

1 Title page

2 Effects of lunch club attendance on the dietary intake of older adults in the UK: a pilot 3 cross-sectional study.

4 **Running Title:** Lunch-clubs and dietary intake of older people.

5 Fotini Tsofliou,¹ Maria G. Grammatikopoulou,^{2,3,*} Rosie Lumley,¹ Konstantinos Gkiouras,^{2,3} Jose Lara,⁴ Carol Clark¹

6 ¹ *Department of Rehabilitation and Sport Sciences, Bournemouth University, Bournemouth, BH1 3LT, UK;* ² *Department of*
7 *Nutrition & Dietetics, Alexander Technological Educational Institute, Thessaloniki, Greece;* ³ *Department of Medicine,*
8 *Faculty of Health Sciences, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Thessaloniki, Greece; and* ⁴ *Department of Applied Sciences,*
9 *Northumbria University, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE1 8ST, UK.*

10 * During the time of the study, M.G.G. was a visiting scholar at University of Bournemouth, funded by the Erasmus
11 program.

12 **Author Information:** F. Tsofliou, PhD, Senior Lecturer; M.G. Grammatikopoulou, PhD, Senior Lecturer; R. Lumpley, MSc,
13 Research Associate; K. Gkiouras, MSc, Research Associate; J. Lara, PhD, Senior Lecturer; C. Clark, PhD, Professor.

14 **Correspondence:** Fotini Tsofliou, Department of Rehabilitation and Sport Sciences, Bournemouth University,
15 Bournemouth, BH1 3LT, UK. Email: ftsofliou@bournemouth.ac.uk; Tel.: +44 1202 961583.

16 **Author contributions:** F.T. (corresponding author) conceived the idea and designed the study. M.G.G. prepared the
17 first draft of the manuscript, which was adapted by F.T. R.L. collected all data, analysed the dietary data and drafted
18 part of the methodology. K.G. performed all statistical analyses and drafted the results. J.L. and C.C. edited and
19 revised study procedures. F.T. was responsible for the final content of the paper and all authors have read and
20 approved the final manuscript.

21 **Conflicts of interest:** The authors declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship
22 and/or publication of this article.

23 **Funding source:** The present study did not receive any funding, however, during the study, M.G.G. was a visiting scholar at
24 Bournemouth University, funded by the Erasmus program.

25 **Ethical permission:** Bournemouth University. Ethics checklist ID 11511

26

27 **Abstract**

28 **Background:** Lunch clubs are community-based projects where meals are offered with opportunities for social
29 interaction, and a unique dining experience of dual commercial and communal nature.

30 **Aim:** The aim of the present cross-sectional study was to assess differences in the dietary intake between lunch club and
31 non-lunch club days among community-dwelling elderly, living in [removed for blind peer review].UK.

32 **Methods:** A total of 39 elderly individuals attending local lunch clubs, were recruited. Socioeconomic factors were
33 recorded, anthropometric measurements were taken and the dietary intake was assessed in lunch-clubs and non-lunch
34 club days via 24h dietary recalls.

35 **Results:** For the majority of participants, having a hot meal (74.4%), meeting with friends (92.3%) , dining outside home
36 (76.9%) , having a home-styled cooked meal (71.8%), and skipping cooking (43.6%) were considered as important factors
37 for lunch club dining. Absolute intake energy, protein, fat, carbohydrate, saturated fatty acids (SFA), fiber, potassium,
38 calcium, iron, vitamins A, C and folate, as well as water from drinks were significantly greater among lunch club days.
39 When intake was expressed as a % of the reference values, all examined nutrients were consumed in greater adequacy
40 during lunch club days, except from potassium and vitamin D.

41 **Conclusions:** Lunch clubs appear to be an effective means for ameliorating nutrient intake among older adults, while in
42 parallel, offer the opportunity for socializing and sharing a hot meal with peers.

43

44 **Keywords:** dietary survey; older people; ageing, social dining; community meals, cooked hot meal.

45 Introduction

46 During the last decades, the elderly population appears to grow faster than any other age group (Stokes and Preston,
47 2013). With increased morbidity characterizing older age (Shlisky *et al.*, 2017; Kingston *et al.*, 2018), this substantial
48 increase in longevity is hallmarked by a need to promote healthier ageing (Marsman *et al.*, 2018; Grammatikopoulou
49 *et al.*, 2019). On the other hand, nutritional status and in particular malnutrition, appears to be a pivotal health
50 effector among elderly, triggering the development of several health issues (Shlisky *et al.*, 2017), while in parallel,
51 increasing mortality risk.

52 A high proportion of elder individuals are malnourished (Grammatikopoulou *et al.*, 2019), mainly as a result
53 of altered nutritional needs, decreased appetite, chewing problems, sensory decline, food insecurity, social isolation,
54 and poor psychological health (Feldblum *et al.*, 2007; Grammatikopoulou *et al.*, 2012; Agarwal *et al.*, 2013; Clegg and
55 Williams, 2018). Therefore, developing effective interventions to tackle malnutrition among older adults is an
56 important public health priority. Community-based projects such as lunch clubs are a fairly recent approach in the U.K.
57 and other countries (Brunet, 1987). Lunch clubs are community places where meals are offered in a social setting
58 such as a day centre, or a village hall. They are delivered by community, faith or charitable groups, meeting on
59 average once a week and recruiting participants via word of mouth, advertising or referral from health and social
60 care professionals. Apart from a healthy meal, lunch clubs also offer opportunities for social interaction, and a
61 unique dining experience of dual commercial and communal nature (Thomas and Emond, 2017).

62 Despite the importance of lunch clubs in improving the psychology of elderly (Corcoran, Over and Withrow,
63 2010; Thomas and Emond, 2017), we lack data concerning their effect on the dietary intake. Limited research
64 suggests that regular attendance to lunch clubs can increase compliance with the recommendations for key
65 nutrients intake, including calcium, iron, folate and vitamin D (Burke *et al.*, 2011). Given that elderly malnutrition is
66 also associated with lower income tiers (Donini *et al.*, 2013), lunch clubs could also form as a means for improving
67 dietary intake. Based on this hypothesis, the present pilot cross-sectional study was designed, aiming to compare
68 dietary intake between lunch club and non-lunch club days, among elderly in the U.K.

70 **Methods**

71 The present cross-sectional study was carried out at lunch clubs in [removed for blind peer review] U.K., between
72 November and January 2015 – 2016. Lunch clubs with a target audience of attendees over 65 years old, were
73 approached with details of the study. Once agreed, a mutually convenient date was arranged for the researcher to
74 visit on the day of a lunch. Five lunch clubs in total were visited in the [removed for blind peer review].area.
75 Participants were recruited from these clubs on a convenience sampling basis, with the only criteria being 1) age
76 greater than 65 years old, 2) attending a lunch club at least once per week, 3) being able to communicate effectively
77 in the English language, and 4) willing to participate. In further detail, ten older adults were recruited from [removed
78 for blind peer review], twelve from [removed for blind peer review], six from the [removed for blind peer review],
79 five from the [removed for blind peer review] and seven from the [removed for blind peer review]. A total of 40
80 participants were recruited, but the final sample included 39 elderly with complete data. All participants were
81 provided with an information letter, a consent form and a questionnaire, making it clear that they could withdraw at
82 any point. The study was approved by [removed for blind peer review] , ethics checklist ID 11511. Written informed
83 consent was obtained from all participants prior to participation. The study followed the STrengthening the
84 Reporting of OBServational studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) guidelines for cross-sectional studies (Supplementary
85 file).

86 The questionnaire was designed specifically for this project and standardised with pilot testing to be used in
87 more than one location. It was piloted twice on three older adults who were willing to take part on the preliminary
88 phase of the questionnaire's development. Subsequently, modifications were performed including transposing all
89 responses in a Likert scale or closed question tick boxes with an additional option for those opting exclusion from the
90 answer, for increased easiness and accuracy. Questions included length and frequency of lunch club attendance,
91 meal enjoyment, reasons for attending and participants' perceived influence of dining in the clubs, on their dietary
92 habits.

93 Anthropometric measurements included height, weight, waist circumference and hand grip strength. Due to
94 the season (winter) and the variety of participants' mobility issues, it was safer to complete the weight and height
95 measurements with shoes and one layer of top clothing on. Additionally, Body Mass Index (BMI) was calculated and

96 body fat, as a percentage of body weight, was estimated with the Lean *et al.* (Lean, Han and Deurenberg, 1996)
97 method.

98 Self-reported food intake was assessed using three 24h dietary recalls. This was taken on the day of the
99 interview (including their breakfast, lunch club meal and what they anticipated eating for the rest of the day) and
100 two recent days that they were not at a lunch club. Validity of self-reporting has been suggested to decrease with
101 age (Ortiz-Andrellucchi *et al.*, 2009) due to memory loss, impairments such as hearing difficulties with the
102 overweight elderly tending towards under-reporting energy and unhealthy food (Cade and Hutchinson, 2015). In
103 order to obtain as much accuracy as possible, several measures were taken. To aid dietary recall, the researcher led
104 recovery of missed food items and preparation methods by providing assistance with writing, particularly in the case
105 of hearing or sight problems. In further detail, a structured dietary recall was used to provide helpful prompts, in
106 addition to visual aids, similar in size and shape to anticipated portions of a ruler, to better estimate solid foods.
107 These props were consistent at all clubs and helped to refine estimations of portion sizes.

108 NetWisp version 4.0 dietary software (Tinuviel Software Ltd., U.K.) was used to analyse the 39 completed
109 dietary recalls. Micronutrient intake was compared to the dietary reference values (DRVs), (Great Britain.
110 Department of Health. and Panel on Dietary reference Values of the Committee on Medical Aspects of Food Policy.,
111 1991) while the energy and carbohydrate intake were compared to the estimated average requirements (EAR), (The
112 Scientific Advisory Committee on Nutrition recommendations on the DRVs for energy, 2011; The Scientific Advisory
113 Committee on Nutrition recommendations on carbohydrates including sugars and fibre, 2015) and water from
114 drinks, based on the British Dietetic Association guidelines (British Dietetic Association, 2017).

115 Data is presented as means \pm standard deviations (SD) for normally-distributed variables or medians with
116 their interquartile range (IQR) for non-normal variables and frequencies/percentages for categorical variables.
117 Normality was assessed with the Shapiro-Wilk test. Independent t-tests assessed differences in age and
118 anthropometric characteristics between the genders. Fisher's exact tests was used to compare categorical variables.
119 Differences in nutrient intake between lunch club and non-lunch club days were assessed with paired t-test or
120 Wilcoxon signed rank tests when the assumption of normality was violated. Multivariable linear regression models
121 tested the relationship among the difference (Δ) in nutrient intake between lunch club and non-lunch club days

(dependent variables) and male sex, age (continuous) and being married (independent variables), and were adjusted for non-lunch club days' nutrients (continuous) (regression to the mean) (Barnett, van der Pols and Dobson, 2004). All analyses were conducted on SPSS version 23.0 (IBM, SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA) and STATA 12.0 (Stata Corp, College Station, Texas, USA), and the significance level was set at $\alpha=0.05$.

Results

The sample was comprised of 39 individuals with a mean age of 82.1 (SD 8.2) years, and no difference in the gender distribution (43.6% male *versus* 56.4% female, $P=0.423$). Overall, participants were overweight (BMI 27.4 (SD 4.3) (kg/m²), abdominally obese (waist circumference 100.2 (SD 12.7) cm), with low hand-grip strength 18.0 (SD 6.4) kg. Table 1 stresses the sample's characteristics and between-genders tests of differences. Men were taller and heavier than women ($P=0.006$, and $P<0.001$), and demonstrated a stronger hand grip strength ($P<0.001$), however the two genders did not differ in BMI, waist circumference, or body fat (all $P>0.05$).

Reasons for lunch club attendance, proximity to the lunch clubs, attendance duration and means of transport to and from the clubs, are also detailed in **Table 1**. The majority of participants reported that having a hot meal (74.4%), meeting with friends (92.3%), dining outside home (76.9%) , having a home-styled cooked meal (71.8%), and skipping cooking (43.6%), were perceived as important factors in relation to their lunch club dining experience . Meal affordability and participating in the activities offered at the lunch clubs were not deemed as important factors among elderly. The majority of participants had been attending lunch clubs for more than a year and had chosen lunch clubs distanced less than a mile from their home (84.6% and 71.8% of participants respectively). Transportation to the lunch clubs was performed by vehicle from most of the elderly.

Table 2 compares the dietary intake of participants between lunch club and non-lunch club days. In terms of absolute intake energy, protein, fat, carbohydrate, saturated fatty acids (SFA), fiber, potassium, calcium, iron, vitamins A, C and folate, as well as water from drinks were significantly greater among lunch club days. When intake was expressed as a % of the DRV, all examined nutrients were consumed in greater adequacy during lunch club days, except from potassium and vitamin D.

147 Male sex, age and being married did not have a significant relationship with the difference (Δ) of energy,
148 total protein and fat, or SFA, intake between lunch club and non-lunch club days in multivariable linear regression
149 models (**Table 3**). However, it was observed that being married had a significant, positive relationship with Δ
150 carbohydrate intake, expressed as a % of the total daily energy consumption ($\beta = 9.26$, 95% CI=1.62 to 16.91,
151 $P=0.019$). When the models were repeated for the micronutrients intake only age had a positive relationship with
152 the Δ sodium intake ($\beta = 74.78$, 95% CI=3.43 to 146.12, $P=0.040$). Finally, being married had a positive relationship
153 with the Δ %DRV water intake ($\beta = 10.59$, 95% CI=0.89 to 20.28, $P=0.033$).

154

155 **Discussion**

156 The present study reveals that the dietary intake of elderly is substantially improved on the days when dining at
157 lunch clubs. In particular, energy, and macronutrient intake, as well as the consumption of several micronutrients is
158 greater during the lunch club days compared to the non-lunch club days. Additionally, being married was associated
159 with increased carbohydrate and water consumption on lunch club, compared to non-lunch club days.

160 The positive effect of lunch clubs on improving dietary intake and quality in the elderly appears to stem from
161 two main factors being, improved psychology and ameliorated diet quality. Research has showed that dining with
162 company increases both the intake of key nutrients and the appetites of those living alone (Vesnaver and Keller,
163 2011; Conklin *et al.*, 2014). The community spirit, social support, social network and reduction in social isolation has
164 recently been highlighted by older people as a pivotal factor for affecting diet quality (McIntosh, Shifflett and Picou,
165 1989; Bloom *et al.*, 2016, 2017). In addition, the elderly perceive lunch clubs as an opportunity to reduce the feeling
166 of loneliness (Thomas and Emond, 2017). In this context, lunch clubs have been shown to negate some of the
167 psychological effects caused by social isolation, including depression, poor cognitive performance and low perceived
168 health status (Thomas, 2015). In a qualitative study (Thomas and Emond, 2017), older people reported lunch club
169 dining as an out of routine procedure, while dining in and alone as being the commonest everyday method of
170 dining.

171 As far as diet quality is concerned, lunch clubs provide older people with regular shared meals, and a wider
172 variety of food compared to their norm (Thomas and Emond, 2017). This previous finding may explain the increased
173 dietary intakes and quality of nutrients that were noted amongst participants attending lunch clubs in this study. In
174 addition the elderly consider lunch clubs meals as appetizing, and perceive the experience as a “treat” (Thomas and
175 Emond, 2017).

176 In our study, there were no differences in dietary intake between age and gender on lunch club and non-
177 lunch club days. However, it was observed that there was a significant increase in carbohydrate and fluid intake
178 among married elderly on lunch club days. Overall, literature indicates that being married is associated with
179 increased dietary intake during older age (Horwath, 1989; McIntosh, Shifflett and Picou, 1989). While widowhood is
180 associated with increased depressive symptoms and a less-enjoyment of meals which may lead to reduced dietary
181 intake and quality (Vesnaver *et al.*, 2015, 2016). Thus, it is highly likely that the improved intake of married elderly is
182 further increased on lunch club days.

183 Caveats of the present research include its pilot nature, allowing for a relatively small, although homogenous
184 sample of participants. Additionally, the cross-sectional nature of the design does not allow for a prospective
185 understanding of the effects of lunch club dining on the dietary intake and health of elderly. Future research should
186 aim in recruiting more participants and evaluating the psychological status of elderly, as well as compare the diet
187 quality of lunch club meals compared to those eaten at home.

188 To summarize, the present pilot study shows that lunch club dining is associated with increased dietary
189 intake and nutrient quality among older people. This finding is important for stakeholders and policy makers in
190 supporting better dietary intake among community-dwelling older people.

191
192 **Availability of data:** Due to the personal nature of the data, they will be available blinded, upon request.

193 **Acknowledgements:** The authors appreciate the cooperation of all participants.

194 **Declaration of Conflicts of interest:** The authors declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the
195 research, authorship and/or publication of this article.

196 **Funding:** The present study did not receive any funding, however, during the study, [removed for blind peer
197 review].was a visiting scholar at [removed for blind peer review]., funded by the Erasmus program.

198 **Author contributions:** [removed for blind peer review], (corresponding author) conceived the idea and designed the
199 study. [removed for blind peer review], prepared the first draft of the manuscript, which was adapted by [removed
200 for blind peer review]. [removed for blind peer review]collected all data, analysed the dietary data and drafted part
201 of the methodology. [removed for blind peer review], performed all statistical analyses and drafted the results.
202 [removed for blind peer review], and [removed for blind peer review], edited and revised study procedures.
203 [removed for blind peer review],. was responsible for the final content of the paper and all authors have read and
204 approved the final manuscript.

205 **References**

206 Agarwal, E. *et al.* (2013) 'Malnutrition in the elderly: A narrative review', *Maturitas*, 76, pp. 296–302. doi:
207 10.1016/j.maturitas.2013.07.013.

208 Barnett, A. G., van der Pols, J. C. and Dobson, A. J. (2004) 'Regression to the mean: what it is and how to deal with it',
209 *International Journal of Epidemiology*. Oxford University Press, 34(1), pp. 215–220. doi: 10.1093/ije/dyh299.

210 Bloom, I. *et al.* (2016) 'Influences on diet quality in older age: the importance of social factors', *Age and Ageing*,
211 46(2), pp. 277–283. doi: 10.1093/ageing/afw180.

212 Bloom, I. *et al.* (2017) 'What influences diet quality in older people? A qualitative study among community-dwelling
213 older adults from the Hertfordshire Cohort Study, UK', *Public Health Nutrition*, 20(15), pp. 2685–2693. doi:
214 10.1017/S1368980017001203.

215 British Dietetic Association (2017) *Food Fact Sheets: Fluids*. London, U.K. Available at:
216 <https://www.bda.uk.com/foodfacts/fluid.pdf> (Accessed: 25 February 2019).

217 Brunet, D. (1987) 'Lunch clubs for the elderly in England: a study.', *Canadian family physician Medecin de famille*
218 *canadien*, 33, pp. 1299–306.

219 Burke, D. *et al.* (2011) 'Community luncheon clubs benefit the nutritional and social well-being of free living older
220 people', *Journal of Human Nutrition and Dietetics*. Wiley/Blackwell (10.1111), 24(3), pp. 278–278. doi:
221 10.1111/j.1365-277X.2011.01175_2.x.

222 Cade, J. and Hutchinson, J. (2015) 'Study Design: Population-Based Studies', in *Nutrition Research Methodologies*.
223 Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, pp. 13–27. doi: 10.1002/9781119180425.ch2.

224 Clegg, M. E. and Williams, E. A. (2018) 'Optimizing nutrition in older people', *Maturitas*, 112, pp. 34–38. doi:
225 10.1016/j.maturitas.2018.04.001.

226 Conklin, A. I. *et al.* (2014) 'Social relationships and healthful dietary behaviour: evidence from over-50s in the EPIC
227 cohort, UK.', *Social Science & Medicine*. Elsevier, 100(100), pp. 167–75. doi: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2013.08.018.

228 Corcoran, I., Over, R. and Withrow, A. (2010) *Proving the Social and Economic Value of the Lunch Club for Older*
229 *Persons*. Worcester, UK.

230 Donini, L. M. *et al.* (2013) 'Malnutrition in elderly: Social and economic determinants', *The journal of nutrition, health*
231 *& aging*, 17(1), pp. 9–15. doi: 10.1007/s12603-012-0374-8.

232 Feldblum, I. *et al.* (2007) 'Characteristics of undernourished older medical patients and the identification of
233 predictors for undernutrition status', *Nutrition Journal*, 6(1), p. 37. doi: 10.1186/1475-2891-6-37.

234 Grammatikopoulou, M. *et al.* (2012) 'Food Insecurity among elderly in Athens', *Clinical Nutrition*, S7, p. 46.

235 Grammatikopoulou, M. G. *et al.* (2019) 'Food insecurity increases the risk of malnutrition among community-
236 dwelling older adults', *Maturitas*, 119, pp. 8–13. doi: 10.1016/j.maturitas.2018.10.009.

237 Great Britain. Department of Health. and Panel on Dietary reference Values of the Committee on Medical Aspects of
238 Food Policy. (1991) *Dietary reference values for food energy and nutrients for the United Kingdom : Report of the*
239 *Panel on Dietary Reference Values of the Committee on Medical Aspects of Food Policy*. H.M.S.O.

240 Horwath, C. C. (1989) 'Marriage and diet in elderly Australians: results from a large random survey', *Journal of*

241 *Human Nutrition and Dietetics*. Wiley/Blackwell (10.1111), 2(3), pp. 185–193. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-
242 277X.1989.tb00023.x.

243 Kingston, A. *et al.* (2018) 'Projections of multi-morbidity in the older population in England to 2035: estimates from
244 the Population Ageing and Care Simulation (PACSim) model', *Age and Ageing*, 47(3), pp. 374–380. doi:
245 10.1093/ageing/afx201.

246 Lean, M. E., Han, T. S. and Deurenberg, P. (1996) 'Predicting body composition by densitometry from simple
247 anthropometric measurements', *The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*, 63(1), pp. 4–14. doi:
248 10.1093/ajcn/63.1.4.

249 Marsman, D. *et al.* (2018) 'Healthy ageing: the natural consequences of good nutrition—a conference report',
250 *European Journal of Nutrition*, 57(S2), pp. 15–34. doi: 10.1007/s00394-018-1723-0.

251 McIntosh, W. A., Shifflett, P. A. and Picou, J. S. (1989) 'Social Support, Stressful Events, Strain, Dietary Intake, and the
252 Elderly', *Medical Care*. Lippincott Williams & Wilkins, pp. 140–153. doi: 10.2307/3765138.

253 Ortiz-Andrellucchi, A. *et al.* (2009) 'Dietary assessment methods for micronutrient intake in elderly people: a
254 systematic review', *British Journal of Nutrition*, 102(S1), p. S118. doi: 10.1017/S0007114509993175.

255 Shlisky, J. *et al.* (2017) 'Nutritional Considerations for Healthy Aging and Reduction in Age-Related Chronic Disease.',
256 *Advances in nutrition (Bethesda, Md.)*, 8(1), pp. 17–26. doi: 10.3945/an.116.013474.

257 Stokes, A. and Preston, S. H. (2013) 'Population Change among the Elderly: International Patterns.', *Population and
258 development review*. NIH Public Access, 38(Suppl 1), pp. 309–321. doi: 10.1111/j.1728-4457.2013.00566.x.

259 The Scientific Advisory Committee on Nutrition recommendations on carbohydrates including sugars and fibre
260 (2015) *Independent report. SACN Carbohydrates and Health Report*. London, U.K.

261 The Scientific Advisory Committee on Nutrition recommendations on the DRVs for energy (2011) *Independent
262 report. SACN Dietary Reference Values for Energy*. London, U.K.

263 Thomas, J. (2015) *Insights into loneliness, older people and well-being*. London, U.K.

264 Thomas, N. and Emond, R. (2017) 'Living alone but eating together: Exploring lunch clubs as a dining out experience',
265 *Appetite*, 119, pp. 34–40. doi: 10.1016/j.appet.2017.03.003.

266 Vesnaver, E. *et al.* (2015) 'Food behavior change in late-life widowhood: A two-stage process', *Appetite*, 95, pp. 399–
267 407. doi: 10.1016/j.appet.2015.07.027.

268 Vesnaver, E. *et al.* (2016) 'Alone at the Table: Food Behavior and the Loss of Commensality in Widowhood: Table 1.',
269 *The Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, 71(6), pp. 1059–1069. doi:
270 10.1093/geronb/gbv103.

271 Vesnaver, E. and Keller, H. H. (2011) 'Social Influences and Eating Behavior in Later Life: A Review', *Journal of*
272 *Nutrition in Gerontology and Geriatrics*, 30(1), pp. 2–23. doi: 10.1080/01639366.2011.545038.

273

274

275

276

277

278

279

280

281

282

283

284 **Table 1.** Participant characteristics of older people attending lunch clubs (mean \pm SD, or n and %)

| | All (N=39) | Males (n=17) | Females (n=22) | Significance ^a |
|---|------------------|------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|
| Age (years) | 82.1 \pm 8.2 | 81.1 \pm 7.5 | 82.9 \pm 8.8 | 0.504 |
| <i>Anthropometrics:</i> | | | | |
| Body weight (BW) (kg) | 72.8 \pm 13.8 | 79.5 \pm 12.5 | 67.6 \pm 12.6 | 0.006 |
| Height (cm) | 162.9 \pm 9.9 | 171.2 \pm 5.8 | 156.4 \pm 7.2 | <0.001 |
| Body mass index (kg/m ²) | 27.4 \pm 4.3 | 27.2 \pm 4.7 | 27.5 \pm 4.1 | 0.836 |
| Waist circumference (cm) | 100.2 \pm 12.7 | 104.6 \pm 12.6 | 96.8 \pm 12.1 | 0.057 |
| Body Fat (% BW) | 44.6 \pm 10.2 | 46.2 \pm 11.1 | 43.3 \pm 9.5 | 0.384 |
| Hand grip strength (kg) | 18.0 \pm 6.4 | 22.9 \pm 4.8 | 14.2 \pm 4.6 | <0.001 |
| <i>Marital status:</i> | | | | |
| Married | 8 (20.5%) | 5 (29.4%) | 3 (13.6%) | 0.261 |
| Other (single/divorcee/windowed) | 31 (79.5%) | 12 (70.6%) | 19 (86.4%) | |
| <i>Living arrangements:</i> | | | | |
| Alone | 25 (64.1%) | 9 (52.9%) | 16 (72.7%) | 0.314 |
| With one or more adults ^b | 14 (35.9%) | 8 (47.1%) | 6 (27.3%) | |
| <i>Retirement status:</i> | | | | |
| Pension/savings/benefits | 37 (94.9%) | 15 (88.2%) | 22 (100%) | 0.184 |
| Work income | 2 (5.1%) | 2 (11.8%) | 0 (0%) | |
| <i>Transportation means:</i> | | | | |
| By vehicle | 25 (64.1%) | 10 (58.8%) | 15 (68.2%) | 0.738 |
| On foot | 14 (35.9%) | 7 (41.2%) | 7 (31.8%) | |
| <i>Residential proximity to the lunch club:</i> | | | | |
| Less than 1 mile | 28 (71.8%) | 13 (76.5%) | 15 (68.2%) | 0.725 |
| More than 1 mile | 11 (28.2%) | 4 (23.5%) | 7 (31.8%) | |
| <i>Duration of attendance to lunch club:</i> | | | | |
| Less than 1 year | 6 (15.4%) | 1 (5.9%) | 5 (22.7%) | 0.206 |
| More than 1 year | 33 (84.6%) | 16 (94.1%) | 17 (77.3%) | |
| <i>Reasons for lunch club attendance:</i> | | | | |
| | Important | Neither | Unimportant | |
| To have a hot meal | 29 (74.4%) | 7 (17.9%) | 3 (7.7%) | |
| To meet with friends | 36 (92.3%) | 3 (7.7%) | 0 (0.0%) | |
| To dine outside home | 30 (76.9%) | 8 (20.5%) | 1 (2.6%) | |
| For a home-styled cooked meal | 28 (71.8%) | 5 (12.8%) | 6 (15.4%) | |
| To skip cooking at home | 17 (43.6%) | 16 (41.0%) | 6 (15.4%) | |
| For an affordable meal | 15 (38.5%) | 19 (48.7%) | 5 (12.8%) | |
| For the extra activities | 6 (15.4%) | 28 (71.8%) | 5 (12.8%) | |

BW: Body Weight; SD: Standard Deviation;

^a Significance values refer to either independent t-tests or Fisher's exact tests for continuous and categorical variables, respectively; ^b One female individual was in warden-controlled housing

Table 2. Dietary intake of participants at the day of lunch club and non-lunch club days (mean \pm SD, or median with respective IQR) (N=39)

| | Absolute Intakes | | significance | % DRV ^a | | Significance ^b |
|------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|
| | Lunch club day | Non-lunch club days | | Lunch club day | Non-lunch club days | |
| Energy (kcal) | 1,850.1 \pm 483.9 | 1,367.3 \pm 516.8 | <0.001 | 83.2 (28.0) | 62.7 (26.0) | <0.001 |
| Protein (g) | 77.6 \pm 27.2 | 65.3 \pm 26.6 | 0.023 | 148.4 (92.0) | 132.0 \pm 52.6 | 0.019 |
| Protein (%) | 17.0 \pm 4.9 | 19.3 (7.0) | 0.021 | | | |
| Total fat (g) | 67.0 (31.0) | 57.6 \pm 24.7 | 0.001 | | | |
| Total fat (%) | 37.2 \pm 8.6 | 38.0 \pm 10.0 | 0.702 | | | |
| SFA (g) | 26.0 (21.0) | 23.3 \pm 10.6 | 0.037 | | | |
| Total Carbohydrate (g) | 205.0 (80.0) | 147.0 (87.0) | <0.001 | | | |
| Total Carbohydrate (%) | 47.4 \pm 8.6 | 43.4 \pm 10.6 | 0.065 | | | |
| Dietary Fibre (g) | 12.0 (6.0) | 9.0 (9.0) | 0.013 | 41.0 (21.0) | 31.0 (36.0) | 0.031 |
| Na (mg) | 2,252.0 (1,387.0) | 1,966.0 (1,452.0) | 0.089 | 141.0 (87.0) | 124.0 (81.0) | 0.11 |
| K (mg) | 2,783.0 (1,225.0) | 1,995.0 (1,129.0) | <0.001 | 80.0 (35.0) | 58.0 (27.0) | <0.001 |
| Ca (mg) | 909.0 \pm 337.6 | 634.0 (353.0) | <0.001 | 129.7 \pm 48.3 | 90.0 (50.0) | <0.001 |
| Fe (mg) | 8.9 (5.0) | 8.0 (7.0) | 0.028 | 102.0 (53.0) | 90.0 (77.0) | 0.026 |
| Vitamin A (μ g) | 1185.0 (1438.0) | 865.0 (960.0) | 0.020 | 202.7 (290.0) | 123.6 (153.0) | 0.015 |
| Vitamin D (μ g) | 1.8 (2.0) | 1.1 (1.0) | 0.130 | 18.0 (18.0) | 11.0 (14.0) | 0.133 |
| Folate (μ g) | 235.0 (173.0) | 172.0 (116.0) | 0.003 | 117.0 (87.0) | 86.0 (58.0) | 0.003 |
| Vitamin C (μ g) | 73.0 (70.0) | 33.0 (43.0) | 0.002 | 183.0 (177.0) | 80.0 (95.0) | 0.002 |
| Water from drinks (ml) | 970.0 (400.0) | 850.0 (437.0) | 0.003 | 57.8 (24.0) | 52.5 (28.0) | 0.005 |

BDA: British Dietetic Association; DRV: Dietary Reference Values; EAR: Estimated Average Requirements; IQR: Interquartile range; SD: Standard Deviation; SFA: Saturated

Fat Intake;

286 **Table 3.** Multivariable linear regression models^a of the relationships among male sex, age, married status and the dietary intake difference between lunch club and non-
 287 lunch club days

| DV/IV | Male sex | Age | Married |
|----------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| | β, (95% CI), Significance | β, (95% CI), Significance | β, (95% CI), Significance |
| Δ Energy intake (EI) | 38.30, (-156.73 to 233.33), P = 0.692 | 5.36, (-7.41 to 18.12), P = 0.400 | 45.65, (-222.85 to 314.14), P = 0.732 |
| Δ Protein (g) | -4.34, (-22.74 to 14.07), P = 0.635 | -0.15, (-1.39 to 1.09), P = 0.808 | 10.60, (-15.35 to 36.54), P = 0.412 |
| Δ Protein (%DRV) | -0.46, (-3.81 to 2.88), P = 0.780 | 0.01, (-0.22 to 0.24), P = 0.936 | -2.35, (-6.96 to 2.28), P = 0.310 |
| Δ Total fat (g) | 8.69, (-13.77 to 31.16), P = 0.437 | -0.82, (-2.37 to 0.74), P = 0.292 | -20.08, (-52.02 to 11.87), P = 0.210 |
| Δ Fat (%EI) | 4.59, (-1.44 to 10.61), P = 0.131 | -0.01, (-0.41 to 0.39), P = 0.953 | -4.91, (-13.01 to 3.19), P = 0.226 |
| Δ SFA (g) | -0.11, (-10.62 to 10.39), P = 0.983 | -0.52, (-1.24 to 0.20), P = 0.151 | -8.39, (-22.80 to 6.02), P = 0.245 |
| Δ Carbohydrate (g) | -4.95, (-44.10 to 34.21), P = 0.799 | 0.98, (-1.61 to 3.56), P = 0.447 | 52.63, (-2.22 to 107.48), P = 0.059 |
| Δ Carbohydrate (%EI) | -4.65, (-10.27 to 0.97), P = 0.102 | 0.11, (-0.26 to 0.49), P = 0.540 | 9.26, (1.62 to 16.91), P = 0.019 |

Δ denotes the difference in nutrient intakes between lunch club and non-lunch club days; β denotes linear regression beta coefficient;

CHO; Carbohydrates; CI; Confidence intervals; DRV: Dietary Reference Values; DV/IV; Dependent/Independent variables; EI: Energy Intake; SFA; Saturated fatty Acids.

^a Multivariable linear regression models included differences in nutrient intakes as DV and IV were male sex, age (continuous), being married and were adjusted for non-lunch club days' nutrients (continuous)

288

289

290

291

292

293