Rosário, R., Araújo, A., Padrão, P., Lopes, O., Moreira, A., Abreu, S., . . . Moreira, P. (2016). Impact of a school-based intervention to promote fruit intake: a cluster randomized controlled trial. *Public health*, 94-100. doi:10.1016/j.puhe.2016.03.013



Universidade do Minho Instituto de Educação Centro de Investigação em Estudos da Criança (CIEC)



### Professora Doutora Maria Beatriz Ferreira Leite de Oliveira Pereira (Pereira, Beatriz)

Category: Full Professor

Institution: Universidade do Minho (UMinho)

Email: <u>beatriz@ie.uminho.pt</u>

Online CV: http://www.degois.pt/visualizador/curriculum.jsp?key=2030897209377539

Available online at www.sciencedirect.com

## Public Health

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/puhe



# Original Research

# Impact of a school-based intervention to promote fruit intake: a cluster randomized controlled trial



R. Rosário <sup>a,b,\*</sup>, A. Araújo <sup>c</sup>, P. Padrão <sup>c</sup>, O. Lopes <sup>d</sup>, A. Moreira <sup>e</sup>, S. Abreu <sup>f</sup>, S. Vale <sup>f</sup>, B. Pereira <sup>b</sup>, P. Moreira <sup>c,f</sup>

<sup>a</sup> University of Minho, School of Nursing, Largo do Paço, 4704-553 Braga, Portugal

<sup>b</sup> University of Minho, School of Education, Research Centre in Child Studies, Campus de Gualtar, 4710-057 Braga, Portugal

 $^{
m c}$  University of Porto, Faculty of Nutrition and Food Sciences, Rua Roberto Frias, 4200-465 Porto, Portugal

<sup>d</sup> Erdal Association, Guimarães, Portugal

<sup>e</sup> University of Porto, Faculty of Medicine, Al. Prof. Hernâni Monteiro, 4200 — 319 Porto, Portugal

<sup>f</sup> University of Porto, Research Centre in Physical Activity, Health and Leisure, Rua Dr. Plácido Costa, 91, 4200-450 Porto, Portugal

#### ARTICLE INFO

Article history: Received 27 May 2015 Received in revised form 23 January 2016 Accepted 9 March 2016 Available online 18 April 2016

Keywords: Children Intervention programme Fruit for dessert Public health

#### ABSTRACT

*Objective*: There is evidence that fruit consumption among school children is below the recommended levels. This study aims to examine the effects of a dietary education intervention program me, held by teachers previously trained in nutrition, on the consumption of fruit as a dessert at lunch and dinner, among children 6–12 years old.

Study design: This is a randomized trial with the schools as the unit of randomisation. *Methods*: A total of 464 children (239 female, 6–12years) from seven elementary schools participated in this cluster randomized controlled trial. Three schools were allocated to the intervention and four to the control group. For the intervention schools, we delivered professional development training to school teachers (12 sessions of 3 h each). The training provided information about nutrition, healthy eating, the importance of drinking water and healthy cooking activities. After each session, teachers were encouraged to develop classroom activities focused on the learned topics. Sociodemographic was assessed at baseline and anthropometric, dietary intake and physical activity assessments were performed at baseline and at the end of the intervention. Dietary intake was evaluated by a 24-h dietary recall and fruit consumption as a dessert was gathered at lunch and dinner.

Results: Intervened children reported a significant higher intake in the consumption of fruit compared to the controlled children at lunch (P = 0.001) and at dinner (P = 0.012), after adjusting for confounders.

*Conclusions:* Our study provides further support for the success of intervention programmes aimed at improving the consumption of fruit as a dessert in children.

© 2016 The Royal Society for Public Health. Published by Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.puhe.2016.03.013

<sup>\*</sup> Corresponding author. Universidade do Minho, Escola Superior de Enfermagem, Largo do Paço, 4704-553 Braga, Portugal.

E-mail addresses: rrosario@ese.uminho.pt (R. Rosário), anam\_araujo@iol.pt (A. Araújo), patriciapadrao@fcna.up.pt (P. Padrão), oscar.lopes@erdal.pt (O. Lopes), andremoreira@med.up.pt (A. Moreira), sandramrabreu@gmail.com (S. Abreu), susanavale@hotmail. com (S. Vale), beatriz@ie.uminho.pt (B. Pereira), pedromoreira@fcna.up.pt (P. Moreira).

<sup>0033-3506/© 2016</sup> The Royal Society for Public Health. Published by Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

#### Introduction

The evidence suggests that children's consumption of fruit and vegetables is below the recommended levels.<sup>15,21</sup> It is known that human biology does not predispose children to eat the recommended amounts of fruit and vegetables and makes them especially exposed to the current food environment of foods high in refined sugars.<sup>23</sup>

Previous studies found that a western dietary pattern is characterized by the consumption of sweet desserts, which are correlated to an increase in the intake of solid fats and added sugars in children's diets.<sup>5,10,19</sup> In 2–18-year-old children, grain desserts such as cakes, cookies, doughnuts, pies, crisps, cobblers and granola bars are the top source of energy, the second major source of solid fats and third of added sugars. In addition, dairy desserts are the fourth major source of added sugars.<sup>32</sup> In Portugal, it is common to eat fruit as a dessert, at least at lunch and dinner, nevertheless total consumption of fruit is still lower than the recommended levels.<sup>20</sup> Schools in Portugal have canteens and most of the children eat there. Government recommendations provide guidelines to schools and their canteens to offer healthy food such as fruit and soup.<sup>43</sup>

There is growing evidence that childhood is an important time to establish eating behaviours. School-based intervention programmes aimed to improve students diets and reduce chronic diseases have had mixed success.<sup>2,7</sup> Some of the studies have a positive impact on fruit and vegetable consumption during the day.<sup>12,22,27,34,44</sup> However to the best of our knowledge, none of them analysed the effects of an educational programme on fruit for dessert. Until now, it is unclear the role of teachers in the delivery features of the interventions.<sup>39,41</sup> Although teachers are not able to devote as much time and energy to provide interventions as dedicated interventionists, at least theoretically, because they have responsibilities in the classroom that take precedence,41 some studies consider them dedicated interventionists.<sup>39</sup> In Portugal, teachers have to attend professional development training (lifelong training) to progress in their career. There are few, if any, examples of studies that consider the programme to have impact on the progression of a teaching career. It is hypothesized that participation in this school-based intervention programme have impact on children from primary schools by increasing consumption of fruit as a dessert at lunch and dinner.

The purpose of the present study is to examine the effects of a six-month dietary education intervention programme, delivered and taught by trained teachers, on the consumption of fruit as a dessert in children aged 6–12 years.

#### Methods

#### Participants

During 2007/2008, seven of 80 public elementary schools from a city in the north of Portugal were selected by a simple random sample and invited to participate in this study. The number of schools involved was according to constraints of personnel for assessment and intervention. The unit of randomization was the school, and three of them were assigned into intervention, and four into the control group (Fig. 1). Previous data collection, the written consent forms signed by parents, was gathered according to the ethical standards laid down in the Helsinki Declaration. Immediately before data collection children gave oral assent. Also, both the schools where the study was carried out, and the Portuguese Data Protection Authority (CNPD-Comissão Nacional de Proteção de Dados, process number 7613/2008) approved the study. In addition the protocol for this study was registered in the clinicaltrials.gov, NCT01397123.

Of the 574 children who were invited to participate, 464 (239 female), aged 6–12 years old, agreed and returned (80.8%) the written consent forms filled by their parents. From these, 233 (50.2%) were allocated to the intervention group, and 231 (49.8%) to the control group. Follow-up assessment was available for 63.4% of the children, 143 (61.9%) in the control and 151 (64.8%) in the intervention groups. Attrition rates did not differ between intervention and control group (35.2% and 38.1%, respectively). Major reasons for non-participation were school transfer (94.1%), parental refusal (4.1%) and absence from school (1.8%). A total of 257 parents of the children involved in the study provided data at baseline and 203 (79.0%) at postintervention, i.e. after the programme ended during the year 2009.

#### Overview of the intervention

Fifteen teachers from intervention schools (15 classrooms) were invited to participate in the programme conducted between October 2008 and March 2009, and all of them agreed to be involved. This intervention programme was based on the Health Promotion Model<sup>28</sup> and the social cognitive theory,<sup>3</sup> and aimed to promote healthier active lifestyles by encouraging children to be more active and make a better food selection. The professional development training for the teachers was approved by the Minister of Education, Scientific-Pedagogic Council for In-service Training (Conselho Científico Pedagógico da Formação Contínua, Ministério da Educação) in the form of 'training workshop' with 72- h duration. The programme was implemented over two terms: (1) teachers' training delivered by researchers between October 2008 and March 2009; and (2) intervention delivered by the trained teachers to children between November and March 2009 and as previously described elsewhere.35,36 Briefly, teachers of the intervention group had 12 sessions of three hours each with the study researchers during six months, which included contents related to health promotion and overweight and obesity prevention, concepts of food, nutrition and dietary guidelines, hydration and the importance of water, appropriate physical activity levels and strategies to reduce screen time. After each session, teachers delivered the learnt contents and developed creative and engaging classroom activities about the addressed topic. Individual meetings with teachers occurred just before the beginning of the intervention to clarify doubts and review the materials to be used in the sessions.

The implementation of the programme occurred as planned. All the children of the intervention schools had contact with trained teachers. Teachers taught the components of the



programme as prescribed and the researchers were always available to answer any question. Teachers reported they were enthusiastic about the training, and had a total attendance in the sessions with the researchers. There were no changes in standard care provided by teachers from control schools.

#### Assessments

In each school, previously trained assessors performed anthropometric evaluation, using standardized procedures<sup>46</sup> before the intervention, from February to June of the school year 2007/2008, as well as after the intervention from April to June of 2009. Children and outcomes assessors were blinded to group assignment. Anthropometric measurements were performed with children with light indoor clothing who were barefoot. Weight was measured in an electronic scale, with an error of ±100 g (Seca, Model 703, Germany), and height was measured using a stadiometer, with the head in the Frankfort plane. Body mass index (BMI) was computed as mass, (kg)/ height,<sup>2</sup> (m). The prevalence of underweight, normal weight, overweight and obesity was calculated according to the International Obesity Task Force (IOTF) criteria, making a correspondence between the traditional adult cut-off and specific values for children according to gender and age.<sup>8,9</sup> A z-score (the number of standard deviations [SDs] from the reference population) was calculated for each child using the LMS method and the calculation was determined using the LMS growth add-in for excel. $^{26}$ 

Dietary intake was gathered by a 24-h dietary recall obtained by nutritionists and/or trained interviewers, before and immediately after the intervention. These interviews captured the time, type, local, and foods and beverages at each eating occasion. Children did not have previous notification of when the recalls would occur to prevent potentially biasing reports and were asked to remember all food and beverages consumed during the previous 24-h. Portion sizes were assessed using various presentations of book images. Energy and nutritional intake were estimated using the nutritional analysis software Food Processor Plus (ESHA Research Inc., Salem, OR, USA), which was added with Portuguese foods and recipes. Fruit consumed as a dessert was gathered, according to whole fruit consumption after lunch and dinner (excluding fruit juice).

To evaluate the mean population bias in reported energy intake, at baseline and after intervention, the ratio Energy intake (EI):Basal metabolic Rate (BMR) was computed for each subject, according to gender and age-specific equation<sup>38</sup> adopted by the FAO/WHO/UNU report.<sup>45</sup> BMR was determined through the Schofield equations and the subjects with EI:BMR  $\leq$ 0.89 were classified as Low Energy Reporters (LERs) and excluded from analysis.<sup>16</sup>

In order to assess the level of physical activity of children, parents were asked five questions with four answer choices (four-point scale) ranging from one to four, from a questionnaire developed by Telama et al.<sup>42</sup> and previously applied to the Portuguese population.<sup>24</sup> Overall a maximum of 20 points could be reached. A Physical Activity Index was obtained dividing the total score of the questionnaire into four levels of activity: sedentary group (five scores); low activity group (six–10 scores); moderately active group (11–15 scores); and vigorously active group (16–20 scores), on the basis of their reported physical activity.<sup>24,31</sup>

Social, demographic and family characteristics were assessed by questionnaire. The survey sent to parents contained questions about gender and age of the children, education of the parents (recorded in five categories: zero;one-four; five-nine; 10–12; and more than 12 years of formal education). This information was further grouped for analysis into three categories: up to nine years; 10–12 years; and more than 12 years of education.

#### Statistical analyses

Data are described as mean (SD) or *n* (%) where appropriate. Student t-tests, Mann–Whitney U, Kruskal–Wallis and chisquared tests were used to compare several variables grouped by intervention and control groups and gender. These tests were also conducted to assure comparability of fruit for dessert between groups at baseline. A 0.05 level of significance was considered.

Schools were randomized according to a random number generator, with blinding to schools. The effect of the programme was evaluated based on changes in fruit for dessert at lunch and dinner, comparing intervention to control schools. The tests examining these differences were developed using Generalized Linear Models and took into account the nested nature of the data (children were nested within schools). The adjustment was made for gender (boy vs girl), age, school, baseline energy intake, parents' education, weight status, Physical Activity Index, underreporting (ratio of EI:BMR) and baseline measures of the dependent variable. Baseline values were used as covariates to control of any differences between participants on these variables prior to the intervention. The data analysis was performed using SPSS<sup>®</sup>, version 21.0 (SPSS Inc; Chicago, IL, USA).

#### Results

Table 1 shows the anthropometric and sociodemographic characteristics of the participants, before and after the intervention. At baseline, subjects included 239 (51.5%) girls, with 8.3 (1.2) years. As there were no differences between genders, data from boys and girls are shown combined.

The average BMI was 17.9 (3.4) kg/m<sup>2</sup>, ranging from 11.9 to 26.9 kg/m<sup>2</sup> and mean BMI z-score was 0.8 (1.1). Overall, 23.3% of the children were classified as overweight and 9.5% as obese. The large majority of the children were classified as sedentary or having low activity (64% for the intervention and 68.9% for the control group). Mean energy intake was not statistically significantly different (P = 0.257) between

intervention and control groups at baseline (2091 [684] kcal/ day vs 2024 [582] kcal/day respectively).

There were significant differences between groups with regard to mother (P = 0.021) and father (P = 0.003) education levels, which were higher in the intervention group. To account for these differences at baseline, these variables were controlled for in subsequent analyses.

As we can see in Table 1 no significant differences were found on fruit for dessert consumed on lunch and dinner at baseline between intervention and control groups.

Overall, children from the intervention group reported an increase in fruit consumption at dessert whereas the control group reported a reduction in fruit as dessert for lunch. These differences were significant after controlling for confounders (P = 0.001), Table 2. Children from both groups (control and intervention) reported an increase on fruit for dessert consumption at dinner. Intervened children had a significantly higher consumption compared to controllers and this difference was significant after controlling for confounders (P = 0.012), Table 2. In addition, 43 children increased both consumption at lunch and dinner, 30 (70%) of which belonged to the intervention group.

#### Discussion

Our study showed that a nutrition programme, delivered and taught by in-service teachers trained in nutrition is effective in improving fruit consumption as a dessert. There was a significant higher increase in fruit for dessert at lunch and dinner among intervened children compared to the controllers, after adjusting for confounders. This is noteworthy because since both environment and genetics affect dietary preferences,<sup>14</sup> effective promoting strategies that improve the consumption of healthy food as a dessert can shape preferences.<sup>23</sup> Moreover, the habits acquired early in life tend to be maintained into adulthood.<sup>4,25</sup>

Until now it has not been clearly established that the increased willingness to consume fruit observed in the school environment is mirrored in the child's eating behaviour at home. Our study adds upon other by showing that the teachers' intervention in improving children's behaviour related to fruit intake, perhaps also induced their abilities to ask parents to buy or prepare a favourite fruit and influence its readiness in the home.<sup>6,33</sup> Moreover, our data suggest that the professional development training provided teachers with the knowledge and skills needed to properly integrate health nutrition in the school curriculum. Indeed, it seems that teachers were able to adapt the topics according to the children's needs and learning abilities throughout the year. Although the results of this programme cannot be extrapolated to demonstrate lifelong changes in eating habits, it does show the ability of an education programme to impact on diet at a crucial life stage when eating habits are being established.

Previous studies identified that fruit consumption is below recommended levels among school children.<sup>21</sup> This study provides further support to improve fruit consumption at a particular time, as a dessert.<sup>11,17</sup>

It has been questioned the role of teachers as interventionists.<sup>39,41</sup> This study contributes to clarify the scant

#### Table 1 – Characteristics of the sample at baseline and postintervention. Portugal 2007–2009.

|  | Baseline               |  |         | Postintervention       |  |          |
|--|------------------------|--|---------|------------------------|--|----------|
| Characteristics                                  | Intervention $n = 231$ | $\begin{array}{l} \text{Control} \\ n=233 \end{array}$ | P-value | Intervention $n = 151$ | $\begin{array}{l} \text{Control} \\ n=143 \end{array}$ | P-value  |
| Boys <sup>a</sup>                                | 116 (49.8)             | 109 (47.2)   |         | 76 (50.3)              | 68 (47.6)  |          |
| Girls <sup>a</sup>                               | 117 (50.2)             | 122 (52.8)   | 0.575   | 75 (49.7)              | 75 (52.4)  | 0.634    |
| Age (years) <sup>b,c</sup>                       | 8.3 (1.2)              | 8.2 (1.2)  | 0.846   | 9.2 (0.9)              | 9.1 (1.0)  | 0.494    |
| BMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> ) <sup>b,c</sup>          | 18.1 (2.7)             | 17.7 (2.8)   | 0.062   | 18.7 (2.6)             | 18.7 (2.7)   | 0.966    |
| Energy intake (kcal/day) <sup>b,c</sup>          | 2091 (683.9)           | 2024.2 (581.8)   | 0.257   | 2388.0 (1036.5)        | 2475.6 (684.9)   | 0.049    |
| Fruit for dessert at lunch (g) $^{\mathrm{b,c}}$ | 81.94 (76.0)           | 88.8 (91.4)  | 0.057   | 90.1 (95.8)            | 52.3 (67.8)  | < 0.0001 |
| Fruit for dessert at dinner (g) <sup>b,c</sup>   | 53.4 (80.1)            | 27.7 (65.4)  | 0.077   | 71.2 (93.1)            | 48.8 (89.2)  | 0.044    |
| Mother's education <sup>a</sup>                  |                        |  |         |                        |  |          |
| Up to nine years                                 | 116 (58.6)             | 128 (69.9)   |         | 77 (59.2)              | 81 (69.8)  |          |
| 10-12 years                                      | 52 (26.3)              | 36 (19.7)  |         | 32 (24.6)              | 26 (22.4)  |          |
| >12 years  | 30 (15.2)              | 19 (10.4)  | 0.021   | 21 (16.2)              | 9 (3.7)  | 0.050    |
| Father's education <sup>a</sup>                  |                        |  |         |                        |  |          |
| Up to nine years                                 | 122 (62.9)             | 132 (75.9)   |         | 84 (65.6)              | 82 (74.5)  |          |
| 10–12 years                                      | 39 (20.1)              | 31 (17.8)  |         | 24 (18.8)              | 20 (18.2)  |          |
| >12 years  | 33 (17.0)              | 11 (6.3)   | 0.003   | 20 (15.6)              | 8 (3.4)  | 0.087    |
| Physical Activity Index <sup>a</sup>             |                        |  |         |                        |  |          |
| Sedentary  | 23 (14.0)              | 21 (15.6)  |         | 5 (5.9)                | 6 (7.1)  |          |
| Low activity                                     | 82 (50.0)              | 72 (53.3)  |         | 40 (47.1)              | 48 (56.5)  |          |
| Moderately active                                | 49 (29.9)              | 35 (25.9)  |         | 30 (35.3)              | 26 (30.6)  |          |
| Vigorously active                                | 10 (6.1)               | 7 (5.2)  | 0.398   | 10 (11.8)              | 5 (5.9)  | 0.133    |
| IOTF <sup>a</sup>                                |                        |  |         |                        |  |          |
| Underweight                                      | 7 (1.5)                | 10 (2.1)   |         | 2 (0.7)                | 0 (0.0)  |          |
| Normal   | 138 (29.7)             | 157 (33.8)   |         | 95 (62.9)              | 90 (62.9)  |          |
| Overweight                                       | 67 (14.4)              | 41 (8.8)   |         | 44 (29.1)              | 40 (28.0)  |          |
| Obesity  | 21 (4.5)               | 23 (5.0)   | 0.054   | 10 (6.6)               | 13 (9.1)   | 0.610    |

IOTF (International Obesity Task Force) criteria (Cole et al. 2000).

Sample sizes correspond to all the children that involved the study and vary according to missing and new data.

<sup>a</sup> Categorical variables; results expressed as n (%); P-value from Chi-squared test.

<sup>b</sup> Continuous variables; results expressed as mean (SD).

<sup>c</sup> P-value from t-test.

# Table 2 – Impact of the intervention programme on fruit consumed at lunch and dinner among children. Portugal 2007–2009.

| Fruit for dessert at lunch       52.3 (5.9)       50.9 (9.8)       0.001         Intervention       85.6 (6.6)       90.1 (8.0)       94.6 (8.6)         Fruit for dessert at dinner       70.000       48.8 (7.8)       48.9 (10.9)       0.012         Intervention       45.2 (6.5)       71.2 (7.8)       85.1 (9.5)       85.1 (9.5)            | Measure                     | Baseline mean (SE) (g) | Postintervention mean (SE) (g) | Postintervention adjusted mean (SE) | Adjusted P-value |  |  |  |
|--|-----------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|--|--|--|
| Control         105.5 (8.1)         52.3 (5.9)         50.9 (9.8)         0.001           Intervention         85.6 (6.6)         90.1 (8.0)         94.6 (8.6)         7           Fruit for dessert at dinner         48.8 (7.8)         48.9 (10.9)         0.012           Intervention         45.2 (6.5)         71.2 (7.8)         85.1 (9.5) | Fruit for dessert at lunch  |                        |                                |                                     |                  |  |  |  |
| Intervention         85.6 (6.6)         90.1 (8.0)         94.6 (8.6)           Fruit for dessert at dinner         48.8 (7.8)         48.9 (10.9)         0.012           Control         29.7 (5.8)         48.8 (7.8)         48.9 (10.9)         0.012           Intervention         45.2 (6.5)         71.2 (7.8)         85.1 (9.5)           | Control                     | 105.5 (8.1)            | 52.3 (5.9)                     | 50.9 (9.8)                          | 0.001            |  |  |  |
| Fruit for dessert at dinner       Control       29.7 (5.8)       48.8 (7.8)       48.9 (10.9)       0.012         Intervention       45.2 (6.5)       71.2 (7.8)       85.1 (9.5)  | Intervention                | 85.6 (6.6)             | 90.1 (8.0)                     | 94.6 (8.6)                          |                  |  |  |  |
| Control         29.7 (5.8)         48.8 (7.8)         48.9 (10.9)         0.012           Intervention         45.2 (6.5)         71.2 (7.8)         85.1 (9.5)  | Fruit for dessert at dinner |                        |                                |                                     |                  |  |  |  |
| Intervention 45.2 (6.5) 71.2 (7.8) 85.1 (9.5)  | Control                     | 29.7 (5.8)             | 48.8 (7.8)                     | 48.9 (10.9)                         | 0.012            |  |  |  |
|  | Intervention                | 45.2 (6.5)             | 71.2 (7.8)                     | 85.1 (9.5)                          |                  |  |  |  |

Adjusted for gender, age and baseline energy intake, parents' education, weight status, Physical Activity Index, underreporting (ratio of EI:BMR) and baseline measures of the dependent variable.

evidence of the effect of nutrition education-only programmes delivered by teachers, and provides support for their role in improving children's eating habits.

The present study has important strengths that should be acknowledged. We did not include fruit juice in the analysis, because the evidence for its benefits is less clear than for whole fruit, which is higher in fibre and less concentrated in sugar. In addition, dietary intake was measured with a 24 dietary recall, which is the most commonly used method in Europe and suggested by European Food Safety Authority.<sup>13</sup> A single 24 h dietary recall instead of at least two days was used, limiting the possibility to adjust for intra-individual variability and to estimate habitual intake.<sup>13</sup> Nevertheless, estimations of dietary intake of four- and eight-year-old children obtained by 24-h dietary recalls may be related to those of seven-day records from the same individuals.<sup>29</sup> Moreover, to the best of our knowledge, this is the first dietary intervention based on professional development training with impact on teachers' professional careers. This probably induced teachers to increase their motivation in the delivery of the intervention. This intervention benefits from the long-term in-service training, and the subsequent network developed between teachers, researchers and children. In Portugal, university education degrees do not have specific health promotion subjects in their academic curricula, neither are considering change in that direction.<sup>30</sup> Being aware of this need and that long-term

programmes are more effective than those of short duration,<sup>41</sup> we promoted a six-month duration professional development training with the expectation that teachers could become nutrition educators. We believe this period allowed teachers to recognize how important healthy eating and physical activity are for children's health, well being and development. Our approach was to standardize recommendations to teachers, allowing them enough flexibility to create interactive interventions and pedagogical instruments and materials to be used in children taking into consideration their educational context. This is in concordance with the 'scholarship of teaching and learning'40 and contrary to previous school-based interventions that have used tight controls to ensure uniform implementation but required frequent staff training and ongoing supports.<sup>1,18,37</sup> We believe that this approach could be disseminated to other school districts with focus on other aspects like school environment and environments beyond the school (e.g. corner shops and homes). Furthermore, we adopt an appropriate control group against which to compare the intervention group's changes in food consumption.

However, our study also has some limitations that should be mentioned. One of the weaknesses is that we have not explored whether there were differences among the schools selected for the study and those that were not selected, due to resources constraints. In addition, from 574 children invited to participate, 110 did not agreed to be included in the study. We lost to followup 88 children in control and 82 in the intervention group, essentially because of school transfer due to the achievement of the end of a primary degree. However, children and schools are from the same geographical area and, to the best of our knowledge, no data are available reporting significant sociodemographic and income differences between schools selected and non-selected. Furthermore, we failed to get identically equivalent groups after randomization, namely in the level of parents' education and children's height, mainly because we performed a cluster randomization at the school level instead of a simple randomization by participant, to avoid cross contamination between intervention and control groups and to improve the evidence, through the intervention programme, to all children from the same class. Nevertheless, these differences were taken into account in all of the statistical models. Also, physical activity levels were obtained upon parents' reported data creating possible recall bias, missing data and overestimation. However, this questionnaire is reliable for Portuguese children and adolescents<sup>24</sup> and we have no reason to assume that these biases would affect groups differently. Finally, we did not perform a follow-up study after a nonintervention period to clarify if children continued to eat significantly more fruit for dessert than they had done before the intervention.

#### Author statements

#### Acknowledgements

We express our deepest appreciation to all the collaborators who assisted the development and implementation of the study, namely Célia Oliveira, Fernando Ferreira and Elisete Ferreira. Special thanks are extended to Dra. Paula Neves and Dr. Benjamim Sampaio for the assistance provided throughout this programme. Our grateful acknowledgement goes to all the children and their parents for the participation in this study, school administrators and school staff for the opportunity of the implementation of the study.

#### Ethical approval

The Portuguese Data Protection Authority (process number 7613/2008) approved the study.

#### Funding

None declared.

#### **Competing interests**

None declared.

#### REFERENCES

- Anderson A, Porteous L, Foster E, Higgins C, Stead M, Hetherington M, et al. The impact of a school-based nutrition education intervention on dietary intake and cognitive and attitudinal variables relating to fruits and vegetables. Public Health Nutr 2005;8(6):650–6.
- 2. Anderson J, Parker N, Steyn N, Grimsrud A, Kolbe-Alexander T, Lambert E, et al. Interventions on diet and physical activity: what works, summary report. Geneva: WHO; 2009.
- **3**. Bandura A. Social foundations of thought and action: a social cognitive theory. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall; 1986.
- Beauchamp GK, Mennella JA. Early flavor learning and its impact on later feeding behavior. J Pediatr Gastroenterol Nutr 2009;48(Suppl. 1):S25–30. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/</u> <u>MPG.0b013e31819774a5</u>.
- Birch LL. Children's preferences for high-fat foods. Nutr Rev 1992;50(9):249-55.
- Blanchette L, Brug J. Determinants of fruit and vegetable consumption among 6–12-year-old children and effective interventions to increase consumption. J Hum Nutr Diet 2005;18(6):431–43. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-</u> 277X.2005.00648.x.
- Bleich SN, Segal J, Wu Y, Wilson R, Wang Y. Systematic review of community-based childhood obesity prevention studies. *Pediatrics* 2013;132(1):e201–10. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1542/</u> peds.2013-0886.
- Cole TJ, Bellizi MC, Flegal KM, Dietz WH. Establishing a standard definition for child overweight and obesity worldwide: international survey. Br Med J 2000;320:1–6.
- Cole TJ, Flegal KM, Nicholls D, Jackson AA. Body mass index cut offs to define thinness in children and adolescents: international survey. BMJ 2007;335(7612):194. <u>http://</u> <u>dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmj.39238.399444.55</u>.
- Cooke LJ, Wardle J. Age and gender differences in children's food preferences. Br J Nutr 2005;93(5):741-6.
- Cullen KW, Chen TA, Dave JM, Jensen H. Differential improvements in student fruit and vegetable selection and consumption in response to the new national school lunch program regulations: a pilot study. J Acad Nutr Diet 2015;115(5):743–50. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/</u> j.jand.2014.10.021.
- 12. D'Addesa D, Martone D, Sinesio F, Marzi V, Comendador FJ, Peparaio M, et al. Testing a nutritional and taste education

intervention approach to increase vegetables and fruit consumption among children. *Ann Ig* 2008;**20**(2):159–69.

- European Food Safety Authority. General principles for the collection of national food consumption data in the view of a pan-European dietary survey. EFSA J 2009;7(12):1435–86.
- Fildes A, Jaarsveld van CH, Llewellyn CH, Fisher A, Cooke L, Wardle J. Nature and nurture in children's food preferences. Am J Clin Nutr 2014;99(4):911–7. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.3945/</u> ajcn.113.077867.
- Fox MK, Condon E, Briefel RR, Reidy KC, Deming DM. Food consumption patterns of young preschoolers: are they starting off on the right path? J Am Diet Assoc 2010;110(12 Suppl):S52–9. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jada.2010.09.002</u>.
- 16. Goldberg GR, Black AE, Jebb SA, Cole TJ, Murgatroyd PR, Coward WA, et al. Critical evaluation of energy intake data using fundamental principles of energy physiology. 1. Derivation of cut-off limits to identify under-recording. Eur J Clin Nutr 1991;45:569–81.
- Hendy HM, Williams KE, Camise TS. "Kids Choice" school lunch program increases children's fruit and vegetable acceptance. Appetite 2005;45(3):250–63. <u>http://dx.doi.org/</u> <u>10.1016/j.appet.2005.07.006.</u>
- Hoelscher D, Feldman H, Johnson C, Lytle L, Osganian S, Parcel G, et al. School-based health education programs can be maintained over time: results from the CATCH institutionalization study. *Prev Med* 2004;38:594–606.
- Kuhl ES, Clifford LM, Stark LJ. Obesity in preschoolers: behavioral correlates and directions for treatment. Obes (Silver Spring) 2012;20(1):3–29. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/</u> oby.2011.201.
- Lopes C, Oliveira A, Afonso L, Moreira T, Durão C, Severo M, et al. Consumo alimentar e nutricional de crianças em idade préescolar: resultados da coorte Geração 21; 2014. Porto.
- Lynch C, Kristjansdottir AG, Te Velde SJ, Lien N, Roos E, Thorsdottir I, et al. Fruit and vegetable consumption in a sample of 11-year-old children in ten European countries – the PRO GREENS cross-sectional survey. Public Health Nutr 2014;17(11):2436–44. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/</u> s1368980014001347.
- Mangunkusumo RT, Brug J, de Koning HJ, van der Lei J, Raat H. School-based internet-tailored fruit and vegetable education combined with brief counselling increases children's awareness of intake levels. Public Health Nutr 2007;10(3):273–9. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/</u> <u>s1368980007246671</u>.
- Mennella JA. Ontogeny of taste preferences: basic biology and implications for health. Am J Clin Nutr 2014;99(3):704s-11. http://dx.doi.org/10.3945/ajcn.113.067694.
- **24.** Mota J, Esculcas C. Leisure-time physical activity behavior: structured and unstructured choices according to sex, age, and level of physical activity. Int J Behav Med 2002;**9**(2):111–21.
- Nicklaus S. Development of food variety in children. Appetite 2009;52(1):253–5. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/</u> j.appet.2008.09.018.
- Pan H, Cole T. ImsGrowth, a Microsoft Excel add-in to access growth references based on the LMS method (Version 2.68), http:// www.healthforallchildren.co.uk/; 2009.
- 27. Panunzio MF, Antoniciello A, Cela EP, Ferguson LR, Bucci E, Petracca L, et al. 15-week long school-based nutritional education program to promote Italian primary schoolchildren's fruit and vegetable intake. Ann Ig 2010;22(5):481–4.

- 28. Pender NJ. Health promotion in nursing practice. New Jersey: Prentice Hall; 1996.
- Persson LA, Carlgren G. Measuring children's diets: evaluation of dietary assessment techniques in. Int J Epidemiol 1984;13(4):506–17.
- Precioso J. Educação para a saúde na Universidade: um estudo realizado em alunos da Universidade do Minho. Rev Electrónica enseñanza las ciencias 2004;3(2).
- 31. Raitakari OT, Porkka KV, Taimela S, Telama R, Rasanen L, Viikari JS. Effects of persistent physical activity and inactivity on coronary risk factors in children and young adults. The Cardiovascular Risk in Young Finns study. Am J Epidemiol 1994;140(3):195–205.
- Reedy J, Krebs-Smith SM. Dietary sources of energy, solid fats, and added sugars among children and adolescents in the United States. J Am Diet Assoc 2010;110(10):1477–84. <u>http:// dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jada.2010.07.010</u>.
- **33.** Reynolds K, Hinton A, Schewchuk R, Hickey C. Social coginitive model of fruit and vegetable consumption in elementary school children 1999;**31**:23–30.
- 34. Rosário R, Araújo A, Oliveira B, Padrão P, Lopes O, Teixeira V, et al. The impact of an intervention taught by trained teachers on childhood fruit and vegetable intake: a randomized trial. J Obes; 2012;. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1155/2012/342138</u>.
- 35. Rosário R, Araújo A, Oliveira B, Padrão P, Lopes O, Teixeira V, et al. Impact of an intervention through teachers to prevent consumption of low nutrition, energy-dense foods and beverages: a randomized trial. Prev Med 2013;57(1):20–5. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ypmed.2013.02.027</u>.
- Rosário R, Oliveira B, Araújo A, Lopes O, Padrão P, Moreira A, et al. The impact of an intervention taught by trained teachers on childhood overweight. Int J Environ Res Public Health 2012;9(4):1355–67. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/</u> ijerph9041355.
- 37. Sallis J, McKenzie T, Conway T, Elder J, Prochaska J, Brown M, et al. Environmental interventions for eating and physical activity, a randomized controlled trial in middle schools. Am J Prev Med 2003;24(3):209–17.
- Schofield WN. Predicting basal meatbolic rate, new standards and review of previous work. Hum Nutr Clin Nutr 1985;39:5–41.
- Sharma M. International school-based interventions for preventing obesity in children. Obes Rev 2006;8(2):155–67. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-789X.2006.00268.x.
- Shulman L. From Minsk to Pinsk: why a scholarship of teaching and learning? J Scholarsh Teach Learn 2000;1(1):48–53.
- Stice E, Marti CN. A meta-analytic review of obesity prevention programs for children and adolescents: the skinny on interventions that work. *Psychol Bull* 2006;132(5):667–91.
- **42**. Telama R, Yang X, Laakso L, Viikari J. Physical activity in childhood and adolescence as predictor of physical activity in young adulthood. *Am J Prev Med* 1997;**13**(4):317–23.
- **43.** Truninger M, Teixeira J, Horta A, Silva V, Alexandre S. Health education in Portugal: a case study on children's relations with school meals. *Educ Sociedade Cuturas* 2013;**38**:117–33.
- 44. Wells L, Nelson M. The National School Fruit Scheme produces short-term but not longer-term increases in fruit consumption in primary school children. Br J Nutr 2005;93(4):537–42.
- **45.** WHO, FAO, UNU. Human energy requirements: report of a joint FAO/WHO/UNU expert consultation. Rome: FAO; 2004.
- **46.** WHO Expert Commitee. Physical status: the use and interpretation of anthropometry. Geneva: Who; 1995.