**Greater access to healthy food outlets in the home and school environment is associated with better dietary quality in young children**

Millie Barrett1, Sarah Crozier2, Daniel Lewis3, Keith Godfrey 1,2, Sian Robinson1,2, Cyrus Cooper1,2,4, Hazel Inskip1,2, Janis Baird2, Christina Vogel2

1 NIHR Southampton Biomedical Research Centre, University Hospital Southampton NHS Foundation Trust and University of Southampton, Southampton SO16 6YD, UK

2 Medical Research Council Lifecourse Epidemiology Unit, University of Southampton, Southampton General Hospital, Tremona Road, Southampton, SO16 6YD, UK

3 Department of Social and Environmental Health Research, Faculty of Public Health & Policy, London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, 15-17 Tavistock Place, London WC9H 1SH, UK

4 NIHR Oxford Musculoskeletal Biomedical Research Unit, University of Oxford, Nuffield Orthopaedic Centre, Headington, Oxford, OX3 7HE, UK

**Correspondence to:** Christina Vogel, cv@mrc.soton.ac.uk, Tel: 023 8076 4042, University of Southampton, Southampton General Hospital, Tremona Road, Southampton SO16 6YD, UK

**Short title:** Food environment and diet quality in children

**Acknowledgements**

We are grateful to the mothers and children who participated in the Southampton Women’s Survey and thank the dedicated team of research nurses and ancillary staff for their contributions to the study. We also thank Miss Jamie Lawrence for her assistance ground-truthing the neighbourhood food environment and Ken Cox and Vanessa Cox for computing support.

**Funding declarations**

This work was supported by grants from the Medical Research Council, British Heart Foundation, Arthritis Research UK, Dunhill Medical Trust, Food Standards Agency, National Osteoporosis Society, International Osteoporosis Foundation, NIHR Southampton Biomedical Research Centre, University of Southampton and University Hospital Southampton NHS Foundation Trust, and the European Union’s Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013), project EarlyNutrition under grant agreement number 289346. Christina Vogel was supported by a National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Doctoral Research Fellowship. The NHS, the NIHR or the Department of Health and other funders had no role in the design, analysis or writing of this article.

**Competing interests**

MB, CV, SC, DL and SR have no conflicts of interest to declare. JB has received grant research support from Danone Nutricia Early Life Nutrition however the study in this manuscript is not related to this relationship.

KG has received reimbursement for speaking at conferences sponsored by companies selling nutritional products, and is part of an academic consortium that has received research funding from Abbott Nutrition, Nestec and Danone. CC has received consultancy, lecture fees and honoraria from AMGEN, GSK, Alliance for Better Bone Health, MSD, Eli Lilly, Pfizer, Novartis, Servier, Medtronic and Roche. While not directly receiving the funds herself, members of HI’s team have received funds from Abbott Nutrition, Nestec and Danone.

**Contributions**

MB and CV conceived the study and wrote the first draft of the manuscript. HMI, SR, KG and CC participated in the design and management of the Southampton Women’s Survey, oversaw data collection and helped draft the manuscript. MB and CV cleaned the 6-year dietary data and school data. CV collected and cleaned the food environment data. DL provided methodological advice and conducted the ArcGIS analyses. MB and SC conducted the data analysis in discussion with CV. All authors read and approved the manuscript.

**Ethical standards**

This study was conducted according to the guidelines laid down in the Declaration of Helsinki and all procedures involving participants were approved by the Southampton and South West Hampshire Local Research Ethics Committee. Written informed consent was obtained from all parents of participants.

**Data access**

These data cannot be made openly available because of ethical concerns about the potential to identify individuals from the demographic and postcode information within the dataset. These variables cannot be removed as they are fundamental to development of the exposure variables. The dataset can be made available upon request, subject to appropriate approvals. Researchers wishing to use the data would need to make a formal application to the Southampton Initiative for Health Oversight Group through the corresponding author (Dr Christina Vogel: cv@mrc.soton.ac.uk). Subject to approval and formal agreements being signed, the data would then be provided.

**Greater access to healthy food outlets in the home and school environment is associated with better dietary quality in young children**

**Abstract**

**Objective:** To explore associations between dietary quality and access to different types of food outlets around both home and school in primary-school aged children.

**Design:** Cross-sectional observational study.

**Setting:** Hampshire, UK.

**Participants:** 1173 children in the Southampton Women’s Survey underwent dietary assessment at age 6 by food frequency questionnaire, and a standardised diet quality score was calculated. An activity space around each child’s home and school was created using ArcGIS. Cross-sectional observational food outlet data were overlaid to derive four food environment measures: counts of supermarkets, healthy specialty stores (e.g. greengrocers), fast-food and takeaway outlets, and a relative measure representing healthy outlets (supermarkets and specialty stores) as a proportion of total retail and takeaway outlets.

**Results:** In univariate multilevel linear regression analyses better diet scores were associated with exposure to greater numbers of healthy specialty stores (β=0.025SD/store: 95% CI 0.007, 0.044), and greater exposure to healthy outlets relative to all outlets in children’s activity spaces (β=0.068SD per 10% increase in healthy outlets as a proportion of total outlets, 95% CI 0.018, 0.117). After adjustment for mothers’ educational qualification and level of home neighbourhood deprivation, the relationship between diet and healthy specialty stores remained robust (p=0.002) while the relationship with the relative measure weakened (p=0.095). Greater exposure to supermarkets and fast food outlets were associated with better diet only in the adjusted models (p= 0.017 and p=0.014 respectively).

**Conclusion:** The results strengthen the argument for local authorities to increase the number of healthy food outlets to which young children are exposed.

**Keywords:** Food outlet exposure, Activity space, Children’s diet quality, Primary school-aged children

**Introduction**

Many high-income countries are facing an epidemic of overweight and obesity(1) that starts in childhood(2; 3). The National Child Measurement Programme (NCMP) shows that over a fifth of children aged 4-5 years in the United Kingdom (UK) are overweight or obese, increasing to over a third of children aged 10-11 years old(4). Poor diet is a core factor affecting childhood obesity(5).

Globally, there is increasing evidence that the local food environment is a determinant of both diet and weight status(6; 7; 8). Among adults and children, greater access to unhealthy food outlets is associated with higher levels of overweight and obesity and poorer dietary behaviours(7; 9; 10). However, despite a surge in studies assessing relationships between food outlet access and health outcomes in recent years, a number of gaps and methodological limitations exist. A recent review concluded that measuring the food environment is complicated and there is an ongoing need for further research using more robust measures(11).

There is continued interest in understanding how the food environment impacts health-related outcomes, especially the risk of obesity and its contributing health behaviours(12). Current evidence indicates the association between local food environment exposures and childhood dietary quality is stronger in the US, with trends less evident in other developed countries(6; 7). There are significant differences between the US and the UK in neighbourhood design(13; 14) that may lead to differences in how the food environment affects the health of communities. In addition, studies among children are less abundant than those among adults despite recognition that these two populations relate differently to their food environments(15). Therefore, to inform public health policy and intervention design, more UK studies among children are needed(16).

In children, the majority of studies have assessed relationships between access to food outlets and BMI(9; 10; 17) as opposed to diet. In addition, studies have focused on access to one type of food outlet (usually fast-food outlets) rather than examining a range of ‘healthy’ and ‘unhealthy’ outlets. Reviews have recommended that future studies include exposure to a range of outlets(13; 18) and there is increasing acknowledgment of the need to use relative exposure measures(19) (which consider an outlet type relative to all outlets in the area) in addition to absolute count measures. In 2015 a systematic review concluded that indices including multiple food outlets were most consistently associated with obesity in adults(20). The evidence relating to children remains limited.

The childhood food environment literature shows that residential neighbourhood food environments are more strongly associated with weight and dietary outcomes than school neighbourhood food environments(17; 21). However, in order to provide a more nuanced representation of children’s daily food outlet exposure, activity space measures including both home and school are needed. Activity space can be defined as the subset of locations that an individual comes into contact with as a result of their daily mobility(22). For young children, home and school represent two sites in which children typically spend the vast majority of their time(23). Activity space measures may also improve the specificity between exposure and health behaviour or health outcome(22). Studies in adults that account for exposures from multiple locations, including both residential and non-residential settings, are more strongly associated with health outcomes than estimates based on exposures in one setting only(24) (Cobb 2015). To date, few published studies have used an activity space approach to assess this relationship in young children(21; 25; 26).

The majority of food environment studies have applied proxy dietary measures, measuring only one aspect of diet, rather than assessing overall diet quality(6; 27; 28). Measuring dietary quality provides a more comprehensive understanding of overall patterns of dietary behaviour and is preferable to single nutrient or food measures when quantifying NCD risk(29; 30).

This study aimed to address the limitations of the current evidence. The aims of this study were to: (i) examine the relationship between counts of supermarkets, healthy specialty stores (greengrocers, health food stores, farm shops and butchers), fast-food outlets (chains and takeaway outlets) and total number of retail and fast-food outlets in children’s combined residential and school neighbourhood with their dietary quality at 6 years, and (ii) explore the relationship between a relative measure of healthy outlets as a proportion of total outlets, in children’s combined residential and school neighbourhood with their dietary quality at 6 years.

**Materials and Methods**

**Participants**

Participants were children of women participating in the Southampton Women’s Survey (SWS). The SWS is a prospective cohort of 12,583 non-pregnant women recruited between 1998 and 2002 when aged 20-34 years. Assessments of smoking status and highest educational qualification were made at study entry for all participants. Each woman’s height and weight was measured by trained research nurses and used to derive body mass index (BMI). Those who subsequently became pregnant were followed up; the growth and development of the SWS children were assessed periodically during infancy and childhood, and the children continue to be followed-up. This study was conducted according to the guidelines laid down in the Declaration of Helsinki and all procedures involving participants were approved by the Southampton and South West Hampshire Local Research Ethics Committee. Written informed consent was obtained from all parents of participants. A full description of the SWS is published elsewhere(31).

This study used data from the 6-year follow-up assessment for children conducted between 2007 and 2014, and mother’s SWS study entry assessment data. At the 6-year follow-up, height (cm) was measured using a portable stadiometer (Leicester Height Measure; Seca). Child’s diet over the previous three months was assessed using an interviewer-administered 80-item food frequency questionnaire (FFQ) completed by each child’s parent or guardian. Average frequency of consumption (ten options from never, to number of times per day) of all listed foods were recorded. Daily volumes, types and amounts of milks were recorded as well as any sugar added to food. A prudent diet score (dietary quality score) was calculated for each child. The FFQ items were categorised into 51 groups on the basis of similarity of type of food or nutrient composition. The reported standardised frequency of each group was then multiplied by corresponding coefficients identified from a principal components analysis and the results summed. The dietary quality scores were standardised to have a mean of zero and standard deviation of one. Higher scores represented better dietary quality and a dietary pattern consistent with the dietary recommendations, characterised by frequent consumption of fruit, vegetables and fish. A full description of FFQ delivery and analysis, as well as creation of the dietary quality score, has been published elsewhere(32). School and home postcodes were also collected at the 6 year assessment. Home postcode was used to determine the level of neighbourhood deprivation for each child using quintiles of the 2010 English Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD).

**Exposure area – activity space (home and school)**

The exposure area applied was an activity space around home and school. This method involves drawing boundaries around a number of individualised points to create activity spaces(33). An activity space for each child was created using geocoded home and school postcode centroids as midpoints buffered by an 800 metre radius. If these home and school boundaries overlapped, the overlapping area was merged to ensure that food outlets in these areas were not duplicated. The 800m buffer has been frequently applied in the literature(34), and corresponds to an approximately 10-minute walk for children(17; 35). Euclidean distance (straight line) was used to buffer locations instead of road network distance because the two measures are highly correlated at 800m in urban settings(34). The decision not to measure exposure in home and school environments separately was taken due to the urban setting and the fact that fewer than one hundred children had activity spaces within which their home and school address did not overlap.

**Exposure variable – food stores**

Food environment data were collected as part of the process evaluation of the Southampton Initiative for Health (SIH)(36). A list of 1682 food retail stores and fast-food outlets and their postcodes in six council boundaries (Southampton, Eastleigh, Fareham, Gosport, Havant, Portsmouth) within Hampshire, UK, was compiled in July and August 2010 using information from each Council’s Food Safety Register. We used the directories Yellow Pages and yell.com to supplement the local authority registers in an effort to obtain a complete picture of food outlet locations across the study area. Between July 2010 and June 2011, trained fieldworkers ‘ground-truthed’ the study area and confirmed existence and type of all food retail stores and takeaway outlets; 245 were no-longer present and 350 additional outlets were identified making a total of 1787 outlets in the study area at the time of data collection. A great proportion of the study area was assessed however not all streets within the study area were checked for food outlets. It is therefore possible that some food outlets were missed. The food outlets were geocoded using ArcGIS10.1(37) and data about the location of food outlets was overlaid onto each child’s home and school activity space.

Exposure variables included the count of three categories of outlets, i) supermarkets including high-range, large, discount and small supermarkets, ii) fast-food outlets including fast-food chains and takeaway outlets, and iii) healthy specialty stores including greengrocers, health food stores, farm shops and butchers. These categories are similar to those used in previous research(38; 39) and the healthy specialty category included outlets aligned with previous work(40). In addition to the total counts, a relative measure was created, representing the number of healthy food outlets as a proportion of all food retail stores and fast-food outlets with each child’s activity space which included convenience stores, newsagents, bakers, confectioners and ‘world’ food stores as well as supermarkets, healthy specialty stores and fast-food outlets.

**Statistical analysis**

Participants’ characteristics were summarised using means and standard deviations (SD) for normally distributed continuous variables, medians and inter-quartile range (IQR) for non-normally distributed continuous variables, and percentages for categorical variables.

All analyses investigating the research questions were cross-sectional. Diet scores were standardised, thus the units of the outcome measure are standard deviations. Multilevel linear regression models were used to assess the relationship between the outcome measure: diet score, and five predictor variables: (i) count of supermarkets, (ii) count of healthy specialty stores, (iii) count of fast-food and takeaways, (iv) total number of outlets and (v) relative measure of healthy outlets as a proportion of total food outlets. These multilevel models accounted for clustering within schools (rho: 0.05-0.06). The count models were not mutually adjusted due to the high correlation between fast food outlets and healthy specialty stores (r=0.8).

We used the directed acyclic graph (DAG) approach(41) to select suitable confounders for linear regression models. Potential confounding variables considered for the DAG comprised age the child was last breastfed, maternal BMI, child height, child sex, maternal educational attainment and home neighbourhood deprivation. Ethnicity was not considered to be a confounder because of little variability: 96% of the women participants who had a live singleton birth were white and 94% of their children were also white. A DAG identifies that a variable is a confounder when it is causally associated with at least two variables already included in the model. The DAG for this study identified two confounding variables that should be included in our analyses: mother’s educational attainment and level of neighbourhood deprivation (Supplementary Figure 1). Results are presented for the adjusted and unadjusted models.

All statistical analyses were conducted using Stata statistical software package version 14.1.(42) Geoconvert™ software was used to geocode home, school and food outlet addresses, and ArcGIS 10.3.1 was used to create the activity spaces and food outlet exposure variables.

**Results**

**Characteristics of participants and food environment exposures**

The study included 1173 children (590 boys and 583 girls) from the SWS 6-year assessment whose home and school were both located in the food environment exposure area. Table 1 presents the characteristics of the children and their mothers. Girls were slightly shorter than boys and had better mean diet scores. Mothers had a median pre-pregnancy BMI of 24.3 (21.9-27.5) which is at the higher end of the healthy weight range. Approximately 14% of mothers smoked during pregnancy, and 60% had qualifications higher than GSCE or equivalent (at 16 years of age). Most children lived in neighbourhoods of medium-level deprivation (70%), with 17% in the least deprived quintile and 13% in the most deprived quintile.

Figure 1 shows the distribution of supermarkets, healthy specialty stores and fast-food outlets in children’s activity spaces. Nine percent of children had no supermarket in their activity space and 27% had no healthy specialty store. More than half (52%) of children were exposed to ≥10 fast-food and takeaways in the area surrounding their home and school. Three children in this study had ≥50 fast-food and takeaway outlets in their activity spaces.

**Relationship between food environment and dietary quality**

Table 2 shows that increasing counts of healthy specialty stores in children’s activity spaces were associated with better diet scores. A greater number of healthy specialty stores was associated with higher diet score in both the univariate multilevel linear regression model (β=0.025SD/store, 95% CI 0.007, 0.044; p=0.008) and in the model adjusted for educational attainment and level of neighbourhood deprivation (β=0.024/store, 95% CI 0.009, 0.040; p=0.002; Figure 2). Children with an additional two healthy specialty stores around home and school had dietary quality scores 0.04SD greater than other children. This difference could for example be achieved by eating approximately one extra serving of green vegetables each week.

Increasing counts of supermarkets, fast-food outlets and total number of retail and fast-food outlets were also positively associated with better diet scores, but only in the adjusted multilevel models (β=0.044/store, 95% CI 0.008, 0.079; p=0.017, β=0.009/outlet, 95% CI 0.002, 0.016; p=0.014, β=0.005/outlet, 95% CI 0.001, 0.007; p=0.005 respectively). The effect sizes for total outlets and fast-food outlets were smaller than for healthy specialty stores and supermarkets.

The relative number of healthy outlets as a proportion of total outlets showed a strong positive association with diet score in the unadjusted multilevel linear regression model (β=0.068SD per 10% increase in healthy outlets as a proportion of total outlets, CI 0.018, 0.117, p=0.008). This effect weakened after adjusting for educational attainment and neighbourhood deprivation (β=0.037SD per 10% increase, 95% CI -0.064, 0.081, p=0.095).

**Discussion**

**Summary of findings**

To our knowledge, this is the first study to examine how both absolute and relative exposure measures of different types of food outlets in activity spaces relates to overall dietary quality among primary school-aged children. We found that children were exposed to more unhealthy than healthy outlets in their home and school environments. Greater access to healthy specialty stores including greengrocers, and health-food stores was consistently associated with better dietary quality. Greater access to supermarkets and fast-food outlets was also associated with better diet after adjustment for socioeconomic demographics suggesting that exposure to more food outlets per se was better for diet. However, consideration of healthy outlets as a proportion of total outlets, showed a tendency for greater exposure to more healthy food outlets and better dietary quality.

**Comparison with previous research**

Previous research examining the relationship between the local food environment and children’s health outcomes has largely focused on weight and body composition, rather than diet. This may be because large datasets such as the UK’s National Child Measurement Programme (NCMP) provide data on BMI for very large numbers of children at two time points (age 4-5 and 10-11 years) during primary school. The challenges of dietary assessment, as opposed to measuring weight or BMI, may indicate why diet has been considered less frequently than body composition in the childhood food environment literature(27; 43). Yet diet is a key determinant of weight status and empirical evidence exploring the relationship between diet and spatial access to different food outlet types is paramount to understanding the complexity of how the food environment influences obesity in children.

Our findings provide empirical evidence for a relationship between greater access to healthy outlets such as greengrocers, which sell predominantly healthy minimally-processed food products, and better dietary quality among younger primary school-aged children. This finding is consistent with previous research from the UK which has shown a range of health outcomes to be associated with increased local access to healthier food outlets among younger children. One study found that children with one or more greengrocers or supermarkets around their home had lower fizzy drink intake and percentage body fat than children with no access to these outlets(44). Another study showed that having greater access to healthy specialty stores in home neighbourhood was associated with better bone health in children aged 4 years(45). Furthermore, a large national study observed that higher counts of healthy specialty stores, supermarkets and cafes in home neighbourhood related to a lower prevalence of overweight and obesity among young children (aged 4-5 years) but not older children (aged 10-11 years)(46). Research from Australia involving 5-6 and 10-12 year olds identified no association between fruit and vegetable intake and access to greengrocers around home but did observe that lower fruit intake related to greater access to fast-food outlets and convenience stores(47). These Australian findings differ from the UK evidence but it may be that the larger numbers of children aged 10-12 years involved in the Australian study were driving the overall results and that differential age effects may have been observed had these analyses included younger children.

Collectively, the results of the studies described above indicate that food retailing influences the dietary patterns of children differently depending on their age. Older children are likely to have greater independent purchasing opportunities than younger children whose diets are more likely to be under greater influence of parental food decisions(48). Parents may be more inclined to shop at conveniently located greengrocers or farm shops as part of household grocery shopping habits, while older children may have pocket money and greater independence than younger children, enabling them to purchase less healthy food items from convenience stores or fast-food outlets for immediate consumption. Current strategies to improve the food retail landscape are predominantly focused on reducing access to fast-food and takeaway outlets(49). However, it may be pertinent to also explore opportunities to increase access to healthy specialty stores, which have diminished in number in recent years(50), in order to improve the diets and weight status of younger children.

The results of the current study showed that, like healthy specialty stores, higher numbers of supermarkets and fast-food outlets in home and school neighbourhoods were associated with better dietary patterns. These findings could indicate that increased access to food outlets per se may improve diet. However, they could also be indicative of collinearity of different types of food outlets, which often are co-located in retail precincts. Empirical evidence from the US showed that because fast-food outlets and banks are often co-located in areas of high commercial density, access to fast-food outlets and banks were both independently positively associated with obesity prevalence(51). Having greater access to areas of high commercial density may enhance behavioural and health outcomes through mechanisms of increased employment and increased concentration of community services and resources(52). The use of relative measures of food outlet exposure is a methodological strategy that endeavours to somewhat account for outlet co-location and overcome issues of multicollinearity occurred during statistical analyses(19). Our results for the relative measure showed that more healthy outlets relative to the proportion of total outlets in home and school environment was associated with better dietary quality although the relationship weakened after adjustment for socioeconomic variables. These results are similar to a Canadian study which found that an increased ratio of ‘unhealthful’ to ‘healthful’ outlets in school neighbourhood only was weakly associated with higher intake of sugar sweetened beverages and lower daily fruit and vegetable intake(53). The results of the relative measure and the larger effect sizes for associations between diet and exposure to supermarkets and healthy specialty stores than fast-food outlets identified in the current study suggest that more can be done to the balance of healthy and unhealthy food outlets in retail precincts.

Supermarkets sell a large variety of both healthy and unhealthy products ranging from fresh fruit and vegetables to ultra-processed foods that are high in saturated fat, sugar and salt making it difficult to classify supermarkets as healthy or unhealthy(7). Our findings are consistent with findings from a previous UK study among children aged 9-10 years which found that greater density of supermarkets was associated with an increased intake of both healthy and unhealthy foods(54). More recent UK research has also shown that the volume of unhealthy food product sales from a supermarket within home neighbourhood was associated with prevalence of overweight and obesity among children aged 4-5 and 10-11 years(55). Future research considering both the density of different types of food outlets and the marketing activities within supermarkets is necessary to better understand the multiple environmental determinants of children’s diet and weight status(43).

**Strengths and Limitations**

Two main strengths of this study are the ‘activity space’ approach covering both home and school environment, and the use of absolute (count) as well as a relative measure of a range of food outlet access. Relative measures are more comprehensive, but absolute measures help policy makers and practitioners interpret results(19). A further strength of the study was the use of a food frequency questionnaire administered by trained research nurses that enabled calculation of an overall measure of children’s dietary quality rather than proxy dietary measures seen in much of the literature. The focus on younger children in the UK is a further strength because food environment research has predominantly focused on adults and adolescents and has mainly come from the US.

This study also has some limitations, many of which are common to research assessing food outlet access. Measuring dietary quality accurately is challenging and response bias in FFQs is possible. However, interviewer-administered questionnaires have generally shown greater accuracy than self-administered questionnaires(56). FFQs capture data from a higher proportion of the population than other dietary measures, thus increasing the likelihood of a more representative sample. The study was observational and cross-sectional in design and results therefore could be due to residual confounding. However, a DAG approach was used to identify appropriate confounding variables and adjustments made accordingly (Supplementary Figure 1). Dietary data were collected at a different time from the food outlet data and it is therefore possible that the number and location of food outlets may not be an accurate representation for some children. However, this is a recognised limitation of much food environment research(18). The sample come from a pre-conception cohort study where attrition over time means the sample may not be entirely representative of children aged 6 years in the UK.

Geographical analysis using GIS software has recognised limitations, including assumptions made about food choices being primarily determined by people’s proximity to food outlets. In addition, it does not account for factors such as taste preferences, social norms, or affordability(11). While the geocoding of addresses can also introduce bias, very few locations were not matched in this study (<3%) and this small number is most likely due to the overlap between the study period and the Geoconvert data (both 2011). The use of GPS technology might have allowed for a more accurate measure of food environment exposure, but the use of such measures is still in its infancy and poses a number of difficulties not least technical challenges including signal loss, delay in acquiring satellite signal, precision of the device, battery power, or participants forgetting to switch the device on(16; 57) These are perhaps reasons, why very few food environment studies to date have used GPS technology, especially in young children.

**Public health implications**

This study contributes to the empirical evidence supporting government action to improve the nutritional quality of food outlets that children have access to in their home and school environments in order to improve their diets and health. In the UK, The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) includes the requirement for planning departments to promote healthy communities, taking into account and supporting local Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategies (JHWS)(58). Outcomes identified in the Public Health Outcomes Framework (PHOF) include a specific indicator about excess weight in 4-5 and 10-11 year olds(59) giving local public health teams the opportunity to work strategically with planning and environment colleagues in local authorities to meet these joint objectives.

Prompted by the guidance in 2014 from Public Health England (PHE) and the Local Government Association (LGA), an increasing number of local authorities are responding by introducing planning laws to ban outlets selling hot food takeaway within 400m of schools as well as placing general restrictions on the clustering of takeaway outlets(60). This recommendation has not been implemented in the study area. The findings of our study support action to increase access to healthy food outlets, especially healthy specialty stores such as greengrocers in both home and school environments. Financial constraints on local authorities may prevent the introduction of such policies or laws. However, robust evaluation of such policies, to demonstrate health and/or financial benefits from making such changes, or support from central government grants could provide further impetus for councillors to take action. A common sense approach, implemented over a period of time, could allow for increased access to stores selling predominantly healthy foods.

Recent reviews indicate that more longitudinal evidence is needed and that more attention needs be given to the reliability and validity of food environment exposure measurement tools(11; 61). In addition, qualitative research and community-based methods with children and families would enhance our understanding of how children interact with their local food outlets and could help them to advocate for changes to their local food environment(62). Building knowledge of the different accessibility issues for younger and older primary-school aged children as well as adolescents could offer additional support for action by local authorities to improve the imbalance in the current retail food environment.

**Conclusion**

Our findings suggest that the food environment around home and school to which young children are exposed is associated with their diet quality, with access to greater numbers of all food outlets being associated with better diet quality. However, the effect size for healthy outlets is greater than for other outlet types suggesting there is an opportunity for local authorities to use their powers to increase the numbers of healthy stores that families with young children have access to. Further evidence from intervention, longitudinal and qualitative research is needed to support the case for action.

**References**

1. Public Health England (2015) About Obesity. <https://www.noo.org.uk/NOO_about_obesity> (accessed 14th October 2015 2015)

2. Daniels SR (2006) The consequences of childhood overweight and obesity. *Future Child* **16**, 47-67.

3. World Health Organisation (2016) *Report of the Commission on Ending Childhood Obesity*. Geneva, Swtizerland.

4. Public Health England (2015) National Child Measurement Programme. <https://www.noo.org.uk/NCMP> (accessed 26th June 2015

5. Conrad D, Capewell S (2012) Associations between deprivation and rates of childhood overweight and obesity in England, 2007-2010: an ecological study. *BMJ Open* **2**.

6. Engler-Stringer R, Le H, Gerrard A *et al.* (2014) The community and consumer food environment and children's diet: a systematic review. *BMC Public Health* **14**.

7. Caspi CE, Sorensen G, Subramanian SV *et al.* (2012) The local food environment and diet: a systematic review. *Health & Place* **18**, 1172-1187.

8. Holsten JE (2009) Obesity and the community food environment: a systematic review. *Public Health Nutrition* **12**, 397-405.

9. Cetateanu A, Jones A (2014) Understanding the relationship between food environments, deprivation and childhoodoverweight and obesity: evidence from a cross sectional England-wide study. *Health & Place* **27**, 68-76.

10. Fraser LK, Edwards KL (2010) The association between the geography of fast food outlets and childhood obesity rates in Leeds, UK. *Health & Place* **16**, 1124-1128.

11. Lytle LA, Sokol RL (2017) Measures of the food environment: A systematic review of the field, 2007-2015. *Health Place* **44**, 18-34.

12. Vandevijvere S, Dominick C, Devi A *et al.* (2015) The healthy food environment policy index: findings of an expert panel in New Zealand. *Bull World Health Organ* **93**, 294-302.

13. Black C, Moon G, Baird J (2014) Dietary inequalities: What is the evidence for the effect of the neighbourhood food environment? *Health & Place* **27**, 229-242.

14. Cummins S, Macintyre S (2005) Food environments and obesity - neighbourhood or nation? *International Journal of Epidemiology* **35**, 100-104.

15. Brembeck H, Johansson B, Bergstrom K *et al.* (2013) Exploring children's foodscapes. *Child Geogr* **11**, 74-88.

16. Cetateanu A, Jones A (2016) How can GPS technology help us better understand exposure to the food environment? A systematic review. *SSM Popul Health* **2**, 196-205.

17. Williams J, Scarborough P, Townsend N *et al.* (2015) Associations between Food Outlets around Schools and BMI among Primary Students in England: A Cross-Classified Multi-Level Analysis. *PLOS One* **10**.

18. Charriere H, Casey R, Salze P (2010) Measuring the food environment using geographical information systems: a methodological review. *Public Health Nutrition* **13**, 1773-1785.

19. Clary C, Ramos Y, Shareck M *et al.* (2015) Should we use absolute or relative measures when assessing foodscape exposure in relation to fruit and vegetable intake? Evidence from a wide-scale Canadian study. *Prev Med* **71**, 83-87.

20. Cobb LK, Appel LJ, Franco M *et al.* (2015) The relationship of the local food environment with obesity: A systematic review of methods, study quality, and results. *Obesity (Silver Spring)* **23**, 1331-1344.

21. Van Hulst A, Barnett TA, Gauvin L *et al.* (2012) Associations between children's diets and features of their residential and school neighbourhood food environments. *Canadian Journal of Public Health Revue Canadienne de Sante Publique* **103**, eS48-54.

22. Perchoux C, Chaix B, Cummins S *et al.* (2013) Conceptualization and measurement of environmental exposure in epidemiology: accounting for activity space related to daily mobility. *Health & Place* **21**, 86-93.

23. Harrison F, Burgoine T, Corder K *et al.* (2014) How well do modelled routes to school record the environments children are exposed to? A cross-sectional comparison of GIS-modelled and GPS-measured routes to school. *Int J Health Geogr* **13**, 5.

24. Kestens Y, Lebel A, Daniel M *et al.* (2010) Using experienced activity spaces to measure foodscape exposure. *Health & Place* **16**, 1094-1103.

25. Timperio AF, Ball K, Roberts R *et al.* (2009) Children's takeaway and fast-food intakes: associations with the neighbourhood food environment. *Public Health Nutrition* **12**, 1960-1964.

26. An RP, Sturm R (2012) School and Residential Neighborhood Food Environment and Diet Among California Youth. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* **42**, 129-135.

27. Kirkpatrick S, Reedy J, Butler E *et al.* (2014) Dietary assessment in food environment research: a systematic review. *Am J Prev Med* **46**, 94-102.

28. Bornhorst C, Huybrechts I, Ahrens W (2012) Prevalence and determinants of misreporting among European children in proxy-reported 24hr dietary recalls. *Br J Nutr* **1**, 1-9.

29. Jacques PT, KL. (2001) Are dietary patterns useful for understanding the role of diet in chronic disease? *Am J Clin Nutr* **73**, 1-2.

30. Hu F (2002) Dietary pattern analysis: a new direction in nutritional epidemiology. *Curr Opin Lipidol* **13**, 3-9.

31. Inskip H, Godfrey K, Robinson S *et al.* (2006) Cohort profile: The Southampton Women's Survey. *International Journal of Epidemiology* **35**, 42-48.

32. Okubo H, Crozier S, Harvey N *et al.* (2015) Diet quality across early childhood and adiposity at 6 years: the Southampton Women's Survey. *International Journal of Obesity*, 1-7.

33. Chaix B, Merlo J, Evans D *et al.* (2009) Neighbourhoods in eco-epidemiologic research: delimiting personal exposure areas. A response to Riva, Gauvin, Apparicio and Brodeur. *Social Science & Medicine* **69**, 1306-1310.

34. Burgoine T, Alvanides S, Lake A (2013) Creating 'obesogenic realities': do our methodological choices make a difference when measuring the food environment? *Int J Health Geog* **12**, 1-9.

35. Williams J, Scarborough P, Matthews A *et al.* (2014) A systematic review of the influence of the retail food environment around schools on obesity-related outcomes. *Obesity Reviews* **15**, 359-374.

36. Barker M, Baird J, Lawrence M *et al.* (2011) The Southampton Initiative for Health: A Complex Intervention to Improve the Diets and Increase Physical Activity Levels of Women from Disadvantaged Communities. *Journal of Health Psychology* **16**, 178-191.

37. Environmental Systems Research Institute (ESRI) (2012) ArcGIS, 10.1 ed. California, US Environmental Systems Research Institute (ESRI).

38. Black C, Ntani G, Inskip H *et al.* (2014) Measuring the healthfulness of food retail stores: variations by store type and neighbourhood deprivation. *International Journal of Behavioural Nutrition and Physical Activity* **11**.

39. Rundle A, Neckerman K, Freeman L *et al.* (2009) Neighborhood food environment and walkability predict obesity in New York City. *Environ Health Perspect* **117**, 442-447.

40. Thornton LE, Kavanagh AM (2012) Association between fast food purchasing and the local food environment. *Nutrition & Diabetes* **2**, e53.

41. Greenland S, Pearl J, Robins JM (1999) Causal diagrams for epidemiological research. *Epidemiology* **10**, 37-48.

42. Statcorp (2014) Stata Statistical Software: Release 14.1. Texas.

43. Caspi CE, Sorensen G, Subramanian SV *et al.* (2012) The local food environment and diet: A systematic review. *Health & Place* **18**, 1172-1187.

44. Jennings A, Welch A, Jones AP *et al.* (2011) Local food outlets, weight status, and dietary intake: associations in children aged 9-10 years. *Am J Prev Med* **40**, 405-410.

45. Vogel C, Parsons C, Godfrey K *et al.* (2016) Greater access to fast-food outlets is associated with poorer bone health in young children. *Osteoporos Int* **27**, 1011-1019.

46. Cetateanu A, Jones A (2014) Understanding the relationship between food environments, deprivation and childhood overweight and obesity: evidence from a cross sectional England-wide study. *Health Place* **27**, 68-76.

47. Timperio A, Ball K, Roberts R *et al.* (2008) Children's fruit and vegetable intake: associations with the neighbourhood food environment. *Prev Med* **46**, 331-335.

48. Engler-Stringer R, Schaefer J, Ridalls T (2016) An examination of the roles played by early adolescent children in interactions with their local food environment. *Can J Public Health* **107**, 5296.

49. Public Health England (2013) *Obesity and the environment: regulating the growth of fast food outlets.* no. 2013319. London.

50. Burgoine T, Lake AA, Stamp E *et al.* (2009) Changing foodscapes 1980-2000, using the ASH30 Study. *Appetite* **53**, 157-165.

51. Bader MD, Schwartz-Soicher O, Jack D *et al.* (2013) More neighborhood retail associated with lower obesity among New York City public high school students. *Health & Place* **23**, 104-110.

52. Cummins S, Macintyre S, Davidson S *et al.* (2005) Measuring neighbourhood social and material context: generation and interpretation of ecological data from routine and non-routine sources. *Health & Place* **11**, 249-260.

53. Van Hulst A, Barnett TA, Gauvin L *et al.* (2012) Associations between children's diets and features of their residential and school neighbourhood food environments. *Can J Public Health* **103**, eS48-54.

54. Skidmore P, Welch A, van Sluijs E *et al.* (2010) Impact of neighbourhood food environment on food consumption in children aged 9-10 years in the UK SPEEDY (Sport, Physical Activity and Eating behaviour: Environmental Determinants in Young people) study. *Public Health Nutr* **13**, 1022-1030.

55. Howard Wilsher S, Harrison F, Yamoah F *et al.* (2016) The relationship between unhealthy food sales, socio-economic deprivation and childhood weight status: results of a cross-sectional study in England. *The international journal of behavioral nutrition and physical activity* **13**, 21.

56. Cade JE, Burley VJ, Warm DL *et al.* (2004) Food-frequency questionnaires: a review of their design, validation and utilisation. *Nutrition research reviews* **17**, 5-22.

57. Thornton LE, Pearce JR, Kavanagh AM (2011) Using Geographic Information Systems (GIS) to assess the role of the built environment in influencing obesity: a glossary. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition & Physical Activity* **8**, 71.

58. Public Health England Obesity Knowledge and Intelligence Team (2015) Planning and Environment. <https://www.noo.org.uk/LA/tackling/planning>

59. Department of Health (2012) Public Health Outcomes Framework 2013-2016. London: Crown.

60. Camden Borough Council (2016) Camden Local Plan Evidence Report: fast food takeaways and health. Camden: Camden Borough Council.

61. Gebremariam MK, Vaque-Crusellas C, Andersen LF *et al.* (2017) Measurement of availability and accessibility of food among youth: a systematic review of methodological studies. *The international journal of behavioral nutrition and physical activity* **14**, 22.

62. Sheats JL, Winter SJ, Romero PP *et al.* (2017) FEAST: Empowering Community Residents to Use Technology to Assess and Advocate for Healthy Food Environments. *J Urban Health* **94**, 180-189.

**Table 1: Characteristics of participants and their mothers by gender**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Boys** | | **Girls** | | **Total** | |
| **Child** | **n mean (SD)** | | | | | |
| Age (years) | 590 | 6.7 (0.3) | 583 | 6.7 (0.3) | 1173 | 6.7 (0.3) |
| Height (cm) | 583 | 121.0 (5.1) | 576 | 120.2 (5.4) | 1159 | 120.6 (5.3) |
| Diet Score (SD) | 590 | -0.09 (1.1) | 583 | -0.04 (1.0) | 1173 | -0.07 (1.0) |
| **Mothers** | **n median (IQR)** | | | | | |
| Pre-pregnancy BMI (kg/m2) | 582 | 24.5  (22.1, 27.6) | 579 | 24.0  (21.8, 27.2) | 1161 | 24.3  (21.9, 27.5) |
|  | **n (%)** | | | | | |
| Smoked in pregnancy  Yes  No | 557 | 73 (13)  484 (87) | 566 | 86 (15)  480 (85) | 1123 | 159 (14)  964 (86) |
| Educational attainment  Low (≤GCSE/ age 16)  Mid  High (degree) | 587 | 234 (40)  217 (37)  136 (23) | 582 | 232 (40)  222 (38)  128 (22) | 1169 | 466 (40)  439 (38)  264 (23) |
| Neighbourhood deprivation  Least deprived  2  3  4  Most deprived | 590 | 97 (16)  161 (27)  141 (24)  125 (21)  66 (11) | 583 | 98 (17)  148 (25)  110 (19)  143(25)  84 (14) | 1173 | 195 (17)  309 (26)  251 (21)  268 (23)  150 (13) |

**Table 2: Multilevel regression analysis assessing the relationship between food environment exposures and dietary quality among 6 year olds**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Diet quality score (z-score)  *unadjusted models*  n = 1173 | Diet quality score (z-score) *adjusted models*a  n = 1173 |
|  | ***Beta (SD/outlet)(95% C.I.)*** | |
| Supermarkets | 0.035 (-0.007, 0.077) | 0.044 (0.008, 0.079) |
| Healthy specialty stores | 0.025 (0.007, 0.044) | 0.024 (0.009, 0.040) |
| Fast-food outlets | 0.005 (-0.004, 0.013) | 0.009 (0.002,0.016) |
| Total number of outlets | 0.003 (-0.001, 0.007) | 0.005 (0.001, 0.007) |
|  | ***Beta (SD per 10% increase in healthy outlets as***  ***a proportion of total outlets) (95% C.I.)*** | |
| Relative measure (10% increase) | 0.068 (0.018, 0.117) | 0.037 (-0.064, 0.081) |

a Confounding variables included: maternal educational attainment and level of neighbourhood deprivation


**Figure 1: Frequency of different outlet types within home and school activity spaces of 6 year olds**



**Figure 2: Multilevel regression coefficients expressing the relationship between dietary quality at 6 years and different food outlet types within home and school activity space after adjustment for confounding variables**

****

**Supplementary Figure 1:** Directed acyclic graph describing the causal relationships between food environment and child’s prudent diet score

****