

## **Estimating salt consumption in 49 low- and middle-income countries: Development, validation and application of a machine learning model**

Wilmer Cristobal Guzman-Vilca <sup>1,2,3</sup>

Manuel Castillo-Cara <sup>4</sup>

Rodrigo M. Carrillo-Larco <sup>2,5</sup>

1. School of Medicine “Alberto Hurtado”, Universidad Peruana Cayetano Heredia, Lima, Peru.
2. CRONICAS Centre of Excellence in Chronic Diseases, Universidad Peruana Cayetano Heredia, Lima, Peru.
3. Sociedad Científica de Estudiantes de Medicina Cayetano Heredia (SOCEMCH), Universidad Peruana Cayetano Heredia, Lima, Peru.
4. Universidad de Lima, Lima, Peru.
5. Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, School of Public Health, Imperial College London, London, London, UK.

### **Correspondence author:**

Rodrigo M Carrillo-Larco, MD

Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics

School of Public Health

Imperial College London

[rcarrill@ic.ac.uk](mailto:rcarrill@ic.ac.uk)

**Conflict of interest:** None to declare.

**Contributions:** All authors conceived the idea. MC-C conducted the analysis with support from WCG-V and RMC-L. WCG-V drafted the manuscript with support from MC-C and RMC-L. All

**NO authors approved the submitted version. This preprint has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.**

## ABSTRACT

**Background:** Global targets to reduce salt intake have been proposed but their monitoring is challenged by the lack of population-based data on salt consumption. We developed a machine learning (ML) model to predict salt consumption based on simple predictors, and applied this model to national surveys in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs).

**Methods:** Pooled analysis of WHO STEPS surveys. We used 19 surveys with spot urine samples for the ML model derivation and validation; we developed a supervised ML regression model based on: sex, age, weight, height, systolic and diastolic blood pressure. We applied the ML model to 49 new STEPS surveys to quantify the mean salt consumption in the population.

**Results:** The pooled dataset in which we developed the ML model included 45,152 people. Overall, there were no substantial differences between the observed (8.1 g/day (95% CI: 8.0-8.2 g/day)) and ML-predicted (8.1 g/day (95% CI: 8.1-8.2 g/day)) mean salt intake ( $p=0.065$ ). The pooled dataset where we applied the ML model included 157,699 people; the overall predicted mean salt consumption was 8.1 g/day (95% CI: 8.1-8.2 g/day). The countries with the highest predicted mean salt intake were in Western Pacific. The lowest predicted intake was found in Africa. The country-specific predicted mean salt intake was within reasonable difference from the best available evidence.

**Conclusions:** A ML model based on readily available predictors estimated daily salt consumption with good accuracy. This model could be used to predict mean salt consumption in the general population where urine samples are not available.

**Funding:** Wellcome Trust (214185/Z/18/Z)

**Key words:** artificial intelligence; deep learning; cardio-metabolic risk factors; cardiovascular health; global health; population health.

## INTRODUCTION

The association between high sodium/salt intake and high blood pressure, a major risk factor of cardiovascular diseases (CVD), is well-established.<sup>1-3</sup> More than 1.7 million CVD deaths were attributed to a diet high in sodium in 2019, with ~90% of these deaths occurring in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs).<sup>4,5</sup> Consequently, salt reduction has been included in international goals: the World Health Organization (WHO) recommendation of limiting salt consumption to <5 g/day,<sup>2</sup> and the agreement by the WHO state members of a 30% relative reduction in mean population salt intake by 2025.<sup>6</sup> Because available evidence suggests that sodium/salt consumption is higher than the global targets,<sup>7-9</sup> we need timely and consistent data of sodium/salt consumption in the general population to track progress of salt reduction targets.

Global efforts have been made to produce comparable estimates of sodium/salt intake for all countries.<sup>7</sup> Similarly, researchers have summarized all the available evidence in specific world regions.<sup>8,9</sup> Although the global endeavor was based on the gold standard method to assess sodium/salt intake (i.e., 24-hour urine sample), their estimates were up to 2010.<sup>7</sup> Therefore, robust and comparable sodium/salt intake estimates for all countries lack for the last ten years. The regional endeavors summarized population-based evidence, yet they conducted study-level meta-analyses in which the original studies could have followed different laboratory methods, and they did not study all countries in the region. Therefore, comparability across studies could be limited and evidence lacks for many countries. Finding a method to estimate sodium/salt consumption in national samples leveraging on available data is needed to update and complement the existing evidence.<sup>7-10</sup> However, quantifying sodium/salt intake based on 24-hour urine samples is costly and burdensome, limiting its use in population-based studies or national health surveys. As an alternative, equations have been developed to estimate sodium/salt intake based on spot urine (SU) samples.<sup>11-14</sup> However, these equations have been used in few WHO STEPS and other national health surveys,<sup>15</sup> leaving several countries without data to quantify the local sodium/salt consumption because they do not have access to SU samples.<sup>16</sup>

If we could (accurately) estimate sodium/salt intake based on variables that are routinely available in national health surveys (e.g., weight or blood pressure), mean sodium/salt intake in countries

that currently lack urine data (i.e., 24-hour or spot) could be computed using these available predictors. Advanced analytic techniques like machine learning (ML) could make accurate predictions, and inform about the population sodium/salt intake in LMICs. We developed a ML predictive model to estimate salt intake using routinely available variables in WHO STEPS surveys, and we applied this ML model to WHO STEPS surveys without urine data to compute the mean salt intake in the general population.

## **METHODS**

### **Study design**

This is a data pooling ML analysis of individual-level data of WHO STEPS surveys. First, we downloaded 19 WHO STEPS surveys with SU samples; these surveys were used for the training, validation and testing the ML model. These 19 WHO STEPS surveys represented 17 LMICs; two countries contributed with two surveys: Bhutan 2014 and 2019 as well as Mongolia 2013 and 2019. Second, we downloaded 49 new WHO STEPS surveys which had the variables included in the ML prediction model (see Variables section), but did not have SU samples. The ML model herein developed was applied to these 49 surveys to estimate the mean salt consumption in the population. All WHO STEPS surveys herein analysed were national (i.e., sub-national surveys were excluded).

### **Rationale**

We hypothesized that a ML model could accurately predict salt consumption at the individual level, to then inform the overall mean in the underlying population. In addition, we endeavoured to develop a ML model with simple predictors; that is, variables that are routinely available in national health surveys contrary to urine sample that are seldom collected in national health surveys in LMICs. If the model were indeed accurate, then it could be applied to national surveys without urine samples but with the relevant predictors to inform about the mean salt consumption in the target population. These model-driven estimates could be preliminary, until a national health survey is conducted to study mean salt consumption with urine samples (ideally 24-hour urine samples).

## Variables

The predictors we used in the ML model were: sex, age (years), weight (kg), height (m), systolic blood pressure (SBP, mmHg) and diastolic blood pressure (DBP, mmHg).

The WHO STEPS surveys collect anthropometric and three blood pressure measurements. These are taken by trained fieldworkers following a standard protocol.<sup>15</sup> We used measured weight and height to compute the body mass index (BMI, kg/m<sup>2</sup>). We used the mean SBP and mean DBP of the second and third blood pressure measurements (i.e., the first blood pressure measurement was discarded).

The outcome was salt intake as per the INTERSALT equation.<sup>11</sup> We chose this equation because it has been used by some WHO STEPS surveys. There is a specific INTERSALT equation for each sex, and they both include the following variables: age (years), BMI (kg/m<sup>2</sup>), SU sodium (mmol/L), and SU creatinine (mmol/L).<sup>11</sup> We used the following sex-specific formulas.

$$\text{Men: } \{23.51 + [0.45 \times Na_{SU}] - [3.09 \times Cr_{SU}] + [4.16 \times BMI] + [0.22 \times age]\}$$

$$\text{Women: } \{3.74 + [0.33 \times Na_{SU}] - [2.44 \times Cr_{SU}] + [2.42 \times BMI] + [2.34 \times age] - [0.03 \times age^2]\}$$

Where the subscript *SU* indicates spot urine, *Na* is sodium, *Cr* is creatinine and *BMI* is body mass index. Because some STEPS surveys had SU creatinine in mg/dl, these values were multiplied by 0.00884 to obtain SU creatinine in mmol/L. No conversion was needed for sodium in SU samples because all WHO STEPS surveys herein included already had urinary sodium in mmol/L. The INTERSALT equation computes 24-hour sodium intake, which is then divided by 17.1 to obtain the salt intake in grams per day (g/d).<sup>11</sup> For descriptive purposes, we also computed salt intake based on the Kawasaki,<sup>12</sup> Toft<sup>13</sup> and Tanaka<sup>14</sup> equations.

## Analysis

### Data preparation

Our complete-case analysis was restricted to men and non-pregnant women aged between 15 and 69 years. We dropped participants with implausible BMI levels (outside the range 10-80

kg/m<sup>2</sup>) or with implausible weight (outside the range 12-300 kg) or height records (outside the range 1.00-2.50 m). Participants with SBP outside the range 70-270 mmHg were discarded, and so were participants with DBP outside the range 30-150 mmHg. We excluded records with SU creatinine <1.8 or >32.7 mmol/L for males and <1.8 or >28.3 for females.<sup>17,18</sup> In addition, we excluded participants with estimated salt intake (using the 4 equations) above or below three standard deviations from the equation-specific mean (Supplementary Figure 1).<sup>19</sup> After completing data preparation, observations were randomly assigned from the pooled dataset (100%) into three datasets for the ML analysis: training data (50%), test data (30%) and validation data (20%).

### **Machine learning modelling**

Our research aim was a regression problem where we had a known outcome attribute (salt consumption at the subject level). Therefore, we planned a supervised ML regression analysis. Details about the modelling process are available in the Extended Methods (Supplementary Material pp. 03-06). In brief, we designed a work pipeline with five steps. First, *data analysis*, where we dropped missing observations, we explored the available data to choose scaling and transformation methods to secure all variables were in the same scale or units, and we also planned transformations for categorical variables (e.g., one-hot encoding). Second, *feature importance analysis*, where we investigated the contribution of each predictor to the regression model through methods like Random Forest and Recursive Feature Elimination. The aim of this second step was to exclude any predictor that would not contribute to the regression model. Notably, all predictors (see Variables section) chosen following expert knowledge were kept in the analysis (i.e., the feature importance analysis did not suggest the exclusion of any predictor). Third, *data processing*, having explored the available data (first step in the work pipeline), we implemented different scaling and transformation methods (e.g., Box-Cox, Principal Component Analysis and polynomial features). Fourth, *data modelling*, where we implemented ten ML algorithms: i) Linear Regression (LiR); ii) Huber Regressor (HuR); iii) Ridge Regressor (RiR); iv) Multilayer Perceptron (MLP); v) Support Vector Regressor (SVR); vi) *k*-Nearest Neighbors (KNN); vii) Random Forest (RF); viii) Gradient Boost Machine (GBM); ix) Extreme Gradient Boosting (XBG); and x) a customized neural network. All these ML algorithms performed similarly, so the

decision to choose one was postponed to the fifth (last) step in the work pipeline. Up to this point, we used the training and validations datasets. Five, *forecasting* of the predicted attribute in new data (i.e., data not used for model training); in this step we used the test dataset to choose the model that yielded predictions closest to the observed salt intake. Results comparing the observed and the predicted salt intake were computed in the test dataset alone. For each country we ran a paired t-test between the observed and predicted salt consumption, where a difference was deemed significant at a  $p < 0.05$ . We also computed the absolute difference between the observed and predicted salt intake. We chose the RF algorithm because it showed the mean difference closest to zero in both sexes combined (observed – predicted = 0) (Supplementary table 1, Supplementary figure 2). All summary estimates (e.g., mean salt intake) were computed accounting for the complex survey design of the WHO STEPS surveys.

### **Application of the developed ML model**

Having developed the ML model following the steps above described, we applied the model to 49 WHO STEPS national surveys which did not have urine samples but included the predictors in the ML model (see Variables section). In each of these 49 surveys we computed the mean daily salt intake accounting for the complex survey design. These surveys were pre-processed following the same procedures described in the Data preparation section.

### **Ethics**

We did not seek approval by an Institutional Review Board. We used individual-level survey data which do not include any personal identifiers.

### **Role of the funding source**

The funder had no role in the study design, analysis, interpretation or decision to publish. The authors are collectively responsible for the accuracy of the data. The arguments and opinions in this work are those of the authors alone, and do not represent the position of the institutions to which they belong.

## RESULTS

### Study population for model derivation and validation

The pooled dataset included 45,152 people from 17 LMICs in 19 WHO STEPS surveys (i.e., two countries, Bhutan and Mongolia, had 2 surveys) conducted between 2013-2019 (Supplementary table 2). Overall, the mean age was 38.6 (95% confidence interval (95% CI): 38.1-39.0) years and the proportion of women was 52.1%. The mean SBP was 122.0 mmHg (95% CI: 121.4-122.6 mmHg) and mean DBP was 79.2 mmHg (95% CI: 78.8-79.6 mmHg). The mean weight was 59.2 kg (95% CI: 58.8-59.7 kg) and the mean height was 1.59 m (95% CI: 1.58-1.59 m).

### Observed and predicted mean salt intake during the ML model derivation and validation

In the test dataset including 19 WHO STEPS surveys, the observed mean salt intake computed as per the INTERSALT equation was 8.1 g/day (95% CI: 8.0-8.2 g/day) across countries. The observed salt intake was higher in men (8.9 g/day; 95% CI: 8.7-9.0 g/day) than in women (7.4 g/day; 95% CI: 7.3-7.4 g/day). Across countries, the predicted mean salt intake was 8.1 g/day (95% CI: 8.1-8.2 g/day). Men had a higher predicted mean salt intake (8.9 g/day; 95% CI: 8.8-8.9 g/day) than women (7.4 g/day; 95% CI: 7.4-7.5 g/day). Overall, there were no substantial differences between the observed and predicted estimates ( $p=0.065$ ). Results for each survey are presented in Figure 1 and Supplementary table 3.

In men across all countries in the test dataset including 19 WHO STEPS surveys representing 17 LMICs, the mean difference between observed and predicted mean salt intake was 0.02 g/day ( $p=0.277$ ). Across all surveys, the positive mean difference farthest from zero was 1.39 g/day (Malawi,  $p<0.001$ ), and the negative mean difference farthest from zero was -0.74 g/day (Lebanon,  $p=0.227$ ). The mean difference closest to zero was 0.03 g/day (Armenia,  $p=0.787$ ) (Supplementary table 4).

In women across all countries in the test dataset including 19 WHO STEPS surveys representing 17 LMICs, the mean difference between the observed and predicted mean salt intake was -0.02 g/day ( $p=0.124$ ). The positive mean difference farthest from zero was 1.02 g/day (Malawi,  $p<0.001$ ) and the negative mean difference farthest from zero was in -0.71 g/day (Brunei



Darussalam,  $p < 0.001$ ). The mean difference closest to zero was  $-0.07$  g/day (Armenia,  $p = 0.343$ ) (Supplementary table 4).

None of the LMICs herein analysed, regardless of the method of sodium intake assessment (i.e., observed or predicted), showed a mean salt intake below the WHO recommended level of  $< 5$  g/day (Figure 1, Supplementary table 3). The same occurred for the mean salt intake estimates using the Kawasaki, Toft and Tanaka formulas (Supplementary table 5).

### **Implementation of the developed ML model to predict salt consumption in 49 LMICs**

The pooled dataset where we applied the ML model included 157,699 people from 49 LMICs in 49 WHO STEPS surveys conducted between 2004-2018 (Supplementary table 6). Overall, the mean age was 37.7 (95% CI: 37.2-38.1) years and the proportion of women was 48.8%. The mean SBP was 123.8 mmHg (95% CI: 123.1-124.4 mmHg) and mean DBP was 79.1 mmHg (95% CI: 78.7-79.6 mmHg). The mean weight was 60.6 kg (95% CI: 60.2-61.0 kg) and the mean height was 1.61 m (95% CI: 1.61-1.61 m).

Across the 49 LMICs, the predicted mean salt intake was 8.1 g/day (95% CI: 8.1-8.2 g/day), and it was higher in men (8.9 g/day; 95% CI: 8.8-8.9 g/day) than in women (7.4 g/day; 95% CI: 7.3-7.4 g/day). None of the LMICs herein analysed, regardless of sex, showed a predicted mean salt intake below the WHO recommended level of  $< 5$  g/day (Figure 2, Supplementary table 7).

In men, the countries with the highest predicted mean salt intakes were Nauru and American Samoa (both with 11.1 g/day), Cook Islands (11.0 g/day) and Niue (10.7 g/day); remarkably, three of these countries (Nauru, Cook Islands and Niue) are in Western Pacific. In contrast, the lowest predicted mean salt intake in men were in Ethiopia (8.3 g/day), Eritrea and Timor-Leste (both with 8.4 g/day), and United Republic of Tanzania, Botswana and Uganda (all with 8.6 g/day); remarkably, all of these countries except Timor-Leste are in Africa.

In women, the countries with the highest predicted mean salt intakes were American Samoa (9.0 g/day), Nauru (8.8 g/day), and Cook Islands, Samoa and Tuvalu (all with 8.6 g/day); the latter four

countries are in Western Pacific. Conversely, the lowest predicted mean salt intake in women were in Ethiopia and Eritrea (both with 6.9 g/day), Timor-Leste (7.0 g/day), and Vietnam (7.1 g/day); the first two countries (out of four) are in Africa.

## **DISCUSSION**

### **Main findings**

This work leveraged on 19 national health surveys and readily available predictors to develop a ML model to predict salt consumption; this model was then applied to national surveys in 49 LMICs. The RF ML algorithm yielded the predictions closest to the observed salt intake: the mean difference between predicted and observed salt consumption across surveys was 0.02 g/day in men and -0.02 g/day in women. We used this novel ML model to predict salt consumption in 49 LMICs, where the mean salt consumption ranged from 8.3 g/day (Ethiopia) to 11.1 g/day (Nauru) in men; these numbers in women ranged from 6.9 g/day (Ethiopia and Eritrea) to 9.0 g/day (American Samoa). This work aimed to elaborate on novel analytical tools to predict salt consumption where national surveys have not collected this information limiting their ability to keep track of mean sodium consumption in the general population. Pending external independent validation, our model could be used in monitoring frameworks of salt consumption because most countries do not collect sodium samples in their national health surveys. Our model could contribute to the global surveillance of salt consumption, a relevant cardio-metabolic risk factor.<sup>1-</sup>

3

### **Public health implications**

ML models have been used extensively to predict relevant clinical outcomes (e.g., mortality) and epidemiological indicators (e.g., forecasting COVID-19 cases).<sup>20-24</sup> Furthermore, ML algorithms have proven to be useful for understanding complex outcomes (e.g., identifying clusters of people with diabetes) based on simple predictors (e.g., BMI) in nationally-representative survey data.<sup>25-</sup>  
<sup>27</sup> Our work complements the current evidence on ML algorithms by demonstrating its use in a relevant field: population salt consumption. In so doing, we delivered a pragmatic tool which could be used to inform the surveillance of salt consumption in countries where national surveys do not objectively collect this information (e.g., SU samples). Moreover, this work provided preliminary

evidence to update the global estimates of population-based sodium consumption,<sup>7</sup> by informing about the mean sodium consumption in 49 LMICs. Our results suggest that mean salt consumption is above the WHO recommended level in all the 49 LMICs herein analysed, and it was the highest among LMICs in Western Pacific, and the lowest among LMICs in Africa. This finding, which is consistent with a global work,<sup>7</sup> calls for urgent actions to reduce salt consumption in these 49 LMICs, especially those in Western Pacific.

We do not believe that our -or any other- ML model should replace a comprehensive population-based nationally representative health survey with 24-hour or spot urine samples. However, until such surveys are available in many LMICs and periodically conducted, we could suggest using an estimation approach to shed lights about the mean salt consumption in the population. Our ML model seems to be a reasonably good alternative, and could become a pragmatic tool for surveillance systems that keep track of sodium consumption in accordance with global goals.<sup>2,6</sup>

### **Research in context**

A global effort provided mean sodium/salt consumption estimates for 187 countries in 1990 and 2010;<sup>7</sup> they used 24-hour urine samples and dietary reports from surveys conducted in 66 countries, including LMICs. Unfortunately, their results were until 2010 and many LMICs were not included. Our results advanced this evidence by providing more recent salt consumption estimates, because most of the surveys in which we applied our ML model were conducted after 2010 (Supplementary table 6).

Compared to the global estimates for the same LMICs in 2010,<sup>7</sup> our mean salt consumption estimates were very similar. For example, our 2010 mean salt consumption estimates for Cambodia, Eritrea and the Gambia were 8.0 g/day, 7.2 g/day and 8.3 g/day, whereas the estimates by Powles *et al.* were 11.0 g/day, 5.9 g/day and 7.7 g/day (Supplementary table 8).<sup>7</sup> We further compared our estimates for surveys conducted between 2007 and 2013 (+/- 3 years around 2010) with the 2010 estimates provided by Powles *et al.*,<sup>7</sup> and our results were also within reasonable difference. The largest differences were in Kyrgyzstan (8.7 by our ML model versus 13.4 by Powles *et al.*<sup>7</sup>), as well as in Comoros (8.4 versus 4.2<sup>7</sup>) and Rwanda (8.0 versus 4.0<sup>7</sup>). It

appears that our predictions were higher than those provided by Powles *et al.*<sup>7</sup> in countries with presumably low salt consumption (e.g., Comoros, Rwanda); conversely, in countries with presumably high salt consumption (e.g., Kyrgyzstan), our predictions revealed smaller estimates than those by Powles *et al.*<sup>7</sup> (Supplementary table 8). These differences could be explained by the fact that our ML model was developed based on SU samples rather than 24-hour urine samples as Powles *et al.* did. Strong evidence indicates that estimates based on SU may overestimate salt intake at lower levels of consumption and underestimate salt intake at higher levels of consumption.<sup>28</sup>

In addition to the global work by Powles *et al.*,<sup>7</sup> there are other reports from some specific LMICs. For example, a survey conducted between 2012 and 2016 with 24-hour urine samples in Fiji and Samoa showed that the mean salt consumption was 10.6 g/day and 7.1 g/day, respectively.<sup>17</sup> The estimates from our ML model for Fiji (2011) and Samoa (2013) suggested that the mean salt consumption was 8.9 g/day and 9.6 g/day, respectively. A survey in Vanuatu in 2016 based on 24-hour urine sample informed that the mean salt intake was 5.9 g/day;<sup>18</sup> our estimate for the year 2011 was 8.6 g/day. In 2009 in Vietnam a survey with SU samples revealed that the mean salt consumption was 9.9 g/day;<sup>19</sup> our prediction for the year 2015 was 7.9. These comparisons suggest that our ML-predicted estimates are plausible and close to the best available evidence.

Although these comparisons do not validate our predictions in the 49 national surveys, they suggest that our salt consumption estimates are within reasonable distance from the best available evidence. Until better data are available (e.g., national survey with spot or 24-hour urine sample), our model could provide preliminary evidence to inform the national mean salt consumption. Careful interpretation is warranted to understand the strengths and limitations of our ML-based predictions.

### **Strengths and limitations**

We followed sound and transparent methods to develop a ML model to predict salt consumption at the individual level. We leveraged on open-access national data collected following standard and consistent protocols (WHO STEPS surveys). Most of the surveys we analysed were

conducted after 2010, providing more recent evidence than the latest global effort to quantify salt consumption in all countries.<sup>7</sup> Notwithstanding, we must acknowledge some limitations. First, urine data was based on a spot sample, which is not the gold standard (24-hour urine sample) to measure daily salt consumption. Future work should verify and advance our results using on 24-hour urine samples available in nationally representative samples; in the meantime, our work has led the foundations and hopefully sparked interest to use available data and novel analytical techniques to deliver estimates of salt consumption in the general population. Second, even though we analysed 19 national surveys (representing 17 LMICs) to develop our ML model, the sample size could still be limited for a data-driven ML algorithm (i.e., 22,577 observations were included in model development). A larger and global work in which all relevant data sources are pooled is needed; while this endeavour takes place, our work has provided recent estimates of salt consumption at the population level in 49 LMICs. In this line, there are still countries which were not herein included. Researchers in these countries, along with local (e.g., ministries of health) and international health authorities (e.g., WHO), should conduct studies/surveys to collect data on salt consumption. This would inform global targets but also local needs and interventions.

## **Conclusions**

A ML model based on readily available variables was accurate to predict daily salt consumption. This ML model applied to 49 national surveys with no urine samples to compute daily salt consumption, revealed high levels of salt intake particularly in the Western Pacific region. Pending further validation, this ML model could be used to keep track of the overall sodium consumption where resources are not available to conduct national surveys with urine samples.


## **DATA SHARING STATEMENT**

This study used nationally-representative survey data that are in the public domain, which was requested through the online repository (<https://extranet.who.int/ncdsmicrodata/index.php/home>).

We provide the analysis code of data preparation and data analysis as supplementary materials to this paper.


## FIGURES

**Figure 1. Observed and predicted mean salt intake (g/day) by sex in each survey included in the ML model development**



Exact estimates (along with their 95% CI) are presented in Supplementary table 3. These results were computed with the test dataset only. Results are for the Random Forest algorithm, which was the model with the best performance.

**Figure 2. Predicted mean salt intake (g/day) by sex in each of the 49 national surveys included in the application of the model herein developed.**



Exact estimates (along with their 95% CI) are presented in Supplementary table 7. Countries are presented in ascending order based on their overall mean salt intake (i.e., countries with the highest mean salt intake are at the bottom).



## REFERENCES

1. He FJ, Li J, Macgregor GA. Effect of longer term modest salt reduction on blood pressure: Cochrane systematic review and meta-analysis of randomised trials. *BMJ*. 2013 Apr 3;346:f1325.
2. World Health Organization. Salt reduction [Internet]. [cited 2021 Jun 6]. Available from: <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/salt-reduction>
3. Poggio R, Gutierrez L, Matta MG, Elorriaga N, Irazola V, Rubinstein A. Daily sodium consumption and CVD mortality in the general population: systematic review and meta-analysis of prospective studies. *Public Health Nutr*. 2015 Mar;18(4):695–704.
4. GBD 2019 Risk Factors Collaborators. Global burden of 87 risk factors in 204 countries and territories, 1990–2019: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2019. *The Lancet*. 2020 Oct 17;396(10258):1223–49.
5. GBD Results Tool | GHDx [Internet]. Available from: <http://ghdx.healthdata.org/gbd-results-tool>
6. World Health Organization. Population sodium reduction strategies [Internet]. WHO. World Health Organization; [cited 2021 Jun 6]. Available from: <http://www.who.int/dietphysicalactivity/reducingsalt/en/>
7. Powles J, Fahimi S, Micha R, Khatibzadeh S, Shi P, Ezzati M, et al. Global, regional and national sodium intakes in 1990 and 2010: a systematic analysis of 24 h urinary sodium excretion and dietary surveys worldwide. *BMJ Open*. 2013 Dec 23;3(12):e003733.
8. Carrillo-Larco RM, Bernabe-Ortiz A. Sodium and Salt Consumption in Latin America and the Caribbean: A Systematic-Review and Meta-Analysis of Population-Based Studies and Surveys. *Nutrients*. 2020 Feb 20;12(2).
9. Oyebo O, Oti S, Chen Y-F, Lilford RJ. Salt intakes in sub-Saharan Africa: a systematic review and meta-regression. *Popul Health Metr*. 2016;14:1.
10. Thout SR, Santos JA, McKenzie B, Trieu K, Johnson C, McLean R, et al. The Science of Salt: Updating the evidence on global estimates of salt intake. *J Clin Hypertens (Greenwich)*. 2019 Jun;21(6):710–21.
11. Brown IJ, Dyer AR, Chan Q, Cogswell ME, Ueshima H, Stamler J, et al. Estimating 24-hour urinary sodium excretion from casual urinary sodium concentrations in Western populations: the INTERSALT study. *Am J Epidemiol*. 2013 Jun 1;177(11):1180–92.
12. Kawasaki T, Itoh K, Uezono K, Sasaki H. A simple method for estimating 24 h urinary sodium and potassium excretion from second morning voiding urine specimen in adults. *Clin Exp Pharmacol Physiol*. 1993 Jan;20(1):7–14.
13. Toft U, Cerqueira C, Andreasen AH, Thuesen BH, Laurberg P, Ovesen L, et al. Estimating salt intake in a Caucasian population: can spot urine substitute 24-hour urine samples? *Eur J Prev Cardiol*. 2014 Oct;21(10):1300–7.
14. Tanaka T, Okamura T, Miura K, Kadowaki T, Ueshima H, Nakagawa H, et al. A simple method to estimate populational 24-h urinary sodium and potassium excretion using a casual urine specimen. *J Hum Hypertens*. 2002 Feb;16(2):97–103.
15. World Health Organization. STEPwise Approach to NCD Risk Factor Surveillance (STEPS) [Internet]. [cited 2021 Jun 6]. Available from: <https://www.who.int/teams/noncommunicable-diseases/surveillance/systems-tools/steps>

16. World Health Organization. NCD Microdata Repository [Internet]. [cited 2021 Jun 6]. Available from: <https://extranet.who.int/ncdsmicrodata/index.php/catalog/STEPS>
17. Santos JA, Rosewarne E, Hogendorf M, Trieu K, Pillay A, Ieremia M, et al. Estimating mean population salt intake in Fiji and Samoa using spot urine samples. *Nutr J*. 2019 Sep 10;18(1):55.
18. Paterson K, Hinge N, Sparks E, Trieu K, Santos JA, Tarivonda L, et al. Mean Dietary Salt Intake in Vanuatu: A Population Survey of 755 Participants on Efate Island. *Nutrients*. 2019 Apr 24;11(4).
19. Jensen PN, Bao TQ, Huong TTT, Heckbert SR, Fitzpatrick AL, LoGerfo JP, et al. The association of estimated salt intake with blood pressure in a Viet Nam national survey. *PLoS One*. 2018 Jan 18;13(1):e0191437.
20. Wang W, Kiik M, Peek N, Curcin V, Marshall IJ, Rudd AG, et al. A systematic review of machine learning models for predicting outcomes of stroke with structured data. *PLoS One*. 2020 Jun 12;15(6):e0234722.
21. Wynants L, Calster BV, Collins GS, Riley RD, Heinze G, Schuit E, et al. Prediction models for diagnosis and prognosis of covid-19: systematic review and critical appraisal. *BMJ*. 2020 Apr 7;369:m1328.
22. Groot OQ, Ogink PT, Lans A, Twining PK, Kapoor ND, DiGiovanni W, et al. Machine learning prediction models in orthopedic surgery: A systematic review in transparent reporting. *J Orthop Res*. 2021 Mar 18;
23. Watson GL, Xiong D, Zhang L, Zoller JA, Shamshoian J, Sundin P, et al. Pandemic velocity: Forecasting COVID-19 in the US with a machine learning & Bayesian time series compartmental model. *PLOS Computational Biology*. 2021 Mar 29;17(3):e1008837.
24. Mohan S, A J, Abugabah A, M A, Kumar Singh S, Kashif Bashir A, et al. An approach to forecast impact of Covid-19 using supervised machine learning model. *Softw Pract Exp*. 2021 Apr 1;
25. Oh J, Yun K, Maoz U, Kim T-S, Chae J-H. Identifying depression in the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey data using a deep learning algorithm. *J Affect Disord*. 2019 Oct 1;257:623–31.
26. García de la Garza Á, Blanco C, Olfson M, Wall MM. Identification of Suicide Attempt Risk Factors in a National US Survey Using Machine Learning. *JAMA Psychiatry*. 2021 Apr 1;78(4):398–406.
27. Carrillo-Larco RM, Castillo-Cara M, Anza-Ramirez C, Bernabé-Ortiz A. Clusters of people with type 2 diabetes in the general population: unsupervised machine learning approach using national surveys in Latin America and the Caribbean. *BMJ Open Diabetes Res Care*. 2021 Jan;9(1):e001889.
28. Huang L, Crino M, Wu JHY, Woodward M, Barzi F, Land M-A, et al. Mean population salt intake estimated from 24-h urine samples and spot urine samples: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Int J Epidemiol*. 2016 Feb;45(1):239–50.

## **SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL**

### **Estimating salt consumption in 49 low- and middle-income countries: Development, validation and application of a machine learning model**

#### **Correspondence author:**

Rodrigo M Carrillo-Larco, MD

Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics

School of Public Health

Imperial College London

[rcarrill@ic.ac.uk](mailto:rcarrill@ic.ac.uk)

## Table of Contents

Expanded methods**3**

Overview**3**

Data analysis**4**

Feature importance analysis**4**

Data processing**4**

Data modelling**4**

Forecasting modelling**5**

Algorithm application**6**

Supplementary figure 1. Flowchart of data cleaning and inclusion criteria**7**

Supplementary Table 1. Mean difference between observed and predicted salt intake by sex across all ML algorithms**8**

Supplementary Table 2. Weighted distribution of predictors in each survey included in the ML model development.**10**

Supplementary Table 3. Observed and predicted mean salt intake (g/day) by sex in each survey included in the ML model development.**14**

Supplementary Table 4. Mean difference between observed and predicted salt intake by sex in each survey included in the ML model development.**17**

Supplementary Table 5. Observed mean salt intake (g/day) by equation and sex in each survey included in the ML model development.**20**

Supplementary Table 6. Weighted distribution of predictors in each of the 49 national surveys included in the application of the model herein developed.**25**

Supplementary Table 7. Predicted mean salt intake (g/day) by sex in each of the 49 national surveys included in the application of the model herein developed.**29**


Supplementary Table 8. Comparison between mean salt intake predictions and global estimates across national surveys included in the ML application.**34**

## Expanded methods

### Overview

We worked with a structured dataset which mostly had numeric attributes (variables). Given our study problem, we opted for a supervised learning model because there was a target attribute (i.e., salt consumption at the subject level); specifically, we conducted a supervised regression because the target attribute was a numeric variable. For the machine learning analyses we used Python and the Scikit-Learn library.

First, we developed a pipeline for data management and model development. This way, we followed a consistent and transparent methodology to secure an optimal model for the training set and that would adequately generalize to other (unseen) datasets. The following figure depicts the pipeline we developed: i) we studied the available data and where needed, we did a one-hot encoding; ii) we did feature importance analysis; iii) we chose and tried different scaling and transformation methods, so that all variables would be in the same scale or units; iv) we tried a set of machine learning models, including a customized neural network; v) we forecasted (predicted) the attribute of interest (salt consumption at the subject level) in an unseen dataset (i.e., not used for model training). Notably, we went backwards and forwards (see arrows in the figure) between the four first stages until we reached the best combinations and results for each model. In the following sections, we will describe each of these five stages.



## Data analysis

This was an exploratory analysis to understand the dataset and its characteristics. We worked with a complete-case dataset; in other words, we excluded missing observations in the variables considered in the analysis. Consequently, we did not do any data imputation analysis.

We explored the distribution of all numerical variables, which were in different units and scales; this exploratory analysis informed the choices of data processing methods (e.g., Box-Cox) implemented in the third stage.

## Feature importance analysis

Even though we followed expert knowledge to select a reduced, though relevant number of predictors to be included in the regression model, we conducted feature importance analyses to understand the role each predictor would play in the model. This process aimed to eliminate variables that would not carry substantial information for the model. We used Random Forest, Recursive Feature Elimination and Extra Trees. Consistently, these three methods suggested that all the chosen predictors would contribute to a better model.


## Data processing

As described in the data analysis section (first stage), numeric variables were in different units and scales; therefore, these variables needed to be scaled or transformed. This scaling would also help to find a better prediction model. It is common knowledge that machine learning models would perform differently (and better) depending on data transformation methods. We did: i) Min-Max whereby numeric variables were scaled to a range between 0 and 1; ii) Standardization; iii) Normalization; iv) Polynomial features of degree 2 (quadratic polynomial); v) Principal Component Analysis with 3 components and explained variance of  $\geq 0.95$ ; and vi) Box-Cox.

## Data modelling

There are several machine learning algorithms for a supervised regression model. Those that we used, and that are depicted in the figure, yielded much better results and were studied in detail. That is, at the beginning of our work we explored other algorithms, though these did not perform well and were not considered thereafter. The algorithms we considered were: i) Linear Regression (LiR); ii) Hubber Regressor (HuR); iii) Ridge Regressor (RiR); iv) Multilayer Perceptron (MLP); v) Support Vector Regressor (SVR); vi)  $k$ -Nearest Neighbors (KNN); vii) Random Forest (RF); viii) Gradient Boost Machine (GBM); and ix) Extreme Gradient Boosting (XBG).

In addition to these nine machine learning algorithms, we also implemented a neural network (see figure below). This neural network was optimized empirically. We used a batch size = 256; epochs = 300; and optimizer = 'adam'. The neural network was implemented in Python using the Keras library.



For each model and processing method (see Data Processing section) we studied the  $R^2$ , Mean Absolute Error (MAE) and Root Mean Square Error (RMSE). As shown in the table, all algorithms showed a similar performance. Because all the algorithms had an equivalent performance, the chosen one needed to be defined at the forecasting stage; that is, the one that would generalize better to new (unseen) data.

Algorithm	Processing	$R^2$	MAE	RMSE
LiR	Polynomial(g=2)	0.442	1.1156	1.4456
HuB	Polynomial(g=2)	0.442	1.1156	1.4455
RiR	Polynomial(g=2)	0.441	1.1163	1.4135
MLP	BoxCox	0.445	1.1096	1.4418
SVR	MinMax	0.440	1.1000	1.4480
KNN	Standarized	0.416	1.1437	1.4478
RF	Polynomial(g=2)	0.422	1.1373	1.4717
GBM	MinMax	0.443	1.1146	1.4432
XGB	BoxCox	0.424	1.1134	1.4687
Customized NN	BoxCox	0.456	1.1045	1.4445

### Forecasting modelling

This stage implies studying the predicted results in new (unseen) data (i.e., data not used for model training). For this stage we used the validation and test datasets. We chose the model that yielded predictions closest to the observed results. In this line, we compared the mean difference between the observed and predicted mean salt intake results (i.e., observed – predicted) across all prediction algorithms.

We observed there was no unique algorithm that had the mean difference closest to zero in men and women at the same time (Supplementary table 1). The RF algorithm had the mean difference closest to zero in both sexes combined (mean difference = 0.0004), the MLP algorithm performed the best in

men (mean difference = 0.0052), and in women the GBR algorithm showed the best results (mean difference = -0.0005).

To support our decision process, we plotted the mean differences in men and women for each survey (Supplementary figure 2); this figure only included the predictions based on the top five algorithms (RF, MLP, GBR, LiR and RiR). We counted how many times (i.e., number of surveys) each algorithm had the mean difference closest to zero.


Because the RF algorithm had the mean difference closest to zero in both sexes combined and it was among the top 5 algorithms in men and women (Supplementary table 1), we decided to choose the RF algorithm. Additionally, predictions based on the RF algorithm were the closest to zero across surveys (Supplementary figure 2). These analyses were performed in R (version 4.0.3).

### **Algorithm application**

To make the predictions in the new 49 datasets without information about urine samples, we used the RF model (i.e., ML algorithm and predictors) developed following the methods above described (see Forecasting Modelling section). We re-trained the model with the full dataset used for model development and validation (i.e., train, validated and test dataset pooled), and then predicted the outcome (i.e., mean salt intake) in the 49 new datasets.



### Supplementary figure 1. Flowchart of data cleaning and inclusion criteria



**Supplementary Table 1. Mean difference between observed and predicted salt intake by sex across all ML algorithms**

ML algorithm	Mean difference between observed and predicted mean salt intake	Sex
prediction_CNN_boxcox	0.0308	both sexes
prediction_CNN_standardized	0.023	both sexes
prediction_GBR_boxcox	0.1781	both sexes
prediction_GBR_minmax	0.1739	both sexes
prediction_GBR_orig	0.0221	both sexes
prediction_GBR_standarized	0.1809	both sexes
prediction_HBR_poly	0.1372	both sexes
prediction_HGB_boxcox	0.0935	both sexes
prediction_HGB_orig	0.0676	both sexes
prediction_HGB_standardized	0.0681	both sexes
prediction_KNN_boxcox	0.0443	both sexes
prediction_KNN_standarized	0.0289	both sexes
prediction_LiR_poly	0.0187	both sexes
prediction_MLP_boxcox	-0.0238	both sexes
prediction_MLP_minmax	-0.1559	both sexes
prediction_MLP_standarized	-0.0659	both sexes
prediction_RF_poly	0.0004	both sexes
prediction_RiR_poly	0.0172	both sexes
prediction_SVR_minmax	0.1675	both sexes
prediction_XGB_boxcox	0.0935	both sexes
prediction_XGB_minmax	-1.161	both sexes
prediction_XGB_orig	0.0295	both sexes
prediction_XGB_standardized	0.0249	both sexes
prediction_CNN_boxcox	0.0546	men
prediction_CNN_standardized	0.0514	men
prediction_GBR_boxcox	0.1788	men
prediction_GBR_minmax	0.1728	men
prediction_GBR_orig	0.0447	men
prediction_GBR_standarized	0.1859	men
prediction_HBR_poly	0.1621	men
prediction_HGB_boxcox	0.0605	men
prediction_HGB_orig	0.0237	men

prediction_HGB_standardized	0.0285	men
prediction_KNN_boxcox	0.0724	men
prediction_KNN_standardized	0.053	men
prediction_LiR_poly	0.0384	men
prediction_MLP_boxcox	0.0052	men
prediction_MLP_minmax	-0.1718	men
prediction_MLP_standardized	-0.0859	men
prediction_RF_poly	0.0199	men
prediction_RiR_poly	0.0369	men
prediction_SVR_minmax	0.1541	men
prediction_XGB_boxcox	0.0605	men
prediction_XGB_minmax	-0.2716	men
prediction_XGB_orig	0.0488	men
prediction_XGB_standardized	0.0481	men
prediction_CNN_boxcox	0.0071	women
prediction_CNN_standardized	-0.0053	women
prediction_GBR_boxcox	0.1774	women
prediction_GBR_minmax	0.175	women
prediction_GBR_orig	-0.0005	women
prediction_GBR_standardized	0.1759	women
prediction_HBR_poly	0.1122	women
prediction_HGB_boxcox	0.1266	women
prediction_HGB_orig	0.1114	women
prediction_HGB_standardized	0.1077	women
prediction_KNN_boxcox	0.0161	women
prediction_KNN_standardized	0.0047	women
prediction_LiR_poly	-0.0009	women
prediction_MLP_boxcox	-0.0529	women
prediction_MLP_minmax	-0.1401	women
prediction_MLP_standardized	-0.0458	women
prediction_RF_poly	-0.0192	women
prediction_RiR_poly	-0.0025	women
prediction_SVR_minmax	0.181	women
prediction_XGB_boxcox	0.1266	women
prediction_XGB_minmax	-2.0504	women
prediction_XGB_orig	0.0102	women
prediction_XGB_standardized	0.0018	women

**Supplementary Table 2. Weighted distribution of predictors in each survey included in the ML model development.**

Country	Year	Region	Sample size (n)	Mean age (years)	Age range (years)	Proportion of men (%)	Mean, minimum and maximum values of SBP (mmHg)	Mean, minimum and maximum values of DBP (mmHg)	Mean, minimum and maximum values of weight (kg)	Mean, minimum and maximum values of height (m)	Mean, minimum and maximum values of urinary sodium (mmol/L)	Mean, minimum and maximum values of urinary creatinine (mmol/L)
Armenia	2016	Europe	1074	40	18-69	49.7	129.5 (86-237.5)	84.5 (49-147.5)	70.9 (35-139)	1.66 (1.27-1.89)	128.6 (10.6-237.6)	10.1 (1.9-27.3)
Azerbaijan	2017	Europe	2359	39	18-69	49.5	125.9 (81.5-230)	81.4 (47.5-142.5)	73.1 (36-174)	1.67 (1.15-1.98)	167.7 (2-389)	11.9 (1.8-31.8)
Bangladesh	2018	Southeast Asia	5815	39	18-69	47.4	120.2 (72-251)	78.6 (32-147)	55.6 (28-111)	1.56 (1-2.11)	119.9 (4-403)	8.4 (2.2-32.3)
Belarus	2017	Europe	4506	43	18-69	47.1	134.6 (87.5-257)	84.9 (53.5-147)	77.7 (41-144)	1.7 (1.05-1.99)	149.6 (10.5-371.4)	12.2 (1.8-32.7)

<b>Bhutan</b>	2014	Southeast Asia	5734	38	18-69	59.1	125.6 (75-228.5)	84.5 (46-141.5)	61.4 (23-115)	1.6 (1.11-1.96)	142.2 (6-388)	8.1 (1.9-29.7)
<b>Bhutan</b>	2019	Southeast Asia	5734	34	15-69	56.5	122.9 (85-224.5)	80.7 (43.5-137)	61.4 (28.5-140)	1.58 (1.07-1.92)	130.5 (4.7-444.9)	10.4 (1.8-32.7)
<b>Brunei Darussalam</b>	2016	Western Pacific	1636	35	18-69	51.5	122.6 (75.5-218)	78.4 (45.5-138)	69 (31.2-138.3)	1.59 (1.32-1.84)	122.6 (19.9-329)	12.6 (1.8-32.6)
<b>Jordan</b>	2019	Eastern Mediterranean	1040	37	18-69	50.2	117.7 (75-200)	78.4 (50-119.5)	76.3 (35.5-159.5)	1.66 (1.36-1.95)	165.4 (13-365)	13.6 (1.8-32.5)
<b>Lebanon</b>	2017	Eastern Mediterranean	999	42	17-69	48.7	128.5 (80-214.5)	76.9 (35-123)	78.3 (40-141)	1.68 (1.2-1.96)	124.4 (4-385)	11.5 (1.9-32)
<b>Malawi</b>	2017	Africa	1603	35	18-69	56.3	121.8 (74.5-221.5)	75.6 (39.5-142.5)	58.4 (33.6-119)	1.61 (1.36-1.96)	186.5 (11-399.9)	10.7 (1.9-32.4)
<b>Mongolia</b>	2013	Western Pacific	7508	42	15-64	50.3	129.3 (88.5-219.5)	82.1 (49.5-133.5)	71 (30.6-138)	1.62 (1.27-1.92)	134.1 (13.1-515)	10.9 (1.8-31.9)

<b>Mongolia</b>	2019	Western Pacific	7508	36	15-69	50.9	120.4 (76.5-253.5)	77.2 (48-143)	68.5 (29-159)	1.64 (1.34-1.98)	117.1 (2.1-348.9)	7.5 (1.8-28.3)
<b>Morocco</b>	2017	Eastern Mediterranean	3438	40	18-69	50.6	128.1 (83-228.5)	78.1 (40-139)	70.9 (35-168)	1.66 (1.34-1.95)	122.3 (26.3-575.2)	10.3 (1.8-31.4)
<b>Nepal</b>	2019	Southeast Asia	2442	36	15-69	40.7	122.8 (81-212.5)	80.5 (55-146.5)	54.4 (26-160)	1.55 (1.21-2.03)	142.3 (3-437)	5.6 (1.8-25.5)
<b>Solomon Islands</b>	2015	Western Pacific	172	38	18-69	61.4	121 (88.5-188.5)	76.5 (52-104.5)	67.9 (38.5-122)	1.61 (1.41-1.8)	99.3 (7-250)	9.7 (1.9-28.4)
<b>Sudan</b>	2016	Eastern Mediterranean	571	36	18-69	55.9	128.2 (89-231)	84.9 (58-131.5)	72.2 (35.6-174)	1.67 (1.42-1.92)	128.5 (5-459)	14 (1.9-32.4)
<b>Tokelau</b>	2014	Western Pacific	182	35	18-63	56.2	124.8 (76-184.5)	79 (53-128.5)	94.7 (58-158.3)	1.71 (1.16-1.88)	62.9 (20-265)	5 (2-7.7)
<b>Turkmenistan</b>	2018	Europe	3584	37	18-69	52.7	127.5 (87.5-268)	82.9 (54.5-149)	72.4 (39-142)	1.68 (1.16-1.98)	109.2 (10-163)	11.1 (4.5-18.3)

<b>Zambia</b>	2017	Africa	2489	33	18-69	50.3	124.8 (73-248)	77 (35.5-147.5)	60.9 (33.8-150)	1.62 (1.01-2.07)	137.1 (10-375)	12.2 (1.8-32.4)
---------------	------	--------	------	----	-------	------	----------------	-----------------	-----------------	------------------	----------------	-----------------

**Supplementary Table 3. Observed and predicted mean salt intake (g/day) by sex in each survey included in the ML model development.**

Country	Year	Sex	Mean salt intake (g/day)	Mean salt intake (g/day) lower	Mean salt intake (g/day) upper	Category
Armenia	2016	Men	9.41	9.13	9.7	ML predicted
Armenia	2016	Men	9.44	9.05	9.83	Observed
Armenia	2016	Women	7.54	7.38	7.71	ML predicted
Armenia	2016	Women	7.47	7.28	7.66	Observed
Azerbaijan	2017	Men	9.51	9.37	9.65	ML predicted
Azerbaijan	2017	Men	10.28	9.99	10.58	Observed
Azerbaijan	2017	Women	7.57	7.45	7.69	ML predicted
Azerbaijan	2017	Women	8.01	7.77	8.25	Observed
Bangladesh	2018	Men	8.68	8.59	8.77	ML predicted
Bangladesh	2018	Men	8.56	8.4	8.72	Observed
Bangladesh	2018	Women	7.41	7.34	7.48	ML predicted
Bangladesh	2018	Women	7.24	7.12	7.35	Observed
Belarus	2017	Men	9.73	9.62	9.85	ML predicted
Belarus	2017	Men	9.92	9.69	10.14	Observed
Belarus	2017	Women	7.45	7.36	7.53	ML predicted
Belarus	2017	Women	7.56	7.41	7.71	Observed
Bhutan	2014	Men	9.04	8.88	9.19	ML predicted
Bhutan	2014	Men	9.49	9.12	9.86	Observed
Bhutan	2014	Women	7.55	7.46	7.65	ML predicted
Bhutan	2014	Women	8.11	7.88	8.34	Observed
Bhutan	2019	Men	9.14	8.99	9.29	ML predicted
Bhutan	2019	Men	8.83	8.6	9.06	Observed
Bhutan	2019	Women	7.51	7.42	7.59	ML predicted
Bhutan	2019	Women	7.42	7.24	7.59	Observed
Brunei Darussalam	2016	Men	9.92	9.72	10.11	ML predicted



<b>Brunei Darussalam</b>	2016	Men	9.37	9.07	9.67	Observed
<b>Brunei Darussalam</b>	2016	Women	7.8	7.66	7.95	ML predicted
<b>Brunei Darussalam</b>	2016	Women	7.1	6.87	7.32	Observed
<b>Jordan</b>	2019	Men	9.6	9.17	10.02	ML predicted
<b>Jordan</b>	2019	Men	10.26	9.65	10.87	Observed
<b>Jordan</b>	2019	Women	8	7.71	8.29	ML predicted
<b>Jordan</b>	2019	Women	8.4	8.03	8.77	Observed
<b>Lebanon</b>	2017	Men	10.08	9.67	10.48	ML predicted
<b>Lebanon</b>	2017	Men	9.33	8.88	9.78	Observed
<b>Lebanon</b>	2017	Women	7.63	7.46	7.81	ML predicted
<b>Lebanon</b>	2017	Women	7.53	6.93	8.13	Observed
<b>Malawi</b>	2017	Men	8.7	8.57	8.82	ML predicted
<b>Malawi</b>	2017	Men	10.09	9.61	10.57	Observed
<b>Malawi</b>	2017	Women	7.38	7.24	7.52	ML predicted
<b>Malawi</b>	2017	Women	8.4	8.07	8.74	Observed
<b>Mongolia</b>	2013	Men	9.64	9.46	9.82	ML predicted
<b>Mongolia</b>	2013	Men	9.71	9.31	10.1	Observed
<b>Mongolia</b>	2013	Women	7.84	7.74	7.94	ML predicted
<b>Mongolia</b>	2013	Women	7.72	7.52	7.92	Observed
<b>Mongolia</b>	2019	Men	9.41	9.31	9.51	ML predicted
<b>Mongolia</b>	2019	Men	9.71	9.55	9.86	Observed
<b>Mongolia</b>	2019	Women	7.55	7.48	7.62	ML predicted
<b>Mongolia</b>	2019	Women	7.43	7.31	7.56	Observed
<b>Morocco</b>	2017	Men	9.25	9.12	9.39	ML predicted
<b>Morocco</b>	2017	Men	9.04	8.82	9.26	Observed
<b>Morocco</b>	2017	Women	7.65	7.58	7.72	ML predicted
<b>Morocco</b>	2017	Women	7.5	7.39	7.62	Observed
<b>Nepal</b>	2019	Men	8.81	8.5	9.13	ML predicted

<b>Nepal</b>	2019	Men	9.63	9.25	10	Observed
<b>Nepal</b>	2019	Women	7.27	7.17	7.37	ML predicted
<b>Nepal</b>	2019	Women	7.98	7.78	8.18	Observed
<b>Solomon Islands</b>	2015	Men	9.48	9.07	9.89	ML predicted
<b>Solomon Islands</b>	2015	Men	8.92	8.04	9.8	Observed
<b>Solomon Islands</b>	2015	Women	7.78	7.47	8.1	ML predicted
<b>Solomon Islands</b>	2015	Women	7.4	6.67	8.13	Observed
<b>Sudan</b>	2016	Men	9.02	8.52	9.52	ML predicted
<b>Sudan</b>	2016	Men	8.29	7.56	9.02	Observed
<b>Sudan</b>	2016	Women	7.72	7.47	7.97	ML predicted
<b>Sudan</b>	2016	Women	7.31	6.94	7.68	Observed
<b>Tokelau</b>	2014	Men	10.13	9.42	10.83	ML predicted
<b>Tokelau</b>	2014	Men	10	9.28	10.72	Observed
<b>Tokelau</b>	2014	Women	8.41	8.11	8.72	ML predicted
<b>Tokelau</b>	2014	Women	7.89	7.45	8.33	Observed
<b>Turkmenistan</b>	2018	Men	9.45	9.32	9.58	ML predicted
<b>Turkmenistan</b>	2018	Men	8.87	8.72	9.01	Observed
<b>Turkmenistan</b>	2018	Women	7.35	7.27	7.43	ML predicted
<b>Turkmenistan</b>	2018	Women	6.79	6.7	6.89	Observed
<b>Zambia</b>	2017	Men	8.82	8.68	8.96	ML predicted
<b>Zambia</b>	2017	Men	8.47	8.15	8.8	Observed
<b>Zambia</b>	2017	Women	7.33	7.22	7.44	ML predicted
<b>Zambia</b>	2017	Women	7.14	6.96	7.32	Observed

**Supplementary Table 4. Mean difference between observed and predicted salt intake by sex in each survey included in the ML model development.**

Country	Year	Sex	Mean difference (g/day)	Mean difference (g/day) lower	Mean difference (g/day) upper	Category	P value
Armenia	2016	Men	0.03	-0.21	0.26	Observed vs predicted	0.7873
Armenia	2016	Women	-0.07	-0.18	0.03	Observed vs predicted	0.3432
Azerbaijan	2017	Men	0.77	0.49	1.06	Observed vs predicted	<0.0001
Azerbaijan	2017	Women	0.44	0.25	0.62	Observed vs predicted	<0.0001
Bangladesh	2018	Men	-0.12	-0.26	0.02	Observed vs predicted	0.0033
Bangladesh	2018	Women	-0.17	-0.28	-0.06	Observed vs predicted	0.0002
Belarus	2017	Men	0.18	0	0.37	Observed vs predicted	0.0032
Belarus	2017	Women	0.11	-0.02	0.24	Observed vs predicted	0.004
Bhutan	2014	Men	0.45	0.14	0.76	Observed vs predicted	<0.0001
Bhutan	2014	Women	0.55	0.36	0.75	Observed vs predicted	<0.0001
Bhutan	2019	Men	-0.31	-0.53	-0.09	Observed vs predicted	<0.0001
Bhutan	2019	Women	-0.09	-0.25	0.07	Observed vs predicted	0.108
Brunei Darussalam	2016	Men	-0.55	-0.8	-0.29	Observed vs predicted	<0.0001
Brunei Darussalam	2016	Women	-0.71	-0.87	-0.54	Observed vs predicted	<0.0001

<b>Jordan</b>	2019	Men	0.66	0.01	1.32	Observed vs predicted	0.75
<b>Jordan</b>	2019	Women	0.4	0.05	0.75	Observed vs predicted	0.0513
<b>Lebanon</b>	2017	Men	-0.74	-1.27	-0.22	Observed vs predicted	0.2274
<b>Lebanon</b>	2017	Women	-0.11	-0.68	0.47	Observed vs predicted	0.4273
<b>Malawi</b>	2017	Men	1.39	0.9	1.88	Observed vs predicted	<0.0001
<b>Malawi</b>	2017	Women	1.02	0.7	1.35	Observed vs predicted	<0.0001
<b>Mongolia</b>	2013	Men	0.06	-0.3	0.43	Observed vs predicted	0.4277
<b>Mongolia</b>	2013	Women	-0.12	-0.3	0.06	Observed vs predicted	0.3048
<b>Mongolia</b>	2019	Men	0.3	0.16	0.43	Observed vs predicted	<0.0001
<b>Mongolia</b>	2019	Women	-0.12	-0.21	-0.03	Observed vs predicted	0.0009
<b>Morocco</b>	2017	Men	-0.22	-0.4	-0.03	Observed vs predicted	0.0171
<b>Morocco</b>	2017	Women	-0.15	-0.25	-0.04	Observed vs predicted	0.0095
<b>Nepal</b>	2019	Men	0.81	0.5	1.13	Observed vs predicted	<0.0001
<b>Nepal</b>	2019	Women	0.71	0.54	0.88	Observed vs predicted	<0.0001
<b>Solomon Islands</b>	2015	Men	-0.56	-1.3	0.19	Observed vs predicted	0.0358
<b>Solomon Islands</b>	2015	Women	-0.39	-1.05	0.28	Observed vs predicted	0.1386

<b>Sudan</b>	2016	Men	-0.73	-1.2	-0.27	Observed vs predicted	0.0018
<b>Sudan</b>	2016	Women	-0.41	-0.66	-0.16	Observed vs predicted	<0.0001
<b>Tokelau</b>	2014	Men	-0.13	-0.69	0.44	Observed vs predicted	0.9361
<b>Tokelau</b>	2014	Women	-0.52	-1.07	0.02	Observed vs predicted	0.279
<b>Turkmenistan</b>	2018	Men	-0.59	-0.68	-0.5	Observed vs predicted	<0.0001
<b>Turkmenistan</b>	2018	Women	-0.56	-0.62	-0.49	Observed vs predicted	<0.0001
<b>Zambia</b>	2017	Men	-0.35	-0.65	-0.05	Observed vs predicted	0.0004
<b>Zambia</b>	2017	Women	-0.19	-0.34	-0.04	Observed vs predicted	0.0001

**Supplementary Table 5. Observed mean salt intake (g/day) by equation and sex in each survey included in the ML model development.**

Country	Year	Sex	Mean salt intake (g/day)	Mean salt intake (g/day) lower	Mean salt intake (g/day) upper	Category
Armenia	2016	Men	9.44	9.05	9.83	Observed_intersalt
Armenia	2016	Men	13.79	13.03	14.55	Observed_kawasaki
Armenia	2016	Men	9.87	9.43	10.3	Observed_tanaka
Armenia	2016	Men	12.31	11.84	12.78	Observed_toft
Armenia	2016	Women	7.47	7.28	7.66	Observed_intersalt
Armenia	2016	Women	12.18	11.67	12.69	Observed_kawasaki
Armenia	2016	Women	9.81	9.47	10.15	Observed_tanaka
Armenia	2016	Women	8.34	8.2	8.47	Observed_toft
Azerbaijan	2017	Men	10.28	9.99	10.58	Observed_intersalt
Azerbaijan	2017	Men	14.92	14.28	15.55	Observed_kawasaki
Azerbaijan	2017	Men	10.37	10.02	10.72	Observed_tanaka
Azerbaijan	2017	Men	12.88	12.5	13.25	Observed_toft
Azerbaijan	2017	Women	8.01	7.77	8.25	Observed_intersalt
Azerbaijan	2017	Women	12.48	11.92	13.03	Observed_kawasaki
Azerbaijan	2017	Women	10.05	9.7	10.4	Observed_tanaka
Azerbaijan	2017	Women	8.4	8.25	8.55	Observed_toft
Bangladesh	2018	Men	8.56	8.4	8.72	Observed_intersalt
Bangladesh	2018	Men	12.9	12.61	13.19	Observed_kawasaki
Bangladesh	2018	Men	8.94	8.77	9.1	Observed_tanaka
Bangladesh	2018	Men	11.81	11.63	11.99	Observed_toft
Bangladesh	2018	Women	7.24	7.12	7.35	Observed_intersalt
Bangladesh	2018	Women	11.91	11.62	12.19	Observed_kawasaki
Bangladesh	2018	Women	8.91	8.73	9.08	Observed_tanaka
Bangladesh	2018	Women	8.28	8.2	8.36	Observed_toft
Belarus	2017	Men	9.92	9.69	10.14	Observed_intersalt
Belarus	2017	Men	13.88	13.51	14.25	Observed_kawasaki
Belarus	2017	Men	9.97	9.76	10.19	Observed_tanaka
Belarus	2017	Men	12.24	12.01	12.47	Observed_toft
Belarus	2017	Women	7.56	7.41	7.71	Observed_intersalt
Belarus	2017	Women	11.61	11.31	11.92	Observed_kawasaki
Belarus	2017	Women	9.67	9.47	9.87	Observed_tanaka
Belarus	2017	Women	8.14	8.06	8.23	Observed_toft
Bhutan	2014	Men	9.49	9.12	9.86	Observed_intersalt

<b>Bhutan</b>	2014	Men	14.44	13.65	15.23	Observed_kawasaki
<b>Bhutan</b>	2014	Men	9.77	9.33	10.2	Observed_tanaka
<b>Bhutan</b>	2014	Men	12.68	12.2	13.16	Observed_toft
<b>Bhutan</b>	2014	Women	8.11	7.88	8.34	Observed_intersalt
<b>Bhutan</b>	2014	Women	14.11	13.57	14.66	Observed_kawasaki
<b>Bhutan</b>	2014	Women	10.53	10.19	10.87	Observed_tanaka
<b>Bhutan</b>	2014	Women	8.81	8.67	8.95	Observed_toft
<b>Bhutan</b>	2019	Men	8.83	8.6	9.06	Observed_intersalt
<b>Bhutan</b>	2019	Men	12.34	11.86	12.82	Observed_kawasaki
<b>Bhutan</b>	2019	Men	8.51	8.27	8.75	Observed_tanaka
<b>Bhutan</b>	2019	Men	11.36	11.06	11.65	Observed_toft
<b>Bhutan</b>	2019	Women	7.42	7.24	7.59	Observed_intersalt
<b>Bhutan</b>	2019	Women	11.63	11.23	12.02	Observed_kawasaki
<b>Bhutan</b>	2019	Women	8.91	8.66	9.15	Observed_tanaka
<b>Bhutan</b>	2019	Women	8.2	8.09	8.3	Observed_toft
<b>Brunei Darussalam</b>	2016	Men	9.37	9.07	9.67	Observed_intersalt
<b>Brunei Darussalam</b>	2016	Men	11.95	11.52	12.38	Observed_kawasaki
<b>Brunei Darussalam</b>	2016	Men	8.44	8.2	8.68	Observed_tanaka
<b>Brunei Darussalam</b>	2016	Men	11.09	10.82	11.36	Observed_toft
<b>Brunei Darussalam</b>	2016	Women	7.1	6.87	7.32	Observed_intersalt
<b>Brunei Darussalam</b>	2016	Women	10	9.62	10.38	Observed_kawasaki
<b>Brunei Darussalam</b>	2016	Women	8.1	7.85	8.36	Observed_tanaka
<b>Brunei Darussalam</b>	2016	Women	7.75	7.63	7.86	Observed_toft
<b>Jordan</b>	2019	Men	10.26	9.65	10.87	Observed_intersalt
<b>Jordan</b>	2019	Men	13.76	12.59	14.93	Observed_kawasaki
<b>Jordan</b>	2019	Men	9.71	9.12	10.3	Observed_tanaka
<b>Jordan</b>	2019	Men	12.18	11.51	12.84	Observed_toft
<b>Jordan</b>	2019	Women	8.4	8.03	8.77	Observed_intersalt
<b>Jordan</b>	2019	Women	12.28	11.58	12.98	Observed_kawasaki
<b>Jordan</b>	2019	Women	9.81	9.36	10.26	Observed_tanaka
<b>Jordan</b>	2019	Women	8.37	8.18	8.57	Observed_toft
<b>Lebanon</b>	2017	Men	9.33	8.88	9.78	Observed_intersalt
<b>Lebanon</b>	2017	Men	12.79	11.35	14.23	Observed_kawasaki

Lebanon	2017	Men	9.21	8.41	10	Observed_tanaka
Lebanon	2017	Men	11.5	10.6	12.4	Observed_toft
Lebanon	2017	Women	7.53	6.93	8.13	Observed_intersalt
Lebanon	2017	Women	11.48	10.08	12.88	Observed_kawasaki
Lebanon	2017	Women	9.44	8.44	10.44	Observed_tanaka
Lebanon	2017	Women	8.06	7.58	8.54	Observed_toft
Malawi	2017	Men	10.09	9.61	10.57	Observed_intersalt
Malawi	2017	Men	14.37	13.72	15.02	Observed_kawasaki
Malawi	2017	Men	9.62	9.26	9.98	Observed_tanaka
Malawi	2017	Men	12.68	12.3	13.07	Observed_toft
Malawi	2017	Women	8.4	8.07	8.74	Observed_intersalt
Malawi	2017	Women	13.74	12.87	14.6	Observed_kawasaki
Malawi	2017	Women	10.32	9.8	10.84	Observed_tanaka
Malawi	2017	Women	8.69	8.48	8.91	Observed_toft
Mongolia	2013	Men	9.71	9.31	10.1	Observed_intersalt
Mongolia	2013	Men	13.25	12.63	13.87	Observed_kawasaki
Mongolia	2013	Men	9.37	9.04	9.7	Observed_tanaka
Mongolia	2013	Men	11.96	11.57	12.35	Observed_toft
Mongolia	2013	Women	7.72	7.52	7.92	Observed_intersalt
Mongolia	2013	Women	11.65	11.11	12.2	Observed_kawasaki
Mongolia	2013	Women	9.37	9.01	9.73	Observed_tanaka
Mongolia	2013	Women	8.18	8.03	8.34	Observed_toft
Mongolia	2019	Men	9.71	9.55	9.86	Observed_intersalt
Mongolia	2019	Men	14.77	14.43	15.1	Observed_kawasaki
Mongolia	2019	Men	10.09	9.91	10.27	Observed_tanaka
Mongolia	2019	Men	12.81	12.61	13	Observed_toft
Mongolia	2019	Women	7.43	7.31	7.56	Observed_intersalt
Mongolia	2019	Women	11.97	11.68	12.25	Observed_kawasaki
Mongolia	2019	Women	9.54	9.35	9.73	Observed_tanaka
Mongolia	2019	Women	8.27	8.19	8.35	Observed_toft
Morocco	2017	Men	9.04	8.82	9.26	Observed_intersalt
Morocco	2017	Men	13.14	12.7	13.58	Observed_kawasaki
Morocco	2017	Men	9.41	9.16	9.66	Observed_tanaka
Morocco	2017	Men	11.82	11.55	12.09	Observed_toft
Morocco	2017	Women	7.5	7.39	7.62	Observed_intersalt
Morocco	2017	Women	11.74	11.43	12.04	Observed_kawasaki
Morocco	2017	Women	9.5	9.3	9.69	Observed_tanaka
Morocco	2017	Women	8.19	8.11	8.27	Observed_toft



<b>Nepal</b>	2019	Men	9.63	9.25	10	Observed_intersalt
<b>Nepal</b>	2019	Men	16.78	15.86	17.69	Observed_kawasaki
<b>Nepal</b>	2019	Men	10.82	10.34	11.29	Observed_tanaka
<b>Nepal</b>	2019	Men	14.15	13.63	14.68	Observed_toft
<b>Nepal</b>	2019	Women	7.98	7.78	8.18	Observed_intersalt
<b>Nepal</b>	2019	Women	15.76	15.21	16.32	Observed_kawasaki
<b>Nepal</b>	2019	Women	11.15	10.83	11.46	Observed_tanaka
<b>Nepal</b>	2019	Women	9.21	9.09	9.34	Observed_toft
<b>Solomon Islands</b>	2015	Men	8.92	8.04	9.8	Observed_intersalt
<b>Solomon Islands</b>	2015	Men	12.07	10.21	13.92	Observed_kawasaki
<b>Solomon Islands</b>	2015	Men	8.63	7.55	9.7	Observed_tanaka
<b>Solomon Islands</b>	2015	Men	11.14	9.94	12.33	Observed_toft
<b>Solomon Islands</b>	2015	Women	7.4	6.67	8.13	Observed_intersalt
<b>Solomon Islands</b>	2015	Women	13.18	10.5	15.86	Observed_kawasaki
<b>Solomon Islands</b>	2015	Women	9.96	8.3	11.63	Observed_tanaka
<b>Solomon Islands</b>	2015	Women	8.44	7.74	9.15	Observed_toft
<b>Sudan</b>	2016	Men	8.29	7.56	9.02	Observed_intersalt
<b>Sudan</b>	2016	Men	11.27	10.41	12.13	Observed_kawasaki
<b>Sudan</b>	2016	Men	8.19	7.66	8.73	Observed_tanaka
<b>Sudan</b>	2016	Men	10.6	10.04	11.15	Observed_toft
<b>Sudan</b>	2016	Women	7.31	6.94	7.68	Observed_intersalt
<b>Sudan</b>	2016	Women	10.36	9.8	10.93	Observed_kawasaki
<b>Sudan</b>	2016	Women	8.72	8.31	9.12	Observed_tanaka
<b>Sudan</b>	2016	Women	7.81	7.65	7.98	Observed_toft
<b>Tokelau</b>	2014	Men	10	9.28	10.72	Observed_intersalt
<b>Tokelau</b>	2014	Men	15.6	14.19	17	Observed_kawasaki
<b>Tokelau</b>	2014	Men	10.89	10.05	11.73	Observed_tanaka
<b>Tokelau</b>	2014	Men	13.19	12.36	14.03	Observed_toft
<b>Tokelau</b>	2014	Women	7.89	7.45	8.33	Observed_intersalt
<b>Tokelau</b>	2014	Women	12.38	11.16	13.59	Observed_kawasaki
<b>Tokelau</b>	2014	Women	10.22	9.46	10.98	Observed_tanaka
<b>Tokelau</b>	2014	Women	8.38	8.07	8.68	Observed_toft
<b>Turkmenistan</b>	2018	Men	8.87	8.72	9.01	Observed_intersalt

<b>Turkmenistan</b>	2018	Men	12.05	11.85	12.25	Observed_kawasaki
<b>Turkmenistan</b>	2018	Men	8.8	8.69	8.92	Observed_tanaka
<b>Turkmenistan</b>	2018	Men	11.16	11.03	11.28	Observed_toft
<b>Turkmenistan</b>	2018	Women	6.79	6.7	6.89	Observed_intersalt
<b>Turkmenistan</b>	2018	Women	10.07	9.9	10.24	Observed_kawasaki
<b>Turkmenistan</b>	2018	Women	8.54	8.41	8.67	Observed_tanaka
<b>Turkmenistan</b>	2018	Women	7.77	7.72	7.82	Observed_toft
<b>Zambia</b>	2017	Men	8.47	8.15	8.8	Observed_intersalt
<b>Zambia</b>	2017	Men	12.52	11.85	13.19	Observed_kawasaki
<b>Zambia</b>	2017	Men	8.66	8.31	9.02	Observed_tanaka
<b>Zambia</b>	2017	Men	11.37	10.95	11.78	Observed_toft
<b>Zambia</b>	2017	Women	7.14	6.96	7.32	Observed_intersalt
<b>Zambia</b>	2017	Women	11.47	10.98	11.97	Observed_kawasaki
<b>Zambia</b>	2017	Women	9.02	8.71	9.33	Observed_tanaka
<b>Zambia</b>	2017	Women	8.09	7.95	8.23	Observed_toft

**Supplementary Table 6. Weighted distribution of predictors in each of the 49 national surveys included in the application of the model herein developed.**

Country	Year	Region	Sample size	Mean age (years)	Age range (years)	Proportion of men (%)	Mean, minimum and maximum values of SBP (mmHg)	Mean, minimum and maximum values of DBP (mmHg)	Mean, minimum and maximum values of weight (kg)	Mean, minimum and maximum values of height (m)
Algeria	2017	Africa	6536	38	18-69	51.7	126.6 (77-227)	75.2 (32-137)	73.3 (25-174)	1.67 (1.02-2.05)
American Samoa	2004	Americas	2042	40	25-64	50.3	130.7 (84.5-230.5)	82.4 (46.5-134.5)	100.4 (38.6-219.1)	1.69 (1.36-2.19)
Bahamas	2012	Americas	1400	42	24-64	49.9	127.4 (73-248.5)	81.6 (32.5-139.5)	84.8 (27.9-184.9)	1.67 (1.15-2.03)
Barbados	2007	Americas	282	43	25-69	51.9	121.9 (86-191)	80.1 (55-115)	77.5 (40.6-232.1)	1.67 (1.17-1.93)
Benin	2015	Africa	4841	34	18-69	49.6	125.8 (74.5-254.5)	81.6 (45-142.5)	62.3 (30-167)	1.64 (1.21-1.98)
Botswana	2014	Africa	3894	33	15-69	52.1	127.5 (84.5-262.5)	80 (47-148.5)	63.9 (31.7-171.1)	1.66 (1.02-2)
British Virgin Islands	2009	Americas	1067	43	25-64	54.1	130.5 (81-225.5)	80.3 (47.5-126)	83.2 (39.6-176.9)	1.7 (1.14-2.26)
Cabo Verde	2007	Africa	1723	38	25-64	50.3	133.3 (86-233.5)	79.7 (47.5-140)	68.3 (35-150)	1.68 (1.23-1.96)
Cambodia	2010	Western Pacific	5223	40	25-64	49.4	116.2 (70.5-225.5)	72.4 (41.5-138)	53.7 (21.1-111)	1.57 (1.24-1.85)
Cayman Islands	2012	Americas	1229	42	24-64	50.7	124.7 (84-207.5)	76 (46.5-127)	82.3 (31-196)	1.69 (1-2.1)

<b>Comoros</b>	2011	Africa	5029	39	25-64	52.6	127.6 (82.5-236.5)	78.5 (48.5-144)	64.2 (23.5-166)	1.61 (1-2.15)
<b>Cook Islands</b>	2015	Western Pacific	879	39	18-64	46.5	128 (91.5-194)	78.8 (45-118.5)	98.6 (49.1-205.1)	1.69 (1.07-1.96)
<b>Ecuador</b>	2018	Americas	4466	40	18-69	49.4	119.9 (78-220.5)	76 (42-130)	69.2 (33.4-198.4)	1.59 (1.24-1.93)
<b>Eritrea</b>	2010	Africa	5651	42	25-69	17.2	117 (71.5-230.5)	74.3 (45.5-130.5)	51.8 (28.1-99.1)	1.6 (1.16-1.89)
<b>Eswatini</b>	2014	Africa	3042	31	15-69	47.4	124.3 (72-251.5)	79.7 (42-149.5)	67.8 (22.2-227.6)	1.63 (1.01-2.02)
<b>Ethiopia</b>	2015	Africa	9270	31	15-69	56.1	119.7 (71-250.5)	77.7 (30-142)	54.4 (20-99.5)	1.63 (1.05-2)
<b>Fiji</b>	2011	Western Pacific	2492	42	25-64	51	130.3 (84.5-228)	80.2 (39-143)	78.6 (30.3-198.1)	1.68 (1.03-1.94)
<b>French Polynesia</b>	2010	Western Pacific	2239	36	18-64	50.7	125 (85.5-230.5)	79.4 (48-149.5)	86.2 (41-193)	1.7 (1.41-2)
<b>Gambia</b>	2010	Africa	3496	38	25-64	50.4	130.4 (85-252)	80.3 (44-143.5)	64.8 (26.5-168.9)	1.64 (1-2)
<b>Grenada</b>	2011	Americas	1055	41	25-64	50.7	130.5 (71-212.5)	80.5 (49.5-128)	77.6 (40.8-158.8)	1.7 (1.32-2.49)
<b>Guyana</b>	2016	Americas	2625	37	18-69	52	125.7 (73.5-245)	77.6 (37-149)	69.9 (26.4-198)	1.63 (1.01-2.07)
<b>Iraq</b>	2015	Eastern Mediterranean	3655	35	18-69	53.6	128.1 (78.5-225)	82.7 (45-150)	76.5 (36.6-187.2)	1.65 (1.01-1.97)
<b>Kenya</b>	2015	Africa	4270	34	16-69	50.6	124.7 (76.5-262)	80.8 (46.5-146)	63.2 (30-171.3)	1.65 (1.01-1.95)
<b>Kiribati</b>	2016	Western Pacific	1240	40	18-69	42.8	128 (85-219.5)	84.6 (49-147.5)	81.1 (30-219)	1.64 (1.22-1.89)
<b>Kuwait</b>	2014	Eastern Mediterranean	2871	36	18-69	49.5	120.4 (70-240)	77.4 (50-130)	80.5 (37.3-195)	1.65 (1.04-1.96)

<b>Kyrgyzstan</b>	2013	Eastern Mediterranean	2539	41	25-64	51.9	133.2 (81.5-244.5)	86.8 (56.5-149.5)	71.7 (36.6-162.4)	1.64 (1.38-1.95)
<b>Lao People's Democratic Republic</b>	2013	Western Pacific	2464	39	16-65	42.3	118.7 (72-239.5)	76.4 (30-130)	54.2 (27-103.1)	1.54 (1.16-1.97)
<b>Lesotho</b>	2012	Africa	2162	38	25-64	49.8	126.3 (77.5-250)	82.6 (46.5-146)	66.2 (21.5-164.6)	1.61 (1.02-1.97)
<b>Liberia</b>	2011	Africa	2242	40	25-64	50.7	129 (87.5-232)	79.8 (32-137.5)	65.4 (32-163)	1.58 (1-2.5)
<b>Libya</b>	2009	Eastern Mediterranean	3223	37	25-64	51.5	133.4 (74-237.5)	79.5 (44-148.5)	77 (31.7-186.2)	1.67 (1-1.97)
<b>Myanmar</b>	2014	Southeast Asia	7892	42	25-64	50.4	126.1 (70-252)	81.8 (35-144)	57.1 (26.3-173)	1.59 (1-2.18)
<b>Nauru</b>	2016	Western Pacific	1037	36	18-69	50	122.6 (76-223)	80.5 (46.5-125)	92.4 (43.4-197.9)	1.63 (1.41-1.86)
<b>Niue</b>	2012	Western Pacific	779	40	15-69	50.1	127.5 (89-223)	75.7 (44.5-117)	91.5 (44.7-165.9)	1.69 (1.17-1.96)
<b>Palau</b>	2013	Western Pacific	2148	43	25-64	53	138.3 (87-236)	84.7 (40-135)	79.4 (32-180.6)	1.62 (1.02-2.03)
<b>Qatar</b>	2012	Eastern Mediterranean	2287	35	18-64	50.9	118.5 (78.5-203)	78.8 (46.5-129.5)	79.1 (34.4-190.5)	1.64 (1.35-2)
<b>Republic of Moldova</b>	2013	Europe	4077	39	18-69	52.5	132.9 (83-257)	85.1 (49-148)	75 (32.5-166)	1.68 (1.2-1.98)
<b>Rwanda</b>	2013	Africa	6882	32	15-64	48.8	120.7 (75-250)	77.9 (45-140)	57 (23.1-165.8)	1.6 (1-1.91)
<b>Samoa</b>	2013	Western Pacific	1490	37	18-64	54.1	124.9 (80.5-221.5)	75.3 (44.5-131.5)	90.3 (32.1-160)	1.68 (1.22-1.97)
<b>Sao Tome and Principe</b>	2008	Africa	2272	40	25-64	48.4	135 (77.5-240.5)	82.5 (34.5-143)	66.1 (30-186.2)	1.64 (1.01-1.98)
<b>Sierra Leone</b>	2009	Africa	4473	40	25-64	50.3	131.3 (72-220)	80.5 (42.5-148)	60 (28-185)	1.62 (1-2.34)

<b>Sri Lanka</b>	2015	Southeast Asia	4566	39	18-69	51.5	125.3 (74-258.5)	80.6 (36-150)	58 (26.2-156.9)	1.59 (1.02-1.9)
<b>Tajikistan</b>	2017	Europe	2643	32	18-69	53.8	128.6 (81-267)	84.4 (54.5-149.5)	66.7 (27.8-148)	1.63 (1.09-2)
<b>Timor-Leste</b>	2014	Southeast Asia	2480	36	18-69	63.8	130.4 (72.5-235)	84 (42.5-136)	52 (27-165)	1.57 (1.24-1.83)
<b>Togo</b>	2011	Africa	3995	32	15-64	49.3	123 (70-251)	76.8 (31-141.5)	61.6 (26-165)	1.64 (1.02-1.99)
<b>Tuvalu</b>	2015	Western Pacific	1024	39	18-69	54.9	134.4 (92.5-246)	84.4 (48.5-145)	91.9 (35.8-181.8)	1.68 (1.17-2.06)
<b>Uganda</b>	2014	Africa	3673	35	18-69	50.5	125 (83-249)	80.8 (50-148)	59.4 (30.2-165)	1.62 (1.15-2.03)
<b>United Republic of Tanzania</b>	2012	Africa	5381	39	25-64	50.6	129.1 (80-240)	80.5 (40-145.5)	60.6 (29-171.1)	1.63 (1.13-1.97)
<b>Vanuatu</b>	2011	Western Pacific	4420	40	25-64	47.7	129.6 (77-269)	79.6 (37.5-139)	69.4 (28.3-199.8)	1.63 (1.02-2.1)
<b>Vietnam</b>	2015	Western Pacific	3033	39	18-69	50.4	120 (71-223.5)	77.2 (40-127.5)	54.7 (27.8-106.4)	1.58 (1.01-1.98)

**Supplementary Table 7. Predicted mean salt intake (g/day) by sex in each of the 49 national surveys included in the application of the model herein developed.**

Country	Year	Sex	Mean salt intake (g/day)	Mean salt intake (g/day) lower	Mean salt intake (g/day) upper	Category
Algeria	2017	Men	9.43	9.37	9.48	predicted
Algeria	2017	Women	7.72	7.68	7.76	predicted
Algeria	2017	Total	8.6	8.56	8.64	predicted
American Samoa	2004	Men	11.06	10.99	11.13	predicted
American Samoa	2004	Women	9.01	8.95	9.06	predicted
American Samoa	2004	Total	10.04	10	10.08	predicted
Bahamas	2012	Men	10.39	10.21	10.58	predicted
Bahamas	2012	Women	8.26	8.01	8.51	predicted
Bahamas	2012	Total	9.33	9.19	9.46	predicted
Barbados	2007	Men	9.61	9.31	9.92	predicted
Barbados	2007	Women	7.86	7.54	8.18	predicted
Barbados	2007	Total	8.77	8.56	8.98	predicted
Benin	2015	Men	8.81	8.72	8.91	predicted
Benin	2015	Women	7.29	7.2	7.37	predicted
Benin	2015	Total	8.04	7.92	8.16	predicted
Botswana	2014	Men	8.61	8.54	8.69	predicted
Botswana	2014	Women	7.39	7.34	7.45	predicted
Botswana	2014	Total	8.03	7.97	8.09	predicted
British Virgin Islands	2009	Men	10.09	10.03	10.16	predicted
British Virgin Islands	2009	Women	8.02	8.01	8.02	predicted
British Virgin Islands	2009	Total	9.14	9.08	9.2	predicted
Cabo Verde	2007	Men	9.13	9	9.25	predicted
Cabo Verde	2007	Women	7.46	7.36	7.55	predicted
Cabo Verde	2007	Total	8.3	8.19	8.41	predicted
Cambodia	2010	Men	8.7	8.66	8.75	predicted
Cambodia	2010	Women	7.23	7.2	7.25	predicted
Cambodia	2010	Total	7.96	7.92	7.99	predicted
Cayman Islands	2012	Men	9.95	9.89	10	predicted
Cayman Islands	2012	Women	8.08	7.86	8.29	predicted
Cayman Islands	2012	Total	9.03	8.96	9.09	predicted
Comoros	2011	Men	9.09	9.04	9.15	predicted

<b>Comoros</b>	2011	Women	7.74	7.7	7.78	predicted
<b>Comoros</b>	2011	Total	8.45	8.4	8.5	predicted
<b>Cook Islands</b>	2015	Men	11.02	10.95	11.1	predicted
<b>Cook Islands</b>	2015	Women	8.63	8.56	8.69	predicted
<b>Cook Islands</b>	2015	Total	9.74	9.64	9.84	predicted
<b>Ecuador</b>	2018	Men	9.74	9.67	9.81	predicted
<b>Ecuador</b>	2018	Women	7.8	7.75	7.84	predicted
<b>Ecuador</b>	2018	Total	8.76	8.68	8.83	predicted
<b>Eritrea</b>	2010	Men	8.4	8.34	8.47	predicted
<b>Eritrea</b>	2010	Women	6.93	6.89	6.97	predicted
<b>Eritrea</b>	2010	Total	7.18	7.14	7.22	predicted
<b>Eswatini</b>	2014	Men	9.01	8.9	9.12	predicted
<b>Eswatini</b>	2014	Women	7.71	7.65	7.77	predicted
<b>Eswatini</b>	2014	Total	8.33	8.26	8.39	predicted
<b>Ethiopia</b>	2015	Men	8.28	8.24	8.32	predicted
<b>Ethiopia</b>	2015	Women	6.92	6.89	6.95	predicted
<b>Ethiopia</b>	2015	Total	7.69	7.65	7.72	predicted
<b>Fiji</b>	2011	Men	9.75	9.63	9.86	predicted
<b>Fiji</b>	2011	Women	8.02	7.95	8.08	predicted
<b>Fiji</b>	2011	Total	8.9	8.79	9.01	predicted
<b>French Polynesia</b>	2010	Men	10.24	10.13	10.35	predicted
<b>French Polynesia</b>	2010	Women	8.04	7.95	8.13	predicted
<b>French Polynesia</b>	2010	Total	9.16	9.06	9.25	predicted
<b>Gambia</b>	2010	Men	9.1	8.96	9.24	predicted
<b>Gambia</b>	2010	Women	7.54	7.46	7.62	predicted
<b>Gambia</b>	2010	Total	8.33	8.22	8.43	predicted
<b>Grenada</b>	2011	Men	9.49	9.39	9.59	predicted
<b>Grenada</b>	2011	Women	7.89	7.8	7.98	predicted
<b>Grenada</b>	2011	Total	8.7	8.61	8.79	predicted
<b>Guyana</b>	2016	Men	9.28	9.17	9.39	predicted
<b>Guyana</b>	2016	Women	7.85	7.78	7.92	predicted
<b>Guyana</b>	2016	Total	8.59	8.53	8.66	predicted
<b>Iraq</b>	2015	Men	9.73	9.63	9.84	predicted
<b>Iraq</b>	2015	Women	8.01	7.95	8.07	predicted
<b>Iraq</b>	2015	Total	8.94	8.86	9.01	predicted
<b>Kenya</b>	2015	Men	8.69	8.59	8.78	predicted
<b>Kenya</b>	2015	Women	7.35	7.27	7.42	predicted
<b>Kenya</b>	2015	Total	8.02	7.94	8.11	predicted



<b>Kiribati</b>	2016	Men	10.19	9.99	10.39	predicted
<b>Kiribati</b>	2016	Women	8.25	8.14	8.36	predicted
<b>Kiribati</b>	2016	Total	9.08	8.94	9.23	predicted
<b>Kuwait</b>	2014	Men	10.19	10.11	10.26	predicted
<b>Kuwait</b>	2014	Women	8.08	8.03	8.13	predicted
<b>Kuwait</b>	2014	Total	9.13	9.07	9.18	predicted
<b>Kyrgyzstan</b>	2013	Men	9.58	9.43	9.73	predicted
<b>Kyrgyzstan</b>	2013	Women	7.8	7.75	7.85	predicted
<b>Kyrgyzstan</b>	2013	Total	8.72	8.65	8.8	predicted
<b>Lao People's Democratic Republic</b>	2013	Men	8.97	8.88	9.05	predicted
<b>Lao People's Democratic Republic</b>	2013	Women	7.38	7.32	7.43	predicted
<b>Lao People's Democratic Republic</b>	2013	Total	8.05	7.98	8.12	predicted
<b>Lesotho</b>	2012	Men	9.01	8.9	9.11	predicted
<b>Lesotho</b>	2012	Women	7.92	7.83	8	predicted
<b>Lesotho</b>	2012	Total	8.46	8.38	8.54	predicted
<b>Liberia</b>	2011	Men	9.52	9.38	9.65	predicted
<b>Liberia</b>	2011	Women	7.93	7.82	8.05	predicted
<b>Liberia</b>	2011	Total	8.74	8.61	8.87	predicted
<b>Libya</b>	2009	Men	9.67	9.59	9.75	predicted
<b>Libya</b>	2009	Women	8.07	8	8.14	predicted
<b>Libya</b>	2009	Total	8.89	8.83	8.95	predicted
<b>Myanmar</b>	2014	Men	8.71	8.59	8.82	predicted
<b>Myanmar</b>	2014	Women	7.41	7.32	7.49	predicted
<b>Myanmar</b>	2014	Total	8.06	7.98	8.14	predicted
<b>Nauru</b>	2016	Men	11.11	11.01	11.2	predicted
<b>Nauru</b>	2016	Women	8.76	8.6	8.92	predicted
<b>Nauru</b>	2016	Total	9.93	9.8	10.06	predicted
<b>Niue</b>	2012	Men	10.73	10.61	10.85	predicted
<b>Niue</b>	2012	Women	8.33	8.21	8.44	predicted
<b>Niue</b>	2012	Total	9.53	9.41	9.65	predicted
<b>Palau</b>	2013	Men	10.52	10.4	10.65	predicted
<b>Palau</b>	2013	Women	8.19	8.12	8.26	predicted
<b>Palau</b>	2013	Total	9.43	9.33	9.53	predicted
<b>Qatar</b>	2012	Men	10.17	10.06	10.29	predicted

<b>Qatar</b>	2012	Women	8.11	8.01	8.21	predicted
<b>Qatar</b>	2012	Total	9.16	9.06	9.26	predicted
<b>Republic of Moldova</b>	2013	Men	9.64	9.56	9.72	predicted
<b>Republic of Moldova</b>	2013	Women	7.56	7.5	7.62	predicted
<b>Republic of Moldova</b>	2013	Total	8.65	8.59	8.72	predicted
<b>Rwanda</b>	2013	Men	8.67	8.63	8.7	predicted
<b>Rwanda</b>	2013	Women	7.29	7.26	7.32	predicted
<b>Rwanda</b>	2013	Total	7.96	7.93	7.99	predicted
<b>Samoa</b>	2013	Men	10.44	10.3	10.58	predicted
<b>Samoa</b>	2013	Women	8.63	8.56	8.7	predicted
<b>Samoa</b>	2013	Total	9.61	9.51	9.7	predicted
<b>Sao Tome and Principe</b>	2008	Men	9.11	9.07	9.15	predicted
<b>Sao Tome and Principe</b>	2008	Women	7.54	7.44	7.64	predicted
<b>Sao Tome and Principe</b>	2008	Total	8.3	8.22	8.38	predicted
<b>Sierra Leone</b>	2009	Men	8.83	8.73	8.93	predicted
<b>Sierra Leone</b>	2009	Women	7.41	7.32	7.51	predicted
<b>Sierra Leone</b>	2009	Total	8.13	8.03	8.23	predicted
<b>Sri Lanka</b>	2015	Men	8.82	8.75	8.89	predicted
<b>Sri Lanka</b>	2015	Women	7.29	7.25	7.33	predicted
<b>Sri Lanka</b>	2015	Total	8.08	8.03	8.13	predicted
<b>Tajikistan</b>	2017	Men	9.4	9.3	9.5	predicted
<b>Tajikistan</b>	2017	Women	7.55	7.48	7.62	predicted
<b>Tajikistan</b>	2017	Total	8.55	8.46	8.64	predicted
<b>Timor-Leste</b>	2014	Men	8.42	8.37	8.46	predicted
<b>Timor-Leste</b>	2014	Women	7	6.88	7.11	predicted
<b>Timor-Leste</b>	2014	Total	7.9	7.8	8	predicted
<b>Togo</b>	2011	Men	8.71	8.66	8.77	predicted
<b>Togo</b>	2011	Women	7.21	7.16	7.26	predicted
<b>Togo</b>	2011	Total	7.95	7.9	8	predicted
<b>Tuvalu</b>	2015	Men	10.57	10.44	10.71	predicted
<b>Tuvalu</b>	2015	Women	8.59	8.5	8.68	predicted
<b>Tuvalu</b>	2015	Total	9.68	9.57	9.79	predicted
<b>Uganda</b>	2014	Men	8.63	8.57	8.69	predicted
<b>Uganda</b>	2014	Women	7.22	7.16	7.28	predicted

<b>Uganda</b>	2014	Total	7.93	7.87	7.99	predicted
<b>United Republic of Tanzania</b>	2012	Men	8.6	8.47	8.72	predicted
<b>United Republic of Tanzania</b>	2012	Women	7.48	7.41	7.55	predicted
<b>United Republic of Tanzania</b>	2012	Total	8.04	7.98	8.11	predicted
<b>Vanuatu</b>	2011	Men	9.52	9.44	9.59	predicted
<b>Vanuatu</b>	2011	Women	7.75	7.69	7.81	predicted
<b>Vanuatu</b>	2011	Total	8.59	8.53	8.66	predicted
<b>Vietnam</b>	2015	Men	8.75	8.68	8.82	predicted
<b>Vietnam</b>	2015	Women	7.11	7.07	7.16	predicted
<b>Vietnam</b>	2015	Total	7.94	7.88	8	predicted

**Supplementary Table 8. Comparison between mean salt intake predictions and global estimates across national surveys included in the ML application.**

Country	Year (for ML predictions)	ML-predicted mean salt intake and 95% CI (g/day)	Year (for global estimates)	Estimated mean salt intake and 95% CI (g/day)	Ratio between predicted and estimated mean salt intake	Absolute difference between predicted mean salt intake and global estimated mean salt intake
Algeria	2017	8.6 (8.6-8.6)	2010	10.7 (9-12.5)	0.8	2.1
Bahamas	2012	9.3 (9.2-9.5)	2010	7.5 (6.2-8.8)	1.2	1.8
Barbados	2007	8.8 (8.6-9)	2010	8.6 (7.8-9.4)	1	0.2
Benin	2015	8 (7.9-8.2)	2010	7.1 (6.2-8.1)	1.1	0.9
Botswana	2014	8 (8-8.1)	2010	6.3 (5.4-7.4)	1.3	1.7
Cabo Verde	2007	8.3 (8.2-8.4)	2010	8.1 (6.8-9.7)	1	0.2
Cambodia	2010	8 (7.9-8)	2010	11 (9.3-12.9)	0.7	3
Comoros	2011	8.4 (8.4-8.5)	2010	4.2 (3.5-5)	2	4.2
Ecuador	2018	8.8 (8.7-8.8)	2010	7.6 (6.4-8.9)	1.2	1.2
Eritrea	2010	7.2 (7.1-7.2)	2010	5.9 (5-7)	1.2	1.3
Ethiopia	2015	7.7 (7.7-7.7)	2010	5.7 (4.9-6.7)	1.4	2
Fiji	2011	8.9 (8.8-9)	2010	7.2 (6-8.5)	1.2	1.7
Gambia	2010	8.3 (8.2-8.4)	2010	7.7 (6.5-8.9)	1.1	0.6
Grenada	2011	8.7 (8.6-8.8)	2010	6.5 (5.5-7.7)	1.3	2.2
Guyana	2016	8.6 (8.5-8.7)	2010	6.1 (5.1-7.3)	1.4	2.5
Iraq	2015	8.9 (8.9-9)	2010	9.4 (8-11.2)	0.9	0.5
Kenya	2015	8 (7.9-8.1)	2010	3.7 (3.4-4)	2.2	4.3
Kiribati	2016	9.1 (8.9-9.2)	2010	5.6 (4.6-6.7)	1.6	3.5
Kuwait	2014	9.1 (9.1-9.2)	2010	9.7 (8.7-10.8)	0.9	0.6
Kyrgyzstan	2013	8.7 (8.7-8.8)	2010	13.4 (11.4-15.8)	0.6	4.7

<b>Lao People's Democratic Republic</b>	2013	8.1 (8-8.1)	2010	11.1 (9.4-13.2)	0.7	3
<b>Lesotho</b>	2012	8.5 (8.4-8.5)	2010	6.6 (5.5-7.8)	1.3	1.9
<b>Liberia</b>	2011	8.7 (8.6-8.9)	2010	6.7 (5.6-7.9)	1.3	2
<b>Libya</b>	2009	8.9 (8.8-8.9)	2010	10.6 (8.9-12.5)	0.8	1.7
<b>Myanmar</b>	2014	8.1 (8-8.1)	2010	11.2 (9.4-13.2)	0.7	3.1
<b>Qatar</b>	2012	9.2 (9.1-9.3)	2010	10.5 (8.3-12.9)	0.9	1.3
<b>Republic of Moldova</b>	2013	8.7 (8.6-8.7)	2010	9.9 (8.3-11.6)	0.9	1.2
<b>Rwanda</b>	2013	8 (7.9-8)	2010	4 (3.3-4.9)	2	4
<b>Samoa</b>	2013	9.6 (9.5-9.7)	2010	5.2 (4.6-5.8)	1.8	4.4
<b>Sao Tome and Principe</b>	2008	8.3 (8.2-8.4)	2010	5.9 (4.9-6.9)	1.4	2.4
<b>Sierra Leone</b>	2009	8.1 (8-8.2)	2010	6.3 (5.3-7.3)	1.3	1.8
<b>Sri Lanka</b>	2015	8.1 (8-8.1)	2010	9.7 (8.2-11.3)	0.8	1.6
<b>Tajikistan</b>	2017	8.6 (8.5-8.6)	2010	13.5 (11.6-15.7)	0.6	4.9
<b>Timor-Leste</b>	2014	7.9 (7.8-8)	2010	11.2 (9.3-13.3)	0.7	3.3
<b>Uganda</b>	2014	7.9 (7.9-8)	2010	5.3 (4.4-6.3)	1.5	2.6
<b>United Republic of Tanzania</b>	2012	8 (8-8.1)	2010	6.9 (6.1-7.7)	1.2	1.1
<b>Vanuatu</b>	2011	8.6 (8.5-8.7)	2010	5.6 (4.8-6.6)	1.5	3
<b>Vietnam</b>	2015	7.9 (7.9-8)	2010	11.5 (9.5-13.7)	0.7	3.6

\*There are 38 countries in this table; that is, countries included in our analysis that were not available in the previous global work, were not included in this table.


Reference: Powles J, Fahimi S, Micha R, Khatibzadeh S, Shi P, Ezzati M, et al. Global, regional and national sodium intakes in 1990 and 2010: a systematic analysis of 24 h urinary sodium excretion and dietary surveys worldwide. *BMJ Open*. 2013 Dec 23;3(12):e003733.

**Supplementary Figure 2. Comparison between mean difference between observed and predicted salt intake across the best algorithms**

Men

Women

Mean difference between observed and predicted mean salt intake



category

- prediction\_GBR\_orig
- prediction\_LIR\_poly
- prediction\_MLP\_boxcox
- prediction\_RF\_poly
- prediction\_RfR\_poly