

Manuscript version: Author's Accepted Manuscript

The version presented in WRAP is the author's accepted manuscript and may differ from the published version or Version of Record.

Persistent WRAP URL:

<http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/134409>

How to cite:

Please refer to published version for the most recent bibliographic citation information. If a published version is known of, the repository item page linked to above, will contain details on accessing it.

Copyright and reuse:

The Warwick Research Archive Portal (WRAP) makes this work by researchers of the University of Warwick available open access under the following conditions.

Copyright © and all moral rights to the version of the paper presented here belong to the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. To the extent reasonable and practicable the material made available in WRAP has been checked for eligibility before being made available.

Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

Publisher's statement:

Please refer to the repository item page, publisher's statement section, for further information.

For more information, please contact the WRAP Team at: wrap@warwick.ac.uk.

1 **TITLE PAGE**

2 **Title: Meat, fruit and vegetable consumption in sub-Saharan Africa: a systematic review**
3 **and meta-regression analysis.**

4 **Authors:**

5 Daniel O. Mensah^{1*}, Ana R. Nunes¹, Tahir Bockarie¹, Rob Lillywhite², Oyinlola Oyeboode¹,

6 ¹Health Sciences Division, Warwick Medical School, University of Warwick, Gibbet Hill
7 Campus, Coventry CV4 7AL, UK.

8
9 ²Life Sciences Department, Warwick Medical School, University of Warwick, Gibbet Hill
10 Campus, Coventry CV4 7AL, UK.

11

12 ***Correspondence:** d.mensah.2@warwick.ac.uk. Health Sciences Division, Warwick Medical
13 School, University of Warwick, Gibbet Hill Campus, Coventry CV4 7AL, UK. Tel:
14 02476522644, Mobile: 07741180188.

15

16

17 **Key words:** Meat consumption/Fruit and Vegetable consumption; Health; Environmental
18 Sustainability; Systematic Review; sub-Saharan Africa.

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 **ABSTRACT**

44 **Context:** The dietary choices people make affect personal health and have consequences for the
45 environment, both of which have serious implications for the 2030 Sustainable Development
46 Agenda. In global reviews, the literature on meat, fruit, and vegetable consumption in sub-
47 Saharan Africa (SSA) is limited.

48

49 **Objective:** This systematic review set out to quantify meat, fruit, and vegetable consumption in
50 sub-Saharan African populations and to answer the question: How much meat, fruit and/or
51 vegetables are being consumed daily by which individuals in SSA over the years?

52

53 **Data Sources:** Following the PRISMA guidelines, the authors systematically searched
54 MEDLINE, EMBASE, ASSIA CINAHL, Web of Science, POPLINE and Google Scholar to
55 identify 47 (out of 5922 search results) studies reporting meat, fruit and/or vegetable
56 consumption in sub-Saharan African populations.

57

58 **Data Extraction:** Three independent investigators extracted data on year of data collection,
59 study country, study population and geographical context, and population intake of meat, fruit
60 and/or vegetables.

61 **Data Analysis:** Using STATA SE version 15, random effects meta-regression analyses were
62 used to test the effect of year of data collection and method of data collection on population
63 meat, fruit, and vegetable consumption. The analyses also tested any association between age,
64 sex, urban/rural residence or a country's economic development, and population intake of meat,
65 fruits and/or vegetables. The review was started in 2017 and completed in 2019.

66

67 **Results:** Richer SSA countries were likely to consume more meat ($\beta = 36.76$, $p=0.04$) and
68 vegetables ($\beta = 43.49$, $p=0.00$) than poorer countries. Vegetable intake has increased dramatically
69 over the last three decades from $\approx 10g$ to $\approx 110g$ ($\beta=4.43$, $p=0.00$). Vegetable ($\beta=-25.48$, $p=0.00$)
70 consumption was higher in rural than urban residents. Although the trend of meat consumption
71 has gone up ($\approx 25g$ to $\approx 75g$), the trend is non-significant ($\beta=0.63$, N.S.). Daily average per capita
72 meat consumption was 98g, above 70g recommendation, while fruit and vegetable intake (268g)
73 remain below WHO's recommendation (400g).

74

75 **Conclusions:** Given the low intake of plant-based foods it is likely that SSA populations may be
76 deficient in high quality protein and micronutrients as suggested by the EAT-lancet commission.

77 There is the need for promoting both the adequate supply and demand of plant-based protein
78 and micronutrients including fruit, vegetables, nuts, seeds and legumes in SSA countries. While
79 dietary changes in SSA may offer large absolute benefits, consideration of the magnitude of
80 dietary change, particularly increasing or reducing meat consumption, will need to occur in a way
81 that ensures that policy and interventions support the reduction of under-nutrition and
82 micronutrient deficiencies without worsening NCD prevalence and environmental impacts.
83 There is also the need for preventive action that ensures that SSA populations do not increase
84 their meat consumption as disposable incomes increase and countries' economic development
85 rise as seen in most countries undergoing economic transformation.

86
87 PROSPERO registration number: CRD42018090497.

88 89 INTRODUCTION

90
91 The dietary choices people make affect personal health and have consequences for the
92 environment. The food system, for example, accounts for 70% of freshwater* drawn for human
93 consumption.¹ It also takes up over one-third of the Earth's productive land² and is responsible
94 for nearly a fourth of global greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions³ with livestock production alone
95 accounting for 80% in each instance.^{2,3} According to the 2017 Global Burden of Diseases,
96 Injuries and Risk Factors Study, poor diets including overconsumption of meat and low intake of
97 fruit and vegetables, is a risk factor in one of five deaths worldwide and the second highest risk
98 factor (after smoking) for premature deaths.⁴ This situation is projected to worsen in the
99 absence of planned and directed dietary shifts or modifications as a growing, increasingly urban
100 and wealthy global population adopt diets that are obesogenic.⁵ These in turn may contribute to
101 increasing the burden of non-communicable diseases (NCDs),⁶⁻⁹ emit more GHGs,⁵ and
102 potentially limit the Earth's future capacity to supply safe and affordable food for all.^{10,11} This is
103 particularly important for Africa where the largest population growth¹² and most drastic future
104 urbanisation, as well as the largest growth in NCD deaths¹³ are expected to happen in the next
105 few decades amid severe food insecurity issues.

106
107 There is a strong consensus in recent evidence that reducing meat intake in favour of fruit and
108 vegetables and other plant-based diets could offer multiple benefits, including improved public

***Freshwater** refers to all naturally occurring water except seawater and brackish water. Freshwater drawn for human consumption includes those that could be used for drinking, hygiene, agriculture and industry.

109 health ^{14,15} and potentially reduced environmental impact. ^{15,16} Meat is an important source of
110 protein, readily absorbable zinc and other essential minerals (iron, potassium and selenium),
111 amino acids and vitamins (vitamins B3, niacin, B6, riboflavin, and B12).¹⁷⁻¹⁹ This makes meat
112 admittedly important for combating micronutrient-deficiency including iron deficiency (leading
113 to anaemia) in sub-Saharan Africa (SSA), where prevalence is highest. ²⁰ However, excessive
114 consumption of meat leads to excess intake of energy, saturated fats and cholesterol which are
115 important risk factors for ischaemic heart disease. ²¹ This may partly explain meat's association
116 with all-cause mortality in recent research. ²² Meat (particularly red and processed meat) has also
117 been positively linked to some cancers, particularly, colorectal, pancreatic, stomach and prostate
118 and other NCDs. ²³ Recent evidence corroborating this has suggested that every 50g meat
119 consumed per day increases the likelihood of developing colorectal cancer by about 18%.^{23,24}

120

121 Epidemiological studies imply a convincing involvement of carcinogenic compounds such as
122 polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) and N-nitro formed in meat during high temperature
123 cooking in the development of some NCDs. ²⁵⁻²⁸ In contrast, high fruit and vegetable intake is
124 proven to increase carotenoids and vitamin C, both of which possess antioxidant characteristics
125 that may prevent the initial phase development of some NCDs. ²⁹⁻³² The protective effect of
126 dietary fiber contained in fruit and vegetables (with some starchy vegetables containing higher
127 amounts) for some NCDs such as colorectal cancer is well documented. ³³⁻³⁹ Low fruit and
128 vegetables consumption is thus an important risk factor for NCDs, accounting for nearly 5.2
129 million deaths annually. ⁴⁰ Populations in SSA may be at a higher risk given that one in four
130 people lack adequate food. ⁴¹ Moreover, along with a complexity of other determinants of food
131 choice, high meat diets are desirable status symbols in most parts of the African sub-region. ⁴²
132 Along with meat, other foods like starchy staples, are deeply entrenched in the local religious
133 beliefs, customs and traditions. ⁴³ Empirical evidence on meat, fruit and vegetable (MFV)
134 consumption in SSA is a precondition for effective interventions targeted at reducing NCD
135 deaths as targeted in the WHO Global Action Plan for the Prevention and Control of NCDs. ⁴⁵
136 The WHO suggests nine key targets including a 25% relative reduction in risks of death from
137 NCDs and a 0% increase in obesity and diabetes by 2025. ⁴⁵

138

139 The environmental sustainability of meat-rich diets has become a global concern on the grounds
140 that meat production overexploits and degrades land and water resources and is the single largest
141 contributor to global warming within agriculture. ⁴⁵ Meat and dairy alone account for 14.5% of
142 global GHG emissions. ⁴⁶ According to recent analysis, emissions for every gram of protein from

143 meat is 250 times the GHG emissions from plant-based food⁵. Emerging literature indicates that
144 meat uses 36 times more land than vegetarian protein,⁴⁵ requires 11 and 6 times more water and
145 fertilizer, respectively, than other crops.⁴⁷ Additionally, one-third of global food crops are fed to
146 livestock with only 12% returning as meat and other dairy products.⁴⁸

147

148 A dietary shift from meat and dairy to fruit and vegetables, could deliver major reductions in
149 environmental impacts, e.g. 70 to 80% of GHG emissions, 50% land use and 50% of water use,
150 compared to 1995 levels.¹⁶ It may also contribute to the current target of the International
151 Climate Change treaty of keeping global temperature increases below 2°C.³ Increasing fruit and
152 vegetables consumption to WHO recommended levels could also prevent 6 to 10% deaths
153 globally.⁸ The EAT-Lancet Commission has recently introduced a flexitarian dietary regime that
154 requires dietary shifts in every part of the world which makes it possible to feed 10 billion people
155 a healthy diet within planetary boundaries by 2050.⁴⁹ The Commission suggests a drastic increase
156 of plant protein in the diet which can optimally contain modest amounts of fish and dairy foods,
157 while drastically cutting back on meat consumption. Recent evidence has also highlighted that
158 dietary shifts in Africa and other developing countries would offer the largest absolute health and
159 environmental benefits.⁸ Clearly, these have serious implications for the 2030 Sustainable
160 Development Agenda.⁵⁰ They have direct implications for the achievement of seven of the
161 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) from poverty alleviation through sustainable production
162 and consumption to food security, ensuring healthy lives, climate change, and protecting
163 planetary resources, including water, land, biodiversity, etc. At the same time, one of the key
164 health and well-being co-benefits of sustainable development include sustainable food
165 production and distribution.^{51,52} Moreover, while health and well-being is an end in itself in the
166 principle of sustainable development, it is also an essential prerequisite for achieving all other
167 SDGs as they are intrinsically connected and interdependent.^{52,53} There is thus a strong
168 consensus on the need for intersectoral actions among nutrition, health and non-health sectors in
169 achieving health, well-being and sustainable development.^{51,54-56}

170

171 Though only a small proportion of the global population meets the WHO/FAO (2003)⁵⁸
172 recommended daily minimum of 400g or five servings of fruit and vegetables,⁵⁹ little is known
173 about how much is consumed by populations in SSA. The World Cancer Research Fund
174 International's recommendation of less than 500g (18oz) [or 71.43g per day] of meat per person
175 per week⁶¹ is also exceeded in many populations.⁶² While consumption trends seem to have
176 stagnated or declined in high income countries (HICs) in the last five decades, consumption

177 trends across sub-Saharan Africa are not clear.⁶² As SSA is on the path of an unprecedented
178 wave of urbanisation,¹² understanding meat, fruit and vegetable (MFV) consumption trends in
179 SSA is an important first step in understanding the dynamics of how urban/rural food
180 environments impact diets in SSA. Robust results could be used to develop new and improved
181 agricultural, trade, food security and nutrition policies. Moreover, given the importance of the
182 quantity of MFV in constituting a healthy diet, and in achieving the UNFCC climate change,⁶³
183 WHO NCD targets⁶⁴ and the SDGs, it is essential to quantify MFV consumption in SSA
184 populations and any accompanying secular trend.

185

186 Systematic reviews that synthesize evidence on meat, fruit and vegetables consumption have
187 focused on developed countries and low-and-middle-income countries (LMICs) in Asia.⁶⁵⁻⁶⁷ This
188 review aims to bridge this gap by systematically gathering and synthesizing evidence on the
189 quantity of MFV consumed in SSA using the PRISMA guidelines to inform the development of
190 tailored policy interventions. The main review question is: How much meat, fruit and/or
191 vegetables are being consumed daily, by which individuals in SSA over the years?

192

193

194

195 **REVIEW QUESTIONS**

196 This systematic review aimed to answer three questions defined following the PICOS model (table
197 1):

- 198 1. How much meat, fruit and/or vegetables are being consumed daily by individuals in SSA?
- 199 2. Who is consuming the most (rural/urban; male/female, etc.)?
- 200 3. How has consumption changed over time?

201

202

203 **METHODS**

204 **Study protocol**

205 A protocol for this systematic review was registered with PROSPERO on 15th March 2018
206 CRD42018090497 (available from:

207 http://www.crd.york.ac.uk/PROSPERO/display_record.php?ID=CRD42018090497).

208

209 **Search Strategy**

210 The search strategy designed in consultation with a specialist librarian included the following
211 steps:

- 212 1. An initial limited search of MEDLINE database was conducted with the following
213 search terms; (Fruit or vegetable or meat) combined with (consumption or portion size)
214 AND (sub-Saharan Africa) to identify additional relevant keywords from the titles,
215 abstracts and subject descriptors.
- 216 2. Key words identified from the initial scoping search were then included as search terms
217 for extensive searches of MEDLINE, EMBASE, ASSIA CINAHL, Web of Science,
218 POPLINE and Google Scholar electronic databases. The search terms are summarized
219 in Table 2. Searches were conducted between July and September 2018 with no time
220 limits. Results were limited to French and English Languages.
- 221 3. Reference lists of papers that met the inclusion criteria after formal screening were also
222 searched for additional relevant papers.

223
224
225

226 **Inclusion Criteria**

227 **Types of studies**

228 The review considered quantitative studies that explored the consumption of meat, fruit and/or
229 vegetable consumption in sub-Saharan Africa. Study types considered for inclusion were
230 observational studies such as cross-sectional studies, and longitudinal studies like cohort studies
231 and panel surveys with reports published in peer-reviewed academic journals. Studies that did
232 not report the outcome of interest were excluded. Experimental studies that reported baseline
233 consumption data were also considered for inclusion.

234

235 **Types of participants**

236 Studies that included children, adolescents or adults were considered for inclusion. Studies that
237 included patient population samples were excluded.

238

239 The research participants should have been in a sub-Saharan African country. The World Bank's
240 definition of sub-Saharan Africa as of July 2018 was adopted (see Appendix 1 or here:
241 <https://data.worldbank.org/region/sub-saharan-africa>). Multi-country studies that did not report
242 country-specific data for included sub-Saharan African countries were excluded.

243

244 **Phenomena of interest**

245 Studies that estimated the portions/quantities/servings of meat, fruit and/or vegetables
246 consumed were included.

247

248 Definition of Meat

249 Meat was essentially defined as animal tissue, including any accompanying skeletal muscle and fat
250 consumed as food. This comprised both red and white meat. Red meat, according to the WHO⁶¹
251 are usually listed to include beef and veal from cattle, mutton from sheep, chevon from goat,
252 venison from deer, ham, bacon and pork from pigs. White meat includes fish and poultry from
253 chicken, ducks and turkeys. These were considered in this review, not excluding their processed
254 forms such as sausages, corned beef, hot dogs, kebabs, canned meat, canned fish/sardines,
255 etc.⁶⁸ Studies that looked at bush meat and dog flesh consumption were also included. Studies
256 that included eggs within their definition of meat were also eligible for inclusion.

257

258 Definition of Fruit and Vegetable

259 The significant between-country variations in the definition of what constitutes fruit and vegetable
260 are well-known concerns among food and nutrition researchers.^{69,70} The main area of controversy
261 has been the inclusion or exclusion of starchy tubers such as potatoes in classifying fruits and
262 vegetables.⁷¹ For instance, the USA, Australia, and Canada classify potatoes as vegetable, while
263 the UK does not.⁷¹ The review followed the definitions of study authors, but where possible,
264 starchy crops such as potatoes, plantain, yam, taro, cassava, and breadfruits were excluded from
265 the definition of vegetable. The global estimates of the burden of disease attributable to inadequate
266 intake of fruit and vegetable^{72,73} and other studies that assess fruit and vegetable consumption,
267 including WHO studies (WHO and FAO, 2003)⁵⁸ and other research^{74,75} have exempted starchy
268 crops. Although, starchy vegetables provide a variety of valuable nutrients that can make a healthy
269 addition to diets, starchy vegetables contain 3 to 6 times more carbohydrates and calories than
270 non-starchy vegetables.⁷⁶ A sensitivity analysis was also conducted excluding studies that included
271 starchy vegetables in their estimation of vegetable consumption to assess the robustness of the
272 results.

273

274 To ensure transparency, the search procedure and results, including the number of studies
275 in/excluded at each stage have been summarized in a Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic
276 Review and Meta-Analysis (PRISMA) flow chart presented in the results section (Figure 1).^{77,78}

277

278 **Study selection**

279 There was an initial decision for possible inclusion based on titles and abstracts conducted by
280 two independent researchers (DOM, TB). At this stage, studies were only eliminated if eligibility

281 criteria were clearly not met. Where there was uncertainty about a study meeting the inclusion
282 criteria, full texts were obtained for extensive assessment against the criteria. Full texts of
283 potentially relevant papers selected based on titles and abstracts were retrieved and assessed
284 against the eligibility criteria by two independent reviewers (DOM, OO). Any differences in
285 opinions were resolved by consensus.

286
287

288 **Data Extraction and Quality Assessment**

289 **Data Extraction**

290 Three independent investigators completed data extraction in duplicate (DOM, ARN, OO). Data
291 were organized in excel spreadsheets using the following data types as headings:

- 292 1. Authors
- 293 2. Type of study
- 294 3. Year of publication
- 295 4. Year of data collection
- 296 5. Study population (e.g. size, age cohort, etc.)
- 297 6. Country of research
- 298 7. Geographical context (this included rural or urban). Peri-urban/semi-urban
- 299 8. Variable(s) measured (meat, fruit or vegetables)
- 300 9. Measurement method used
- 301 10. Meat, fruit or vegetables intake (g/day/portion/serving size). Data were extracted for age
302 cohorts, male and female, and urban and rural settings. Where required, portion or serving
303 size is converted into grams using the conversion 1 Portion/Serving=80g. Consumption
304 data were reported differently in different studies. For example, some studies presented
305 mean (standard deviation or standard error or confidence intervals) and others presented
306 median (inter-quartile ranges IQR) in various measurement units. Measurement units
307 reported in the selected papers include grams, number of servings, litres, ounce, and kg
308 (per year, month and day). Consumption data were therefore standardized into gram/day
309 (SD). Conversions used have been outlined in Appendix 2.
- 310 11. Standard deviation of mean meat, fruit or vegetables intake
- 311 12. Standard error of mean meat, fruit or vegetables intake

312
313
314
315

Any disagreements and discrepancies were resolved by referring to original papers and further discussion.

316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350

Quality Assessment

It was anticipated that the robustness of methods of the papers included in the review would differ, and that lower quality papers could disguise essential findings. This was more importantly so, given that a number of confounding factors and design limitations often exist in observational studies.^{79,80} The quality of included studies was therefore carefully and rigorously assessed.

There is no universally accepted quality assessment tool for observational studies^{79–81} at the time of writing this report. The methodological quality of included studies was assessed using a tool adapted from Louw and colleagues (2007)⁸² and subsequently used in systematic reviews by Wong et al., 2008;⁸³ Davids and Roman 2014;⁸⁴ Davids et al., 2016;⁸⁵ Roman and Frantz 2013,⁸⁶ among others. The areas outlined in Table 3 were examined to assess methodological quality.

At the quality appraisal stage, studies with methodological weakness were not excluded. All studies were initially included in the analysis. Sensitivity analysis was conducted at a later stage to gauge or evaluate the impact of low quality papers on the overall review outcome.

Statistical Analysis

A descriptive summary of findings from the included studies was organized as presented in Table 6. Table 6 presents important information regarding characteristics of study population, type of research, and measurement technique, among others enlisted above under data extraction section.

Extracted data were pooled into a meta-regression using a random effects model in Stata SE version 15.⁸⁷ Random effects model was used because the studies included in this review were conducted by different people in different locations at different times using different sample sizes. It is assumed that the studies included in the analysis are a random sample of all possible studies that meet the inclusion criteria for the review. Though the studies looked at the same or similar phenomena (MFV consumption in this case) it holds that the true mean will differ from study to study and therefore a random effects analysis fits best. This was intended to test heterogeneity among included studies as a result of gender, age cohort, rural/urban residence, year of data collection, method used to measure dietary intake, and the economic development of the setting/countries where included studies were conducted. The economic development of the study setting was based on the World Bank definition (low income, lower-middle income, upper-middle income) at the time of writing this report.⁸⁸ In conducting these analyses, ‘farm’

351 men and women, peri-urban, semi-urban, and pastoralist populations were classified as rural,
352 while unplanned settlements were considered urban. Country-specific data for each particular
353 country in multi-country studies were treated as separate/standalone entries. The age cohort
354 classifications used by authors of included studies were followed (see Table 6).

355 Food intake measurement methods were grouped into Single 24-hour recalls, Food
356 Frequency/Propensity Questionnaires, Multiple-pass 24-hour recalls, Food Balance Sheets and
357 Others. The latter “Others” group captured all methods that did not fall under the first 4,
358 including papers that did not report method of collection.

359 Where studies did not report period of data collection, three years prior to date of publication
360 was estimated.⁸⁹ A median estimate was used in cases where reported collection period spanned
361 two years or more.⁹⁰ For longitudinal studies, each reported year was treated separately in the
362 meta-analysis. The baseline year and baseline data were extracted in the case of experimental
363 studies.

364 Median intakes were converted to means where both median and interquartile ranges (IQRs)
365 were reported following the quantile rule (after Wan et al., 2014 and Higgins et al., 2008)^{91,92} as
366 indicated in Table 3 along with other conversion methods adopted. Studies reporting only
367 median intakes without sufficient data (without IQRs, etc. which are required to estimate mean
368 intakes and standard deviations) to approximate mean intakes were excluded from the meta-
369 analysis. Where standard deviations were missing, they were calculated using Cochrane
370 Handbook procedures⁹¹ where ample data were reported or supplied by original authors when
371 contacted.

372

373 Sensitivity analyses were also conducted to assess the robustness of review conclusions. This
374 involved the exclusion of studies with the lowest overall methodological appraisal scores that fell
375 within the “Bad/Low” class score as described in Table 3. The quality appraisal scores for the
376 various studies are presented in Table 7. All consumption estimates for children and adolescents
377 were excluded in the third model of the sensitivity analyses. In a fourth model, studies that
378 included starchy vegetables in their estimation/definition of vegetable consumption were
379 excluded.

380

381

382 **RESULTS**

383 Our searches of MEDLINE, EMBASE, ASSIA, CINHAI, POPLINE, Google Scholar, and
384 Web of Science retrieved 5922 records. The search of Google scholar found 28508. The first
385 1000 papers, after sorting by relevance, were included for review, making a total of 6922 records.
386 These records were screened, and the abstracts of 1197 papers retrieved after omitting irrelevant
387 papers. After title and abstract screening, the full-texts of 215 papers were retrieved after 982
388 papers were excluded. Of the remaining, 44 papers were found relevant after reviewing full-texts
389 against eligibility criteria. Five more papers were identified through reference searches, giving a
390 total of 49 papers.⁹⁴⁻¹⁴² Two ^{103,112} studies were subsequently excluded due to insufficient reported
391 data and authors not responding with additional information when contacted. The remaining 47
392 ^{94-104,113-124,133-140} were included in the narrative synthesis. Figure 1 is a PRISMA flow chart
393 detailing the search results.

394

395 The included studies covered 24 SSA countries with the highest number of studies coming from
396 South Africa (17) ³¹⁻⁴⁷ followed by Kenya (4) ¹⁰¹⁻¹⁰⁴ and Ghana (4) ⁹⁷⁻¹⁰⁰. Fifty percent of these
397 were conducted in low income countries, 29% within lower-middle income and 21% within the
398 Upper-middle income category (based on World Bank, 2018 classification). These studies were
399 published between 1985 and 2018. Dates of data collection span from 1977 to 2015, though a
400 few papers did not report this. Of the 47 included studies, 31 reported on meat, fruit and
401 vegetable consumption, ^{93-95,99,101,103-108,110-112,116,121-131,134-136,138} 8 reported on fruit and vegetables
402 only, ^{97,98,102,113,115,118,120,139} 3 reported on meat and vegetables only, ^{109,132,133} 1 reported on vegetables
403 only, ¹¹⁷ and 4 reported on meat only. ^{96,100,119,137} In terms of age-cohort, 28 of the included studies
404 looked at adults only, 13 included children only and 6 studied both children and adults.
405 Consumption of meat, fruit and vegetables in the various populations reported in the 47 studies
406 are summarized in Table 6. Quality of these studies were assessed by two reviewers working
407 independently (summarized in Table 7).

408

409

410 **Meat Consumption**

411 After extracting data separately for five domains; children and adults, for male and female, for
412 rural and urban populations, for method, and period of data collection, as reported in included
413 studies, there were 91 (adults=75, children=16) population estimates for meat consumption. The
414 oldest and most recent data collection dates were 1977 and 2013, respectively. Forty-eight
415 percent (45) of all 91 meat consumption estimates were above 70g per day, putting average per

416 capita intake at 98g. Fifty-one percent of adult estimates were above 70g per day, compared to
417 44% of child population estimates.

418

419 The 3 lowest meat intakes (1 to 2g) were reported in rural Mali populations in the mid-1990s. Of
420 the remaining intakes under 12g, one was recorded in rural Namibians in the 1980s, four from
421 rural Malian adults and one found in rural children in Kenya all of which were studied in the late
422 1990s. The rest included 2 urban adult populations and one rural adult population, respectively
423 found in Ethiopia and Burkina Faso and all were studied in the early 2000's.

424

425 The highest meat intakes of over 380g and 340 g per day were respectively recorded in urban
426 adult populations in Equatorial Guinea and Ghana in 2003 and 2005. These, including a 320g per
427 day intake in two other South African adult populations, were outliers and are likely to be
428 unreliable. These estimates were mostly extracted from studies that derived consumption data
429 (portions) from household expenditure on meat, ¹⁰⁰ total protein intake from meat, fish, poultry,
430 eggs, legumes and nuts reported together as 'meat group' ¹³¹ and 24-hour recalls of amount of
431 meat purchased. ¹³⁷

432

433 In all 8 studies that reported meat intakes for both males and females separately, male intake
434 estimates were always higher, except for Amare et al., 2012.⁹⁵ In 5 studies that reported estimates
435 for both urban and rural populations, urban intakes were always higher than intakes in rural
436 populations.

437

438 For the meta-regression, two studies, ^{138,140} were excluded due to non-reporting of IQRs of
439 median meat intakes to allow mean intake conversions and attempts to contact authors were
440 unsuccessful. Six outliers were also excluded. Regressing mean meat intake on 6 potential
441 sources of heterogeneity separately, suggested that there was a correlation between method of
442 data collection and meat intake; between economic development of included countries and meat
443 intake; and between residence (rural or urban) and meat intake. Meat consumption has been on
444 an upward trend over the last 3 decades, with higher intakes in more recent studies, however this
445 trend was not statistically significant. (Table 4 and Figures 2 to 5).

446 Multivariate meta-regression showed statistically significant association between country
447 economic development and meat intake, with populations from richer countries consuming
448 more meat than those from lower income countries. This association remained robust in
449 sensitivity analysis (Table 5).

450

451

452

453

454 **Vegetable Consumption**

455 By extracting data separately for the five domains, 87 population estimates were recorded
456 between 1985 and 2015 for vegetable intake. Out of this, 39.1% (34) reported daily per capita
457 vegetable intakes below 80g (1 portion) while 72.4% (63) reported intakes of less than 160g (2
458 portions). An overall average consumption of 132.26g compared to a 100.66g average in adults
459 and 245.33g average daily intake in children.

460

461 The 3 lowest intakes (2 to 8g) were reported in rural Namibian and urban Ethiopian adults in
462 1985 and 2005 respectively. Five others under 30g were recorded in rural adults studied in Mali
463 in the 1990's. Of the rest, one each was found in Kenya, Mozambique and Congo (D.R) among
464 adults in the early 2000's.

465

466 The highest vegetables intake was found in rural Kenyan children at 502g per day in 2012. Other
467 high vegetables intakes at more than 400g per day were recorded in 2 South African populations
468 in 2011 and 1999. Intakes between 240 and 323g (3 and 4 portions) per day were also found in
469 13 populations in Zambia, Kenya, Ghana, South Africa, Nigeria, and Benin. Of the remaining, 7
470 study populations were reported to be consuming between 160 and 232g (2 to 2.5 portions) per
471 day. In terms of rural-urban differences in vegetables intake, 60% of studies reporting estimates
472 separately for both populations, pointed to higher intakes in urban than rural residents.

473

474 All 87 population estimates were included in the meta-regression. Examining the 6 potential
475 sources of heterogeneity separately, suggested that there was an association between year of data
476 collection and vegetable intake; between economic development of included countries and
477 vegetable intake; and between age and vegetable intake. Vegetable consumption has increased
478 dramatically over the 30-year period, with higher intakes in more recent studies, higher intakes in
479 children than adults; higher intakes in higher income than poorer SSA economies/countries; and
480 slightly higher intakes in rural than urban populations (Table 8 and Figures 6 to 8).

481

482 A meta-regression including all covariates confirmed statistically significant association between
483 year of data collection and vegetable intake; between rural-urban residence and vegetable intake;
484 between economic development and vegetable intake; and between age and vegetable intake (at

485 10% level). These associations remained robust in sensitivity analysis excluding low quality
486 studies (Model 2, Table 9). In sensitivity analyses including only non-starchy vegetables, the
487 associations remained robust between vegetable intake and year of data collection; vegetable
488 intake and rural-urban residence; and economic development and vegetable intake (Model 4,
489 Table 9a and Figure 8a). However, the rural-urban gradient became more visible after excluding
490 starchy vegetables.

491

492

493 **Fruit Consumption**

494 There were 83 population estimates for fruit intake. These data were collected between 1991 and
495 2015. Of all 83 estimates, the proportion consuming less than 80g (1 portion) and 160g (2
496 portions) of fruits a day reached 36.1% (30) and 66.0% (55) respectively. Average daily fruit
497 intake in adults was lower at 147.45g than the overall mean of 155.64g. These compared to an
498 average of 187.45g in children.

499

500 The lowest intakes found in 6 study populations in Botswana, Ethiopia, and Mali between 2002
501 and 2005 were less than 10g per day. All these but one study in Botswana were urban adult
502 populations. Of the remaining, 14 of the populations studied reported daily per person intakes
503 of between 10 and 49g, studied mostly between 2000 and 2009. The rest included 9 populations
504 in Ghana, South Africa and Kenya consuming between 60 and 80g. While the lowest fruit
505 intake (0.80g) was recorded in urban adults in Ethiopia, the lowest intake in children was at 10g,
506 reported in rural Kenya in 2012.

507

508 Fruit intake was highest at over 805g per day in Senegalese adults studied in 2007. Other high
509 daily fruit intakes between 450 and 687g (4.5 and 6.6 portions) were also recorded in 5 other
510 adult populations in Nigeria, Uganda and South Africa. The rest included 11 estimates,
511 representing 13%, consuming between 240 and 365g (3 to 4.5 portions) per day. The highest
512 fruit intake in children was reported at 365g per day found in South Africa compared to over
513 805g in Senegalese adults.

514 All the 83 population estimates were included in the meta-regression. Exploring the 6 potential
515 sources of heterogeneity separately, suggested that there was an association between year of data
516 collection and fruit intake, with lower intakes in more recent studies; between age and fruit
517 intake, with children consuming higher; and between residence (rural or urban) and fruit intake,
518 where intakes were higher in rural than urban populations (Table 10 and Figures 9 to 11).

519

520 A meta-regression including all covariates pointed to statistically significant association between
521 age and fruit intake. This relationship remained robust in sensitivity analysis (Table 11).

522
523
524

525 **Fruit and Vegetables intake**

526 Data were extracted for 115 population estimates based on the five domains (children and
527 adults, male and female, rural and urban populations, method dietary data collection, and period
528 of data collection) for fruit and vegetables intake, reported between 1977 and 2015. These
529 covered 22 SSA countries and included 90 estimates for adults and 25 estimates for children. Of
530 all 115 estimates, 79.13% (91) reported intakes below WHO's recommended daily intake of
531 400g. Up to 15.65% (18) found per capita intakes below 80g per day and 28.70% (33) consuming
532 less than 160g (2 portions). Over 32% (37) reported daily intakes of 161 to 240.70g (2 to 3
533 portions). Those reporting intakes of 400g or more reached 20.87% (24), with 15.65% (18)
534 consuming between 502 and 923g per day.

535

536 The 4 lowest intakes (3 to 4g) were adult populations (1 male, 3 females) in 1977 and 2005 in
537 South Africa and Ethiopia. Other low fruit and vegetables intakes (between 10 and 74g) were
538 found in 12 adult and 2 populations of children in Namibia, Kenya, Ethiopia, Botswana, Burkina
539 Faso, Mali, Mozambique and Zimbabwe mostly recorded between 2002 and 2005. The lowest
540 intake in children was 10g per day reported in rural Namibia in 2002 compared to 3.22g in urban
541 adults reported in 2005 in Ethiopia.

542

543 The highest fruit and vegetables intakes at 922.52g and 830.50g were respectively recorded in
544 Senegalese and South African adults in 2007 and 1994. Other high intakes between 705 and 774g
545 (8.8 and 9.7 portions) per day were found in 4 populations (2 adult, 2 children) in Nigeria and
546 South Africa. The rest included 12 populations (5 adult, 7 children) in Cameroon, Kenya, Ghana,
547 South Africa and Uganda consuming between 500 and 690g. In children, the highest intake
548 reported was 738g per day in South Africa in the 2005.

549 In 6 of 8 papers that reported separately for both males and females reported higher intakes for
550 females than males. Out of 9 papers reporting intakes separately for both urban and rural
551 residents, 6 always reported higher intakes in urban. The highest intake in females (830.50g) and
552 males (344g) were both reported in South Africa in 1994 and 1979 respectively.

553

554 All 115 population estimates were pooled in the meta-regression. Exploring the 6 potential
555 sources of heterogeneity separately suggested that there was an association between method of
556 data collection and fruit and veg. intake; and rural-urban residence and fruit and veg. intake.
557 Although not statistically significant, fruit and veg. consumption has increased over the last 38
558 years, with higher estimates in more reliable methods; higher intake in rural than urban areas; and
559 higher intake in males and females (Table 12 and Figures 12 to 14). No clear difference was
560 observed between LICs and HICs. However, in a sensitivity analysis removing starchy
561 vegetables, higher consumption was observed in HICs than LICs (Figures 15) and this was
562 statistically significant (Table 13a).

563
564

565 **DISCUSSION**

566 This review systematically identified and reviewed 49 papers reporting meat, fruit and/or
567 vegetables consumption focused on sub-Saharan Africa and with no date restrictions.

568

569 **Summary of Key Findings**

570 The average per capita daily consumption over the previous 30 years was found to be 98g for
571 meat and 268g for fruit and vegetables. While nearly a half of mean population meat intake
572 estimates were above 70g, about a third of mean population daily vegetable (32%) or fruit (36%)
573 consumption estimates was less than one portion. Through random effects meta-regression, it
574 was found that richer SSA countries consumed more meat ($p=0.010$) and more vegetables
575 ($p=0.000$) per capita than poorer SSA countries, and these findings remained robust in both
576 multivariate and sensitivity analyses. Vegetable consumption ($p=0.000$) in rural areas was also
577 more likely to reach WHO recommended levels than in urban areas, after controlling for age,
578 gender, year of data collection, method of data collection, and country economic development.
579 This rural-urban gradient became more evident after removing estimates that included starchy
580 vegetable consumption; suggesting that a greater proportion of the vegetables that urban SSA
581 populations consume is starchy vegetables. Rural residents were more likely than their urban
582 counterparts to meet WHO recommended daily intakes for fruits ($p=0.000$) in univariate
583 regression analyses, but meat consumption ($p=0.013$) was higher in urban populations. The
584 rural-urban difference in meat or fruit consumption was, however, not robust in multivariable
585 analyses. No clear gender differences in meat, fruit or/and vegetables consumption were found.

586
587
588

589 **Comparison & Interpretation**

590 **MFV consumption by Countries' Economic Development**

591 The results of the meta-regression showed that higher income SSA countries consumed more
592 meat ($p=0.002$) than poorer countries (Figure 4, Table 4), which appear to support the
593 hypothesis that meat consumption increases as societies get richer. This income gradient was
594 also observed for vegetable intake in the meta-regression (Figure 7). Poorer countries consumed
595 fewer vegetables than higher income SSA countries ($p=0.006$) (Table 8, 9 and 9a). These results
596 are in line with existing literature¹⁴²⁻¹⁴⁴ which could be a confirmation of the robustness of the
597 results in this review. As disposable incomes increase, usually resulting from economic
598 development and urbanisation, people tend to consume more protein and high-calorie products,
599 especially meat and other livestock products, potentially influenced by a desire to emulate
600 “western” lifestyle. Economic growth and urbanisation are widely believed to alter lifestyle and
601 dietary patterns partly as a result of changes they bring to the food environment, increased
602 disposable incomes, more sedentary and time-consuming occupations.^{145,146} According to
603 Marques et al. (2018)¹⁴³ economic growth has greater impact on poorer countries' change in the
604 consumption of such products. This impact reduces along the way towards the richer HIC state
605 on the Economic development scale. At this point the consumption of meat plateaus and
606 possibly even declines among individuals in high-income economies as is being witnessed in
607 some HICs, according to the FAO.^{147,148} Given that meat consumption in HICs (at already high
608 levels) will level off, in the future, the greater adverse health and environmental impacts will
609 likely result from low-income and emerging economies. It has been previously found that
610 persons in lower income economies are less likely than those in high income economies to meet
611 recommendations for vegetables consumption.¹⁴⁹ Miller and colleagues¹⁴⁹ also found that for
612 persons in LICs, the cost of both fruits and vegetables in relation to household incomes were
613 markedly higher compared to individuals in richer countries. In the same study, increase in the
614 prices of fruits and vegetables was associated with reduced intakes. A systematic review and
615 other studies have also found recommended healthy diets to be more expensive and less
616 desirable in deprived and lower income societies.^{150,151} Households on low incomes are more
617 concerned about hunger and are more likely to choose food that is filling or with high satiety
618 value (such as starchy staples, including starchy vegetables) over food such as fruit or vegetable
619 with high nutrient value.¹⁵² The current results provide added support for studies that have
620 reported monetary cost as a key determinant and known barrier to vegetable and fruit
621 consumption, especially for those in lower socioeconomic societies.¹⁵³⁻¹⁵⁵ Culture as an influence
622 on dietary behaviours is well-documented.^{146,156,157} In most African cultures and other LICs,

623 some food items are associated with social status and seen as desirable status symbols ¹⁵⁸—often
624 referred to as ‘luxury’ foods, and usually include meat, other animal products, chocolates and
625 other confectionery, biscuits, ice-cream, soft drinks, fried foods and ready meals. ^{159,160} Eating
626 such foods on a regular basis is seen to confer a superior social status compared to fruit,
627 vegetable and legumes which are less desirable and seen as survival food for the poor. ^{160,161}

628
629
630

631 **MFV Consumption trends between 1977 and 2015**

632 The results of the meta-regression also showed that consumption of two of the variables of
633 interest (meat and vegetables) have been on an upward trend over the last three decades (Figures
634 2, 6, 9 & 13). Meat consumption (N.S) and especially, vegetable intake ($p=0.002$) are likely to
635 have increased dramatically over the 30-year period, with meat intake in many adult populations
636 (49% of population estimates) exceeding the upper limit of 70g recommended by the WCRF,
637 and above this level in some populations of children. It is however possible a section of the
638 population may be consuming way too small amounts of meat given that the results presented
639 here are averages. This is because averages may conceal the differences in consumption among
640 different sections of the population. This finding is consistent with global meat consumption
641 trends which has seen a 20kg per capita increase per annum between 1961 and 2014 ⁶² and in
642 LICs, ¹⁴² but in contrast, a slow decline in many HICs. ⁶² The results also support the EAT
643 Lancet Commission’s report regarding low intake of fruit and vegetables compared to higher
644 meat intakes. ⁴⁹ Though the increase in meat consumption in this study (Figure 2) was statistically
645 non-significant, other studies have also found an upward trend in many LDCs. ¹⁶² In most SSA
646 cultures and especially countries going through economic transition, eating meat is seen as a
647 symbol of wealth and thus aspirational and desirable. ^{42,163} Such between-country disparities in
648 meat consumption have been attributed partly to cultural differences. ^{164,165}

649

650 On the contrary, fruit or/and vegetable intake remain substantially below WHO recommended
651 levels (Figures 6 and 9). Similar findings of less than 1 portion of fruit or vegetables have been
652 reported in Ghana, ⁹⁸ Uganda, ¹⁶⁶ Tanzania ¹⁶⁷ and other low-income countries (LICs) like
653 Bangladesh, India, Jamaica, and Philippines. ¹⁶⁸ The prevalence of low fruit intakes (less than 1
654 portion daily) was in a similar range as those reported by other studies conducted in some high-
655 income countries. In 2015, for example, 37% of U.S adults in the Behavioral Risk Factor
656 Surveillance System (BRFSS) survey consumed less than 1 serving of fruit. ¹⁶⁹ A similar finding

657 has been reported in 29% of Austrian adults.¹⁷⁰ In Barbados 26.9% of adults are reported to
658 consume less than 1 serving of fruit and vegetable.¹⁶⁸
659 Compared to meat and other animal-source foods consumption which in most African cultures
660 is seen to confer a superior social status, fruit, vegetables, legumes, and grains are less desirable
661 and seen as survival food for the poor.^{160,161} It is therefore likely that as suggested in the EAT-
662 Lancet commission's report, the consumption of other plant-based foods like legumes, nuts or
663 seeds is also low in SSA populations apart from fruit and vegetables, though the review did not
664 cover legumes, nuts or seeds. Based on inference from the EAT-Lancet report on plant-based
665 foods as sources of high quality protein and micronutrients, it may also follow that the SSA
666 population may likely be deficient in micronutrients and high quality protein.

667

668 **Rural/urban variations in MFV consumption**

669 Through a between-study comparison in univariable meta-regression, it was found that urban
670 populations in SSA may be consuming significantly more meat than rural populations ($p=0.013$)
671 (Figure 5) but taking slightly fewer vegetables ($p=0.000$) and fruits ($p=0.000$) than rural residents
672 (Figures 8 and 14). The observed vegetable consumption difference between rural and urban
673 areas becomes more prominent after adjusting for starchy vegetables (Figures 8 and 8a). This
674 suggests that urban populations may be consuming more starchy vegetables than non-starchy
675 vegetables which are usually relatively cheaper in urban areas. Although rural-urban difference
676 for meat consumption did not remain statistically significant (robust) in multivariable analysis,
677 higher meat intakes in urban areas may be due to higher disposable incomes associated with
678 urban living^{99,171-173} and/or shifts towards high animal protein diets that characterize populations
679 in transition to the “degenerative disease” period of Popkin's (1999) nutrition transition.¹⁷⁴
680 Yıldırım & Ceylan (2008)¹⁷⁵ have previously reported similar finding of high meat intakes in
681 urban populations in Turkey, and there are similar findings report in urban Ghanaian adults⁹⁹
682 and in Italian adolescents.¹⁷⁶ Conversely, studies conducted in Australia and Romania have
683 reported higher meat intakes in rural than urban adults.^{177,178}

684

685 Regarding fruit and vegetable consumption, the rural-urban difference observed in this review is
686 corroborated by findings in other African countries (Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Kenya, Zambia and
687 Tunisia) and in Bangladesh, Ecuador, Paraguay, Philippines, and Ukraine in a multi-country
688 study based on WHO survey data.⁷⁴ Padrão et al. (2012)¹⁷⁹ have also reported lower intakes of
689 both fruit and vegetables in urban than rural Mozambique's. In rural areas in SSA and other
690 LICs, farming is largely for subsistence and provides increased access to fruits and vegetables in

691 rural areas. It is therefore conceivable that rural populations would consume more fruits and
692 vegetables. The influences of food environments on food choice may also explain low fruit and
693 vegetable intake in urban areas of SSA where the food environment offers a wider variety of
694 food products, especially ultra-processed foods. However, based on household expenditure data
695 on 10 SSA countries, Ruel et al. (2005)⁷⁵ reported higher fruit and vegetable intake in urban than
696 rural populations. While this may have changed after nearly two decades of their research, similar
697 findings have been reported in 3 Baltic countries (Estonia, Lithuania and Latvia) and in Norway.
698 ¹⁸⁰⁻¹⁸² Similarly, rural residence has been associated with low fruit and vegetable intake also in
699 countries of the former Soviet Union, ¹⁸³ in the USA, ¹⁷⁸ Morocco, ¹⁸⁴ India, ¹⁸⁵ and other
700 countries from 8 geographical regions. ¹⁸⁶

701

702 **MFV consumption by Age cohort & Dietary Assessment Method**

703 Whiles there was no clear difference between adults and children for meat consumption, it was
704 found that consumption decreased with age for fruits (Table 10) and for vegetables (Table 9).
705 This finding is in line with findings from studies by Ndagire et al. (2019)¹⁶⁶ in Uganda, ¹⁶⁶ for
706 fruits in Tanzania ¹⁶⁷ and in the UK based on National Diet and Nutrition Survey (NDNS). ¹⁸⁷
707 Conversely, studies from Tanzania ¹⁶⁷ have reported higher vegetable intakes in the old than in
708 younger populations. Surprisingly, adults consumed more in terms of fruit plus vegetables,
709 though this was not statistically significant ($p=0.310$) (Table 12), given that higher intakes in
710 children for fruits only and vegetable only were both statistically significant (Tables 9 and 11).
711 There were no clear and statistically significant differences in consumption of MFV between
712 sexes.

713

714 In terms of method of data collection, studies that adopted more reliable dietary assessment
715 methods (MDR, FFQ) reported lower consumption estimates than methods considered less
716 accurate, such as a single dietary recall method (Figures 3, 10 & 13 and Tables 10, 12 & 13),
717 except for combined fruit and vegetable intakes, though not statistically significant. A systematic
718 review that assessed the validity of dietary assessment methods against doubly labelled water as a
719 gold standard, found similar results. ¹⁸⁸ Over-reporting was most often associated with 24-hour
720 recalls than food frequency questionnaires. As most of the reviewed studies adopted single 24-
721 hour dietary recalls, it is recommended that future research adopts more reliable assessment
722 methods that give more accurate dietary intake estimates.

723

724

725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757

Strengths and Weaknesses of the study

This systematic review has a number of strengths and weaknesses. Most of the shortcomings of this review largely reflect the limitations of the included studies.

This review is the first of its kind that focuses on SSA and in terms of strengths, it involved an extensive and thorough search of literature. Despite adopting narrow inclusion criteria, a large set of 47 relevant studies that focused on SSA and provides diversity were identified. Previous systematic reviews like ¹⁸⁹ included 7 studies from SSA. To minimize bias, ensure transparency and achieve objectivity, this review included articles published in peer-reviewed journals selected based on predetermined criteria. Papers written in languages other than English and French were excluded, which is a potential limitation, as other relevant data may have been identified in such papers. However, the diversity of included studies offers an interpretive context in which the generalizability of findings is enhanced, which is otherwise not available in any one study or a smaller number of studies. This is because the large set of reviewed studies captured a diversity of SSA participants, wide variety of MFVs, and different methods of measurement.

The large diversity regarding data available from the included studies may also be a limitation. While some consumption data were derived from national level data based on FAO balance sheet and Euromonitor passport, other studies collected and reported consumption estimates at the individual level. The data were however standardized using conversion parameters in appendix 2. Congruently, some of the reviewed reports were restricted regarding sample size and generalizability as they included small non-random samples of specific groups (including, for example, studies with less than 200 participants) which may not be nationally representative. The inclusion of studies with both large and small sample sizes means a low/no publication bias, which is more likely to capture a more complete picture of MFV consumption in SSA populations. However, the results may not be necessarily representative of dietary intakes of the different countries or other sub-population groups used in the analysis. The results must be interpreted cautiously. In relation to the above, non-reporting of response rate in some of the included studies could increase non-responder bias in the results. This was dealt with by conducting a sensitivity analysis in which studies with low quality were excluded. It is recommended that future SSA research reporting should highlight response rates and other

758 relevant statistics including missing data which was also not reported in some of the reviewed
759 reports.

760

761 The included studies defined “meat”, “fruits” and “vegetables” differently. The significant
762 between-country and between-study variations in the definition of what constitutes fruits or
763 vegetables are well-known concerns among food and nutrition researchers.^{69,70} The main area in
764 classifying vegetables.⁷¹ Eleven^{107,108,112,118,121,122,124,127,129,130,134,190} of 43 studies reporting on
765 vegetable intake captured starchy tubers in their vegetable consumption estimates, while others
766^{110,121,138} did not. In 5^{99,120,133,139} of studies reporting fruit consumption, fruit juices were captured
767 in fruit consumption estimates. Of the 38 studies that reported meat consumption estimates, 15
768 studies included fish but 23 excluded it from meat consumption estimates. These differences in
769 definitions may affect the accuracy of consumption estimates.

770

771 Another potential limitation relates to the use of different dietary intake measurement methods
772 that agree less with each other. Some methods also relied on respondents’ memory and skills of
773 the interviewer. This has been associated with recall bias and social desirability bias¹⁹¹ and may
774 have resulted in under-and/or over-reporting of consumption estimates. By entering this into the
775 multivariable models, the investigators have taken some account of the nature of the
776 measurements in the analyses.

777

778 It is also widely known that vegetable and fruit consumption display seasonal variability, which
779 may limit the comparison of the current findings within and across countries. This is because the
780 different time periods for data collection for the various countries included in this review may
781 have influenced meat, fruit or vegetable intakes at the time of data collection.

782 For example, according to Amo-Adjei and Kumi-Kyereme (2014)⁹⁷ in Ghana and most SSA
783 countries,^{98,105,108,127,134} during peak season, fruit and vegetable are in abundant supply and prices
784 are cheaper. This is especially so in and around production areas and areas that are better
785 connected to production areas in terms of distribution systems. Where majority of included
786 studies are based on dietary data gathered during off peak season, resulting consumption
787 estimates would not be representative of consumption in a full year. Though some papers
788 included in this review collected data during the dry season,^{102,106,119,133} others captured data
789 during the peak season or throughout the year.^{97,98,101,123} This makes consumption estimates in
790 this review reflective of consumption estimates throughout the year.

791

792

793

794

795 **Policy Implications**

796 The findings of this review have important implications for food and nutrition security, health
797 and environmental sustainability policies in sub-Saharan Africa. This is because the subregion
798 has the world's highest prevalence of hunger and undernourishment. Coexisting with this is a
799 rapidly increasing prevalence of nutrition-related NCDs. These trends are likely to worsen in the
800 business-as-usual scenario where meat consumption continues to increase as incomes rise in SSA
801 countries as have been observed in this review. Meat production and supply would need to
802 increase to meet increasing demand. This will mean the emission of more GHGs to increase
803 climate change and catastrophic weather events which impairs agricultural production and
804 contributes to food insecurity and undernutrition in LICs. GHG emissions from livestock
805 production in SSA and other LICs has increased by 117% between 1961 and 2010 compared to a
806 9% global average increase and a 23% decrease in HICs.¹⁹² In addition to the adverse
807 environmental footprints of meat production including biodiversity loss, land and water
808 degradation, and deforestation, about 36% of global crop calories (especially from grains) is fed
809 to livestock and only 12% return as food for people.⁴⁸ The latter increases demand for grain and
810 drives up grain prices making it difficult for the poor in especially SSA to feed. This traverses the
811 2030 Sustainable Development agenda and makes the achievement of the SDGs and targets
812 problematic. Apart from the need for the adoption of more efficient livestock production
813 methods in SSA, climate change, health and well-being need to be properly integrated in
814 livestock production systems along with other agricultural practices in the sub-region. There is
815 the need for the promotion of both the adequate supply and demand (including the production,
816 access to and consumption) of plant-based protein and micronutrients including nuts, seeds and
817 legumes in SSA countries. While dietary changes in SSA may offer large absolute health and
818 environmental benefits, consideration of the magnitude of dietary change, particularly reducing
819 or increasing the consumption of meat or other animal protein, will need to occur to ensure
820 reduction of under-nutrition and micronutrient deficiencies without worsening NCD prevalence
821 and environmental impacts. There is also the need for interventions like public health education
822 to ensure that as disposable incomes increase and countries' economic development rise, SSA
823 populations do not continue to increase their meat intake as seen in most countries undergoing
824 economic transformation. The EAT-Lancet Commission's planetary health diet may be a good
825 starting point. The Commission recommends a flexitarian diet that does not completely eliminate
826 meat and dairy but recommends a larger proportion of plant-based protein portions.⁴⁹ In Africa,

827 however, the guideline calls for reduction in the consumption of starchy vegetables like cassava
828 and taro, which the sensitivity analyses (model 4) indicate make up a larger proportion of
829 vegetable consumption in richer SSA countries and in urban populations. Given that starchy
830 vegetables are important staple foods in most SSA countries, it might be recommendable
831 retaining them as part of healthy diet of developing and urbanizing countries. While low starchy
832 vegetable diets would fit the EAT-Lancet Commission's flexitarian dietary regime retaining a
833 place in a healthy diet of developing and urbanizing countries may deserve more attention. The
834 flexitarian diet promises to save 11 million lives each year and ensure availability of safe,
835 nutritious and affordable food for all 10 billion global population expected by 2050, without
836 causing damage to the environment. The adoption of such policy will require multi-sectoral and
837 multi-disciplinary collaboration to be successful and sustainable given the complexity of the
838 nutrition situation in the sub-region. The complexity and multi-faceted nature of the factors that
839 influence food behaviour and choice are also well-known.

840

841 Countries like South Africa, Nigeria, Ghana, Tanzania and Uganda have been proactive in
842 interventions and national food and nutrition policy frameworks. Apart from Uganda's National
843 Nutrition Action plan, these policies acknowledge the need for multi-sectoral and multi-
844 dimensional approaches at both national and community levels to achieving good nutrition that
845 is safe and accessible to all. However, there appears to be a disconnect among relevant sectors in
846 terms of sector-specific policy direction. For example, while health sector institutions
847 (public/private) educate on health benefits of fruit and vegetable consumption and good
848 nutrition, government institutions in charge of finance focus on providing financial assistance
849 mainly to cash crop producers, while agricultural sector policies encourage farmers to "farm for
850 cash" rather than producing more healthy food and meat products and in ways that protect the
851 environment. Fertilizer use in SSA for instance has increased by 240% since 1961 compared to
852 8% in Europe.¹⁹³ Run off from fertilizer application has polluted many water bodies¹⁹⁴ and
853 nitrogenous fertilizers are harmful to human health and threaten terrestrial ecosystems.^{195,196}
854 Agricultural policies in SSA need to be properly aligned with environmental sector policies due
855 to the existing interdependencies. Likewise, trade ministries are more export-oriented and this is
856 counterproductive to the health and nutritional needs of local populations,⁹⁷ and to health
857 promotion efforts. Efforts need to move away from discrete sector-specific actions and
858 objectives towards 'integrated and indivisible' actions for sustainable development.

859

860 Across the sub-region, the most popular policy interventions have been catchall health
861 promotion interventions that have sought to educate on the health benefits of fruit and

862 vegetables/good nutrition with little or no attention to environmental sustainability and climate
863 change mitigation.^{98,190,197} This may be partly attributable to the reluctance of political decision
864 makers to implement more effective policies which they deem expensive, opposition by powerful
865 commercial vested interests and inadequate pressure from the public and civil society to demand
866 for change from policy makers. Though there has been some improvement over the years
867 through health promotion interventions,^{98,197} consumption of fruit and vegetable is still
868 unpopular in the sub-region. This has been attributed to the one-size-fits-all nature of
869 interventions though the determinants of food consumption behaviour are complex and vary
870 across socio-cultural, economic, demographic and genetic factors.^{156,198,199} Additionally, of the 28
871 low-middle income countries (LMICs) that have policies to promote fruit and vegetable
872 consumption, only 5 include strategies to meet WHO's recommended daily intake for fruit and
873 vegetable.¹⁹⁷ This underscores the need for innovative and informed policy interventions that are
874 tailored to various socioeconomic and demographic sub-groups. Of concern is the fact that meat
875 and other dairy as well as starchy staples (like cassava, taro, potato, etc.) have been longstanding
876 and entrenched cultural identity, religious and status symbols in most societies of the sub-region.
877 Suggestions to reduce or increase consumption of starchy staples and meat may challenge or
878 reinforce most of these values. Interventions aimed at reducing or increasing consumption of
879 these foods need to recognize these values as they may pose major barriers to desired dietary
880 behaviour changes.

881
882 Further research to better understand and update knowledge on the attitudes and perceptions of
883 SSA populations towards meat consumption is therefore recommended in order to inform
884 policy. Research to understand how personal health, body image/weight, animal welfare and
885 environmental sustainability concerns influence these attitudes will also shed more light on the
886 direction of future policy and interventions. Ascertaining the level of awareness of individuals in
887 the sub-region of the health and environmental impacts of their food choices would be a useful
888 future research focus. Research on individuals' willingness to reduce starchy staples or
889 increase/reduce meat consumption as well as increasing fruit and vegetable is also
890 recommended. Finally, research towards standardized definitions for meat, fruit or vegetable is
891 highly recommended to facilitate uniformity and consistency in research reporting and allow
892 more realistic cross-regional comparison.

893
894
895

896 **Conclusion**

897 Given the low intake of plant-based foods it is likely that SSA populations may be deficient in

898 high quality protein and micronutrient as suggested by the EAT-lancet commission. There is the
899 need for promoting both the adequate supply and demand of plant-based protein and
900 micronutrients including fruit, vegetables, nuts, seeds and legumes in SSA countries. While
901 dietary changes in SSA may offer large absolute benefits, consideration of the magnitude of
902 dietary change, particularly increasing or reducing meat consumption, will need to occur in a way
903 that ensures that policy and interventions support the reduction of under-nutrition and
904 micronutrient deficiencies without worsening NCD prevalence and environmental impacts.
905 There is also the need for preventive action that ensures that SSA populations do not increase
906 their meat consumption as disposable incomes increase and countries' economic development
907 rise as seen in most countries undergoing economic transformation.

908
909
910

911 **Competing interests:** The authors declare that they have no competing interests. This
912 systematic review was not funded.

913
914

915 **Authors' contributions:** DOM performed the searches and screening, quality appraisal, extracted
916 data, performed the meta-regression, and wrote the first draft of the manuscript. TB screened titles
917 and abstracts. OO screened full text articles, performed quality appraisal, extracted data and helped
918 design meta-regression analyses. ARN screened full text articles, performed quality appraisal and
919 extracted data. RL checked the manuscript. All authors contributed to conception and drafting the
920 manuscript, and all read and approved the final manuscript.

921
922

923 **Acknowledgments:** The authors would like to thank Samantha Johnson, Academic Medical
924 Librarian (University of Warwick) for assisting with the design of the search strategy, and the
925 University of Warwick Library staff for retrieval of some articles for this review.

926 **Funding source:** DM is supported by a Chancellor's International Scholarship. The funder had
927 no role in the conception, design, performance or approval of this work.

928
929 **REFERENCES**

- 930 1. WWAP. *The United Nations World Water Development Report 2018: Nature-Based Solutions for Water*. Paris; 2018.
- 931 2. Smith P, Bustamante M, Ahammad H, et al. Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use (AFOLU). In:
932 *Climate Change 2014: Mitigation of Climate Change. Contribution of Working Group III to the Fifth Assessment Report of*
933 *the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*[Edenhofer, O., R. Pichs-Madruga, Y. Sokona, E. Farahani, S. Kadner, K.
934 *Seyboth, A. Adler, . Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA: Cambridge University Press;*
935 2014:811-922.
- 936 3. UNFCC. *Decision 1/CP.16: The Cancun Agreements: Outcome of the Work of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Long-*
937 *Term Cooperative Action under the Convention*. UNFCC document: FCCC/CP/2010/7/Add.1 Decision; 2010.
- 938 4. Stanaway JD, Afshin A, Gakidou E, et al. Global, regional, and national comparative risk assessment of 84
939 behavioural, environmental and occupational, and metabolic risks or clusters of risks for 195 countries and

- 940 territories, 1990 – 2017: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease S. *Lancet*. 2018;392:1923-
941 1994. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(18)32225-6
- 942 5. Tilman D, Clark M. Global diets link environmental sustainability and human health. *Nature*. 2014.
943 doi:10.1038/nature13959
- 944 6. Popkin BM. Global nutrition dynamics: the world is shifting rapidly toward a diet linked with
945 noncommunicable diseases. *Am J Clin Nutr*. 2006;84(2):289-298.
- 946 7. Malik VS, Willett WC, Hu FB. Global obesity: trends, risk factors and policy implications. *Nat Rev*
947 *Endocrinol*. 2013;9(1):13-27. doi:10.1038/nrendo.2012.199
- 948 8. Springmann M, Godfray HCJ, Rayner M, Scarborough P. Analysis and valuation of the health and climate
949 change cobenefits of dietary change. *PNAS*. 2016;1-6. doi:10.1073/pnas.1523119113
- 950 9. Popkin BM, Adair LS, Ng SW. NOW AND THEN: The Global Nutrition Transition: The Pandemic of
951 Obesity in Developing Countries. *Nutr Rev*. 2013;70(1):3-21. doi:10.1111/j.1753-4887.2011.00456.x.NOW
- 952 10. Hedenus F, Wirsenius S, Johansson DJA. The importance of reduced meat and dairy consumption for
953 meeting stringent climate change targets. 2014:79-91. doi:10.1007/s10584-014-1104-5
- 954 11. Scheelbeek PFD, Bird FA, Tuomisto HL, et al. Effect of environmental changes on vegetable and legume
955 yields and nutritional quality. *PNAS*. 2018;115(26):6804–6809. doi:10.1073/pnas.1800442115
- 956 12. UN-DESA. *World Population Prospects: The 2017 Revision, Key Findings and Advance Tables*. New York; 2017.
- 957 13. WHO. *Global Status Report on Noncommunicable Diseases 2014. “Attaining the Nine Global Noncommunicable
958 Diseases Targets; a Shared Responsibility.”* Geneva, Switzerland; 2014.
- 959 14. Smet S De, Vossen E. Meat: The balance between nutrition and health . A review. *MESOC*. 2016;120:145-
960 156. doi:10.1016/j.meatsci.2016.04.008
- 961 15. Clark M, Hill J, Tilman D. The Diet, Health, and Environment Trilemma. *Annu Rev of Environment Resour*.
962 2018;43:109-134.
- 963 16. Aleksandrowicz L, Green R, Joy EJM, Smith P, Haines A. The Impacts of Dietary Change on Greenhouse
964 Gas Emissions, Land Use, Water Use, and Health: A Systematic Review. *PLoS One*. 2016;11(11):1-16.
965 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0165797
- 966 17. Bradbury KE, Tong TYN, Key TJ. Dietary Intake of High-Protein Foods and Other Major Foods in Meat-
967 Eaters, Poultry-Eaters, Fish-Eaters, Vegetarians, and Vegans in UK Biobank. *Nutrients*. 2017;9(1317):1-17.
968 doi:10.3390/nu9121317
- 969 18. McAfee AJ, Mensorley EM, Cuskelly GJ, et al. Red meat consumption : An overview of the risks and
970 benefits. *Meat Sci*. 2010;84(1):1-13. doi:10.1016/j.meatsci.2009.08.029
- 971 19. McNeill SH. Inclusion of red meat in healthful dietary patterns. *MESOC*. 2014;98(3):452-460.
972 doi:10.1016/j.meatsci.2014.06.028
- 973 20. Moschovis PP, Wiens MO, Arlington L, et al. Individual, maternal and household risk factors for anaemia
974 among young children in sub-Saharan Africa: a cross- sectional study. *BMJ Open*. 2018;8(e019654):1-14.
975 doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2017-019654
- 976 21. Boada LD, Henríquez-hern LA. The impact of red and processed meat consumption on cancer and other
977 health outcomes: Epidemiological evidences. *Food Chem Toxicol*. 2016;92:236-244.
978 doi:10.1016/j.fct.2016.04.008
- 979 22. Schwingshackl L, Hoffmann G, Kalle-uhlmann T, Arregui M. Fruit and Vegetable Consumption and
980 Changes in Anthropometric Variables in Adult Populations : A Systematic Review and Meta- Analysis of
981 Prospective Cohort Studies. 2015:1-19. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0140846
- 982 23. IARC. *Red Meat and Processed Meat: IARC Monographs on the Evaluation of Carcinogenic Risks to Humans*. Vol 114.
983 Lyon; 2018. <http://monographs.iarc.fr/ENG/Publications/corrigenda.php>.
- 984 24. Bouvard V, Loomis D, Guyton KZ, et al. Carcinogenicity of consumption of red and processed meat.
985 *Lancet Oncol*. 2015;16(16):1599-1600. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/S1470-2045(15)00444-1
- 986 25. Zur Hausen H. Red meat consumption and cancer: Reasons to suspect involvement of bovine infectious
987 factors in colorectal cancer. *Int J Cancer*. 2012;130(11):2475-2483. doi:10.1002/ijc.27413
- 988 26. Amine EK, Baba NH, Belhadj M, et al. *Diet, Nutrition and the Prevention of Chronic Diseases*.; 2003.
- 989 27. Wang H, Yamamoto JF, Caberto C, et al. Genetic variation in the bioactivation pathway for polycyclic
990 hydrocarbons and heterocyclic amines in relation to risk of colorectal neoplasia. *Carcinogenesis*.
991 2010;32(2):203-209.
- 992 28. zur Hausen H, Bund T, de Villiers E-M. Infectious Agents in Bovine Red Meat and Milk and Their
993 Potential Role in Cancer and Other Chronic Diseases. 2017.
- 994 29. Aune D, Giovannucci E, Boffetta P, Riboli E, Vatten LJ, Tonstad S. Fruit and vegetable intake and the risk
995 of cardiovascular disease , total cancer and all- cause mortality — a systematic review and dose- response
996 meta-analysis of prospective studies. *Int J Epidemiol*. 2017;46(3):1029-1056. doi:10.1093/ije/dyw319
- 997 30. Zhang Y, Gan R, Li S, Zhou Y, Li A, Xu D. Antioxidant Phytochemicals for the Prevention and Treatment
998 of Chronic Diseases. *Molecules*. 2015;20:21138-21156. doi:10.3390/molecules201219753
- 999 31. Rodriguez-casado A. The Health Potential of Fruits and Vegetables Phytochemicals : Notable Examples
1000 The Health Potential of Fruits and Vegetables Phytochemicals : Notable Examples. *Crit Rev Food Sci Nutr*.

- 2016;56(7):1097-1107. doi:10.1080/10408398.2012.755149
- 1002 32. Miller HE, Rigelhof F, Marquart L, Prakash A, Kanter M. Antioxidant content of whole grain breakfast
1003 cereals, fruits and vegetables. *J Am Coll Nutr.* 2000;19(sup3):312S-319S.
- 1004 33. Burkitt DP. Epidemiology of cancer of the colon and rectum. *Cancer.* 1971;28(1):3-13. doi:10.1002/1097-
1005 0142(197107)28:1<3::aid-cnrc2820280104>3.0.co;2-n
- 1006 34. Lockyer S, Spiro A, Stanner S. Dietary fibre and the prevention of chronic disease – should health
1007 professionals be doing more to raise awareness? *Nutr Bull.* 2016;41(3):214-231. doi:10.1111/nbu.12212
- 1008 35. Slavin J, Lloyd B. Health Benefits of Fruits and Vegetables. *Adv Nutr.* 2012;3(4):506-516.
1009 doi:10.3945/an.112.002154.506
- 1010 36. Boeing H, Bechthold A, Bub A, et al. Critical review: vegetables and fruit in the prevention of chronic
1011 diseases. *Eur J Nutr.* 2012;51(6):637-663.
- 1012 37. Erkkila AT, Lichtenstein AH. Fiber and cardiovascular disease risk: how strong is the evidence? *J Cardiovasc*
1013 *Nurs.* 2006;21(1):3-8.
- 1014 38. Kim Y, Je Y. Flavonoid intake and mortality from cardiovascular disease and all causes: A meta-analysis of
1015 prospective cohort studies. *Clin Nutr ESPEN.* 2017;20(1):68-77. doi:10.1016/j.clnesp.2017.03.004
- 1016 39. Farvid MS, Eliassen AH, Cho E, Liao X, Chen WY, Willett WC. Dietary Fiber Intake in Young Adults and
1017 Breast Cancer Risk. *Pediatrics.* 2016;137(3):e20151226-e20151226. doi:10.1542/peds.2015-1226
- 1018 40. World Health Organisation. Increasing fruit and vegetable consumption to reduce the risk of
1019 noncommunicable diseases. e-Library of Evidence for Nutrition Actions (eLENA).
1020 http://www.who.int/elena/titles/fruit_vegetables_ncds/en/. Published 2017. Accessed December 4, 2017.
- 1021 41. FAO, IFAD, UNICEF, WFP, WHO. *The State of Food Security and Nutrition in the World 2017. Building*
1022 *Resilience for Peace and Food Security.* Rome; 2017.
- 1023 42. Macdiarmid JI, Douglas F, Campbell J. Eating like there 's no tomorrow : Public awareness of the
1024 environmental impact of food and reluctance to eat less meat as part of a sustainable diet. *Appetite.*
1025 2016;96:487-493. doi:10.1016/j.appet.2015.10.011
- 1026 43. Osseo-Asare F. *Food Culture in Sub-Saharan Africa.* Greenwood Publishing Group; 2005.
- 1027 44. World Health Organization. *Global Action Plan for the Prevention and Control of NCDs 2013-2020.* Geneva; 2013.
- 1028 45. Poore J, Nemecek T. Reducing food's environmental impacts through producers and consumers. *Science (80-*
1029 *J).* 2018;360(6392):987-992. doi:10.1126/science.aag0216
- 1030 46. Gerber PJ, Steinfeld H, Henderson B, et al. *Tackling Climate Change through Livestock- A Global Assessment of*
1031 *Emissions and Mitigation Opportunities.* Rome; 2013.
- 1032 47. Eshel G, Shepon A, Makov T, Milo R. nitrogen burdens of meat , eggs , and dairy production in the United
1033 States. 2014. doi:10.1073/pnas.1402183111
- 1034 48. Cassidy ES, West PC, Gerber JS, Foley JA. Redefining agricultural yields: from tonnes to people nourished
1035 per hectare. *Environ Res Lett.* 2013;8. doi:10.1088/1748-9326/8/3/034015
- 1036 49. Willett W, Rockström J, Loken B, et al. The Lancet Commissions Food in the Anthropocene: the EAT–
1037 Lancet Commission on healthy diets from sustainable food systems. *Lancet Comm.* 2019;6736(18).
1038 doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(18)31788-4
- 1039 50. UN. *Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Resolution Adopted by the General*
1040 *Assembly on 25 September 2015. Seventieth Session.* Vol 16301.; 2015.
1041 <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/post2015/transformingourworld>.
- 1042 51. Nunes AR, Lee K, Riordan TO. The importance of an integrating framework for achieving the Sustainable
1043 Development Goals : the example of health and well-being. *BMJ Glob Heal.* 2016;1(e000068).
1044 doi:10.1136/bmjgh-2016-000068
- 1045 52. Pradhan P, Costa L, Rybski D, Lucht W, Kropp JP. A Systematic Study of Sustainable Development Goal
1046 (SDG) Interactions. *Earth' s Futur.* 2017;5:1169–1179. doi:10.1002/ef2.266
- 1047 53. WHO. *Positioning Health in the Post-2015 Development Agenda WHO Discussion Paper. WHO Discussion Paper.*
1048 Geneva; 2012.
- 1049 54. Niessen LW, Mohan D, Akuoku JK, et al. Tackling socioeconomic inequalities and non-communicable
1050 diseases in low-income and middle-income countries under the Sustainable Development agenda. *Lancet.*
1051 201AD;391:2036-2046. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(18)30482-3
- 1052 55. Pradyumna A, Egal F, Utzinger J. Acta Tropica Sustainable food systems, health and infectious diseases:
1053 Concerns and opportunities. *Acta Trop.* 2019;191(September 2018):172-177.
1054 doi:10.1016/j.actatropica.2018.12.042
- 1055 56. Tong S, Confalonieri U, Ebi K, Olsen J. Managing and Mitigating the Health Risks of Climate Change:
1056 Calling for Evidence-Informed Policy and Action. *Environ Health Perspect.* 2016;124(10):176-179.
- 1057 58. WHO/FAO. Diet, nutrition and the prevention of chronic diseases. *World Health Organ Tech Rep Ser.*
1058 2003;916:i-viii-1-149-backcover. doi:ISBN 92 4 120916 X ISSN 0512-3054 (NLM classification: QU 145)
- 1059 59. Micha R, Khatibzadeh S, Shi P, Andrews KG. Global , regional and national consumption of major food
1060 groups in 1990 and 2010: a systematic analysis including 266 country-specific nutrition surveys worldwide.
1061 *BMJ Open.* 2015;5. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2015-008705

- 1062 60. World Cancer Research Fund International. Our Cancer Prevention Recommendations-Animal foods.
1063 Continuous Update Project. [http://www.wcrf.org/int/research-we-fund/cancer-prevention-](http://www.wcrf.org/int/research-we-fund/cancer-prevention-recommendations/animal-foods)
1064 [recommendations/animal-foods](http://www.wcrf.org/int/research-we-fund/cancer-prevention-recommendations/animal-foods). Accessed January 19, 2018.
- 1065 61. WCRF/AICR. *Analysing Research on Cancer Prevention and Survival: Recommendations and Public Health and Policy*
1066 *Implications*.; 2018.
- 1067 62. Ritchie H, Roser M. “Meat and Seafood Production & Consumption”. Our World in Data. Our World In
1068 Data. <https://ourworldindata.org/meat-and-seafood-production-consumption>. Published 2018. Accessed
1069 August 20, 2012.
- 1070 63. UNFCCC. *Yearbook of Global Climate Action 2018*. Bonn, Germany; 2018.
1071 https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/GCA_Yearbook2018.pdf.
- 1072 64. Diseases N. *NCD Progress Monitor 2017*.; 2017. doi:10.2766/120051
- 1073 65. Woodside J V, Young IS, McKinley MC. Fruits and vegetables: measuring intake and encouraging increased
1074 consumption. *Proc Nutr Soc*. 2013;72(2):236-245. doi:10.1017/S0029665112003059
- 1075 66. Nicklett EJ, Kadell AR. Fruit and vegetable intake among older adults: a scoping review. *Maturitas*.
1076 2013;75(4):305-312. doi:10.1016/j.maturitas.2013.05.005
- 1077 67. Hosking J, Campbell-Lendrum D. How Well Does Climate Change and Human Health Research Match the
1078 demands of policymakers? A scoping review. *Environ Heal*. 2012;1076(8):1076-1082.
- 1079 68. WHO. Q&A on the Carcinogenicity of the Consumption of red meat and processed meat.
1080 doi:<http://www.who.int/features/qa/cancer-red-meat/en/>
- 1081 69. Thompson FE, Willis GB, Thompson OM, Yaroch AL. The meaning of “fruits” and “vegetables.” *Public*
1082 *Health Nutr*. 2011;14(7):1222-1228. doi:10.1017/S136898001000368X
- 1083 70. Roark RA, Niederhauser VP. Fruit and vegetable intake: issues with definition and measurement. *Public*
1084 *Health Nutr*. 2013;16(01):2-7. doi:10.1017/S1368980012000985
- 1085 71. IARC. *Fruits and Vegetables*. Volume 8. Lyon: IARC Press; 2003.
- 1086 72. Lock K, Pomerleau J, Causier L, Altmann DR, McKee M. The global burden of disease attributable to low
1087 consumption of fruit and vegetables: implications for the global strategy on diet. *Bull World Heal Organ*.
1088 2005;83(2):100-108. doi:/S0042-96862005000200010
- 1089 73. Pomerleau J, Lock K, Mckee M, Altmann DR. The Challenge of Measuring Global Fruit and Vegetable
1090 Intake 1 , 2. *Am J Prev Med*. 2004;(December 2003):1175-1180.
- 1091 74. Hall JN, Moore S, Harper SB, Lynch JW. Global Variability in Fruit and Vegetable Consumption. *Am J Prev*
1092 *Med*. 2009;36(5):402-409. doi:10.1016/j.amepre.2009.01.029
- 1093 75. **Patterns and determinants of fruit and vegetable consumption in sub-Saharan Africa: a multicountry**
1094 **comparison.**
- 1095 76. Condé Nast. Lentils, mature seeds, cooked, boiled, with salt Nutrition Facts & Calories. SelfNutritionData-
1096 know what you eat. <https://nutritiondata.self.com/facts/legumes-and-legume-products/4439/2>. Published
1097 2018. Accessed December 31, 2019.
- 1098 77. Liberati A, Altman DG, Tetzlaff J, et al. The PRISMA statement for reporting systematic reviews and meta-
1099 analyses of studies that evaluate health care interventions: Explanation and elaboration. *PLoS Med*.
1100 2009;6(7). doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1000100
- 1101 78. Dhillon JK, Gill NC. Deciphering the system of a systematic review. *Dent Res J (Isfahan)*. 2014;11(5):531-536.
1102 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4241603/>.
- 1103 79. Harrison JK, Reid J, Quinn TJ, Shenkin SD. Using quality assessment tools to critically appraise ageing
1104 research: A guide for clinicians. *Age Ageing*. 2017;46(3):359-365. doi:10.1093/ageing/afw223
- 1105 80. Ross LE, Grigoriadis S, Mamisashvili L, et al. Quality assessment of observational studies in psychiatry: an
1106 example from perinatal psychiatric research. *Int J Methods Psychiatr Res*. 2011;16(S1):S16-S23. doi:10.1002/mpr
- 1107 81. Shamliyan T, Kane RL, Dickinson S. A systematic review of tools used to assess the quality of observational
1108 studies that examine incidence or prevalence and risk factors for diseases. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2010;63(10):1061-
1109 1070. doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2010.04.014
- 1110 82. Louw QA, Morris LD, Grimmer-Somers K. The prevalence of low back pain in Africa: a systematic review.
1111 *BMC Musculoskelet Disord*. 2007;8(1):105.
- 1112 83. Wong WCW, Cheung CSK, Hart GJ. Development of a quality assessment tool for systematic reviews of
1113 observational studies (QATSO) of HIV prevalence in men having sex with men and associated risk
1114 behaviours. *Emerg Themes Epidemiol*. 2008;5(1):23.
- 1115 84. Davids EL, Roman NV. A systematic review of the relationship between parenting styles and children’s
1116 physical activity. *African J Phys Heal Educ Recreat Danc*. 2014;20(Supplement 2):228-246.
- 1117 85. Davids EL, Roman NV, Leach L. Decision making styles: A systematic review of their associations with
1118 parenting. *Adolesc Res Rev*. 2016;1(1):69-90.
- 1119 86. Roman N V, Frantz JM. The prevalence of intimate partner violence in the family: a systematic review of
1120 the implications for adolescents in Africa. *Fam Pract*. 2013;30(3):256-265.
- 1121 87. StataCorp. Statistical Software. 2017.
- 1122 88. The World Bank. *Data World Bank Country and Lending Groups*.; 2019.
1123 <https://datahelpdesk.worldbank.org/knowledgebase/articles/906519-world-bank-country-and-lending->

- 1124 groups. Accessed September 20, 2002.
- 1125 89. Welsh J, Lu Y, Dhruva SS, Bikdeli B, Desai NR, Benchetrit L. Age of Data at the Time of Publication of
1126 Contemporary Clinical Trials. *Med Journals Publ.* 2018;1(4):1-12. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2018.1065
- 1127 90. Oyeboode O, Oti S, Chen Y-F, Lilford RJ. Salt intakes in sub-Saharan Africa: a systematic review and meta-
1128 regression. *Popul Health Metr.* 2016;14(1):1. doi:10.1186/s12963-015-0068-7
- 1129 91. Wan X, Wang W, Liu J, Tong T. Estimating the sample mean and standard deviation from the sample size,
1130 median, range and / or interquartile range. *BMC Medical Res Methodol.* 2014;14(135):1-13.
- 1131 92. Higgins JP, Green S. Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions Version 5.1.0 [updated
1132 March 2011]. 2011. www.cochrane-handbook.org.
- 1133 93. Nago ES, Lachat CK, Huybregts L, Roberfroid D, Dossa RA, Kolsteren PW. Food, energy and
1134 macronutrient contribution of out-of-home foods in school-going adolescents in Cotonou, Benin. *Br J Nutr.*
1135 2010;103:281-288.
- 1136 94. Sodjinou R, Agueh V, Fayomi B, Delisle H. Dietary patterns of urban adults in Benin: Relationship with
1137 overall diet quality and socio-demographic characteristics. *Eur J Clin Nutr.* 2009.
1138 doi:10.1038/sj.ejcn.1602906
- 1139 95. Amare B, Moges B, Moges F, et al. Nutritional status and dietary intake of urban residents in Gondar,
1140 Northwest Ethiopia. *BMC Public Health.* 2012;12(1):752. doi:10.1186/1471-2458-12-752
- 1141 96. Foerster S, Wilkie D, Telfer PT. Correlates of Bushmeat Hunting among Remote Rural Households in
1142 Gabon, Central Africa. *Conserv Biol.* 2015;26(2):335-344. doi:10.1111/j.1523-1739.2011.01802.x
- 1143 97. Amo-Adjei J, Kumi-Kyereme A. Fruit and vegetable consumption by ecological zone and socioeconomic
1144 status in Ghana. *J Biosoc Sci.* 2014;(July):1-19. doi:10.1017/S002193201400025X
- 1145 98. Amoateng AY, Doegah PT, Udomboso C. Socio-demographic factors associated with dietary behaviour
1146 among young Ghanaians aged 15-34 years. *J Biosoc Sci.* 2017;187(205):187-205.
1147 doi:10.1017/S0021932016000456
- 1148 99. Galbete C, Nicolaou M, Meeks KA, et al. Food consumption, nutrient intake, and dietary patterns in
1149 Ghanaian migrants in Europe and their compatriots in Ghana. *Food Nutr Res.* 2017.
1150 doi:10.1080/16546628.2017.1341809
- 1151 100. Osei-Asare YB, Eghan M. Meat Consumption in Ghana, Evidence from Household Micro-data. *Empir Econ*
1152 *Lett.* 2014;13(2):141-153.
- 1153 101. Ferguson E, Chege P, Kimiywe J, Wiesmann D, Hotz C. Zinc, iron and calcium are major limiting nutrients
1154 in the complementary diets of rural Kenyan children. *Matern Child Nutr.* 2016;11(2015):6-20.
1155 doi:10.1111/mcn.12243
- 1156 102. Keding GB, Kehlenbeck K, Kennedy G, McMullin S. Fruit production and consumption: practices,
1157 preferences and attitudes of women in rural western Kenya. *Food Secur.* 2017;9:453-469.
1158 doi:10.1007/s12571-017-0677-z
- 1159 103. Mwaniki E, Makokha A. Nutrition status and associated factors among children in public primary schools in
1160 Dagoretti, Nairobi, Kenya. *Afr Health Sci.* 2013;13(1):39-45.
- 1161 104. Gewa CA, Murphy SP, Weiss RE, Neumann CG. Determining minimum food intake amounts for diet
1162 diversity scores to maximize associations with nutrient adequacy: an analysis of schoolchildren's diets in
1163 rural Kenya. *Public Health Nutr.* 2014;17(12):2667-2673. doi:10.1017/S1368980014000469
- 1164 105. Jackson MD, Motswagole BS, Kwape LD, et al. Validation and reproducibility of an FFQ for use among
1165 adults in Botswana. *Public Health Nutr.* 2012;16(11):1995-2004. doi:10.1017/S1368980012004636
- 1166 106. CL P, I B, LE T, et al. Validation of the second version of a quantitative food-frequency questionnaire for
1167 use in Western Mali. *Public Health Nutr.* 2002;5(6):769-781.
1168 <https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=cin20&AN=106852245&site=ehost-live>.
- 1169 107. Torheim LE, Barikmo I, Hatløy A, et al. Validation of a quantitative food-frequency questionnaire for use in
1170 Western Mali. *Public Health Nutr.* 2001;4(6):1267-1277. doi:10.1079/PHN2001181
- 1171 108. VÄHÄTALO L, MIKKILÄ V, RÄSÄNEN L. Schoolchildren's food consumption and dietary intake
1172 during the dry season in north-west Namibia. *Int J Food Sci Nutr.* 2005;(November 2014):1-22.
1173 doi:10.1080/09637480500195157
- 1174 109. O'Keefe S, Rund JE, Marot NR, Symmonds KL, Berger GM. Nutritional status, dietary intake and disease
1175 patterns in rural Hereros, Kavangos and Bushmen in South West Africa/ Namibia. *South African Med J.*
1176 1988;73(June):643-648.
- 1177 110. Sanusi A, Olurin A. Portion and Serving Sizes of Commonly Consumed Foods, in Ibadan, Southwestern
1178 Nigeria. *Afr J Biomed Res.* 2012;15(September):149-158.
- 1179 111. Oguntona CR., Kanye O. Contribution of street foods to nutrient intakes by Nigerian adolescents. *Nutr*
1180 *Health.* 1995;10:165-171.
- 1181 112. Anderson CAM, Bellamy S, Figures M, et al. Dietary intake of Senegalese adults. *Nutr J.* 2010;9(7):1-5.
- 1182 113. Matsinkou CF, Yergeau O, Blaney S, Sall M, Guélaye S. Improving fruits and vegetables consumption
1183 among Senegalese adolescent girls. In: Lengyel C, ed. *Canadian Journal of Dietetics Practice and Research.* Vol 77.
1184 Winnipeg, Manitoba; 2016:1-14. doi:10.3148/cjdp-2016-016
- 1185 114. Bourne LT, Langenhoven ML, Steyn K, Jooste PL, Laubscher JA, Bourne DE. Nutritional status of 3-6-

- 1186 year-old African children in the Cape Peninsula. *East Afr Med J*. 1994;71(11):695-702.
- 1187 115. Faber M, Laubscher R, Laurie S. Availability of, access to and consumption of fruits and vegetables in a
1188 peri-urban area in KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa. *Matern Child Nutr*. 2011;1-16. doi:10.1111/j.1740-
1189 8709.2011.00372.x
- 1190 116. Huybrechts LF, Roberfroid DA, Kolsteren PW, Camp JH Van. Dietary behaviour, food and nutrient intake
1191 of pregnant women in a rural community in Burkina Faso. *Matern Child Nutr*. 2008;5:211-222.
1192 doi:10.1111/j.1740-8709.2008.00180.x
- 1193 117. Faber M, Jaarsveld PJ Van, Laubscher R. The contribution of dark-green leafy vegetables to total micro -
1194 nutrient intake of two- to five-year-old children in a rural setting. *Water SA*. 2007;33(3):407-412.
- 1195 118. Jemmott LS, Icard L, Bellamy S. Cognitive-Behavioral Health-Promotion Intervention Increases Fruit and
1196 Vegetable Consumption and Physical Activity among South African Adolescents: A Cluster-Randomized
1197 Controlled Trial. *Psychol Heal*. 2015;26(2):167-185. doi:10.1080/08870446.2011.531573.Cognitive-Behavioral
- 1198 119. Nel J, Stuijvenberg ME Van, Schoeman SE, Dhansay MA, Lombard CJ, Plessis LM. Liver intake in 24 -59-
1199 month-old children from an impoverished South African community provides enough vitamin A to meet
1200 requirements. *Public Health Nutr*. 2013;17(12):2798-2805. doi:10.1017/S1368980013003212
- 1201 120. Peltzer K, Phaswana-mafuya N. Fruit and vegetable intake and associated factors in older adults in South
1202 Africa. *Glob Health Action*. 2012;5(1):1654-9880.
- 1203 121. Ronquest-Ross L-C, Vink N, Sigge GO, Ronquest- L-C, Email R. Food consumption changes in South
1204 Africa since 1994. *South African J Sci South Africa since S Afr J Sci*. 2015;111111(12):2014-2354.
1205 <http://www.sajs.co.za>.
- 1206 122. Steyn NP, Abercrombie R, Labadarios D. Food security-an update for health professionals. *SAJCN*.
1207 2001;14(3):98-102.
- 1208 123. Steyn N, Nel JH, Casey A. Secondary data analyses of dietary surveys undertaken in South Africa to
1209 determine usual food consumption of the population. *Public Health Nutr*. 2003;6(7):631-644.
1210 doi:10.1079/PHN2003482
- 1211 124. Faber M. Dietary intake of primary school children in relation to food production in a rural area in
1212 KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa. *Int J Sci Nutr*. 1999;50(1):57-64. doi:10.1080/096374899101427
- 1213 125. Macintyre UE, Venter CS, Vorster HH. A culture-sensitive quantitative food frequency questionnaire used
1214 in an African population: 2. Relative validation by 7-day weighed records and biomarkers. *Public Health Nutr*.
1215 2000;4(1):63-71. doi:10.1079/PHN200041
- 1216 126. MacIntyre UE, Kruger HS, Venter CS, Vorster HH. Dietary intakes of an African population in different
1217 stages of transition in the North West Province, South Africa: The THUSA study. *Nutr Res*. 2002;22(3):239-
1218 256. doi:10.1016/S0271-5317(01)00392-X
- 1219 127. Maruapula SD, Chapman-Novakofski KM. Poor Intake of Milk, Vegetables, and Fruit with Limited Dietary
1220 Variety by Botswana's Elderly. *J Nutr Elder*. 2008;25(3-4):61-72. doi:10.1300/J052v25n03
- 1221 128. Steyn NP, Senekal M, Brits S, Dsc JN. Urban and rural differences in dietary intake, weight status and
1222 nutrition knowledge of black female students. *Asia Pacific J Clin Nutr*. 2000;9(1):53-59.
- 1223 129. Steyn NP, Jaffer N, Nel J, et al. Dietary intake of the Urban Black Population of Cape Town: The
1224 cardiovascular risk in black South Africans (CRIBSA) study. *Nutrients*. 2016;8(285):1-13.
1225 doi:10.3390/nu8050285
- 1226 130. Bourne LT, Langenhoven ML, Steyn K, Jooste PL, Nesamvuni AE, Laubscher JA. The food and meal
1227 pattern in the urban African population of the Cape Peninsula, South Africa: the BRISK Study. *Cent Afr J*
1228 *Med*. 1994;40(6):140-148.
- 1229 131. Langenhoven ML, Wolmarans P, Groenewald G, Richter MJC, Van Eck M. Nutrient Intakes and Food and
1230 Meal Patterns in Three South African Population Groups. *Prog Diet Nutr*. 1988;14:41-48.
1231 doi:10.1159/000414745
- 1232 132. O'Keefe SJD, Ndaba N, Woodward A. Relationship between nutritional status, dietary intake patterns and
1233 plasma lipoprotein concentrations in rural black South Africans. *Hum Nutr Clin Nutr*. 1985;39(C):335-341.
- 1234 133. Caswell BL, Talegawkar SA, Dyer B, Siamusantu W, Klemm RDW, Palmer AC. Assessing Child Nutrient
1235 Intakes Using a Tablet-Based 24-Hour Recall Tool in Rural Zambia. *Food Nutr Bull*. 2015;36(4):467-480.
- 1236 134. Caswell BL, Talegawkar SA, Siamusantu W, West KP, Palmer AC. Usual nutrient intake adequacy among
1237 young, rural Zambian children. *Br J of Nutrition*. 2018;119:57-65. doi:10.1017/S000711451700335X
- 1238 135. Premji ZG, Abdulla S, Ogutu B, et al. The content of African diets is adequate to achieve optimal efficacy
1239 with fixed-dose artemether-lumefantrine: A review of the evidence. *Malar J*. 2008. doi:10.1186/1475-2875-7-
1240 244
- 1241 136. Nkondjock A, Bizome E. Dietary patterns associated with hypertension prevalence in the Cameroon
1242 defence forces. *Eur J Clin Nutr*. 2010. doi:10.1038/ejcn.2010.109
- 1243 137. Albrechtsen L, Fa JE, Barry B, MacDonald DW. Contrasts in availability and consumption of animal
1244 protein in Bioko Island, West Africa: the role of bushmeat. *Environ Conserv*. 2006;32(4):340-348.
1245 doi:10.1017/S0376892906002694
- 1246 138. Asayehu TT, Lachat C, Henauw S De, Gebreyesus SH. Dietary behaviour, food and nutrient intake of
1247 women do not change during pregnancy in Southern Ethiopia. *Matern Child Nutr*. 2017;13(e12343):1-10.

- 1248 doi:10.1111/mcn.12343
- 1249 139. Gelibo T, Amenu K, Taddele T, Taye G, Getnet M, Getachew T. Low fruit and vegetable intake and its
1250 associated factors in Ethiopia: A community based cross sectional NCD steps survey. *Ethiop J Heal Dev.* 31.
1251 140. Iannotti L, Lesorogol C. Dietary Intakes and Micronutrient Adequacy Related to the Changing Livelihoods of
1252 Two Pastoralist Communities in Samburu, Kenya. *Curr Anthropol.* 2016;55(4):475-482. doi:10.1086/677107
1253 141. Gomna A, Rana K. Inter-household and intra-household patterns of fish and meat consumption in fishing
1254 communities in two states in Nigeria. *Br J Nutr.* 2007;97:145-152. doi:10.1017/S0007114507201734
1255 142. Delgado CL. Animal Source Foods to Improve Micronutrient Nutrition and Human Function in
1256 Developing Countries Rising Consumption of Meat and Milk in Developing Countries Has Created a New
1257 Food Revolution 1 , 2. 2003:3907-3910.
- 1258 143. Marques AC, Fuinhas JA, Pais DF. Economic growth, sustainable development and food consumption:
1259 Evidence across different income groups of countries. *J Clean Prod.* 2018;196:245-258.
1260 doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.06.011
- 1261 144. Vranken L, Avermaete T, Petalios D, Mathijs E. Curbing global meat consumption: Emerging evidence of a
1262 second nutrition transition. *Environ Sci Policy.* 2014;39:1-12. doi:10.1016/j.envsci.2014.02.009
- 1263 145. Kuuire VZ, Bisung E, Were J. Examining the connection between residential histories and obesity among
1264 Ghanaians: evidence from a national survey. *J Public Health (Bangkok).* 2018.
- 1265 146. HaganJnr JE, Elvis J, Nsiah-Asamoah C, Hormenu T, Pollman D, Schack T. Managing Overweight and
1266 Obesity in Ghana from a Cultural Lens: The Complementary Role of Behaviour Modification. *J Prev Med
1267 care.* 2018;2(2):18-31. doi:10.14302/issn.2474
- 1268 147. OECD/FAO. "Meat", in *OECD-FAO Agricultural Outlook 2016-2025*. Paris; 2016.
1269 doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/agr_outlook-2016-10-en
- 1270 148. Godfray HCJ, Aveyard P, Garnett T, et al. Meat consumption, health, and the environment. *Science.*
1271 2018;361(6399). doi:10.1126/science.aam5324
- 1272 149. Miller V, Yusuf S, Chow CK, et al. Availability, affordability, and consumption of fruits and vegetables in 18
1273 countries across income levels: findings from the Prospective Urban Rural Epidemiology (PURE) study.
1274 *Lancet Glob Heal.* 2016. doi:10.1016/S2214-109X(16)30186-3
- 1275 150. Ball K, Lamb KE, Costa C, et al. Neighbourhood socioeconomic disadvantage and fruit and vegetable
1276 consumption : a seven countries comparison. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act.* 2015;12(68):1-13.
1277 doi:10.1186/s12966-015-0229-x
- 1278 151. Giskes K, Avendaño M, Brug J, Kunst AE. A systematic review of studies on socioeconomic inequalities in
1279 dietary intakes associated with weight gain and overweight / obesity conducted among. *Obes Rev.*
1280 2010;11:413-429. doi:10.1111/j.1467-789X.2009.00658.x
- 1281 152. Kennedy L. Poor diet is the result of poverty not lack of education. The conversation.
1282 http://theconversation.com/poor-diet-is-the-result-of-poverty-not-lack-of-education-26246. Published
1283 2014.
- 1284 153. Chapman K, Nutr M, Goldsbury D, et al. Exploring perceptions and beliefs about the cost of fruit and
1285 vegetables and whether they are barriers to higher consumption. *Appetite.* 2017;113:310-319.
1286 doi:10.1016/j.appet.2017.02.043
- 1287 154. Pollard CM, Miller MR, Daly AM, et al. Increasing fruit and vegetable consumption : success of the
1288 campaign Western Australian Go for 2 & 5. 2007;11(3):314-320. doi:10.1017/S1368980007000523
- 1289 155. Pollard, Kirk SFL, Cade JE. Factors affecting food choice in relation to fruit and vegetable intake : a review.
1290 *Nutr Res Rev.* 2002;15:373-387. doi:10.1079/NRR200244
- 1291 156. Boatemaa S, Badasu DM, De-Graft Aikins A. Food beliefs and practices in urban poor communities in
1292 Accra: Implications for health interventions. *BMC Public Health.* 2018;18(1):1-12. doi:10.1186/s12889-018-
1293 5336-6
- 1294 157. Kruger HS, Puoane T, Senekal M, van der Merwe M-T. Obesity in South Africa: challenges for government
1295 and health professionals. *Public Health Nutr.* 2005;8(5):491-500. doi:10.1079/phn2005785
- 1296 158. Agyei-mensah S, Aikins A. Epidemiological Transition and the Double Burden of Disease in Accra , Ghana.
1297 2010;87(5):879-897. doi:10.1007/s11524-010-9492-y
- 1298 159. Agyei-Mensah S, de-Graft Aikins A. Epidemiological Transition and the Double Burden of Disease in
1299 Accra , Ghana. *J Urban Heal.* 2010;87(5):879-897. doi:10.1007/s11524-010-9492-y
- 1300 160. Renzaho AMN. Fat, rich and beautiful: Changing socio-cultural paradigms associated with obesity risk,
1301 nutritional status and refugee children from sub-Saharan Africa. *Heal Place.* 2004;10(1):105-113.
1302 doi:10.1016/S1353-8292(03)00051-0
- 1303 161. Appiah CA, Otoo GE, Steiner-Asiedu M. Preferred body size in urban Ghanaian women: implication on
1304 the overweight/obesity problem. *Pan Afr Med J.* 2016;23(239):1-9. doi:10.11604/pamj.2016.23.239.7883
- 1305 162. Vranken L, Avermaete T, Petalios D, Mathijs E. Curbing global meat consumption: Emerging evidence of a
1306 second nutrition transition. *Environ Sci Policy.* 2014;39:95-106. doi:10.1016/j.envsci.2014.02.009
- 1307 163. Popkin BM. Commentary Global nutrition dynamics : the world is shifting rapidly toward a diet linked with
1308 noncommunicable diseases 1 – 3. 2006.

- 1309 164. Kanerva M. *Meat Consumption in Europe: Issues, Trends and Debates* Minna Kanerva *Meat Consumption in Europe: Issues, Trends and Debates*. Bremen; 2014.
- 1310
- 1311 165. De-Boer J, Helms M, Aiking H. Protein consumption and sustainability: Diet diversity in EU-15. *Ecol Econ*. 2006;59:267-274.
- 1312
- 1313 166. Ndagire CT, Muyonga JH, Nakimbugwe D. Fruit and vegetable consumption , leisure- - time physical activity , and sedentary behavior among children and adolescent students in Uganda. 2019;(August 2018):1-9. doi:10.1002/fsn3.883
- 1314
- 1315
- 1316 167. Msambichaka B, Eze IC, Abdul R, et al. Insufficient Fruit and Vegetable Intake in a Low- and. *Nutrients*. 2018;10(222):16. doi:10.3390/nu10020222
- 1317
- 1318 168. Peltzer K, Pengpid S. Correlates of healthy fruit and vegetable diet in students in low, middle and high income countries. *Int J Public Heal*. 2015;60:79-90. doi:10.1007/s00038-014-0631-1
- 1319
- 1320 169. Health S. 2018 Washington State Health Assessment. 2018.
- 1321 170. Schatzer M, Rust P, Elmadfa I. Fruit and vegetable intake in Austrian adults: intake frequency, serving sizes, reasons for and barriers to consumption, and potential for increasing consumption. *Public Health Nutr*. 2009;13(4):480-487. doi:10.1017/S136898000999142X
- 1322
- 1323
- 1324 171. Cockx L, Colen L, De Weerd J. *From Corn to Popcorn? Urbanization and Food Consumption in Sub-Saharan Africa: Evidence from Rural-Urban Migrants in Tanzania*. Leuven; 2017. <http://hdl.handle.net/10419/172042>.
- 1325
- 1326 172. Popkin BM. Urbanization, lifestyle changes and the nutrition transition. *World Dev*. 1999;27(11):1905-1916. doi:10.1016/S0305-750X(99)00094-7
- 1327
- 1328 173. OECD. Meat consumption. Meat consumption. doi:10.1787/fa290fd0-en
- 1329 174. Mogre V, Nyaba R, Aleyira S, Sam NB. Demographic , dietary and physical activity predictors of general and abdominal obesity among university students : a cross-sectional study. *Springerplus*. 2015;4(226):1-8. doi:10.1186/s40064-015-0999-2
- 1330
- 1331
- 1332 175. Yıldırım İ, Ceylan M. Urban and rural households' fresh chicken meat consumption behaviors in Turkey. *Nutr Food Sci*. 2008;38(2):154-163. doi:10.1108/00346650810863037
- 1333
- 1334 176. Grosso G, Matalone M, Buscemi S, et al. Factors Associated with Adherence to the Mediterranean Diet among Adolescents Living in Sicily, Southern Italy. *Nutrients*. 2013;5:4908-4923. doi:10.3390/nu5124908
- 1335
- 1336 177. Martin JC, Moran LJ, Teede HJ, Ranasinha S, Lombard CB, Harrison CL. Exploring Diet Quality between Urban and Rural Dwelling Women of Reproductive Age. *Nutrients*. 2017;9(586):1-14. doi:10.3390/nu9060586
- 1337
- 1338
- 1339 178. Lutfiyya MN, Chang LF, Lipsky MS. A cross-sectional study of US rural adults' consumption of fruits and vegetables: do they consume at least five servings daily? *BMC Public Health*. 2012;12(1):280.
- 1340
- 1341 179. Padrão P, Laszczyńska O, Silva-Matos C, Damasceno A, Lunet N. Low fruit and vegetable consumption in Mozambique: Results from a WHO STEPwise approach to chronic disease risk factor surveillance. *Br J Nutr*. 2012. doi:10.1017/S0007114511003023
- 1342
- 1343
- 1344 180. Ritva P, Paalanen L, Grinberga D, Helasoja V, Kasmel A, Petkeviciene J. Gender differences in the consumption of meat , fruit and vegetables are Gender differences in the consumption of meat , fruit and vegetables are similar in Finland and the Baltic countries. *Eur J Public Health*. 2014;17(5):520-525. doi:10.1093/eurpub/ckl265
- 1345
- 1346
- 1347
- 1348 181. Johansson L, Thelle DS, Solvoll K, Bjørneboe GA, Drevon CA. Healthy dietary habits in relation to social determinants and lifestyle factors. *Br J Nutr*. 1999;81:211-220.
- 1349
- 1350 182. Prattala R, Paalanen L, Grinberga D, et al. Gender differences in the consumption of meat , fruit and vegetables are similar in Finland and the Baltic countries. *Eur J Public Health*. 2006;17(5):520-525. doi:10.1093/eurpub/ckl265
- 1351
- 1352
- 1353 183. Abe SK, Stickley A, Roberts B, et al. Changing patterns of fruit and vegetable intake in countries of the former Soviet Union. *Public Health Nutr*. 2013;16(11):1924-1932. doi:10.1017/S1368980013001316
- 1354
- 1355 184. El-Rhazi K, Nejari C, Romaguera D, et al. Adherence to a Mediterranean diet in Morocco and its correlates: cross-sectional analysis of a sample of the adult Moroccan population. *BMC Public Health*. 2012;12:1-7. doi:10.1186/1471-2458-12-345
- 1356
- 1357
- 1358 185. Bowen L, Ebrahim S, Stavola B De, et al. Dietary Intake and Rural-Urban Migration in India: A Cross-Sectional Study. *PLoS One*. 2011;6(6):1-8. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0014822
- 1359
- 1360 186. Miller V, Mente A, Dehghan M, et al. Fruit, vegetable, and legume intake, and cardiovascular disease and deaths in 18 countries (PURE): a prospective cohort study. *Lancet*. 2017;390(10107):2037-2049. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(17)32253-5
- 1361
- 1362
- 1363 187. Albani V, Butler LT, Traill WB, Kennedy OB, Ne T. Fruit and vegetable intake: change with age across childhood and adolescence. *Br J of Nutrition*. 2017;117:759-765. doi:10.1017/S0007114517000599
- 1364
- 1365 188. Burrows TL, Martin RJ, Collins CE. Review A Systematic Review of the Validity of Dietary Assessment Methods in Children when Compared with the Method of Doubly Labeled Water. *JADA*. 2010;110(10):1501-1510. doi:10.1016/j.jada.2010.07.008
- 1366
- 1367
- 1368 189. Mayen A, Marques-vidal P, Paccaud F, Bovet P, Stringhini S. Socioeconomic determinants of dietary patterns in low- and middle-income countries: a systematic review. *Am J Clin Nutr*. 2014;100:1520-1530.
- 1369

- 1370 doi:10.3945/ajcn.114.089029.Socioeconomic
1371 190. Lachat C, Otchere S, Roberfroid D, et al. Diet and Physical Activity for the Prevention of
1372 Noncommunicable Diseases in Low- and Middle-Income Countries: A Systematic Policy Review. *PLoS*
1373 *Med.* 2013;10(6):1-19. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1001465
1374 191. Gibson RS, Charrondiere UR, Bell W. Measurement Errors in Dietary Assessment Using Self-Reported 24-
1375 Hour Recalls in Low-Income Countries and Strategies for Their Prevention. *Am Soc Nutr.* 2017;8:980-991.
1376 doi:10.3945/an.117.016980
1377 192. Caro D, Davis SJ, Bastianoni S, Caldeira K. Global and regional trends in greenhouse gas emissions from
1378 livestock. *Clim Change.* 2014;126(1):203-216. doi:10.1007/s10584-014-1197-x
1379 193. Clark M, Hill J, Tilman D. The Diet, Health, and Environment Trilemma. *Annu Rev Environ Resour.*
1380 2018;43:109–34.
1381 194. Smith VH, Tilman GD, Nekola JC. Eutrophication: impacts of excess nutrient inputs on freshwater,
1382 marine, and terrestrial ecosystems. *Environ Pollut.* 1999;100(1-3):179-196.
1383 195. Le Moal M, Gascuel-odoux C, Ménesguen A, et al. Science of the Total Environment Eutrophication: A
1384 new wine in an old bottle? *Sci Total Environ.* 2019;651:1-11. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2018.09.139
1385 196. Ortiz-reyes E, Anex RP. A life cycle impact assessment method for freshwater eutrophication due to the
1386 transport of phosphorus from agricultural production. *J Clean Prod.* 2018;177:474-482.
1387 doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.12.255
1388 197. Darfour-Oduro SA, Andrade JE, Grigsby-Toussaint DS. Review of policies to increase fruit and vegetable
1389 consumption and physical activity in 49 low- and middle-income countries. *J Public Health (Bangkok).*
1390 2018;41(1):119-129. doi:10.1093/pubmed/fdy039
1391 198. Deliens T, Clarys P, Bourdeaudhuij I De, Deforche B. Determinants of eating behaviour in university
1392 students: a qualitative study using focus group discussions. *BMC Public Health.* 2014;14(53):1-12.
1393 <http://www.biomedcentral.com/1471-2458/14/53%0APage>.
1394 199. Ruel TM, Minot N, Smith L. Patterns and determinants of fruits and vegetable consumption in sub-Saharan
1395 Africa: a multicountry comparison. 2005;9:1-45.
1396 http://www.who.int/dietphysicalactivity/publications/f&v_africa_economics.pdf?ua=1.
1397 200. Methley AM, Campbell S, Chew-Graham C, McNally R, Cheraghi-Sohi S. PICO, PICOS and SPIDER: A
1398 comparison study of specificity and sensitivity in three search tools for qualitative systematic reviews. *BMC*
1399 *Health Serv Res.* 2014;14(1). doi:10.1186/s12913-014-0579-0
1400 201. Pollock A, Berge E. How to do a systematic review. *Int J Stroke.* 2018;13(2):138-156.
1401 doi:10.1177/1747493017743796
1402 202. Pienaar E, Grobler L, Busgeeth K, Eisinga A, Siegfried N. Developing a geographic search filter to identify
1403 randomised controlled trials in Africa: finding the optimal balance between sensitivity and precision. *Health*
1404 *Info Libr J.* 2011;28:210-215. doi:10.1111/j.1471-1842.2011.00936.x
1405 203. Sodjinou R, Agueh V, Fayomi B, Delisle H. Dietary patterns of urban adults in Benin : relationship with
1406 overall diet quality and socio-demographic characteristics. *Eur J Clin Nutr.* 2009;63:222-228.
1407 doi:10.1038/sj.ejcn.1602906
1408
1409
1410
1411

1412 TABLE LEGEND

- 1413 Table 1: PICOS model
1414 Table 2: Search strategy
1415 Table 3: Methodological Quality Appraisal Tool
1416 Table 4: Meta-regression for meat consumption entering single covariates
1417 Table 5: Meta-regression for meat consumption entering all covariates
1418 Table 6: Characteristics of included studies
1419 Table 7: Quality appraisal
1420 Table 8: Meta-regression for vegetable consumption entering single covariates
1421 Table 9: Meta-regression for vegetable consumption entering all covariates
1422 Table 9a: Model 4 (excluding starchy vegetables)
1423 Table 10: Meta-regression for fruit consumption entering individual covariates
1424 Table 11: Meta-regression for fruit consumption entering all covariates
1425 Table 12: Meta-regression for fruit and vegetable consumption entering single covariates

1426 Table 13: Meta-regression for fruit and vegetable consumption entering all covariates

1427 Table 13a: Model 4 (excluding starchy vegetables)

1428

1429

1430

1431

1432 **FIGURE LEGEND**

1433 Figure 1: PRISMA 2009 flow chart of search and screening results

1434 Figure 2: Mean meat intake by year of data collection

1435 Figure 3: Mean meat intake & method of data collection

1436 Figure 4: Mean meat intake & country economic classification

1437 Figure 5: Mean meat intake by rural/urban residence

1438 Figure 6: Mean vegetable intake by year of data collection

1439 Figure 7: Mean vegetable intake & economic classification

1440 Figure 8: Mean vegetable intake by rural/urban residence

1441 Figure 9: Mean fruit intake by year of data collection

1442 Figure 10: Mean fruit intake & method of data collection

1443 Figure 11: Mean fruit intake by rural/urban residence

1444 Figure 12: Mean fruit & veg. intake by year of data collection

1445 Figure 13: Mean fruit & veg. intake & method of data collection

1446 Figure 14: Mean fruit & veg. intake by rural/urban residence

1447

1448

1449

1450

TABLES

Table 1: PICOS model

Mnemonic	Adapted PICOS	Description
P	P opulation or P articipants	Children (1 to 10 yos), Adolescents (11 to 19 yos), Adults (19+). Excluded patient population samples.
I	Phenomena of I nterest	Meat, Fruit and Vegetables consumption (quantity, portions, servings)
C	C ontext	sub-Saharan Africa (World Bank, July 2018)
O		
S	S tudy design/type	Quantitative Observational studies (Cross-sectional, Longitudinal, Panel studies). Experimental studies with baseline data. All peer-viewed academic journals

Source: adapted from Methley et al., 2014²⁰⁰; Pollock and Berge 2018²⁰¹

Table 2: Search strategy

Summary of search terms for MEDLINE, EMBASE (countries searched individually after Pienaar et al. (2011)²⁰²)
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. sub-Saharan africa.mp. or exp "Africa South of the Sahara"/ 2. Angola or Benin or Botswana or "Burkina Faso" or Burundi or Cameroon or "Cape Verde" or "Central African Republic" or Chad or Comoros or Congo or "Cote d'Ivoire" or Djibouti or "Equatorial Guinea" or Eritrea or Ethiopia or Gabon or Gambia or Ghana or Guinea or Guinea-Bissau or Kenya or Lesotho or Liberia or Madagascar or Malawi or Mali or Mauritania or Mauritius or Mozambique or Namibia or Niger or Nigeria or Rwanda or "Sao Tome and Principe" or Senegal or Seychelles or "Sierra Leone" or Somalia or "South Africa" or "South Sudan" or Sudan or Swaziland or Tanzania or Togo or Uganda or Zambia or Zimbabwe 3. 1 OR 2 4. meat/ or meat products/ processed meat or poultry/ or red meat/ or fish 5. exp FRUIT/ 6. exp VEGETABLES/ 7. 4 OR 5 OR 6 8. 3 AND 7 9. consumption/ or intake or EATING/ 10. diet/ or portion size/ or serving size/ or frequency 11. 9 OR 10 12. 8 AND 11 13. limit to humans
Search terms for Google Scholar & POPLINE (countries searched individually after Pienaar et al. (2011)²⁰²)
(sub-Saharan Africa or Angola or Benin or Botswana or "Burkina Faso" or Burundi or Cameroon or "Cape Verde" or "Central African Republic" or Chad or Comoros or Congo or "Cote d'Ivoire" or Djibouti or "Equatorial Guinea" or Eritrea or Ethiopia or Gabon or Gambia or Ghana or Guinea or Guinea-Bissau or Kenya or

Lesotho or Liberia or Madagascar or Malawi or Mali or Mauritania or Mauritius or Mozambique or Namibia or Niger or Nigeria or Rwanda or “Sao Tome and Principe” or Senegal or Seychelles or “Sierra Leone” or Somalia or “South Africa” or “South Sudan” or Sudan or Swaziland or Tanzania or Togo or Uganda or Zambia or Zimbabwe) AND (meat or “meat products” or “processed meat” or poultry or “red meat” or fish or fruit or vegetable) AND (consumption or intake or diet) AND (“portion size” or frequency or quantity)

Table 3: Methodological Quality Appraisal Tool

Domain/Question	Explanation	Scoring algorithm
Statement of study objective/aim 1. Was the research objective clearly stated (to measure meat/fruits/vegetables consumption)?	This examines whether a paper spelt out exactly what it set out to do. That is, to measure meat or fruits or vegetables consumption or both, for this review.	A score 0—2 will be assigned. Where, 0—Not stated, 1—Not clearly stated and 2—Explicitly stated.
Clarity of study population definition 2. Was the study population clearly defined?	This assesses whether the authors specified the characteristics of respondents they sought to include in their research.	0—Not stated 1—Not clearly defined 2—Explicitly defined
Sampling method 3. Was the sampling method one that achieves a sample representative of the intended study population?	A. Non-probability sampling—such as quota, snowball, convenience and purposive sampling B. Probability sampling—such as simple random, cluster, systematic, stratified, two-stage, and multi stage sampling	Not Reported—0 Category A—1 Category B—2
Response rate 4. Was a response rate mentioned in the study?	Response Rate is reported if authors reported a precise rate or drop-outs & cancellation of interviews were reported. Compute Response Rate where enough information is reported but precise rate not reported.	Not reported—0 Reported (below 60%)—1 Reported (60% plus)—2
Reliability and accuracy of measurement technique 5. Was the measuring technique accurate and reliable?	This is to examine how susceptible the measuring tool used in a FV consumption study is to errors. This brings clarity to how accurate measurements are, and the level of confidence readers should put in the results of the review. D1—Single Dietary recall (e.g. 24-hour recall) D2—Food Frequency Questionnaire D3—Repeated/Multiple dietary recalls (e.g. food records, multiple pass recall, etc.) D4—Biomarkers (e.g. vitamin C, carotenoids, etc.)	D1—1 D2—2 D3—3 D4—4
Reporting of data	Researchers indicated the number of respondents with missing data/incomplete responses and	Not reported—0 Reported only—1

6.a. Missing Data—Were missing data and strategies for addressing missing data reported?	appropriate steps/methods for addressing same.	Reported and addressed—2
6.b. Presentation of data—Were data clearly and accurately reported	Data presented were clear and accurate. Data presentation is accurate if average consumption data (MEAN/MEDIAN) and measures of statistical dispersion (SD, Variance, Range/IQR) are all reported correctly, Score 2. Score 1 where there are anomalies in reported data or only consumption data is reported without any measure of dispersion or where consumption data is reported in a graph/figure only.	Not reported—0 Reported with error—1 Reported accurately—2
Class Scoring: Total score divided by total number of items multiplied by 100		
Methodological Appraisal Class Score		
Bad/Low	Satisfactory	Good
0—33%	34—66 %	67—100 %

Table 4: Meta-regression for meat consumption entering single covariates²

Covariate	Coefficient	CI	Standard error	p
Year of data collection	1.27	-2.33 to 4.87	1.81	0.49
Gender	-3.28	-44.54 to 37.99	20.75	0.88
Age (children/adults)	8.14	-71.86 to 88.13	40.22	0.84
Method of data collection	-45.45	-85.46 to -5.44	20.12	0.03
Economic development	44.32	16.82 to 71.82	13.83	0.00
Location (rural-urban)	35.80	7.81 to 63.78	14.07	0.01

Table 5: Meta-regression for meat consumption entering all covariates³

Covariate	Model 1 (including all studies)			Model 2 (excluding quality<34%)			Model 3 (including adults only)		
	Coefficient (95% CI)	SE	p	Coefficient (95% CI) (M2)	SE	p	Coefficient (95% CI) (M3)	SE	p
Year of data collection	0.63 (-3.51 to 4.77)	2.1	0.76	0.63 (-3.55 to 5.80)	2.08	0.76	-2.92 (-8.74 to 2.90)	2.91	0.32
Gender	3.03 (-34.64 to 40.70)	18.9	0.87	3.03 (-34.92 to 40.98)	18.92	0.87	4.86 (-34.04 to 43.76)	19.45	0.80
Age (children/Adults)	-14.64 (-100.82 to 61.02)	43.3	0.74	-14.64 (-101.46 to 72.19)	43.29	0.74	N/A	N/A	N/A
Method of data collection	-28.80 (-67.66 to 71.55)	20.8	0.17	-28.80 (-70.51 to 12.92)	20.80	0.17	-29.33 (-80.38 to 21.73)	25.53	0.26

² Entering single covariates: The covariates used in our analyses included: year of data collection, gender, age, method of data collection, economic development of included countries, and rural/urban residence. Only one covariate was entered at a time to test its effect on or association with meat consumption estimates of the population in the included studies.

³ Entering all covariates: All six covariates were entered together at the same time to explore the role of year of data collection, gender, age, method of data collection, country's economic development, and rural/urban residence as sources of heterogeneity for the estimated meat intakes of the population in the included studies.

Economic Development	36.76 (2.61 to 70.91)	17.2	0.04	36.77 (2.36 to 71.17)	17.15	0.04	54.26 (13.68 to 94.83)	20.29	0.01
Location (Rural-Urban)	15.29 (-20.72 to 51.31)	18.1	0.40	15.29 (-20.99 to 51.58)	18.09	0.40	19.68 (-22.36 to 61.72)	21.02	0.35

Table 6: Characteristics of included studies

Country of study	Date of data collection	Study population/sample	Variable(s) of Interest Measured (Meat/ Fruit/ Vegetable)	Author's definition of variable(s)	Measurement method (FFQ/24H Recall/FBS/Portion Size)	Reference
Benin	January to May 2007	656 Secondary School adolescents 13 to 19 years randomly recruited from 12 randomly selected Secondary schools based on the Beninese Ministry of Secondary Education list of all private (n 109) and public (n 18) secondary schools in Cotonou.	Fruit, Vegetables and Vegetable products Meat & Meat Products	Adapted from FAO food composition table for use in Africa (Wu Leung et al., 1968). FRUIT : examples cited to include pineapples, mangoes, apples and oranges were present as fruit. VEGETABLES : green leafy vegetables consumed in sauces	24-hour dietary recall repeated on two non-consecutive school days. Standardised recipes and portion sizes (grams) were used for street foods.	Nago et al. (2010) ⁹³
Benin	Not Stated	200 men and women randomly selected in 10 neighbourhoods in Cotonou	Meat, Fruit, Vegetables	MEAT : Reported separately for White meat, red meat, and fish. FRUIT (not explicit): reports separately for Fruit, fruit juices. VEGETABLES (not explicit): Green leafy vegetables, other vegetables.	Three non-consecutive 24-hour recalls using food frequency questionnaire (FFQ). Local cups, bowls, spoons, plates and glasses commonly used in the study area served as visual aids to increase the accuracy of portion size estimations.	Sodjinou, Agueh, Fayomi, & Delisle (2009) ⁹⁴
Botswana	September 2006 to August 2007	79 adults (63 women, 16 men) aged 18 to 75 recruited--one from every second household in a larger epidemiological study in Kanye, a large village in southern Botswana	Meat, Fruit, Vegetables	MEAT : red meat, poultry and fish; FRUITS : (not defined), VEGETABLES : dark green leafy and yellow vegetables, other vegetables	4 repeated 24-hour recalls at 3 months intervals using FFQ, Cross sectional	Jackson et al. (2012) ¹⁰⁵

Botswana	June to August 2003	99 elderly persons aged 60-69 recruited and interviewed at local post offices or the Kgotla (traditional meeting place) by convenience sampling in Urban stratum (represented by Gaborone the capital city and Francistown); Urban village stratum (Kanye, Molepolole, and Mahalapye); and Rural villages (Makaleng, Molapowabojang, and Sebina)	Fruits, Vegetables, Meat (includes animal-sourced foods)	Followed the USDA Food Guide Pyramid. MEAT: meat, poultry, fish, dry beans, eggs, and nuts Definitions for Fruits and Vegetables were not explicitly stated but the USDA Food Guide defines. FRUITS: Orange, 100% fruit juices, apple, banana, etc. VEGETABLES: Sweet potatoes, corn, peas, tomatoes, onions, green beans, carrots, lettuce, green beans, spinach, romaine, broccoli	Multiple-pass 24-hour recalls. Followed USDA Food Guide Pyramid (1996) to estimate mean servings per day	Maruapula & Chapman-Novakofski (2007) ¹²⁷
Burkina Faso	December 2004	176 non-pregnant women conveniently selected and 218 randomly sampled pregnant women from two villages, Koho and Karaba, in the health district of Houndé, province of Tuy, Burkina Faso. (Data extracted for non-pregnant women)	Meat, Fruit, Vegetables	MEAT (Meat/poultry/fish products): Dried fish, chicken, Sheep and goat, pork. VITAMIN A-RICH FRUIT & VEGETABLES: Baobab leaves, Cowpea leaves, Bush okra leaves, Kapok tree flowers, Sorrel leaves; OTHER VEGETABLES: okra, tomato, onion, and cabbage; OTHER FRUIT: Lemon, Orange. Data collected for "Other Fruits" but not presented because Medians and 25th and 75th percentiles are only presented if the at least 75% of sample consumed the food group	An interactive 24-hour recall survey	Huybregts, Roberfroid, Kolsteren, & Camp (2009) ¹¹⁶
Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Congo, Dem Republic of, Côte d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Malawi, Mali, Mozambique, Nigeria, Sudan, Uganda,	2001 to 2003	Multi-country analysis based on FAO data for SSA countries	Meat, Fruit, Vegetables	Not defined	Data from FAO balance sheets.	Premji et al. (2008) ¹³⁵

Tanzania, Zimbabwe						
Cameroon	November 2008	Randomly recruited 541 members of the defence force (including national gendarmerie, army, air force, navy and fire brigade) for 8 military institutions aged 21 to 59 years in Yaoundé, Cameroon.	Meat, Fruit, Vegetables,	MEAT: Beef, lamb, pork, smoked meat; Bush meat; Organ meats: Liver, kidney and other organ meats; Poultry. FISH and SEAFOOD: Fish, dry fish, shrimp, crab. FRUITS and VEGETABLES: Fresh fruits, yellow/dark-green vegetables (not explicitly); Fruit juices: Orange/pineapple/lemon/mango juices; Vegetable juices Red beet/folere juices	Self-administered validated FFQ. Frequency of intake and amounts consumed in grams per day.	Nkondjock & Bizome (2010) ¹³⁶
Equatorial Guinea	December 2003– March 2004	198 households randomly selected from 7 neighbourhoods within the city of Malabo, Bioko Island, Equatorial Guinea	Meat	Bush meat, Small livestock meats, Beef, and Fresh fish	24-hour recall. Consumption figures converted to per capita using Adult Male Equivalent (AME)	Albrechtsen, Fa, Barry, & MacDonald (2006) ¹³⁷
Ethiopia	July to August 2013	Random sample of 164 Non-pregnant women (159 Pregnant women) recruited from a subsistence farming community of Butajira district southern Ethiopia	Meat, Fruit, Vegetables	Based on Ethiopian & Ugandan Food Composition Tables definition: MEAT (excludes FISH & seafoods): Red meat, white meat, poultry, game, rodents, processed meats, organ meats (kidney, liver, mixed offals, intestines), blood, animal skin/ears/feet/head, insects Fish (includes SEAFOODS): Whole fish, fish meat, eel, reptiles, shell fish. FRUITS (includes FRUIT JUICES): Fresh fruits, dried fruits, undiluted pure fruit juices, starchy fruits (banana/plantain). VEGETABLES: Fresh vegetables, dried vegetables (excludes potatoes).	Multiple pass 24-hour recalls. Spoons and calibrated utensils used to estimate amount consumed in grams.	Asayehu, Lachat, Henauw, & Gebreyesus (2017) ¹³⁸

Ethiopia	April to June 2015	Random sample 9800 of 10,260 study participants aged 15 to 69 from 513 EA's in the 9 regions and the 2 Administrative cities (Addis-ababa and Dire Dawa) in Ethiopia based on 2007 Population and Housing Census. 60% participants were female	Fruit and Vegetables	VEGETABLE: Not defined. FRUIT: not explicit but lists include apple, banana, orange, fruit juice, cooked and canned fruit.	Weekly food recalls, "Asked for the number of days they ate fruit and vegetables in a typical week and on one of those days how many servings they ate". Serving size measured using pictorial show cards. The conversion 1 Serving= 80 grams. For raw green leafy vegetables, 1 serving = one cup; for cooked or chopped vegetables, 1 serving = ½ cup; for fruit (apple, banana, orange etc.), 1 serving = 1 medium size piece; for chopped, cooked and canned fruit, 1 serving = ½ cup; and for juice from fruit, 1 serving = ½ cup.	Gelibo et al. (2017) ¹³⁹
Ethiopia	July 2005	356 participants (71.3% female and 28.7% male) randomly selected from Gondar city, Northwest Ethiopia. Household level data collection. Only one adult individual was selected from a household.	Meat, Fruit, Vegetables	Not defined	Food frequency questionnaire and 24-hour dietary recall. Quantities of food consumed were estimated in household measures and a digital household dietary scale.	Amare et al. (2012) ⁹⁵

Gabon	Longitudinal Feb to May 2006, Sept to Dec 2006	1219 households in 121 Rural villages in the vicinity of three newly established national parks in rural Gabon: Biringou, Ivindo, and Monts de Cristal in Gabon. Data reported based on 751 adult respondents.	Bushmeat	Blue duiker (<i>Philantomba monticola</i>), Red duikers, Unidentified duikers (<i>Cephalophus</i> spp.), Sitatunga (<i>Tragelaphus spekii</i>), Brush-tailed porcupine (<i>Atherurus africanus</i>), Red river hog (<i>Potamochoerus porcus</i>), Monkeys (<i>Cercopithecus</i> spp.), Water chevrotain (<i>Hyemoschus aquaticus</i>), Bay duiker (<i>Cephalophus dorsalis</i>), Mandrill (<i>Mandrillus sphinx</i>), Gambian rat (<i>Cricetomys gambianus</i>), African palm civet (<i>Nandinia binotata</i>), Cane rat (<i>Thryonomys swinderianus</i>), Golden cat (<i>Profelis aurata</i>), Long-tailed pangolin (<i>Manis tetradactyla</i>), Leopard (<i>Panthera pardus</i>), Gabon viper (<i>Bitis gabonica</i>), Western lowland gorilla (<i>Gorilla g. gorilla</i>), Bushbuck (<i>Tragelaphus scriptus</i>), Sun-tailed guenon (<i>Cercopithecus solatus</i>)	Household heads recalled all produce, natural resources and manufactured foods consumed during the 48 hours prior to the survey. Estimated weights based on Wikie et al., 2005.	Foerster et al. (2012) ⁹⁶
Ghana	September to November 2008	Data from the 2008 Ghana Demographic and Health Survey. 4916 Women aged 15–49 years and 4568 Males aged 15–59 years selected in a two-stage sampling technique based on year 2000 Ghana Population and Housing Census	Fruit, Vegetables	No definition stated. But the GDHS from which data were used cites examples to include- FRUIT : mangoes, pawpaw, banana, orange, avocados, tomatoes, passion fruit, apples. VEGETABLES : kontomire, aleefu, ayoyo, kale, cassava leaves.	Household Questionnaire, Men/Women's Questionnaire to estimate Mean intake of fruits and vegetables: Captured as "in a typical week, on how many days do you eat fruit?" and "on a day when you eat fruit, how many servings do you eat on average" and similar for vegetables	Amo-Adjei & Kumi-Kyereme (2014) ⁹⁷
Ghana	September to November 2008	Data from the 2008 Ghana Demographic & Health Survey on 6193 young people aged 15 to 34 (45% Males, 55% Females Mean age: Females: 23.43, Males: 23.21 (S.D: 5.6) selected using a two-stage sampling design based on year 2000 Ghana Population and Housing Census	Fruit, Vegetables	Not defined but the GDHS from which data were used cites examples to include- FRUIT : mangoes, pawpaw, banana, orange, avocados, tomatoes, passion fruit, apples. VEGETABLES : kontomire, aleefu, ayoyo, kale, cassava leaves.	Household Questionnaire, Men/Women's Questionnaire to estimate Mean intake of fruits and vegetables: Captured as "in a typical week, on how many days do you eat fruit?" and "on a day when you eat fruit, how many servings do you eat on average" and similar for vegetables	Amoateng et al. (2017) ⁹⁸

Ghana	Not Stated (as of January 2014 had interviewed 3868 participants in all 4 centers out of which 1920 from Ghana site)	1619 Urban GH Adults (Kumasi, Obuasi) and 946 Rural GH Adults (Ashanti Region) selected in a random sampling design based on 2010 Ghana Population and Housing Census (part of RODAM multi-centre study Ghana, Berlin, London, Amsterdam).	Meat, Fruit, Vegetables	<p>MEAT: Beef, goat, pork, bush meat, liver, and giblets. Data presented separately for poultry, processed meat products, fish, and mixed meaty dishes. FRUITS (excludes FRUIT JUICES): Orange, mandarin, kiwi, watermelon, mango, cantaloupe, pawpaw, pineapple, banana, plum, peach, apricot, nectarine, flat peach, apple, pear, strawberries, cherries, berries, grapes, and stewed fruit. Presents data on consumption of fruit juices together with SODAs.</p> <p>VEGETABLES: Green leaves, spinach, chard, lettuce, endive, chicory, Chinese and white cabbage, tomatoes, peppers, carrots, cucumber, eggplant, beans (green beans), onions and garlic. Excludes potatoes. Presents data on consumption of Vegetable soups, stews and sauces separately.</p> <p>Vegetable soups, stews and sauces: Palmnut soup, nkontomire stew, okro stew, tomato sauce and stew, vegetable soup.</p>	Food Propensity Questionnaire (12-month food and 24-hour recalls). Ghanaian household utensils were used to estimate consumption in grams.	Galbete et al. (2017) ⁹⁹
Ghana	September 2005 to September 2006	Data on 5313 Ghanaian Households from the Ghana Living Standards Survey Round 5 (included a total of 8,687 households) recruited randomly	Meat	Pork, Beef, Chevron, Mutton, Game, and Chicken	Estimates mean intakes of meat using Ghana Living Standards Survey (GLSS) data. Survey questionnaire	Osei-Asare & Eghan (2014) ¹⁰⁰

Kenya	August to November 2012. Conducted in four districts of Vihiga County during a season of relatively high food diversity (August 2012) and in four districts of Kitui County at the end of the food shortage season (October/November 2012)	Random sample of children 6 to 23 months old recruited from 4 purposively selected districts in Vihiga County (Luanda, Emuhaya, East Tiriki and West Tiriki; n = 201) and Kitui County (Kitui Central, Lower Yatta, Mutomo and Kitui West; n = 200) Kenya. Data extracted for 12 to 23 months cohort: 8.2 % of 179 children from Kitui County and 6.4% of 156 children from Vihiga County.	Meat, Fruit, Vegetables	WHO et al., (2008) definition of fruit and vegetables	Four-pass 24-hour recalls, cross sectional, Portion sizes from weighing of foods. Dietary data collected through caregivers.	Ferguson et al. (2015) ¹⁰¹
Kenya	Longitudinal Panel Survey: collected in 2000, 2005, and 2010	200 Households randomly selected from register of households in Siambu and Mbaringon Pastoralist communities. 100 from each community, Kenya. However, there was attrition: 2000: 199 households 2005: 186 households 2010: 159 households. Household heads interviewed.	Vegetable and Meat	MEAT: not explicitly defined but mentions cattle, chicken, or livestock ownership VEGETABLES: cabbage, kale.	Three waves of data using 24-hour recalls were collected in 2000, 2005, and 2010	Iannotti & Lesorogol (2014) ¹⁴⁰
Kenya	S1: July/Aug 2013 S2: Feb/Mar 2014	272 Rural Kenyan Women (Mean age: 40 years) randomly selected from household lists supplied by village elders of villages covering 5 different agro-ecological zones (AEZ) in the counties of Kakamega and Siaya in western Kenya	Fruit, Vegetables	Not explicitly defined but listed as follows: FRUIT: Mango, Cape gooseberry, Papaya, Passion fruit, Loquat, Guava, water melon, Orange, Jack fruit, Sweet banana, Avocado, Pineapple, Lemon, Tamarind, Custard apple, mulberry, Soursop	24-hour food recalls to capture fruit consumption in Rural Women	Keding et al. (2017) ¹⁰²
Kenya	November 2009 and February 2010	208 School-aged children aged 4 to 11 years randomly selected from four public primary schools in Dagoretti Division (including several unplanned settlements namely; Dagoretti Corner, Congo, Wanyee, Githembe, Ngando, Lenana, Waithaka and Gachui Village) in Nairobi, Kenya	Meat, Fruit, Vegetables	MEAT: chicken, fish, beef. FRUIT (not defined). VEGETABLES: listed in table to include Cabbage, kales, spinach. Excluded carrots and potatoes	24-hour recalls using FFQ used to obtain the foods consumed for breakfast, lunch and supper. Portions/grams. Amounts of foods/ meals served were approximated using standard cups, plates and measuring jug	Mwaniki & Makokha (2013) ¹⁰³

Kenya	Baseline study from July to August 1998	529 Grade 1 schoolchildren aged 6 to 14 from twelve primary schools selected based on size and accessibility for food delivery criteria that participated in the Child Nutrition Project study	Meat, Fruit, Vegetables	MEAT: Meat, fish, poultry and eggs reported together. FRUIT: Avocado, Ripe mangoes, Oranges, lemons, papaya. Fruit and vegetables intake reported together. VEGETABLES: Kales, cowpea leaves, green beans, onions.	Three non-consecutive 24-hour recalls in a randomized controlled feeding intervention study	Gewa et al. (2014) ¹⁰⁴
Mali	October to December 1998, March to May in 1999	34 women and 36 men aged 15–45 years, from 29 random selection of households (during a village meeting) in the village of Ouassala in the Kayes region, Western Mali	Meat, Fruit, Vegetables	MEAT not defined but meat estimates includes Eggs. FRUIT: Apple, banana, mandarin, lemon, date, guava, mango, orange, papaya, watermelon, sweetsop (<i>Annona squamosa</i>), sweet dattock (<i>Detarium microcarpum</i>), akee fruit (<i>Blighia sapida</i>), cashew fruit, jujube (<i>Zizyphus spina-Christi</i>), tamarind, shea-butterseed (<i>Butyrospermum parkii</i>), red sorrel (<i>Hibiscus sabdariffa</i>), baobab pulp (<i>Adansonia digitata</i>). VEGETABLES: Cassava, potato, sweet potato, yam, African fan palm (fruit and germinating radicle), cabbage, carrot, cucumber, eggplant, garlic, okra, onion, tomato, tomato paste, bitter tomato (<i>Solanum incanum</i>) and ginger; Green leaves: Lettuce, amaranth leaves, baobab leaves, onion leaves, mint leaves, horseradish-tree leaves (<i>Moringa oleifera</i>), cassava leaves and cow-pea leaves.	Quantitative Food Frequency Questionnaire (QFFQ) and Weighed Record (WR). Household measures typical of the area (plastic cup and aluminium serving), measuring tape and measuring jugs were used to estimate amounts of foods consumed.	Parr et al. (2002) ¹⁰⁶

Mali	October to December 1996	75 persons. 27 men and 48 women aged 15 to 59 years representing 18 households recruited from a small village, Kersignane, in the Cercle of Bafoulabe. Bafoulabe is in the Kayes Region of Western Mali.	Meat, Fruit, Vegetables	MEAT AND FISH reported together (meat not defined). FRUIT AND VEGETABLES (reported together): Pumpkin, lady fingers, bitter tomato (<i>Solanum incanum</i>), onion, tomato, pepper, sweet potato, cassava, yam, lemon, watermelon and monkey bread (<i>Adansonia digitata</i>); Green leaves (reported separately): Pumpkin leaves, baobab leaves (fresh and dried), onion leaves, bean leaves, amaranth leaves and sweet potato leaves.	QFFQ and Combined Weighed/Recalled Dietary Records. In QFFQs, volume measures of different sizes were used for estimating amounts eaten of non-solid foods, groundnuts and beverages. Digital scales were used to determine the weight equivalents of volumes. In the Combined weighed/recalled dietary records, ingredients of the dishes were weighed separately, using the same digital scales	Torheim et al. (2001) ¹⁰⁷
Namibia	September to October 2002, dry season	53 school children (Town: 43, Rural: 10) aged 8 to 15/Grades 1 to 4 randomly selected from a Primary school and 4 mobile school units in a small town and in two rural villages in the Kaokoland area, situated in north-west Namibia.	Meat, Fruit, vegetables	Listed to include: MEAT: in Town: beef, goat and chicken; in the Rural area: goat. VEGETABLES: including potatoes.	24-hour recall interviews. Local dishware, food photographs, and food models were used as aids for estimating food quantities.	Vähätalo et al. (2005) ¹⁰⁸
Namibia	Not stated	18 years or older adults sampled from Rural villages accessible by four-wheel drive vehicle based on ordinance survey maps of Hereroland and Kavangoland. Villages from Hereroland were Okakarara, Otumborombonga, Otjinene and Otjituo. Villages from Kavangoland: Rundu, Andara and Bagani	Meat, Vegetables	None was defined but examples include- MEAT: fresh or tinned; FISH: tilapia, tiger fish.	Food frequency questionnaire	O'Keefe, Rund, Marot, Symmonds, & Berger (1988) ¹⁰⁹

Nigeria	January to July 2003	50 fishing households and 50 Non-fishing households randomly selected from traditional fishing communities in the coastal state of Lagos and the inland state of Niger. Average 7 members per household.	Meat	39 species of fish (including Tilapia spp, Synodontis spp, Mormyrops spp, Citharinus spp, Clarias spp, Bagrus spp, Heteroitis niloticus, Gnathonemus spp, Hydrocynus spp, Clarotes spp, Titus ice fish, Petrocephalus spp, Snail, etc. and 16 types of meat including beef, goat, chicken, lamb, grasscutter and other bush meat	24-hour recalls. Portions obtained by weighing with weighing balance/scales.	Gomna & Rana (2007) ¹⁴¹
Nigeria	June to September 2011	413 adult males and females aged 20 or older randomly selected from two Local Government Areas--Ibadan South-West and Ibadan North-West of Oyo state in Nigeria	Meat, Fruit and Vegetables	MEAT: Lean Beef. VEGETABLES (excludes/reports starchy tubers, legumes, etc. separately): Vegetable soup (Efo riro, Egusi and Efo). Fruit: Banana and Orange.	Interviewer-administered questionnaire with a 24-hour dietary recall. Amount of foods consumed at a sitting/portion size were determined using measuring guides (household measures).	Sanusi & Olurin (2012) ¹¹⁰
Nigeria	October 1993 to April 1994	142 (out of 187) children recruited from 12 randomly selected schools (that included two private and ten public schools) in two Local Government Areas of Abeokuta Government Areas of Abeokuta, the capital of Ogun State, Nigeria. Male: 79, Female: 63	Meat, Fruit, Vegetables	Not explicitly defined but MEAT, FISH and EGG intake reported together. Vegetables and fruit intake also reported together	Repeated (3 times) 24-hour recalls. Estimates of serving sizes and quantities of foods eaten were based on common household measuring utensils	Oguntona & Kanye (1995) ¹¹¹
Senegal	Not Stated	Convenience sample of 50 Adult Men recruited at the Hôpital Général de Grand Yoff (but were not hospitalized) in Dakar, Senegal (n=40) and from neighbouring Sendou village (n= 10).	Meat, Fruit, Vegetables	Not explicitly stated but listed the following under various food groups. MEAT: Fish, Beef, Sausage, Chicken, Ox, Goat, Sheep, Pork, Eggs/Omelet, Chockpeas, Peanuts. FRUITS (excludes fruit juices listed separately): Mango, Coconot, Cola nut, Banana, Rasins, Papaya, Pear, Watermelon, Apple, Grapes, Sapoti, and Maad bi. VEGETABLES (excludes Vegetable juices. listed separately): Potato, Tomatoes, Lettuce, Carrot, Cabbage, Corn, Eggplant, Okra, Garlic, Onion, Potato, Turin, Cucumber, Green bean, Green pepper, Green pea,	Single 24-hour dietary recall. Estimated amount per day consumed	Anderson et al. (2010) ¹¹²

				Petit pois, Broccoli, Green olive, Cowpeas.		
Senegal	Not Stated	20 adolescent girls (13–15 years) attending a high school in the city of Dakar. Sampling method not reported	Fruit and Vegetables	Not defined	24-hour recalls administered over a 3-day period before and after the implementation of the activities. Food quantities were estimated using local measures or weighted	Matsinkou et al. (2016) ¹¹³
South Africa	January to March 1990	163 children (Boys: 93, Girls: 70) aged 3 to 6 years selected in a Stratified proportional sampling from all black residential areas of Cape Town, including squatter and formal housing areas	Meat, Fruit, Vegetables	No explicit definitions were stated. But Sweet potatoes and potatoes were included as vegetables. Portion sizes for food groups were estimated using Diabetic Exchange Lists Reference as set out in Langenhoven et al., 1989. One Meat portion was calculated as total protein from the meat group divided by 6 and 7 (6g of protein equals 1 egg and 7g of protein = 30g meat 125ml cooked legumes). For vegetables, total available carbohydrate minus sugar was divided by 5 to estimate the number of vegetable portions, and for fruit by 15 for number of portions (5 g carbohydrate represents one 125 ml vegetable portion and 15 g carbohydrate one fruit portion).	24-hour recalls combined with questions on habitual intake	Bourne, Langenhoven, Steyn, Jooste, Laubscher, et al. (1994) ¹³⁰
South Africa	February to October 2007	Caregivers of 400 children (2 to 5-year-old/ Grade 6 and 7 learners) selected randomly from 4 Primary Schools in the Mariannhill area, Pinetown in the KwaZulu-Natal Province, South Africa	Fruit, Vegetables	WHO 1990 definition of fruit and vegetables. Reports intake (grams) for FRUIT: Apple and Banana; VEGETABLES: Cabbage and Mixed vegetables.	24-hour recall repeated at one-week intervals	Faber et al. (2011) ¹¹⁵

South Africa	A repeated cross-sectional study done during February, May, August, and November of 2005	2 to 5-year olds registered on the Community-based growth monitoring project in 2 neighbouring rural villages in KwaZulu Natal willing to be interviewed 5 consecutive times: February (n=79), May (n=74), August (n=75) and November (n=78). Caregivers interviewed.	Vegetables (Dark green leafy vegetables).	Includes Spinach and Imifino. Imifino is a collective term for various dark-green leaves that are eaten as a vegetable; the leaves either grow wild or come from vegetables such as pumpkin, beetroot and sweet potato	Five repeated 24-hour dietary recalls per study period. Food intake reported in household measures was converted into weight using the MRC Food Quantities Manual (Langenhoven et al., 1991a)	Faber et al. (2007) ¹¹⁷
South Africa	October 2004 to December 2006	1057 grade 6 learners from 18 schools at baseline, 9 schools during 3 months, 6 months and 12 months follow-up. Random sampling of 9 pairs of schools from 17 matched pairs. Convenience sample of grade 6 learners based on parent consent and child assent then a random sample of those to reduce numbers	Fruit, Vegetables	FRUIT and VEGETABLES: 100% orange or grapefruit juice, other 100% juices, fruit, green salad, fried potatoes, other potatoes, and other vegetables	7 item FFQ in a Cluster randomised controlled trial	Jemmott-III et al. (2011) ¹¹⁸
South Africa	May 2010 and August 2011	150 children aged 24 to 59 months recruited based on eligibility criteria Calvinia West, the disadvantaged section of the town Calvinia in the Hantam district of the Northern Cape Province. Mothers responded to questions	Liver (Meat)	Sheep's liver	24 hour recalls and a quantified liver frequency questionnaire. Frequency of consumption and Portion sizes.	Nel et al. (2013) ¹¹⁹
South Africa	2008	3840 persons aged 50 years and older recruited randomly in a national population-based cross-sectional study in South Africa	Fruit, Vegetables	FRUIT: such as an apple, banana, or orange, cooked, chopped, or canned fruit; and fruit juice, not artificially flavored. Insufficient FV consumption was defined as less than five servings of fruits and/or vegetables a day. Not defined but lists examples to include the following: VEGETABLES: tomatoes, carrots, pumpkin, corn, Chinese cabbage, beans, or onions, vegetable juice.	Used questionnaire to estimate number of servings per day in a 24-hour recall. Fruit and vegetable consumption were assessed using two questions 'How many servings of fruit do you eat on a typical day?' and 'How many servings of vegetables do you eat on a typical day?'	Peltzer & Phaswana-mafuya (2012) ¹²⁰

South Africa	Consumption data since 1994. Intervals of 5 years were compared, from 1994 to 2009 for FAOSTAT FBS data and from 1999 to 2012 for Euromonitor PFBC data, with specific time overlaps in 1999, 2004 and 2009	South Africa	Meat, Fruit, vegetables	FAOSTAT: MEAT : Bovine data, Mutton and goat meat, Pig meat, Poultry meat, Meat (other). Reports data for Offal but not as part of meat. EUROMONITOR PASSPORT: not explicit on Offal as part of meat and does not report Offal separately. FRUIT : Oranges, mandarins, Lemons, limes, Grapefruit, Citrus (other), Bananas, Apples, Pineapples, Fruits (other). VEGETABLE (excludes Starchy roots (Potatoes, Sweet potatoes), Pulses and Nuts): Tomatoes, Onion, and Vegetables (other).	Used FAO food balance sheets (FBS) and Euromonitor International Passport data. Both sets of exported data (Euromonitor International Passport and FAOSTAT FBS) were converted to per capita consumption figures as this considers increases in population growth over time. Per capita intake is a crude estimate of consumption as it is the total amount consumed divided by the total population and does not take into account wastage, losses in storage, urban/rural distribution differences or distribution within households	Ronquest-Ross et al. (2015) ¹²¹
South Africa	1998 to 1999 period	Food balance sheets published by the South African National Department of Agriculture's Directorate of Statistical Information	Meat, Fruit, Vegetables	MEAT : Beef and veal; Mutton and goat; Pork and Chicken. VEGETABLES and FRUIT : Potatoes, sweet potatoes, other vegetables, citrus, other fruit, and dry fruit and nut.	Used food balance sheets published by the National Department of Agriculture's Directorate of Statistical Information on the food supply in South Africa for the 1998/99 period. Consumption data were derived by taking total production of a specific food item in the country and by subtracting the total amount used for animal feed as well as the total amount of imports and exports of the specific food item. This amount was then divided by the total population in the country, thus obtaining the per capita availability of each food item	Steyn, Abercrombie, & Labadaros (2001) ¹²²

South Africa	Primary data from the National Food Consumption Survey (NFCS) in 1999 provided primary data on children. Data on adults: from 8 different studies (secondary sources) conducted from 1983 to 2000	Secondary data from various sources, including the National Food Consumption Survey (NFCS) in 1999 provided primary data on children. Data on adults: from 8 different studies conducted in different provinces and ethnic groups. Total sample not reported.	Meat, Fruit, Vegetables	MEAT: Beef & offal; Vension; Mutton/goat & offal; Pork & offal; and Chicken & offal. FRUIT: Pome, Tropical, Citrus, Stone, Berry, and Other. VEGETABLES: Stem, Brassica, Leaf, Fruiting, Cucurbits, Bulb, Green legumes, and Mixed vegetables.	Used National Survey data and secondary data from 8 cross-sectional studies conducted previously in addition to National Food Balance sheet. Only datasets collected by 24-hour recalls were used here, results of the frequency databases were excluded and reported elsewhere.	Steyn, Nel, & Casey (2003) ¹²³
South Africa	Not stated	50 children and 42 mothers/caretakers who were part of a school-based clinical trial in a low socioeconomic rural area, 60 km northwest of Durban, KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa.	Meat, Fruit, Vegetables	MEAT: beef, chicken, chicken pie, sausage. FRUITS: Apple, Pear, Avocado. VEGETABLES: Tomato, Cabbage, Onion, Mealie, Imifino, Pumpkin, Carrots, Onion, Potato.	24-hour recall and an unquantified food frequency questionnaire. Fresh food, food models, household utensils and sponge models were used for quantifying and recording food intake. In addition, dry samp (commercially available coarsely broken maize) was used to quantify portion sizes of dishes made with either samp or maize. Actual food intake reported in household measures was converted into weight using the MRC Food Quantities Manual (Langenhoven et al., 1992a)	Faber (1999) ¹²⁴
South Africa	Not stated	7-day Weighed Food Record: 74 (out of 85) volunteers (15 to 65-year-olds) recruited from participants in the THUSA study (n= 890). To test the relative validity of a culture sensitive Quantitative Food Frequency Questionnaire (QFFQ).	Meat, Fruit, Vegetables	Not defined	7-day Weighed Food Record: 74 participants Scales, measuring jug and set of measuring spoons were used to determine weight of foods consumed	Macintyre et al. (2000) ¹²⁵

South Africa	1996 (15 to 65-year-old participants) and in 1998 participants older than 65 years were recruited	Randomly recruited 1751 respondents (743 males and 1008 females), aged between 15 and 80 years and apparently healthy from 37 randomly selected sites representing the health districts in the North West Province	Meat, Fruit, Vegetables	Listed examples of VEGETABLES: Onion, Tomato, Cabbage; Fruit: Apple, Banana,	Quantitative Food Frequency Questionnaire (QFFQ) made of 145 food items. Photographs of commonly eaten foods in a validated food portion photograph book (FPPB), common utensils and containers were used to estimate portion sizes.	MacIntyre et al. (2002) ¹²⁶
South Africa	February 1994	115 black female students aged 17 to 34 years mean age: 21.4 years) attending a first-year pre-registration program at the University of the North.	Meat, Fruit, Vegetables	Not defined but list examples to include MEAT: poultry, red meat. FRUIT: Bananas. VEGETABLES: Spinach, pumpkin.	QFFQ gather data on each student's diet over 6 months prior to entering the University. Food models based on local foods were developed and used during the study along with other dietary aids, such as empty food containers and volume measures.	Steyn, Senekal, Brits, & Dsc (2000) ¹²⁸
South Africa	2009	544 randomly selected 19 to 64 years old urban Africans participants living in the townships of Langa, Gugulethu, Khayelitsha, Crossroads and Nyangain in Cape Town	Meat, Fruit, Vegetables	Reports the following classifications but reports each sub-item separately: MEAT group: red meat, white meat, eggs, legumes. VEGETABLES and FRUIT: Vitamin C rich, Carotene rich, Potato/sweet potato, Other veg/fruit.	24-hour recall using the multiple pass method. Visual life-size photographs and sketches of foods and measures (such as cups, glasses) were used to identify portion sizes	Steyn et al. (2016) ¹²⁹
South Africa	1990	983 respondents (Female: 542. Male: 441) in Black residential areas of Cape Town aged 15 to 64 years randomly selected from sampling frame based on 1988 Human Sciences Research Council Census.	Meat, Fruit, Vegetables	MEAT: Red meat (beef, mutton, pork, and cold cuts made of these commercial pies). White meat (chicken and fish) and Organ meats. VEGETABLE and FRUIT: Vitamin C rich, Carotene rich, Potato and sweet potato, other vegetables and fruit.	24-hour recall method used in combination with questions on habitual intake. Household crockery and utensils used in serving meals, and the checking of food labels were adopted to estimate portion sizes.	Bourne, Langenhoven, Steyn, Jooste, Nesamvuni, et al. (1994) ¹³⁰
South Africa	1977	1977: 96 randomly selected lactating Xhosas (black race) women aged 16 to 44 years (mean age: 26) from rural and urban areas in Ciskei	Meat, Fruit, Vegetables	Not defined but vegetable and fruit consumption reported together. Meat and fish intake also reported together	24-hour recall and diet history methods	Langenhoven et al. (1988) ¹³¹

	1979	Random sample of 1113 male and female (out of 7188 respondents) from three Rural Afrikaans speaking white communities aged 15 to 64 years	Meat, Fruit, Vegetables		24-hour recalls to collect dietary data and Food models and portions of real food used as visual aids to quantify food intake	
	1982	976 randomly selected healthy urban male and female coloured population in Cape Peninsula aged 15 to 64 years	Meat, Fruit, Vegetables		24 hour recalls and frequency questionnaire. Number of portions estimated based on the principle of food exchanges: milk and meat portions were based on protein content, vegetable, fruit and cereal portions based on carbohydrate content, and fat portions on fat content. Total protein from meat and fish was divided by 21g for number of portions estimate, total carbohydrate from vegetables divided by 5g, for fruit by 20g for number of portions.	
South Africa		42 men and 60 women (aged over 18 years) of the Isandhlwana area of rural district in Zululand. the sample was selected by travelling from one group of huts to another in a four-wheel drive vehicle to interview adults met at home or at work in the fields	Meat, vegetables	Not defined	Simple frequency questionnaire	O'Keefe, Ndaba, & Woodward (1985) ¹³²

Zambia	September 2012 to March 2013	938 Children aged 4 to 8 years (not attending school) recruited for an efficacy trial through a Door-to-door census of all households in towns or villages (accessible by vehicle all year round) in Mkushi, a rural district in central Zambia (baseline results used)	Vegetable, Meat (Chicken)	Based on Ugandan & Zambian Food Composition Tables. Most food items in the Zambian Food Composition Tables are presented in local languages. MEAT (excludes FISH & seafoods): Red meat, white meat, poultry, game, rodents, processed meats, organ meats (kidney, liver, mixed offals, intestines), blood, animal skin/ears/feet/head, insects. Fish (includes SEAFOODS): Whole fish, fish meat, eel, reptiles, shell fish. FRUITS (includes FRUIT JUICES): Fresh fruits, dried fruits, undiluted pure fruit juices, starchy fruits (banana/plantain). VEGETABLES : Fresh vegetables, dried vegetables (excludes potatoes).	24-hour recall tool on Android tablets	Caswell et al. (2015) 133
Zambia	August 2012 to April 2013	200 Children (4 to 8 years not yet enrolled in school) in non-intervened group of an efficacy trial. Selected in a door-to-door census of all households in towns or villages (accessible by vehicle all year round) in northern Mkushi, a rural district in Zambia	Meat, Fruit, Vegetables	MEAT : small fish, tilapia or bream fish, chicken. Other ASF : milk, eggs, insects. FRUIT : mango, other fruit. VEGETABLES : tomato, onion, rape leaves, pumpkin leaves, beans, other dark green leafy vegetables, eggplant, cabbage, cassava.	Multipass 24-hour recall tool using Android tablets to estimate number of servings per day and quantity consumed per serving of 25 most frequently consumed foods. Photo aids used to estimate Portion size/Quantity in grams from Number of Servings per day. Caregivers of children answered. Randomised efficacy trial. But could use data for the non-intervened group.	Caswell et al. (2018) 134

Table 7: Quality appraisal

	Domain	Statement of study objective/aim	Clarity of study population definition	Sampling method	Response rate	Reliability and accuracy of measurement technique	Reporting of data		Total Score (E)	Class Score Calc (%)
	Question	1. Was the research objective clearly stated (to measure meat/fruits/vegetables consumption)?	2. Was the study population clearly defined?	3. Was the sampling method one that achieves a sample representative of the intended study population?	4. Was a response rate mentioned in the study?	5. Was the measuring technique accurate and reliable?	6.a. Missing data—Were missing data and strategies for addressing missing data reported?	6.b. Presentation of data—Were data clearly and accurately reported		E/19 x100
Author(s)		0—Not stated, 1—Not clearly stated and 2—Explicitly stated.	0—Not stated 1—Not clearly defined 2—Explicitly defined * Clear definition of population/sample should be beyond country of study to include exact location, age cohort gender and other socio-demographic details.	Not Reported—0 Category A—1 Category B—2	Not reported—0 Reported (below 60%)—1 Reported (60% plus)—2 *Response Rate is reported if authors reported a precise rate or drop-outs & cancellation of interviews were reported. Compute Response Rate where enough information is reported but precise rate not reported.	D1—Single Dietary recall (e.g. 24-hour recall) D2—Food Frequency Questionnaire D3— Repeated/Multiple dietary recalls (e.g. food records, multiple pass recall, etc.)	Not reported—0 Reported only—1 Reported and addressed—2 **Apart from being explicitly stated, Missing data is reported if exclusions based on incompleteness of responses are reported	Not reported—0 Reported with error—1 Reported accurately—2 **Data presentation is accurate if average consumption data (MEAN/MEDIAN) and measures of statistical dispersion (SD, Variance, Range/IQR) are all reported correctly, Score 2. Score 1 where there are anomalies in reported data or only consumption data is reported without any measure of dispersion or where consumption data is reported in a graph/figure only.		
Amo-Adjei & Kumi-Kyereme (2014)		2	2	2	0	0	0	2	8	53
Albrechtsen, Fa, Barry, & MacDonald (2006)		2	1	2	0	1	0	2	8	53
Amare et al. (2012)		2	2	2	2	2	2	2	14	93
Amoateng et al. (2017)		2	2	2	0	0	0	0	6	40
Anderson et al. (2010)		2	2	1	0	1	0	1	7	47
Asayehu, Lachat, Henauw, & Gebreyesus (2017)		2	1	2	0	3	0	2	10	67
Bourne, Langenhoven, Steyn, Jooste, Laubscher, et al. (1994)		2	2	2	0	1	0	2	9	60
Bourne, Langenhoven, Steyn, Jooste, Nesamvuni, et al. (1994)		2	2	2	0	2	0	2	10	67
Caswell et al. (2015)		2	2	2	0	1	0	2	9	60
Caswell et al. (2018)		2	2	2	0	3	0	2	11	73
Faber et al. (2011)		2	1	1	0	2	0	1	7	47

Faber et al. (2007)	2	2	1	0	3	0	1	9	60
Faber (1999)	2	2	0	0	1	0	2	7	47
Ferguson et al. (2015)	2	2	1	2	3	0	1	11	73
Foerster et al. (2012)	2	1	1	2	1	0	2	9	60
Galbete et al. (2017)	2	2	2	0	2	0	1	9	60
Gelibo et al. (2017)	2	2	2	0	0	0	2	8	53
Gewa et al. (2014)	2	2	1	1	3	0	2	11	73
Gomna & Rana (2007)	2	2	2	0	1	0	1	8	53
Huybregts, Roberfroid, Kolsteren, & Camp (2009)	2	2	1	2	1	0	2	10	67
Iannotti & Lesorogol (2014)	1	2	2	0	1	0	1	7	47
Jackson et al. (2012)	2	1	1	2	3	0	2	11	73
Jemmott-III et al. (2011)	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	13	87
Keding et al. (2017)	2	2	2	2	3	0	2	13	87
Langenhoven et al. (1988)	2	2	2	2	1	0	2	11	73
MacIntyre et al. (2002)	2	2	2	2	2	0	2	12	80
Macintyre et al. (2000)	2	1	0	0	2	0	2	7	47
Maruapula & Chapman-Novakofski (2007)	2	2	2	2	3	0	2	13	87
Matsinkou et al. (2016)	2	2	0	0	3	0	2	9	60
Mwaniki & Makokha (2013)	2	2	2	0	1	0	1	8	53
Nago et al. (2010)	2	2	2	2	3	1	1	13	87
Nel et al. (2013)	2	2	1	2	1	0	2	10	67
Nkondjock & Bizome (2010)	2	2	2	0	2	2	1	11	73
Oguntona & Kanye (1995)	2	1	2	0	3	2	1	11	73
O'Keefe, Rund, Marot, Symmonds, & Berger (1988)	2	2	1	0	2	0	2	9	60
Osei-Asare & Eghan (2014)	2	1	2	0	1	0	1	7	47
Parr et al. (2002)	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	13	87
Peltzer & Phaswana-mafuya (2012)	2	2	2	2	1	0	2	11	73
Premji et al. (2008)	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	27
Ronquest-Ross et al. (2015)	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	27

Sanusi & Olurin (2012)	2	2	2	0	1	0	2	9	60
Sodjinou, Agueh, Fayomi, & Delisle (2009)	2	2	2	0	3	0	1	10	67
Steyn, Abercrombie, & Labadarios (2001)	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	20
Steyn, Nel, & Casey (2003)	2	1	0	0	1	0	2	6	40
Steyn et al. (2016)	2	2	1	0	3	2	2	12	80
Steyn, Senekal, Brits, & Dsc (2000)	2	2	1	1	2	1	2	11	73
Torheim et al. (2001)	2	2	1	2	2	0	2	11	73
Vähätalo et al. (2005)	2	2	1	2	1	0	2	10	67
O'Keefe, Ndaba, & Woodward (1985)	2	2	1	0	2	0	2	9	60

Table 8: Meta-regression for vegetable consumption entering single covariates⁴

Covariate	Coefficient	CI	Standard error	p
Year of data collection	2.97	0.47 to 5.48	1.35	0.00
Gender	-5.40	-36.08 to 25.27	15.32	0.73
Age (children/adults)	171.20	-91.76 to 250.63	39.95	0.00
Method of data collection	0.77	-20.06 to 21.60	10.48	0.94
Economic development*	24.58	7.40 to 41.77	8.64	0.01
Location (rural-urban)	-3.83	-27.02 to -19.36	11.66	0.74

⁴ Entering single covariates: Only one covariate was entered at a time to test its effect on or association with vegetable consumption estimates of the population in the included studies.

Table 9: Meta-regression for vegetable consumption entering all covariates⁵

Covariate	Model 1 (including all studies)			Model 2 (excluding quality<34%)			Model 3 (including adults only)		
	Coefficient (95% CI)	SE	p	Coefficient (95% CI) (M2)	SE	p	Coefficient (95% CI)	SE	p
Year of data collection	4.43 (1.74 to 7.12)	1.35	0.00	4.43 (1.72 to 7.14)	1.35	0.00	4.79 (2.05 to 7.53)	1.37	0.00
Gender	-0.18(-4.04 to 3.67)	1.94	0.93	3.029 (-4.07 to 3.70)	1.94	0.93	-.44(-6.71 to 5.84)	3.14	0.89
Age (children/adults)	80.32 (-10.62 to 171.27)	45.70	0.08	80.32(-11.26 to 171.90)	45.70	0.08	N/A	N/A	N/A
Method of data collection	1.75 (-8.73 to 12.22)	5.26	0.74	1.75 (-8.80 to 12.29)	5.26	0.74	3.44 (-7.59 to 14.47)	5.52	0.54
Economic development*	43.49 (25.96 to 61.03)	8.81	0.00	43.49 (25.84 to 61.15)	6.74	0.00	44.94(27.15 to 62.73)	8.90	0.00
Location (rural-urban)	-25.48 (-38.88 to -12.07)	6.74	0.00	-25.48 (-38.98 to -11.97)	6.74	0.00	-26.63(-40.51 to -12.75)	6.94	0.00

Table 9a: Model 4 (excluding starchy vegetables)

Covariate	Entering Individual Covariates (Univariate Analysis)			Entering all Covariates (Multivariate Analysis)		
	Coefficient (95% CI)	SE	p	Coefficient (95% CI) (M4)	SE	p
Year of data collection	2.15 (-0.74 to 5.04)	1.45	0.14	3.38 (-0.06 to 6.70)	1.66	0.05
Gender	-16.45(-60.96 to 28.06)	22.04	0.46	-5.45 (-31.57 to 20.67)	13.06	0.68
Age (children/adults)	156.45 (-66.88 to 246.02)	44.86	0.00	76.64 (-28.68 to 181.95)	52.67	0.15
Method of data collection	-44.91 (-67.67 to -22.14)	11.27	0.00	-22.96 (-46.79 to 0.87)	11.92	0.06
Economic development*	16.05 (-14.61 to 46.71)	15.36	0.30	43.85 (10.64 to 77.06)	16.61	0.01
Location (rural-urban)	-9.53 (-50.67 to 31.61)	20.61	0.64	1.50 (-37.68 to 40.68)	19.59	0.94

Table 10: Meta-regression for fruit consumption entering individual covariates⁶

Covariate	Coefficient	CI	Standard error	p
Year of data collection	2.46	1.33 to 3.58	0.57	0.00
Gender	-1.43	-21.80 to 18.94	10.24	0.89
Age (children/adults)	224.55	28.85 to 420.26	98.36	0.03
Method of data collection	-8.32	-12.07 to -4.57	1.87	0.00
Economic development*	5.30	-10.21 to 20.82	7.80	0.50
Location (rural-urban)	-16.60	-23.39 to -9.82	3.41	0.00

⁵ Entering all covariates: All six covariates were entered together at the same time, adjusting for covariates, to explore the role of year of data collection, gender, age, method of data collection, country's economic development, and rural/urban residence as sources of heterogeneity for the estimated vegetable intakes of the population in the included studies. In Model 1 of the multivariable analysis, data extracted from all included studies were included. In Model 2, data from studies that scored less than 34% in quality appraisal were excluded. Model 3 included data extracted for adults only.

⁶ Entering single covariates: Only one covariate was entered at a time to test its effect on or association with fruit consumption estimates of the population in the included studies.

Table 11: Meta-regression for fruit consumption entering all covariates⁷

Covariate	Model 1 (including all studies)			Model 2 (excluding quality<34%)			Model 3 (including adults only)		
	Coefficient (95% CI)	SE	p	Coefficient (95% CI) (M2)	SE	p	Coefficient (95% CI)	SE	p
Year of data collection	-1.55 (-6.30 to 3.21)	2.39	0.52	-1.55 (-6.36 to 3.27)	2.39	0.52	-1.41(-6.20 to 3.40)	2.40	0.56
Gender	-0.16 (-2.98 to 2.66)	1.42	0.91	-0.16 (-3.01 to 2.69)	1.42	0.91	-.162(-2.99 to 2.67)	1.42	0.91
Age (children/adults)	219.87 (23.42 to 416.33)	98.62	0.03	219.87 (21.25 to 418.50)	98.62	0.03	N/A	N/A	N/A
Method of data collection	-9.56 (-25.15 to 6.04)	7.83	0.23	-9.56 (-25.32 to 6.21)	7.83	0.23	-9.02(-24.77 to 6.73)	7.87	0.26
Economic development*	6.38 (-5.48 to 18.24)	5.95	0.29	6.38 (-5.61 to 18.37)	5.95	0.29	6.20(-5.72 to 18.12)	5.96	0.30
Location (rural-urban)	-9.24 (-23.35 to 4.88)	7.09	0.20	-9.24 (-23.51 to 5.04)	7.09	0.20	-9.36(-23.54 to 4.82)	7.09	0.19

Table 12: Meta-regression for fruit and vegetable consumption entering single covariates⁸

Covariate	Coefficient	CI	Standard error	p
Year of data collection	1.31	-2.59 to 5.21	1.97	0.51
Gender	21.51	-39.73 to 82.75	30.91	0.49
Age (children/adults)	-68.37	-201.33 to 64.59	67.07	0.31
Method of data collection	35.17	.255 to 70.09	17.62	0.05
Economic development*	-12.83	-57.77 to 32.12	22.69	0.57
Location (rural-urban)	-31.79	-78.28 to 14.70	23.46	0.18

Table 13: Meta-regression for fruit and vegetable consumption entering all covariates⁹

Covariate	Model 1 (including all studies)			Model 2 (excluding quality<34%)			Model 3 (including adults only)		
	Coefficient (95% CI)	SE	p	Coefficient (95% CI)	SE	p	Coefficient (95% CI)	SE	p
Year of data collection	1.82 (-2.477 to 6.12)	2.16	0.40	1.78 (-2.52 to 6.08)	2.16	0.41	2.49 (-1.66 to 6.65)	2.09	0.24
Gender	8.31 (-53.977 to 70.59)	31.32	0.79	8.41 (-53.91 to 70.72)	31.34	0.79	8.06 (-52.02 to 68.14)	30.22	0.79
Age	-72.96 (-218.36 to 72.46)	73.12	0.32	-72.52 (-217.98 to 72.93)	73.14	0.32	N/A	N/A	N/A
Method of data collection	32.58 (-2.34 to 67.50)	17.56	0.07	32.63 (-2.32 to 67.57)	17.57	0.07	27.47 (-6.52 to 61.47)	17.10	0.11
Economic development*	11.25 (-43.41 to 65.90)	27.49	0.68	10.92 (-43.70 to 65.54)	27.47	0.69	16.19(-35.09 to 67.46)	25.79	0.53
Location (rural-urban)	-34.57 (-82.10 to 12.97)	23.90	0.15	-34.39 (-81.92 to 13.14)	23.90	0.15	-37.20(-85.80 to 11.40)	24.45	0.13

⁷ Entering all covariates: All six covariates were entered together at the same time, adjusting for covariates, to explore the role of each covariate as a source of heterogeneity for the fruit consumption estimates of the population in the included studies. In Model 1 of the multivariable analysis, data extracted from all included studies were included. In Model 2, data from studies that scored less than 34% in quality appraisal were excluded. Model 3 included data extracted for adults only.

⁸ Entering single covariates: Only one covariate was entered at a time to test its effect on or association with fruit & vegetable consumption estimates of the population in the included studies.

⁹ Entering all covariates: All six covariates were entered together at the same time, adjusting for covariates, to explore the role of each covariate as a source of heterogeneity for the fruit & vegetable consumption estimates of the population in the included studies. In Model 1 of the multivariable analysis, data extracted from all included studies were included. In Model 2, data from studies that scored less than 34% in quality appraisal were excluded. Model 3 included data extracted for adults only.

Table 13a: Model 4 (excluding starchy vegetables)

Covariate	Entering Individual Covariates (Univariate Analysis)			Entering all Covariates (Multivariate Analysis)		
	Coefficient (95% CI)	SE	p	Coefficient (95% CI) (M4)	SE	p
Year of data collection	0.93 (-3.09 to 4.96)	2.03	0.65	0.70 (-3.92 to 5.32)	2.33	0.76
Gender	16.00 (-47.29 to 79.30)	31.86	0.50	9.24 (-54.07 to 72.56)	31.85	0.77
Age (children/adults)	-77.78 (-217.07 to 61.51)	70.13	0.27	-135.06 (-294.19 to 24.06)	80.06	0.09
Method of data collection	-4.14 (-33.49 to -25.21)	14.76	0.78	-7.30 (-41.61 to 27.01)	17.26	0.67
Economic development*	-13.33 (-62.22 to 35.57)	24.62	0.59	17.28 (-49.17 to 83.72)	33.43	0.60
Location (rural-urban)	-54.05 (-108.42 to 0.33)	27.38	0.05	-60.75 (-126.98 to 5.47)	33.32	0.07

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: World Bank definition of sub-Saharan Africa as of July 2018

Angola

Benin

Botswana

Burkina Faso

Burundi

Cabo Verde

Cameroon

Central African Republic

Chad

Comoros

Democratic Republic of Congo

Congo Republic

Cote D'ivoire

Equatorial Guinea

Eritrea

Swaziland (now Eswatini)

Ethiopia

Gabon

Gambia

Ghana

Guinea

Guinea-Bissau

Kenya

Lesotho

Liberia

Madagascar

Malawi

Mali

Mauritania

Mauritius

Mozambique

Namibia

Niger

Nigeria

Rwanda

Sao Tome and Principe

Senegal

Seychelles

Sierra Leone
 Somalia
 South Africa
 South Sudan
 Sudan
 Tanzania
 Togo
 Uganda
 Zambia
 Zimbabwe

Appendix 2: Conversion **methods for standardizing data**

Conversion	Estimation Method	Explanation	Source
Median to mean	$(q1 + m + q3)/3$	Where q1=the first quartile, q3=the third quartile, m=median	after Wan et al., 2014
IQR to SD	$\frac{q3 - q1}{1.35}$	Where q1=the first quartile, q3=the third quartile	after Higgins et al., 2008 (Cochrane Handbook)
SE to SD	$SD = SE \times \sqrt{N}$	SE=Standard Error, N=Sample size	after Higgins et al., 2008 (Cochrane Handbook)
CI to SD	$SD = \sqrt{N} \times (\text{upper limit} - \text{lower limit})/3.92$	For 90% confidence intervals 3.92 should be replaced by 3.29, and for 99% confidence intervals it should be replaced by 5.15	after Higgins et al., 2008 (Cochrane Handbook)
Ounze (meat, fish) to gram	1Oz= 28.35g*	Reported number of ounce multiplied by 28.35g	*
Kilogram to gram	1kg= 1000g	Consumption reported in kg is multiplied by 1000 to achieve gram values	
Portion/Serving of fruit/veg. to gram	1 portion/serving= 80g**	Reported number of portions/servings multiplied by 80g	**
Cup of fruit juice to gram	1 cup= 250ml=250g	Reported number of cups multiplied by 250g	*
Cup of orange vegetable (e.g. carrot, pumpkin) to gram	1 cup= 150g	Reported number of cups multiplied by 150g	*
Cup of raw leafy vegetable (leafy) to gram	1 cup= 40g	Reported number of cups multiplied by 40g	*
Portion/Serving of meat (cooked) to gram	1 portion/serving= 100g	Reported number of portions/servings multiplied by 100g	*
Portion/Serving of poultry (cooked) to gram	1 portion/serving= 80g	Reported number of portions/servings multiplied by 80g	*

Portion/Serving of fish (cooked) to gram	1 portion/serving= 100g	Reported number of portions/servings multiplied by 100g	*
Per week to day	1 week= 7 days	Consumption reported as g/week is divided by 7 to achieve g/day values.	
Per month to day	1 month= 30 days	Consumption reported as g/month is divided by 30 to achieve g/day values	
Per year to day	1 year= 365 days	Consumption reported as g/month is divided by 30 to achieve g/day values	

**WHO recommendation

*after Saxelby 2009

Appendix 3: Extracted Data



Extracted Data .xlsx

NB: Double-click MS Excel icon to open data file