

Northumbria Research Link

Citation: Shinwell, Jackie, Bateson, Melissa, Nettle, Daniel and Pepper, Gillian (2022) Food insecurity and patterns of dietary intake in a sample of UK adults. *British Journal of Nutrition*, 128 (4). pp. 770-777. ISSN 0007-1145

Published by: Cambridge University Press

URL: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0007114521003810>
<<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0007114521003810>>

This version was downloaded from Northumbria Research Link:
<https://nrl.northumbria.ac.uk/id/eprint/47344/>

Northumbria University has developed Northumbria Research Link (NRL) to enable users to access the University's research output. Copyright © and moral rights for items on NRL are retained by the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. Single copies of full items can be reproduced, displayed or performed, and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided the authors, title and full bibliographic details are given, as well as a hyperlink and/or URL to the original metadata page. The content must not be changed in any way. Full items must not be sold commercially in any format or medium without formal permission of the copyright holder. The full policy is available online: <http://nrl.northumbria.ac.uk/policies.html>

This document may differ from the final, published version of the research and has been made available online in accordance with publisher policies. To read and/or cite from the published version of the research, please visit the publisher's website (a subscription may be required.)



**Northumbria
University**
NEWCASTLE



University**Library**

Food insecurity and patterns of dietary intake in a sample of UK adults

Authors:

Jackie Shinwell¹, Melissa Bateson², Daniel Nettle¹, Gillian V. Pepper³

¹Population Health Sciences Institute, Newcastle University, Newcastle, UK

²Biosciences Institute, Newcastle University, Newcastle, UK

³Department of Psychology, Northumbria University, Newcastle, UK

Corresponding author contact details: Dr Gillian Pepper, Northumberland Building, Northumbria University, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE1 8ST, UK,
gillian.pepper@northumbria.ac.uk, +0044 (0)191 227 3882.

Short title: Food insecurity and patterns of eating

Financial support

This project has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement No AdG 666669, COMSTAR).



This peer-reviewed article has been accepted for publication but not yet copyedited or typeset, and so may be subject to change during the production process. The article is considered published and may be cited using its DOI

10.1017/S0007114521003810

The British Journal of Nutrition is published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of The Nutrition Society

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.

Authorship using CRediT taxonomy:

Shinwell, J: Conceptualization, Data curation, Formal Analysis, Investigation, Visualization, Project administration, Methodology, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing

Bateson, M: Conceptualization, Methodology, Writing – review & editing

Nettle, D: Conceptualization, Resources, Formal Analysis, Supervision, Funding acquisition, Visualization, Methodology, Project administration, Writing – review & editing

Pepper, G, V.: Conceptualization, Supervision, Investigation, Visualization, Methodology, Project administration, Writing – review & editing

Ethical Standards Disclosure: This study was conducted according to the guidelines laid down in the Declaration of Helsinki and all procedures involving research study participants were approved by the Newcastle University Faculty of Medical Sciences Ethics Committee (ref: 24577). Informed consent was obtained from all subjects.

Abstract

The aim of this study was to identify the dietary-intake correlates of food insecurity in UK adults. We recruited groups of low-income participants who were classified as food insecure ($n = 196$) or food secure ($n = 198$). Participants completed up to five 24h dietary recalls.

There was no difference in total energy intake by food insecurity status ($\beta_{FI} = -0.06$, 95% CI -0.25 to 0.13). Food insecure participants consumed a less diverse diet, as evidenced by fewer distinct foods per meal ($\beta_{FI} = -0.27$, 95% CI -0.47 to -0.07), and had more variable time gaps between meals ($\beta_{FI} = 0.21$, 95% CI 0.01 to 0.41). These associations corresponded closely to those found in a recent U.S. study using similar measures, suggesting that the dietary intake signature of food insecurity generalizes across populations. The findings suggest that the consequences of food insecurity for weight gain and health are not due to increased energy intake. We suggest that there may be important health and metabolic effects of temporal irregularity in dietary intake, which appears to be an important component of food insecurity.

Introduction

Food insecurity (FI) is defined as the ‘the inability to acquire or consume an adequate quality or sufficient quantity of food in socially acceptable ways, or the uncertainty that one will be able to do so’⁽¹⁾. FI is associated with poorer health, higher mortality, and, in the case of women, a greater risk of overweight or obesity, even after adjusting for socioeconomic position^(2–8). Some of these health consequences may be due to different patterns of dietary intake in people experiencing FI compared with people who are not^(9–11). However, understanding is currently limited of how patterns of dietary intake vary with FI status. The questionnaires used to assess FI consist of general statements such as “we couldn’t afford to eat balanced meals”. Hence, although positive questionnaire responses suggest altered dietary intake, they are uninformative as to exactly how it differs. Datasets are therefore required where the same individuals complete FI questionnaires, and separately provide detailed dietary recall information.

Where such studies have been carried out, people experiencing FI have not been found to have higher total energy intake^(9,12–15). Their intake has sometimes been found to differ in other ways. Overall measures of dietary quality are poorer in some but not all studies^(review: 16). Several studies have found reduced consumption of fruit and vegetables, and consequently fibre, associated with FI, though again findings are mixed⁽¹⁶⁾. Nettle and Bateson⁽¹⁰⁾ used data from the U.S. National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES) 2013–14 to study a range of dietary intake parameters in relation to FI status. They confirmed that there was no difference in total energy intake. The largest differences they found were that people experiencing food insecurity had more variable time gaps between eating; and had a less diverse intake (fewer distinct foods per meal). These differences in eating patterns partially mediated the association (in women) between FI status and BMI. These findings have not yet been replicated in any other population.

The goal of the present study was to examine how dietary intake patterns differed by FI status in a UK population. In a two-stage design, we first targeted a sector of the population (adults from households below the UK median income) likely to contain substantial exposure to food insecurity. We then invited all individuals classified by questionnaire as food insecure, and an equal number of demographically similar food secure individuals, to complete four, 24h dietary recalls. We measured the same dietary intake parameters as Nettle and Bateson⁽¹⁰⁾ had done for the U.S. NHANES sample. Our aims were: first, to examine which dietary intake parameters differed by FI status, and how, in this UK sample; and second, to directly

compare the associations between FI status and dietary intake across the UK sample and the NHANES 2013-14 sample studied by⁽¹⁰⁾. To facilitate direct comparison, we re-present the key analyses of the NHANES 2013-14 data in this paper, alongside the UK ones.

Materials and Methods

Data for the present UK study were collected in two phases, as depicted in Figure 1. Phase 1 of the study was a screening exercise used to identify potential participants for phase 2.

Phase 1

Participant recruitment

Participants were recruited to phase 1 of this study via Prolific, an internet based crowd sourcing platform that provides access to a high quality pool of potential research participants (for a review of Prolific, see⁽¹⁷⁾). All participants were resident in the UK, were not in full-time education and had a total household income of less than £30,800 per annum (the median household income in the UK⁽¹⁸⁾). The household income filter was applied in order to identify individuals likely to experience FI, as well as food secure participants of similar socio-economic status. A total of 1500 participants were recruited to phase 1 of the study (male, 598, female, 898, other, 4, see Table S1).

Demographic data

Demographic data were collected via a Qualtrics questionnaire distributed via Prolific (see Table S1). Measures included: age, gender, self-reported weight and height (from which we calculated body mass index (BMI)), number of people living in the household, whether participants did/paid for most of the food shopping for the household, employment status, and household income. Household income was assessed by first presenting a choice of weekly, monthly or annual reporting; and then 24 income bands. These were taken from the Food and You survey, wave 5⁽¹⁹⁾. Income band was used in statistical models but we converted to pounds, using the mid-point of the band, for Table 1.

Food insecurity

Household FI status was assessed using the Household Food Security Survey Six-Item Short Form module (HFSSM) developed by the US National Centre for Health Statistics (NCHS)⁽²⁰⁾. The six-item short form module identifies households which are food insecure and/or have very low food security. It has relatively high specificity compared to the longer, 18 item measure developed by the NCHS⁽²⁰⁾.

Data for this study were collected during spring/summer 2020, during which pandemic lockdowns had caused turmoil and disruption to normal routines. The type of food insecurity experience we were interested in was that directly comparable to earlier studies, not shorter-term anxieties that might have been provoked by the onset of the pandemic. We thus amended the HFSSM questions from their usual ‘in the last 12 months’ timeframe to ‘in the 12-month period prior to the pandemic’.

Responses to questions in the HFSSM were coded in accordance with guidance issued by the USA National Centre for Health Research⁽²⁰⁾. In accordance with USDA HFSSM guidance, we dichotomised participants’ scores into two groups, food secure/marginal food security (score of 0-1) ($n = 1268$) and low/very low food security (score of 2-6) ($n = 232$).

Phase 2

Participant recruitment

Data collected in Phase 1 were used to identify participants for phase 2 of the study (see Figure 1). At the end of phase 1, participants were asked to indicate if they could be contacted about participating in phase 2 of the study. A total of 93 participants (77 high or marginal food security status, 16 low or very low food security status) indicated that they did not want to take part in phase 2, resulting in a potential phase 2 participant pool of 1407. We invited 216 participants who had low/very low food security status to participate in phase 2 of the study. Sixteen participants declined to take part. The remaining 200 low/very low food security status participants were then matched by age and gender with 200 participants who had high/marginal food security status in phase 1. Four food secure participants declined to take part.

In addition, in accordance with guidance from the developers of Intake 24, the dietary intake collection tool (see below), dietary intake data on two low/very low food secure participants were excluded from the analysis due to incorrect food diary completion. This resulted in a final sample for analysis of 198 low/very low food secure participants and 196 high/marginal food secure participants. For brevity, we henceforth refer to these groups as ‘food insecure’ and ‘food secure’ respectively. This final sample size, which was determined by logistical constraints, provided a minimum detectable difference of $d = 0.28$ between food insecure and food secure groups, with $p < 0.05$ and 80% power. This would be considered a small-medium effect size⁽²¹⁾.

Dietary intake

Dietary intake data were collected using Intake24. Intake24 is an open source, on-line, self-completion dietary recall system which was designed to capture food intake in population wide studies. In trials, Intake24 compared favourably with face to face nutritional intake data collection^(22,23). Participants were asked to complete four consecutive days of dietary recall. On day 1, participants were sent a link and were asked to record all food and drink and timing of consumption in the previous 24 hours. The following day, a link was sent for day 2 of data collection. This process was repeated until up to four days of dietary intake data were recorded. Two participants accidentally completed five days; 370 participants completed four days; 11 participants completed three days; 6 completed two days; and 5 participants, one day.

Mood and sleep

Data on participants' mood for the previous 24 hours, and how well they slept the night before, were also collected before completing each day's dietary recall. These data are not analysed here but will form the focus of a future study.

Food consumption variables

In line with the approach adopted by⁽¹⁰⁾, we extracted 16 variables of interest from the recall data, organised by CE, with each CE representing a time when participants consumed an item of food or drink (including water). Details of the variables extracted are presented in Table 1. The variables were of three types: those concerning consumption amounts; those concerning the intra-day patterning of CEs; and those concerning inter-day variation in eating patterns. The consumption amount variables were expressed as daily averages. The consumption of different macronutrients was adjusted for total energy intake (i.e., the residual of a regression on amount of macronutrient consumption on total energy intake). In⁽¹⁰⁾, the inter-day variables were (unsigned) difference scores between the two days, since there were two days of food recall data for each participant in NHANES. For the present UK sample, since there were up to 5 days of recall per participant, the inter-day variables were standard deviations across days rather than difference scores.

Ethical standards

All procedures involving research study participants were approved by the Newcastle University Faculty of Medical Sciences Ethics Committee (ref: 24577). Informed consent was obtained from all subjects.

Data analysis strategy

All data analyses were performed in R⁽²⁴⁾.

UK data

Our data analysis closely followed that of Nettle and Bateson⁽¹⁰⁾. We first used multi-variate analyses of variance (MANOVAs) to investigate differences between food secure and food insecure adults for each of the three sets of consumption variables, using FI status as the predictor. The three sets of consumption variables were: consumption amounts (total energy intake and relative carbohydrate, protein, fat, and fibre intake); intraday patterns of eating (time of the first CE, number of CEs, mean number of foods per CE, variability in time gaps between CEs and variability in the amount of energy consumed at each CE), and interday patterns of eating (energy intake, time of the first CE, number of foods, number of CEs and mean time gaps between CEs). We then followed up these MANOVAs with separate general linear models for each of the sixteen variables individually. We also tested whether FI status predicted BMI.

Despite the matched design, there were some demographic differences between our food secure and food insecure groups (see Table 1). However, in view of the sample size, the scope for including many control variables was limited. We therefore included income band as well as gender, since we judged income to be the most critical to patterns of food consumption, and also likely to covary with other demographic variables such as employment status and home ownership.

NHANES data

To compare the patterns found in the UK data with those from NHANES 2013-4, we repeated the analyses reported by⁽¹⁰⁾, but with all genders pooled. We entered gender as a predictor. The present analysis of the NHANES data also differed from that of⁽¹⁰⁾ in counting participants with a score of 1 on the food insecurity questionnaire as food secure rather than insecure. This was for closer comparability with the present study. It resulted in around 6% of NHANES respondents receiving a different FI status than in⁽¹⁰⁾, and no substantive difference to the results. Other control variables (age, income, education, ethnicity and presence of children in the household), and overall analytical strategy for the NHANES data were otherwise identical to⁽¹⁰⁾.

Results

Descriptive statistics

The demographic makeup of the UK sample is summarised in Table 1. Participants were, on average, in their mid-thirties, 43% were male, with average household incomes around £17,000. Most were employed and lived in rented accommodation or with their parents. Compared to the food secure group, the food insecure participants had lower incomes, were less likely to be employed, and were less likely to own their own homes. Descriptive statistics for the main food consumption variables for the UK sample and the NHANES dataset are shown in Table 2.

Main analyses

Results of the main analyses for both the UK and NHANES datasets are summarized in Table 3.

UK dataset

There was no significant effect of FI overall for the five food consumption variables. In follow up univariate analyses, there were marginally non-significant tendencies for food insecure respondents to consume more carbohydrate, less protein, and less fibre relative to their total energy intake than their food secure counterparts did. There was no significant difference by FI status in total energy intake or relative fat consumption. There was a significant overall effect of FI on intraday patterns of eating. Food insecure adults consumed a significantly smaller and less variable number of foods per CE and had significantly more variable time gaps between CEs. However, there was no significant difference in the time of the first CE, the number of CEs, or the amount of energy consumed at each CE. There was no significant effect of FI on the interday patterns of eating, either in the MANOVA nor in relation to any of the individual variables.

Standardized parameter estimates, plus 95% confidence intervals, from the univariate analyses are shown in figure 2. The variables are ordered from the largest to the smallest absolute parameter estimate in ⁽¹⁰⁾, rather than the order of their size in the UK dataset.

NHANES dataset

For the five food consumption variables, there was a significant effect of FI overall. Food insecure adults consumed significantly more carbohydrate, but less protein, fat and fibre relative to energy intake than food secure adults. Total energy intake did not however differ significantly. There was a significant effect of FI overall on intraday patterns of eating. Food

insecure adults ate a smaller and less variable number of foods at each CE and had fewer distinct foods at each CE with more variable time gaps between CEs. The difference in number of CEs was marginally non-significant. There was no significant difference in the time of the first CE, nor in the total amount of energy consumed at each CE. There was a significant effect overall of FI on interday variation in patterns of eating. However, in the follow up analyses, none of the individual variables differed significantly by FI status.

Comparison of associations with FI in UK and NHANES datasets

Comparing which associations are significant in the UK and NHANES data is a poor way of assessing the similarity of patterns, since the much smaller sample from the UK means that associations are estimated with much less statistical power. Therefore, to investigate the extent to which being food insecure is associated with the same patterns of eating in our UK sample as in the NHANES sample, we compared the standardized parameter estimates related to FI status for each of the sixteen consumption variables. The pattern of associations was extremely similar for the two samples (correlation of parameter estimates between UK sample and NHANES, $r = 0.85$, $p < 0.001$; see figure 3).

Association between FI and BMI

There was no significant association between BMI and FI status in the UK sample, even including an expected interaction with gender in the model: $B_{\text{female}} = 1.19$, $\text{se } 1.12$, $t = -1.06$, $p = 0.29$; $B_{\text{FI}} = 0.10$, $\text{se } 1.13$, $t = 0.08$, $p = 0.94$; $B_{\text{interaction}} = 0.19$, $\text{se } 0.91$, $p = 0.91$). Thus, we did not investigate mediation of the FI-BMI association by food consumption variables.

Discussion

In a sample of 394 UK adults who provided a mode of four 24h dietary recalls each, food secure and food insecure individuals did not differ in total energy intake. Food insecure participants did however have less diverse intake, as indicated by a smaller (and, concomitantly, less variable) number of distinct foods per consumption event. Food insecure participants also had more variable time gaps between consumption events than food secure participants. No other differences by FI status were significant by conventional criteria, though there were marginally non-significant trends for food insecure individuals to consume less fibre and protein, and more carbohydrate, relative to their total intake.

These findings corresponded very closely to those for the U.S. population established using the representative NHANES 2013-14 dataset by Nettle and Bateson⁽¹⁰⁾. Notably, in that study, as here, the difference in total energy intake by FI status was negligible, and the largest

differences by FI status were in diversity of distinct foods, and in temporal regularity of intake. Some of the associations differed between the UK and NHANES datasets in terms of statistical significance, but this is to be expected because of the much larger NHANES sample size. The magnitude and direction of the associations was strikingly similar in the two cases. Specifically, differences in macronutrient composition – FI being associated with greater relative intake of carbohydrate, and lesser of protein and fibre – were much weaker than those involving diversity and temporal regularity. This meant that they were significant in the large NHANES sample but missed criteria for significance in the smaller UK dataset.

The lack of difference in total energy intake accords with most previous studies of FI^(9,13,15,25), though some have found reduced energy intake^(14,26). This means that the higher BMI that is robustly associated with FI in women⁽⁸⁾ is apparently not driven by increased habitual calorie consumption. (Note that in the present dataset, there was a null association between FI and BMI. However, our study was only modestly powered to detect such an association given the expected effect size, and the association is very well established from larger studies⁽⁸⁾). The finding that food insecure participants had more variable time gaps between consumption events is potentially relevant to this puzzle. Aspects of the temporal patterning of eating have been found to covary with obesity in a number of studies^(10,27–30). Moreover, there is evidence from randomized control trials that the same number of calories consumed on a more irregular temporal schedule has greater obesogenic potential^(31,32). It is possible that temporal irregularity is the factor responsible for some of the health consequences of FI.

The fact that FI was associated with more variable time gaps between food consumption events, here as in Nettle and Bateson (2019), connects the human FI literature to a rich experimental tradition in birds, in which time gaps between periods of food access are made more variable and/or unpredictable^(33–38). Those studies too show that FI causes weight gain, generally without a concomitant increase in energy intake. In the avian case, it appears to do so by changes in digestive or metabolic efficiency⁽³⁶⁾, and reducing some components of energy expenditure^(39,40). These possible pathways should therefore be investigated in humans too.

It is not clear why FI should increase the variability of time gaps between eating. To discover this would require richer study of which food resources participants are accessing, how and where. One obvious possibility is that there are times in the week or month when, for

financial reasons, food insecure participants are skipping meals, and other times when they do not have to. However, such a pattern would show up primarily in the inter-day standard deviation of time gap between meals. The stronger association, in both datasets, is with the *intra*-day standard deviation in time gap. This might suggest that FI interferes with the ability to plan or choose a personal food consumption schedule, instead forcing people to rely on opportunities that present themselves at irregular moments or places.

The UK study had several limitations. First, the sample was small: the small number of participants compared to NHANES is not completely offset by the greater precision that arises from having more than two 24-hour food recalls per participant. Second, we relied on an opportunity sample. Although we restricted screening to low-income participants to draw from a relatively homogenous pool, matched participants by age, and adjusted for income, unmeasured socioeconomic or contextual differences between our food secure and food insecure groups may remain, and generalizability to the wider UK food insecure population is unknown. Third, our data collection took place during the coronavirus pandemic of 2020. This has a number of implications. It meant we had to assess FI with respect to the pre-pandemic period, but the dietary recalls themselves took place during the pandemic-affected period. Respondents were more likely to have been at home than usual, may have had routines disrupted, and many were affected by economic hardship. These uncertainties militated against finding stable associations of dietary intake patterns with (pre-pandemic) exposure to FI. Given these uncertainties, it is, perhaps, all the more remarkable that we found significant associations between FI status and dietary intake patterns, and in particular that these would be so strikingly similar to those of the earlier study in a different population unaffected by the pandemic. This does suggest that the FI questionnaire proxies some repeatable, systematic, general differences in patterns of dietary intake.

A further limitation is the possibility of biased reporting or under-reporting in dietary recalls. For under-reporting to affect our conclusions, there would have to be differential under-reporting by FI status. This is certainly possible. Under-reporting in nutritional intake studies is often associated with social desirability, low income and high BMI^(41–45). Thus, it could also be associated with FI status. Under-reporting has been particularly highlighted in relation to total energy intake. Our significant findings concern other variables, such as temporal gaps, and the extent to which these are affected by under-reporting or biased reporting is not known.

Conclusion

In a sample of UK adults, we found that the strongest dietary intake correlates of FI were lower diversity of foods, and greater variability in the time gaps between eating. Total energy intake did not differ by FI status. The findings closely mirrored those of a recent study in a U.S. sample, and suggest that the signatures of FI for dietary intake generalize across populations.

Data availability

The data and code required to reproduce all analyses reported in this paper are freely available via the Zenodo repository at: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4668564>

References

1. Dowler E & O'Connor D (2012) Rights-based approaches to addressing food poverty and food insecurity in Ireland and UK. *Soc. Sci. Med.* **74**, 44–51. Elsevier Ltd.
2. Laraia B a (2012) Food Insecurity and Chronic Disease. *Adv. Nutr.* **4**, 203–212.
3. Vozoris NT & Tarasuk VS (2003) Household food insufficiency is associated with poorer health. *J. Nutr.* **133**, 120–126.
4. Larson NI & Story MT (2011) Food insecurity and weight status among U.S. children and families: A review of the literature. *Am. J. Prev. Med.* **40**, 166–173. Elsevier Inc.
5. Townsend MS, Peerson J, Love B, et al. (2001) Food insecurity is positively related to overweight in women. *J. Nutr.* **131**, 1738–1745.
6. Pan L, Sherry B, Njai R, et al. (2012) Food Insecurity is Associated with Obesity among US Adults in 12 states. *J. Acad Nutr. Sci.* **112**, 1403–1409.
7. Kowaleski-Jones L, Wen M & Fan JX (2018) Unpacking the paradox: testing for mechanisms in the food insecurity and BMI association. *J. Hunger Environ. Nutr.* **0248**, 1–15.
8. Nettle D, Andrews C & Bateson M (2017) Food insecurity as a driver of obesity in humans: The insurance hypothesis. *Behav. Brain Sci.* **40**, e105.
9. Zizza CA, Duffy PA & Gerrior SA (2008) Food insecurity is not associated with lower energy intakes. *Obesity* **16**, 1908–1913.
10. Nettle D & Bateson M (2019) Food-Insecure Women Eat a Less Diverse Diet in a More Temporally Variable Way: Evidence from the US National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey, 2013-4. *J. Obes.* **2019**.
11. Kendall A, Olson CM & Frongillo EA (1996) Relationship of hunger and food insecurity to food availability and consumption. *J. Am. Diet. Assoc.*, 1019–1024.
12. Bocquier A, Vieux F, Lioret S, et al. (2015) Socio-economic characteristics, living conditions and diet quality are associated with food insecurity in France. *Public Health Nutr.* **18**, 2952–2961.
13. Leung CW, Epel ES, Ritchie LD, et al. (2014) Food Insecurity Is Inversely Associated with Diet Quality of Lower-Income Adults. *J. Acad. Nutr. Diet.* **114**, 1943–1953.e2.

Elsevier Inc.

14. Dixon LB, Winkleby MA & Radimer KL (2001) Dietary intakes and serum nutrients differ between adults from food-insufficient and food-sufficient families: Third National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey, 1988-1994. *J. Nutr.* **131**, 1232–1246.
15. Basiotis PP & Lino M (2002) Food Insufficiency and Prevalence of Overweight Among Adult Women. *Nutr. Insights*, 1–2.
16. Hanson K & Connor L (2014) Food insecurity and dietary quality in US adults and children: a systematic review. *Am. J. Clin. Nutr.* **100**, 684–692.
17. Peer E, Samat S, Brandimarte L, et al. (2016) Beyond the Turk : Alternative platforms for crowdsourcing behavioral research. *J. Exp. Soc. Psychol.* **70**, 153–163. Elsevier Inc.
18. Office for National Statistics (2020) Average household income, UK: financial year ending 2020 (provisional). .
19. Food Standards Agency (2019) *The Food and You survey. Wave 5 technical report*. London: .
20. USDA Economic Research Services (2020) Survey Tools. .
21. Cohen J (1988) *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*. 2nd editio. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
22. Simpson E, Bradley J, Poliakov I, et al. (2017) Iterative development of an online dietary recall tool: INTAKE24. *Nutrients* **9**, 1–14.
23. Bradley J, Simpson E, Poliakov I, et al. (2016) Comparison of INTAKE24 (an Online 24-h dietary recall tool) with interviewer-led 24-h recall in 11–24 year-old. *Nutrients* **8**.
24. R Core Development Team (2020) R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. Vienna: R Foundation for Statistical Computing.
25. Burns C, Cook K & Mavoa H (2013) Role of expendable income and price in food choice by low income families. *Appetite* **71**, 209–217. Elsevier Ltd.
26. Kirkpatrick SI & Tarasuk V (2008) Food insecurity is associated with nutrient

- inadequacies among Canadian adults and adolescents. *J. Nutr.* **138**, 604–612.
27. Murtaugh MA, Herrick JS, Sweeney C, et al. (2007) Diet Composition and Risk of Overweight and Obesity in Women Living in the Southwestern United States{A figure is presented}. *J. Am. Diet. Assoc.* **107**, 1311–1321.
 28. Howarth NC, Huang TTK, Roberts SB, et al. (2007) Eating patterns and dietary composition in relation to BMI in younger and older adults. *Int. J. Obes.* **31**, 675–684.
 29. Saneei P, Esmaillzadeh A, Keshteli AH, et al. (2016) Patterns of dietary habits in relation to obesity in Iranian adults. *Eur. J. Nutr.* **55**, 713–728. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
 30. St-Onge MP, Ard J, Baskin ML, et al. (2017) Meal Timing and Frequency: Implications for Cardiovascular Disease Prevention: A Scientific Statement from the American Heart Association. *Circulation* **135**, e96–e121.
 31. Alhussain MH, Macdonald IA & Taylor MA (2016) Irregular meal-pattern effects on energy expenditure, metabolism, and appetite regulation: A randomized controlled trial in healthy normal-weight women. *Am. J. Clin. Nutr.* **104**, 21–32.
 32. Farshchi HR, Taylor M & Macdonald IA (2004) Decreased thermic effect of food after an irregular compared with a regular meal pattern in healthy lean women. *Int. J. Obes.* **28**, 653–660.
 33. Bednekoff PA & Krebs JR (1995) Great tit fat reserves: effects of changing and unpredictable feeding day length. *Funct. Ecol.* **9**, 457–462.
 34. Witter MS & Swaddle JP (1997) Mass regulation in juvenile Starlings: response to change in food availability depends on initial body mass. *Funct. Ecol.* **11**, 11–15.
 35. Witter MS, Swaddle JP & Cuthill IC (1995) Periodic food availability and strategic regulation of body mass in the European Starling , *Sturnus vulgaris*. *Funct. Ecol.* **9**, 568–574.
 36. Bateson M, Andrews C, Dunn J, et al. (2021) Food insecurity increases energetic efficiency, not food consumption: an exploratory study in European starlings. *PeerJ* **9**, e11541.
 37. Cuthill IC, Maddocks SA, Weall CV, et al. (2000) Body mass regulation in response to

- changes in feeding predictability and overnight energy expenditure. *Behav. Ecol.* **11**, 189–195.
38. Bauer CM, Glassman LW, Cyr NE, et al. (2011) Effects of predictable and unpredictable food restriction on the stress response in molting and non-molting European starlings (*Sturnus vulgaris*). *Comp. Biochem. Physiol. - A Mol. Integr. Physiol.* **160**, 390–399. Elsevier Inc.
39. Wiersma P & Verhulst S (2005) Effects of intake rate on energy expenditure, somatic repair and reproduction of zebra finches. *J. Exp. Biol.* **208**, 4091–4098.
40. Andrews C, Zuidersma E, Verhulst S, et al. (2021) Exposure to food insecurity increases energy storage and reduces somatic maintenance in European starlings. *Zenodo*.
41. Orcholski L, Luke A, Plange-Rhule J, et al. (2015) Under-reporting of dietary energy intake in five populations of the African diaspora. *Br. J. Nutr.* **113**, 464–472.
42. Scagliusi FB, Ferriolli E, Pfrimer K, et al. (2009) Characteristics of women who frequently under report their energy intake: A doubly labelled water study. *Eur. J. Clin. Nutr.* **63**, 1192–1199.
43. Schoch AH & Raynor HA (2012) Social desirability, not dietary restraint, is related to accuracy of reported dietary intake of a laboratory meal in females during a 24-hour recall. *Eat. Behav.* **13**, 78–81. Elsevier Ltd.
44. Maukonen M, Männistö S & Tolonen H (2018) A comparison of measured versus self-reported anthropometrics for assessing obesity in adults: a literature review. *Scand. J. Public Health* **46**, 565–579.
45. Shields M, Gorber-Connor S & Tremblay MS (2015) Estimates of obesity based on self-report versus direct measures. *Heal. Reports* **19**.


Figure captions

Figure 1. Flow chart depicting the recruitment and sampling (phase 1) and data collection (phase 2) stages of the study.




Figure 2. Standardized associations (plus 95% confidence interval) of the sixteen dietary variables with food insecurity status in the UK dataset. The order in which the variables appear is for direct comparability against figure 1 of Nettle and Bateson⁽¹⁰⁾. IDSD: Inter-day standard deviation.




Figure 3. Standardized associations with food insecurity status in the NHANES 2013-4 dataset against those in the UK dataset. Each point represents one variable. Error bars represent one standard error in the corresponding dataset

Table 1. Demographic profile of final UK sample. Data are frequencies or mean and standard deviation (SD).

Characteristic	Food secure	Food insecure	Difference
N	196	198	
Age (SD)	35.80 (10.99)	35.53 (10.71)	t = 0.25, p = 0.80
Income (SD)	17840 (8213)	16008 (9316)	t = 2.07, p = 0.04
Male	82	87	χ^2 = 0.08, p = 0.78
Employed	143	124	χ^2 = 4.69, p = 0.03
Unemployed/Furloughed/ Retired/Ill health etc.	52	74	χ^2 = 4.69, p = 0.03
Household type			χ^2 = 7.87, p = 0.02
Homeowner	61	39	
Rent	90	115	
Live with parents	44	44	
Number of people living in the household (SD)	2.98 (1.22)	2.88 (1.38)	t = 0.76, p = 0.44

Table 2. Variables extracted from the food recalls for the UK and NHANES datasets.

	Variable name	Definition	Units	UK data Mean (sd)	NHANES 2013-4 Mean (sd)
Consumption amounts	Energy intake	Total energy intake per day	kcals	1759 (680)	2056 (878)
	Carbohydrate	Carbohydrate	g	218.92 (95.21)	247.89 (112.52)
	Protein	Protein	g	67.22 (28.2)	81.96 (39.48)
	Fat	Fat	g	69.8 (30.93)	78.5 (40.07)
	Fibre	Fibre	g	16.48 (8.61)	16.9 (9.54)
Intraday patterns	First CE	Time of first CE	Hours from midnight	9.3 (1.9)	7.9 (2.3)
	Number of CE	Mean number of CE per day	Number	4.07 (1.08)	5.47(1.63)
	Mean foods per CE	Mean number of distinct foods per CE	Number	3.41 (1.02)	9.63 (3.3)
	Variability foods per CE	Intraday standard deviation number of distinct foods per CE	Number	1.47 (0.68)	5.34(1.94)
	Variability time gap	Intraday standard deviation in time gap between CEs	Minutes	93.38 (45.3)	109.42 (55.88)
	Variability energy per CE	Intraday standard deviation Kcals per CE	kcals	334.23 (247.19)	407.38 (195.52)

Interday variability ¹	IDSD energy intake	Interday standard deviation energy intake	Kcals	587 (614.94)	736.11 (688.83)
	IDSD first CE	Interday standard deviation time of first CE	Hours	1.42 (1.52)	1.83
	IDSD number of foods	Interday standard deviation number of foods	Number	0.68(0.4)	(2.40)
	IDSD number of CEs	Interday standard deviation number of CEs	Number	0.74 (0.6)	4.62 (3.90)
	IDSD mean time gap	Interday standard deviation mean time gap between CEs	Minutes	47.78 34.49)	1.51 (1.33)
					68.69 (74.60)

1. These variables represent standard deviations for the UK data, but difference scores for the NHANES data where there are only two recall days per participant. Hence, the descriptive statistics are not directly comparable. CE = Consumption event. IDSD = Interday standard deviation.

Table 3. Parameter estimates for the difference between food-secure and food insecure participants, UK and NHANES datasets. Food secure is the reference category.

	UK dataset		NHANES dataset	
	B (se)	p-value	B (se)	p-value
<i>Consumption variables</i>	MANOVA F(5,385) = 1.21	0.30	MANOVA F(5, 4946) = 41.80	<0.001
Energy intake per day	-39.12 (66.14)	0.55	10.94 (32.13)	0.73
Relative carbohydrate	7.75 (4.15)	0.06	7.92 (1.45)	<0.001
Relative protein	-3.23 (1.70)	0.06	-4.30 (1.02)	<0.001
Relative fat	-1.38 (1.50)	0.36	-2.27 (0.84)	0.007
Relative fibre	-1.23 (0.70)	0.08	-1.35 (0.27)	<0.001
<i>Intraday pattern variables</i>	MANOVA F(6,378) = 3.02	<0.001	MANOVA F(6,4727) = 44.55	<0.001
First CE	2.28 (11.83)	0.85	-0.07 (0.09)	0.45
Number of CE	-0.12 (0.11)	0.26	-0.12 (0.06)	0.07
Mean foods per CE	-0.28 (0.10)	0.01	-0.55 (0.12)	<0.001
Variability foods per CE	-0.23 (0.07)	<0.001	-0.39 (0.07)	<0.001
Variability time gap	9.44 (4.60)	0.04	8.04 (2.14)	<0.001
Variability energy per CE	-5.19 (24.50)	0.8	5.23 (7.14)	0.46
<i>Interday variability variables</i>	MANOVA F(5,364) = 1.23	0.32	MANOVA F(5,4365) = 12.37	<0.001
IDSD energy intake	34.07 (62.30)	0.58	48.11 (28.75)	0.08
IDSD first CE	17.27 (9.26)	0.06	-0.01 (0.10)	0.96
IDSD number of foods	-0.04 (0.05)	0.42	0.25 (0.17)	0.14
IDSD number of CEs	0.04 (0.04)	0.41	0.09 (0.09)	0.13
IDSD mean time gap	6.72 (3.59)	0.06	5.54 (3.07)	0.07