

1 **Effectiveness of Cluster-Level Behavioral Interventions to Reduce Salt Intake: A Systematic Review**
2 **and Meta-analysis**

3
4 Sujiv Akkilagunta^a, Victoria Thomas^a, Kalaiselvi Selvaraj^b, Jaya Prasad Tripathy^a, Sitikanth^{ha}
5 Banerjee^c, Ranjan Solanki^a, Pradeep R Deshmukh^a
6
7

8 ^a Department of Community Medicine, AIIMS Nagpur

9 ^b Department of Community and Family Medicine, AIIMS Madurai

10 ^c Department of Community Medicine, AIIMS Vijaypur, Jammu

11

12 Sujiv Akkilagunta ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5575-4577>

13 Victoria Thomas ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0001-0438-4262>

14 Kalaiselvi Selvaraj ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0596-0495>

15 Jaya Prasad Tripathy ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2626-5977>

16 Sitikanth^{ha} Banerjee ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2598-0354>

17 Ranjan Solanki ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9359-8758>

18 Pradeep R Deshmukh ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4172-9522>

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

1 **Effectiveness of Cluster Level Behavioral Interventions to Reduce Salt Intake: A Systematic Review** 2 **and Meta-analysis**

3 **Abstract**

4 **Background**

5 The mean global salt intake is estimated at 10g/day much higher when compared to the WHO
6 recommendation of less than 5g/day. Behavioral change interventions are most effective when
7 applied at groups instead of individuals. The previous reviews on the topic did not compile evidence
8 on cluster interventions.

9 **Objectives**

10 We conducted a systematic review and meta-analysis to find out the effectiveness of cluster-level
11 dietary interventions in reducing average daily salt intake and mean 24-hr urinary sodium excretion
12 among general population.

13 **Search Methods**

14 We searched the following research databases using search terms relevant to this review – PubMed,
15 EmBASE, Web of Science, Global Index Medicus, LILACS, Cochrane CENTRAL, TROPHI databases, CTRI
16 and WHO-ICTRP.

18 **Selection criteria**

19 We included published randomized controlled trials and quasi-experimental studies with
20 interventions for population groups that reflect the resident communities. There were no restrictions
21 for age or gender. We excluded the studies targeting patient groups with specific underlying health
22 conditions.

23 The primary outcomes were mean reduction in daily salt intake in g/day and the mean reduction in
24 daily 24-hr Urine sodium output.

26 **Data collection and analysis**

27 Two authors independently screened the titles, abstracts and full-text articles. Two review authors
28 independently extracted data and assessed the risk of bias. We classified the complex interventions
29 into six categories based on the principles of health promotion. The duration of follow-up (outcome
30 assessment after the intervention) was classified as short (≤ 6 months), medium (6 to < 12 months) or
31 long-term (≥ 12 months). Risk of bias was assessed using RoB2 tool for cluster RCTs and ROBINS-I tool

1 for Non-randomized studies of intervention. We pooled effect size estimates from individual studies
2 using generic inverse variance method using a random-effects model.

3 **Main results**

4 We included 15 studies based on the selection criteria including 10 RCTs and 5 Non-randomised
5 studies of Interventions (NRSI). Information and counselling measures, in the short-term, reduced the
6 salt intake by 1.25g/day (95% CI: -1.9 to -0.6). At the medium-term, it was 0.47 g/day (95% CI: -0.81
7 to -0.14). On long term follow-up, it was 1.51g/day (95% CI: -2.62 to -0.4).

8 Use of salt-monitoring tools reduced salt intake by 2.48 g/day (95% CI: -4.66 to -0.3). Environmental
9 modification measures did not reduce salt intake significantly.

10

11 **Discussion**

12 Information and counselling interventions in conjunction with other measures effectively reduced the
13 salt intake. When quantified, there was an average reduction up to 1.5g/day. Salt monitoring tools
14 showed a greater effect in reducing dietary salt.

15 A total of nine RCTs were assessed for risk of bias, of which five high-risk of bias. Among five Non-
16 randomized studies of intervention, four of them showed serious risk of bias. An updated review in
17 the future is likely to resolve these issues.

18

19 **Funding:** The study was funded by the Indian Council of Medical Research proposal no. 2019-7206
20 under Adhoc Scheme.

21 **Registration No.:** PROSPERO (registration ID: CRD42020168783)

22 **Competing Interests:** None declared

23 **Data Availability:** The search strategy used for various databases, the data extraction form are
24 attached as supplementary files. The excel sheet used for metaanalysis will be available on request
25 from the corresponding author.

26 **Introduction**

27 Dietary salt reduction is an important precursor to reduce the global non-communicable disease (NCD)
28 mortality. It is estimated that high salt intake contributes to 1.72 million cardiovascular deaths and
29 40.54 million DALYs (Disability-adjusted Life years) The Global action plan for NCDs targeted a 30%
30 relative reduction in mean population salt intake by 2025.¹ The benefits of salt reduction in reducing
31 blood pressure and risk of coronary artery disease and stroke are well documented.^{2,3,4} The World
32 Health Organization (WHO) recommends reduction in salt intake to less than 5g/day to reduce the
33 disease risk.⁵ Compared to other risk factors, the population exposure to high salt intake is more with
34 an estimate suggesting that 45% of the global population is exposed.⁶ The global mean salt intake is

1 estimated at 10 g/day and among Indians it is estimated at 10.98g/day (95% CI 8.57-13.40).^{7,8} The
2 global NCD target translates to a reduction of 3.3g of salt per day for Indians. However, to what extent
3 the proven behavioral intervention strategies achieve reduction and the amount of reduction needs
4 to be evaluated.

5 For behavioral risk factors, the population approach to prevention is expected to have a large overall
6 effect when compared to the individual approach.⁹ Given this, multiple countries have initiated salt
7 reduction programs. A Cochrane review by McLaren et al., summarized the effectiveness of these
8 national programs on salt intake.¹⁰ But the review included uncontrolled program evaluation studies.

9 A similar review compiled studies on state-level and community level programs on reduction
10 of salt intake. The majority of the studies included in this review were observational in nature.¹¹
11 Community program evaluations are often uncontrolled and prone to self-selection bias. Non-
12 randomized studies have a problem of attribution. Both these reviews have not quantified the pooled
13 effect of the interventions. Hence, systematic review of controlled trials with pooled analysis is
14 needed. Documentation of the interventions will also help us in understanding the type of
15 interventions carried out and the feasibility of implementation.

16 We conducted a systematic review to determine the effectiveness of cluster-level dietary
17 interventions in reducing average daily salt intake and mean 24-hr urinary sodium excretion among
18 general population.

19

20 **Methods:**

21 **Search strategy and selection criteria:**

22 **Types of studies:** Randomized controlled trials with single or multiple arms and quasi-experimental
23 studies, conducted globally and published from their start date to September 2021 were included in
24 this search.

25 **Types of participants:** Studies with participants reflecting the general population were included. We
26 did not place restrictions on gender, age and geographic area. Studies specifically conducted among
27 patients or specific disease subgroups were excluded from the review.

28 **Types of Interventions** : We included cluster-based interventions aimed at behaviour change.
29 Behaviour change may be obtained through health education given by a trained counsellor with or
30 without the use of counselling aids . The following types of interventions were included - information
31 campaigns, food product reformulation, pricing interventions, marketing restrictions and nutrition
32 information on package. Since settings based interventions (workplace, school etc.,) reflect the
33 general population, we included these in the review.

1 **Outcomes:** The outcome variables included were mean change in salt intake, mean reduction in daily
2 sodium intake in (g/day) and mean change in 24-hr urinary sodium output.

3

4 **Search Strategy:** We searched the following research databases :PubMed, Embase, Web of Science,
5 Global Index Medicus, Latin American Caribbean Health Sciences Literature (LILACS) database
6 published by BIREME, Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL), Trial Register of
7 Promoting Health Interventions (TRoPHI) databases, Central Trials Registry-India (CTRI) and
8 International Clinical Trial Registry Platform (ICTRP)-WHO- WHO-ICTRP.

9 This systematic review and meta-analysis was registered with PROSPERO (registration ID:
10 CRD42020168783) and is designed, conducted and reported following the preferred reporting items
11 for systematic reviews and meta-analyses (PRISMA) guidelines.

12

13 We developed a peer-reviewed detailed search strategy using the PICO principle by combining
14 established search terms and free text terms for each database and trial registers. A search strategy
15 for PubMed was initially developed which was adapted for the other databases and trial registers to
16 account for differences in search terms and syntax rules. Two authors (SA and VT) jointly conducted
17 the search using extensive keywords and Medical Subject Heading terms. The key search terms
18 included: (“Sodium, dietary” OR “Sodium Chloride, Dietary”) AND (“substitut*” OR “reduc*”) AND
19 (“program*” OR “strateg*” OR “initiative*” OR “Nutrition policy” OR “Food formulated” OR “Food
20 industry” OR “Health Promotion” OR “Mass media”) (see **Supplementary File S1** for full search
21 strategy). Further, hand search was carried out by going through the references of the retrieved
22 articles. We also performed related reference searches on PubMed to ensure that we had identified
23 all available published material for each intervention.

24

25 **Screening:**

26 The titles and abstracts of the reports identified through the online searching was screened for
27 eligibility using a standard checklist. Full extract of all reports that appeared to meet the inclusion
28 criteria, or for which titles and abstracts provided insufficient details were retrieved and reviewed by
29 two independent researchers (SA and VT). The disagreements were resolved by discussion with other
30 co-authors.

31

32 **Data Extraction:**

33 Data were extracted from the studies meeting inclusion criteria by two independent researchers (SA
34 and KS) using pre-tested data extraction forms. The data extraction form is attached as annexure in

1 **Supplementary File S1.** Studies reported in other languages were translated before assessment. In
2 case of multiple publications reported from a single research study, the record with the relevant data
3 was included, however the data for methodology was extracted from other publications.

4 Risk of bias was assessed using the Revised Cochrane Risk-of-Bias tool (RoB2) for randomized
5 controlled trials and ROBINS-I tool for quasi experimental studies, based on the domains provided in
6 the tool. (Supplementary table-2) Two independent reviewers (SA and VT) assessed risk of bias (high,
7 low, unclear) for each bias domain. Risk of bias assessment was based on information obtained from
8 different sources (reports of the same study, information in trial registers).

9

10 **Risk of Bias assessment:**

11 Risk of bias was assessed using RoB2 tool for cluster RCTs for the primary outcome -salt intake.
12 Following domain was assessed in terms of low-risk, some concern and high risk: bias arising from the
13 randomization process, bias arising from timing of recruitment of participants in a cluster RCT, bias
14 due to deviations from intended interventions, bias due to missing outcome data, bias in
15 measurement of the outcome and bias in selection of the reported result. Overall five RCTs were
16 judged as high risk of bias since most of them showed some concern on two or more domains.^{17,18,20,22}
17 We labelled three RCTs as having some concerns^{14,16,19} and one RCT as having low-risk of bias¹⁵. The
18 risk of bias graph and summary of all studies is presented in Fig. 4.1.1 and Fig. 4.1.2 respectively. The
19 risk of bias for Non-randomized studies of intervention was assessed using ROBINS-I tool (results
20 presented in Fig. 4.1.3.)

21

22 **Data Synthesis:**

23 The data was compiled in MS Excel and entered into Review Manger to calculate the pooled treatment
24 effects. The main outcome were Salt intake in g/day and 24-hr urine sodium output in mmol/L in 24-
25 hr. We used mean differences (MDs) to estimate the pooled outcomes. We entered the data using the
26 generic inverse variance method when the studies reported the effect estimates with their 95% CIs or
27 standard errors. When the mean change with standard deviations for each group were reported, we
28 entered the data using inverse variance method. When an analysis included studies that reported both
29 types of outcomes, the final analysis was computed using the generic inverse variance method. For
30 pre-post designs, the mean change (SE) was extracted instead of mean (SD) in each group to avoid
31 inflating the sample size. When studies reported sodium intake instead of salt intake, it was converted
32 into salt intake using the conversion factor of 2.542.¹² When salt intake or sodium intake was reported
33 per week or per month, it was converted to daily intake using the relevant conversion factor (7 or 30).

1 When the cluster studies adjusted for clustering effect in their analysis using multi-level modelling or
2 other methods, these effect estimates were entered directly using the generic inverse variance
3 method. When the studies did not adjust for clustering effect, we decided adjustment on a case-to-
4 case basis. For cluster RCTs, we assumed a Intraclass correlation coefficient of 0.1¹², but we could not
5 adjust clustering for pre-post designs or repeated cross-sectional designs. For missing data, such as
6 standard deviations, we calculated these following the advice in the Cochrane Handbook.¹³

7
8 **Assessment of heterogeneity:** The studies included in the review were described in the characteristics
9 of studies table. We assessed homogeneity of the studies based on similarity of populations,
10 interventions, type of outcomes, and follow-up times. We considered populations to be similar based
11 on the age group two sub-groups - adults and children. The interventions were classified based on the
12 activities employed in behavioural change. We regarded follow-up times of six months or less as short-
13 term, between six months to less than a year as medium-term, and more than one year as long-term.
14 We quantified the degree of heterogeneity using the I² statistic, where an I² value of 25% to 50%
15 indicates a low degree of heterogeneity, 50% to 75% a moderate degree of heterogeneity, and more
16 than 75% a high degree of heterogeneity. When moderate to high heterogeneity was identified, we
17 explored it using subgroup analyses.

18 The following sub-group analyses were performed: primary salt-intake intervention or multiple risk-
19 factor intervention, type of control – active or no-intervention control and type of setting – Worksite
20 or family base intervention. We pooled effect size estimates from individual studies using Review
21 Manager 5 (Review Manager 2014). Since the heterogeneity was moderate to high in most of the
22 analyses, we used a random-effects model for pooling the effect estimates and the output was
23 displayed using Forest plot. It was decided to assess funnel plot for assessment of reporting bias where
24 ten or more studies were included in a meta-analysis.

25 26 **Results:**

27 We identified a total of 2,898 records in the initial search. After removing duplicates (n=514), a total
28 of 2384 titles/abstracts were screened. Based on the screening, a total of 150 reports were sought for
29 full-text scrutiny. Of these, we excluded 118 reports and included 32 reports (15 studies). (PRISMA
30 study flow diagram, **Fig.1**). The range of sample sizes of included trials ranged from 68 (Takada, T et al
31 2016¹³), to 2566 (Li, N. et al¹⁴).

32 Out of the 15 included studies, 10 were cluster RCTs and 5 were Quasi-Experimental studies. All the
33 RCTs had two arms except for that of Riis, N.L. et al¹⁵ which had three arms. Among the five quasi-
34 experimental studies, two were controlled before-after studies (Geaney, F et al.; Jafari, M et al)^{16,17} ,

1 two were pre-post designs (Enkthungalag, M et al; Beer-Borst, S et al)^{18,19} and the other was a
2 repeated cross-sectional design (Land, M.A. et al)²⁰. The studies included in this review used multiple
3 methods for achieving behavioural change. We grouped the interventions based on the means
4 employed for behavioural change- Information & Counselling measures, Salt monitoring tools,
5 Environmental modification, Provision of low-sodium salt substitute, Skill training in cooking low-
6 sodium meals and Food product reformulation. Few studies used a single type of intervention. A brief
7 overview of the studies included in the review on cluster-level studies have been provided in **Table-1**.
8 The detailed description of the studies is presented in **Supplementary file S2**.

9

10 **Risk of Bias assessment:**

11 We assessed risk of bias among the randomized trials using RoB2 tool for cluster RCTs for the primary
12 outcome i.e., salt intake. Of the 10 RCTs, five were judged as high risk of bias.^{17,18,20,22} We labelled
13 three RCTs as having some concerns^{14,16,19} and one RCT as having low-risk of bias¹⁵. The risk of bias
14 graph and summary of all studies is presented in **Fig. 2** and **Fig. 3** respectively.

15

16 **Effect of interventions with information and counselling measures on salt intake**

17 Seven studies^{13,15,17,21-24} evaluated the short term (≤ 6 months) effect of information and
18 counselling measures on reduction of salt intake. Their meta-analysis revealed that the information
19 and counselling measure alone or in combination with other interventions reduced the salt intake by
20 1.25g/day (95% CI: -1.9 to -0.6, $I^2 = 84\%$). Sub-group analysis revealed that RCT sub-group (6 studies)
21 significantly reduced salt intake by 1.16g/ day (95% CI: -1.85 to -0.48, $I^2 = 85\%$) (**Fig. 4**).

22 Two studies^{16,23} evaluated the medium term (6 to <12 months) effect of the intervention (one RCT
23 and one NRSI). Pooled analysis of the two studies revealed a reduction in salt intake by 0.47 g/day
24 (95% CI: -0.81 to -0.14, $I^2 = 47\%$). (**Fig. 5**) We observed six studies^{18-20,23,25,26} reporting long-term
25 effect (≥ 12 months) of information and counselling measures on salt-intake. Pooled analysis among
26 them revealed an overall reduction in salt intake by 1.51g/day (95% CI: -2.62 to -0.4, $I^2 = 85\%$). But no
27 significant reduction was noted in sub-group analysis (RCT and NRSI) (**Fig. 6**).

28

29 **Effect of interventions with salt-monitoring tools in reducing dietary salt intake**

30 Three studies^{21,22,26} reported the effect of salt-monitoring tools alone or in conjunction with other
31 measures on salt-intake (**Fig. 7**). In the pooled analysis, there was a reduction in salt intake by 2.48
32 g/day (95% CI: -4.66 to -0.3, $I^2 = 94\%$). Sub-group analysis was not attempted due to few studies.

33

34 **Effect of interventions with environmental modification in reducing dietary salt intake**

1 Five studies^{16,18,20,25,26} evaluated the effect of environmental modification measures alone or in
2 conjunction with measures on salt-intake (**Fig. 8**). In the pooled analysis, there was no significant
3 reduction in salt intake (pooled mean reduction in 0.65 g/day [95% CI: -1.12 to -0.19, $I^2 = 75\%$]).
4

5 **Effect of interventions with low-sodium cooked foods in reducing dietary salt intake**

6 Two studies^{15,17} included provision of cooked foods alone or in conjunction with measures on salt-
7 intake (**Fig. 6.**). In the pooled analysis, there was a significant reduction in salt intake (mean reduction
8 was 1.60 g/day [95% CI: -2.42 to -0.78, $I^2 = 0\%$]).
9

10 **Effect of interventions at workplace settings in reducing dietary salt intake**

11 Four studies including three NRSIs^{16,18,19,23} conducted in workplace settings with one or more
12 measures for reduction in salt intake. In the pooled analysis (**Fig. 9**), salt intake was significantly
13 reduced by 1.15 g/day (95% CI: -2.21 to -0.1, $I^2 = 83\%$).
14

15 **Effect of interventions at the household level in reducing dietary salt intake**

16 Salt reduction by intervening among households was attempted in four RCTs.^{13,15,22,26} In all studies,
17 information and counselling measures were used as a part of the intervention. In the metaanalysis
18 (**Fig. 10**), there was a significant reduction in salt intake – a reduction in 1.48 g/day (95% CI: -2.62 to -
19 0.34, $I^2 = 78\%$).
20

21 The analysis for 24-hr urinary sodium output and comparison of unique salt-reduction interventions
22 vs multiple risk-factor interventions is given in (**Supplementary file S2**). The effect of unique salt-
23 reduction interventions was higher compared to when combined with other risk factors. We did not
24 find any significant pooled reduction in 24 hr-Urine sodium output (**See Supplementary file S2**).
25

26 **DISCUSSION**

27 We identified 15 cluster-intervention studies which evaluated interventions for reducing salt intake
28 among general populations. Of these 5 were non-randomized studies of interventions. These
29 interventions were categorized as – information and counselling measures, salt-monitoring tools,
30 provision of low-sodium salt and low-sodium cooked foods.

31 Information and counselling measures were used in all studies alone or in conjunction with other
32 measures. In the short-term (≤ 6 months), the interventions reduced the salt intake by 1.25g/day (95%
33 CI: -1.9 to -0.6, $I^2 = 84\%$). At medium-term (6 to < 12 months), it was 0.47 g/day (95% CI: -0.81 to

1 -0.14, $I^2 = 47\%$). In long term follow-up (≥ 12 months), there was an overall reduction in salt intake by
2 1.51g/day (95% CI: -2.62 to -0.4, $I^2 = 85\%$). The effect size was lower on medium-term follow up but
3 only two studies supported this evidence.

4

5 Monitoring the salt intake could increase the awareness and thereby promote behavior change. Use
6 of salt-monitoring tools as a part of the intervention reduced salt intake by 2.48 g/day (95% CI: -4.66
7 to -0.3, $I^2 = 94\%$). The heterogeneity among these studies was much higher when compared to other
8 analyses. This could be due to difference in interventions— a spoon and a measuring kit were used by
9 He et al²¹ and Daivadanam, M. et al²⁶ respectively. The measurement of outcome also varied. Takada,
10 T. et al., ²²(2017) used an instrument for measuring 24-hr urinary sodium output as monitoring tool
11 whereas Daivadanam, M. et al²⁶ assessed self-reported outcome.

12

13 Environmental modification measures were those aimed at changing the socio-cultural and physical
14 environment to enable the participants to consume low-sodium foods. Some of these interventions
15 were made in workplace settings while others in the community. In work settings, the interventions
16 included modification of canteen food by changing the menu and/or training the staff. In community
17 the focus was to reduce accessibility and visibility of high-sodium preparations and vice-versa. When
18 used in conjunction with other measures, environmental modification did not induce a large reduction
19 in salt intake— with a moderate reduction of 0.65 g/day (95% CI: -1.12 to -0.19, $I^2 = 75\%$).

20

21 Pre-cooked or reformulated low-sodium foods were provided directly to the participants as a part of
22 few interventions. However, there was no significant reduction in salt intake – a reduction in 1.12
23 g/day (95% CI: -2.28 to 0.05, $I^2 = 35\%$). Since there were only two cluster trials^{15,17}, further studies are
24 required for conclusive evidence. Reformulated low-sodium foods may help once a person is
25 motivated for behavior change. Hence we propose such intervention should always be used in
26 conjunction with other measures as is the case.

27

28 **Inferences and application of evidence**

29 We included 15 cluster-based interventional studies to reduce salt intake among general populations.
30 The studies were heterogenous in terms of the study setting, participants, intervention strategies,
31 design and measurement of outcomes.

32

1 These studies were done in multiple strata of countries worldwide including high income countries
2 (HICs) and low and middle income countries (LMICs). Hence the findings are applicable to most of the
3 countries in the world.

4 All the studies used information and counselling measures as one of the intervention strategies.
5 Information and counselling measures had significant impact on the reduction in salt intake in short-
6 term. Dietary counselling is a simple means of intervention and feasible in most situations. But the
7 intensity of counselling varied among all studies and it is difficult to generalize it as a uniform
8 intervention.

9

10 Environmental modification measures, salt monitoring tools and provision of low-sodium
11 reformulated foods also had significant impact when used in conjunction with other interventions. Of
12 all these measures, salt monitoring tools had a higher effect and environmental modification
13 measures had the least impact.

14

15 In both workplace and household settings the interventions showed significant impact, though the
16 type of interventions and study design varied. We found that focused interventions solely aimed at
17 reducing salt intake showed greater impact when compared to multiple risk factor interventions.(see
18 file S1)

19

20 To the best of our knowledge, this is the only review that pooled the effectiveness of cluster-based
21 salt-reduction strategies among otherwise healthy population sub-groups in terms of salt intake
22 (g/day).

23

24 The average salt intake in India is estimated at 11g/ day.²⁷ Since salt intake is socially influenced,
25 population-based approaches have higher impact than individual-level approaches. The interventions
26 at cluster level showed a modest reduction in salt intake ranging from 1.2 to 1.5g/ day. Salt monitoring
27 tools used in conjunction with other measures showed a slightly higher average effect of 2.5 g/day.
28 The description of interventions in this review can help in preparing and evaluating a nation-wide
29 strategy to reduce salt intake.

30

31 **Quality of evidence**

32 **Risk of Bias in cluster RCTs**

33 Of the 9 RCTs assessed for risk of bias, 5 of them had high-risk of bias. In most of these studies the risk
34 of bias was due to randomization and allocation concealment process. Since these studies were cluster

1 studies, allocation concealment was challenging. Many studies showed some concern in the domain
2 – deviation from intended interventions. This was more often due to lack of adequate documentation
3 rather than actual deviation from protocol.

4

5 **Risk of bias in included studies – NRSIs**

6 Among the Non-randomized studies of intervention most of the studies (4 of 5) showed serious risk
7 of bias, though none of them had critical risk of bias. The risk of bias was mainly in two domains –
8 confounding and selection of participants.

9

10 Since majority of the studies had high-risk (RCTs) or serious risk of bias (NRSIs), the quality of evidence
11 in this systematic review may be considered as low to very low. However, the challenge of allocation
12 concealment and blinding is persistent for conduct of high-quality cluster trials.

13

14 **Potential biases, strengths and Limitations**

15 We tried to pool the effect of salt-reduction interventions among general population. To the best of
16 our knowledge, this is the first meta-analysis on dietary salt reduction interventions. We tried to
17 include all the important databases to avoid any risk of publication bias. But since we did not include
18 grey literature like conference abstracts, there was some possibility of excluding smaller studies. We
19 tried to avoid language bias by searching regional scientific databases and not limiting to any language
20 in the search strategy.

21

22 Generalizability may be limited due to wide heterogeneity among the studies. The attributability of a
23 given intervention to the outcome was difficult due to multiple interventions. As newer studies are
24 conducted in this area, these issues may be addressed by sub-group analysis and meta-regression.

25

26 We did not assess publication bias using a funnel plot owing to limitation in number of studies in each
27 analysis (<10). Sub-group analyses and sensitivity analyses were done where feasible. Most sub-group
28 analyses did not show an extensive variation in the effect estimate. The major variation was seen
29 when single-risk factor and multiple risk factor studies were grouped separately. Such a variation in
30 results is expected.

31

32 We included randomized and non-randomized studies in the meta-analysis, though non-randomized
33 studies are considered inferior to randomized trials in terms of quality. This could be a major limitation
34 in the study.

1

2 We pooled the outcome assessed by various methods in a single pooled analysis. This could have
3 caused considerable heterogeneity.

4

5

6 **Comparison with other studies**

7 The present review focused on interventional studies that were conducted among otherwise healthy
8 populations. We evaluated the primary outcome salt intake rather than blood pressure or other health
9 related outcomes. There were similar reviews published in literature. Most of the reviews conducted
10 were on hypertensive populations and evaluated blood pressure as the outcome.

11

12 Some reviews were restricted to regional population groups^{28,29}. These reviews did not restrict to any
13 population sub-group healthy or otherwise. For example, Jin, A. et al²⁸ included studies that were
14 conducted among hypertensive population, and healthy population. The reviews by McLaren, L. et
15 al¹⁰ and Christoforou et al¹¹ reviewed programmatic interventions. McLaren, L. et al¹⁰ reviewed
16 programmatic interventions conducted among large population subgroups (country or state level) and
17 obtained data from grey literature, in this case program reports. Most of them were not research
18 studies but programs which had a pre-intervention and post-intervention data points. Due to wide
19 heterogeneity in the population and interventions, they did not conduct a meta-analysis.

20

21 **Conclusion**

22 Information and counselling interventions in conjunction with other measures effectively
23 reduced salt intake. When quantified, there was an average reduction up to 1.5g/day. Salt
24 monitoring tools showed a greater effect in reducing dietary salt.

25

26 **Table 1. Brief Summary of the studies included in the review on cluster-level studies**


Sl. No.	First_author (Year) Country	Study Design and Description of Cluster	Types of intervention	Information and counselling methods	Type of control group	Follow-up	Relevant Outcomes reported
1.	Enkhtungalag, B. (2015) Mongolia	Quasi-Experimental Study Pre-post study without control	1. Information and Counselling	1. Individual/ Group Counselling	No control group	2 years	Salt intake

		Cluster - Factory					
2.	Jafari, M. (2016) Iran	Quasi-Experimental Study Pre-post study with control Cluster – City	1. Information and Counselling 2. Provision of low-sodium cooked foods	1. Information campaign using banners 2. Educational workshops in cooking	Information through print media	12 weeks	Salt intake
3.	Land, M. A. et al., (2016) Australia	Quasi-Experimental Study Repeated cross-sectional design Cluster – Town	1. Information and Counselling 2. Environmental modification 3. Provision of low-salt substitute	1. Participatory meetings 2. Information campaign using Print media 3. Individual counselling 4. Information on sodium content of foods through IT support	No intervention	3 years	Salt intake
4.	Geane, F. (2016) Ireland	Quasi-Experimental Study Pre-post study with control Cluster: Multi-national manufacturing worksite	1. Information and Counselling (Int. Groups 2 & 4) 2. Environmental modification (intervention groups 3 &4)	1. Individual Counselling 2. Group Counselling 3. Information on low-sodium foods	No intervention	2 follow-up measurements at 3-4 and 7-9 months after baseline	Salt intake
5.	Beer-Borst, S. et al., (2019) Switzerland	Quasi-Experimental Study Pre-post study Cluster: Worksite with catering facility	1. Information and Counselling 2. Environmental modification	1. Educational workshops in cooking 2. Group counselling	No intervention	2 follow-up measures at 6 months and 12 months	Daily salt intake in g/day estimated by extrapolation of 24-hr urinary sodium excretion values

6.	Cappuccio, F.P. (2006) Ghana	Cluster Randomised Controlled Trial Cluster: Village	1. Information and Counselling	Group Counselling	1. Information and Counselling on other public health issues		24-hr Urine sodium output
7.	Brown, D.L. et al., (2015) USA	Cluster Randomised Trial Cluster - Church Parish	Information and Counselling Environment modification	1. Information through Print media 2. Educational workshops in cooking 3. Peer support	No intervention	3 follow-up measurements at 0, 6 and 12 months	Sodium intake
8.	He, F. J.(2015) China	Randomised Controlled Trial Single-blind Cluster: Urban Primary School	1. Information and Counselling 2. Salt monitoring tool	1. Group counselling 2. Participatory activities 3. Information through print media	No intervention	3.5 months	1. Salt intake 2. 24-hr Urinary sodium output
9.	Li,N. (2016) China	Randomised Controlled Trial Cluster: Township	1. Information and Counselling 2. Provision of low-sodium salt substitute	1. Group counselling	No intervention	18 months	24-hr Urine sodium output
10.	Takada,T. (2016) Japan	Randomised Single-blind Trial Cluster: Family	1. Information and Counselling 2. Skill training in cooking low-sodium meals	1. Educational workshops in cooking (Intervention group) 2. Group counselling (Intervention and control group)	1. Group Counselling - two sessions	2 months	Salt intake
11.	Takada,T. (2017) Japan	Single-blind Randomised Controlled Trial (Blinding of assessment)	1. Information and Counselling 2.Salt monitoring tool	1.Group counselling (Intervention and control group)	1. Group Counselling	4 weeks	Salt intake

		Cluster: Family					
12.	Doran, K. (2018) USA	Randomised Controlled Trial Cluster – Worksite intervention among long-term care facilities	Information and Counselling Environmental modification	1. Individual counselling (B) 2. Group counselling (B) 3. Information through electronic media 4. Peer support	1. Group Counselling – single session	3 follow-up measurements at 6, 9 and 12 months	Sodium intake i
13.	Daivadanam, M. et al., (2018) India	Cluster Randomised Trial Cluster - Neighborhood group of 6-11 households under a poverty alleviation welfare scheme	1. Information and Counselling 2. Environmental modification 3. Salt monitoring tools	1. Individual Counselling 2. Group Counselling 3. Information through print media	Information through print media	12 months	Salt intake
14.	Kaur, J. (2019) India	Randomised Controlled Trial Cluster : Geographical housing based cluster	1. Information and Counselling	1. Individual Counselling 2. Information through print and electronic media	1. Information through print media	6 months	Salt intake
15.	Riis, NL. et al., (2020) Denmark	A three-arm Randomised Controlled Trial Cluster: Family	1. Information and Counselling (B) 2. Provision of low-sodium cooked foods (A and B)	1. Individual counselling (B) 2. Group Counselling (B) 3. Information through electronic media (B)	No intervention	16 weeks	Sodium intake 24-hr Urinary Sodium output

Figure 1. PRISMA study flow diagram



1 **Figure 2. Risk of Bias (Summary) for the primary outcome (Salt intake) among the included cluster-**
 2 **RCTs using RoB2 tool**

	Risk of bias from the randomization process	Risk of Bias from Timing of recruitment (Cluster RCT)	Risk of bias due to deviations from the intended interventions	Risk of bias due to missing outcome data	Risk of bias in measurement of the outcome	Risk of bias in selection of the reported result
Brown 2015	?	?	?	+	+	+
Cappuccio 2006	+	+	?	+	+	+
Daivadanam 2018	?	+	+	+	?	+
Doran 2018	-	+	?	+	?	+
He 2015	+	+	+	+	+	+
Kaur 2020	-	+	+	+	?	+
Riis 2020	+	+	?	+	+	+
Takada 2016	?	+	?	+	+	+
Takada 2017	?	+	?	+	+	+

3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

1 **Figure 3. Risk of Bias for the primary outcome (Salt -intake) among the included NRSIs using ROBINS-**

2 **I tool**

3

4

		Risk of bias domains							
		D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	D7	Overall
5	Geane, F (2016) Ireland	⊖	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊖
6	Beer-Borst S et al (2019) Switzerland	⊕	⊗	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊗	⊗
7	Land MA et al (2016) Australia	⊗	⊗	⊕	⊕	⊗	⊕	⊕	⊗
8	Jafari, M. (2016) Iran	⊗	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊗	⊕	⊗
9	Enkhtungalag B (2015) Mongolia	⊗	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊗

10

11

12 Domains:
D1: Bias due to confounding.
D2: Bias due to selection of participants.
D3: Bias in classification of interventions.
D4: Bias due to deviations from intended interventions.
D5: Bias due to missing data.
D6: Bias in measurement of outcomes.
D7: Bias in selection of the reported result.

13 Judgement
⊗ Serious
⊖ Moderate
⊕ Low

14


15

16


17

18 **Figure 4. Forest plot showing effect of information and counselling measures on salt intake (g/day)**


19 **in short term (<=6 months)**




1 **Figure 5. Forest plot showing effect of information and counselling measures on salt intake (g/day)**
 2 **in medium term (6 to <12 months)**




8 **Figure 6. Forest plot showing effect of information and counselling measures on salt intake (g/day)**
 9 **in long-term (>=12 months)**




19 **Figure 7. Forest plot showing effect of Salt monitoring tools on salt intake (g/day)**




25 **Figure 8. Forest plot showing effect of Environmental modification on salt intake (g/day)**



30 **Figure 9. Forest plot showing effect of providing low-sodium cooked foods on salt intake (g/day)**



1 **Figure 10. Forest plot showing effect of information and counselling measures given at workplaces**
 2 **on salt intake**



3
4
5
6
7
8

6 **References**

9 1. WHO. Global Action Plan for the Prevention and Control of Noncommunicable
 10 Diseases. World Health. Geneva; 2013.

11 2. Taylor RS, Ashton KE, Moxham T, Hooper L, Ebrahim S. Reduced dietary salt for the
 12 prevention of cardiovascular disease. In: Taylor RS, editor. Cochrane Database of
 13 Systematic Reviews. Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd; 2011. p. CD009217.

14 3. WHO. Effect of reduced sodium intake on blood pressure, renal function, blood lipids
 15 and other potential adverse effects. Geneva; 2012.

16 4. Mozaffarian D, Fahimi S, Singh GM, Micha R, Khatibzadeh S, Engell RE, et al. Global
 17 Sodium Consumption and Death from Cardiovascular Causes. *New England Journal of*
 18 *Medicine*. 2014 Aug 14;371(7):624–34.

19 5. World Health Organization (WHO). Guideline: sodium intake for adults and children.
 20 Guideline: Potassium Intake for Adults and Children. 2012;1–46.

21 6. Murray CJL, Aravkin AY, Zheng P, Abbafati C, Abbas KM, Abbasi-Kangevari M, et al.
 22 Global burden of 87 risk factors in 204 countries and territories, 1990–2019: a
 23 systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2019. *The Lancet*
 24 [Internet]. 2020 Oct;396(10258):1223–49. Available from:
 25 <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0140673620307522>

26 7. Johnson C, Praveen D, Pope A, Raj TS, Pillai RN, Land MA, et al. Mean population salt
 27 consumption in India. *J Hypertens*. 2017 Jan;35(1):3–9.

28 8. Adler AJ, Taylor F, Martin N, Gottlieb S, Taylor RS, Ebrahim S. Reduced dietary salt for
 29 the prevention of cardiovascular disease. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*.
 30 2014 Dec 18;(12).

31 9. Rose G. Sick individuals and sick populations. *Int J Epidemiol* [Internet]. 2001 [cited
 32 2022 Sep 2];30(3):427–32. Available from:
 33 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/11416056/>

34 10. McLaren L, Sumar N, Barberio AM, Trieu K, Lorenzetti DL, Tarasuk V, et al. Population-
 35 level interventions in government jurisdictions for dietary sodium reduction.
 36 *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. 2016 Sep 16;(9).

37 11. Christoforou A, Trieu K, Land MA, Bolam B, Webster J. State-level and community-
 38 level salt reduction initiatives: a systematic review of global programmes and their
 39 impact. *J Epidemiol Community Health* (1978). 2016 Nov;70(11):1140–50.

- 1 12. Land MA, Webster J, Christoforou A, Praveen D, Jeffery P, Chalmers J, et al. Salt intake
2 assessed by 24 h urinary sodium excretion in a random and opportunistic sample in
3 Australia. *BMJ Open* [Internet]. 2014 [cited 2022 Sep 8];4(1). Available from:
4 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/24440795/>
- 5 13. Takada T, Imamoto M, Fukuma S, Yamamoto Y, Sasaki S, Uchida M, et al. Effect of
6 cooking classes for housewives on salt reduction in family members: a cluster
7 randomized controlled trial. *Public Health*. 2016 Nov;140:144–50.
- 8 14. Li N, Yan LL, Niu W, Yao C, Feng X, Zhang J, et al. The effects of a community-based
9 sodium reduction program in rural China - A cluster-randomized trial. *PLoS One*.
10 2016;11(12):1–12.
- 11 15. Riis NL, Bjoernsbo KS, Toft U, Trolle E, Hyldig G, Hartley IE, et al. Impact of salt
12 reduction interventions on salt taste sensitivity and liking, a cluster randomized
13 controlled trial. *Food Qual Prefer* [Internet]. 2021;87(May 2020):104059. Available
14 from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodqual.2020.104059>
- 15 16. Geaney F, Kelly C, Di Marrazzo JS, Harrington JM, Fitzgerald AP, Greiner BA, et al. The
16 effect of complex workplace dietary interventions on employees' dietary intakes,
17 nutrition knowledge and health status: A cluster controlled trial. *Prev Med (Baltim)*
18 [Internet]. 2016;89:76–83. Available from:
19 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ypmed.2016.05.005>
- 20 17. Jafari M, Mohammadi M, Ghazizadeh H, Nakhaee N. Feasibility and Outcome of
21 Reducing Salt in Bread: A Community Trial in Southern Iran. *Glob J Health Sci*.
22 2016;8(12):163.
- 23 18. Beer-Borst S, Hayoz S, Eisenblätter J, Jent S, Siegenthaler S, Strazzullo P, et al. RE-AIM
24 evaluation of a one-year trial of a combined educational and environmental
25 workplace intervention to lower salt intake in Switzerland. *Prev Med Rep* [Internet].
26 2019;16(March):100982. Available from:
27 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pmedr.2019.100982>
- 28 19. Enkhtungalag B, Batjargal J, Chimedsuren O, Tsogzolmaa B, Anderson CS, Webster J.
29 Developing a national salt reduction strategy for Mongolia. *Cardiovasc Diagn Ther*
30 [Internet]. 2015;5(3):229–37. Available from:
31 [http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=4451311&tool=pmcentr
33 ez&rendertype=abstract](http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=4451311&tool=pmcentr
32 ez&rendertype=abstract)
- 33 20. Land MA, Wu JHY, Selwyn A, Crino M, Woodward M, Chalmers J, et al. Effects of a
34 community-based salt reduction program in a regional Australian population. *BMC*
35 *Public Health* [Internet]. 2016;16(1):1–11. Available from:
36 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12889-016-3064-3>
- 37 21. He FJ, Wu Y, Feng XX, Ma J, Ma Y, Wang H, et al. School based education programme
38 to reduce salt intake in children and their families (School-EduSalt): cluster
39 randomised controlled trial. *BMJ*. 2015 Mar 18;350(mar18 13):h770–h770.
- 40 22. Takada T, Imamoto M, Sasaki S, Azuma T, Miyashita J, Hayashi M, et al. Effects of self-
41 monitoring of daily salt intake estimated by a simple electrical device for salt
42 reduction: A cluster randomized trial article. *Hypertension Research* [Internet].
43 2018;41(7):524–30. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41440-018-0046-0>
- 44 23. Doran K, Resnick B, Alghzawi H, Zhu S. The worksite heart health improvement
45 project's impact on behavioral risk factors for cardiovascular disease in long-term
46 care: A randomized control trial. Vol. 86, *International Journal of Nursing Studies*.
47 Elsevier Ltd; 2018. 107–114 p.

- 1 24. Kaur J, Kaur M, Chakrapani V, Webster J, Santos JA, Kumar R. Effectiveness of
2 information technology-enabled “SMART Eating” health promotion intervention: A
3 cluster randomized controlled trial. *PLoS One*. 2020;15(1):1–22.
- 4 25. Brown DL, Conley KM, Sánchez BN, Resnicow K, Cowdery JE, Sais E, et al. A
5 multicomponent behavioral intervention to reduce stroke risk factor behaviors: The
6 stroke health and risk education cluster-randomized controlled trial. *Stroke*.
7 2015;46(10):2861–7.
- 8 26. Daivadanam M, Wahlström R, Sundari Ravindran TK, Sankara Sarma P, Sivasankaran
9 S, Thankappan KR. Changing household dietary behaviours through community-based
10 networks: A pragmatic cluster randomized controlled trial in rural Kerala, India. *PLoS*
11 *One*. 2018;13(8):1–26.
- 12 27. Johnson C, Praveen D, Pope A, Raj TS, Pillai RN, Land MA, et al. Mean population salt
13 consumption in India: a systematic review. *J Hypertens* [Internet]. 2017 [cited 2022
14 Sep 2];35(1):3–9. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/27755388/>
- 15 28. Jin A, Xie W, Wu Y. Effect of salt reduction interventions in lowering blood pressure in
16 Chinese populations: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomised controlled
17 trials. *BMJ Open*. 2020 Feb 17;10(2).
- 18 29. Tekle DY, Santos JA, Trieu K, Thout SR, Ndanuko R, Charlton K, et al. Monitoring and
19 implementation of salt reduction initiatives in Africa: A systematic review. *J Clin*
20 *Hypertens*. 2020;22(8):1355–70.
- 21