

1 Validity and reproducibility of a culturally tailored dietary screening tool for hypertension
2 risk in Nigerian healthcare

3

4

5

6 **Nimisoere P. Batubo¹, Carolyn I. Auma¹, J. Bernadette Moore¹, and Michael A.**

7 **Zulyniak^{1*}**

8

9

10 ¹ Nutritional Epidemiology Group, School of Food Science and Nutrition, University of
11 Leeds, 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26 **NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.**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
30 culturally tailored FFQ for estimating food intake among Nigerian adults in clinical settings.
31 The FFQ 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
33 recalls (24DR) were also conducted as a reference method to evaluate the validity of the FFQ.
34 Spearman's rank correlations, Wilcoxon signed-rank tests, cross-classification agreement,
35 intraclass correlation coefficients (ICC), and Bland-Altman analysis were performed in R to
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
41 24DR for classifying individuals into quartiles ranged from 17% for salt to 88% for processed
42 meats and alcoholic drinks, with 90% of individuals classified into the same or neighbouring
43 quartile. Additionally, the Bland-Altman analysis demonstrated acceptable agreement, with >
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
46 0.77 between the FFQs delivered two weeks apart. These data demonstrate good agreement
47 between our culturally tailored FFQ and 24DR, and moreover, robust reproducibility for
48 quantifying intakes of food groups associated with hypertension in Nigeria. This confirms that
49 this novel FFQ is a valid and reliable tool for assessing the intake of key food groups among
50 Nigerian adults.

51

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

54

55 **Introduction**

56 Hypertension is a leading risk factor for cardiovascular disease [1], which is annually
57 attributes to over 10 million deaths worldwide [2, 3]. The highest hypertension burdens exist
58 in low- and middle-income countries, with over 30% of adults affected in some African regions
59 [4, 5]. In Nigeria specifically, hypertension prevalence has more than doubled since 1990, from
60 11.4% to 24.8% in 2015, with just over a quarter of hypertensive adults achieving blood
61 pressure control [6, 7]. This escalating epidemic underscores an urgent need for improved
62 screening, treatment, and prevention strategies.

63

64 Unhealthy dietary patterns are a predominant modifiable risk factor for hypertension
65 globally, including in Sub-Saharan Africa [8, 9]. Specifically, diets characterised by elevated
66 levels of saturated fat, processed meats, and sugar-sweetened beverages have been associated
67 with an increased risk of hypertension [10]. Moreover, deficiencies in vital dietary components
68 like fruits, vegetables, nuts, legumes, and omega-3 fatty acids from seafood correlate with
69 elevated blood pressure levels [11]. In our prior research, we highlighted a significant
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
75 optimisation as a crucial component of population-level and clinical hypertension prevention
76 strategies in Nigeria.

77

78 Dietary assessment represents an essential first step for establishing the association
79 between diet and chronic diseases and designing effective public health dietary prevention
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].
83 Food frequency questionnaires (FFQs) developed for Western populations show limited
84 validity for immigrant groups retaining traditional diets [16]. This underscores the need for
85 culturally adapted FFQs, especially in ethnically diverse countries like Nigeria, which has over
86 250 ethnic groups [17]. However, culturally specific and validated FFQs for assessing dietary
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

90 In this study, following a robust validation protocol in a clinical setting in Nigeria, the
91 validity of a novel culturally tailored FFQ was evaluated against three repeat 24-hour dietary
92 recalls (24DR). Through assessing reproducibility, we sought to enhance the applicability of
93 the FFQ in hypertension management and provide crucial insights for implementing the FFQ
94 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

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

105

106 **Ethics approval**

107

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

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

126

127 **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 the past 2 years	Individuals who have been resident in Nigeria for shorter than 2 years
Ability to read, write, and communicate over the phone in English	Individuals on dietary restriction or recent changes to 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 **Participant recruitment and informed consent**

131

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

141 or concerns with the study personnel, ensuring their consent to participate was voluntary and
142 fully informed. All patients provided written informed consent before participating in the study
143

144 **Sample size and sampling technique**

145
146 Previous validation studies investigating the correlation between FFQs and 24DR have
147 demonstrated good agreement, with correlation coefficients (r_s) ranging from 0.3 to 0.7 [19-
148 22]. A moderate $r_s = 0.5$ is typically considered a robust indicator of correlation [23]; therefore,
149 it was used to estimate the sample size along with a statistical power of $P = 0.8$, a 95%
150 confidence interval, and a two-tailed alpha level of 0.05 utilising the G*Power software [24].
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
154 non-probability convenience sampling method.

155

156 **Dietary Assessment**

157

158 **Dietary screening tool**

159

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

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

176

177 **24-hour Dietary Recalls (24DR)**

178

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

184

185 **Data Collection**

186

187 Data collection was over four weeks in August 2023. At clinic visit 1 in week 1, the
188 eligible consenting patients completed sociodemographic and health status questionnaires and
189 underwent baseline assessments, including height, weight, and blood pressure measurement
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 $BMI = \text{body weight in Kg} / (\text{height}$
193 $\text{in metre})^2$. 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).

195

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
205 conducted by phone to collect the patients' food intake on a weekend day in week 2 (**Fig 1**).
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 **Participant compensation**

212

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

218

219 **Statistical analysis**

220

221 Dietary data (i.e., frequencies of food group intakes) from the first FFQ (FFQ1), second
222 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
225 multiplying the average servings per week and then dividing the average by 7 days according
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

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

241

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

248 no statistically significant difference and good agreement [37, 38]. Thirdly, the cross-
249 classification of intakes into quartiles by the 3 methods (FFQ 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,
252 disagreement by 3 quartiles. Finally, the Bland-Altman analysis [39] was used to assess the
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 ($[(\text{mean FFQ} + \text{mean 24DR})/2]$) 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

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

271

272 Results

273

274 Participant characteristics

275

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

284

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

287

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

Characteristics	Overall (n=58)	Non-hypertensive (n=29)	Hypertensive(n=29)
Age (years), mean \pm SD	42.6 \pm 11.9	38.7 \pm 12.4	46.4 \pm 10.1
Sex, n (%)			
Male	18 (31.0)	9 (31.0)	9 (31.0)
Female	40 (69.0)	20 (69.0)	20 (69.0)
Education n (%)			
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)

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

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

290

291 A considerable proportion of participants had experienced hypertension for more than
 292 5 years (41.4%), but only 55.2% reported using antihypertensive medications. Participants with
 293 hypertension, on average, appeared to be heavier (83.8kg vs 75kg), with more presenting with
 294 obesity (mean±/− SD BMI: 32.1 ± 6.4 kg/m²) than those who did not have hypertension (26.9
 295 ± 6.8 kg/m²). Similarly, participants with hypertension, on average, had higher systolic blood
 296 pressures (159.0 ± 16.9 mmHg vs 121.0 ± 11.7 mmHg) in spite of a high percentage using
 297 antihypertensive medications (**Table 2**).

298

299 Dietary intake assessment

300

301 The mean and median servings/day were similar between the two dietary assessment
 302 methods for most food groups (**Table 3**). The mean fold differences varied from 0.25 for fats
 303 and oils to 1.25 for yam and potatoes, indicating that, on average, the FFQ provided food groups
 304 intake estimates within 75% below to 25% above the 24DR amounts. Overall, no significant
 305 differences were observed between the food group intakes estimated by the FFQ and the 24DR.
 306
 307 **Table 3.** Food group intake estimates from the novel food frequency questionnaire (FFQ) and
 308 the 24-hour dietary recall (24DR).

Food Group (servings/day)	FFQ			24DR			Mean Fold Difference (FFQ/24DR)		
	Mean	Median	IQR	Mean	Median	IQR	Mean	95% CI	p-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 FFQ: Food frequency questionnaire; 24DR: 24-hour dietary recalls; IQR: Interquartile range

310

311 **Assessment of relative validity**

312

313 To assess the validity of the FFQ, we evaluated the relationship between the food group

314 intake estimated by the FFQ relative to the 24DR. The Spearman’s correlation coefficients (r_s)

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

317 fat & oils, and salt, most of the food groups ($n=15$) had a correlation coefficient ≥ 0.50 ,

318 indicating a strong positive correlation between the mean FFQ and mean 24DR ($p < 0.05$). In

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

321 signed-rank test was applied — the exception was ‘fats and oils’ ($p < 0.05$) (**Table 4**). Overall,

322 the results suggest that the FFQ provides comparable rankings and intake estimates for most

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

324 approaches.

325

326 **Table 4.** Comparison of food group intake obtained from a semi-quantitative food frequency

327 questionnaire (FFQ) and the 24-hour dietary recalls (24DRs).

Food Group (servings/day)	Agreement between FFQ and 24DR			Disagreement between FFQ and 24DR		
	r_s	$^a p$ -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

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

328 ¹ Gross misclassification, disagreement by 3 quartiles, r_s : Spearman's correlation coefficient, a : p -value of Spearman's
 329 Rank correlation coefficients, b p -value: p -value for Wilcoxon signed-rank test of difference. FFQ: Food frequency
 330 questionnaire; 24DR: 24-hour dietary recalls

331

332

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

339 90% of participants were classified in the same or neighbouring quartile, indicating a good
340 agreement 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
346 hypertension in West African countries, including Nigeria [12] (e.g., salt, fried/fast foods, and
347 fats and oils). The plots for the remaining food groups are provided in supplementary materials
348 (**S1 Fig**). Although moderate bias and wide limits of agreement (-4.18 to 3.93) were observed
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
354 agreement (**S3 Table**). A high proportion (>96%) of observations fell within the acceptable
355 limits of agreement (± 3 standard deviation LOA) without increased differences across higher
356 food intake ranges (**S3 Table**). In summary, the Bland-Altman analysis and plots suggest a
357 high level of agreement between the FFQ and 24DR for the majority of food groups assessed
358 ($n=18$).

359

360 **Fig 3. Bland-Altman plots related to food groups identified in the DASH diet (A: Fruit, B: Vegetables, C:**
361 **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

368 **Assessment of reproducibility**

369

370 Assessing reproducibility between the two administrations of the FFQ, Spearman's
371 ranked correlation coefficient ranged from 0.38 for yam and potatoes to 0.97 for salt, with an
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
375 the 20 food groups evaluated for reproducibility, no significant differences in the mean and
376 median intakes between the FFQ1 and FFQ2 were observed in the Wilcoxon signed-rank test
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 $ICC \geq 0.70$, 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
384 good reproducibility and consistency in individual rankings and negligible between time points
385 for the FFQ, confirming the test-retest reliability of the FFQ across the food groups evaluated.

386

387 **Table 5** Reproducibility on the number of food group serving/day estimated by repeated
388 administration of a Food Frequency Questionnaire

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

(Servings/day)	Mean	Median	IQR	Mean	Median	IQR	r_s	* p -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; 0.97
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
396 This study is the first to test and validate a culturally sensitive food frequency
397 questionnaire (FFQ) for dietary screening of men and women for high-risk dietary habits
398 associated with hypertension in a Nigerian clinic. Our aim is for the tool to be used by clinicians

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

405

406 **Relative validation**

407

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

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

424

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
429 aligns with or exceeds the results of previous work, where FFQ validations study among (i)
430 130 men with prostate cancer reported similar small mean differences and acceptable
431 agreements across 11 food groups [40]; and, (ii) 114 Lebanese adults with >80% agreement
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
434 and indicates that our tailored FFQ is well-designed for capturing the dietary habits of men and
435 women in Nigerian populations.

436

437 **Reproducibility**

438

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

450

451 **Practical application and clinical relevance**

452
453 The validity and reproducibility of our study data provide compelling evidence to further
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
456 in food groups associated with hypertension [11, 12], including fruits, vegetables, grains, dairy,
457 salt and fats and oil-based foods (soups and stew), to a similar degree of accuracy as 24DR, but
458 was able to be completed in < 20 minutes. The results indicate that the FFQ can identify patients
459 with high-risk dietary patterns who may benefit from prioritised education and support around
460 dietary modification for blood pressure management. Integrating this rapid dietary screening
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

465 **Strengths and limitations**

466
467 Although the study results underline the strength and potential of the FFQ in a clinical
468 setting, we openly acknowledge some limitations: (i) 24DR has inherent limitations, including
469 possible recall biases and within-person variability in daily intake, which can attenuate
470 validation study results [53]. However, we aimed to reduce this by having a designated
471 professional perform all 24DR evaluations and the use of repeat recalls on non-consecutive
472 days, including two weekdays and one weekend day, which also mitigates this intra-individual
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
475 we foresee this limitation as minor and inherent to the tools primary purpose; (iii) literacy
476 barriers among some participants required interviews instead of self-administration, which
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

482 Nonetheless, despite these limitations, this study had several important strengths: (i)
483 the use of multiple 24DR as the reference method provided detailed participant-informed
484 dietary intake data and allowed for day-to-day variability to be assessed, thereby strengthening
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
487 of the reproducibility or test-retest reliability of the FFQ two weeks apart permitted the
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
491 validation.

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,
498 we offer a valid short FFQ that could help assess common food group intakes for the assessment
499 and prevention of hypertension, which could empower clinicians, patients, and researchers to
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
502 validity for some food groups.

503

504 **Acknowledgement**

505
506 We would like to extend our heartfelt gratitude to the patients and medical professionals
507 at Rivers State University Teaching Hospital in Port Harcourt, Nigeria. Their invaluable
508 participation and feedback were critical for the successful implementation of this research. In
509 particular, we are thankful to Drs. Nkiru Ahiakwo, Ifeoma Enyoghasim, Eneyo Nelly, Comfort
510 Imarhiagbe, Janny Ikurayeke, Valentine Kogbara, Titi Owen, Dickson Christian, Anwuri
511 Grend, Anita Oweredaba, Ununuma Oguzor and Josephine Sokolo from the Family Medicine
512 Department for their qualitative inputs on refining the food frequency questionnaire screening
513 tool. We also sincerely appreciate the insights provided by Drs. Ibieneiyi, Edith Reuben, Elile
514 Okpara, Imaobong Nonju, Siya George-Batubo, Chinnasa Nzokurum and Prof. Amah-Tariah,
515 which significantly enhanced the quality of our study. In addition, we are grateful to the
516 hospital management and the Internal Medicine and Family Medicine Departments for granting
517 us ethical approval and access to facilities, which facilitated the seamless execution of this
518 project.

519

520 **Authors' Contributions**

521
522 NPB and MAZ collaborated on the research methodology design. NPB led the trial.
523 NPB led the analysis and prepared the first draft. MAZ and JBM provided analytical expertise.
524 MAZ, JBM, and CIA provided critical feedback. NPB revised the manuscript. All authors
525 approved the final manuscript.

526

527 **Funding**

528
529 This study was funded by the Tertiary Education Trust Fund (TETFund) of Nigeria. MAZ is
530 currently funded by Wellcome Trust (217446/Z/19/Z). The funders do not have any role in any

531 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.
- 547 2. GBD. Risk Factors Collaborators. Global burden of 87 risk factors in 204 countries
548 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.
- 551 3. Saloni D, Fiona S, Hannah R, Max R. "Deaths by risk factor" Published online at
552 [OurWorldInData.org](https://ourworldindata.org/causes-of-death). 2023, '<https://ourworldindata.org/causes-of-death>'
- 553 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:
564 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.
- 572 10. 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
576 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.0000000000003499.
- 582 13. Ojji D, Nigeria Sodium Study T. Developing long-term strategies to reduce excess
583 salt consumption in Nigeria. *Eur Heart J.* 2022;43(13):1277-9 DOI:
584 10.1093/eurheartj/ehac025.
- 585 14. Lee RD, Nieman DC. *Nutritional assessment.* 6 ed: McGraw-Hill, New York, NY,;
586 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*
589 *assessment of food and agriculture systems. Mediterranean diet, organic food: new*
590 *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
593 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

- 603 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
609 validation of a food frequency questionnaire to estimate food intake in an adult
610 population. *Food Nutr Res.* 2017;61(1):1305193 DOI:
611 10.1080/16546628.2017.1305193.
- 612 22. Willett W. Foreword. The validity of dietary assessment methods for use in
613 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: [https://www.bmj.com/about-bmj/resources-](https://www.bmj.com/about-bmj/resources-readers/publications/statistics-square-one/11-correlation-and-regression)
617 [readers/publications/statistics-square-one/11-correlation-and-regression,](https://www.bmj.com/about-bmj/resources-readers/publications/statistics-square-one/11-correlation-and-regression)
618 [https://www.bmj.com/about-bmj/resources-readers/publications/statistics-square-](https://www.bmj.com/about-bmj/resources-readers/publications/statistics-square-one/11-correlation-and-regression)
619 [one/11-correlation-and-regression.](https://www.bmj.com/about-bmj/resources-readers/publications/statistics-square-one/11-correlation-and-regression)
- 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](https://extranet.who.int/countryplanningcycles/sites/default/files/planning_cycle_repository/nigeria/nutritionalguideline.pdf)
633 [sitory/nigeria/nutritionalguideline.pdf](https://extranet.who.int/countryplanningcycles/sites/default/files/planning_cycle_repository/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://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcgclefindmkaj/[https://extranet.who.int/nutrition/gina/](https://extranet.who.int/nutrition/gina/sites/default/filesstore/GHA-2012-NCDs.pdf)
637 [sites/default/filesstore/GHA-2012-NCDs.pdf](https://extranet.who.int/nutrition/gina/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-](https://www.ars.usda.gov/northeast-area/beltsville-md-bhnrc/beltsville-human-nutrition-research-center/food-surveys-research-group/docs/ampm-usda-automated-multiple-pass-method/)
640 [bhnrc/beltsville-human-nutrition-research-center/food-surveys-research-](https://www.ars.usda.gov/northeast-area/beltsville-md-bhnrc/beltsville-human-nutrition-research-center/food-surveys-research-group/docs/ampm-usda-automated-multiple-pass-method/)
641 [group/docs/ampm-usda-automated-multiple-pass-method/](https://www.ars.usda.gov/northeast-area/beltsville-md-bhnrc/beltsville-human-nutrition-research-center/food-surveys-research-group/docs/ampm-usda-automated-multiple-pass-method/),
642 [https://www.ars.usda.gov/northeast-area/beltsville-md-bhnrc/beltsville-human-](https://www.ars.usda.gov/northeast-area/beltsville-md-bhnrc/beltsville-human-nutrition-research-center/food-surveys-research-group/docs/ampm-usda-automated-multiple-pass-method/)
643 [nutrition-research-center/food-surveys-research-group/docs/ampm-usda-automated-](https://www.ars.usda.gov/northeast-area/beltsville-md-bhnrc/beltsville-human-nutrition-research-center/food-surveys-research-group/docs/ampm-usda-automated-multiple-pass-method/)
644 [multiple-pass-method/](https://www.ars.usda.gov/northeast-area/beltsville-md-bhnrc/beltsville-human-nutrition-research-center/food-surveys-research-group/docs/ampm-usda-automated-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
653 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
658 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
661 for Statistical Computing. 4.3.1 ed: Vienna, Austria; 2020, [https://www.R-](https://www.R-project.org/)
662 [project.org/](https://www.R-project.org/).
- 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 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/2868172>.
- 677 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.
- 682 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: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK482514/>,
688 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK482514/>.
- 689 43. Streppel MT, de Vries JH, Meijboom S, Beekman M, de Craen AJ, Slagboom PE, et
690 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.
- 695 45. Wong JE, Parnell WR, Black KE, Skidmore PM. Reliability and relative validity of a
696 food frequency questionnaire to assess food group intakes in New Zealand
697 adolescents. *Nutr J*. 2012;11:65 DOI: 10.1186/1475-2891-11-65.

- 698 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, <https://doi.org/10.4163/kjn.2009.42.3.246>.
- 701 47. Aoun C, Bou Daher R, El Osta N, Papazian T, Khabbaz LR. Reproducibility and
702 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.
- 705 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.
- 708 49. Fallaize R, Forster H, Macready AL, Walsh MC, Mathers JC, Brennan L, et al. Online
709 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.
- 712 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
717 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.
- 719 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; <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.09.23297914>

723 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.09.23297914> DOI:

724 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.09.23297914>.

725 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

735 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.

739




Figure 1




Figure 2




Figure 3