% of observations within the acceptable limits of agreement for all food groups. For 45 reproducibility, the ICC ranged from 0.31 for stew to 0.98 for fruit, with an average ICC of 0.77 between the FFQs delivered two weeks apart. These data demonstrate good agreement 46 between our culturally tailored FFQ and 24DR, and moreover, robust reproducibility for 47 quantifying intakes of food groups associated with hypertension in Nigeria. This confirms that 48 49 this novel FFQ is a valid and reliable tool for assessing the intake of key food groups among 50 Nigerian adults.

Keywords: Dietary assessment, food frequency questionnaire, Nigeria, relative validity,
reproducibility, 24-hour dietary recalls

54

55 Introduction

Hypertension is a leading risk factor for cardiovascular disease [1], which is annually attributes to over 10 million deaths worldwide [2, 3]. The highest hypertension burdens exist in low- and middle-income countries, with over 30% of adults affected in some African regions [4, 5]. In Nigeria specifically, hypertension prevalence has more than doubled since 1990, from 11.4% to 24.8% in 2015, with just over a quarter of hypertensive adults achieving blood pressure control [6, 7]. This escalating epidemic underscores an urgent need for improved screening, treatment, and prevention strategies.

63

Unhealthy dietary patterns are a predominant modifiable risk factor for hypertension 64 65 globally, including in Sub-Saharan Africa [8, 9]. Specifically, diets characterised by elevated levels of saturated fat, processed meats, and sugar-sweetened beverages have been associated 66 with an increased risk of hypertension [10]. Moreover, deficiencies in vital dietary components 67 like fruits, vegetables, nuts, legumes, and omega-3 fatty acids from seafood correlate with 68 elevated blood pressure levels [11]. In our prior research, we highlighted a significant 69 70 association between high consumption of diets rich in dietary salt, red meat, processed foods, 71 fried foods, dietary fat, and alcohol and an elevated risk of hypertension with a mean overall 72 risk increase of 1.42 not only in Nigeria but also in various West African countries [12]. The 73 average daily sodium intake in Nigeria ranges from 9-12 grams, which exceeds the World 74 Health Organization's (WHO's) recommended limit of 5 grams [13]. This highlights dietary optimisation as a crucial component of population-level and clinical hypertension prevention 75 strategies in Nigeria. 76

77

78 Dietary assessment represents an essential first step for establishing the association between diet and chronic diseases and designing effective public health dietary prevention 79 80 strategies against chronic conditions, including hypertension [14]. To ensure optimal relevance 81 and validity, dietary assessment tools must be customised to the cultural context of the 82 population, encompassing region-specific foods, meals, serving sizes, and eating patterns [15]. Food frequency questionnaires (FFQs) developed for Western populations show limited 83 validity for immigrant groups retaining traditional diets [16]. This underscores the need for 84 85 culturally adapted FFQs, especially in ethnically diverse countries like Nigeria, which has over 250 ethnic groups [17]. However, culturally specific and validated FFOs for assessing dietary 86 87 status, particularly for hypertension, are notably lacking in Nigeria and other West African 88 countries, impeding progress in diet-disease research and clinical support.

89

In this study, following a robust validation protocol in a clinical setting in Nigeria, the
validity of a novel culturally tailored FFQ was evaluated against three repeat 24-hour dietary
recalls (24DR). Through assessing reproducibility, we sought to enhance the applicability of
the FFQ in hypertension management and provide crucial insights for implementing the FFQ
tailored to the Nigerian population.

95

96 Materials and methods

97 Study design and setting

98 This was a single-centre study incorporating both quantitative and qualitative 99 methodologies. We sought to assess the relative validity and reproducibility of a newly 100 developed tailored dietary screening tool consisting of a 27-food groups that we aim to

incorporate into routine clinical practice in Nigeria to identify adults at high risk of
hypertension. The investigation was conducted at the Internal Medicine and Family Medicine
Department outpatient clinics of Rivers State University Teaching Hospital (RSUTH) in Port
Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria.

105

106 Ethics approval

107

The study protocol underwent review by two ethics boards. Firstly, it was submitted to 108 109 the Business, Earth & Environment, Social Sciences (AREA FREC) Committee at the University of Leeds, Leeds, United Kingdom, on the 21st of March 2023. Subsequently, it was 110 111 presented to the Rivers State University Teaching Hospital Research Ethics Committee in Port Harcourt, Nigeria, on March 20th, 2023. Final approvals were granted with the following 112 reference numbers: 0484 on 28/04/2023 and RSUTH/REC/2023316 on 30/03/2023, 113 respectively. The trial was duly registered at *clinicaltrials.gov* under the identifier 114 NCT05973760. 115

116

117 Eligible participants

118

119 Our study enrolled adult patients between the ages of 18 to 70 years attending the Rivers 120 State University Teaching Hospital for their routine medical care, including both men and 121 women, who had been residing in Nigeria for at least two years and possessed proficiency in 122 reading, writing, and communicating in English. The complete list of inclusion and exclusion 123 criteria are present in **Table 1**.

124

125

Table 1: Inclusion and exclusion criteria

Inclusion criteria	Exclusion criteria
Age between 18 and 70 years	Individuals < 18 years or > 70 years of age
Men and women	Pregnant women or intent to become pregnant or
	breastfeeding woman
Hypertensive or non-hypertensive individual	Diagnosis of other chronic diseases such as cancer,
	diabetes, renal failure, endocrine diseases, and
	previous and recent incidence of cardiovascular
	disease (CVD) and stroke
Individuals who have been residents in Nigeria for	Individuals who have been resident in Nigeria for
the past 2 years	shorter than 2 years
Ability to read, write, and communicate over the	Individuals on dietary restriction or recent changes to
phone in English	their diet or food
Individuals who gave their consent to participate	Individuals who did not give their consent to
	participate or are currently enrolled in other studies

128

129

130

131

Participant recruitment and informed consent

Participant recruitment occurred over four weeks in July 2023 during regular clinic 132 visits. This process was facilitated through strategically placed recruitment posters within the 133 134 hospital premises, referrals from healthcare professionals, and morning briefing sessions at the outpatient clinics of the Internal Medicine and Family Medicine Departments of RSUTH. 135 Patients expressing interest in the study were screened for eligibility using a structured 136 questionnaire (Table 1). Subsequently, eligible patients were categorised into either the 137 hypertension or non-hypertension groups. The study adheres to SPIRIT guidelines for reporting 138 clinical trials [18]. Before participation, each participant received and reviewed a simplified 139 140 version of the participant information sheet. They had the opportunity to address any queries

or concerns with the study personnel, ensuring their consent to participate was voluntary and
fully informed. All patients provided written informed consent before participating in the study

143

144 Sample size and sampling technique

145 Previous validation studies investigating the correlation between FFQs and 24DR have 146 demonstrated good agreement, with correlation coefficients (r_s) ranging from 0.3 to 0.7 [19-147 22]. A moderate $r_s = 0.5$ is typically considered a robust indicator of correlation [23]; therefore, 148 it was used to estimate the sample size along with a statistical power of P = 0.8, a 95% 149 confidence interval, and a two-tailed alpha level of 0.05 utilising the G*Power software [24]. 150 151 While a minimum of 29 participants was determined to be required to accommodate an 152 anticipated dropout rate of 20% and address any potential missing or incomplete data, we set 153 the target sample size at 50 participants [25, 26]. Eligible participants were recruited through a non-probability convenience sampling method. 154

155

156 **Dietary Assessment**

157

159

158 Dietary screening tool

The dietary screening tool was a newly developed, 27-food group semi-quantitative 160 161 food frequency questionnaire (FFQ) that was designed to capture the usual food intake over the past month. The initial list of commonly consumed foods was created through guidance 162 163 from the Nigerian and Ghana National Nutritional Guideline on Non-Communicable Disease Prevention, Control and Management [27, 28] and supported by our prior systematic review 164 165 and meta-analysis the investigated dietary factors associated with hypertension in the West 166 Africa [12]. Designed to be completed in less than 20 minutes, the final FFO comprised 26 questions on major food groups and an additional 6 questions related to salt (S1 Table). These 167 168 food groups encompassed various foods such as fruit, vegetable, fibre-breakfast cereals, rice

and pasta, beans, yam and potatoes, fried or fast foods, whole meat, white meat, processed meat, sugary fizzy drinks and fruits, diet non-alcoholic drinks, tea and coffee, soups and stew (fatty soups, vegetable soups, draw soups, native soups, and stews), nuts and seeds, dessert and sweets, fats and oils, salt, milk and milk-based beverages (**S1 Table**). For each food item, participants were asked about the frequency of consumption over the past month, with response options ranging from 'rarely or never,' '1-2 times/week,' '3-5 times/week,' to 'daily,' and 'more than once per day' (**S1 Table**).

176

177 178

7 24-hour Dietary Recalls (24DR)

Three repeat 24-hour dietary recalls (24DR) were conducted by trained nutritionists on non-consecutive days, covering two weekdays and one weekend day. This approach aimed to account for the day-to-day variation in dietary intake. Throughout the recalls, detailed descriptions of all foods, snacks and beverages consumed in the preceding 24 hours were recorded, including cooking methods and brand names (where possible).

184

185 Data Collection

186

Data collection was over four weeks in August 2023. At clinic visit 1 in week 1, the 187 eligible consenting patients completed sociodemographic and health status questionnaires and 188 underwent baseline assessments, including height, weight, and blood pressure measurement 189 190 (Fig 1). The height and body weight were measured twice using a standard stadiometer (model 191 number: DG2301, China), and the Body mass index (BMI) was calculated based on the 192 measurements from the height and weight using the formula BMI= body weight in Kg/ (height 193 in metre)². The participant's blood pressure was recorded twice in the non-dominant arm using 194 an automated mercury sphygmomanometer (model number: ZK-BB68, Shenzhen, China).

196 Fig 1. Study design, patient recruitment, enrolment, and data collection flowchart.

197 FFQ1: first food frequency questionnaire, FFQ2: second food frequency questionnaire, 24DR1:
198 first 24-hour dietary recall, 24DR2: second 24-hour dietary recall, 24DR3: third 24-hour
199 dietary recall, BP: Blood pressure, H: Height, W: Weight.

200

201 At clinic visit 2 in week 2, eligible consenting patients completed the first self-202 administered dietary screening (FFQ1) tool. In conjunction with the FFQ1, the first interview-203 based 24DR (24DR1) was conducted to collect patient food intake data for the past 24 hours 204 on one weekday using the multiple-pass method [29-31]. The second 24DR (24DR2) was conducted by phone to collect the patients' food intake on a weekend day in week 2 (Fig 1). 205 206 During clinic visit 3, the study patients completed the FFQ for the second time (FFQ2). The 207 third 24DR (24DR3) was conducted on another weekday to collect food intake data for the past 208 24 hours. Finally, a second measurement of height, weight, and blood pressure was collected 209 (Fig 1).

- 210
- 211 212

Participant compensation

Upon completing all the requirements of the study protocol, consisting of the two FFQs and the three 24DR, and including all the physical measurements (weight, height, and blood pressure), patients were given a token of appreciation in the form of a £5 gift (equivalent to approximately \aleph 6,000). This was extended to participants as a gesture of gratitude for their participation and compensation for their valuable time.

218

- 219 Statistical analysis
- 220

Dietary data (i.e., frequencies of food group intakes) from the first FFQ (FFQ1), second
FFQ (FFQ2) and the three repeats 24-hour dietary recalls (24DR1, 24DR2 and 24DR3) for

223 each participant were entered into a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet with quality checks. The 224 frequencies of intakes reported in FFQ1 and FFQ2 were converted into servings/day by multiplying the average servings per week and then dividing the average by 7 days according 225 226 to the method by Fatihal et al. [32]. For example, 3-5 times/ week was converted ($[3+5/2] \div 7$ 227 days) into 0.57 serving/day. The salt intake assessed by the FFQ was coded numerically as '1 228 for 'never or rarely', 2 for 'sometimes', 3 for 'usually' and 4 for 'always'. The food intake data 229 from the FFQ and 24DR data were aggregated into 20 major food groups (S2 Table). The mean 230 of the FFQ was calculated by combining the data from both administrations (FFQ1 and FFQ2). 231 Additionally, the mean for the 24DR was computed based on three non-consecutive repetitions 232 of the 24DR. These means were used for the validity analysis.

233

The frequency data and the mean differences between the FFQ and 24DR were tested for normality using the Shapiro-Wilk [33] and Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests [34] with inspection of the histogram. The data were not normally distributed; therefore, non-parametric methods were used for the analysis. The results were reported as mean, median and interquartile range (IQR) for continuous data and n (%) for categorical data. P-values <0.05 were considered statistically significant. All analyses were performed using R Statistical Software (v4.3.1) [35]. The statistical analyses were performed in 2 phases.

241

In the first phase, we used multiple methods to assess the relative validity of the FFQ by evaluating the agreement between the mean of the FFQ and the mean of the 24DR. First, Spearman's rank correlation was used to compare the frequency of food group intakes from the FFQ with those from the 24DR. A correlation coefficient above 0.5 indicated a good correlation [36]. Secondly, the Wilcoxon signed-rank test compared the difference between the mean FFQ and mean 24DR for each food group. A *p*-value > 0.05 was considered to indicate

no statistically significant difference and good agreement [37, 38]. Thirdly, the cross-248 249 classification of intakes into quartiles by the 3 methods (FFO and 24DR); (i) proportion of 250 exact agreement, deviation by 1 quartile; (ii) proportion of adjacent agreement, indicating 251 deviation by adjacent quartiles; and (ii) proportion of grossly misclassified participants, disagreement by 3 quartiles. Finally, the Bland-Altman analysis [39] was used to assess the 252 253 level of agreement and whether differences between FFQ and 24DR estimated measurements 254 were dependent on the magnitude of measurements. The mean difference (mean FFQ- mean 255 24DR) was plotted against the average of the two measures ([mean FFO + mean 24DR)/2]) for 256 each food group. An acceptable level of agreement was defined as differences in means falling 257 within the range of ± 3 standard deviations (SDs) [40]. Additionally, the relative differences 258 (%) within this range were calculated to quantify agreement.

259

In phase 2, we assessed the reproducibility of the FFQ at two different administrations 260 (FFO1 vs FFO2). The strength and association of the FFO1 and FFO2 were evaluated using 261 262 Spearman's rank correlations. The agreement and consistency between food groups from the two FFQ administrations were assessed using intraclass correlation coefficients (ICCs). ICC 263 264 values were calculated based on a single rating, absolute agreement, and 2-way mixed-effects model [41]. ICC values above 0.60 were considered evidence of good reproducibility between 265 266 the two FFO administrations [36]. The ranking agreement between the FFO1 and FFO2 was 267 evaluated using the Wilcoxon signed-rank test, and a *p*-value >0.05 was considered to indicate 268 a good agreement between the FFQ1 and FFQ2.

269

270

272 **Results**

273

275

274 **Participant characteristics**

A total of 90 patients indicated interest in the study. Of these, 66 met the inclusion 276 criteria and consented to participate in the study. Of the 66 eligible consenting patients, 58 277 completed the study protocol and their data were included in the final data analysis (Fig 2). 278 The overall average age was 42.6 ± 11.9 years, with hypertensive participants being older, on 279 280 average 46.4 ± 10.1 years, compared to non-hypertensives with a mean age of 38.7 ± 12.4 years. The majority of participants were female (69%) and over two-thirds (69%) had 281 282 university or postgraduate education. Family history of hypertension was reported by 55.2% (Table 2). 283

284

Fig 2. Participant selection and sequence of assessments flowchart. FFQ: food frequency
questionnaire, 24DR: 24-hour dietary recalls.

288	Table 2.	Sociodemographic	, anthropometric,	and clinical	characteristics	of participants
-----	----------	------------------	-------------------	--------------	-----------------	-----------------

Characteristics	Overall (n=58)	Non-hypertensive (<i>n</i> =29)	Hypertensive(<i>n</i> =29)
Age (years), mean \pm SD	42.6 ± 11.9	38.7 ± 12.4	46.4 ± 10.1
Sex, <i>n</i> (%)			
Male	18 (31.0)	9 (31.0)	9 (31.0)
Female	40 (69.0)	20 (69.0)	20 (69.0)
Education <i>n</i> (%)			
Primary	2 (3.5)	1 (3.5)	1 (3.5)
Secondary	12 (20.7)	3 (10.3)	9 (31.0)
High school	4 (6.9)	2 (6.9)	2 (6.9)
University	26 (44.8)	14 (48.3)	12 (41.4)
Postgraduate	14 (24.1)	9 (31.0)	5 (17.2)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.01.24.24301732; this version posted January 24, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a	CC-BV 4 0	International	liconso
It is made available under a	CC-DT 4.0	memanona	license.

Family history of Hypertension, <i>n</i> (%)			
Yes	32 (55.2)	19 (65.5)	13 (44.8)
Years of hypertension <i>n</i> (%)			
< 1 year	9 (31.0)	NA	9 (31.0)
1-5 years	8 (27.6)	NA	8 (27.6)
> 5 years	12 (41.4)	NA	12 (41.4)
Antihypertensive medications use <i>n</i> (%)			
Yes	16 (55.2)	None	16 (55.2)
No	13 (44.8)	None	13 (44.8)
Height (m)	1.65 ± 0.1	1.68 ± 0.1	1.62 ± 0.1
Body weight (kg)	79.4 ± 17.2	75.0 ± 15.4	83.8 ± 18.1
Body mass index (kg/m ²)	29.5 ± 7.1	26.9 ± 6.8	32.1 ± 6.4
Blood pressure			
SBP (mmHg)	140.3 ± 23.9	121.0 ± 11.7	159.0 ± 16.9
DBP (mmHg)	87.4 ± 17.3	75.4 ± 9.7	99.3 ± 14.8

290

289 Data are presented as: n= frequency, %= percentage, mean ± SD= Standard deviation, NA = not applicable

A considerable proportion of participants had experienced hypertension for more than 5 years (41.4%), but only 55.2% reported using antihypertensive medications. Participants with hypertension, on average, appeared to be heavier (83.8kg vs 75kg), with more presenting with obesity (mean+/- SD BMI: $32.1 \pm 6.4 \text{ kg/m}^2$) than those who did not have hypertension (26.9 $\pm 6.8 \text{ kg/m}^2$). Similarly, participants with hypertension, on average, had higher systolic blood pressures (159.0 \pm 16.9 mmHg vs 121.0 \pm 11.7 mmHg) in spite of a high percentage using antihypertensive medications (**Table 2**).

298

Dietary intake assessment

The mean and median servings/day were similar between the two dietary assessment methods for most food groups (**Table 3**). The mean fold differences varied from 0.25 for fats and oils to 1.25 for yam and potatoes, indicating that, on average, the FFQ provided food groups intake estimates within 75% below to 25% above the 24DR amounts. Overall, no significant differences were observed between the food group intakes estimated by the FFQ and the 24DR.

307 Table 3. Food group intake estimates from the novel food frequency questionnaire (FFQ) and308 the 24-hour dietary recall (24DR).

Food Group		FFQ		24DR			Mean Fold Difference (FEO/24DB)		
(servings/day)	Mean	Median	IQR	Mean	Median	IQR	Mean	95% CI	<i>p</i> -value
Fruit	0.38	0.21	0.57	0.35	0.33	0.67	1.09	0.82; 1.41	0.288
Vegetables	0.48	0.21	0.36	0.46	0.39	0.36	1.05	0.94; 1.19	0.193
Grains	0.40	0.33	0.19	0.42	0.44	0.20	0.96	0.84; 1.10	0.741
Beans and lentils	0.33	0.21	0.36	0.34	0.33	0.26	0.99	0.82; 1.12	0.723
Meat	0.55	0.50	0.30	0.61	0.50	0.29	0.90	0.80; 1.00	0.975
Processed meat	0.16	0.00	0.21	0.14	0.00	0.00	1.19	0.95; 1.59	0.069
Fish and seafoods	0.62	0.39	0.58	0.54	0.33	0.59	1.16	0.96; 1.36	0.058
Eggs	0.32	0.21	0.36	0.31	0.33	0.67	1.04	0.85; 1.28	0.365
Fried or fast food	0.23	0.21	0.37	0.29	0.33	0.33	0.80	0.62; 1.03	0.954
Yam and potatoes	0.30	0.21	0.18	0.25	0.33	0.33	1.25	0.88; 1.85	0.136
Soups	0.35	0.32	0.22	0.33	0.33	0.23	1.08	0.96; 1.20	0.096
Stew	0.45	0.39	0.36	0.42	0.33	0.34	1.09	0.92; 1.27	0.164
Nuts and seeds	0.46	0.29	0.36	0.44	0.33	0.67	1.06	0.86; 1.29	0.298
Desserts and sweets	0.19	0.00	0.21	0.21	0.00	0.33	0.96	0.60; 1.48	0.615
Soft drinks	0.22	0.13	0.24	0.19	0.17	0.33	1.15	0.85; 1.57	0.222
Alcoholic drinks	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.04	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.43; 1.57	0.787
Tea and coffee	0.39	0.21	0.47	0.34	0.33	0.67	1.15	0.89; 1.47	0.153
Milk and milk drinks	0.46	0.39	0.36	0.48	0.33	0.34	0.96	0.82; 1.11	0.739

Fats and oils	0.58	0.57	0.74	2.30	2.33	0.92	0.25	0.20; 0.31	1.000
Salt and seasonings	3.37	4.00	1.00	3.45	3.33	1.33	0.98	0.88; 1.08	0.672

309

310

FFO: Food frequency questionnaire; 24DR: 24-hour dietary recalls; IOR: Interquartile range

- Assessment of relative validity 311
- 312
- 313

To assess the validity of the FFO, we evaluated the relationship between the food group intake estimated by the FFQ relative to the 24DR. The Spearman's correlation coefficients (r_s) 314 315 ranged from 0.20 for fats and oils to 0.78 for vegetables, with an average correlation coefficient 316 of 0.60 (**Table 4**). Although weaker positive correlation coefficients ($r_s < 0.3$) were found for fat & oils, and salt, most of the food groups (n=15) had a correlation coefficient ≥ 0.50 , 317 indicating a strong positive correlation between the mean FFQ and mean 24DR (p<0.05). In 318 319 addition, among the 20 food groups evaluated in the FFQ, 19 food groups had no significant 320 differences (p>0.05) in the mean and median intakes compared to 24DR when a Wilcoxon signed-rank test was applied — the exception was 'fats and oils' (p < 0.05) (Table 4). Overall, 321 322 the results suggest that the FFQ provides comparable rankings and intake estimates for most

foods (n=19) compared to 24DR and shows good agreement between the dietary assessment 323 324 approaches.

- 325
- **Table 4**. Comparison of food group intake obtained from a semi-quantitative food frequency
 326 327 questionnaire (FFQ) and the 24-hour dietary recalls (24DRs).

Food Group	Agreement between FFQ and 24DR			Disagreement between FFQ and 24DR		
(servings/day)	r _s	^{<i>a</i>} <i>p</i> -value	^b p-value	Exact (%)	Adjacent (%)	GM ¹ (%)
Fruit	0.65	< 0.001	0.748	53	33	14
Vegetables	0.78	< 0.001	0.706	50	45	5
Grains	0.64	< 0.001	0.042	40	53	7
Beans and lentils	0.64	<0.001	0.632	53	40	7

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.01.24.24301732; this version posted January 24, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a	CC-BY	Y 4.0 International license.

Meat	0.65	< 0.001	0.063	50	43	7
					-	
Processed meat	0.74	< 0.001	0.215	88	10	2
Fish and seafoods	0.72	< 0.001	0.869	62	35	3
Eggs	0.77	< 0.001	0.224	28	55	17
Fried or fast food	0.48	< 0.001	0.081	52	33	15
Yam and potatoes	0.37	0.004	0.619	45	45	10
Soups	0.66	< 0.001	0.361	48	45	7
Stew	0.62	< 0.001	0.174	47	47	7
Nuts and seeds	0.71	< 0.001	0.862	66	31	3
Desserts and sweets	0.47	< 0.001	0.237	64	26	10
Soft drinks	0.65	< 0.001	0.806	69	29	2
Alcoholic drinks	0.63	< 0.001	0.287	88	12	0
Tea and coffee	0.55	< 0.001	0.501	48	38	14
Milk & milk drinks	0.75	< 0.001	0.338	67	26	7
Fats and oils	0.20	0.135	<0.001	22	59	19
Salt and seasonings	0.22	0.154	0.968	17	24	59

¹ Gross misclassification, disagreement by 3 quartiles, r_s. Spearman's correlation coefficient, ^a: p-value of Spearman's

329 Rank correlation coefficients, ^bp-value: p-value for Wilcoxon signed-rank test of difference. FFQ: Food frequency

330 questionnaire; 24DR: 24-hour dietary recalls

331

332

Additionally, the percentage of participants grossly misclassified by 3 quartiles ranged from 0% for alcoholic drinks to 59% for salt, with an average of 11% (**Table 4**). For most food groups (n=15), over 50% of the participants were classified into the same or neighbouring quartile. Specifically, the classification of participants into the exact or adjacent quartiles ranges from 10% for dessert and sweets to 88% for processed meat and alcoholic drinks, with an average exact agreement of 53% and an adjacent agreement of 37% (**Table 4**). Importantly,

90% of participants were classified in the same or neighbouring quartile, indicating a goodagreement between the FFQ and 24DR.

341

342 Furthermore, the Bland-Altman analysis was used to assess the level of agreement 343 between the FFQ and 24DR (S3 Table). Fig 3A-F presents the Bland-Altman plots for the 3 344 healthy food groups of the DASH diet (e.g., fruits, vegetables, and nuts and seeds) [42] and 3 345 less healthy food groups/items identified by our recent meta-analysis of foods associated with hypertension in West African countries, including Nigeria [12] (e.g., salt, fried/fast foods, and 346 347 fats and oils). The plots for the remaining food groups are provided in supplementary materials (S1 Fig). Although moderate bias and wide limits of agreement (-4.18 to 3.93) were observed 348 349 for fats/oils and salt food groups (Fig 3D-F), very limited bias was observed for the majority 350 (n=18) of the food groups, where mean differences (bias) ranged from -0.06 servings/day (meat 351 and fried and fast foods) to 0.08 servings/day (fish) (Fig 3A- 3C and S1 Fig). In addition, the 352 95% limits of agreement (LOA) spanned from -1.23 to -0.20 servings/day (lower LOA) to 0.19 353 to 1.40 servings/day (upper LOA) for most food groups (n=18), suggesting reasonable agreement (S3 Table). A high proportion (>96%) of observations fell within the acceptable 354 355 limits of agreement (± 3 standard deviation LOA) without increased differences across higher food intake ranges (S3 Table). In summary, the Bland-Altman analysis and plots suggest a 356 357 high level of agreement between the FFQ and 24DR for the majority of food groups assessed 358 (*n*=18).

359

Fig 3. Bland-Altman plots related to food groups identified in the DASH diet (A: Fruit, B: Vegetables, C:
Nuts and seeds) and D: Salts, E: Fried and fast foods and F: Fats and oils.

362 Differences in the serving/day of food groups derived from the mean of the three repeat 24-hour recalls (24DR)363 and the mean of the food frequency questionnaire (FFQ) were plotted against the corresponding mean serving/day

364 derived from the two methods. Dashed red lines represent the mean difference (bias), and dashed blue lines show 365 the upper and lower 95% limits of agreement (n=58).

366

- 367

Assessment of reproducibility 368

369

Assessing reproducibility between the two administrations of the FFO. Spearman's 370 ranked correlation coefficient ranged from 0.38 for yam and potatoes to 0.97 for salt, with an 371 372 average correlation coefficient of 0.75, with most food groups (17/20) showing correlation 373 coefficients above 0.60. All correlation coefficients were statistically significant (p < 0.001), 374 reaffirming the high level of agreement between the two FFQs (Table 5). Additionally, among the 20 food groups evaluated for reproducibility, no significant differences in the mean and 375 median intakes between the FFQ1 and FFQ2 were observed in the Wilcoxon signed-rank test 376 377 for all the food groups (p>0.05) (Table 5).

378

379 Furthermore, the intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC) was used to evaluate the 380 consistency and agreement between the FFQ1 and FFQ2 (Table 5). ICCs ranged from 0.31 for 381 stew to 0.98 for fruit, with an average intraclass correlation coefficient of 0.77. The majority 382 of food groups (n=17) had ICC >0.70, which, according to the criteria of Koo and Li [41] and 383 Cade et al. [36], indicates good to excellent reproducibility (Table 5). These findings suggest good reproducibility and consistency in individual rankings and negligible between time points 384 385 for the FFQ, confirming the test-retest reliability of the FFQ across the food groups evaluated. 386

 Table 5 Reproducibility on the number of food group serving/day estimated by repeated
 387

388 administration of a Food Frequency Questionnaire

Food Groups	FFQ1	FFQ2	Reproducibility (FFQ1 and FFQ2)
-------------	------	------	---------------------------------

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.01.24.24301732; this version posted January 24, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

IL IS ITIAUE AVAIIADIE UTIUEI A CC-DT 4.0 ITILEITIALIONALIICENSE	under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .
--	---

(Servings/day)	Mean	Median	IQR	Mean	Median	IQR	rs	* <i>p</i> -value	ICC	95%CI
Fruit	0.38	0.21	0.57	0.39	0.21	0.57	0.90	0.750	0.98	0.96; 0.98
Vegetables	0.49	0.21	0.36	0.46	0.21	0.36	0.84	0.154	0.92	0.88; 0.95
Grains	0.43	0.21	0.57	0.42	0.21	0.57	0.70	0.577	0.72	0.64; 0.79
Beans and lentils	0.32	0.21	0.36	0.33	0.21	0.36	0.91	0.479	0.87	0.80; 0.92
Meat	0.59	0.57	0.79	0.56	0.57	0.79	0.83	0.123	0.85	0.80; 0.90
Processed meat	0.16	0.00	0.21	0.15	0.00	0.21	0.79	0.751	0.87	0.79; 0.92
Fish and seafoods	0.65	0.39	0.79	0.58	0.39	0.79	0.79	0.166	0.80	0.68; 0.88
Eggs	0.31	0.21	0.36	0.33	0.21	0.36	0.85	0.590	0.79	0.66; 0.87
Fried or fast foods	0.26	0.21	0.48	0.22	0.21	0.21	0.76	0.203	0.73	0.59; 0.83
Yam and potatoes	0.29	0.21	0.27	0.32	0.21	0.00	0.38	0.886	0.55	0.34; 0.71
Soups	0.35	0.21	0.36	0.21	0.21	0.36	0.65	0.783	0.75	0.69; 0.80
Stew	0.45	0.39	0.36	0.46	0.21	0.36	0.53	0.867	0.31	0.06; 0.53
Nuts and seeds	0.54	0.21	0.36	0.39	0.21	0.36	0.68	0.099	0.50	0.28; 0.67
Desserts & sweets	0.19	0.00	0.21	0.19	0.00	0.21	0.55	0.746	0.45	0.21; 0.63
Soft drinks	0.23	0.00	0.21	0.21	0.00	0.21	0.87	0.290	0.92	0.89; 0.95
Alcoholic drinks	0.04	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.71	0.773	0.94	0.91; 0.97
Tea and coffee	0.38	0.21	0.36	0.39	0.21	0.57	0.73	0.944	0.73	0.58; 0.83
Milk & milk drinks	0.44	0.21	0.36	0.46	0.39	0.36	0.92	1.000	0.95	0.92; 097
Fats and oils	0.57	0.57	0.79	0.57	0.57	0.79	0.62	0.985	0.72	0.57; 0.82
Salt intake	0.83	1.00	0.29	0.81	1.00	0.29	0.97	0.371	0.96	0.94; 0.98

389 FFQ1: First food frequency questionnaire administration, FFQ2: Second food frequency questionnaire 390 administration, ICC: Intraclass correlation coefficients (p<0.05), CI= Confidence interval of ICC, r_s : Spearman's 391 rank correlation coefficient, IQR: Interquartile range, *p-value for the test of the difference between FFQ1 and 392 FFQ2 by Wilcoxon signed-rank test.

393

394 **Discussion**

395

This study is the first to test and validate a culturally sensitive food frequency questionnaire (FFQ) for dietary screening of men and women for high-risk dietary habits associated with hypertension in a Nigerian clinic. Our aim is for the tool to be used by clinicians

and patients across West Africa to: (i) facilitate discussions of dietary habits and cardiovascular
health in the clinical setting; (ii) inform personalised dietary advice for patients at risk or with
hypertension; and (iii) empower its citizens to take an active role in managing hypertension.
With the participation of 58 men and women, the FFQ demonstrated good validity and
reproducibility in a clinical setting for assessing intakes of food associated with hypertension
in Nigeria, compared to 24DR.

405

407

406 **Relative validation**

In all validation studies, some under- and over-estimation is expected but must be 408 409 within an acceptable range. Streppel et al. evaluated the validity of an FFQ against the 24DR among 128 Dutch adults and reported overestimation in 13 of 21 foods by the FFQ [43], while 410 411 Steinemann et al. reported overestimation in 13 of 25 foods compared to a 4-day weighed food record among 56 participants in Germany and a correlation coefficients from 0.09 (soup) to 412 0.92 (alcohol) with 16 out of the 25 food groups having correlation coefficients <0.50 [6][21]. 413 414 Our FFQ demonstrated similar measures of overestimation from 4-25% and correlation coefficients between the FFQ and 24DR from 0.20 to 0.78, with the majority of the food groups 415 (n=15) demonstrating moderate to strong positive correlations ($r_s > 0.50$), indicating good 416 417 agreement.

Additionally, our study reported that 90% of participants were classified into the same or neighbouring quartiles when comparing FFQ and 24DR, where the exact agreement for most food groups (17/27) was 30-88% with an average gross misclassification of 11% across food groups. This is in agreement with other successful validation studies in Australia (n=96 adults) that reported 27-70% exact agreement and under 15% gross misclassification for most food groups [44, 45].

425 Finally, the Bland-Altman method [39] was used to illustrate the agreement between 426 the FFQ and 24DR. Although 'Fats and oils' and salt were underestimated by the FFQ, as noted 427 in other studies [46], the majority of the food groups assessed in our study demonstrated 428 minimal bias. Indeed, > 96% of observations were within acceptable limits of agreement. This aligns with or exceeds the results of previous work, where FFQ validations study among (i) 429 430 130 men with prostate cancer reported similar small mean differences and acceptable agreements across 11 food groups [40]; and, (ii) 114 Lebanese adults with >80% agreement 431 432 for the majority of the food groups [47]. Collectively, these results suggest that the validity of 433 our novel FFQ meets or exceeds the levels of agreement reported by other validation studies and indicates that our tailored FFQ is well-designed for capturing the dietary habits of men and 434 435 women in Nigerian populations.

436

438

437 **Reproducibility**

439 The reproducibility of an FFQ is an important attribute to minimise bias [48]. The FFQ 440 exhibited commendable reproducibility between the two collection points (FFQ1 vs FFQ2), 441 vielding a robust positive correlation that surpassed $r_s > 0.50$ for the majority of assessed food groups and intraclass correlation coefficient > 0.70 for all the food groups assessed. These 442 443 findings align with the results of other FFQ reproducibility studies that reported correlation coefficients between 0.32 and 0.87 [40] and 0.65 to 0.98 [47, 49] and agree with current 444 recommended standards for reproducibility between 0.5 and 0.70 [36, 41, 50]. According to 445 446 these criteria, our novel FFQ demonstrated good levels of agreement between baseline and follow-up. This suggests that it is well suited for accurately collecting dietary information and 447 capturing dietary inconsistencies in Nigeria for clinicians [48], researchers, and public health 448 449 professionals [51].

451 **Practical application and clinical relevance**

The validity and reproducibility of our study data provide compelling evidence to further 453 454 investigate the implementation and use of our novel FFQ as a practical clinical tool to screen 455 and evaluate patient-mediated dietary risk for hypertension. The FFQ was able to rank intakes in food groups associated with hypertension [11, 12], including fruits, vegetables, grains, dairy, 456 salt and fats and oil-based foods (soups and stew), to a similar degree of accuracy as 24DR, but 457 was able to be completed in < 20 minutes. The results indicate that the FFQ can identify patients 458 459 with high-risk dietary patterns who may benefit from prioritised education and support around dietary modification for blood pressure management. Integrating this rapid dietary screening 460 461 tool into primary and tertiary care workflows will be a key step to enable a systematic approach 462 to dietary monitoring and counselling in a clinical setting for hypertension prevention and 463 management [52].

464

452

465 466

5 Strengths and limitations

Although the study results underline the strength and potential of the FFQ in a clinical 467 468 setting, we openly acknowledge some limitations: (i) 24DR has inherent limitations, including possible recall biases and within-person variability in daily intake, which can attenuate 469 validation study results [53]. However, we aimed to reduce this by having a designated 470 471 professional perform all 24DR evaluations and the use of repeat recalls on non-consecutive days, including two weekdays and one weekend day, which also mitigates this intra-individual 472 473 variation; (ii) the use of a non-random, convenience sample may restrict the generalizability of 474 findings to the broader target population; however, as this tool will be used in a clinical setting we foresee this limitation as minor and inherent to the tools primary purpose; (iii) literacy 475 barriers among some participants required interviews instead of self-administration, which 476 477 could have impacted their responses in the form of respondent bias/social desirability; and

478 finally (iv) testing the FFQ in a relatively small geographic area reduces the applicability of
479 results more widely across diverse Nigerian populations, which is something we aim to address
480 in future work.

481

Nonetheless, despite these limitations, this study had several important strengths: (i) 482 the use of multiple 24DR as the reference method provided detailed participant-informed 483 dietary intake data and allowed for day-to-day variability to be assessed, thereby strengthening 484 485 the quality of the reference data; (ii) the use of multiple analytical methods permitted a 486 comprehensive assessment of the agreement between the FFQ and the 24DR; (iii) evaluation of the reproducibility or test-retest reliability of the FFO two weeks apart permitted the 487 488 reliability and consistency of the FFQ to be estimated over time, which will offer a better 489 measure of habitual dietary habits; and finally (iv) testing the FFQ in the patient demographic, 490 clinical setting and cultural context of its intended use improves the applicability of the validation. 491

492

493 **Conclusion**

494

495 This study provides important evidence that the culturally tailored FFQ has adequate 496 relative validity and reproducibility for ranking dietary intake of major foods and food groups 497 in a clinical setting, compared to the average of three repeat non-consecutive 24DR. Therefore, we offer a valid short FFQ that could help assess common food group intakes for the assessment 498 and prevention of hypertension, which could empower clinicians, patients, and researchers to 499 500 take an active role in preventing hypertension in Nigeria and other West African countries. 501 Further refinements of the FFQ and future studies on the acceptability of the FFQ will improve validity for some food groups. 502

504 Acknowledgement

We would like to extend our heartfelt gratitude to the patients and medical professionals at Rivers State University Teaching Hospital in Port Harcourt, Nigeria. Their invaluable participation and feedback were critical for the successful implementation of this research. In particular, we are thankful to Drs. Nkiru Ahiakwo, Ifeoma Enyoghasim, Eneyo Nelly, Comfort Imarhiagbe, Janny Ikurayeke, Valentine Kogbara, Titi Owen, Dickson Christian, Anwuri Grend, Anita Oweredaba, Ununuma Oguzor and Josephine Sokolo from the Family Medicine Department for their qualitative inputs on refining the food frequency questionnaire screening tool. We also sincerely appreciate the insights provided by Drs. Ibieneiyi, Edith Reuben, Elile Okpara, Imaobong Nonju, Siya George-Batubo, Chinnasa Nzokurum and Prof. Amah-Tariah, which significantly enhanced the quality of our study. In addition, we are grateful to the hospital management and the Internal Medicine and Family Medicine Departments for granting us ethical approval and access to facilities, which facilitated the seamless execution of this project.

519

521

505

506

507

508

509

510

511

512

513

514

515

516

517

518

520 Authors' Contributions

NPB and MAZ collaborated on the research methodology design. NPB led the trial.
NPB led the analysis and prepared the first draft. MAZ and JBM provided analytical expertise.
MAZ, JBM, and CIA provided critical feedback. NPB revised the manuscript. All authors
approved the final manuscript.

526

528

527 Funding

This study was funded by the Tertiary Education Trust Fund (TETFund) of Nigeria. MAZ is
currently funded by Wellcome Trust (217446/Z/19/Z). The funders do not have any role in any

- aspect of this study. The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis,
- 532 decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

533

534 **Conflicts of Interest**

- 535
- 536 The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

537

538 Data Availability

539

540 The values behind the means, standard deviations and other measures are reported in the 541 manuscript and anonymised data is available online at 4tu.researchdata.

542

543 References

544 1. Forouzanfar MH, Liu P, Roth GA, Ng M, Biryukov S, Marczak L, et al. Global

545 Burden of Hypertension and Systolic Blood Pressure of at Least 110 to 115 mm Hg,

546 1990-2015. JAMA. 2017;317(2):165-82 DOI: 10.1001/jama.2016.19043.

5472.GBD. Risk Factors Collaborators. Global burden of 87 risk factors in 204 countries

and territories, 1990-2019: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease

- 549 Study 2019. Lancet. 2020;396(10258):1223-49 DOI: 10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30752-
- 550

2.

- Saloni D, Fiona S, Hannah R, Max R. "Deaths by risk factor" Published online at
 OurWorldInData.org. 2023, 'https://ourworldindata.org/causes-of-death'
- 4. Mills KT, Bundy JD, Kelly TN, Reed JE, Kearney PM, Reynolds K, et al. Global
- 554 Disparities of Hypertension Prevalence and Control: A Systematic Analysis of

- 555 Population-Based Studies From 90 Countries. Circulation. 2016;134(6):441-50 DOI:
- 556 10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.115.018912.
- 557 5. Mills KT, Stefanescu A, He J. The global epidemiology of hypertension. Nat Rev
 558 Nephrol. 2020;16(4):223-37 DOI: 10.1038/s41581-019-0244-2.
- 559 6. Akinlua JT, Meakin R, Umar AM, Freemantle N. Current Prevalence Pattern of
- 560 Hypertension in Nigeria: A Systematic Review. PLoS One. 2015;10(10):e0140021
- 561 DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0140021.
- 562 7. Murthy GV, Fox S, Sivasubramaniam S, Gilbert CE, Mahdi AM, Imam AU, et al.
- 563 Prevalence and risk factors for hypertension and association with ethnicity in Nigeria:
- results from a national survey. Cardiovasc J Afr. 2013;24(9-10):344-50 DOI:
- 565 10.5830/CVJA-2013-058.
- 566 8. Mozaffarian D, Fahimi S, Singh GM, Micha R, Khatibzadeh S, Engell RE, et al.
- 567 Global sodium consumption and death from cardiovascular causes. N Engl J Med.

568 2014;371(7):624-34 DOI: 10.1056/NEJMoa1304127.

- 569 9. Oyebode O, Oti S, Chen YF, Lilford RJ. Salt intakes in sub-Saharan Africa: a
- 570 systematic review and meta-regression. Popul Health Metr. 2016;14:1 DOI:
- 571 10.1186/s12963-015-0068-7.
- 57210.Collaborators GBDD. Health effects of dietary risks in 195 countries, 1990-2017: a

573 systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2017. Lancet.

574 2019;393(10184):1958-72 DOI: 10.1016/S0140-6736(19)30041-8.

- 575 11. Schwingshackl L, Schwedhelm C, Hoffmann G, Knuppel S, Iqbal K, Andriolo V, et
- al. Food Groups and Risk of Hypertension: A Systematic Review and Dose-Response
- 577 Meta-Analysis of Prospective Studies. Adv Nutr. 2017;8(6):793-803 DOI:
- 578 10.3945/an.117.017178.

- 579 12. Batubo NP, Moore JB, Zulyniak MA. Dietary factors and hypertension risk in West
- 580 Africa: a systematic review and meta-analysis of observational studies. J Hypertens.
- 581 2023;41(9):1376-88 DOI: 10.1097/HJH.0000000003499.
- 582
 13.
 Ojji D, Nigeria Sodium Study T. Developing long-term strategies to reduce excess
- 583salt consumption in Nigeria. Eur Heart J. 2022;43(13):1277-9 DOI:
- 584 10.1093/eurheartj/ehac025.
- Lee RD, Nieman DC. Nutritional assessment. 6 ed: McGraw-Hill, New York, NY,;
 2013.
- 587 15. Meybeck A, Redfern S, Paoletti F, Strassner C, Office of Assistant Director-General
- 588 (Agriculture Department). Assessing sustainable diets within the sustainability
- 589assessment of food and agriculture systems. Mediterranean diet, organic food: new
- challenges: FAO; 2015.
- 591 16. Goulet J, Nadeau G, Lapointe A, Lamarche B, Lemieux S. Validity and
- 592 reproducibility of an interviewer-administered food frequency questionnaire for
- healthy French-Canadian men and women. Nutr J. 2004;3:13 DOI: 10.1186/1475-
- **594 2891-3-13**.
- 595 17. Ene-Obong HN, Onuoha NO, Aburime LU, Emebu PK. Prevalence of
- 596 overweight/obesity and hypertension amongst adults in three ethnic groups in Nigeria.597 Asia Journal of Public Health. 2013;2:12-9.
- 598 18. Chan AW, Tetzlaff JM, Altman DG, Laupacis A, Gotzsche PC, Krleza-Jeric K, et al.
- 599 SPIRIT 2013 statement: defining standard protocol items for clinical trials. Ann Intern
- 600 Med. 2013;158(3):200-7 DOI: 10.7326/0003-4819-158-3-201302050-00583.
- 601 19. Adebamowo SN, Eseyin O, Yilme S, Adeyemi D, Willett WC, Hu FB, et al. A
- 602 Mixed-Methods Study on Acceptability, Tolerability, and Substitution of Brown Rice

- for White Rice to Lower Blood Glucose Levels among Nigerian Adults. Front Nutr.
- 604 2017;4:33 DOI: 10.3389/fnut.2017.00033.
- 605 20. Mertens E, Kuijsten A, Geleijnse JM, Boshuizen HC, Feskens EJM, Van't Veer P.
- 606 FFQ versus repeated 24-h recalls for estimating diet-related environmental impact.
- 607 Nutr J. 2019;18(1):2 DOI: 10.1186/s12937-018-0425-z.
- 608 21. Steinemann N, Grize L, Ziesemer K, Kauf P, Probst-Hensch N, Brombach C. Relative
- validation of a food frequency questionnaire to estimate food intake in an adult
- 610 population. Food Nutr Res. 2017;61(1):1305193 DOI:
- 61110.1080/16546628.2017.1305193.
- 612 22. Willett W. Foreword. The validity of dietary assessment methods for use in
- epidemiologic studies. Br J Nutr. 2009;102 Suppl 1:S1-2 DOI:
- **614** 10.1017/S0007114509993102.
- 615 23. Swinscow T.D.V., Campbell M.J. Statistics at square one. Correlation and regression
- 616 BMJ [19:[Available from: <u>https://www.bmj.com/about-bmj/resources-</u>
- 617 <u>readers/publications/statistics-square-one/11-correlation-and-regression</u>,
- 618 <u>https://www.bmj.com/about-bmj/resources-readers/publications/statistics-square-</u>
- 619 <u>one/11-correlation-and-regression</u>.
- 620 24. Faul F, Erdfelder E, Buchner A, Lang AG. Statistical power analyses using G*Power
- 621 3.1: tests for correlation and regression analyses. Behav Res Methods.
- 622 2009;41(4):1149-60 DOI: 10.3758/BRM.41.4.1149.
- 623 25. Gupta KK, Attri JP, Singh A, Kaur H, Kaur G. Basic concepts for sample size
- 624 calculation: Critical step for any clinical trials! Saudi J Anaesth. 2016;10(3):328-31
- 625 DOI: 10.4103/1658-354X.174918.

626	26.	Thabane L, Ma J, Chu R, Cheng J, Ismaila A, Rios LP, et al. A tutorial on pilot
627		studies: the what, why and how. BMC Med Res Methodol. 2010;10:1 DOI:
628		10.1186/1471-2288-10-1.
629	27.	Federal Ministry of Health. National Nutritional Guideline On Non-Communicable
630		Disease Prevention, Control and Management In: Federal Ministry of Health A,
631		editor. 2014. p. 62,
632		https://extranet.who.int/countryplanningcycles/sites/default/files/planning_cycle_repo
633		sitory/nigeria/nutritionalguideline.pdf.
634	28.	Ministry of Health RoG. Strategy for the Management, Prevention and Control of
635		Chronic Non-Communicable Diseases in Ghana. August, 2012, chrome-
636		extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/ <u>https://extranet.who.int/nutrition/gina/</u>
637		sites/default/filesstore/GHA-2012-NCDs.pdf.
638	29.	U.S. Department of Agriculture. AMPM - USDA Automated Multiple-Pass Method
639		2021 [Available from: https://www.ars.usda.gov/northeast-area/beltsville-md-
640		bhnrc/beltsville-human-nutrition-research-center/food-surveys-research-
641		group/docs/ampm-usda-automated-multiple-pass-method/,
642		https://www.ars.usda.gov/northeast-area/beltsville-md-bhnrc/beltsville-human-
643		nutrition-research-center/food-surveys-research-group/docs/ampm-usda-automated-
644		multiple-pass-method/.
645	30.	Blanton CA, Moshfegh AJ, Baer DJ, Kretsch MJ. The USDA Automated Multiple-
646		Pass Method accurately estimates group total energy and nutrient intake. J Nutr.
647		2006;136(10):2594-9 DOI: 10.1093/jn/136.10.2594.
648	31.	Conway JM, Ingwersen LA, Moshfegh AJ. Accuracy of dietary recall using the
649		USDA five-step multiple-pass method in men: an observational validation study. J
650		Am Diet Assoc. 2004;104(4):595-603 DOI: 10.1016/j.jada.2004.01.007.

- 651 32. Fatihah F, Ng BK, Hazwanie H, Norimah AK, Shanita SN, Ruzita AT, et al.
- 652 Development and validation of a food frequency questionnaire for dietary intake
- assessment among multi-ethnic primary school-aged children. Singapore Med J.
- 654 2015;56(12):687-94 DOI: 10.11622/smedj.2015190.
- 655 33. SHAPIRO SS, WILK MB. An analysis of variance test for normality (complete
- 656 samples)[†]. Biometrika. 1965;52(3-4):591-611 DOI: 10.1093/biomet/52.3-4.591.
- 657 34. Massey FJ. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test for Goodness of Fit. Journal of the

American Statistical Association. 1951;46(253):68-78 DOI:

- **659** 10.1080/01621459.1951.10500769.
- 660 35. R Core Team. A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation
- for Statistical Computing. 4.3.1 ed: Vienna, Austria; 2020, <u>https://www.R-</u>

662 <u>project.org/</u>.

663 36. Cade J, Thompson R, Burley V, Warm D. Development, validation and utilisation of
664 food-frequency questionnaires - a review. Public Health Nutr. 2002;5(4):567-87 DOI:

665 10.1079/PHN2001318.

- 666 37. Rohrmann S, Klein G. Validation of a short questionnaire to qualitatively assess the
- 667 intake of total fat, saturated, monounsaturated, polyunsaturated fatty acids, and

668 cholesterol. J Hum Nutr Diet. 2003;16(2):111-7 DOI: 10.1046/j.1365-

669 277x.2003.00425.x.

- 670 38. Rey D, Neuhäuser M. Wilcoxon-Signed-Rank Test. In: Lovric M, editor. International
- 671 Encyclopedia of Statistical Science;10.1007/978-3-642-04898-2 61610.1007/978-3-
- 672 642-04898-2_616. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg; 2011. p. 1658-9
- 673 DOI: 10.1007/978-3-642-04898-2_616.

- 674 39. Bland JM, Altman DG. Statistical methods for assessing agreement between two
- 675 methods of clinical measurement. Lancet. 1986;1(8476):307-10,
- 676 <u>https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/2868172</u>.
- 40. Savija N, Leong DP, Pinthus J, Karampatos S, Shayegan B, Mian R, et al.
- 678 Development and Comparability of a Short Food-Frequency Questionnaire to Assess
- 679 Diet in Prostate Cancer Patients: The Role of Androgen Deprivation Therapy in
- 680 CArdiovascular Disease A Longitudinal Prostate Cancer Study (RADICAL PC)
- 681 Substudy. Curr Dev Nutr. 2021;5(11):nzab106 DOI: 10.1093/cdn/nzab106.
- 41. Koo TK, Li MY. A Guideline of Selecting and Reporting Intraclass Correlation
- 683 Coefficients for Reliability Research. J Chiropr Med. 2016;15(2):155-63 DOI:
- 684 10.1016/j.jcm.2016.02.012.
- 685 42. Challa HJ AM, Uppaluri KR, DASH Diet To Stop Hypertension: In: StatPearls
- 686 [Internet]. Treasure Island (FL): StatPearls Publishing; January 23, 2023 [Available

687 from: <u>https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK482514/</u>,

688 <u>https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK482514/</u>.

- 689 43. Streppel MT, de Vries JH, Meijboom S, Beekman M, de Craen AJ, Slagboom PE, et
- al. Relative validity of the food frequency questionnaire used to assess dietary intake
- 691 in the Leiden Longevity Study. Nutr J. 2013;12:75 DOI: 10.1186/1475-2891-12-75.
- 692 44. Marks GC, Hughes MC, van der Pols JC. Relative validity of food intake estimates
- 693 using a food frequency questionnaire is associated with sex, age, and other personal

694 characteristics. J Nutr. 2006;136(2):459-65 DOI: 10.1093/jn/136.2.459.

- Wong JE, Parnell WR, Black KE, Skidmore PM. Reliability and relative validity of a
 food frequency questionnaire to assess food group intakes in New Zealand
- adolescents. Nutr J. 2012;11:65 DOI: 10.1186/1475-2891-11-65.

- 46. Yun SH, Choi B-Y, Kim M-K. The Effect of Seasoning on the Distribution of
- 699 Nutrient Intakes by a Food-Frequency Questionnaire in a Rural Area. Korean J Nutr.
- 700 2009;42(3):246-55, <u>https://doi.org/10.4163/kjn.2009.42.3.246</u>.
- 47. Aoun C, Bou Daher R, El Osta N, Papazian T, Khabbaz LR. Reproducibility and
- relative validity of a food frequency questionnaire to assess dietary intake of adults
- 703 living in a Mediterranean country. PLoS One. 2019;14(6):e0218541 DOI:
- 704 10.1371/journal.pone.0218541.
- 48. Willett WC, Sampson L, Stampfer MJ, Rosner B, Bain C, Witschi J, et al.
- 706 Reproducibility and validity of a semiquantitative food frequency questionnaire. Am J
- 707 Epidemiol. 1985;122(1):51-65 DOI: 10.1093/oxfordjournals.aje.a114086.
- 49. Fallaize R, Forster H, Macready AL, Walsh MC, Mathers JC, Brennan L, et al. Online
- dietary intake estimation: reproducibility and validity of the Food4Me food frequency
- 710 questionnaire against a 4-day weighed food record. J Med Internet Res.
- 711 2014;16(8):e190 DOI: 10.2196/jmir.3355.
- 50. Baranowski T, Willett W. 4924-Hour Recall and Diet Record Methods. Nutritional
- 713 Epidemiology;10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199754038.003.000410.1093/acprof:oso/9780
- 714 199754038.003.0004: Oxford University Press; 2012. p. 0 DOI:
- 715 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199754038.003.0004.
- 716 51. Lee RD, Nieman DC, Rainwater M. Comparison of eight microcomputer dietary
- analysis programs with the USDA Nutrient Data Base for Standard Reference. J Am
- 718 Diet Assoc. 1995;95(8):858-67 DOI: 10.1016/S0002-8223(95)00240-5.
- 52. Batubo NP, Nwanze NM, Alikor CA, Auma CI, Moore JB, Zulyniak MA.
- 720 Empowering Healthcare Professionals in West Africa. A Feasibility Study and
- 721 Qualitative Assessment of a Dietary Screening Tool to Identify Adults at High Risk of
- 722 Hypertension. 2023; <u>https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.09.23297914</u>

- 723 <u>https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.09.23297914</u> DOI:
- 724 <u>https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.09.23297914</u>.
- 53. Gibson RS, Charrondiere UR, Bell W. Measurement Errors in Dietary Assessment
- 726 Using Self-Reported 24-Hour Recalls in Low-Income Countries and Strategies for
- 727 Their Prevention. Adv Nutr. 2017;8(6):980-91 DOI: 10.3945/an.117.016980.

728

729 Supporting information

730 S1 Table: Food Frequency Questionnaire

731

- 732 S2 Table: Categorisations of food groups in the food frequency questionnaire (FFQ)
- 733 corresponding to the FFQ question numbers.
- 734 S3 Table: Assessment of agreement between the food intake estimation of the food
- frequency questionnaire (FFQ) and 24-hour dietary recalls (24DR) using Bland-Altman

736 analysis.

737

738 **S1 Fig.** Bland-Altman plots related to food groups.



Figure 1



Figure 2





Mean of FFQ & 24DR (Servings/day)

Mean of FFQ & 24DR (Servings/day)



