

This is the author accepted version of the manuscript, which has been accepted for publication and will appear in a revised form, subsequent to peer review and/or editorial input by Cambridge University Press, in **Proceedings of the Nutrition Society** published by Cambridge University Press, © 2016 Cambridge University Press.

Comparison of intakes of Scottish Dietary Goals foods and nutrients by two socio-demographic measures. By K.L. Barton¹, W.L. Wrieden², L.F. Masson³ ¹*Division of Food and Drink, Abertay University, Dundee DD1 1HG,* ²*Human Nutrition Research Centre and Institute of Health and Society, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne NE2 4HH, UK,* ³*School of Pharmacy and Life Sciences, Robert Gordon University, Aberdeen, AB10 7GJ*

Scottish Dietary Goals⁽¹⁾ (Targets) have been monitored since 2001⁽²⁾ using secondary analysis of food purchase data. To date, the area based Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation (SIMD) has been the socio-demographic variable used to determine any associations between diet and socioeconomic status. However little is known about the association between intakes of foods and nutrients and actual household income.

Household food purchase data from 2001 to 2012, for Scotland, from the UK Living Costs and Food Survey were analysed to estimate intakes of Scottish Dietary Goal foods and nutrients by Equivalised Income. Adjustments were made to allocate the correct proportion of each food to the appropriate food group (including to composite foods), for waste⁽²⁾, and for weight increase or loss due to cooking or dilution. Data were analysed using general linear models within the complex samples module of SPSS (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA) weighting to the Scottish population and taking account of sampling methods. Results are presented as population means, with 95% confidence intervals (95% CI), (i.e. includes consumers and non-consumers) estimated from household and eating out food purchases.

	Equivalised Income Quintile					P-value for Linear Association
	1* (n 1284) (wt n 10122)	2 (n 1292) (wt n 11337)	3 (n 1295) (wt n 12760)	4 (n 1294) (wt n 13497)	5* (n 1291) (wt n 12711)	
Fruit and Vegetables ¹	214	243	260	281	343	<0.001
Oil Rich Fish (g/week)	201.227	229.	247.	270.	331.	<0.001
Red and Processed MJ/day	23.6	28.6	27.0	29.6	42.9	0.716
Energy Density (kJ/100g)	19.8.	24.6.	23.2.	26.4.	36.0.	0.003
% Food Energy Fat	59.6	63.9	63.0	62.4	61.6	0.092
% Food Energy	55.9.	60.8.	59.4.	60.0.	59.0.	0.048
% Food Energy NMFES	8.0	8.4	8.5	8.4	8.7	<0.001
	7.8. 8.3	8.1. 8.6	8.2. 8.7	8.2. 8.6	8.5. 8.9	<0.001
	719	725	720	723	708	<0.001
	709. 729	714.	709.	714.	698.	<0.001
	39.3	38.8	38.9	38.7	38.7	<0.001
	38.8.	38.3.	38.5.	38.2.	38.3.	<0.001
	15.7	15.5	15.5	15.2	15.0	<0.001
	15.4.	15.3.	15.3.	15.0.	14.8.	<0.001
	15.3	16.1	15.1	14.9	14.1	<0.001
	14.8.	15.6.	14.7.	14.6.	13.8.	<0.001
	11.1	11.9	12.3	12.6	13.8	<0.001

1=Lowest Income; 5=Highest Income; n = number of households and weighted (wt) n = weighted number of people in the sample; ¹Includes fruit and vegetables and baked beans

Estimated intakes for the majority of foods and nutrients follow similar trends to those calculated by SIMD⁽⁴⁾, particularly for fruit and vegetables, oil rich fish, added sugars (NMES) and fibre (NSP). However significant differences for energy, fat and saturated fat intakes have not been evident in analyses carried out by SIMD. Whilst using SIMD as a measure of socio-economic status allows for comparison with results for other studies, the income available for households to purchase foods does have to be considered and warrants further work to inform future policy to target diet and social inequalities.

Funded by Food Standards Scotland (FS424018). Data from DEFRA, SNS, ONS and the UK Data Archive.

1. Scottish Government. (2016) "Revised Dietary Goals for Scotland." <http://www.gov.scot/Resource/0049/00497558.pdf> (accessed 31 March 2016).
2. Wrieden WL, Armstrong J, Sherriff A et al. (2013) *BJN*, **109**, 1892-1902.
3. Waste and Resource Action Programme (2007) *The food we waste*. Oxon: WRAP.
4. Barton KL, Wrieden WL, Sheriff A et al. (2016) *Public Health Nutr*, **18**, 2970–2980.