

BMJ Open

BMJ Open is committed to open peer review. As part of this commitment we make the peer review history of every article we publish publicly available.

When an article is published we post the peer reviewers' comments and the authors' responses online. We also post the versions of the paper that were used during peer review. These are the versions that the peer review comments apply to.

The versions of the paper that follow are the versions that were submitted during the peer review process. They are not the versions of record or the final published versions. They should not be cited or distributed as the published version of this manuscript.

BMJ Open is an open access journal and the full, final, typeset and author-corrected version of record of the manuscript is available on our site with no access controls, subscription charges or pay-per-view fees (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com>).

If you have any questions on BMJ Open's open peer review process please email info.bmjopen@bmj.com

BMJ Open

Understanding neighbourhood retail food-related environmental mechanisms influencing BMI in the Caribbean: a multilevel analysis from the Jamaica Health and Lifestyle Survey

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2019-033839
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	23-Aug-2019
Complete List of Authors:	Cunningham-Myrie, Colette; University of the West Indies at Mona Faculty of Medical Sciences, Community Health and Psychiatry Younger, Novie; University of the West Indies, Caribbean Institute for Health Research Theall, Katherine; Tulane University, Global Community Health and Behavioral Sciences Greene, Lisa-Gaye; University of the West Indies at Mona, Mona GeoInformatics Institute Lyew-Ayee, Parris; University of the West Indies, Mona GeoInformatics Institute Wilks, Rainford; University of the West Indies, Caribbean Institute for Health Research
Keywords:	EPIDEMIOLOGY, NUTRITION & DIETETICS, PUBLIC HEALTH, DIABETES & ENDOCRINOLOGY

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts



I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our [licence](#).

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which [Creative Commons](#) licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

1
2
3 **Understanding neighbourhood retail food-related environmental mechanisms influencing**
4 **BMI in the Caribbean: a multilevel analysis from the Jamaica Health and Lifestyle Survey**
5
6
7

8 Colette Andrea Cunningham-Myrie ^{1*}, Novie O. Younger-Coleman ², Katherine P. Theall ³,
9 Lisa-Gaye Greene ⁴, Parris Lyew-Ayee ⁴, Rainford J. Wilks ²
10
11
12
13

14 ¹ Department of Community Health and Psychiatry, University of the West Indies, Mona,
15 Jamaica
16

17 ² Caribbean Institute for Health Research, University of the West Indies, Mona, Jamaica
18

19 ³ Department of Global Community Health and Behavioral Sciences, School of Public Health
20 and Tropical Medicine, Tulane University, USA
21

22 ⁴ Mona GeoInformatics Institute, University of the West Indies, Mona, Jamaica
23
24
25
26

27 ***Corresponding author:**
28

29 Colette Cunningham-Myrie
30

31 Department of Community Health & Psychiatry
32

33 3 Gibraltar Camp Way
34

35 The University of the West Indies
36

37 Kingston 7, Jamaica, WI
38

39 Tel (876) 927 2476
40

41 Fax (876) 977 6346
42

43 E-mail: colette.cunninghammyrie@uwimona.edu.jm
44
45

46 **Word count:** 3144 words
47
48
49

50 **Key words:** Body mass index, retail food environment, neighbourhood, geocoding, multilevel
51 modelling, developing country.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

ABSTRACT

Objective To derive estimates of the associations between measures of the retail food environments and mean Body Mass Index (BMI) in Jamaica, a middle-income country with increasing prevalence of obesity.

Design Cross-sectional study

Setting Data from the Jamaica Health and Lifestyle Survey 2008 (JHLS II) a nationally representative population-based survey that recruited persons at their homes over a four-month period from all 14 parishes and 113 neighbourhoods defined as Enumeration Districts (EDs).

Participants A subsample of 2529 participants aged 18-74 years from the JHLS II who completed interviewer administered surveys, provided anthropometric measurements and whose addresses were geocoded.

Primary outcome measure Mean BMI, calculated as weight divided by height squared (kg/m^2)

Results There was significant clustering across neighbourhoods for mean BMI (Intraclass correlation coefficients = 4.16%). Fully adjusted models revealed increased mean BMI among women, with further distance away from supermarkets ($\beta = 0.12$; 95% CI = 8.20×10^{-3} , 0.24; $P=0.036$) and the absence of supermarkets within a 1 km buffer zone ($\beta = 1.36$; 95% CI 0.20, 2.52; $P=0.022$). A 10% increase in the distance from a supermarket was associated with a 1.7 kg/m^2 increase in mean BMI (95% CI 0.03, 0.32; $P=0.020$) in the middle class. No associations were detected with Fast Food Outlets or interaction by urbanicity.

Conclusions Increased mean BMI in Jamaicans may be partially explained by the presence of supermarkets and markets and differ by sex and social class. National efforts to curtail obesity in middle-income countries should consider interventions focused at the neighbourhood-level that not only target the location and density of supermarkets and markets but also consider sex and social class-specific factors that maybe influencing the associations.

Strengths and limitations of this study

- This study is the first in a Caribbean island to demonstrate the influence of the food retail environment on Body Mass Index (BMI) using geocoded data and multilevel modelling.
- This study provided a large sample size representative of Jamaicans 15 to 74 years.
- Individual geocoded addresses from a nationally representative survey were linked with specific objective GIS-based retail food environmental measures.
- Enumeration Districts (EDs) were used to define Jamaican neighbourhoods which are quite heterogeneous geographically in size, composition and context, and may not fully represent exposure to the food obesogenic environments
- The reliability and validity of the area-level environmental variables used were not ascertained for the local context and therefore they may not be the most effective in explaining any variance in BMI.

INTRODUCTION

Obesity has been increasing in the Caribbean [1,2] and in Jamaica is now a major public health problem [3]. Over the past five decades a rapid increase in obesity has been reported with women having consistently higher rates than men [4-6]. The Jamaica Health and Lifestyle Survey 2008 (JHLS II) [3], has documented increased prevalence over the earlier 2001 survey (JHLS I) [7], in obesity as well as the comorbid Chronic Non-communicable Disease (CNCD) conditions of diabetes mellitus (DM) and hypertension (HTN). Approximately 99 % of Jamaicans consumed below the daily recommended portions of fruits and vegetables and 30% of obese persons preferred fried protein in their diets [3].

The presence of supermarkets/markets has been thought to indicate better access to and intake of healthier foods, given its association with higher intake of fruit and vegetables [8]. Toronto, those that lived in close proximity to a supermarket had decreased odds of being overweight or obese [12].

The presence of supermarkets has been shown to be inversely associated with neighbourhood SES in the US, whereby data have revealed greater poverty being associated with a decreased presence [13, 14]. With regards to sex differences, research by Wang et al [15] among 25 – 74 years old adults in California revealed that closer proximity to a supermarket and higher neighborhood density of small grocery stores were associated with higher BMI among women.

Fast food outlets (FFOs) have increased in many countries and thought to be associated with the global rise in obesity. Whilst there is no universally accepted agreement on what the definition of fast food is, most research include foods sold that are low cost, energy dense with high fat and/or sugar content and low nutrient content. Studies have found that frequent consumption of fast foods in areas with a high density of FFOs has been found to increase body weight [16,17] and a positive association of proximity to FFOs with measures of adiposity [18, 19].

The interaction between SES and the density of FFOs has also been investigated. In Australia it was found that persons with poor SES (based on median weekly income) had 2.5 times exposure to FFOs than persons in the wealthiest SES category [20]. Similar associations have been reported in the US [21, 22] and Great Britain [23]. In Europe, eating at restaurants

(which included eating at FFOs) was positively associated with BMI among men [24]. On the other hand, in the US eating at FFOs was positively associated cross-sectionally with BMI among low-income women [25].

The limited body of research on environment influences on the Chronic Non-communicable Diseases (CNCDS) in Jamaica and the developing world, as well as the apparent lack of lifestyle changes despite health promotion programs targeting individual-level prevention, suggests that barriers to these changes may yet be unrecognized and accounted for in the traditional modelling of risk factors. The studies on obesity previously referenced [3,4,6,7] have only assessed geographical variations according to the dichotomized classification of urban/rural area of residence. Review of the literature has not revealed any local studies assessing geographical variations in obesity or other measures of adiposity such as mean BMI, using multilevel modelling (MLM) statistical techniques or Geographic Information Systems (GIS) to determine whether there are associations with the built environment in a middle-income country (MIC) context.

The aim of this study was to provide a unique and important opportunity to address these gaps in understanding the retail food-related environmental mechanisms influencing mean BMI in Jamaica, a small island MIC. Our objective was to derive estimates of the associations between measures of the retail food environments and mean BMI. We hypothesized that: a) there was variability in the mean BMI across Jamaican neighbourhoods, b) the pathway between greater presence/closer proximity to supermarkets/markets, mediated through healthy diet, would lead to lower mean BMI and would be stronger for those of higher SES, c) the pathway between greater presence/closer proximity to fast food outlets, mediated through unhealthy diet would lead to greater mean BMI and would be stronger for those of low SES and residing in urban areas, and d) there would be sex differences in these associations.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study design and sample

The JHLS II was a cross-sectional, interviewer-administered, island wide survey over a 4-month period between 2007 and 2008. The sample of 2848 15-74-year-olds represented approximately 70% of the predominantly (94%) Black Jamaican population [3]. A stratified random sample of clusters known as Enumeration Districts (EDs) was selected using a probability proportionate to

1
2
3 the size of population of the parishes in the island in order to yield a nationally representative
4 sample. Trained interviewers administered a structured questionnaire on diseases and lifestyle
5 behaviours and performed anthropometry. Further details on the sampling technique are provided
6 elsewhere [3].
7
8
9

10 A total of 2529 (or 89% of) participants from the JHLS II dataset were geocoded out of
11 the original 2848 participants. Kreft [26] suggests a '30/30 rule' so that researchers should strive
12 for a sample of at least 30 groups with 30 individuals per group. For this study, each of the 101
13 EDs (sampling units) had an average of 28 individuals, providing sufficient power for the
14 proposed secondary multilevel analyses.
15
16
17
18
19

20 **Patient and public involvement**

21 No patients were involved in the study. The study participants were community residents and
22 were not involved in the design, recruitment or the conduct of the study. The study findings will
23 be disseminated to the Ministry of Health, Jamaica and general public, including the study
24 participants.
25
26
27
28
29

30 **Measures**

31 *Individual-level measures*

32 The primary outcome was mean BMI, calculated as weight divided by height squared (kg/m²).
33 Weight was measured using calibrated electronic scales (Tanita® models HD 314 or 2204) to 0.1
34 kg precision and height measured using a portable stadiometer (Seca®) to 0.1 cm precision.
35
36
37
38

39 Individual-data included age, sex, educational attainment, occupation, urbanicity, diet,
40 and perceived community safety. Named jobs were first categorised using the Jamaica
41 Standardised Occupational Classification codes for 1991 [27] and collapsed into four groups:
42 highly skilled/professional, skilled, unskilled and unemployed/other. Diet was examined as
43 frequency of fruit and vegetable consumption, where an unhealthy diet (poor fruit and vegetable
44 intake) was defined as consumption of < 2 servings of fruit per day or < 3 servings of vegetables
45 per day. Perception of community safety was determined by asking each participant how safe he
46 or she felt to walk in the community.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Household measures

The number of possessions owned (including but not exclusive to owning a radio, telephone, refrigerator, television, computer or car ownership) was used as a proxy for SES [3] and classification based on the following tertiles: 1st tertile = lower class = ≤ 6 items, 2nd tertile = middle class = 7-9 items, 3rd tertile= upper class = 10-16 items.

Environment-level measures

Each observation was linked, through a geocoded residential address, to neighbourhood level proximity and density measures for supermarkets, markets and FFOs. Neighbourhood was defined as the Enumeration District (ED). The final choices of environment-level measures for investigation were based on a combination of previously derived GIS-based measures [28, 29], documented associations seen with the outcome of interest [28, 30] and data availability.

The locations of supermarkets/markets (*Figure 1, Panel A*) and FFOs (*Figure 1, Panel B*) were identified from Mona Geoinformatics Institute's (MonaGIS) proprietary JAMNAV database. The proximities and densities of supermarkets/markets and FFOs were estimated using application of Spatial Analyst tool in ArcGIS to data from MonaGIS proprietary JAMNAV database. Proximity of supermarkets and markets, combined to represent good sources of fresh fruit and vegetable, was determined as the straight-line distance (km) from each geocoded address to the closest supermarket or market. Two density variables created were supermarkets/markets per km² based which was converted to the number of supermarkets/markets per 1000 persons in the corresponding ED according to the 2011 census from the Statistical Institute of Jamaica (STATIN) [31].

FFOs were defined as places where high-caloric food could be obtained relatively quickly and excluded traditional cook shops, snack shops and sit-down restaurants. Proximity and density measures were created in a similar way as done for supermarkets/markets.

Zero-inflated variables

The absence of the environmental-level measure based on the participant's geocoded address was indicated by a large proportion of zero values for most density measures as shown in the Supplementary Table. New indicator variables (dummy variables) were subsequently created and

1
2
3 the specific dummy variable included in regression models alongside the original quantitative
4 forms of the respective retail food environmental-level explanatory variable. These dummy
5 variables are also referenced as the zero-inflated form of the density measures.
6
7
8
9

10 **Missing variables**

11 Addresses for 11% of the JHLS II study participants could not be geocoded and contributed to
12 missing data in subsequent analyses. The age/sex population of the dataset used for this JHLS II
13 secondary analysis subsample was compared with that for the non-geocoded data and no key
14 deviations were observed.
15
16
17
18

19 Geocoded and non-geocoded (missing) participants were compared with respect to age,
20 sex, SES categories and the key outcome variables of mean BMI, mean WC and obesity, using
21 mixed effect models, regression models accounting for survey design and regression models that
22 ignored survey design. No associations were detected between the geocoded status (present or
23 missing) and these other variables. This data analysis was done only on geocoded data, on the
24 assumption that these participants were representative of the target population.
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 **Statistical Analyses**

32 A complex database was created that combined individual-level JHLS II data with contextual
33 environment-level data.
34
35

36 Descriptive data analysis estimated sex-specific and total survey-weighted means,
37 proportions and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) for the outcome, explanatory and confounding
38 variables as well as age-adjusted mean BMI and prevalence of poor fruit and vegetable intake, a
39 key cardiovascular disease (CVD) risk factor. Age-adjustment utilized direct standardization
40 across the strata identified as 10-year age bands with weights being survey-weighted population
41 proportions of the respective 10-year age groups, as estimated using the JHLS II data.
42
43
44
45

46 The adjusted Wald test and the Pearson's chi-squared test corrected for survey design
47 were used to determine whether, respectively, the age-adjusted and unadjusted estimates differed
48 with respect to sex.
49
50

51 Intraclass correlation coefficients (ICCs) from hierarchical models quantified the
52 proportion of variation in mean BMI due to clustering at the ED level. An ICC $\geq 2\%$ suggests a
53 potential clustering effect worth examining in a multilevel framework [32].
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

To determine and account for the effect of clustering at the neighbourhood level, subsequent analyses used multilevel models based on EDs nested within parish and examined the stratum-specific estimates of the effect of the environment variables on mean BMI with and without adjustment for covariates. Strata were defined using the urbanicity, sex and SES variables and stratum-specific multilevel models estimated if terms for interaction between the environment and strata variables were statistically significant. The Akaike's Information Criterion (AIC) statistic was used to determine the final best models. Collinearity assessed using Goodman and Kruskal's gamma coefficient γ [33], was the basis for selection of models covariates. To assess the chance of false positive errors, *P*-values from these models were compared with the Bonferroni corrected significance level.

All analyses were conducted using STATA, versions 12 and 14 (StataCorp LP, College Station, Texas).

Ethical Approval

Ethical approval was received from the University of the West Indies/University Hospital of the West Indies Ethics Research Committee.

RESULTS

Sample characteristics

The weighted total and sex-specific summary statistics are shown in Table 1. Women had higher mean BMI than men and higher proportions in the highly skilled/professional, unskilled and unemployed categories and in both 1st and 2nd SES tertiles based on no. of possessions owned (*P* < 0.001). However, a greater proportion of men perceived their communities as unsafe (males = 86.29 %; 95% CI: 82.64, 89.94 vs. females = 80.38 %; 95% CI: 75.63, 85.13; *P* < 0.012). There were no sex differences in urbanicity, those who had not completed high school and poor fruit and vegetable intake.

There was clustering in mean BMI across neighbourhoods in Jamaica, with an ICC of 4.16%, the proportion of the variance in mean BMI explainable at the neighbourhood level. No associations were found between the retail food environment variables and mean BMI in unadjusted regression models. There was also no effect modification by urbanicity.

Sex-specific regression models

There was interaction between sex and the following variables in their relationship with mean BMI: supermarkets proximity ($P=0.023$), absence of supermarkets within a 1 km buffer zone ($P=0.008$) and fast food outlets proximity ($P=0.031$). Figure 2 reveals that for women, in fully-adjusted models, a 10% increase in proximity (km) to supermarkets was associated with a 1.20 kg/m² increase in mean BMI (95% CI 8.20 x10⁻³, 0.24; $P=0.036$); the absence of supermarkets within a 1 km buffer zone was associated with a 1.36 kg/m² increase in mean BMI (95% CI 0.20, 2.52; $P=0.022$).

SES- tertile-specific regression models

There was interaction between SES of a participant and a few retail food environment variables in their relationship with mean BMI. These included supermarkets proximity ($P=0.015$), absence of supermarkets/1000 people/ ED ($P=0.033$) and fast food outlets proximity ($P=0.045$). Figure 3 reveals that a 10% increase in the distance from a supermarket was consistently associated with an increase in mean BMI for all models for persons within the middle class, with a 1.7 kg/m² increase in mean BMI (95% CI 0.03, 0.32; $P=0.020$) in the final model. Among persons in the upper class, the absence of supermarkets/ 1000 people/ ED was associated with a 2.00 kg/m² increase in mean BMI (95% CI 0.08, 3.92; $P=0.041$) only in age-adjusted models. Proximity to FFOs was not associated with mean BMI in any of the SES classes.

DISCUSSION

This study is the first to examine the impact of the retail food-related environment on obesity-related outcomes in a small Caribbean island. Our finding of $\geq 2.0\%$ of the variance in mean BMI being explainable by environmental influences outside of the individual or at the neighbourhood level is like that reported by Harrington et al for Canada [34] and by Masood and Reidpath [35] for many of the countries that participated in the 2003 World Health Survey. We also found that further distance away from supermarkets and markets, and their absence within a 1 km buffer zone from residences, were associated with increased mean BMI in women; and further proximity to supermarkets associated with mean BMI for the middle class. There was no association with proximity to or density of FFOs, nor urban-rural differences.

Table 1. Total and sex-specific weighted sample characteristics (95% CI) for Jamaicans (JHLS II, 2008)

Variable	Men (n=796)	Women (n=1731)	Total (n=2527)	P value
Individual -level measures				
Mean Age in years (%)	37.00 (36.33, 37.13)	36.73 (36.64, 37.36)	36.87 (36.54, 37.20)	0.158
Urban Residence (%)	53.53 (43.84,62.28)	53.17 (45.11,61.74)	53.35 (44.87,61.64)	0.890
< High School Education (%)	31.75 (27.17, 36.33)	29.13 (25.69, 32.56)	30.43 (26.96, 33.90)	0.208
Occupation (%)				<0.0001
Highly skilled/Professional	38.87 (34.41, 43.34)	52.54 (49.02, 56.06)	45.73 (42.73, 48.72)	
Skilled	40.33 (35.19, 45.48)	8.21 (6.19, 10.23)	24.23 (21.29, 27.16)	
Unskilled	9.75 (6.66, 12.84)	18.13 (15.20, 21.06)	13.95 (11.33, 16.57)	
Unemployed/Other	11.05 (8.22, 13.88)	21.11 (18.17, 24.06)	16.10 (14.12, 18.07)	
Possessions owned (%)				<0.001
Lower class ≤ 6 items	34.09 (29.03, 39.14)	41.51 (37.45, 45.57)	37.82 (33.96, 41.68)	
Middle class 7-9 items	29.92 (25.99, 33.85)	31.17, (28.45, 33.89)	30.55 (27.89, 33.20)	
Upper class 10-16 items	36.00 (30.68, 41.31)	27.32 (22.99, 31.65)	31.63 (27.45, 35.82)	
Perception of unsafe community (%)	86.29 (82.64, 89.94)	80.38 (75.63, 85.13)	83.32 (79.77, 86.86)	0.012
Poor fruit & vegetable (%)	99.50 (98.84, 100.00)	99.83 (99.64, 100.00)	99.57 (99.34, 100.00)	0.340
Mean BMI [□] (kg/m ²)	24.83(24.28, 25.38)	28.40 (27.90, 28.89)	26.64 (26.21, 27.07)	<0.001
Neighbourhood -level measures [†]				
[Mean (95% CI)]				
Supermarkets [§] proximity (km)	3.61 (2.69, 4.54)	3.64 (2.78, 4.49)	3.63 (2.77, 4.48)	0.978
Supermarkets [§] / km ²	1.60 (0.84, 2.36)	1.57 (0.96, 2.19)	1.59 (0.91, 2.26)	0.895
Supermarkets [§] /1000 people/ ED	0.65 (0.27, 1.04)	0.63 (0.20, 1.07)	0.64 (0.26, 1.03)	0.922
FFO proximity (km)	4.56 (3.54, 5.58)	4.68(3.60, 5.76)	4.62 (3.62, 5.62)	0.747
FFO / km ²	0.57 (0.33, 0.81)	0.52 (0.32, 0.72)	0.55 (0.33, 0.76)	0.266
FFO / 1000 people/ ED	0.35 (0.10, 0.60)	0.21 (0.07, 0.35)	0.28 (0.10, 0.46)	0.104

[†] Age-adjusted

[§]Includes supermarkets and markets

CI – Confidence Interval; JHLS II, Jamaica Health and Lifestyle Survey II; BMI, Body Mass Index; ED – Enumeration District; FFO - Fast Food Outlets

P values for difference between means (men versus women)

1
2
3 Our study findings corroborate previous research conducted in developed countries that
4 indicate closer proximity to supermarkets/markets [12, 19, 20] and increased density of
5 supermarkets/markets [9-11, 16, 36, 37] are associated with less obesity-related outcomes in
6 adults and children. Of note however, Wang and colleagues found higher neighbourhood density
7 of small grocery stores associated with higher BMI among a sample of US women [15], while
8 our study found increased BMI for women being associated with further distance from
9 supermarkets/markets (inclusive of small grocery stores). Although the geographic variables are
10 somewhat dissimilar (a density versus proximity measure), the difference in direction of the
11 associations raises the question as to whether presence of grocery stores, supermarkets and
12 markets across different geographical contexts, including small island states like Jamaica, each
13 represent the same degree of accessibility, availability and ultimate consumption of healthy
14 foods. For example, we found no urban-rural differences as hypothesized, perhaps due to PAL,
15 diet or some other unknown confounder masking the association. Living a greater distance away
16 from supermarkets/markets was positively associated with mean BMI in the middle class in our
17 study, however many other studies found this association in the lower class [38]. We are unclear
18 as to the reasons for the association observed among the middle-class participants. We surmise
19 this could possibly be due to the influence of diet or lower PAL in this group, the latter perhaps
20 being influenced by car ownership and/or greater use of motorized transport [39]. PAL, diet and
21 motorized transport were not adjusted for in the food environment regression models. These
22 omissions may have suppressed associations.

23
24 It is also unclear why associations between FFO proximity and mean BMI were not seen
25 in the SES-specific models. This may be an indication that demonstration of associations may
26 depend on which obesogenic food environment variable or outcome measure of adiposity is
27 chosen for the regression models. For example, Menke et al in analysing the 3rd US National
28 Health and Nutrition Examination Survey conducted, found that waist circumference maintained
29 a stronger association with CVD risk factors than the other measures of adiposity [40]. Further
30 work is needed on assessing the quality and utility of the measures used in this study as well as
31 the development of new ones for the Jamaican and developing world context.

32
33 The major strength of this study is that it represents pioneering work in a small island
34 developing country context. We linked individually geocoded addresses from a nationally
35 representative survey, with specific objective GIS-based retail food environmental measures

1
2
3 and provided empirical evidence using MLM to explore the association between objective
4 neighbourhood-level retail food environment measures and BMI.
5

6
7 Despite strengths, there are limitations that deserve mention, including the inability to
8 make causal inferences given the cross-sectional design of the JHLS II and our definition of
9 neighbourhood. Using EDs to represent a Jamaican neighbourhood could be deemed inadequate
10 as they i) are quite heterogeneous geographically in size, composition and context, and ii) may
11 not fully represent exposure to the obesogenic environments being investigated. Additionally,
12 although the outcome was objectively assessed, the risk factors included self-reported data on a
13 single individual representing a household, which may introduce information bias. Furthermore,
14 there was temporal mismatch of the data collected from individual JHLS II participants with that
15 for most of the food environment level variables, most of which were collected in and after the
16 year 2010, which was after the MonaGIS's end of data collection for the JHLS II in 2008. This
17 may have biased the results as individual exposures may have varied after the survey period,
18 although food consumption behaviours are believed to be relatively stable over time. Lastly, the
19 reliability and validity of the area-level environmental variables were untested locally and
20 therefore uncertainty remains as to whether they were most effective in explaining any variance
21 in the obesity-related outcomes.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 In conclusion, we found that further distance away from supermarkets and markets and
33 their absence within a 1 km buffer zone from residences were associated with increased mean
34 BMI, with important and unexpected sex and social class differences. There has been an increase
35 in the prevalence of obesity in Jamaica (3) despite the implementation of policies and
36 programmes to ameliorate its impact on the continuum towards CNCDS (41). Based on our
37 findings, we recommend that national strategic and operational plans crafted for prevention and
38 control of CNCDS, for which obesity is a key risk factor, should place greater emphasis on
39 policies, programmes and interventions that are focused on the neighborhood-level effects and
40 not only on individual-level determinants. They should also be tailored to address sex and social
41 class differences.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

STATEMENTS

Contributors CC-M and KT conceived the study. LG and PL-A geocoded the data. CC-M, NY-C and KT analysed and interpreted the data. RW supervised the research. CC-M wrote the manuscript. PL-A, KT and RW edited the manuscript. All authors provided critical intellectual contributions and read and approved the final manuscript.

Funding This secondary analysis research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

Competing interests None declared.

Ethics approval The University of the West Indies/University Hospital of the West Indies Ethics Research Committee ECP 169, 14/15

Provenance and peer review Not commissioned; externally peer reviewed.

Data sharing statement No additional data are available.

REFERENCES

1. Caribbean Commission on Health and Development. Report of the Caribbean Commission on Health and Development pgs 37-42: Ian Randle Publishers; 2006. http://www.who.int/macrohealth/action/PAHO_Report.pdf?ua=1. Accessed 28 Nov 2014.
2. Henry FJ. Obesity prevention: the key to non-communicable disease control. *West Indian Med J* 2011;60(4):446-51.
3. Wilks R, Younger N, Tulloch-Reid M, McFarlane S, Francis D. Jamaica Health and Lifestyle Survey 2007-8. 2008. http://www.mona.uwi.edu/reports/health/jhlsii_final_may09.pdf Accessed 1 February 2015.
4. Ashcroft MT, Ling J, Lovell HG, Miall WE. Heights and weights of adults in rural and urban areas of Jamaica. *Br J Prev Soc Med* 1966;20(1):22-6.
5. Rotimi CN, Cooper RS, Ataman SL, Osotimehin B, Kadiri S, Muna W, et al. Distribution of anthropometric variables and the prevalence of obesity in populations of West African origin: the International Collaborative Study on Hypertension in Blacks (ICSHIB). *Obes Res* 1995;3(S2):95s-105s.
6. Wilks R, Rotimi C, Bennett F, McFarlane-Anderson N, Kaufman J, Anderson S, et al. Diabetes in the Caribbean: results of a population survey from Spanish Town, Jamaica. *Diab Med* 1999;16(10):875-83.
7. Wilks R, Zohoori N, Ashley D, Figueroa P. The Jamaican Healthy Lifestyle Survey: Ministry of Health Jamaica. 2000.
8. Morland K, Wing S, Roux AD. The contextual effect of the local food environment on residents' diets: The Atherosclerosis Risk in Communities Study. *Am J Public Health* 2002;92(11):1761.
9. Jilcott SB, Keyserling T, Crawford T, McGuirt JT, Ammerman AS. Examining associations among obesity and per capita farmers' markets, grocery stores/supermarkets, and supercenters in US counties. *J Am Diet Assoc* 2011;111(4):567-72.
10. Morland K, Roux AVD, Wing S. Supermarkets, other food stores, and obesity: The Atherosclerosis Risk in Communities Study. *Am J Prev Med* 2006;30(4):333-9.
11. Rundle A, Neckerman KM, Freeman L, Lovasi GS, Purciel M, Quinn J, et al. Neighborhood food environment and walkability predict obesity in New York City. *Environ Health Perspect* 2009;117(3):442.

12. Larsen K, Cook B, Stone MR, Faulkner GE. Food access and children's BMI in Toronto, Ontario: assessing how the food environment relates to overweight and obesity. *Int J Public Health* 2015;60(1):69-77.
13. Bower KM, Thorpe RJ, Jr., Rohde C, Gaskin DJ. The intersection of neighborhood racial segregation, poverty, and urbanicity and its impact on food store availability in the United States. *Prev Med* 2014;58:33-9.
14. Moore LV, Diez Roux AV. Associations of neighborhood characteristics with the location and type of food stores. *Am J Public Health* 2006;96(2):325-31.
15. Wang MC, Kim S, Gonzalez AA, MacLeod KE, Winkleby MA. Socioeconomic and food-related physical characteristics of the neighborhood environment are associated with body mass index. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2007;61(6):491-8.
16. Li F, Harmer P, Cardinal BJ, Bosworth M, Johnson-Shelton D, Moore JM, et al. Built environment and 1-year change in weight and waist circumference in middle-aged and older adults: Portland Neighborhood Environment and Health Study. *Am J Epidemiol*. 2009;169(4):401-8.
17. Nago ES, Lachat CK, Dossa RA, Kolsteren PW. Association of out-of-home eating with anthropometric changes: a systematic review of prospective studies. *Crit Rev Food Sci Nutr* 2014;54(9):1103-16.
18. Reitzel LR, Regan SD, Nguyen N, Cromley EK, Strong LL, Wetter DW, et al. Density and proximity of fast food restaurants and body mass index among African Americans. *Am J Public Health* 2014;104(1):110-6.
19. Davis B, Carpenter C. Proximity of fast-food restaurants to schools and adolescent obesity. *Am J Public Health* 2009;99(3):505-10.
20. Reidpath DD, Burns C, Garrard J, Mahoney M, Townsend M. An ecological study of the relationship between social and environmental determinants of obesity. *Health Place* 200;8(2):141-5.
21. Maddock J. The relationship between obesity and the prevalence of fast-food restaurants: state-level analysis. *Am J Health Promot* 2004;19:137-43.
22. Lewis LB, Sloane DC, Nascimento LM et al. African-American's' access to healthy food options in South Los Angeles Restaurants. *Am J Pub Health* 2005;95:668-73.

23. Cummins S, McKay L, Macintyre S. McDonald's Restaurants and neighbourhood deprivation in Scotland & England. *Am J Prev Med* 2005;4:308–10.
24. Naska A, Orfanos P, Trichopoulou A, May AM, Overvad K, Jakobsen MU, et al. Eating out, weight and weight gain. A cross-sectional and prospective analysis in the context of the EPIC-PANACEA study. *International journal of obesity*. 2011 Mar;35(3):416.
25. Jeffery RW, French SA. Epidemic obesity in the United States: are fast foods and television viewing contributing? *Am J Public Health* 1998; 88 (2): 277–280.
26. Kreft I, De Leeuw J. *Introducing multilevel modeling* London: Sage; 1998.
27. The Statistical Institute of Jamaica (STATIN) (1991) *Jamaica Standard Occupational Classification*. Statistical Institute of Jamaica, Kingston.
28. Prince SA, Kristjansson EA, Russell K, Billette JM, Sawada M, Ali A, et al. A multilevel analysis of neighborhood built and social environments and adult self-reported physical activity and body mass index in Ottawa, Canada. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2011;8(10):3953-78.
29. Brownson RC, Hoehner CM, Day K, Forsyth A, Sallis JF. Measuring the built environment for physical activity: state of the science. *Am J Prev Med* 2009;36(4):S99-S123. e12.
30. Prince SA, Kristjansson EA, Russell K, Billette JM, Sawada MC, Ali A, et al. Relationships between neighborhoods, physical activity, and obesity: a multilevel analysis of a large Canadian city. *Obesity* 2012;20(10):2093-100.
31. The Statistical Institute of Jamaica (STATIN). 2011 Census of Population and Housing - Jamaica. <http://statinja.gov.jm/Census/PopCensus/Popcensus2011Index.aspx> Accessed 1 Apr 2016.
32. Raudenbush SW, Bryk AS. *Hierarchical linear models: Applications and data analysis methods*: Sage Publications, Incorporated; 2001.
33. Goodman and Kruskal's gamma. In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Goodman_and_Kruskal%27s_gamma&oldid=722481108 2016. Accessed 28 May 2016.
34. Harrington DW, Elliott SJ. Weighing the importance of neighborhood: a multilevel exploration of the determinants of overweight and obesity. *Soc Sci Med* 2009;68(4):593-600.
35. Masood M, Reidpath DD. Intraclass correlation and design effect in BMI, physical activity and diet: a cross-sectional study of 56 countries. *BMJ Open* 2016;6(1):e008173.

- 1
2
3 36. Lamichhane AP, Puett R, Porter DE, Bottai M, Mayer-Davis EJ, Liese AD. Associations
4 of built food environment with body mass index and waist circumference among youth with
5 diabetes. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act* 2012;9:81.
6
7
8 37. Burgoine T, Forouhi NG, Griffin SJ, Wareham NJ, Monsivais P. Associations between
9 exposure to takeaway food outlets, takeaway food consumption, and body weight in
10 Cambridgeshire, UK: population based, cross sectional study. *BMJ* 2014; Mar13:348:g1464.
11
12
13 38. Black JL, Macinko J. Neighborhoods and obesity. *Nutr Rev* 2008;66(1):2-20.
14
15 39. Inagami S, Cohen DA, Finch BK, Asch SM. You are where you shop: grocery store
16 locations, weight, and neighborhoods. *Am J Prev Med* 2006;31(1):10-7.
17
18 40. Menke A, Muntner P, Wildman RP, Reynolds K, Jiang H. Measures of Adiposity and
19 Cardiovascular Disease Risk Factors. *Obesity (Silver Spring)* 2007;15(3):785.
20
21 41. The National Health Fund Act 2003 [cited 2010 May 26]. Available from:
22 <http://www.moh.gov.jm/laws/statutes>.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Figure 1. Spatial Distribution of Supermarket/markets (A) and Fast Food Outlets in Jamaica (B)

For peer review only

1
2
3 **Figure 2.** Sex-specific unadjusted and adjusted β Coefficients for the association of retail food
4 environments with mean Body Mass Index
5

6
7 † Dummy variable for zero inflated predictor

8 CI – Confidence Interval

9 Model 1 - unadjusted

10 Model 2 - age adjusted

11 Model 3 - adjusted for age and no. of possessions

12 Model 4 - adjusted for age, no. of possessions, urban, occupation, education, perception of
13 unsafe community

14 *p < 0.05
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **Figure 3.** SES-specific unadjusted and adjusted β Coefficients for the association of retail food
4 environments with mean Body Mass Index
5

6 CI – Confidence Interval; ED – Enumeration District

7 † Dummy variable for zero inflated predictor

8 Model 1 - unadjusted



9 Model 2 - age adjusted

10 Model 3 - adjusted for age and sex


11 Model 4 - adjusted for age, sex, urban, occupation, education, perception of unsafe community

12 * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




104x103mm (300 x 300 DPI)



73x155mm (300 x 300 DPI)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60



211x441mm (96 x 96 DPI)

Supplementary Table. Proportion of zero-valued observations for geographic variables

Retail Food Environments	Frequency (%)
	N=2527
Supermarkets/markets proximity (km)	0
Supermarkets/markets / km ²	61.30
Supermarkets/markets /1000 people/ ED	92.13
FFO proximity (km)	0
FFO / km ²	68.22
FFO / 1000 people/ ED	94.46

ED – Enumeration District; FFO - Fast Food Outlets

STROBE Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of *cross-sectional studies*

	Item No	Recommendation
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract [Within the title page 1 and methods section of the abstract page 2] (b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found [See methods and results sections of abstract page 2]
Introduction		
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported [pages 4-5]
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses [page 5]
Methods		
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper [page 5-6]
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection [pages 6-8]
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants [pages 5- 6]
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. [pages 6-9] Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable [N/A]
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group [pages 6-9]
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias [pages 5-6, 8-9]
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at [page 5-6]
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why [pages 8-9]
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding [pages 8-9] (b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions [page 9] (c) Explain how missing data were addressed [page 8] (d) If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy [page 9] (e) Describe any sensitivity analyses [N/A]
Results		
Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed [N/A] (b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage [N/A] (c) Consider use of a flow diagram [N/A]
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders [page 9; Table 1] (b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest [N/A]
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures [page 9; Table 1]

1			
2	Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). [pages 9-10; Figures 2-3] Make clear which
3			confounders were adjusted for and why they were included [page 6, Figures 2-3]
4			(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized [page 10,
5			Table 1]
6			(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a
7			meaningful time period [N/A]
8			
9			
10			
11	Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity
12			analyses [pages 9-10]
13			
14	Discussion		
15	Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives [page 10]
16	Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or
17			imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias [page 13]
18			
19	Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations,
20			multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence [pages
21			12-13]
22			
23	Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results [page 13]
24			
25	Other information		
26	Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if
27			applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based [page 14]
28			

*Give information separately for exposed and unexposed groups.

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.

BMJ Open

Understanding neighbourhood retail food environmental mechanisms influencing BMI in the Caribbean: a multilevel analysis from the Jamaica Health and Lifestyle Survey: a cross-sectional study

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2019-033839.R1
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	20-Jan-2020
Complete List of Authors:	Cunningham-Myrie, Colette; University of the West Indies at Mona Faculty of Medical Sciences, Community Health and Psychiatry Younger, Novie; University of the West Indies, Caribbean Institute for Health Research Theall, Katherine; Tulane University, Global Community Health and Behavioral Sciences Greene, Lisa-Gaye; University of the West Indies at Mona, Mona GeoInformatics Institute Lyew-Ayee, Parris; University of the West Indies, Mona GeoInformatics Institute Wilks, Rainford; University of the West Indies, Caribbean Institute for Health Research
Primary Subject Heading:	Epidemiology
Secondary Subject Heading:	Public health
Keywords:	EPIDEMIOLOGY, NUTRITION & DIETETICS, PUBLIC HEALTH, DIABETES & ENDOCRINOLOGY

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts



I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our [licence](#).

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which [Creative Commons](#) licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

1
2
3 **Understanding neighbourhood retail food environmental mechanisms influencing BMI in**
4 **the Caribbean: a multilevel analysis from the Jamaica Health and Lifestyle Survey: a cross-**
5 **sectional study**
6
7

8
9
10 Colette Andrea Cunningham-Myrie ^{1*}, Novie O. Younger ², Katherine P. Theall ³, Lisa-Gaye
11 Greene ⁴, Parris Lyew-Ayee ⁴, Rainford J. Wilks ²
12
13

14
15 ¹ Department of Community Health and Psychiatry, University of the West Indies, Mona,
16 Jamaica
17

18 ² Caribbean Institute for Health Research, University of the West Indies, Mona, Jamaica
19

20 ³ Department of Global Community Health and Behavioral Sciences, School of Public Health
21 and Tropical Medicine, Tulane University, USA
22

23 ⁴ Mona GeoInformatics Institute, University of the West Indies, Mona, Jamaica
24
25
26
27
28

29 ***Corresponding author:**

30 Colette Cunningham-Myrie

31 Department of Community Health & Psychiatry

32 3 Gibraltar Camp Way

33 The University of the West Indies

34 Kingston 7, Jamaica, WI

35 Tel (876) 927 2476

36 Fax (876) 977 6346

37 E-mail: colette.cunninghammyrie@uwimona.edu.jm
38
39
40
41
42

43
44
45
46
47 **Word count:** 3845 words
48
49

50
51 **Key words:** Body mass index, retail food environment, neighbourhood, geocoding, multilevel
52 modelling, developing country.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

ABSTRACT

Objective To derive estimates of the associations between measures of the retail food environments and mean Body Mass Index (BMI) in Jamaica, a middle-income country with increasing prevalence of obesity.

Design Cross-sectional study

Setting Data from the Jamaica Health and Lifestyle Survey 2008 (JHLS II) a nationally representative population-based survey that recruited persons at their homes over a four-month period from all 14 parishes and 113 neighbourhoods defined as Enumeration Districts (EDs).

Participants A subsample of 2529 participants aged 18-74 years from the JHLS II who completed interviewer administered surveys, provided anthropometric measurements and whose addresses were geocoded.

Primary outcome measure Mean BMI, calculated as weight divided by height squared (kg/m^2)

Results There was significant clustering across neighbourhoods for mean BMI (Intraclass correlation coefficients = 4.16%). Fully adjusted models revealed higher mean BMI among women, with further distance away from supermarkets ($\beta = 0.12$; 95% CI = 8.20×10^{-3} , 0.24; $P = 0.036$) and the absence of supermarkets within a 1 km buffer zone ($\beta = 1.36$; 95% CI 0.20, 2.52; $P = 0.022$). A 10km increase in the distance from a supermarket was associated with a 1.7 kg/m^2 higher mean BMI (95% CI 0.03, 0.32; $P = 0.020$) in the middle class. No associations were detected with Fast Food Outlets or interaction by urbanicity.

Conclusions Higher mean BMI in Jamaicans may be partially explained by the presence of supermarkets and markets and differ by sex and social class. National efforts to curtail obesity in middle-income countries should consider interventions focused at the neighbourhood-level that not only target the location and density of supermarkets and markets but also consider sex and social class-specific factors that maybe influencing the associations.

Strengths and limitations of this study

- This study is the first in a Caribbean island to demonstrate the influence of the retail food environment on Body Mass Index (BMI) using geocoded data and multilevel modelling.
- This study provided a large sample size representative of Jamaicans 15 to 74 years.
- Individual geocoded addresses from a nationally representative survey were linked with specific objective GIS-based retail food environmental measures.
- Enumeration Districts (EDs) were used to define Jamaican neighbourhoods which are quite heterogeneous geographically in size, composition and context, and may not fully represent exposure to the food obesogenic environments
- The reliability and validity of the area-level environmental variables used were not ascertained for the local context and therefore they may not be the most effective in explaining any variance in BMI.

INTRODUCTION

Obesity has been increasing in the Caribbean [1,2] and in Jamaica is now a major public health problem [3]. Over the past five decades a rapid increase in obesity has been reported with women having consistently higher rates than men [4-6]. The Jamaica Health and Lifestyle Survey 2008 (JHLS II) [3], has documented increased prevalence over the earlier 2001 survey (JHLS I) [7], in obesity as well as the comorbid Chronic Non-communicable Disease (NCD) conditions of diabetes mellitus (DM) and hypertension (HTN). Approximately 99 % of Jamaicans consumed below the daily recommended portions of fruits and vegetables and 30% of obese persons preferred fried protein in their diets [3].

The presence of supermarkets/markets has been thought to indicate better access to and intake of healthier foods, given its association with higher intake of fruit and vegetables [8] and inversely associated with obesity [9-11]. For example, among Canadian children residing in Toronto, those that lived in close proximity to a supermarket had decreased odds of being overweight or obese [12].

The presence of supermarkets has been shown to be inversely associated with neighbourhood SES in the US, whereby data have revealed greater poverty being associated with a decreased presence [13, 14]. With regards to sex differences, research by Wang et al [15] among 25 – 74 years old adults in California revealed that closer proximity to a supermarket and higher neighborhood density of small grocery stores were associated with higher BMI among women.

Fast food outlets (FFOs) have increased in many countries and thought to be associated with the global rise in obesity. Whilst there is no universally accepted agreement on what the definition of fast food is, most research include foods sold that are low cost, energy dense with high fat and/or sugar content and low nutrient content. Studies have found that frequent consumption of fast foods in areas with a high density of FFOs has been found to increase body weight [16,17] and a positive association of proximity to FFOs with measures of adiposity [18, 19].

The interaction between SES and the density of FFOs has also been investigated. In Australia it was found that persons with poor SES (based on median weekly income) had 2.5 times

1
2
3 exposure to FFOs than persons in the wealthiest SES category [20]. Similar associations have
4 been reported in the US [21, 22] and Great Britain [23]. In Europe, eating at restaurants (which
5 included eating at FFOs) was positively associated with BMI among men [24]. On the other hand,
6 in the US eating at FFOs was positively associated cross-sectionally with BMI among low- income
7 women [25].
8
9

10
11
12 The limited body of research on environment influences on the chronic NCDs in Jamaica
13 and the developing world, as well as the apparent lack of lifestyle changes despite health promotion
14 programs targeting individual-level prevention, suggests that barriers to these changes may yet be
15 unrecognized and accounted for in the traditional modelling of risk factors. The studies on obesity
16 previously referenced [3,4,6,7] have only assessed geographical variations according to the
17 dichotomized classification of urban/rural area of residence. Within the Caribbean and Latin
18 American regions, there are a limited number of studies assessing geographical variations in
19 obesity or other measures of adiposity such as mean BMI, using multilevel modelling (MLM)
20 statistical techniques and/or Geographic Information Systems (GIS) to determine whether there
21 are associations with the built environment in a middle-income country (MIC) or small island
22 developing state (SIDS) context [26-28].
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 The aim of this study was to provide a unique and important opportunity to address these
32 gaps in understanding the retail food environmental mechanisms influencing mean BMI in
33 Jamaica, a small island MIC. Our objective was to derive estimates of the associations between
34 measures of the retail food environments and mean BMI, using a combination of MLM and GIS-
35 based methods for contextualizing the national survey data and calculating objective community
36 exposures.
37
38
39
40

41 We hypothesized that: a) there was variability in the mean BMI across Jamaican
42 neighbourhoods, b) the pathway between greater presence/closer proximity to
43 supermarkets/markets, and lower mean BMI would be stronger for those of higher SES, c) the
44 pathway between greater presence/closer proximity to fast food outlets and greater mean BMI
45 would be stronger for those of low SES and residing in urban areas, and d) there would be sex
46 differences in these associations.
47
48
49
50
51

52 53 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

54 **Study design and sample**

55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The JHLS II was a cross-sectional, interviewer-administered, island wide survey over a 4-month
4 period between 2007 and 2008. The sample of 2848 15-74-year-olds represented approximately
5 70% of the predominantly (94%) Black Jamaican population [3]. A stratified random sample of
6 clusters known as Enumeration Districts (EDs) was selected using a probability proportionate to
7 the size of population of the parishes in the island in order to yield a nationally representative
8 sample. Trained interviewers administered a structured questionnaire on diseases and lifestyle
9 behaviours and performed anthropometry. Further details on the sampling technique are provided
10 elsewhere [3].
11
12
13
14
15
16

17 A total of 2529 (or 89% of) participants from the JHLS II dataset were geocoded out of the
18 original 2848 participants. Kreft [29] suggests a '30/30 rule' so that researchers should strive for a
19 sample of at least 30 groups with 30 individuals per group. For this study, each of the 101 EDs
20 (sampling units) had an average of 28 individuals, providing sufficient power for the proposed
21 secondary multilevel analyses. Furthermore, we also calculated power to detect a difference in
22 BMI from 2 to 10 units based on differences in food environment exposure, at alpha = 0.05 and
23 power of 80%, with a design effect employed ranging from an ICC of 2% to 10% and in all
24 scenarios our sample and number of groups were sufficient to detect this difference in BMI.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 **Patient and public involvement**

33
34 No patients were involved in the study. The study participants were community residents and were
35 not involved in the design, recruitment or the conduct of the study. The study findings will be
36 disseminated to the Ministry of Health, Jamaica and general public, including the study
37 participants.
38
39
40
41
42

43 **Measures**

44 *Individual-level measures*

45
46 The primary outcome was mean BMI, calculated as weight divided by height squared (kg/m^2).
47 Weight was measured using calibrated electronic scales (Tanita® models HD 314 or 2204) to 0.1
48 kg precision and height measured using a portable stadiometer (Seca®) to 0.1 cm precision.
49
50

51 Additional covariates included age, sex, educational attainment, occupation, urbanicity,
52 and perceived community safety, and were examined as potential confounders; sex and urbanicity
53 were also examined as effect modifiers, based on *a priori* theory. Named jobs were first
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 categorised using the Jamaica Standardised Occupational Classification codes for 1991 [30]
4 comprised of 16 categories. These were collapsed into four groups: a) highly skilled/professional
5 (Legislators, Senior Officials and managers, Professionals/ Technicians & Associate
6 Professionals, Clerks, Service Workers & Shop and Market Sales Workers), b) skilled (Skilled
7 Agricultural & Fishery Workers, Craft and Related Trade Workers, Plant and Machine Operators
8 & Assemblers, c) unskilled (Elementary Occupations) and d) unemployed/other (Armed Forces,
9 Retired, Unemployed, Housewife, Self-employed, Student and Unclassified).

15 Perception of community safety was determined by asking each participant how safe he or
16 she felt to walk in the community.

20 *Household-level measures*

21 The number of possessions owned (including but not exclusive to owning a radio, telephone,
22 refrigerator, television, computer or car ownership) was used as a proxy for SES [3] and
23 classification based on the following tertiles: 1st tertile = lower class = ≤ 6 items, 2nd tertile = middle
24 class = 7-9 items, 3rd tertile = upper class = 10-16 items. The tertile categorization was based on
25 the distribution of ownership of these items. SES, using this definition, was examined as a potential
26 confounder or effect modifier, based on *a priori* theory.

34 *Environment-level measures*

35 Each observation was linked, through a geocoded residential address, to neighbourhood level
36 proximity and density measures for supermarkets, markets and FFOs. Neighbourhood was defined
37 as the Enumeration District (ED). The final choices of environment-level measures for
38 investigation were based on a combination of previously derived GIS-based measures [31, 32],
39 documented associations seen with the outcome of interest [31, 33] and data availability.

44 The locations of supermarkets/markets (*Figure 1, Panel A*) and FFOs (*Figure 1, Panel B*)
45 were identified from Mona Geoinformatics Institute's (MonaGIS) proprietary JAMNAV database,
46 and were collected in 2009. The proximities and densities of supermarkets/markets and FFOs were
47 estimated using application of Spatial Analyst tool in ArcGIS to data from MonaGIS proprietary
48 JAMNAV database. Proximity of supermarkets and markets, combined to represent good sources
49 of fresh fruit and vegetable, was determined as the straight-line distance (km) from each geocoded
50 address to the closest supermarket or market. Two density variables were created. The first was
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59

1
2
3 supermarkets/markets per km², and the second density variable, the number of
4 supermarkets/markets per 1000 persons in the corresponding ED according to the 2011 census
5 from the Statistical Institute of Jamaica (STATIN) [34]. Buffer zones were set at 1 km to reflect a
6 short walking distance that could be completed in about 10-15 minutes [35].
7
8
9

10 FFOs were defined as places where high-caloric food could be obtained relatively quickly
11 and excluded traditional cook shops, snack shops and sit-down restaurants. Proximity and density
12 measures were created in a similar way as done for supermarkets/markets.
13
14

15 The above-mentioned retail food environments excluded informal food spaces (for e.g.
16 street vendors).
17
18
19

20 **Zero-inflated variables**

21 The absence of the environmental-level measure based on the participant's geocoded address was
22 indicated by a large proportion of zero values for most density measures as shown in the
23 Supplementary Table. New indicator variables (dummy variables) were subsequently created and
24 the specific dummy variable included in regression models alongside the original quantitative
25 forms of the respective retail food environmental-level explanatory variable. These dummy
26 variables are also referenced as the zero-inflated form of the density measures.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 **Missing variables**

35 Addresses for 11% of the JHLS II study participants could not be geocoded and contributed to
36 missing data in subsequent analyses. The age/sex population of the dataset used for this JHLS II
37 secondary analysis subsample was compared with that for the non-geocoded data and no key
38 deviations were observed.
39
40
41
42

43 Geocoded and non-geocoded (missing) participants were compared with respect to age,
44 sex, SES categories and the key outcome variables of mean BMI, mean WC and obesity, using
45 mixed effect models, regression models accounting for survey design and regression models that
46 ignored survey design. No associations were detected between the geocoded status (present or
47 missing) and these other variables. This data analysis was done only on geocoded data, on the
48 assumption that these participants were representative of the target population.
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 **Statistical Analyses**

1
2
3 A complex database was created that combined individual-level JHLS II data with contextual
4 environment-level data.
5

6 Descriptive data analysis estimated sex-specific and total survey-weighted means,
7 proportions and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) for the outcome, explanatory and confounding
8 variables as well as age-adjusted mean BMI and prevalence of poor fruit and vegetable intake, a
9 key cardiovascular disease (CVD) risk factor. Age-adjustment utilized direct standardization
10 across the strata identified as 10-year age bands with weights being survey-weighted population
11 proportions of the respective 10-year age groups, as estimated using the JHLS II data.
12
13
14
15
16

17 The adjusted Wald test and the Pearson's chi-squared test corrected for survey design were
18 used to determine whether, respectively, the age-adjusted and unadjusted estimates differed with
19 respect to sex.
20
21

22 Intraclass correlation coefficients (ICCs) from hierarchical models quantified the
23 proportion of variation in mean BMI potentially explainable at the ED level.
24

25 To determine and account for the effect of clustering at the neighbourhood level,
26 subsequent analyses used multilevel models based on EDs nested within parish and examined the
27 stratum-specific estimates of the effect of the environment variables on mean BMI with and
28 without adjustment for covariates. Strata were defined using the urbanicity, sex and SES variables
29 and stratum-specific multilevel models estimated if terms for interaction between the environment
30 and strata variables were statistically significant. The Akaike's Information Criterion (AIC)
31 statistic was used to determine the final best models. Collinearity assessed using Goodman and
32 Kruskal's gamma coefficient γ [36], was the basis for selection of models covariates. To assess the
33 chance of false positive errors, *P*-values from these models were compared with the Bonferroni
34 corrected significance level.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 All analyses were conducted using STATA, versions 12 and 14 (StataCorp LP, College
44 Station, Texas).
45
46
47

48 **Ethical Approval**

49 Ethical approval was received from the University of the West Indies/University Hospital
50 of the West Indies Ethics Research Committee.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

RESULTS

Sample characteristics

The weighted total and sex-specific summary statistics are shown in Table 1. Women had higher mean BMI than men and higher proportions in the highly skilled/professional, unskilled and unemployed categories and in both 1st and 2nd SES tertiles based on no. of possessions owned ($P < 0.001$). However, a greater proportion of men perceived their communities as unsafe (males = 86.29 %; 95% CI: 82.64, 89.94 vs. females = 80.38 %; 95% CI: 75.63, 85.13; $P < 0.012$). There were no sex differences in urbanicity nor among those who had not completed high school.

There was clustering in mean BMI across neighbourhoods in Jamaica, with an ICC of 4.16%, the proportion of the variance in mean BMI that can be accounted for by the neighbourhood level [29,37]. No associations were found between the retail food environment variables and mean BMI in unadjusted regression models. There was also no effect modification by urbanicity.

Sex-specific regression models

There was interaction between sex and the following variables in their relationship with mean BMI: supermarkets proximity ($P = 0.023$), absence of supermarkets within a 1 km buffer zone ($P = 0.008$) and fast food outlets proximity ($P = 0.031$). Figure 2 reveals that for women, in fully-adjusted models, a 10 km increase in distance from supermarkets (or further proximity) was associated with a 1.20 kg/m² higher mean BMI (95% CI 8.20 x10⁻³, 0.24; $P = 0.036$); the absence of supermarkets within a 1 km buffer zone was associated with a 1.36 kg/m² higher mean BMI (95% CI 0.20, 2.52; $P = 0.022$). Proximity to FFOs was not associated with mean BMI in any sex.

SES- tertile-specific regression models

There was interaction between SES of a participant and a few retail food environment variables in their relationship with mean BMI. These included supermarkets proximity ($P = 0.015$), absence of supermarkets/1000 people/ ED ($P = 0.033$) and fast food outlets proximity ($P = 0.045$). Figure 3 reveals that a kilometre increase in the distance from a supermarket was consistently associated with higher mean BMI for all models for persons within the middle class, with a 0.17 kg/m² higher

1
2
3 mean BMI (95% CI 0.03, 0.32; $P=0.020$) in the final model. Among persons in the upper class,
4 the absence of supermarkets/ 1000 people/ ED was associated with a 2.00 kg/m² higher mean BMI
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

Table 1. Total and sex-specific weighted sample characteristics (95% CI) for Jamaicans (JHLS II, 2008)

Variable	Men (n=796)	Women (n=1731)	Total (n=2527)	P value
Individual -level measures				
Mean Age in years (%)	37.00 (36.33, 37.13)	36.73 (36.64, 37.36)	36.87 (36.54, 37.20)	0.158
Urban Residence (%)	53.53 (43.84,62.28)	53.17 (45.11,61.74)	53.35 (44.87,61.64)	0.890
< High School Education (%)	31.75 (27.17, 36.33)	29.13 (25.69, 32.56)	30.43 (26.96, 33.90)	0.208
Occupation (%)				<0.0001
Highly skilled/Professional	38.87 (34.41, 43.34)	52.54 (49.02, 56.06)	45.73 (42.73, 48.72)	
Skilled	40.33 (35.19, 45.48)	8.21 (6.19, 10.23)	24.23 (21.29, 27.16)	
Unskilled	9.75 (6.66, 12.84)	18.13 (15.20, 21.06)	13.95 (11.33, 16.57)	
Unemployed/Other	11.05 (8.22, 13.88)	21.11 (18.17, 24.06)	16.10 (14.12, 18.07)	
Possessions owned (%)				<0.001
Lower class ≤ 6 items	34.09 (29.03, 39.14)	41.51 (37.45, 45.57)	37.82 (33.96, 41.68)	
Middle class 7-9 items	29.92 (25.99, 33.85)	31.17 (28.45, 33.89)	30.55 (27.89, 33.20)	
Upper class 10-16 items	36.00 (30.68, 41.31)	27.32 (22.99, 31.65)	31.63 (27.45, 35.82)	
Perception of unsafe community (%)	86.29 (82.64, 89.94)	80.38 (75.63, 85.13)	83.32 (79.77, 86.86)	0.012
Mean BMI [□] (kg/m ²)	24.83(24.28, 25.38)	28.40 (27.90, 28.89)	26.64 (26.21, 27.07)	<0.001
Neighbourhood -level measures [†]				
[Mean (95% CI)]				
Supermarkets [§] proximity (km)	3.61 (2.69, 4.54)	3.64 (2.78, 4.49)	3.63 (2.77, 4.48)	0.978
Supermarkets [§] / km ²	1.60 (0.84, 2.36)	1.57 (0.96, 2.19)	1.59 (0.91, 2.26)	0.895
Supermarkets [§] /1000 people/ ED	0.65 (0.27, 1.04)	0.63 (0.20, 1.07)	0.64 (0.26, 1.03)	0.922
FFO proximity (km)	4.56 (3.54, 5.58)	4.68(3.60, 5.76)	4.62 (3.62, 5.62)	0.747
FFO / km ²	0.57 (0.33, 0.81)	0.52 (0.32, 0.72)	0.55 (0.33, 0.76)	0.266
FFO / 1000 people/ ED	0.35 (0.10, 0.60)	0.21 (0.07, 0.35)	0.28 (0.10, 0.46)	0.104

[†] Age-adjusted

[§]Includes supermarkets and markets

CI – Confidence Interval; JHLS II, Jamaica Health and Lifestyle Survey II; BMI, Body Mass Index; ED – Enumeration District; FFO - Fast Food Outlets

P values for difference between means (men versus women)

(95% CI 0.08, 3.92; $P=0.041$) only in age-adjusted models. Proximity to FFOs was not associated with mean BMI in any of the SES classes.

DISCUSSION

This study is the first to examine the impact of the retail food environment on obesity-related outcomes in a small Caribbean island. While we observed no significant associations between the retail food environment variables and mean BMI in unadjusted regression models, results revealed significant sex differences in the impact of the food environment, particularly for supermarkets. The further distance away from supermarkets and markets, and their absence within a 1 km buffer zone from residences, were associated with higher mean BMI in women; and further proximity to supermarkets associated with higher mean BMI for the middle class. There was no association with proximity to or density of FFOs, nor urban-rural differences.

We also observed clustering of BMI at the community level, with approximately 4.0% of the variance in mean BMI potentially explainable by environmental influences outside of the individual or at the neighbourhood level. This is similar to those reported by Harrington et al in a Canadian sample [38] and by Masood and Reidpath [39] for many of the countries that participated in the 2003 World Health Survey. It is also similar to ICC by neighborhood seen for obesity-related outcomes among adolescents in the U.S. as part of the National Health and Nutrition Survey (NHANES) [40].

Our study findings corroborate previous research conducted in developed countries that indicate closer proximity to supermarkets/markets [12, 19, 20] and increased density of supermarkets/markets [9-11, 16, 41, 42] are associated with less obesity-related outcomes in adults and children. Of note however, Wang and colleagues found higher neighbourhood density of small grocery stores associated with higher BMI among a sample of US women [15], while our study found higher BMI for women being associated with further distance from supermarkets/markets (inclusive of small grocery stores). There are potential explanations for this sex-specific difference as some studies have found that residential environments have a greater effect on women's health [43]. For example, women as primary food providers may depend more on neighbourhood sources for food than men do, which may in turn have an effect on their health outcomes, such as BMI. However, the influence of gender specific roles in the provision of food supplies for families was

1
2
3 not the focus of our study and so additional studies would be needed to better understand the
4 differences observed. Although the geographic variables are somewhat dissimilar (a density
5 versus proximity measure), the difference in direction of the associations raises the question as to
6 whether presence of grocery stores, supermarkets and markets across different geographical
7 contexts, including small island states like Jamaica, each represent the same degree of
8 accessibility, availability and ultimate consumption of healthy foods. For example, we found no
9 urban-rural differences as hypothesized, perhaps due to Physical Activity Levels (PALs), diet or
10 some other unknown confounder masking the association. For example, it is quite possible that
11 the presence or absence of supplementary food sources, utilized in rural communities and not
12 captured in the environmental-level variables used in our study, for e.g. small produce plots or
13 seasonal vegetable/fruits that supplement diets, may have played a role in the lack of urban-rural
14 differences seen.

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24 Living a greater distance away from supermarkets/markets was positively associated with
25 mean BMI in the middle class in our study, however many other studies found this association in
26 the lower class [44]. We are unclear as to the reasons for the association observed among the
27 middle-class participants. We surmise this could possibly be due to the influence of shopping
28 preferences in terms of location. For example, a study conducted in low income neighbourhoods
29 in Philadelphia USA found that many residents did most of their shopping outside of the
30 neighbourhood [45]. Other possible influences could be cost, types of food purchased, or lower
31 PALs in this group, the latter perhaps being influenced by car ownership and/or greater use of
32 motorized transport. Inagami et al [46] found in a study conducted in the Los Angeles area of
33 California, USA that BMI was higher a) where persons frequented grocery stores located in more
34 disadvantaged neighbourhoods, which usually have higher availability of relatively inexpensive,
35 energy-dense foods and b) among those who owned cars and travelled farther to their grocery
36 stores. However, other studies reveal inconsistencies, with mixed findings across various
37 neighbourhood food retail contexts which may be due to the heterogeneity in defining
38 neighbourhoods using socioeconomic status [47,48] and methodological limitations in measuring
39 the interrelatedness of neighbourhood residence, determinants of purchasing choices within and
40 outside of the residential neighbourhood and issues such as dietary preferences [49].
41 In our study, PAL, motorized transport and diet were not adjusted for in the regression models.
42 These omissions may have suppressed associations.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 It is also unclear why associations between FFO proximity and mean BMI were neither
4 seen in the sex-specific nor SES-specific models. This may be an indication that demonstration of
5 associations may depend on which obesogenic retail food environment variable or outcome
6 measure of adiposity is chosen for the regression models. For example, Menke et al in analysing
7 the 3rd US National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey conducted, found that waist
8 circumference maintained a stronger association with CVD risk factors than the other measures of
9 adiposity [50]. Further work is needed on assessing the quality and utility of the measures used in
10 this study as well as the development of new ones for the Jamaican and developing world context.

11
12
13
14
15
16
17 The major strength of this study is that it represents pioneering work in a small island
18 developing country context. We linked individually geocoded addresses from a nationally
19 representative survey, with specific objective GIS-based retail food environment measures and
20 provided empirical evidence using MLM to explore the association between objective
21 neighbourhood-level retail food environment measures and BMI. Additionally, the sample
22 characteristics that differed significantly with sex, were also included as covariates in the final
23 models in order to minimize over or underestimation of the true strength of the associations
24 detected between the neighbourhood food retail environment measures and BMI.

25
26
27
28
29
30
31 Despite strengths, there are limitations that deserve mention, including the inability to
32 make causal inferences given the cross-sectional design of the JHLS II and our definition of
33 neighbourhood. Using EDs to represent a Jamaican neighbourhood could be deemed inadequate
34 as they i) are quite heterogeneous geographically in size, composition and context, and ii) may not
35 fully represent exposure to the obesogenic environments being investigated. Additionally,
36 although the outcome was objectively assessed, the risk factors included self-reported data on a
37 single individual representing a household, which may introduce information bias. Furthermore,
38 there was temporal mismatch of the data collected from individual JHLS II participants with that
39 for the retail food environment-level variables, most of which were collected by MonaGIS in and
40 after the year 2009, subsequent to the end of data collection for the JHLS II in 2008. This may
41 have biased the results as individual exposures may have varied after the survey period, although
42 food consumption behaviours are believed to be relatively stable over time. Lastly, the reliability
43 and validity of the area-level environmental variables were untested locally and therefore
44 uncertainty remains as to whether they were most effective in explaining any variance in the
45 obesity-related outcomes. For example, a study conducted in a low-income neighborhood in Spain

1
2
3 found a mismatch between GIS-based measures of the food environment and resident's
4 perceptions of the environment [51]. Another challenge faced in Jamaica with accurately
5 characterizing the neighbourhood retail food environment relates to the presence of and patronage
6 of the foods provided by many itinerant vendors which are often energy-dense foods. The use of
7 mixed-methods approaches in future research within small island developing states similar to
8 Jamaica, may improve understanding on the associations with observed health-related behaviours
9 such as food purchases (cost and locations) and dietary choices with BMI.
10
11
12
13
14

15 In conclusion, we found that further distance away from supermarkets and markets and
16 their absence within a 1 km buffer zone from residences were associated with higher mean BMI,
17 with important sex and social class differences. There has been an increase in the prevalence of
18 obesity in Jamaica [3] despite the implementation of policies and programmes to ameliorate its
19 impact on the continuum towards NCDs [52]. Higher mean BMI in Jamaicans may be partially
20 explained by the presence of supermarkets and markets and differ by sex and social class. National
21 efforts to curtail obesity in SIDS, like Jamaica should consider the inclusion of interventions and
22 future studies focused at the neighbourhood-level that not only target the location and density of
23 supermarkets and markets but also those that consider sex and social class-specific factors that
24 maybe influencing the associations.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 STATEMENTS

35
36
37
38 **Contributors** CC-M and KT conceived the study. LG and PL-A geocoded the data. CC-M, NY-
39 C and KT analysed and interpreted the data. RW supervised the research. CC-M wrote the
40 manuscript. PL-A, KT and RW edited the manuscript. All authors provided critical intellectual
41 contributions and read and approved the final manuscript.
42
43
44
45

46 **Funding** This secondary analysis research received no specific grant from any funding agency in
47 the public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.
48
49
50

51 **Competing interests** None declared.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Ethics approval The University of the West Indies/University Hospital of the West Indies Ethics Research Committee ECP 169, 14/15

Provenance and peer review Not commissioned; externally peer reviewed.

Data sharing statement No additional data are available.

REFERENCES

1. Caribbean Commission on Health and Development. Report of the Caribbean Commission on Health and Development pgs 37-42: Ian Randle Publishers; 2006. http://www.who.int/macrohealth/action/PAHO_Report.pdf?ua=1. Accessed 28 Nov 2014.
2. Henry FJ. Obesity prevention: the key to non-communicable disease control. *West Indian Med J* 2011;60(4):446-51.
3. Wilks R, Younger N, Tulloch-Reid M, McFarlane S, Francis D. Jamaica Health and Lifestyle Survey 2007-8. 2008. http://www.mona.uwi.edu/reports/health/jhlsii_final_may09.pdf Accessed 1 February 2015.
4. Ashcroft MT, Ling J, Lovell HG, Miall WE. Heights and weights of adults in rural and urban areas of Jamaica. *Br J Prev Soc Med* 1966;20(1):22-6.
5. Rotimi CN, Cooper RS, Ataman SL, Osotimehin B, Kadir S, Muna W, et al. Distribution of anthropometric variables and the prevalence of obesity in populations of West African origin: the International Collaborative Study on Hypertension in Blacks (ICSHIB). *Obes Res* 1995;3(S2):95s-105s.
6. Wilks R, Rotimi C, Bennett F, McFarlane-Anderson N, Kaufman J, Anderson S, et al. Diabetes in the Caribbean: results of a population survey from Spanish Town, Jamaica. *Diab Med* 1999;16(10):875-83.
7. Wilks R, Zohoori N, Ashley D, Figueroa P. The Jamaican Healthy Lifestyle Survey: Ministry of Health Jamaica. 2000.
8. Morland K, Wing S, Roux AD. The contextual effect of the local food environment on residents' diets: The Atherosclerosis Risk in Communities Study. *Am J Public Health* 2002;92(11):1761.

- 1
2
3 9. Jilcott SB, Keyserling T, Crawford T, McGuirt JT, Ammerman AS. Examining
4 associations among obesity and per capita farmers' markets, grocery stores/supermarkets, and
5 supercenters in US counties. *J Am Diet Assoc* 2011;111(4):567-72.
- 6
7
8 10. Morland K, Roux AV, Wing S. Supermarkets, other food stores, and obesity: The
9 Atherosclerosis Risk in Communities Study. *Am J Prev Med* 2006;30(4):333-9.
- 10
11 11. Rundle A, Neckerman KM, Freeman L, Lovasi GS, Purciel M, Quinn J, et al.
12 Neighborhood food environment and walkability predict obesity in New York City. *Environ*
13 *Health Perspect* 2009;117(3):442.
- 14
15 12. Larsen K, Cook B, Stone MR, Faulkner GE. Food access and children's BMI in Toronto,
16 Ontario: assessing how the food environment relates to overweight and obesity. *Int J Public Health*
17 2015;60(1):69-77.
- 18
19 13. Bower KM, Thorpe RJ, Jr., Rohde C, Gaskin DJ. The intersection of neighborhood racial
20 segregation, poverty, and urbanicity and its impact on food store availability in the United States.
21 *Prev Med* 2014;58:33-9.
- 22
23 14. Moore LV, Diez Roux AV. Associations of neighborhood characteristics with the location
24 and type of food stores. *Am J Public Health* 2006;96(2):325-31.
- 25
26 15. Wang MC, Kim S, Gonzalez AA, MacLeod KE, Winkleby MA. Socioeconomic and
27 food-related physical characteristics of the neighborhood environment are associated with body
28 mass index. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2007;61(6):491-8.
- 29
30 16. Li F, Harmer P, Cardinal BJ, Bosworth M, Johnson-Shelton D, Moore JM, et al. Built
31 environment and 1-year change in weight and waist circumference in middle-aged and older
32 adults: Portland Neighborhood Environment and Health Study. *Am J Epidemiol*. 2009;169(4):401-
33 8.
- 34
35 17. Nago ES, Lachat CK, Dossa RA, Kolsteren PW. Association of out-of-home eating with
36 anthropometric changes: a systematic review of prospective studies. *Crit Rev Food Sci Nutr*
37 2014;54(9):1103-16.
- 38
39 18. Reitzel LR, Regan SD, Nguyen N, Cromley EK, Strong LL, Wetter DW, et al. Density and
40 proximity of fast food restaurants and body mass index among African Americans. *Am J Public*
41 *Health* 2014;104(1):110-6.
- 42
43 19. Davis B, Carpenter C. Proximity of fast-food restaurants to schools and adolescent obesity.
44 *Am J Public Health* 2009;99(3):505-10.
- 45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 20. Reidpath DD, Burns C, Garrard J, Mahoney M, Townsend M. An ecological study of the
4 relationship between social and environmental determinants of obesity. *Health Place*
5 200;8(2):141-5.
6
7
- 8 21. Maddock J. The relationship between obesity and the prevalence of fast-food restaurants:
9 state-level analysis. *Am J Health Promot* 2004;19:137–43.
10
- 11 22. Lewis LB, Sloane DC, Nascimento LM et al. African-American's' access to healthy food
12 options in South Los Angeles Restaurants. *Am J Pub Health* 2005;95:668–73.
13
- 14 23. Cummins S, McKay L, Macintyre S. McDonald's Restaurants and neighbourhood
15 deprivation in Scotland & England. *Am J Prev Med* 2005;4:308–10.
16
- 17 24. Naska A, Orfanos P, Trichopoulou A, May AM, Overvad K, Jakobsen MU, et al. Eating
18 out, weight and weight gain. A cross-sectional and prospective analysis in the context of the EPIC-
19 PANACEA study. *Int J Obes (Lond)* 2011 Mar;35(3):416.
20
- 21 25. Jeffery RW, French SA. Epidemic obesity in the United States: are fast foods and television
22 viewing contributing? *Am J Public Health* 1998; 88 (2): 277–280.
23
- 24 26. Cunningham-Myrie CA, Mabile E, Govia I, Younger NO, Tulloch-Reid MK, McFarlane
25 S, et al. Neighbourhood characteristics and cumulative biological risk: evidence from the Jamaica
26 Health and Lifestyle Survey 2008: a cross-sectional study. *BMJ Open* 2018 Dec 1;8(12):e021952.
27
- 28 27. Jaime PC, Duran AC, Sarti FM, Lock K. Investigating environmental determinants of diet,
29 physical activity, and overweight among adults in Sao Paulo, Brazil. *J Urban Health* 2011 Jun
30 1;88(3):567-81.
31
- 32 28. Mendes LL, Nogueira H, Padez C, Ferrao M, Velasquez-Melendez G. Individual and
33 environmental factors associated for overweight in urban population of Brazil. *BMC Public*
34 *Health*. 2013 Dec;13(1):988.
35
- 36 29. Kreft I, De Leeuw J. *Introducing multilevel modeling* London: Sage; 1998.
37
- 38 30. The Statistical Institute of Jamaica (STATIN) (1991) *Jamaica Standard Occupational*
39 *Classification*. Statistical Institute of Jamaica, Kingston.
40
- 41 31. Prince SA, Kristjansson EA, Russell K, Billette JM, Sawada M, Ali A, et al. A multilevel
42 analysis of neighborhood built and social environments and adult self-reported physical activity
43 and body mass index in Ottawa, Canada. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2011;8(10):3953-78.
44
- 45 32. Brownson RC, Hoehner CM, Day K, Forsyth A, Sallis JF. Measuring the built environment
46 for physical activity: state of the science. *Am J Prev Med* 2009;36(4):S99-S123. e12.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 33. Prince SA, Kristjansson EA, Russell K, Billette JM, Sawada MC, Ali A, et al. Relationships
4 between neighborhoods, physical activity, and obesity: a multilevel analysis of a large Canadian
5 city. *Obesity* 2012;20(10):2093-100.
6
7
- 8 34. The Statistical Institute of Jamaica (STATIN). 2011 Census of Population and Housing -
9 Jamaica. <http://statinja.gov.jm/Census/PopCensus/Popcensus2011Index.aspx> Accessed 1 Apr
10 2016.
11
12
- 13 35. Titheridge H, Hall P. Changing travel to work patterns in South East England. *J Transp*
14 *Geogr* 2006 Jan 1;14(1):60-75.
15
16
- 17 36. Goodman and Kruskal's gamma. In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia.
18 [https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Goodman_and_Kruskal%27s_gamma&oldid=722481](https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Goodman_and_Kruskal%27s_gamma&oldid=722481108)
19 108 2016. Accessed 28 May 2016.
20
21
- 22 37. Bryk, A.S. and Raudenbush, S.W. (1992) Hierarchical linear models (applications and data
23 analysis methods). Sage Publications, New York; 1992
24
- 25 38. Harrington DW, Elliott SJ. Weighing the importance of neighborhood: a multilevel
26 exploration of the determinants of overweight and obesity. *Soc Sci Med* 2009;68(4):593-600.
27
28
- 29 39. Masood M, Reidpath DD. Intraclass correlation and design effect in BMI, physical activity
30 and diet: a cross-sectional study of 56 countries. *BMJ Open* 2016;6(1):e008173.
31
32
- 33 40. Theall KP, Drury SS, and Shirtcliff EA. Cumulative neighborhood risk of psychosocial
34 stress and allostatic load in adolescents. *Am J Epidemiol* 176.suppl_7 (2012): S164-S174.
35
36
- 37 41. Lamichhane AP, Puett R, Porter DE, Bottai M, Mayer-Davis EJ, Liese AD. Associations
38 of built food environment with body mass index and waist circumference among youth with
39 diabetes. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act* 2012;9:81.
40
41
- 42 42. Burgoine T, Forouhi NG, Griffin SJ, Wareham NJ, Monsivais P. Associations between
43 exposure to takeaway food outlets, takeaway food consumption, and body weight in
44 Cambridgeshire, UK: population based, cross sectional study. *BMJ* 2014; Mar13:348:g1464.
45
46
- 47 43. Stafford M, Cummins S, Macintyre S, et al. Gender differences in the associations between
48 health and neighbourhood environment. *Soc Sci Med* 2005;60:1681-92.
49
50
- 51 44. Black JL, Macinko J. Neighborhoods and obesity. *Nutr Rev* 2008;66(1):2-20.
52
53
- 54 45. Hillier A, Cannuscio C, Karpyn A. How far do low-income parents travel to shop for food?
55 Empirical evidence from two urban neighborhoods. *Urban Geogr* 2011; 32: 712-729.
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
46. Inagami S, Cohen DA, Finch BK, Asch SM. You are where you shop: grocery store locations, weight, and neighborhoods. *Am J Prev Med* 2006;31(1):10-7.
 47. Odoms-Young A, Singleton CR, Springfield S, McNabb L, Thompson T. Retail environments as a venue for obesity prevention. *Curr Obes Rep* 2016 Jun 1;5(2):184-91.
 48. Gordon-Larsen P. Food availability/convenience and obesity. *Adv Nutr* 2014 Nov 3;5(6):809-17.
 49. Mhurchu Ni Mhurchu C, Vandevijvere S, Waterlander W, Thornton LE, Kelly B, Cameron AJ, et al. Monitoring the availability of healthy and unhealthy foods and non-alcoholic beverages in community and consumer retail food environments globally. *Obes Rev* 2013 Oct;14:108-19.
 50. Menke A, Muntner P, Wildman RP, Reynolds K, Jiang H. Measures of Adiposity and Cardiovascular Disease Risk Factors. *Obesity (Silver Spring)* 2007;15(3):785.
 51. Díez J, Valiente R, Ramos C, García R, Gittelsohn J, Franco M. The mismatch between observational measures and residents' perspectives on the retail food environment: A mixed-methods approach in the Heart Healthy Hoods study. *Public Health Nutr* 2017 Nov;20(16):2970-9.
 52. The National Health Fund Act 2003 [cited 2010 May 26]. Available from: <http://www.moh.gov.jm/laws/statutes>.

53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Figure 1. Spatial Distribution of Supermarket/markets (A) and Fast Food Outlets in Jamaica (B)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

Figure 2. Sex-specific unadjusted and adjusted β Coefficients for the association of retail food environments with mean Body Mass Index

1
2
3 † Dummy variable for zero inflated predictor

4 CI – Confidence Interval

5 Model 1 - unadjusted

6 Model 2 - age adjusted

7 Model 3 - adjusted for age and no. of possessions

8 Model 4 - adjusted for age, no. of possessions, urban, occupation, education, perception of
9 unsafe community

10 *p < 0.05
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 **Figure 3.** SES-specific unadjusted and adjusted β Coefficients for the association of retail food
52 environments with mean Body Mass Index
53

54 CI – Confidence Interval; ED – Enumeration District
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 † Dummy variable for zero inflated predictor

4 Model 1 - unadjusted


5 Model 2 - age adjusted

6 Model 3 - adjusted for age and sex

7 Model 4 - adjusted for age, sex, urban, occupation, education, perception of unsafe community


8 *p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




104x103mm (300 x 300 DPI)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60



73x155mm (300 x 300 DPI)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60



211x441mm (96 x 96 DPI)

Supplementary Table. Proportion of zero-valued observations for geographic variables

Retail Food Environments	Frequency (%)
	N=2527
Supermarkets/markets proximity (km)	0
Supermarkets/markets / km ²	61.30
Supermarkets/markets /1000 people/ ED	92.13
FFO proximity (km)	0
FFO / km ²	68.22
FFO / 1000 people/ ED	94.46

ED – Enumeration District; FFO - Fast Food Outlets

STROBE Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of *cross-sectional studies*

	Item No	Recommendation
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract [Within the title page 1 and methods section of the abstract page 2] (b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found [See methods and results sections of abstract page 2]
Introduction		
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported [pages 4-5]
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses [page 5]
Methods		
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper [page 5-6]
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection [pages 6-8]
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants [pages 5- 6]
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. [pages 6-9] Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable [N/A]
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group [pages 6-9]
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias [pages 5-6, 8-9]
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at [page 5-6]
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why [pages 8-9]
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding [pages 8-9] (b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions [page 9] (c) Explain how missing data were addressed [page 8] (d) If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy [page 9] (e) Describe any sensitivity analyses [N/A]
Results		
Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed [N/A] (b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage [N/A] (c) Consider use of a flow diagram [N/A]
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders [page 9; Table 1] (b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest [N/A]
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures [page 9; Table 1]

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). [pages 9-10; Figures 2-3] Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included [page 6, Figures 2-3] (b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized [page 10, Table 1] (c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period [N/A]
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses [pages 9-10]
Discussion		
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives [page 10]
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias [page 13]
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence [pages 12-13]
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results [page 13]
Other information		
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based [page 14]

*Give information separately for exposed and unexposed groups.

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.

BMJ Open

Understanding neighbourhood retail food environmental mechanisms influencing BMI in the Caribbean: a multilevel analysis from the Jamaica Health and Lifestyle Survey: a cross-sectional study

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2019-033839.R2
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	25-May-2020
Complete List of Authors:	Cunningham-Myrie, Colette; University of the West Indies at Mona Faculty of Medical Sciences, Community Health and Psychiatry Younger, Novie; University of the West Indies, Caribbean Institute for Health Research Theall, Katherine; Tulane University, Global Community Health and Behavioral Sciences Greene, Lisa-Gaye; University of the West Indies at Mona, Mona GeoInformatics Institute Lyew-Ayee, Parris; University of the West Indies, Mona GeoInformatics Institute Wilks, Rainford; University of the West Indies, Caribbean Institute for Health Research
Primary Subject Heading:	Epidemiology
Secondary Subject Heading:	Public health
Keywords:	EPIDEMIOLOGY, NUTRITION & DIETETICS, PUBLIC HEALTH, DIABETES & ENDOCRINOLOGY

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts



I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our [licence](#).

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which [Creative Commons](#) licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

1
2
3 **Understanding neighbourhood retail food environmental mechanisms influencing BMI in**
4 **the Caribbean: a multilevel analysis from the Jamaica Health and Lifestyle Survey: a cross-**
5 **sectional study**
6
7
8

9
10 Colette Andrea Cunningham-Myrie ^{1*}, Novie O. Younger ², Katherine P. Theall ³, Lisa-Gaye
11 Greene ⁴, Parris Lyew-Ayee ⁴, Rainford J. Wilks ²
12
13

14
15 ¹ Department of Community Health and Psychiatry, University of the West Indies, Mona,
16 Jamaica
17

18 ² Caribbean Institute for Health Research, University of the West Indies, Mona, Jamaica
19

20 ³ Department of Global Community Health and Behavioral Sciences, School of Public Health
21 and Tropical Medicine, Tulane University, USA
22

23 ⁴ Mona GeoInformatics Institute, University of the West Indies, Mona, Jamaica
24
25
26
27
28

29 ***Corresponding author:**

30 Colette Cunningham-Myrie

31 Department of Community Health & Psychiatry

32 3 Gibraltar Camp Way

33 The University of the West Indies

34 Kingston 7, Jamaica, WI

35 Tel (876) 927 2476

36 Fax (876) 977 6346

37 E-mail: colette.cunninghammyrie@uwimona.edu.jm
38
39
40
41
42

43
44
45
46
47 **Word count:** 3845 words
48
49

50
51 **Key words:** Body mass index, retail food environment, neighbourhood, geocoding, multilevel
52 modelling, developing country.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

ABSTRACT

Objective To derive estimates of the associations between measures of the retail food environments and mean Body Mass Index (BMI) in Jamaica, a middle-income country with increasing prevalence of obesity.

Design Cross-sectional study

Setting Data from the Jamaica Health and Lifestyle Survey 2008 (JHLS II) a nationally representative population-based survey that recruited persons at their homes over a four-month period from all 14 parishes and 113 neighbourhoods defined as Enumeration Districts (EDs).

Participants A subsample of 2529 participants aged 18-74 years from the JHLS II who completed interviewer administered surveys, provided anthropometric measurements and whose addresses were geocoded.

Primary outcome measure Mean BMI, calculated as weight divided by height squared (kg/m^2)

Results There was significant clustering across neighbourhoods for mean BMI (Intraclass correlation coefficients = 4.16%). Fully adjusted models revealed higher mean BMI among women, with further distance away from supermarkets ($\beta = 0.12$; 95% CI = 8.20×10^{-3} , 0.24; $P = 0.036$) and the absence of supermarkets within a 1 km buffer zone ($\beta = 1.36$; 95% CI 0.20, 2.52; $P = 0.022$). A 10km increase in the distance from a supermarket was associated with a 1.7 kg/m^2 higher mean BMI (95% CI 0.03, 0.32; $P = 0.020$) in the middle class. No associations were detected with Fast Food Outlets or interaction by urbanicity.

Conclusions Higher mean BMI in Jamaicans may be partially explained by the presence of supermarkets and markets and differ by sex and social class. National efforts to curtail obesity in middle-income countries should consider interventions focused at the neighbourhood-level that not only target the location and density of supermarkets and markets but also consider sex and social class-specific factors that maybe influencing the associations.

Strengths and limitations of this study

- This study is the first in a Caribbean island to demonstrate the influence of the retail food environment on Body Mass Index (BMI) using geocoded data and multilevel modelling.
- This study provided a large sample size representative of Jamaicans 15 to 74 years.
- Individual geocoded addresses from a nationally representative survey were linked with specific objective GIS-based retail food environmental measures.
- Enumeration Districts (EDs) were used to define Jamaican neighbourhoods which are quite heterogeneous geographically in size, composition and context, and may not fully represent exposure to the food obesogenic environments
- The reliability and validity of the area-level environmental variables used were not ascertained for the local context and therefore they may not be the most effective in explaining any variance in BMI.

INTRODUCTION

Obesity has been increasing in the Caribbean [1,2] and in Jamaica is now a major public health problem [3]. Over the past five decades a rapid increase in obesity has been reported with women having consistently higher rates than men [4-6]. The Jamaica Health and Lifestyle Survey 2008 (JHLS II) [3], has documented increased prevalence over the earlier 2001 survey (JHLS I) [7], in obesity as well as the comorbid Chronic Non-communicable Disease (NCD) conditions of diabetes mellitus (DM) and hypertension (HTN). Approximately 99 % of Jamaicans consumed below the daily recommended portions of fruits and vegetables and 30% of obese persons preferred fried protein in their diets [3].

The presence of supermarkets/markets has been thought to indicate better access to and intake of healthier foods, given its association with higher intake of fruit and vegetables [8] and inversely associated with obesity [9-11]. For example, among Canadian children residing in Toronto, those that lived in close proximity to a supermarket had decreased odds of being overweight or obese [12].

The presence of supermarkets has been shown to be inversely associated with neighbourhood SES in the US, whereby data have revealed greater poverty being associated with a decreased presence [13, 14]. With regards to sex differences, research by Wang et al [15] among 25 – 74 years old adults in California revealed that closer proximity to a supermarket and higher neighborhood density of small grocery stores were associated with higher BMI among women.

Fast food outlets (FFOs) have increased in many countries and thought to be associated with the global rise in obesity. Whilst there is no universally accepted agreement on what the definition of fast food is, most research include foods sold that are low cost, energy dense with high fat and/or sugar content and low nutrient content. Studies have found that frequent consumption of fast foods in areas with a high density of FFOs has been found to increase body weight [16,17] and a positive association of proximity to FFOs with measures of adiposity [18, 19].

The interaction between SES and the density of FFOs has also been investigated. In Australia it was found that persons with poor SES (based on median weekly income) had 2.5 times exposure to FFOs than persons in the wealthiest SES category [20]. Similar associations have been reported in the US [21, 22] and Great Britain [23]. In Europe, eating at restaurants (which

1
2
3 included eating at FFOs) was positively associated with BMI among men [24]. On the other hand,
4 in the US eating at FFOs was positively associated cross-sectionally with BMI among low- income
5 women [25].
6
7

8 The limited body of research on environment influences on the chronic NCDs in Jamaica
9 and the developing world, as well as the apparent lack of lifestyle changes despite health promotion
10 programs targeting individual-level prevention, suggests that barriers to these changes may yet be
11 unrecognized and accounted for in the traditional modelling of risk factors. The studies on obesity
12 previously referenced [3,4,6,7] have only assessed geographical variations according to the
13 dichotomized classification of urban/rural area of residence. Within the Caribbean and Latin
14 American regions, there are a limited number of studies assessing geographical variations in
15 obesity or other measures of adiposity such as mean BMI, using multilevel modelling (MLM)
16 statistical techniques and/or Geographic Information Systems (GIS) to determine whether there
17 are associations with the built environment in a middle-income country (MIC) or small island
18 developing state (SIDS) context [26-28].
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 The aim of this study was to provide a unique and important opportunity to address these
28 gaps in understanding the retail food environmental mechanisms influencing mean BMI in
29 Jamaica, a small island MIC. Our objective was to derive estimates of the associations between
30 measures of the retail food environments and mean BMI, using a combination of MLM and GIS-
31 based methods for contextualizing the national survey data and calculating objective community
32 exposures.
33
34
35
36
37

38 We hypothesized that: a) there was variability in the mean BMI across Jamaican
39 neighbourhoods, b) the pathway between greater presence/closer proximity to
40 supermarkets/markets, and lower mean BMI would be stronger for those of higher SES, c) the
41 pathway between greater presence/closer proximity to fast food outlets and greater mean BMI
42 would be stronger for those of low SES and residing in urban areas, and d) there would be sex
43 differences in these associations.
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

51 **Study design and sample**

52 The JHLS II was a cross-sectional, interviewer-administered, island wide survey over a 4-month
53 period between 2007 and 2008. The sample of 2848 15-74-year-olds represented approximately
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 70% of the predominantly (94%) Black Jamaican population [3]. A stratified random sample of
4 clusters known as Enumeration Districts (EDs) was selected using a probability proportionate to
5 the size of population of the parishes in the island in order to yield a nationally representative
6 sample. Trained interviewers administered a structured questionnaire on diseases and lifestyle
7 behaviours and performed anthropometry. Further details on the sampling technique are provided
8 elsewhere [3].
9

10 A total of 2529 (or 89% of) participants from the JHLS II dataset were geocoded out of the
11 original 2848 participants. Kreft [29] suggests a '30/30 rule' so that researchers should strive for a
12 sample of at least 30 groups with 30 individuals per group. For this study, each of the 101 EDs
13 (sampling units) had an average of 28 individuals, providing sufficient power for the proposed
14 secondary multilevel analyses. Furthermore, we also calculated power to detect a difference in
15 BMI from 2 to 10 units based on differences in food environment exposure, at $\alpha = 0.05$ and
16 power of 80%, with a design effect employed ranging from an ICC of 2% to 10% and in all
17 scenarios our sample and number of groups were sufficient to detect this difference in BMI.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 **Patient and public involvement**

30 No patients were involved in the study. The study participants were community residents and were
31 not involved in the design, recruitment or the conduct of the study. The study findings will be
32 disseminated to the Ministry of Health, Jamaica and general public, including the study
33 participants.
34
35
36
37
38

39 **Measures**

40 *Individual-level measures*

41 The primary outcome was mean BMI, calculated as weight divided by height squared (kg/m^2).
42 Weight was measured using calibrated electronic scales (Tanita® models HD 314 or 2204) to 0.1
43 kg precision and height measured using a portable stadiometer (Seca®) to 0.1 cm precision.
44
45
46
47

48 Additional covariates included age, sex, educational attainment, occupation, urbanicity,
49 and perceived community safety, and were examined as potential confounders; sex and urbanicity
50 were also examined as effect modifiers, based on *a priori* theory. Named jobs were first
51 categorised using the Jamaica Standardised Occupational Classification codes for 1991 [30]
52 comprised of 16 categories. These were collapsed into four groups: a) highly skilled/professional
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 (Legislators, Senior Officials and managers, Professionals/ Technicians & Associate
4 Professionals, Clerks, Service Workers & Shop and Market Sales Workers), b) skilled (Skilled
5 Agricultural & Fishery Workers, Craft and Related Trade Workers, Plant and Machine Operators
6 & Assemblers, c) unskilled (Elementary Occupations) and d) unemployed/other (Armed Forces,
7 Retired, Unemployed, Housewife, Self-employed, Student and Unclassified).

8
9
10
11
12 Perception of community safety was determined by asking each participant how safe he or
13 she felt to walk in the community.

14 15 16 17 *Household-level measures*

18 The number of possessions owned (including but not exclusive to owning a radio, telephone,
19 refrigerator, television, computer or car ownership) was used as a proxy for SES [3] and
20 classification based on the following tertiles: 1st tertile = lower class = ≤ 6 items, 2nd tertile = middle
21 class = 7-9 items, 3rd tertile = upper class = 10-16 items. The tertile categorization was based on
22 the distribution of ownership of these items. SES, using this definition, was examined as a potential
23 confounder or effect modifier, based on *a priori* theory.

24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 *Environment-level measures*

32 Each observation was linked, through a geocoded residential address, to neighbourhood level
33 proximity and density measures for supermarkets, markets and FFOs. Neighbourhood was defined
34 as the Enumeration District (ED). The final choices of environment-level measures for
35 investigation were based on a combination of previously derived GIS-based measures [31, 32],
36 documented associations seen with the outcome of interest [31, 33] and data availability.

37
38
39
40
41 The locations of supermarkets/markets (*Figure 1, Panel A*) and FFOs (*Figure 1, Panel B*)
42 were identified from Mona Geoinformatics Institute's (MonaGIS) proprietary JAMNAV database,
43 and were collected in 2009. The proximities and densities of supermarkets/markets and FFOs were
44 estimated using application of Spatial Analyst tool in ArcGIS to data from MonaGIS proprietary
45 JAMNAV database. Proximity of supermarkets and markets, combined to represent good sources
46 of fresh fruit and vegetable, was determined as the straight-line distance (km) from each geocoded
47 address to the closest supermarket or market. Two density variables were created. The first was
48 supermarkets/markets per km², and the second density variable, the number of
49 supermarkets/markets per 1000 persons in the corresponding ED according to the 2011 census
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 from the Statistical Institute of Jamaica (STATIN) [34]. Buffer zones were set at 1 km to reflect a
4 short walking distance that could be completed in about 10-15 minutes [35].

5
6 FFOs were defined as places where high-caloric food could be obtained relatively quickly
7 and excluded traditional cook shops, snack shops and sit-down restaurants. Proximity and density
8 measures were created in a similar way as done for supermarkets/markets.
9

10
11 The above-mentioned retail food environments excluded informal food spaces (for e.g.
12 street vendors).
13
14

15 16 17 **Zero-inflated variables**

18 The absence of the environmental-level measure based on the participant's geocoded address was
19 indicated by a large proportion of zero values for most density measures as shown in the
20 Supplementary Table. New indicator variables (dummy variables) were subsequently created and
21 the specific dummy variable included in regression models alongside the original quantitative
22 forms of the respective retail food environmental-level explanatory variable. These dummy
23 variables are also referenced as the zero-inflated form of the density measures.
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 31 **Missing variables**

32 Addresses for 11% of the JHLS II study participants could not be geocoded and contributed to
33 missing data in subsequent analyses. The age/sex population of the dataset used for this JHLS II
34 secondary analysis subsample was compared with that for the non-geocoded data and no key
35 deviations were observed.
36
37
38

39 Geocoded and non-geocoded (missing) participants were compared with respect to age,
40 sex, SES categories and the key outcome variables of mean BMI, mean WC and obesity, using
41 mixed effect models, regression models accounting for survey design and regression models that
42 ignored survey design. No associations were detected between the geocoded status (present or
43 missing) and these other variables. This data analysis was done only on geocoded data, on the
44 assumption that these participants were representative of the target population.
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 52 **Statistical Analyses**

53 A complex database was created that combined individual-level JHLS II data with contextual
54 environment-level data.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Descriptive data analysis estimated sex-specific and total survey-weighted means,
4 proportions and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) for the outcome, explanatory and confounding
5 variables as well as age-adjusted mean BMI and prevalence of poor fruit and vegetable intake, a
6 key cardiovascular disease (CVD) risk factor. Age-adjustment utilized direct standardization
7 across the strata identified as 10-year age bands with weights being survey-weighted population
8 proportions of the respective 10-year age groups, as estimated using the JHLS II data.
9

10
11
12
13 The adjusted Wald test and the Pearson's chi-squared test corrected for survey design were
14 used to determine whether, respectively, the age-adjusted and unadjusted estimates differed with
15 respect to sex.
16
17

18
19 Intraclass correlation coefficients (ICCs) from hierarchical models quantified the
20 proportion of variation in mean BMI potentially explainable at the ED level.
21

22 To determine and account for the effect of clustering at the neighbourhood level,
23 subsequent analyses used multilevel models based on EDs nested within parish and examined the
24 stratum-specific estimates of the effect of the environment variables on mean BMI with and
25 without adjustment for covariates. Strata were defined using the urbanicity, sex and SES variables
26 and stratum-specific multilevel models estimated if terms for interaction between the environment
27 and strata variables were statistically significant. The Akaike's Information Criterion (AIC)
28 statistic was used to determine the final best models. Collinearity assessed using Goodman and
29 Kruskal's gamma coefficient γ [36], was the basis for selection of models covariates. To assess the
30 chance of false positive errors, *P*-values from these models were compared with the Bonferroni
31 corrected significance level.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 All analyses were conducted using STATA, versions 12 and 14 (StataCorp LP, College
40 Station, Texas).
41
42
43

44 **Ethical Approval**

45
46 Ethical approval was received from the University of the West Indies/University Hospital
47 of the West Indies Ethics Research Committee.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

RESULTS

Sample characteristics

The weighted total and sex-specific summary statistics are shown in Table 1. Women had higher mean BMI than men and higher proportions in the highly skilled/professional, unskilled and unemployed categories and in both 1st and 2nd SES tertiles based on no. of possessions owned ($P < 0.001$). However, a greater proportion of men perceived their communities as unsafe (males = 86.29 %; 95% CI: 82.64, 89.94 vs. females = 80.38 %; 95% CI: 75.63, 85.13; $P < 0.012$). There were no sex differences in urbanicity nor among those who had not completed high school.

There was clustering in mean BMI across neighbourhoods in Jamaica, with an ICC of 4.16%, the proportion of the variance in mean BMI that can be accounted for by the neighbourhood level [29,37]. No associations were found between the retail food environment variables and mean BMI in unadjusted regression models. There was also no effect modification by urbanicity.

Sex-specific regression models

There was interaction between sex and the following variables in their relationship with mean BMI: supermarkets proximity ($P = 0.023$), absence of supermarkets within a 1 km buffer zone ($P = 0.008$) and fast food outlets proximity ($P = 0.031$). Figure 2 reveals that for women, in fully-adjusted models, a 10 km increase in distance from supermarkets (or further proximity) was associated with a 1.20 kg/m² higher mean BMI (95% CI 8.20 x10⁻³, 0.24; $P = 0.036$); the absence of supermarkets within a 1 km buffer zone was associated with a 1.36 kg/m² higher mean BMI (95% CI 0.20, 2.52; $P = 0.022$). Proximity to FFOs was not associated with mean BMI in any sex.

SES- tertile-specific regression models

There was interaction between SES of a participant and a few retail food environment variables in their relationship with mean BMI. These included supermarkets proximity ($P = 0.015$), absence of supermarkets/1000 people/ ED ($P = 0.033$) and fast food outlets proximity ($P = 0.045$). Figure 3 reveals that a kilometre increase in the distance from a supermarket was consistently associated with higher mean BMI for all models for persons within the middle class, with a 0.17 kg/m² higher mean BMI (95% CI 0.03, 0.32; $P = 0.020$) in the final model. Among persons in the upper class, the absence of supermarkets/ 1000 people/ ED was associated with a 2.00 kg/m² higher mean BMI

Table 1. Total and sex-specific weighted sample characteristics (95% CI) for Jamaicans (JHLS II, 2008)

Variable	Men (n=796)	Women (n=1731)	Total (n=2527)	P value
Individual -level measures				
Mean Age in years (%)	37.00 (36.33, 37.13)	36.73 (36.64, 37.36)	36.87 (36.54, 37.20)	0.158
Urban Residence (%)	53.53 (43.84,62.28)	53.17 (45.11,61.74)	53.35 (44.87,61.64)	0.890
< High School Education (%)	31.75 (27.17, 36.33)	29.13 (25.69, 32.56)	30.43 (26.96, 33.90)	0.208
Occupation (%)				<0.0001
Highly skilled/Professional	38.87 (34.41, 43.34)	52.54 (49.02, 56.06)	45.73 (42.73, 48.72)	
Skilled	40.33 (35.19, 45.48)	8.21 (6.19, 10.23)	24.23 (21.29, 27.16)	
Unskilled	9.75 (6.66, 12.84)	18.13 (15.20, 21.06)	13.95 (11.33, 16.57)	
Unemployed/Other	11.05 (8.22, 13.88)	21.11 (18.17, 24.06)	16.10 (14.12, 18.07)	
Possessions owned (%)				<0.001
Lower class ≤ 6 items	34.09 (29.03, 39.14)	41.51 (37.45, 45.57)	37.82 (33.96, 41.68)	
Middle class 7-9 items	29.92 (25.99, 33.85)	31.17 (28.45, 33.89)	30.55 (27.89, 33.20)	
Upper class 10-16 items	36.00 (30.68, 41.31)	27.32 (22.99, 31.65)	31.63 (27.45, 35.82)	
Perception of unsafe community (%)	86.29 (82.64, 89.94)	80.38 (75.63, 85.13)	83.32 (79.77, 86.86)	0.012
Mean BMI [□] (kg/m ²)	24.83(24.28, 25.38)	28.40 (27.90, 28.89)	26.64 (26.21, 27.07)	<0.001
Neighbourhood -level measures [†]				
[Mean (95% CI)]				
Supermarkets [§] proximity (km)	3.61 (2.69, 4.54)	3.64 (2.78, 4.49)	3.63 (2.77, 4.48)	0.978
Supermarkets [§] / km ²	1.60 (0.84, 2.36)	1.57 (0.96, 2.19)	1.59 (0.91, 2.26)	0.895
Supermarkets [§] /1000 people/ ED	0.65 (0.27, 1.04)	0.63 (0.20, 1.07)	0.64 (0.26, 1.03)	0.922
FFO proximity (km)	4.56 (3.54, 5.58)	4.68(3.60, 5.76)	4.62 (3.62, 5.62)	0.747
FFO / km ²	0.57 (0.33, 0.81)	0.52 (0.32, 0.72)	0.55 (0.33, 0.76)	0.266
FFO / 1000 people/ ED	0.35 (0.10, 0.60)	0.21 (0.07, 0.35)	0.28 (0.10, 0.46)	0.104

[†] Age-adjusted

[§]Includes supermarkets and markets

CI – Confidence Interval; JHLS II, Jamaica Health and Lifestyle Survey II; BMI, Body Mass Index; ED – Enumeration District; FFO - Fast Food Outlets

P values for difference between means (men versus women)

1
2
3 (95% CI 0.08, 3.92; $P=0.041$) only in age-adjusted models. Proximity to FFOs was not associated
4 with mean BMI in any of the SES classes.
5
6
7

8 **DISCUSSION**

9
10 This study is the first to examine the impact of the retail food environment on obesity-related
11 outcomes in a small Caribbean island. While we observed no significant associations between the
12 retail food environment variables and mean BMI in unadjusted regression models, results revealed
13 significant sex differences in the impact of the food environment, particularly for supermarkets.
14 The further distance away from supermarkets and markets, and their absence within a 1 km buffer
15 zone from residences, were associated with higher mean BMI in women; and further proximity to
16 supermarkets associated with higher mean BMI for the middle class. There was no association
17 with proximity to or density of FFOs, nor urban-rural differences.
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 We also observed clustering of BMI at the community level, with approximately 4.0% of
25 the variance in mean BMI potentially explainable by environmental influences outside of the
26 individual or at the neighbourhood level. This is similar to those reported by Harrington et al in a
27 Canadian sample [38] and by Masood and Reidpath [39] for many of the countries that participated
28 in the 2003 World Health Survey. It is also similar to ICC by neighborhood seen for obesity-related
29 outcomes among adolescents in the U.S. as part of the National Health and Nutrition Survey
30 (NHANES) [40].
31
32
33
34
35

36 Our study findings corroborate previous research conducted in developed countries that
37 indicate closer proximity to supermarkets/markets [12, 19, 20] and increased density of
38 supermarkets/markets [9-11, 16, 41, 42] are associated with less obesity-related outcomes in adults
39 and children. Of note however, Wang and colleagues found higher neighbourhood density of small
40 grocery stores associated with higher BMI among a sample of US women [15], while our study
41 found higher BMI for women being associated with further distance from supermarkets/markets
42 (inclusive of small grocery stores). There are potential explanations for this sex-specific difference
43 as some studies have found that residential environments have a greater effect on women's health
44 [43]. For example, women as primary food providers may depend more on neighbourhood sources
45 for food than men do, which may in turn have an effect on their health outcomes, such as BMI.
46 However, the influence of gender specific roles in the provision of food supplies for families was
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

not the focus of our study and so additional studies would be needed to better understand the differences observed. Although the geographic variables are somewhat dissimilar (a density versus proximity measure), the difference in direction of the associations raises the question as to whether presence of grocery stores, supermarkets and markets across different geographical contexts, including small island states like Jamaica, each represent the same degree of accessibility, availability and ultimate consumption of healthy foods. For example, we found no urban-rural differences as hypothesized, perhaps due to Physical Activity Levels (PALs), diet or some other unknown confounder masking the association. For example, it is quite possible that the presence or absence of supplementary food sources, utilized in rural communities and not captured in the environmental-level variables used in our study, for e.g. small produce plots or seasonal vegetable/fruits that supplement diets, may have played a role in the lack of urban-rural differences seen.

Living a greater distance away from supermarkets/markets was positively associated with mean BMI in the middle class in our study, however many other studies found this association in the lower class [44]. We are unclear as to the reasons for the association observed among the middle-class participants. We surmise this could possibly be due to the influence of shopping preferences in terms of location. For example, a study conducted in low income neighbourhoods in Philadelphia USA found that many residents did most of their shopping outside of the neighbourhood [45]. Other possible influences could be cost, types of food purchased, or lower PALs in this group, the latter perhaps being influenced by car ownership and/or greater use of motorized transport. Inagami et al [46] found in a study conducted in the Los Angeles area of California, USA that BMI was higher a) where persons frequented grocery stores located in more disadvantaged neighbourhoods, which usually have higher availability of relatively inexpensive, energy-dense foods and b) among those who owned cars and travelled farther to their grocery stores. However, other studies reveal inconsistencies, with mixed findings across various neighbourhood food retail contexts which may be due to the heterogeneity in defining neighbourhoods using socioeconomic status [47,48] and methodological limitations in measuring the interrelatedness of neighbourhood residence, determinants of purchasing choices within and outside of the residential neighbourhood and issues such as dietary preferences [49]. In our study, PAL, motorized transport and diet were not adjusted for in the regression models. These omissions may have suppressed associations.

1
2
3 It is also unclear why associations between FFO proximity and mean BMI were neither
4 seen in the sex-specific nor SES-specific models. This may be an indication that demonstration of
5 associations may depend on which obesogenic retail food environment variable or outcome
6 measure of adiposity is chosen for the regression models. For example, Menke et al in analysing
7 the 3rd US National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey conducted, found that waist
8 circumference maintained a stronger association with CVD risk factors than the other measures of
9 adiposity [50]. Further work is needed on assessing the quality and utility of the measures used in
10 this study as well as the development of new ones for the Jamaican and developing world context.
11
12

13
14
15
16
17 The major strength of this study is that it represents pioneering work in a small island
18 developing country context. We linked individually geocoded addresses from a nationally
19 representative survey, with specific objective GIS-based retail food environment measures and
20 provided empirical evidence using MLM to explore the association between objective
21 neighbourhood-level retail food environment measures and BMI. Additionally, the sample
22 characteristics that differed significantly with sex, were also included as covariates in the final
23 models in order to minimize over or underestimation of the true strength of the associations
24 detected between the neighbourhood food retail environment measures and BMI.
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 Despite strengths, there are limitations that deserve mention, including the inability to
32 make causal inferences given the cross-sectional design of the JHLS II and our definition of
33 neighbourhood. Using EDs to represent a Jamaican neighbourhood could be deemed inadequate
34 as they i) are quite heterogeneous geographically in size, composition and context, and ii) may not
35 fully represent exposure to the obesogenic environments being investigated. Additionally,
36 although the outcome was objectively assessed, the risk factors included self-reported data on a
37 single individual representing a household, which may introduce information bias. Furthermore,
38 there was temporal mismatch of the data collected from individual JHLS II participants with that
39 for the retail food environment-level variables, most of which were collected by MonaGIS in and
40 after the year 2009, subsequent to the end of data collection for the JHLS II in 2008. This may
41 have biased the results as individual exposures may have varied after the survey period, although
42 food consumption behaviours are believed to be relatively stable over time. Lastly, the reliability
43 and validity of the area-level environmental variables were untested locally and therefore
44 uncertainty remains as to whether they were most effective in explaining any variance in the
45 obesity-related outcomes. For example, a study conducted in a low-income neighborhood in Spain
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

found a mismatch between GIS-based measures of the food environment and resident's perceptions of the environment [51]. Another challenge faced in Jamaica with accurately characterizing the neighbourhood retail food environment relates to the presence of and patronage of the foods provided by many itinerant vendors which are often energy-dense foods. The use of mixed-methods approaches in future research within small island developing states similar to Jamaica, may improve understanding on the associations with observed health-related behaviours such as food purchases (cost and locations) and dietary choices with BMI.

In conclusion, we found that further distance away from supermarkets and markets and their absence within a 1 km buffer zone from residences were associated with higher mean BMI, with important sex and social class differences. There has been an increase in the prevalence of obesity in Jamaica [3] despite the implementation of policies and programmes to ameliorate its impact on the continuum towards NCDs [52]. Higher mean BMI in Jamaicans may be partially explained by the presence of supermarkets and markets and differ by sex and social class. National efforts to curtail obesity in SIDS, like Jamaica should consider the inclusion of interventions and future studies focused at the neighbourhood-level that not only target the location and density of supermarkets and markets but also those that consider sex and social class-specific factors that maybe influencing the associations.

STATEMENTS

Contributors CC-M and KT conceived the study. LG and PL-A geocoded the data. CC-M, NY and KT analysed and interpreted the data. RW supervised the research. CC-M wrote the manuscript. PL-A, KT and RW edited the manuscript. All authors provided critical intellectual contributions and read and approved the final manuscript.

Funding This secondary analysis research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

Competing interests None declared.

Ethics approval The University of the West Indies/University Hospital of the West Indies Ethics Research Committee ECP 169, 14/15

Provenance and peer review Not commissioned; externally peer reviewed.

Data sharing statement No additional data are available.

REFERENCES

1. Caribbean Commission on Health and Development. Report of the Caribbean Commission on Health and Development pgs 37-42: Ian Randle Publishers; 2006. http://www.who.int/macrohealth/action/PAHO_Report.pdf?ua=1. Accessed 28 Nov 2014.
2. Henry FJ. Obesity prevention: the key to non-communicable disease control. *West Indian Med J* 2011;60(4):446-51.
3. Wilks R, Younger N, Tulloch-Reid M, McFarlane S, Francis D. Jamaica Health and Lifestyle Survey 2007-8. 2008. http://www.mona.uwi.edu/reports/health/jhlsii_final_may09.pdf Accessed 1 February 2015.
4. Ashcroft MT, Ling J, Lovell HG, Miall WE. Heights and weights of adults in rural and urban areas of Jamaica. *Br J Prev Soc Med* 1966;20(1):22-6.
5. Rotimi CN, Cooper RS, Ataman SL, Osotimehin B, Kadiri S, Muna W, et al. Distribution of anthropometric variables and the prevalence of obesity in populations of West African origin: the International Collaborative Study on Hypertension in Blacks (ICSHIB). *Obes Res* 1995;3(S2):95s-105s.
6. Wilks R, Rotimi C, Bennett F, McFarlane-Anderson N, Kaufman J, Anderson S, et al. Diabetes in the Caribbean: results of a population survey from Spanish Town, Jamaica. *Diab Med* 1999;16(10):875-83.
7. Wilks R, Zohoori N, Ashley D, Figueroa P. The Jamaican Healthy Lifestyle Survey: Ministry of Health Jamaica. 2000.
8. Morland K, Wing S, Roux AD. The contextual effect of the local food environment on residents' diets: The Atherosclerosis Risk in Communities Study. *Am J Public Health* 2002;92(11):1761.

- 1
2
3 9. Jilcott SB, Keyserling T, Crawford T, McGuirt JT, Ammerman AS. Examining
4 associations among obesity and per capita farmers' markets, grocery stores/supermarkets, and
5 supercenters in US counties. *J Am Diet Assoc* 2011;111(4):567-72.
- 6
7
8 10. Morland K, Roux AV, Wing S. Supermarkets, other food stores, and obesity: The
9 Atherosclerosis Risk in Communities Study. *Am J Prev Med* 2006;30(4):333-9.
- 10
11 11. Rundle A, Neckerman KM, Freeman L, Lovasi GS, Purciel M, Quinn J, et al.
12 Neighborhood food environment and walkability predict obesity in New York City. *Environ*
13 *Health Perspect* 2009;117(3):442.
- 14
15 12. Larsen K, Cook B, Stone MR, Faulkner GE. Food access and children's BMI in Toronto,
16 Ontario: assessing how the food environment relates to overweight and obesity. *Int J Public Health*
17 2015;60(1):69-77.
- 18
19 13. Bower KM, Thorpe RJ, Jr., Rohde C, Gaskin DJ. The intersection of neighborhood racial
20 segregation, poverty, and urbanicity and its impact on food store availability in the United States.
21 *Prev Med* 2014;58:33-9.
- 22
23 14. Moore LV, Diez Roux AV. Associations of neighborhood characteristics with the location
24 and type of food stores. *Am J Public Health* 2006;96(2):325-31.
- 25
26 15. Wang MC, Kim S, Gonzalez AA, MacLeod KE, Winkleby MA. Socioeconomic and
27 food-related physical characteristics of the neighborhood environment are associated with body
28 mass index. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2007;61(6):491-8.
- 29
30 16. Li F, Harmer P, Cardinal BJ, Bosworth M, Johnson-Shelton D, Moore JM, et al. Built
31 environment and 1-year change in weight and waist circumference in middle-aged and older
32 adults: Portland Neighborhood Environment and Health Study. *Am J Epidemiol.* 2009;169(4):401-
33 8.
- 34
35 17. Nago ES, Lachat CK, Dossa RA, Kolsteren PW. Association of out-of-home eating with
36 anthropometric changes: a systematic review of prospective studies. *Crit Rev Food Sci Nutr*
37 2014;54(9):1103-16.
- 38
39 18. Reitzel LR, Regan SD, Nguyen N, Cromley EK, Strong LL, Wetter DW, et al. Density and
40 proximity of fast food restaurants and body mass index among African Americans. *Am J Public*
41 *Health* 2014;104(1):110-6.
- 42
43 19. Davis B, Carpenter C. Proximity of fast-food restaurants to schools and adolescent obesity.
44 *Am J Public Health* 2009;99(3):505-10.
- 45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 20. Reidpath DD, Burns C, Garrard J, Mahoney M, Townsend M. An ecological study of the
4 relationship between social and environmental determinants of obesity. *Health Place*
5 200;8(2):141-5.
6
7
- 8 21. Maddock J. The relationship between obesity and the prevalence of fast-food restaurants:
9 state-level analysis. *Am J Health Promot* 2004;19:137–43.
10
- 11 22. Lewis LB, Sloane DC, Nascimento LM et al. African-American's' access to healthy food
12 options in South Los Angeles Restaurants. *Am J Pub Health* 2005;95:668–73.
13
- 14 23. Cummins S, McKay L, Macintyre S. McDonald's Restaurants and neighbourhood
15 deprivation in Scotland & England. *Am J Prev Med* 2005;4:308–10.
16
- 17 24. Naska A, Orfanos P, Trichopoulou A, May AM, Overvad K, Jakobsen MU, et al. Eating
18 out, weight and weight gain. A cross-sectional and prospective analysis in the context of the EPIC-
19 PANACEA study. *Int J Obes (Lond)* 2011 Mar;35(3):416.
20
- 21 25. Jeffery RW, French SA. Epidemic obesity in the United States: are fast foods and television
22 viewing contributing? *Am J Public Health* 1998; 88 (2): 277–280.
23
- 24 26. Cunningham-Myrie CA, Mabile E, Govia I, Younger NO, Tulloch-Reid MK, McFarlane
25 S, et al. Neighbourhood characteristics and cumulative biological risk: evidence from the Jamaica
26 Health and Lifestyle Survey 2008: a cross-sectional study. *BMJ Open* 2018 Dec 1;8(12):e021952.
27
- 28 27. Jaime PC, Duran AC, Sarti FM, Lock K. Investigating environmental determinants of diet,
29 physical activity, and overweight among adults in Sao Paulo, Brazil. *J Urban Health* 2011 Jun
30 1;88(3):567-81.
31
- 32 28. Mendes LL, Nogueira H, Padez C, Ferrao M, Velasquez-Melendez G. Individual and
33 environmental factors associated for overweight in urban population of Brazil. *BMC Public*
34 *Health*. 2013 Dec;13(1):988.
35
- 36 29. Kreft I, De Leeuw J. *Introducing multilevel modeling* London: Sage; 1998.
37
- 38 30. The Statistical Institute of Jamaica (STATIN) (1991) *Jamaica Standard Occupational*
39 *Classification*. Statistical Institute of Jamaica, Kingston.
40
- 41 31. Prince SA, Kristjansson EA, Russell K, Billette JM, Sawada M, Ali A, et al. A multilevel
42 analysis of neighborhood built and social environments and adult self-reported physical activity
43 and body mass index in Ottawa, Canada. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2011;8(10):3953-78.
44
- 45 32. Brownson RC, Hoehner CM, Day K, Forsyth A, Sallis JF. Measuring the built environment
46 for physical activity: state of the science. *Am J Prev Med* 2009;36(4):S99-S123. e12.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 33. Prince SA, Kristjansson EA, Russell K, Billette JM, Sawada MC, Ali A, et al. Relationships
4 between neighborhoods, physical activity, and obesity: a multilevel analysis of a large Canadian
5 city. *Obesity* 2012;20(10):2093-100.
6
7
- 8 34. The Statistical Institute of Jamaica (STATIN). 2011 Census of Population and Housing -
9 Jamaica. <http://statinja.gov.jm/Census/PopCensus/Popcensus2011Index.aspx> Accessed 1 Apr
10 2016.
11
12
- 13 35. Titheridge H, Hall P. Changing travel to work patterns in South East England. *J Transp*
14 *Geogr* 2006 Jan 1;14(1):60-75.
15
16
- 17 36. Goodman and Kruskal's gamma. In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia.
18 [https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Goodman_and_Kruskal%27s_gamma&oldid=722481](https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Goodman_and_Kruskal%27s_gamma&oldid=722481108)
19 108 2016. Accessed 28 May 2016.
20
21
- 22 37. Bryk, A.S. and Raudenbush, S.W. (1992) Hierarchical linear models (applications and data
23 analysis methods). Sage Publications, New York; 1992
24
- 25 38. Harrington DW, Elliott SJ. Weighing the importance of neighborhood: a multilevel
26 exploration of the determinants of overweight and obesity. *Soc Sci Med* 2009;68(4):593-600.
27
28
- 29 39. Masood M, Reidpath DD. Intraclass correlation and design effect in BMI, physical activity
30 and diet: a cross-sectional study of 56 countries. *BMJ Open* 2016;6(1):e008173.
31
32
- 33 40. Theall KP, Drury SS, and Shirtcliff EA. Cumulative neighborhood risk of psychosocial
34 stress and allostatic load in adolescents. *Am J Epidemiol* 176.suppl_7 (2012): S164-S174.
35
36
- 37 41. Lamichhane AP, Puett R, Porter DE, Bottai M, Mayer-Davis EJ, Liese AD. Associations
38 of built food environment with body mass index and waist circumference among youth with
39 diabetes. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act* 2012;9:81.
40
41
- 42 42. Burgoine T, Forouhi NG, Griffin SJ, Wareham NJ, Monsivais P. Associations between
43 exposure to takeaway food outlets, takeaway food consumption, and body weight in
44 Cambridgeshire, UK: population based, cross sectional study. *BMJ* 2014; Mar13:348:g1464.
45
46
- 47 43. Stafford M, Cummins S, Macintyre S, et al. Gender differences in the associations between
48 health and neighbourhood environment. *Soc Sci Med* 2005;60:1681-92.
49
50
- 51 44. Black JL, Macinko J. Neighborhoods and obesity. *Nutr Rev* 2008;66(1):2-20.
52
53
- 54 45. Hillier A, Cannuscio C, Karpyn A. How far do low-income parents travel to shop for food?
55 Empirical evidence from two urban neighborhoods. *Urban Geogr* 2011; 32: 712-729.
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 46. Inagami S, Cohen DA, Finch BK, Asch SM. You are where you shop: grocery store
4 locations, weight, and neighborhoods. *Am J Prev Med* 2006;31(1):10-7.
5
6 47. Odoms-Young A, Singleton CR, Springfield S, McNabb L, Thompson T. Retail
7 environments as a venue for obesity prevention. *Curr Obes Rep* 2016 Jun 1;5(2):184-91.
8
9 48. Gordon-Larsen P. Food availability/convenience and obesity. *Adv Nutr* 2014 Nov 3;5(6):809-
10 11 17.
12
13 49. Mhurchu Ni Mhurchu C, Vandevijvere S, Waterlander W, Thornton LE, Kelly B, Cameron
14 AJ, et al. Monitoring the availability of healthy and unhealthy foods and non-alcoholic beverages
15 in community and consumer retail food environments globally. *Obes Rev* 2013 Oct;14:108-19.
16
17 50. Menke A, Muntner P, Wildman RP, Reynolds K, Jiang H. Measures of Adiposity and
18 Cardiovascular Disease Risk Factors. *Obesity (Silver Spring)* 2007;15(3):785.
19
20 51. Díez J, Valiente R, Ramos C, García R, Gittelsohn J, Franco M. The mismatch between
21 observational measures and residents' perspectives on the retail food environment: A mixed-
22 methods approach in the Heart Healthy Hoods study. *Public Health Nutr* 2017 Nov;20(16):2970-
23 24 25 26 27 28 29
30 52. The National Health Fund Act 2003 [cited 2010 May 26]. Available from:
31 <http://www.moh.gov.jm/laws/statutes>.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Figure 1. Spatial Distribution of Supermarket/markets (A) and Fast Food Outlets in Jamaica (B)

For peer review only

1
2
3 **Figure 2.** Sex-specific unadjusted and adjusted β Coefficients for the association of retail food
4 environments with mean Body Mass Index
5

6
7 † Dummy variable for zero inflated predictor

8 CI – Confidence Interval

9 Model 1 - unadjusted

10 Model 2 - age adjusted

11 Model 3 - adjusted for age and no. of possessions

12 Model 4 - adjusted for age, no. of possessions, urban, occupation, education, perception of
13 unsafe community

14 *p < 0.05
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **Figure 3.** SES-specific unadjusted and adjusted β Coefficients for the association of retail food
4 environments with mean Body Mass Index
5

6 CI – Confidence Interval; ED – Enumeration District

7 † Dummy variable for zero inflated predictor

8 Model 1 - unadjusted



9 Model 2 - age adjusted

10 Model 3 - adjusted for age and sex


11 Model 4 - adjusted for age, sex, urban, occupation, education, perception of unsafe community

12 * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




104x103mm (300 x 300 DPI)



73x155mm (300 x 300 DPI)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60



211x441mm (96 x 96 DPI)

Supplementary Table. Proportion of zero-valued observations for geographic variables

Retail Food Environments	Frequency (%)
	N=2527
Supermarkets/markets proximity (km)	0
Supermarkets/markets / km ²	61.30
Supermarkets/markets /1000 people/ ED	92.13
FFO proximity (km)	0
FFO / km ²	68.22
FFO / 1000 people/ ED	94.46

ED – Enumeration District; FFO - Fast Food Outlets

STROBE Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of *cross-sectional studies*

	Item No	Recommendation
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract [Within the title page 1 and methods section of the abstract page 2] (b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found [See methods and results sections of abstract page 2]
Introduction		
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported [pages 4-5]
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses [page 5]
Methods		
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper [page 5-6]
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection [pages 6-8]
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants [pages 5- 6]
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. [pages 6-9] Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable [N/A]
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group [pages 6-9]
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias [pages 5-6, 8-9]
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at [page 5-6]
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why [pages 8-9]
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding [pages 8-9] (b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions [page 9] (c) Explain how missing data were addressed [page 8] (d) If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy [page 9] (e) Describe any sensitivity analyses [N/A]
Results		
Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed [N/A] (b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage [N/A] (c) Consider use of a flow diagram [N/A]
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders [page 9; Table 1] (b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest [N/A]
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures [page 9; Table 1]

1			
2	Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). [pages 9-10; Figures 2-3] Make clear which
3			confounders were adjusted for and why they were included [page 6, Figures 2-3]
4			(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized [page 10,
5			Table 1]
6			(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a
7			meaningful time period [N/A]
8			
9			
10			
11	Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity
12			analyses [pages 9-10]
13			
14	Discussion		
15	Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives [page 10]
16	Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or
17			imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias [page 13]
18			
19	Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations,
20			multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence [pages
21			12-13]
22			
23	Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results [page 13]
24			
25	Other information		
26	Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if
27			applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based [page 14]
28			

*Give information separately for exposed and unexposed groups.

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.