Nutrition 65 (2019) 60–67

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Nutrition

journal homepage: www.nutritionjrnl.com

Applied nutritional investigation

Reproducibility and relative validity of a semiquantitative food frequency questionnaire in European preschoolers: The ToyBox study

Theodora Mouratidou Ph.D. [a], María Isabel Mesana Graffe M.D., Ph.D. [a,b,c,d,*], Inge Huybrechts Ph.D. [e,f], Ellen De Decker Ph.D. [g], Marieke De Craemer Ph.D. [g], Odysseas Androutsos Ph.D. [h], Yanis Manios Ph.D. [h], Sonya Galcheva M.D., Ph.D. [i], Mina Lateva M.D., Ph.D. [i], Beata Gurzkowska Ph.D. [j], Zbigniew Kułaga Ph.D. [j], Julia Birnbaum Ph.D. [k], Berthold Koletzko M.D., Ph.D. [k], Luis Alberto Moreno M.D., Ph.D. [a,b,c,l,m], on behalf of the ToyBox-study group

[a] *Instituto Agroalimentario de Aragón (IA2). University of Zaragoza, Zaragoza, Spain*
[b] *Instituto de Investigqación Sanitaria de Aragón, Centro de Investigación Biomédica de Aragón (CIBA) Avda. San Juan Bosco, 13. 50009. Zaragoza, Spain*
[c] *Red de Salud Materno-infantil y del Desarrollo (SAMID), Instituto de Salud Carlos III, Madrid, Spain*
[d] *Red de Salud Materno-infantil y del Desarrollo*
[e] *Department of Public Health, Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium*
[f] *International Agency for Research on Cancer, Lyon, France*
[g] *Department of Movement and Sport Sciences, Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium*
[h] *Department of Nutrition and Dietetics, School of Health Science and Education, Harokopio University, Athens, Greece*
[i] *Medical University Varna, Varna, Bulgaria*
[j] *The Children's Memorial Health Institute, Warsaw, Poland*
[k] *Dr. von Hauner Children's Hospital, University of Munich Medical Centre, Munich, Germany*
[l] *Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Zaragoza, Zaragoza, Spain*
[m] *Centro de Investigación Biomédica en Red de Fisiopatología de la Obesidad y Nutrición*

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:
Received 24 July 2018
Received in revised form 9 February 2019
Accepted 13 March 2019

Keywords:
Reproducibility
Validity
Food frequency questionnaire
Preschool children

ABSTRACT

Objectives: The aim of this study was to examine the reproducibility and relative validity of a semiquantitative food frequency questionnaire (FFQ) in assessing food group estimates.
Methods: Food group estimates were assessed via a 37-item FFQ and a 3-d food record (FR). Pearson's correlation coefficients for log-transformed values were calculated to assess the reproducibility and Spearman's rank correlation coefficients for log-transformed values were calculated to assess the validity. Kindergartens from six European countries participated in the preparatory substudies of the ToyBox intervention study; data from preschool children 4 to 6 y of age (n = 196, reproducibility study; n = 324, validation study) were obtained.
Results: In the reproducibility study, positive Pearson's correlation coefficients for single and aggregated food groups ranged from 0.14 for pasta and rice to 0.90 for cooked vegetables. In the validation study, the FR gave higher estimates of 40 of the 50 food items (single and aggregated) examined compared with those obtained from the FFQ. Positive crude Spearman rank correlation coefficients ranged from 0.01 for total beverages (added sugar) and rice to 0.62 for tea. Corrections for the deattenuation effect did not improve observed correlations. Quartiles and tertiles were calculated for a small number of food groups (N = 14) owing to zero consumption in the rest of the groups.
Conclusions: Moderately good reproducibility and low-moderate relative validity of the FFQ used in preschool children was observed. Relative validity, however, varied by food and beverage group; for some of the "key" foods/drinks targeted in the ToyBox intervention (e.g., biscuits), the validity was good. The findings should be considered in future epidemiologic and intervention studies in preschool children.

MT, MIM, and HI conceived of and designed the study and were responsible for the generation, collection, assembly, analysis, or interpretation of data; and drafting or revision of the manuscript. ED, MD, OA, SVG, ML, BG, ZK, and JB were responsible for the generation, collection, assembly, analysis and interpretation of data; drafting or revision of the manuscript; and approval of the final version of the manuscript. YM, BK, and LAM were responsible for the drafting or revision of the manuscript and approval of the final version of the manuscript.

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +34 87 65 5375, Fax: +34 976 761 752.
E-mail address: Mmesana@unizar.es (M.I. Mesana Graffe).

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nut.2019.03.003
0899-9007/

Introduction

The preschool period plays an important role in the management of weight because many of the energy balance–related behaviors, including eating habits, are developed and adopted early in life [1]. At a European level, studies have already reported low compliance of children with nutrition recommendations [2–5]. Food frequency questionnaires (FFQ) often are used to assess food consumption and nutrient intakes in a wide variety of settings and populations because of their user friendliness. Food records (FR), on the other hand, often are used as a reference method but impose high participant burden and require a relatively high level of literacy [6,7]. All retrospective or prospective self-reporting dietary methodologies are prone to measurement error (random and systematic) leading to bias in estimates, which may not necessarily represent the "true" usual intake [6,7]. For this reason, these kind of evaluation studies are necessary to assess the effect of measurement error and prevent incorrect estimations to strengthen evidence-based public health recommendations [7,8].

The validity of an FFQ in assessing nutrient intakes in various population groups and settings is well documented, but not its ability to capture food group estimates, especially in groups of preschool children [9]. The latter is particularly important within the context of the importance of a whole food approach rather than that of individual nutrients when it comes to public health prevention strategies [10]. Recently, in a study with children 2 to 9 y of age from eight European countries, Bel-Serrat et al. [11] examined the agreement of proxy-reported food group estimates from an FFQ and two non-consecutive 24-h dietary recalls highlighting the importance of validation studies in young populations.

The FFQ used in the ToyBox study was adapted from the one developed by Huybrechts et al. [12] among preschool children (2.5–6.5 y of age) in Flanders. The aim of this study was to evaluate the reproducibility and relative validity of a proxy self-administered, semiquantitative FFQ in a European population of preschool children participating in the ToyBox study (more specifically, in the preparatory substudies of the ToyBox intervention study).

Methods and materials

Study design and population

All studies were approved by the appropriate ethics committees and therefore were performed in accordance with the ethical standards laid down in the 1964 Declaration of Helsinki and its later amendments. All participants gave their informed consent before their inclusion in the study.

The ToyBox study aimed to develop, implement, and evaluate the effectiveness of a kindergarten-based, family-involved intervention (assessment of children's snacking behavior including salty and sweet snacks and beverage consumption) in preschool children applied in six European countries (Belgium [Flanders], Bulgaria, Greece, Germany, Poland, and Spain). The design and methodology of the ToyBox study was described elsewhere [13–15]. Data for the current analysis were obtained from the ToyBox reproducibility and relative validity studies, before the ToyBo-intervention. These studies were performed among preschoolers ages 4 to 6 y from different socioeconomic levels randomly selected. The studies took place between September and October 2011 in each of the six participating centers. The characteristics of the sample in the test–retest and validity of the FFQ reflected those of the main study. The ratio of boys and girls was balanced. Different schools and classes were recruited for the reproducibility and the validity study, respectively; nevertheless, the participants were representative to the whole ToyBox study [15,16].

In the recruitment, municipalities within a 50-km vicinity in all participating countries were sorted by common (i.e., available in all countries) socioeconomic status variables. Tertiles of municipalities were created and a convenient sample of municipalities was selected from each tertile. Within each tertile, a list of the kindergartens in the selected municipalities was created; kindergartens were randomly selected from each tertile (one-third of kindergartens came from the selected municipalities in the first tertile, one-third from the selected municipalities in the second one, and one-third from the selected municipalities in the third one). In addition, no differences between compliers and non-compliers were found in terms of socioeconomic status (data not showed). Teachers were informed about the project and asked to distribute and collect envelopes containing information sheet (instructions for children's proxies, mainly parents) and the appropriate questionnaires. Children took home the envelopes. Support and explanation were provided individually if required.

In the reproducibility study, participants provided two FFQs within a 2-wk interval (FFQ1 and FFQ2) and participants in the validity study provided one FFQ followed by a 3-d FR, with an interval of at least 7 d separating the FFQ administration to the food diary. Reproducibility addressed the question of how consistent the answers were from one occasion to the next in the same participant in terms of food/beverage group estimates. Validity was determined by measuring the agreement of the FFQ food group estimates with FR estimates averaged across three consecutive predefined food records/d obtained for each child participating (or two in some occasions). One of the 3 d was a weekend day and the other two were week days. Therefore, two possible combinations for data collection existed: Sunday, Monday, and Tuesday or Thursday, Friday, and Saturday. The food diaries were distributed on the day of the FFQ collection. Finally, the teacher collected the envelopes with the completed FR on the agreed day (arranged between investigator, teacher, and proxies within a period of 7 or 14 d after administration) and gave them to the investigator.

In the reproducibility study, 30 to 50 participants needed to be recruited per country. In all, 196 participants were included in the analysis, providing one complete FFQ1 and one complete FFQ2, of 326 recruited participants. Participants who did not provide one complete FFQ1 and one complete FFQ2 were excluded from the analysis (n = 130).

In the validity study, 60 to 100 participants needed to be recruited per country. In all, 324 participants were included in the analysis (279 participants provided one complete FFQ and a 3-d FR and 45 participants provided a complete FFQ and a 2-d FR) of 331 recruited participants. Participants who provided a single-day FR (n = 7) were excluded from the analysis.

Food frequency questionnaire

The proxy-reported semiquantitative FFQ [16] covered a wide range of food items to address children's food and beverage consumption relevant to the ToyBox intervention objectives.

The FFQ consisted of 37 food and beverage items and portion size estimates were obtained for each of the food items. Some food groups were aggregated or considered in the same group according to their nutritional profile at a higher level and these results are also presented in the tables (13 aggregated food groups):

- water,
- soft drinks/beverages with added sugar,
- soft drinks/ beverages light,
- fizzy drinks (all),
- fruit juice, homemade, freshly squeezed,
- fruit juice, prepacked, bottled,
- juices (all),
- tea,
- smoothies (all kinds),
- total beverages (added sugar),
- plain milk,
- sugared or chocolate milk,
- plain yogurt,
- fruit, sugared or aromatized yoghurt,
- yogurt (all),
- cheese,
- dried fruit,
- canned fruit,
- fresh fruit,
- fruits (all),
- raw vegetables,
- cooked vegetables,
- vegetables (all),
- chocolate,
- milk-based desserts,
- cakes,
- biscuits,
- pastries,
- cakes and pastries (all),
- sugar-based desserts,
- total sweets,

- chocolate spreads/ other sweet spreads, (33)
- unsweetened breakfast cereals, (34)
- sweetened breakfast cereals,
- breakfast cereals (all),
- white bread and other bakery product,
- brown, whole grain bread, and other bakery products,
- breads and bakery products (all),
- salty snacks,
- meat and poultry,
- fish and fish products,
- Meat products,
- meat products (all),
- pasta,
- rice,
- pasta and rice (all),
- fried potato products,
- potatoes,
- potatoes (all),
- potatoes (all).

Because of the multicenter nature of the study, country-specific food items were included. The parents or caregivers of the preschoolers completed the questionnaire at home and reported the number of times the child consumed the food items included in the questionnaire over the previous 12 mo. The frequency responses consisted of the following categories of consumption: *never/less than once a month, 1 to 3 times a month, 1 d/wk, 2 to 4 d/wk, 5 to 6 d/wk,* and *every day*. These were converted into food group estimates per times per week ranging from 0 to 30 and thereafter into times per day. To relate FFQ food consumption estimates to those of the FR, and to enable comparisons, the "number of times per day" as reported in the FFQ was equated to "number of portions per day" [11]. A guide with food portions (no household measures have been used) specifically developed for the study to assist the proxy reporters was used for both assessment methods.

Food item–specific information on the average amount per day was also obtained. The FFQ offers different options for the amount of the ingested food items. For example, options for average amount of plain yogurt included ≤65 g, between 65 and 195 g, and ≥195 g.

The questionnaire inserts some questions on selected "key" foods and drinks, owing to the relevance for the ToyBox intervention objectives: beverages (water consumption, sugar-sweetened beverages, low-calories beverages, freshly squeezed juices, and manufactured juices), savory snacks (nuts, chips and similar, crackers, pizza), sweet snacks (sweet bakery, chocolate, biscuits, confectionary, milk products), and fruit and vegetable consumption. The associations between these foods and drinks with sedentary or physical activity behaviors have been reported previously [17].

The questionnaire also included five questions on foods eaten between meals and supplement use.

Estimated food records

In this study, the relative validity of food intake estimates derived from the FFQ is evaluated by comparison with a 3-d FR.

The proxies or parents received written instructions for the recording of the foods and drinks consumed by their child over the 3 d, including one weekend day. The teachers received written and oral instructions for the recording of foods and drinks consumed during school days (snacking and lunches). Teachers had to report this information about what the children consumed at school to the proxies or parents so that they could include it in the diaries. In these structured FRs, days were subdivided into six eating occasions: breakfast, morning snacks, lunch, afternoon snacks, dinner, and evening snacks. Detailed information on the type (including brand names) and portion size of the foods consumed was collected using an open entry format (use of standard portion sizes was inevitable for some food products for which portions sizes were difficult to describe/estimate by the respondent). After collection, the FR was checked on quality and completeness by trained survey personnel. Only good-quality FR, containing sufficiently detailed descriptions of the food products and portion sizes consumed, were included in the analysis. Each reported FR food item was mapped and subsequently matched against one of the 37 food items included in the FFQ.

Statistical methods

Statistical analyses were performed using the Predictive Analytics SoftWare (PASW, version 20; SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA). Means and SD were calculated for food consumption estimates obtained from FFQ1, FFQ2, and FR (for single and aggregated food groups). Crude data was log-transformed ($\log_n$) to improve normality for all 37 food groups. No cases were found and subsequently no cases were excluded from this analysis on the basis of being rarely consumed (<5%) or owing to incompleteness (participants with 25% of missing values in the FFQ1 and FFQ2). Pearson product–moment correlation coefficients for log-transformed values were calculated to assess the reproducibility of FFQ1 compared to FFQ2. Spearman's rank correlation coefficients (Spearman's ρ) for log-transformed values were calculated to assess the validity of the FFQ compared with FR. All validity coefficients were corrected for attenuation owing to random error in the FR. Deattenuation of crude correlation coefficients ($r_{adjusted}$) was computed according to the equation from Willet [11]:

$$r_{adjusted} = r_{observed}\sqrt{1 + \lambda_x / n_x}$$

where λ_x is the ratio of the within- and between-person variances (variance ratio) for x, and n_x is the number of replicates for the x variables (here n = 3).

Agreement in ranking individuals was examined by the construction of quartiles for each food group. Non-consumers of a food group were considered as one group, and the remaining individuals were grouped into tertiles (adapted food groups) [11]. Cross-classification analyses were conducted only for a limited number of food items, 14 food groups (11 non-adapted food groups and 3 adapted groups) owing to zero consumption observed for >25% of the participants in the rest of the food items (in the FFQ and/or FR). Non-adapted food groups were fruits (all), raw vegetables, cooked vegetables, vegetables (all), cakes and pastries (all), white bread and other bakery product, breads and bakery products (all), meat products (all), pasta, rice, and pasta and rice (all). Adapted food groups were fruit juice, homemade, freshly squeezed; breakfast cereals (all); brown, whole grain bread and other bakery products.

Results

Reproducibility

Mean food consumption estimates obtained from the FFQ1 and FFQ2 (plus FFQ2 as percent of FFQ1) is presented in Table 1, including single and aggregated groups. Mean consumption estimates for 29 food items of the questionnaire were higher for FFQ1 than FFQ2 including water, yogurt, and raw vegetables, whereas FFQ2 gave higher estimates for 21 food items including soft drinks or beverages (light) and biscuits. The largest differences between administrations were observed for fruit juice (prepacked, bottled; 145% of FFQ1) and for potatoes (244% of FFQ1). The rest of the comparisons showed a relatively high consistency between the two administrations (most of comparisons ranged between 88% and 119% of FFQ1). Significant Pearson correlation coefficients ranged from 0.14 for pasta and rice to 0.90 for cooked vegetables, although for most food consumption estimates correlations ranged from 0.52 to 0.79, showing moderate correlation.

Validity

Table 2 presents food consumption estimates (converted to mean daily number of portions) obtained from the FFQ and the FR (including single and aggregated groups). The FR gave higher estimates for 40 of the food items out of the 50 (mean **Δ** of −0.45 portions per day). Significant mean **Δ** differences between estimates were found for the majority of the food items; non-significant differences were observed for six items such as potatoes and unsweetened breakfast cereals. The largest mean **Δ** difference of 5.49 portions per day between the measurements was observed for total sweets ($P < 0.05$).

Table 3 presents Spearman's rank correlation coefficients (Spearman's ρ) of consumption estimates (equaled to daily number of portions) obtained from the FFQ and the FR for single and aggregated groups. Positive coefficient values ranged from 0.01 for total beverages (added sugar) and rice to 0.62 for tea. For nearly all food items, absence or low correlations (0.01–0.25) were observed. Corrections for the attenuation effect owing to random error observed in the FR did not change the observed crude correlations. Deattenuated correlation coefficients for single food items ranged from 0.01 for rice to 0.68 for tea.

Table 1
Mean food group estimates (equal to mean daily number of portions) from the FFQ1 and FFQ2 and Pearson correlation coefficients between the two FFQ administrations

Food group (portions/d)	N	FFQ1 (mean)	SD	FFQ2 (mean)	SD	% of FFQ1	Pearson r*
Water	316	1.15	0.42	1.10	0.43	104	0.768†
Soft drinks/ Beverages with added sugar	313	0.15	0.29	0.13	0.25	117	0.698†
Soft drinks/Beverages light	312	0.02	0.08	0.03	0.11	73	0.554†
Fizzy drinks (all)	315	0.52	0.22	0.51	0.20	103	0.689†
Fruit juice, homemade, freshly squeezed	315	0.22	0.27	0.22	0.27	100	0.738†
Fruit juice, prepacked, bottled	316	0.46	0.56	0.32	0.31	145	0.668**
Juices (all)	316	0.69	0.21	0.68	0.21	101	0.693†
Tea	316	0.17	0.30	0.15	0.24	116	0.773†
Smoothies (all kinds)	312	0.06	0.17	0.05	0.13	131	0.582†
Total beverages (added sugar)	316	3.85	0.64	3.82	0.62	99	0.618†
Plain milk	314	0.69	0.41	0.66	0.40	105	0.760†
Sugared or chocolate milk	312	0.13	0.25	0.14	0.26	96	0.857†
Plain yogurt	305	0.27	0.28	0.25	0.27	107	0.752†
Fruit, sugared or aromatized yoghurt	307	0.20	0.23	0.22	0.23	92	0.708†
Yogurt (all)	307	0.67	0.21	0.66	0.21	101	0.659†
Cheese	312	0.28	0.22	0.25	0.22	108	0.672†
Dried fruit	310	0.06	0.17	0.06	0.16	103	0.702†
Canned fruit	314	0.04	0.11	0.03	0.09	114	0.659†
Fresh fruit	315	0.72	0.30	0.69	0.28	104	0.754†
Fruits (all)	315	1.04	0.13	1.02	0.11	102	0.710†
Raw vegetables	313	0.39	0.33	0.34	0.29	114	0.774†
Cooked vegetables	313	0.36	0.26	0.36	0.26	100	0.900†
Vegetables (all)	313	0.80	0.26	0.76	0.23	105	0.822†
Chocolate	313	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.21	100	0.741†
Milk-based desserts	311	0.15	0.17	0.13	0.16	119	0.623†
Cakes	314	0.18	0.20	0.16	0.19	112	0.459†
Biscuits	314	0.44	0.41	0.47	0.38	94	0.745†
Pastries	311	0.19	0.22	0.20	0.22	92	0.687†
Cakes and pastries (all)	314	0.60	0.18	0.59	0.17	101	0.529†
Sugar-based desserts	313	0.39	0.41	0.33	0.35	118	0.574†
Total sweets	314	7.18	1.49	7.05	1.44	98	0.745†
Chocolate spreads/Other sweet spreads	312	0.25	0.26	0.80	0.12	31	0.775†
Unsweetened breakfast cereals	305	0.15	0.24	0.16	0.24	96	0.711†
Sweetened breakfast cereals	299	0.20	0.25	0.19	0.24	109	0.762†
Breakfast cereals (all)	305	0.58	0.20	0.58	0.20	100	0.754†
White bread and other bakery product	314	0.59	0.36	0.57	0.36	104	0.586†
Brown, whole grain bread and other bakery products	304	0.33	0.37	0.31	0.35	104	0.696†
Breads and bakery products (all)	314	0.58	0.20	0.92	0.25	63	0.152‡
Salty snacks	315	0.17	0.24	0.16	0.27	102	0.477†
Meat and poultry	311	0.50	0.22	0.48	0.21	105	0.610†
Fish and fish products	311	0.19	0.17	0.19	0.17	97	0.791†
Meat products	305	0.43	0.33	0.43	0.30	100	0.701†
Meat products (all)	311	0.87	0.25	0.88	0.19	99	0.098
Pasta	310	0.28	0.18	0.29	0.18	97	0.499†
Rice	312	0.15	0.12	0.16	0.13	96	0.619†
Pasta and rice (all)	312	0.67	0.15	0.66	0.14	102	0.149‡
Fried potato products	312	0.10	0.11	0.11	0.11	88	0.644†
Potatoes	311	0.44	0.29	0.46	0.30	97	0.646†
Potatoes (all)	312	0.58	0.20	0.24	0.27	244	0.115
Legumes	311	0.18	0.22	1.10	0.43	104	0.671†

FFQ, food frequency questionnaire
*Log-transformed estimates.
†Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (two-tailed).
‡Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (two-tailed).

Table 4 presents the results of the cross-classification agreement and weighted κ (where possible) values describing the ability of the FFQ to classify individuals into the same quartile (tertile in the case of the adapted groups) of food consumption estimates as to those obtained with the FR. Cross-classification analyses were conducted only for a limited number of food items, 14 food groups (11 non-adapted food groups and 3 adapted groups) owing to zero consumption observed for >25% of the participants in the rest of the food items (in the FFQ or FR). In the non-adapted items (n = 11), the proportion of participants classified in the same quartile ranged from 14% for vegetables (all) to 37% for pasta in preschoolers and gross misclassification ranged from 6% for white bread and other bakery products to 25% for rice. Weighted κ values for all food items addressed showed low agreement (0.20). In the adapted items (n = 3), the proportion of participants classified in the same quartile was 57% for fruit juice (homemade, freshly squeezed), 43% for breakfast cereals (all), and 63% for brown, whole grain bread and other bakery products and gross misclassification of 25%, 15%, and 34%, respectively, showing a substantial agreement for fruit juice (homemade, freshly squeezed) and fair agreement for whole grain bread and other bakery products.

Discussion

The aim of the present study was to evaluate the ability of the FFQ in estimating proxy-reported food consumption as part of the wider ToyBox intervention objectives. To our knowledge, this is one of the few studies, at least at a European level, assessing the reproducibility and relative validity of food estimates obtained via

Table 2
Food group consumption estimates (equal to mean daily number of portions) obtained from the FFQ and the FR

Food group (portions/d)	N	FFQ		FR		Mean Δ	*P*-value*
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Water	321	2.64	1.31	0.93	0.54	1.71	0.000†
Soft drinks/Beverages with added sugar	324	0.29	0.72	0.27	0.51	0.02	0.661
Soft drinks/Beverages light	319	0.03	0.18	0.09	0.96	−0.06	0.023†
Fizzy drinks (all)	324	1.80	0.72	1.78	0.51	0.02	0.716
Fruit juice, homemade, freshly squeezed	320	0.25	0.43	0.16	0.39	0.09	0.004†
Fruit juice, prepacked, bottled	322	0.60	0.75	0.86	0.83	−0.26	0.000†
Juices (all)	322	0.68	0.23	0.09	0.52	0.59	0.000†
Tea	322	0.27	0.55	0.48	0.64	−0.21	0.000†
Smoothies (all kinds)	319	0.49	0.13	0.10	0.35	0.39	0.014†
Total beverages (added sugar)	324	3.84	0.85	3.87	0.78	−0.03	0.618
Plain milk	321	1.06	0.92	0.90	0.48	0.16	0.003†
Sugared or chocolate milk	318	0.20	0.46	0.35	0.52	−0.15	0.000†
Plain yogurt	317	0.29	0.36	0.42	0.52	−0.13	0.005†
Fruit, sugared or aromatized yogurt	318	0.28	0.34	0.34	0.49	−0.06	0.049†
Yogurt (all)	318	1.93	0.39	1.60	0.55	0.33	0.000†
Cheese	320	0.32	0.32	0.76	0.65	−0.44	0.000†
Dried fruit	314	0.08	0.24	0.13	0.39	−0.05	0.033†
Canned fruit	321	0.04	0.11	0.13	0.33	−0.09	0.000†
Fresh fruit	323	1.07	0.61	1.29	0.81	−0.22	0.004†
Fruits (all)	323	2.82	0.37	3.03	0.57	−0.21	0.000†
Raw vegetables	321	0.45	0.51	1.34	1.11	−0.89	0.000†
Cooked vegetables	320	0.47	0.45	1.38	0.77	−0.91	0.000†
Vegetables (all)	321	2.19	0.59	3.53	1.21	−1.34	0.000†
Chocolate	323	0.24	0.32	0.52	0.66	−0.28	0.000†
Milk-based desserts	322	0.17	0.24	0.26	0.47	−0.09	0.002†
Cakes	322	0.29	0.44	0.37	0.53	−0.08	0.031†
Biscuits	321	0.78	0.88	0.62	0.61	0.16	0.002†
Pastries	322	0.25	0.43	0.65	0.65	−0.4	0.000†
Cakes and pastries (all)	322	1.91	0.50	2.20	0.57	−0.29	0.000†
Sugar-based desserts	320	0.61	0.91	0.29	0.50	0.32	0.000†
Total sweets	322	1.61	0.91	7.1	1.39	−5.49	0.000†
Chocolate spreads/Other sweet spreads	318	0.35	0.47	0.81	0.47	−0.46	0.000†
Unsweetened breakfast cereals	312	0.17	0.29	0.20	0.44	−0.03	0.259
Sweetened breakfast cereals	317	0.24	0.33	0.52	0.55	−0.28	0.000†
Breakfast cereals (all)	317	1.79	0.35	1.96	0.53	−0.17	0.000†
White bread and other bakery product	322	0.94	0.80	1.25	0.61	−0.31	0.000†
Brown, whole grain bread and other bakery products	315	0.50	0.69	0.59	0.70	−0.09	0.036†
Breads and bakery products (all)	322	2.47	0.66	2.93	0.62	−0.46	0.000†
Salty snacks	322	0.16	0.23	0.18	0.28	−0.02	0.000†
Meat and poultry	319	0.64	0.37	0.96	0.56	−0.32	0.000†
Fish and fish products	320	0.21	0.23	0.61	0.60	−0.4	0.000†
Meat products	311	0.58	0.52	0.95	0.63	−0.37	0.000
Meat products (all)	319	2.44	0.51	2.95	0.63	−0.51	0.000†
Pasta	319	0.34	0.23	0.64	0.56	−0.3	0.000†
Rice	320	0.14	0.13	0.48	0.51	−0.34	0.000†
Pasta and rice (all)	320	1.96	0.29	2.39	0.62	−0.43	0.000†
Fried potato products	318	0.09	0.10	0.18	0.40	−0.09	0.012†
Potatoes	320	0.62	0.53	0.68	0.50	−0.06	0.186
Potatoes (all)	320	1.90	0.27	2.09	0.55	−0.19	0.000†
Legumes	319	0.15	0.22	0.24	0.49	−0.09	0.004†

FFQ, food frequency questionnaire; FR, food record.
*Paired *t* test.
†Significant at the 0.05 level (two-tailed).

an FFQ in a sample of preschool children. Overall, the study findings demonstrated moderately good reproducibility and low-moderate relative validity of the FFQ; however, observed differences in relative validity across different food and beverage groups should be noted, and good results were observed for some key foods targeted by the ToyBox intervention (like biscuits). Here, we relate observed findings to those reported elsewhere (studies that included similar age groups and European populations), but one should be aware that comparison of findings as such is often compromised owing to the different FFQs used (nature and size of the questionnaire), population sample size, and characteristics of the type of reference method used [18]. In the original FFQ [12] study performed in only one country, estimated diet records (3-d FR) were used as reference methods and reproducibility was measured by repeated FFQ administrations 5 wk apart, showing an overall high level of reproducibility. In 2.5 to 6.5 y old Belgian children (650 children included in the validity analyses and 124 in the reproducibility analyses), for most foods, a moderate correlation (0.5-0.7) was obtained between FFQ1 and FFQ2, and moderate levels of relative validity in estimating food group intakes. For median differences between the 3 d FR and the FFQ, six food groups gave a difference of >20% and the proportion of subjects classified within one quartile (in the same/adjacent category) by FFQ and FR ranged from 67% to 88%.

Reproducibility study

Mean estimates differed slightly between the two FFQ administrations and were within the range of ±7%. A study by Huybrechts et al.

Table 3
Spearman's ρ correlation coefficients between food group consumption estimates (equal to daily number of portions) obtained from the FFQ and the FR

Food group	Spearman's ρ	Variance ratio	Deattenuated correlation coefficient (Spearman)
Water	0.233*	0.499	0.252*
Soft drinks/Beverages with added sugar	0.091	0.857	0.103
Soft drinks/ beverages light†	−0.037		
Fizzy drinks (all)†	0.126*		
Fruit juice, homemade, freshly squeezed	0.265‡	0.434	0.284‡
Fruit juice, prepacked, bottled	0.304‡	0.530	0.330‡
Juices (all)†	0.169*		
Tea	0.623‡	0.614	0.684‡
Total beverages (added sugar)†	0.113*		
Smoothies (all kinds)†	−0.020		
Plain milk	0.208‡	0.766	0.233‡
Sugared or chocolate milk	0.070	1.272	0.084
Plain yogurt	0.167‡	1.553	0.206‡
Fruit, sugared or aromatized yogurt	0.082	0.949	0.094
Yogurt (all)†	0.158‡		
Cheese	0.155‡	0.729	0.173‡
Dried fruit†	0.256‡		
Canned fruit†	0.038		
Fresh fruit	0.144*	0.483	0.155*
Fruits (all)†	0.258‡		
Raw vegetables	0.275‡	0.619	0.302‡
Cooked vegetables	0.014	0.693	0.016
Vegetables (all)†	0.260‡		
Chocolate	0.061	1.550	0.075
Milk-based desserts	0.188‡	3.788	0.283‡
Cakes	−0.009	0.689	−0.010
Biscuits	0.339‡	1.174	0.400‡
Pastries	0.088	1.049	0.102
Cakes and pastries (all)†	0.088		
Sugar-based desserts	0.040	1.592	0.049
Total sweets†	0.023		
Unsweetened breakfast cereals	0.253‡	0.935	0.290‡
Sweetened breakfast cereals	0.283‡	0.907	0.323‡
Breakfast cereals (all)†	0.246‡		
White bread and other bakery product	0.148‡	0.684	0.164‡
Brown, whole grain bread and other bakery products	0.392‡	0.543	0.426‡
Breads and bakery products (all)	0.025		
Salty snacks	−0.057	1.397	−0.069
Meat and poultry	0.320‡	0.831	0.362‡
Fish and fish products	0.157‡	3.953	0.239‡
Meat products	0.198‡	0.962	0.228‡
Meat products (all)†	−0.017		
Pasta	0.211*	1.414	0.256*
Rice	0.113*	1.490	0.138*
Pasta and rice (all)†	−0.063		
Fried potato products	0.080		
Potatoes	0.049	1.163	0.058
Potatoes (all)	−0.052		
Chocolate spreads/Other spreads	0.224‡	0.982	0.258**
Legumes†	0.139*		

FFQ, food frequency questionnaire; FR, food record.
*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (two-tailed).
†Variance was not calculated.
‡Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (two-tailed).

[12] suggested good reproducibility for almost all food groups examined in a large survey of Flemish children (n = 124) 2.5 to 6.5 y of age. It should be noted, however, that the Huybrechts et al. study examined FFQ reproducibility in capturing food intakes expressed as grams per recall period, whereas in the present study, food consumption was examined as daily number of portions. Furthermore, in a similar age group (258 children ages 2–9 y participating in the IDEFICS [Identification and Prevention of Dietary- and Lifestyle-Induced Health Effects in Children and Infants] study), the results of the study conducted by Lanfer et al. [19] also showed moderate FFQ reproducibility. More specifically, Spearman's correlation coefficients ranged from 0.32 to 0.76, with the lowest values observed for diet soft drinks and the highest for sweetened milk in the sample of 258 children ages 2 to 9 y participating in the IDEFICS study.

Validity study

The FR gave slightly higher estimates compared with those obtained from the FFQ. Overall validity of the FFQ, as mentioned previously, was low-moderate and differed by food and beverage groups; the same observations were found in other studies of young European population groups. For instance, a study by Bel-Serrat et al. [11] examined the agreement of proxy-reported food group estimates from an FFQ and two non-consecutive 24-h

Table 4
Cross-classification of food group consumption estimates (equal to daily number of portions) obtained from the FFQ and the FR

Food groups	FFQ vs FR		Weighted κ
	Correctly classified (%)	Grossly misclassified (%)	
Fruits (all)	34	11	0.12
Raw vegetables	32	7	0.93
Cooked vegetables	25	7	−0.04
Vegetables (all)	14	7	0.11
Cakes and pastries (all)	28	8	0.04
White bread and other bakery product	27	6	0.03
Breads and bakery products (all)	23	12	−0.02
Meat products (all)	27	14	0.02
Pasta	37	19	0.06
Rice	35	25	0.05
Pasta and rice (all)	22	13	−0.04
Adapted food groups*			
Fruit juice, homemade, freshly squeezed	57	25	0.73
Breakfast cereals (all)	43	15	0.15
Brown, whole grain bread and other bakery products	63	34	0.36

FFQ, food frequency questionnaire; FR, food record.
*Zero consumers were considered as one group and the rest of participants were classified into tertiles.

dietary recalls and reported that observed associations varied by food group. Correlations slightly improved after correction for within-person variation. In the present study, corrections for the deattenuation effect did not significantly improve the correlations for food consumption estimates, meaning that there was not a large random error within the 3-d FR as expected. The study by Huybrechts et al. [12] also showed large differences by food groups when examining the relative validity of the FFQ. The results of the cross-classification analysis varied by the FFQ food and beverage groups examined; the limited number of groups for which quartiles and tertiles were calculated does not facilitate drawing of clear-cut conclusions. A study by Bel-Serrat et al. [11], in which cross-classification analysis was conducted in 15 of the 36 food groups, reported limited ability of the FFQ in discriminating between quartiles of food groups.

Strengths and weaknesses of the study

Low-moderate validity (expressed as correlation values) observed in the present study was not unexpected because reports suggest that correlations in young population groups are generally lower compared with those in adult populations [20]. There are a number of factors to which such observations can be attributed including the use of proxies (i.e., parents/caregivers and teachers) and underreporting, especially at an out-of-home setting [21]. The fact that for a number of participants, however, only proxy-reported FR data were available (e.g., school meal data not available) and in other cases only school FR data were available, could explain, almost partly, the observed results.

Another important factor was the nature of the diet of young population groups, which in a way reflected the difficulties and the complex nature of assessing energy balance–related behaviors of younger children [22]. The reference method used to assess the validity of an FFQ and its specific limitations are also very relevant. It is widely known that dietary and food information are subject to day-to-day variability, and this fact could explain the observed low-moderate agreement between the methods in the present study [20]. This point was addressed in the present study by the use of 3-d (or 2 d in some occasions) FR, which is supposed to be more accurate to other methods of dietary assessment such as a single 24-h dietary recall [20], and because of disadvantages of longer recording periods and in the hope to minimize the refusal rate or dropout within the study. Difficulties in portion size estimations during completion of the 3-d FR might, however, bias the true validity of the FFQ.

Differences also might reflect different recall time frames covered by the two methods. In this way, a higher number of record days in the FR, distributed throughout the year, would have been better as a reference method because this fact could take into account seasonal variation of intake.

Another limitation to the study could be that to relate FFQ food consumption estimates to those of the FR, the "number of times per day" as reported in the FFQ was equated to "number of portions per day."

An important strength of the study was that it was conducted using standardized procedures during the fieldwork data collection with a high level of quality control procedures applied throughout the substudy [16]. Another strength of the study was that the FFQ included country-specific food items owing to its multicenter nature and that the reproducibility and validity studies were performed in a heterogeneous sample comprising the six countries. The high sample size in both the reproducibility and validity assessments was also a strength of the study.

Conclusions

Overall, the findings of this study suggest moderately good reproducibility and low-moderate validity of the FFQ used in the ToyBox study. The latter, however, varied by food and beverage groups. For some of the "key" foods and drinks targeted in the ToyBox intervention (e.g., biscuits), the results were good. The results of this analysis should be taken into consideration when interpreting future results of the ToyBox intervention study and to inform the design and data interpretation of future studies addressing similar objectives.

References

[1] Reilly JJ. Physical activity, sedentary behaviour and energy balance in the preschool child: opportunities for early obesity prevention. Proc Nutr Soc 2008;67:317–25.
[2] Coppinger T, Jeanes YM, Dabinett J, Vögele C, Reeves S. Physical activity and dietary intake of children aged 9-11 years and the influence of peers on these behaviours: a 1-year follow-up. Eur J Clin Nutr 2010;64:776–81.
[3] Kyttälä P, Erkkola M, Kronberg-Kippilä C, Tapanainen H, Veijola R, Simell O, et al. Food consumption and nutrient intake in Finnish 1 to 6-year-old children. Public Health Nutr 2010;13:947–56.
[4] Manios Y, Grammatikaki E, Papoutsou S, Liarigkovinos T, Kondaki K, Moschonis G. Nutrient intakes of toddlers and preschoolers in Greece: the GENESIS study. J Am Diet Assoc 2010;108:357–61.
[5] Huybrechts I, De Henauw S. Energy and nutrient intakes by preschool children in Flanders-Belgium. Br J Nutr 2007;l98:600–10.
[6] Cade J, Thompson R, Burley V, Warm D. Development, validation and utilisation of food-frequency questionnaires – a review. Public Health Nutr 2002;5:567–87.
[7] Willet WC. Nutritional Epidemiology. Second ed. New York: Oxford University Press; 1998.
[8] Saland JM. Update on the metabolic syndrome in children. Curr Opin Pediatr 2007;19:183–91.
[9] Raitakari OT, Juonala M, Kahonen M Taittonen L, Laitinen T, Mäki-Torkko N, et al. Cardiovascular risk factors in childhood and carotid artery intima-media thickness in adulthood: the Cardiovascular Risk in Young Finns study. JAMA 2003;290:2277–83.
[10] Subar AF. Developing dietary assessment tools. J Am Diet Assoc 2004;104:769–70.
[11] Bel-Serrat S, Mouratidou T, Pala V, Huybrechts I, Börnhorst C, Fernández-Alvira JM, et al. Relative validity of the children's eating habits questionnaire-food frequency section among young European children: the IDEFICS study. Public Health Nutr 2013;17:266–76.

[12] Huybrechts I, De Backer G, De Bacquer D, Maes L, De Henauw S. Relative validity and reproducibility of a Food-frequency questionnaire for estimating food intakes among Flemish preschoolers. Int J Environ Res Public Health 2009;6:382–99.
[13] Manios Y, Grammatikaki E, Androutsos O, Chinapaw MJ, Ibson EL, Buijs G, et al. A systematic approach for the development of a kindergarten-based intervention for the prevention of obesity in preschool age children: the ToyBox-study. Obes Rev 2012;13:S3–12.
[14] Androutsos O, Katsarou C, Payr A, Birnbaum J, Geyer C, Wildgruber A, et al. Designing and implementing teachers' training sessions in a kindergarten-based, family-involved intervention to prevent obesity in early childhood. The ToyBox-study. Obes Rev 2014;15:S48–52.
[15] Manios Y, Androutsos O, Katsarou C, Iotova V, Socha P, Geyer C, et al. Designing and implementing a kindergarten-based, family-involved intervention to prevent obesity in early childhood: the ToyBox-study. Obes Rev 2014;3:S5–13.
[16] Mouratidou T, Miguel ML, Androutsos O, Manios Y, De Bourdeaudhuij I, Cardon G, et al. Tools, harmonization and standardization procedures of the impact and outcome evaluation indices obtained during a kindergarten-based, family involved intervention to prevent obesity in early childhood. The ToyBox-study. Obes Rev 2014;3:S53–60.
[17] De Craemer M, De Decker E, De Bourdeaudhuij I, Vereecken C, Deforche B, Manios Y, Cardon G. ToyBox-study group. Correlates of energy balance-related behaviours in preschool children: a systematic review. Obes Rev 2012;13 (suppl 1):13–28.
[18] Mouratidou T, Ford FA, Fraser RB. Reproducibility and validity of a food frequency questionnaire in assessing dietary intakes of low-income caucasian postpartum women living in Sheffield, United Kingdom. Matern Child Nutr 2009;7:128–39.
[19] Lanfer A, Hebestreit A, Ahrens W, Krogh V, Sieri S, Lissner L, et al. Reproducibility of the food frequency questionnaire section of the Children's Eating Habits Questionnaire used in the IDEFICS study. Int J Obes (Lond) 2011;35:S61–8.
[20] Thompson F, Subar A. Dietary assessment methodology. In: Coulston A, Boushey C, eds. Nutrition in the prevention and treatment of disease, Second ed., San Diego, CA: Elsevier Academic Press; 2008:3–39.
[21] Livingstone MB, Robson PJ. Measurement of dietary intake in children. Proc Nutr Soc 2000;59:279–93.
[22] Mouratidou T, Mesana MI, Manios Y, Koletzko B, Chinapaw MJ, De Bourdeaudhuij I, et al. Assessment tools of energy balance related behaviours used in European obesity prevention strategies: review of studies during preschool. Obes Rev 2012;13:S42–5.