Published in final edited form as:

Public Health Nutr. 2019 October ; 22(15): 2777–2792. doi:10.1017/S136898001900065X.

The association of overall diet quality with body mass index and waist circumference by education level in Mexican men and women

Nancy López-Olmedo¹, Barry M Popkin¹, Michelle A Mendez², Lindsey Smith Taillie¹

¹Department of Nutrition, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC

²Department of Environmental and Occupational Health, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA

Abstract

Objective: The present study evaluated the association of two measures of diet quality with BMI and WC, overall and by education level, among Mexican men and women.

Design: We constructed two a priori indices of diet quality, the Mexican Diet Quality Index (MxDQI) and the Mexican Alternate Healthy Eating Index (MxAHEI), which we examined relative to BMI and WC. We computed sex-specific multivariable linear regression models for total sample and by education level.

Setting: Mexico.

Participants: Mexican men (*n* 954) and women (*n* 1356) participating in the Mexican National Health and Nutrition Survey 2012.

Results: Total dietary scores were not associated with BMI in men and women, but total MxDQI was inversely associated with WC in men (−0.10, 95% CI: −0.20, −0.004 cm). We also found that some results differed by education level in men. For men with the lowest education level, a one-unit increase in total MxDQI and MxAHEI score was associated with a mean reduction of BMI of 0.11 (95% CI: −0.18, 0.04) and of 0.18 (95% CI: −0.25, −0.10) kg/m², respectively. Likewise, a one-unit increase in total MxDQI and MxAHEI score was associated with a mean change in WC of −0.30 (95% CI: −0.49, −0.11) and −0.53 (95% CI: −0.75, −0.30) cm, respectively, in men with the lowest level of education. In women, the association of diet quality scores with BMI and WC was not different by education level.

Conclusions: Our findings suggest that a higher diet quality in men with low but not high education is associated with lower BMI and WC.

Corresponding author: Lindsey Smith Taillie, Research Assistant Professor, Nutrition, Gillings School of Public Health, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, Mailing address: 123 West Franklin St, CB # 8120 Carolina Square, Chapel Hill, NC 27516-3997, Phone: 919-445-8313, taillie@unc.edu.

Authorship: NL-O, BMP and LST were responsible for study design, results interpretation, and writing the manuscript. NL-O was responsible of performing statistical analysis and drafting and editing of the manuscript. All authors contributed to study design and critical revision of the manuscript. All authors approved the final manuscript.

Conflict of interest: None

Ethical Standards Disclosure: This study was conducted according to the guidelines laid down in the Declaration of Helsinki and all procedures involving human subjects/patients were approved by the Ethics Committee of the Mexican National Institute of Public Health. Written informed consent was obtained from all subjects/patients under study.

Introduction

Mexico is a middle-income country that has experienced a nutrition transition characterized by a decrease in the prevalence of different forms of undernutrition, whereas the prevalence of obesity has had one of the world's largest increases^(1; 2). For instance, 76% of women and 69% of men had overweight or obesity in 2016, while 88% of women and 65% of men had abdominal obesity during the same year⁽³⁾.

Diets high in energy, saturated fat, sodium, refined carbohydrates, or added sugars but low in fruits, vegetables, or whole-grain products are thought to be the leading risk factors for morbidity and mortality from obesity and obesity-related diseases⁽⁴⁾. Previous studies in Mexico indicate that the consumption of caloric beverages doubled from 1999 to 2006, whereas in 2012, the contribution of sugar-sweetened beverages and food products high in saturated fat or added sugars to the total energy intake was around 10% and 16%, respectively, in all age groups^(5; 6). However, the approach of analyzing single or a few nutrients or foods does not consider the complexity of dietary behaviors, as nutrients and foods are not eaten in isolation⁽⁷⁾.

Dietary indices, or scores, are the most common approaches to providing an overall rating of an individual intake in reference to dietary recommendations used to examine the association between overall diet quality and health outcomes, including manifestation of type 2 diabetes and incidence or mortality due to cardiovascular disease^(8; 9; 10; 11). However, only a few studies have analyzed the relationship of overall diet quality with BMI or waist circumference (WC), finding inconsistent results^(12; 13; 14; 15). Furthermore, there are pre-existing disparities in dietary intakes and obesity by socioeconomic status in Mexico. In 2012, fruit and vegetables intake was higher but also the intakes of saturated fat and added sugars (including sugar-sweetened beverages) among those with high compared with low socioeconomic status^(6; 16). Likewise, the prevalence of obesity was higher in adults with higher socioeconomic status⁽¹⁷⁾. Nevertheless, it has not been explored whether the association of diet quality with BMI and WC differs by socioeconomic status. Therefore, is relevant to understand what role the education level, a proxy of socioeconomic status, plays in the relationship of diet quality with BMI and WC. Finally, the relationship of diet quality with BMI and WC stratified by sex has been barely studied, despite previous evidence showing that women may be more concerned with the quality of the food⁽¹⁸⁾, and health consciousness might vary by education level⁽¹⁹⁾. Furthermore, in obesity research as well as in all biomedical research, it is recognized that the weight gain as well as the adipose tissue storage and metabolism may vary by sex^(20; 21; 22). In this paper, we examine the association of diet quality with BMI and WC, overall and by education level, among Mexican men and women. This paper uses two different dietary quality indices: one based on the Mexican Dietary Guidelines and the other on foods and nutrients associated with cardiometabolic risk. The latter, the Alternate Healthy Eating Index (AHEI) is the only diet quality index validated against many different non-communicable diseases⁽²³⁾.

Methods

Study design and population

We used data from the National Health and Nutrition Survey (ENSANUT, by its Spanish acronym *Encuesta Nacional de Salud y Nutrición*) 2012. We obtained information about sociodemographic characteristics, nutrition, and health from 96 031 people from 50 528 randomly selected households. Dietary collection and assessment have been described elsewhere, but in brief, we collected dietary information in a random subsample ($n = 10\,886$), representing the national, regional (North/Central/South), and urban/rural population⁽²⁴⁾. We used the twenty-four-hour dietary recall developed by the United States Department of Agriculture, adapting it to the Mexican context.^(25; 26) We calculated energy and nutrient intake using the food composition database compiled by the National Institute of Public Health^(27; 28; 29; 30).

We included nonpregnant and nonlactating adults aged twenty to sixty-nine years with dietary information ($n = 2\,676$). We excluded without weight, height, or WC measurements ($n = 107$); without information of type 2 diabetes or smoking status ($n = 282$); and without information of parity ($n = 3$). Moreover, adults classified as underweight ($\text{BMI} < 18.5 \text{ kg/m}^2$) were excluded ($n = 28$). Although there is no an established definition of *low* WC, we also decided to exclude men and women if their WC were equal to or less than 65 cm and 55 cm, respectively ($n = 4$). Finally, we excluded those with a ratio of total energy intake to estimated energy requirement (in logarithmic scale) below -3 SD and above $+3 \text{ SD}$ ($n = 30$), as previously described⁽¹⁶⁾. Some subjects were excluded for two or more variables; therefore, the total number of excluded participants does not equal the sum of all the excluded participants by variable. The analytic sample was composed of 2 310 adults.

Variable definitions

BMI and WC—Body weight was measured with light clothing using digital scales (model 872, Seca) with 0.1 kg precision and height using stadiometers (Dyna-top, model E-I, Mexico) with 0.1 cm precision. WC was measured using fiberglass tape at the midpoint between the highest part of the iliac crest and the lowest part of the ribs margin of the median axial line⁽³¹⁾. Trained personnel took the measurements using standard procedures^(32; 33). We calculated BMI using the standard equation and categorized based on World Health Organization (WHO) definitions⁽³⁴⁾. Men and women with a WC ≥ 90 cm and ≥ 80 cm, respectively, were also categorized as having abdominal obesity, using as reference the classification by the International Diabetes Federation⁽³⁵⁾.

Mexican Diet Quality Index (MxDQI)—We developed the MxDQI based on the Mexican Dietary Guidelines (MxDG), which were published in 2015⁽³⁶⁾. These guidelines recommend the number and size of servings for nine food groups, by age group and by total energy intake. We used the number of servings recommended for adults with a total energy intake of 2 000 kcal per day as reference (for more details see Supplementary Table 1). We created thirteen MxDQI components based on all food groups except tap water because the MxDG include only a suggested range of water consumption, since water needs can vary by age, physical activity, and weather (Table 1). Rather than number of servings, we used cutoff

points recommended by WHO, as well as recommendations of fat intake for Mexican population, to define minimum and maximum scores for polyunsaturated fat, saturated fat, and added sugars^(37; 38; 39). Finally, we considered sodium intake as an MxDQI component because the MxDG, consistent with international guidelines, recommend consuming no more than 2 000 mg of sodium. The minimum score for sodium was based on the results of systematic reviews and meta-analyses⁽⁴⁰⁾. We defined scores between 0 (noncompliance) and 15 (intakes close to recommended) for each component. Specifically, we assigned a maximum score of 5 to those MxDQI components derived from the same food group (e.g., whole-grain and refined-grain cereals). We also assigned the added sugars and sodium components a maximum score of 15, given their high consumption in the Mexican population and therefore their potential impact on health (Table 1)^(41; 42).

Mexican Alternate Healthy Eating Index (MxAHEI)—The Alternate Healthy Eating Index (AHEI) includes twelve components scored from 0 (worst) to 5 or 10 (best), and the total AHEI-2010 score ranges from 0 (nonadherence) to 110 (perfect adherence).⁽²³⁾ For developing the Mexican AHEI, we used the original AHEI-2010 criteria for minimum and maximum score, except for sodium. We considered the same sodium criteria as for MxDQI, since the cutoffs for sodium in AHEI-2010 were based on deciles of distribution in the population⁽²³⁾. Furthermore, we based serving sizes on the Mexican System of Foods Equivalents⁽⁴³⁾. We scaled up the MxAHEI to 100 for comparisons with MxDQI (Table 1).

Covariates

The ENSANUT 2012 captured several variables through questionnaire; for our analysis, we considered education level, type 2 diabetes status, age, sex, parity, area and region of residence, assets index, type of housing, number of individuals in a household, marital status, smoking status, and physical activity. We defined education level as no reading/writing skills, reading/writing skills or 3–9 y of school (elementary and middle school), and 10 y of school (high school or more), based on the reported grade completed and whether participants knew how to read and write. We selected these categories based on studies about the social and economic impact of illiteracy (including individuals 2 y of elementary school) in Latin American and Caribbean regions^(44; 45). The categorization of type 2 diabetes status (yes/no) was based on previous diagnosis by a doctor. We classified parity as none, 1–2, 3–4, and 5 pregnancies. Likewise, we categorized locations with < 2 500 inhabitants as rural and locations with 2 500 inhabitants as urban, and we defined regions as North, Central, and South.^a An assets index was constructed using factor analysis, where factor scores were estimated using a principal components approach, applied to household characteristics and assets⁽⁴⁶⁾. The index score was computed for each respondent and respondents were then classified into three categories (low, medium, and high) using tertiles of the distribution of the assets index scores as cut-off points. The following variables were categorized as presented below: type of housing as owned, rented, or other (individuals occupied the property in another situation not specified); number of individuals in a household as 1-2, 3-4, or 5, and marital status as married/living together, divorced/

^aStates by region: North: Baja California, Chihuahua, Coahuila, Durango, Nuevo León, Sinaloa, Sonora, Tamaulipas, Zacatecas; Central: Aguascalientes, Ciudad de México, Colima, Estado de México, Guanajuato, Hidalgo, Jalisco, Michoacán, Querétaro, San Luis Potosí, Tlaxcala; South: Campeche, Chiapas, Guerrero, Morelos, Oaxaca, Puebla, Tabasco, Veracruz, Yucatán.

separated/widowed, or single. We categorized smoking status as current, former, and none based on the following two questions: 1) “Have you ever smoked at least one hundred cigarettes (5 pack) in your life?”, and 2) How many cigarettes you are smoking currently? (Possible answers: I am not currently smoking or number and frequency). Finally, we assessed physical activity using the Spanish short version of the International Physical Activity Questionnaire and classified based on WHO recommendations⁽⁴⁷⁾.

Statistical analysis

We conducted all the analyses using Stata 14.0 (StataCorp, Stata Statistical Software, Release 14, 2015). We used survey commands to account for survey design and weighting to generate nationally representative results. Statistical tests were two-tailed and considered significant at $P < 0.05$. We examined characteristics of anthropometric measurements, total diet scores, sociodemographic variables, and lifestyle behaviors by sex and education level. We first performed sex-specific multivariable linear regression models for testing the statistically significant associations of MxDQI and MxAHEI scores, total and by component, with BMI and WC, adjusting for age (quadratic), total energy intake, smoking status, type 2 diabetes status, parity, area and region of residence, tertiles of assets index, type of housing, number of individuals in a household, marital status, and education level. Furthermore, we adjusted MxDQI models for alcohol intake. Models including dietary components as outcome variables were also adjusted for the other dietary components to take into account the potential correlation among all components. To test whether the associations of diet quality with BMI and WC was different for individuals with different education levels, we performed models that included interaction terms between diet score and the three defined levels of education. We performed global Wald tests to determine whether any diet score coefficients differed across the three education levels in men and women.

Sensitivity analyses

We did not include physical activity in the main analyses due to the poor validity of the International Physical Activity Questionnaire short form for assessing moderate-to-vigorous physical activity among Mexican adults⁽⁴⁸⁾. However, physical activity could be an important confounder of the relationship between diet quality and anthropometry. Thus, we conducted sensitivity analyses to test whether the inclusion of crude physical activity data in models altered the associations of dietary indices with BMI and WC. Second, we conducted analyses in which corn tortilla was treated as a refined grain instead of a whole grain, since it is uncertain whether all corn tortillas are made with whole grains. Third, a set of sensitivity analyses focused on different approaches for examining the association of dietary components with BMI and WC. We tested two additional types of models, models that were not adjusted for other dietary components and models that adjusted for total score minus the dietary component of interest, to assess whether estimations are different from those obtained when adjusting for the other dietary components.

Results

Overall, the prevalence of overweight was slightly lower in women than in men, but the prevalence of obesity and abdominal obesity was higher in women than in men, as observed in the entire ENSANUT 2012 sample. Moreover, the mean of total MxDQI and MxAHEI score was about 40 in men and women, however, the total dietary scores were higher in men and women with the lowest education level. A higher proportion of men and women with low education level met the scoring criteria of several dietary components, including whole-grain cereals, legumes, red and processed meat, and saturated fat (Table 2).

Association of MxDQI and MxAHEI with BMI in men and women

The total MxDQI score was not associated with BMI among men and women. However, vegetables as well as seafood, poultry, or eggs components were inversely associated with BMI in men. Likewise, the total MxAHEI score was not associated with BMI in both men and women. Nevertheless, red and processed meat component was inversely associated with BMI among men, whereas the alcohol component was positively associated with BMI in women (Table 3).

Association of MxDQI and MxAHEI with WC in men and women

Among men, a one-unit increase in total MxDQI and total MxAHEI scores was associated with a reduction in WC of 0.10 (95% CI: 0.004, 0.20) cm and 0.15 (95% CI: 0.01, 0.28) cm, respectively. With regards to specific components, we observed that seafood, poultry and eggs as well as red and processed meat components were inversely associated with WC. In women, dietary scores were not associated with WC (Table 4).

Association of MxDQI and MxAHEI with BMI by education level in men and women

We found that the association of total MxDQI and total MxAHEI scores with BMI was different by education level in men (P-interaction < 0.05). A one-unit increase in total MxDQI and total MxAHEI scores was associated with a mean reduction of BMI of 0.11 (95% CI: 0.04, 0.18) kg/m² and of 0.18 (95% CI: 0.10, 0.25) kg/m², respectively, for men with the lowest level of education. There was no association between the dietary scores and BMI for higher-educated men. With regards to components, we observed that legumes and refined grains components were inversely associated with BMI in men with lowest education level (P-interaction < 0.05) (Table 5).

In women, the association of total MxDQI score with BMI was not different by education level. However, vegetables, whole fruit, as well as seafood, poultry, or eggs components were inversely associated with BMI in women with no reading/writing skills (P-interaction < 0.05). Likewise, the association between total MxAHEI score and BMI was not different by education level. Nevertheless, the whole fruit component was inversely associated with BMI among women with the lowest education level, and the long-chain (n-3) fats component was inversely associated with BMI in women with 10 y of school (Table 5).

Association of MxDQI and MxAHEI with WC by education level in men and women

As observed for BMI, the association between total MxDQI score and WC was different by education level in men (P-interaction < 0.05). The total MxDQI score was inversely associated with BMI in men with the lowest and highest education level (P < 0.05). Among specific components, legumes as well as red and processed meat MxDQI components were inversely associated with WC among men with no reading/writing skills (P-interaction < 0.05). Likewise, the association between total MxAHEI and WC was different by education level (P-interaction < 0.05). The total MxAHEI score was inversely associated with WC in men with no reading/writing skills. The red and processed meat MxAHEI component was inversely associated with WC in men with lowest education level (P-interaction < 0.05) (Table 6).

The association between total dietary scores and WC in women was not different by education level. However, the whole fruit component was inversely associated with WC among women with no reading/writing skills, whereas the seafood, poultry, or eggs component was inversely associated with WC among women with 10 y of school (P-interaction < 0.05). Likewise, we observed that whole fruit and nuts MxAHEI components were inversely associated with WC in women with the lowest education level, while long-chain (n-3) fats component was inversely associated with WC among women with > 10 y of school (Table 6).

Results of sensitivity analyses

Estimated associations of total MxDQI and MxAHEI scores with BMI and WC were similar to those observed when total MxDQI and MxAHEI models were further adjusted for physical activity. However, when physical activity was included as covariate, the association between dietary scores and WC were no longer statistically significant in men, whereas in women these associations were statistically significant in the MxAHEI models (Supplementary Table 2). Likewise, estimated associations of total MxDQI and MxAHEI scores with BMI and WC were similar to those observed when corn tortilla was considered as refined instead of whole grain (Supplementary Table 2). The whole-grain cereals MxDQI component was positively associated with BMI in men, whereas the refined grain MxDQI component was positively associated with BMI in women when corn tortilla was considered as refined grain (Supplementary Table 3). Supplementary Tables 4 through 7 present the results of testing the association of diet quality scores with BMI and WC without adjusting for the other dietary components and adjusting for total scores minus the dietary component of interest, which were similar to those obtained using models adjusted for the other dietary components.

Discussion

To our best knowledge, this is the first study that examines the association of diet quality with BMI and WC using two different dietary quality scores, one based on the most recent Mexican Dietary Guidelines and the other on foods and nutrients associated with cardiometabolic risk. We found that both total dietary quality scores were not associated with BMI in men and women. However, some dietary components were inversely associated

with BMI, including vegetables and seafood, poultry, or eggs MxDQI components, as well as red and processed meat MxAHEI components in men. We also observed that the total dietary scores were inversely associated with WC in men, but not in women. We specifically found that seafood, poultry, or eggs as well as red and processed meat components were inversely associated with WC in men.

This is also one of the first studies to examine the association of diet quality with BMI and WC by education level, which we considered relevant as a first exploration given the disparities in dietary intakes and obesity prevalence by socioeconomic status already documented in Mexican adults. We found that for men with the least education, total high diet quality was associated with lower BMI and WC. In contrast, there was no association between total diet quality and BMI or WC in higher-educated men.

It is not clear from the current study why better total diet quality predicts lower BMI and WC for lower-educated but not higher-educated men. Several studies have found that individuals with lower socioeconomic status more frequently undertake behaviors that could be detrimental to health than those of higher socioeconomic status, such as low physical activity, smoking, or poor sleep duration^(49; 50). Thus, one possibility is that improvements in diet quality offset the association of these other behaviors with health in low-educated men. A second possibility might be that for low-educated men, diet quality is a proxy for better health behavior overall; men who seek out healthy diets despite the norm may also be more likely to engage in other health-promoting behaviors, and this combined behaviors leads to better weight outcomes. A third possibility relates more specifically to the role of physical activity: men with less education may have jobs that are more physically demanding in comparison to higher-educated men; higher diet quality scores together with higher work-related physical activity could be associated with a reduction of BMI and WC. Previous studies in low- and middle-income countries have found that individuals with less education were more active than groups with more education⁽⁵¹⁾, and occupational activity has been found to be one of the major contributors to the intensity of overall physical activity⁽⁵²⁾. Unfortunately, we were unable to include physical activity in the main analyses due to the poor validity of the International Physical Activity Questionnaire short form in Mexican adults⁽⁵³⁾, so we were able to examine only crude physical activity in our models. More research is needed to understand how diet interacts with other key lifestyle components, such as physical activity, sedentary activity, occupation, and sleep duration, to understand the pathway between diet and obesity across the population.

In our primary models, the association of total MxDQI and MxAHEI scores with BMI and WC was not different by education level in women, but the pattern of the associations tended to be the opposite than in men. We found a statistically significant association of total MxAHEI score with BMI and WC in women with ≥ 10 y of education. Although associations were not statistically significant in women with lower education levels, BMI and WC estimations were in the same direction as those observed in higher-educated women. Sex differences in associations between risk factors and obesity have been reported elsewhere, and several explanations have been proposed given the complexity of the subject matter, including differences in the duration and intensity of occupational physical activity. Studies suggest that higher-educated women could have higher physical activity levels than

lower-educated women, which in turn can be associated with lower BMI or WC if women improve the quality of their diet^(54; 55) One of the potential reasons why we did not find different results by education may be because lower-educated women could also have levels of housework-related physical activity that interact with diet to reduce BMI and WC, but not enough to find statistically significant associations. However, the association between total MxAHEI score and WC differed by education in women after adjusting for physical activity. Future research using valid measurements of physical activity will be needed to understand how diet might interact with physical activity in women.

We specifically observed that the association of different dietary components with BMI or WC was different by education level in men and women. Higher consumption of legumes and lower intakes of refined grains and red and processed meat were inversely associated with BMI or WC among men with the lowest education level, whereas among women in the same level of education as men, a higher consumption of fruit and vegetables was associated with low BMI or WC. A potential explanation of these results is the heterogeneity in the consumption of dietary components among men and women. Given the truncated nature of the diet quality indices, it is possible that, for instance, the consumption of fruit and vegetables were even higher in women than in men, and therefore associated with lower BMI or WC, even though the proportion of individuals that met the scoring criteria of each one of the dietary components was similar between men and women by education level. Another possible reason of the differences by sex is that women and men completed the 24-hour dietary recall differently, potentially resulting in different measurement error. Furthermore, we found that different dietary components were associated with BMI and WC. For instance, red and processed meat, in both MxDQI and MxAHEI, was consistently associated with WC but not with BMI. Similar results were observed in a previous study in Iranian adults⁽⁵⁶⁾. Therefore, it is possible that the WC measure is more sensitive to the changes in some dietary factors, compared to other measures of general obesity such as BMI.

Limitations

It is important to acknowledge the limitations of our study. First, the potential reverse causal link between diet quality and obesity cannot be dismissed, given the nature of the cross-sectional study design. Second, this study was based on a single twenty-four-hour recall, which does not allow between- and within-person variability to be distinguished, and therefore usual intake cannot be estimated. Specifically, episodically consumed dietary components, such as alcohol, could be misrepresented, and this might be why we were unable to find consistent associations of dietary quality with BMI and WC. Even though the limitation of using this method, some cross-sectional studies have found associations between diet quality and health outcomes using a single 24-hour recall^(12; 57; 58), which may indicate that some food components and weights were not the most adequate to estimate the diet quality in Mexican adults. For instance, it could be useful to categorize tortillas as cooked and fried, since both types of tortilla can be highly consumed, but their associations with BMI and WC may be opposite. Therefore future direction should include the modifications of these indices or the creation of other indices that better reflect changes in BMI and WC in Mexican adults. The food frequency questionnaire could provide a better

estimation of usual intake and therefore of usual diet quality. However, the food frequency questionnaire used in this survey was too aggregated and would result in misclassification because many details of dietary intake were not measured, and the quantification of intake was not as accurate as with twenty-four-hour dietary recalls. Recent studies have shown that the combined use of multiple twenty-four-hour dietary recalls and food frequency questionnaire provides data superior to use of either method alone^(59; 60; 61), but this was not possible for this study since these two dietary methods were collected in different subsamples. Therefore, we recommend the collection in the future of both dietary instruments in the same subsample for a better estimation of the usual diet quality index. Finally, we selected education level as the measure of socioeconomic status, rather than occupation or income. Education level can determine the occupation, and education level and occupation are jointly associated with income level⁽⁶²⁾. However, these three proxies of socioeconomic status could also have an independent role in predicting health-related behaviors. We considered inappropriate to analyze occupation because of the complexity of understanding the potential sex differences, since 78% of men reported they had paid work the week prior to the interview, whereas 62% of women reported unpaid work in the same period. Moreover, income was measured using an open-ended question. Income is more difficult to estimate in low- to middle-income countries because of greater reliance on the informal economy and self-employment⁽⁶³⁾. However, we used an asset-based household index as a control variable in our models. This index has been recommended by economists as a key proxy of household income, especially in low- to middle-income countries, including Mexico^(63; 64). Despite the limitations, the results presented provide an overview of how diet quality is associated with BMI and WC and how these association can be potentially different by education level in a representative sample of Mexican men and women, which offers insights for understanding diet–health outcomes disparities in Mexico.

Conclusion

Results show total dietary quality scores were not associated with BMI in men and women, whereas the MxAHEI score was inversely with WC in men but not in women. Furthermore, the association of total MxDQI and MxAHEI scores with BMI and WC was different by education level in Mexican men. In Mexican women, the association of diet quality scores with BMI and WC did not differ by education. These results provide insights when implementing public actions that prevent or ameliorate the high prevalence of obesity in Mexican adults, considering the potential differences by sex and education.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgments:

We thank Dr. Phil Bardsley for exceptional assistance with the data management, Ms. Emily Ford Yoon and Ms. Frances Dancy Burton for administrative assistance, and Ms. Denise Ammons for graphics support.

Financial support: This work was primarily funded by Bloomberg Philanthropies (grants to UNC and CInyS INSP), with support from the NIH R01DK108148, the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation (Grant 71698), and the Carolina Population Center and its NIH Center grant (P2C HD050924). Nancy Lopez-Olmedo is supported by the

Mexican National Council for Science and Technology (CONACyT) scholarship. Funders had no role in the design, analysis or writing of this article.

References

1. Kroker-Lobos MF, Pedroza-Tobias A, Pedraza LS et al. (2014) The double burden of undernutrition and excess body weight in Mexico. *The American journal of clinical nutrition* 100, 1652s–1658s. [PubMed: 25411308]
2. Gómez-Dantés H, Fullman N, Lamadrid-Figueroa H et al. (2016) Dissonant health transition in the states of Mexico, 1990–2013: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2013. *The Lancet* 388, 2386–2402.
3. Hernández-Ávila M, Rivera-Domarco J, Shamah T et al. (2016 (in Spanish)) Encuesta Nacional de Salud y Nutrición de Medio Camino 2016 Informe Final de Resultados. [National Health and Nutrition Survey 2016. Final results.]. Cuernavaca (Mexico): National Institute of Public Health.
4. Lim SS, Vos T, Flaxman AD et al. (2012) A comparative risk assessment of burden of disease and injury attributable to 67 risk factors and risk factor clusters in 21 regions, 1990–2010: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2010. *Lancet* 380, 2224–2260. [PubMed: 23245609]
5. Stern D, Smith LP, Zhang B et al. (2014) Changes in waist circumference relative to body mass index in Chinese adults, 1993–2009. *International journal of obesity* (2005) 38, 1503–1510. [PubMed: 24813367]
6. Aburto TC, Pedraza LS, Sanchez-Pimienta TG et al. (2016) Discretionary Foods Have a High Contribution and Fruit, Vegetables, and Legumes Have a Low Contribution to the Total Energy Intake of the Mexican Population. *J Nutr* 146, 1881s–1887s. [PubMed: 27511928]
7. Arvaniti F, Panagiotakos DB (2008) Healthy indexes in public health practice and research: a review. *Critical reviews in food science and nutrition* 48, 317–327. [PubMed: 18409114]
8. Schwingshackl L, Hoffmann G (2015) Diet quality as assessed by the Healthy Eating Index, the Alternate Healthy Eating Index, the Dietary Approaches to Stop Hypertension score, and health outcomes: a systematic review and meta-analysis of cohort studies. *Journal of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics* 115, 780–800 e785. [PubMed: 25680825]
9. Kourlaba G, Panagiotakos DB (2009) Dietary quality indices and human health: a review. *Maturitas* 62, 1–8. [PubMed: 19128905]
10. George SM, Ballard-Barbash R, Manson JE et al. (2014) Comparing Indices of Diet Quality With Chronic Disease Mortality Risk in Postmenopausal Women in the Women's Health Initiative Observational Study: Evidence to Inform National Dietary Guidance. *American journal of epidemiology* 180, 616–625. [PubMed: 25035143]
11. Harmon BE, Boushey CJ, Shvetsov YB et al. (2015) Associations of key diet-quality indexes with mortality in the Multiethnic Cohort: the Dietary Patterns Methods Project. *The American journal of clinical nutrition* 101, 587–597. [PubMed: 25733644]
12. Sundararajan K, Campbell MK, YH Choi et al. (2014) The relationship between diet quality and adult obesity: evidence from Canada. *Journal of the American College of Nutrition* 33, 1–17. [PubMed: 24533603]
13. Pate RR, Ross SET, Liese AD et al. (2015) Associations among physical activity, diet quality, and weight status in US adults. *Medicine and science in sports and exercise* 47, 743. [PubMed: 25058328]
14. Asghari G, Mirmiran P, Yuzbashian E et al. (2017) A systematic review of diet quality indices in relation to obesity. *The British journal of nutrition* 117, 1055–1065. [PubMed: 28478768]
15. Gregory CO, McCullough ML, Ramirez-Zea M et al. (2009) Diet scores and cardio-metabolic risk factors among Guatemalan young adults. *The British journal of nutrition* 101, 1805–1811. [PubMed: 19025721]
16. López-Olmedo N, Carriquiry AL, Rodríguez-Ramírez S et al. (2016) Usual Intake of Added Sugars and Saturated Fats Is High while Dietary Fiber Is Low in the Mexican Population. *The Journal of Nutrition* 146, 1856S–1865S. [PubMed: 27511932]

17. Pedroza-Tobías A, Rivera-Dommarco JA (2013) Prevalencia de obesidad en adultos mexicanos, ENSANUT 2012 [Prevalence of obesity in Mexican adults, ENSANUT 2012]. *Salud publica de Mexico* 55.
18. Arganini C, Saba A, Comitato R et al. (2012) Gender differences in food choice and dietary intake in modern western societies In *Public health-social and behavioral health: InTech*.
19. Vogel C, Lewis D, Ntani G et al. (2017) The relationship between dietary quality and the local food environment differs according to level of educational attainment: A cross-sectional study. *PloS one* 12, e0183700. [PubMed: 28841678]
20. Lovejoy JC, Sainsbury A (2009) Sex differences in obesity and the regulation of energy homeostasis. *Obesity reviews : an official journal of the International Association for the Study of Obesity* 10, 154–167. [PubMed: 19021872]
21. Palmer BF, Clegg DJ (2015) The sexual dimorphism of obesity. *Molecular and cellular endocrinology* 402, 113–119. [PubMed: 25578600]
22. Whitaker KM, Choh AC, Lee M et al. (2016) Sex differences in the rate of abdominal adipose accrual during adulthood: the Fels Longitudinal Study. *International journal of obesity (2005)* 40, 1278–1285. [PubMed: 27005404]
23. Chiuve SE, Fung TT, Rimm EB et al. (2012) Alternative dietary indices both strongly predict risk of chronic disease. *The Journal of nutrition*, jn. 111.157222.
24. Gutiérrez JP, Rivera-Dommarco J, Shamah-Levy T et al. (2012) Encuesta Nacional de Salud y Nutrición 2012. Resultados Nacionales. Cuernavaca, México: Instituto Nacional de Salud Pública (MX).
25. Conway JM, Ingwersen LA, Vinyard BT et al. (2003) Effectiveness of the US Department of Agriculture 5-step multiple-pass method in assessing food intake in obese and nonobese women. *The American journal of clinical nutrition* 77, 1171–1178. [PubMed: 12716668]
26. Blanton CA, Moshfegh AJ, Baer DJ et al. (2006) The USDA Automated Multiple-Pass Method accurately estimates group total energy and nutrient intake. *J Nutr* 136, 2594–2599. [PubMed: 16988132]
27. Agricultural Research Service, Food Surveys Research Group (2010) USDA Food and Nutrient Database for Dietary Studies, 4.1 <https://www.ars.usda.gov/northeast-area/beltsville-md/beltsville-human-nutrition-research-center/food-surveys-research-group/docs/fndds-download-databases/> (accessed January 10 2017)
28. Ledesma Solano J, Chávez Villasana A, Pérez-Gil Romo F et al. (2010) Composición de Alimentos “Miriam Muñoz de Chávez”. Valor nutritivo de los alimentos de mayor consumo [Food Composition “Miriam Muñoz de Chávez”. Nutrition value of the most consumed foods]. 2a ed ed. Mexico: McGraw-Hill.
29. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Research Service, Nutrient Data Laboratory (2013) National Nutrient Database for Standard Reference, Release 24. <https://www.ars.usda.gov/northeast-area/beltsville-md/beltsville-human-nutrition-research-center/nutrient-data-laboratory/docs/sr24-home-page/> (accessed January 10 2017)
30. Villalpando S, Ramírez-Silva I, Bernal Medina D et al. (2007) Tablas de composición de ácidos grasos de alimentos frecuentes en la dieta mexicana [Tables of fatty acids composition of common foods in the Mexican diet]. Cuernavaca (Mexico): National Institute of Public Health.
31. WHO (2008) Waist Circumference and Waist-Hip Ratio. Geneva: World Health Organization.
32. Lohman T, Roche A, Martorell R (1988) Anthropometric standardization reference manual. Champaign (IL): Human Kinetics.
33. Habicht JP (1974) [Standardization of quantitative epidemiological methods in the field]. *Boletín de la Oficina Sanitaria Panamericana Pan American Sanitary Bureau* 76, 375–384. [PubMed: 4277063]
34. WHO (2000) Obesity: preventing and managing the global epidemic: World Health Organization.
35. Alberti K (2009) International Diabetes Federation Task Force on Epidemiology and Prevention; National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute; American Heart Association; World Heart Federation; International Atherosclerosis Society; International Association for the Study of Obesity: Harmonizing the metabolic syndrome: a joint interim statement of the International Diabetes Federation Task Force on Epidemiology and Prevention; National Heart, Lung, and Blood

Institute; American Heart Association; World Heart Federation; International Atherosclerosis Society; and International Association for the Study of Obesity. *Circulation* 120, 1640–1645. [PubMed: 19805654]

36. Bonvecchio-Arenas A, Fernández-Gaxiola AC, Plazas-Belusteguigoitia M et al. (2015) Guías alimentarias y de actividad física en contexto de sobrepeso y obesidad en la población Mexicana [Dietary and physical activity guidelines in the context of overweight and obesity in the Mexican population]. Academia Nacional de Medicina ed Mexico.
37. Bourges H, Casanueva E, Rosado J (2008) Recomendaciones de ingestión de nutrientes para la población Mexicana: bases fisiológicas Tomo 2 [Recommendations of nutrient intake for the Mexican population: physiological basis] Editorial Medica Panamericana Sa de.
38. World Health Organization (2015) Guideline: Sugars intake for adults and children. Geneva: World Health Organization.
39. World Health Organization / Food And Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (2003) Diet, Nutrition and Prevention of Chronic Diseases. Report of a Joint WHO/FAO Expert Consultation WHO Technical Report Series no. 916 Geneva: WHO.
40. Micha R, Shulkin ML, Peñalvo JL et al. (2017) Etiologic effects and optimal intakes of foods and nutrients for risk of cardiovascular diseases and diabetes: Systematic reviews and meta-analyses from the Nutrition and Chronic Diseases Expert Group (NutriCoDE). *PloS one* 12, e0175149. [PubMed: 28448503]
41. Sánchez-Pimienta TG, Batis C, Lutter CK et al. (2016) Sugar-Sweetened Beverages Are the Main Sources of Added Sugar Intake in the Mexican Population. *The Journal of Nutrition* 146, 1888S–1896S. [PubMed: 27511931]
42. Vallejo M, Colin-Ramírez E, Rivera Mancia S et al. (2017) Assessment of Sodium and Potassium Intake by 24 h Urinary Excretion in a Healthy Mexican Cohort. *Archives of medical research* 48, 195–202. [PubMed: 28625323]
43. Pérez-Lizaur AB (2014) Sistema mexicano de alimentos equivalentes. Dietas normales y terapéuticas: los alimentos en la salud y la enfermedad (6a, 15).
44. Martínez R, Fernández A (2010) Impacto social y económico del analfabetismo: modelo de análisis y estudio piloto.
45. Robles JN, Navarro DM (2013) Analfabetismo en México: una deuda social. Realidad, Datos, y Espacio: Revista Internacional de Estadística y Geografía 3, 5–17.
46. Gutiérrez JP (2008) Clasificación por niveles socioeconómicos de los hogares entrevistados para la Encuesta Nacional de Salud y Nutrición 2006: nota metodológica [Classification of the interviewed households by socioeconomic levels for the National Health and Nutrition Survey 2006: methodological note]. Cuernavaca (Mexico): National Institute of Public Health.
47. Medina C, Janssen I, Campos I et al. (2013) Physical inactivity prevalence and trends among Mexican adults: results from the National Health and Nutrition Survey (ENSANUT) 2006 and 2012. *BMC Public Health* 13, 1–10. [PubMed: 23280303]
48. Medina C, Barquera S, Janssen I (2013) Validity and reliability of the International Physical Activity Questionnaire among adults in Mexico. *Rev Panam Salud Publica* 34.
49. Pampel FC, Krueger PM, Denney JT (2010) Socioeconomic disparities in health behaviors. *Annual review of sociology* 36, 349–370.
50. Pepper GV, Nettle D (2014) Socioeconomic disparities in health behaviour: an evolutionary perspective In *Applied evolutionary anthropology*, pp. 225–243: Springer.
51. Allen L, Williams J, Townsend N et al. (2017) Socioeconomic status and non-communicable disease behavioural risk factors in low-income and lower-middle-income countries: a systematic review. *Lancet Glob Health* 5, e277–e289. [PubMed: 28193397]
52. Chen M, Wu Y, Narimatsu H et al. (2015) Socioeconomic Status and Physical Activity in Chinese Adults: A Report from a Community-Based Survey in Jiaying, China. *PloS one* 10, e0132918. [PubMed: 26177205]
53. Medina C, Barquera S, Janssen I (2013) Validity and reliability of the International Physical Activity Questionnaire among adults in Mexico. *Rev Panam Salud Publica* 34, 21–28. [PubMed: 24006016]

54. Smith LP, Ng SW, Popkin BM (2014) No time for the gym? Housework and other non-labor market time use patterns are associated with meeting physical activity recommendations among adults in full-time, sedentary jobs. *Soc SciMed* 120, 126–134.
55. Vargas AS, Merino ALH, Hernández IP (2015) La participación laboral femenina y el uso del tiempo en el cuidado del hogar en México. *Contaduría y administración* 60, 651–662.
56. Dabbagh-Moghadam A, Mozaffari-Khosravi H, Nasiri M et al. (2017) Association of white and red meat consumption with general and abdominal obesity: a cross-sectional study among a population of Iranian military families in 2016. *Eating and weight disorders : EWD* 22, 717–724. [PubMed: 28421475]
57. Tande DL, Magel R, Strand BNJPhn(2010) Healthy Eating Index and abdominal obesity. 13, 208–214.
58. Guo X, Warden BA, Paeratakul S et al. (2004) Healthy Eating Index and obesity. *European journal of clinical nutrition* 58, 1580–1586. [PubMed: 15162130]
59. Carroll RJ, Midthune D, Subar AF et al. (2012) Taking advantage of the strengths of 2 different dietary assessment instruments to improve intake estimates for nutritional epidemiology. *American journal of epidemiology* 175, 340–347. [PubMed: 22273536]
60. Conrad J, Nothlings U (2017) Innovative approaches to estimate individual usual dietary intake in large-scale epidemiological studies. *The Proceedings of the Nutrition Society* 76, 213–219. [PubMed: 28162110]
61. Freedman LS, Midthune D, Arab L et al. (2018) Combining a Food Frequency Questionnaire With 24-Hour Recalls to Increase the Precision of Estimation of Usual Dietary Intakes—Evidence From the Validation Studies Pooling Project. *American journal of epidemiology* 187, 2227–2232. [PubMed: 29917051]
62. Galobardes B, Morabia A, Bernstein MS (2001) Diet and socioeconomic position: does the use of different indicators matter? *International journal of epidemiology* 30, 334–340. [PubMed: 11369739]
63. Howe LD, Galobardes B, Matijasevich A et al. (2012) Measuring socio-economic position for epidemiological studies in low-and middle-income countries: a methods of measurement in epidemiology paper. *International journal of epidemiology* 41, 871–886. [PubMed: 22438428]
64. Rutstein SO, Johnson KJCOM (2004) The DHS wealth index. DHS comparative reports no. 6.

Table 1
Mexican Diet Quality Index (MxDQI) and Mexican Alternate Healthy Eating Index (MxAHEI). Components and criteria for scoring

Food component	MxDQI			MxAHEI		
	Maximum points	Criteria for minimum score (0)	Criteria for maximum score	Maximum points	Criteria for minimum score (0)	Criteria for maximum score
<i>Adequacy</i>						
Vegetables	10	0 servings	3 servings per 2 000 kcal	9	0 servings	5 servings
Whole fruit	10	0 servings	3 servings per 2 000 kcal	9	0 servings	4 servings
Whole-grain cereals						
Women	5	0 servings	3 servings per 2 000 kcal	9	0 g	75 g
Men						90 g
Legumes	10	0 servings	2 servings per 2 000 kcal	5	0 servings	1 serving
Seafood, poultry, or eggs	5	< 1 serving per 2 000 kcal	2 servings per 2 000 kcal	5	0 servings	1 serving
Nuts						
Low-fat dairy	5	0 servings	3.5 servings per 2 000 kcal	5	0 servings	1 serving
Polyunsaturated fat *	5	< 6% of total energy intake	> 10% of total energy intake	9	2% of total energy intake	10% of total energy intake
Long-chain (n-3) fats (EPA + DHA)						
<i>Moderation</i>						
100% fruit juices	5	> 250 mL per 2 000 kcal	125 mL per 2 000 kcal	9	1 serving	0 servings
Sugar-sweetened beverages						
Refined grains	5	> 3 servings per 2 000 kcal	1 serving per 2 000 kcal	9	1.5 serving	0 servings
Red and processed meat	5	> 1.5 servings per 2 000 kcal	d 0.5 serving per 2 000 kcal	9		
Added sugars	15	> 10% of total energy intake	< 5% of total energy intake	9	>2g	1.5 g
Sodium	15	> 2 g per 2 000 kcal	1.5 g per 2 000 kcal	9		
Saturated fat	5	> 10 % of total energy intake	< 7% of total energy intake	9	4 % of total energy intake	0.5 % of total energy intake
Trans fat						
Alcohol						
Women				9	2.5 drinks	0.5–1.5 drinks
Men					3.5 drinks	0.5–2.0 drinks
Total	100	0	100	100	0	110

MxDQI, Mexican Diet Quality Index; MxAHEI, Mexican Alternate Healthy Eating Index.

* This dietary component in MxAHEI does not include long-chain (n-3) fats (EPA + DHA).

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Table 2
 Characteristics of Mexican men and women by education level. ENSANUT 2012 (*n* 2310)

	Men (<i>n</i> 954)				Women (<i>n</i> 1356)			
	No reading/writing skills (<i>n</i> 100)	Reading/writing skills or 3-9 years of school (<i>n</i> 621)	10 years of school (<i>n</i> 233)		No reading/writing skills (<i>n</i> 165)	Reading/writing skills or 3-9 years of school (<i>n</i> 910)	10 years of school (<i>n</i> 281)	
	Mean SE	Mean SE	Mean SE		Mean SE	Mean SE	Mean SE	
Age (years)	48 2	43 0.9	36 1.4	51 1.4	43 0.6	36 0.9		
BMI (kg/m ²)	27 0.5	27 0.3	27 0.5	29 0.8	30 0.2	29 0.5		
Waist circumference (cm)	93 1.7	95 0.9	95 2.1	92 1.7	94 0.6	90 1.1		
Total MxDQI score	45 2.2	42 0.9	35 1.3	50 2.0	40 0.7	37 1.0		
Total MxAHEI score	42 1.5	40 0.6	37 0.8	45 1.3	40 0.4	38 0.7		
	% SE	% SE	% SE	% SE	% SE	% SE	% SE	
BMI categories								
Normal	34 6.5	37 3	34 4.6	33 6	20 1.9	25 3.6		
Overweight	42 7.2	38 2.9	43 4.6	30 5.3	40 2.6	39 4.1		
Obesity	24 6.6	25 2.3	24 3.7	36 5.6	41 2.5	36 4		
Abdominal obesity	59 7.1	60 3	62 4.7	81 5.8	89 1.4	77 3.6		
Proportion of individuals meeting the scoring criteria								
MxDQI components								
Vegetables	25 6.2	17 2.3	12 2.7	25 4.7	19 1.9	28 3.7		
Whole fruit	6 2.4	7 1.9	11 2.7	9 2.6	6 1.2	7 1.9		
Whole-grain cereals	82 5	74 2.6	55 4.8	86 3.7	71 2.3	45 3.9		
Legumes	30 6.5	14 1.8	9 2.3	26 4.3	11 1.4	3 1.2		
Seafood, poultry, or eggs	30 6.1	37 2.8	33 4.3	33 5.3	43 2.5	38 4		
Low-fat dairy	0 0	1 0.5	2 1.4	2 1.4	1 0.4	2 1.4		
Polysaturated fat	66 6.6	71 2.8	67 4.7	69 5.6	62 2.5	69 3.9		
100% fruit juices	98 1.1	91 1.7	83 3.2	94 2.1	90 1.4	88 2.6		
Refined grains	3 2.4	2 0.8	2 1.1	1 0.4	2 0.6	1 0.7		
Red and processed meat	53 6.9	44 3	38 4.7	70 5.9	52 2.6	37 4.1		

	Men (n 954)						Women (n 1356)					
	No reading/writing skills (n 100)			Reading/writing skills or 3-9 years of school (n 621)			No reading/writing skills (n 165)			Reading/writing skills or 3-9 years of school (n 910)		
	Mean	SE		Mean	SE		Mean	SE		Mean	SE	
Added sugars	27	6.2		19	2.1	14	3.5	34	5.4	19	1.9	13
Sodium	23	5.2		22	2.4	13	3.3	30	5.4	19	1.9	13
Saturated fat	45	7.3		32	2.8	11	2.3	43	5.5	24	2.1	11
MxAHEI components												
Vegetables	4	2.8		7	1.5	4	2	4	2.1	4	1	7
Whole fruit	2	1.6		4	1.5	7	2.5	2	1.2	2	0.6	3
Whole-grain cereals	86	4.6		74	2.5	64	4.6	82	4.2	72	2.1	48
Legumes	38	6.8		33	2.5	19	3.3	35	5.1	21	2	12
Nuts	1	0.5		1	0.6	2	1.2	0	0.3	1	0.3	2
Polysaturated fat	41	6.9		34	3	29	4.2	32	6	26	2.2	34
Long-chain (n-3) fats (EPA + DHA)	7	2.7		6	1.3	7	2.7	4	1.5	4	1	11
Sugar-sweetened beverages	23	6.3		12	1.7	10	2.9	23	4.7	14	1.7	12
Red and processed meat	50	6.9		40	2.9	31	4.6	66	6	46	2.6	32
Sodium	27	5.5		21	2.3	15	3.4	52	6.1	35	2.3	22
Trans fat	98	1.3		95	1.1	85	4	96	1.8	91	1.8	89
Alcohol	3	1.7		3	0.8	4	2.4	0	0	0	0	0
Parity categories												
None	-	-		-	-	-	-	65	5.5	38	2.6	39
1-2	-	-		-	-	-	-	6	3.4	23	2.1	36
3-4	-	-		-	-	-	-	6	2.3	17	2.1	20
5	-	-		-	-	-	-	24	4.6	22	1.9	5
Area												
Urban	47	7.1		68	2.4	88	2.3	56	5.6	73	1.7	84
Rural	53	7.1		32	2.4	12	2.3	44	5.6	27	1.7	16
Region												
North	12	4		20	1.8	23	3.2	11	3.1	20	1.4	18
Central	46	7.2		44	3	50	4.4	38	6.4	50	2.2	51

	Men (n 954)						Women (n 1356)					
	No reading/writing skills (n 100)			Reading/writing skills or 3-9 years of school (n 621)			No reading/writing skills (n 165)			Reading/writing skills or 3-9 years of school (n 910)		
	Mean	SE		Mean	SE		Mean	SE		Mean	SE	
South	42	6.7		35	2.6		52	6		30	1.9	
Tertiles of assets index												
Low	62	7.4		39	2.7		59	6.1		30	2.1	
Medium	27	7.1		33	2.9		26	5.1		35	2.3	
High	11	4.4		28	3		15	5.8		35	2.7	
Type of housing												
Owned	84	6		76	3		90	3		79	2.2	
Rented	11	5.9		11	2.4		3	1.3		7	1.1	
Other *	5	2		13	2		7	2.7		14	1.8	
Number of individuals in a household												
1-2	29	5.6		13	1.5		17	3.2		13	1.4	
3-4	29	6.6		39	2.7		49	5.8		42	2.4	
5	42	7.2		49	2.9		34	5.5		45	2.6	
Marital status												
Married/living together	74	7		81	2.6		67	6		71	2.3	
Divorced/separated/widowed	7	2.7		4	0.9		19	5.3		17	2	
Single	20	6.3		15	2.4		13	4.8		12	1.6	
Smoking status												
Never	53	7.3		46	2.8		91	3.2		84	2	
Former	22	5.3		29	2.6		3	1.8		11	1.8	
Current	25	6.6		25	2.4		7	2.8		5	1	
Physical activity												
Inactive	7	3.3		12	2		16	4.1		16	1.9	
Moderately active	12	4.9		11	2.2		12	4.3		14	1.6	
Active	81	5.6		77	3		72	5.4		70	2.3	

ENSANUT, Mexican National Health and Nutrition Survey; BMI, body mass index; MxHQI, Mexican Diet Quality Index; MxAHEI, Mexican Alternate Healthy Eating Index.

*. They occupied the property in another situation not specified.

Table 3

Association of Mexican Diet Quality Index and Alternate Healthy Eating Index with body mass index in men and women. ENSANUT 2012 (*n* 2310)

	Men (<i>n</i> 954)			Women (<i>n</i> 1356)		
	β	95% CI	P-value	β	95% CI	P-value
MxDQI						
Total	-0.02	-0.05, 0.003	0.09	-0.02	-0.04, 0.01	0.23
Dietary components *						
Vegetables	-0.14	-0.25, -0.02	0.02	0.04	-0.08, 0.16	0.50
Whole fruit	0.12	-0.04, 0.27	0.13	0.05	-0.07, 0.17	0.44
Whole-grain cereals	-0.07	-0.28, 0.14	0.50	-0.04	-0.27, 0.18	0.70
Legumes	-0.05	-0.15, 0.05	0.32	-0.09	-0.20, 0.02	0.12
Seafood, poultry, or eggs	-0.24	-0.42, -0.06	0.01	-0.17	-0.36, 0.02	0.08
Low-fat dairy	-0.08	-0.46, 0.31	0.69	0.38	-0.10, 0.85	0.12
Polyunsaturated fat	-0.01	-0.10, 0.09	0.89	0.08	-0.02, 0.17	0.11
100% fruit juices	0.01	-0.25, 0.28	0.92	0.07	-0.21, 0.34	0.65
Refined grains	0.09	-0.12, 0.31	0.40	0.04	-0.17, 0.24	0.74
Red and processed meat	-0.14	-0.31, 0.03	0.10	-0.16	-0.36, 0.04	0.11
Added sugars	-0.01	-0.07, 0.05	0.81	-0.004	-0.07, 0.06	0.88
Sodium	-0.04	-0.12, 0.04	0.32	-0.02	-0.09, 0.05	0.60
Saturated fat	0.08	-0.10, 0.27	0.37	-0.12	-0.34, 0.09	0.25
MxAHEI						
Total	-0.04	-0.08, 0.004	0.08	-0.03	-0.07, 0.01	0.15
Dietary components *						
Vegetables	-0.12	-0.28, 0.05	0.17	0.09	-0.07, 0.25	0.29
Whole fruit	0.17	-0.04, 0.38	0.11	0.05	-0.10, 0.20	0.51
Whole-grain cereals	-0.04	-0.14, 0.07	0.51	-0.02	-0.13, 0.09	0.69
Legumes	0.04	-0.14, 0.22	0.66	-0.19	-0.38, 0.01	0.06
Nuts	0.47	0.07, 0.87	0.02	0.20	-0.68, 1.07	0.66
Polyunsaturated fat	-0.12	-0.27, 0.03	0.11	0.11	-0.02, 0.23	0.09
Long-chain (n-3) fats	0.01	-0.12, 0.15	0.87	-0.01	-0.17, 0.15	0.92
SSB	-0.04	-0.15, 0.06	0.40	-0.03	-0.14, 0.07	0.55
Red and processed meat	-0.10	-0.19, -0.003	0.04	-0.08	-0.18, 0.01	0.08
Sodium	0.03	-0.09, 0.14	0.67	-0.06	-0.16, 0.04	0.23
Trans fat	0.26	-0.81, 1.33	0.63	-0.41	-1.82, 1.00	0.57
Alcohol	0.01	-0.12, 0.15	0.84	1.45	0.55, 2.35	< 0.01

ENSANUT, National Health and Nutrition Survey; MxDQI, Mexican Diet Quality Index; MxAHEI, Mexican Alternate Healthy Eating Index; SSB, sugar-sweetened beverages.

* Adjusted for the other dietary components

Table 4

Association of total Mexican Diet Quality Index and Alternate Healthy Eating Index with waist circumference in men and women. ENSANUT 2012 (*n* 2310)

	Men (<i>n</i> 954)			Women (<i>n</i> 1356)		
	β	95% CI	P-value	β	95% CI	P-value
MxDQI						
Total	-0.10	-0.20, -0.004	0.04	-0.02	-0.08, 0.04	0.50
Dietary components *						
Vegetables	-0.40	-0.82, 0.02	0.07	0.12	-0.16, 0.40	0.39
Whole fruit	0.40	-0.39, 1.19	0.32	0.17	-0.13, 0.46	0.27
Whole-grain cereals	-0.43	-1.20, 0.35	0.28	0.13	-0.38, 0.65	0.62
Legumes	-0.14	-0.47, 0.18	0.39	-0.13	-0.39, 0.12	0.31
Seafood, poultry, or eggs	-0.88	-1.60, -0.17	0.02	-0.30	-0.71, 0.10	0.14
Low-fat dairy	-0.45	-1.64, 0.75	0.46	0.78	-0.17, 1.74	0.11
Polyunsaturated fat	-0.07	-0.46, 0.31	0.71	0.12	-0.12, 0.35	0.33
100% fruit juices	0.25	-0.58, 1.07	0.55	0.12	-0.47, 0.71	0.69
Refined grains	0.23	-0.58, 1.03	0.58	0.14	-0.33, 0.60	0.56
Red and processed meat	-0.54	-1.06, -0.03	0.04	-0.32	-0.81, 0.17	0.19
Added sugars	-0.05	-0.28, 0.18	0.66	-0.02	-0.16, 0.13	0.82
Sodium	-0.18	-0.49, 0.14	0.27	-0.04	-0.21, 0.12	0.61
Saturated fat	0.49	-0.06, 1.03	0.08	-0.40	-0.89, 0.10	0.12
MxAHEI						
Total	-0.15	-0.28, -0.01	0.03	-0.07	-0.16, 0.02	0.13
Dietary components *						
Vegetables	-0.25	-1.07, 0.58	0.56	0.12	-0.24, 0.49	0.51
Whole fruit	0.64	-0.49, 1.76	0.27	0.19	-0.21, 0.59	0.34
Whole-grain cereals	-0.25	-0.61, 0.11	0.17	0.05	-0.20, 0.30	0.69
Legumes	0.09	-0.61, 0.78	0.81	-0.35	-0.80, 0.09	0.12
Nuts	0.64	-0.53, 1.81	0.28	0.59	-1.54, 2.71	0.59
Polyunsaturated fat	-0.47	-1.17, 0.23	0.19	0.20	-0.13, 0.53	0.24
Long-chain (n-3) fats	-0.06	-0.57, 0.46	0.83	-0.18	-0.59, 0.23	0.39
SSB	-0.13	-0.58, 0.33	0.58	-0.15	-0.37, 0.07	0.19
Red and processed meat	-0.36	-0.67, -0.04	0.03	-0.15	-0.40, 0.10	0.24
Sodium	0.20	-0.20, 0.60	0.33	-0.17	-0.41, 0.07	0.17
Trans fat	0.57	-2.64, 3.78	0.73	-0.76	-4.37, 2.84	0.68
Alcohol	-0.06	-0.48, 0.35	0.77	0.95	0.24, 1.67	0.01

ENSANUT, National Health and Nutrition Survey; MxDQI, Mexican Diet Quality Index; MxAHEI, Mexican Alternate Healthy Eating Index; SSB, sugar-sweetened beverages.

* Adjusted for the other dietary components

Association of Mexican Diet Quality Index and Alternate Healthy Eating Index with body mass index in men and women by education level. ENSANUT 2012 (*n* 2310)

Table 5

		Education level								P-value interaction [*]	
		No reading / writing skills			Reading / writing skills or 3-9y						
		β	95% CI	P- value	β	95% CI	P- value	β	95% CI		P- value
Men											
<i>n</i>			100				621			233	
MxDQI score											
Total		-0.11	-0.18, -0.04	< 0.01	-0.01	-0.04, 0.03	0.70	-0.04	-0.08, 0.01	0.10	0.02
Dietary components [†]											
Vegetables		-0.17	-0.47, 0.13	0.27	-0.17	-0.31, -0.03	0.02	-0.07	-0.29, 0.16	0.56	0.74
Whole fruit		-0.05	-0.43, 0.32	0.78	0.13	-0.03, 0.29	0.11	0.13	-0.17, 0.43	0.41	0.66
Whole-grain cereals		-0.29	-0.76, 0.18	0.22	-0.005	-0.26, 0.25	0.97	-0.16	-0.48, 0.15	0.31	0.48
Legumes		-0.34	-0.55, -0.12	< 0.01	0.01	-0.12, 0.13	0.91	-0.07	-0.26, 0.13	0.51	0.02
Seafood, poultry, or eggs		-0.23	-0.67, 0.20	0.29	-0.12	-0.34, 0.09	0.26	-0.47	-0.82, -0.12	0.01	0.24
Low-fat dairy		-0.16	-2.05, 1.73	0.87	-0.08	-0.55, 0.39	0.74	-0.07	-0.67, 0.52	0.81	1.00
Polyunsaturated fat		-0.15	-0.37, 0.08	0.20	-0.003	-0.10, 0.10	0.95	0.03	-0.18, 0.24	0.78	0.44
100% fruit juices		-0.66	-1.41, 0.08	0.08	-0.10	-0.45, 0.26	0.60	0.20	-0.12, 0.51	0.22	0.08
Refined grains		-0.48	-0.91, -0.04	0.03	0.18	-0.07, 0.44	0.16	0.08	-0.28, 0.43	0.67	0.02
Red and processed meat		-0.63	-1.04, -0.21	< 0.01	-0.12	-0.34, 0.11	0.30	-0.09	-0.44, 0.26	0.62	0.07
Added sugars		-0.10	-0.23, 0.04	0.16	0.002	-0.08, 0.08	0.97	0.003	-0.1, 0.11	0.94	0.42
Sodium		-0.05	-0.20, 0.10	0.50	-0.003	-0.09, 0.09	0.95	-0.13	-0.28, 0.01	0.08	0.27
Saturated fat		-0.15	-0.61, 0.32	0.54	0.10	-0.12, 0.33	0.37	0.12	-0.24, 0.48	0.53	0.60
MxAHEI score											
Total		-0.18	-0.25, -0.10	< 0.01	-0.02	-0.07, 0.03	0.38	-0.04	-0.11, 0.04	0.33	< 0.01
Dietary components [†]											
Vegetables		-0.24	-0.63, 0.16	0.24	-0.18	-0.36, -0.002	0.05	0.03	-0.45, 0.51	0.90	0.65
Whole fruit		-0.25	-0.62, 0.12	0.19	0.15	-0.07, 0.37	0.18	0.29	-0.21, 0.78	0.25	0.12
Whole-grain cereals		-0.19	-0.44, 0.06	0.14	-0.01	-0.16, 0.14	0.89	-0.12	-0.31, 0.06	0.18	0.37

	Education level								P-value interaction *	
	No reading / writing skills			Reading / writing skills or 3-9y						
	β	95% CI	P- value	β	95% CI	P- value	10 y	P- value		
Legumes	-0.39	-0.79, 0.01	0.06	0.14	-0.09, 0.37	0.24	-0.07	-0.41, 0.27	0.68	0.06
Nuts	0.27	-0.36, 0.90	0.40	0.53	-0.15, 1.21	0.12	0.44	0.07, 0.81	0.02	0.84
Polyunsaturated fat	-0.29	-0.64, 0.05	0.10	-0.05	-0.22, 0.12	0.59	-0.25	-0.65, 0.14	0.21	0.31
Long-chain (n-3) fats	-0.13	-0.47, 0.21	0.46	0.07	-0.11, 0.25	0.44	-0.05	-0.36, 0.26	0.75	0.52
SSB	0.18	-0.4, 0.75	0.55	0.19	-0.08, 0.47	0.17	0.04	-0.25, 0.33	0.78	0.71
Red and processed meat	-0.33	-0.56, -0.10	0.01	-0.11	-0.24, 0.02	0.11	-0.07	-0.27, 0.14	0.51	0.17
Sodium	0.03	-0.21, 0.28	0.78	0.06	-0.10, 0.22	0.43	-0.07	-0.27, 0.13	0.49	0.56
Trans fat	13.64	7.64, 19.63	<0.01	0.40	-0.82, 1.61	0.52	0.18	-1.61, 1.96	0.85	<0.01
Alcohol	-0.22	-0.52, 0.08	0.15	0.01	-0.24, 0.25	0.94	0.06	-0.12, 0.24	0.50	0.29
Women		165			910			281		
<i>n</i>										
MxDQI score										
Total	-0.06	-0.14, 0.03	0.18	-0.002	-0.03, 0.03	0.89	-0.04	-0.10, 0.02	0.24	0.35
Dietary components [†]										
Vegetables	-0.36	-0.69, -0.03	0.04	0.11	-0.03, 0.25	0.13	0.03	-0.20, 0.26	0.79	0.03
Whole fruit	-0.35	-0.68, -0.02	0.04	0.06	-0.10, 0.21	0.46	0.16	-0.04, 0.35	0.11	0.03
Whole-grain cereals	-0.67	-1.35, 0.01	0.05	-0.01	-0.25, 0.23	0.93	-0.01	-0.42, 0.40	0.96	0.17
Legumes	-0.17	-0.52, 0.18	0.34	-0.03	-0.16, 0.10	0.61	-0.23	-0.45, -0.01	0.04	0.29
Seafood, poultry, or eggs	-0.59	-1.26, 0.09	0.09	0.02	-0.20, 0.25	0.84	-0.52	-0.84, -0.19	<0.01	0.01
Low-fat dairy	0.79	-0.04, 1.62	0.06	0.06	-0.35, 0.48	0.76	0.67	-0.49, 1.84	0.26	0.24
Polyunsaturated fat	0.08	-0.28, 0.44	0.65	0.13	0.01, 0.24	0.03	-0.03	-0.22, 0.15	0.72	0.34
100% fruit juices	-0.31	-1.40, 0.78	0.57	0.21	-0.03, 0.44	0.08	-0.19	-0.86, 0.48	0.58	0.35
Refined grains	-0.10	-0.80, 0.60	0.78	0.07	-0.18, 0.33	0.57	-0.02	-0.39, 0.35	0.92	0.85
Red and processed meat	-0.05	-1.03, 0.94	0.93	-0.10	-0.32, 0.12	0.38	-0.34	-0.64, -0.05	0.02	0.33
Added sugars	0.07	-0.17, 0.31	0.58	-0.04	-0.11, 0.04	0.31	0.05	-0.06, 0.17	0.37	0.32
Sodium	0.02	-0.20, 0.25	0.84	-0.02	-0.10, 0.06	0.60	-0.03	-0.16, 0.10	0.64	0.92
Saturated fat	-0.28	-1.09, 0.54	0.50	-0.13	-0.36, 0.10	0.28	-0.04	-0.38, 0.30	0.82	0.83
MxAHEI score										

	Education level										P-value interaction *
	No reading / writing skills			Reading / writing skills or 3-9y							
	β	95% CI	P- value	β	95% CI	P- value	β	95% CI	P- value		
Total	-0.03	-0.19, 0.13	0.69	0.001	-0.05, 0.05	0.97	-0.11	-0.20, -0.02	0.02	0.10	
Dietary components [†]											
Vegetables	-0.54	-1.08, 0.01	0.06	0.13	-0.08, 0.34	0.22	0.19	-0.13, 0.51	0.24	0.06	
Whole fruit	-0.60	-1.12, -0.07	0.03	0.04	-0.18, 0.26	0.73	0.25	-0.02, 0.51	0.07	0.01	
Whole-grain cereals	-0.37	-0.76, 0.02	0.07	-0.04	-0.17, 0.09	0.55	-0.03	-0.27, 0.20	0.79	0.27	
Legumes	-0.38	-1.08, 0.31	0.28	-0.04	-0.27, 0.19	0.72	-0.46	-0.82, -0.10	0.01	0.11	
Nuts	-0.84	-2.38, 0.71	0.29	0.64	-0.66, 1.94	0.33	-0.23	-1.16, 0.70	0.63	0.33	
Polyunsaturated fat	0.21	-0.36, 0.77	0.47	0.18	0.01, 0.35	0.04	-0.004	-0.26, 0.25	0.97	0.49	
Long-chain (n-3) fats	0.21	-0.55, 0.97	0.59	0.20	-0.02, 0.42	0.08	-0.35	-0.56, -0.14	< 0.01	< 0.01	
SSB	0.62	-0.85, 2.08	0.41	0.16	-0.11, 0.44	0.25	0.17	-0.17, 0.51	0.33	0.84	
Red and processed meat	-0.05	-0.60, 0.51	0.87	-0.05	-0.16, 0.07	0.42	-0.22	-0.38, -0.05	0.01	0.19	
Sodium	0.14	-0.25, 0.54	0.48	-0.08	-0.20, 0.05	0.24	-0.15	-0.33, 0.03	0.10	0.40	
Trans fat	-4.37	-13.99, 5.25	0.37	-0.82	-2.66, 1.03	0.39	0.75	-1.54, 3.04	0.52	0.40	
Alcohol [‡]	-	-	-	0.84	0.23, 1.45	0.01	2.47	1.91, 3.03	< 0.01	< 0.01	

ENSANUT, National Health and Nutrition Survey; MxDQI, Mexican Diet Quality Index; MxAHEI, Mexican Alternate Healthy Eating Index; SSB, sugar-sweetened beverages.

* The p-value for interaction represents the statistical significance of the interaction term to test whether the association between diet quality and body mass index is different for low vs. high educated individuals.

[†] Adjusted for the other dietary components.

[‡] Blank cells indicate variable was omitted from model.

Table 6

Association of Mexican Diet Quality Index and Alternate Healthy Eating Index with waist circumference in men and women by education level.
 ENSANUT 2012 (*n* 23101)

	Education level								P-value interaction *	
	No reading / writing skills			Reading / writing skills or 3-9y			10 y			
	β	95% CI	P-value	β	95% CI	P-value	β	95% CI		P-value
Men										
<i>n</i>		100			621			233		
MxDQI score										
Total	-0.30	-0.49, -0.11	<0.01	-0.03	-0.16, 0.1	0.66	-0.20	-0.35, -0.05	0.01	0.03
Dietary components [†]										
Vegetables	-0.46	-1.37, 0.44	0.32	-0.73	-1.18, -0.28	<0.01	0.32	-0.73, 1.37	0.55	0.21
Whole fruit	-0.18	-1.13, 0.77	0.71	0.28	-0.25, 0.81	0.31	0.74	-0.98, 2.45	0.40	0.52
Whole-grain cereals	-0.79	-2.50, 0.92	0.37	-0.25	-1.12, 0.62	0.57	-0.69	-2.08, 0.70	0.33	0.80
Legumes	-0.91	-1.56, -0.26	0.01	0.06	-0.35, 0.47	0.77	-0.32	-1.17, 0.53	0.46	0.03
Seafood, poultry, or eggs	-0.86	-2.20, 0.49	0.21	-0.45	-1.22, 0.32	0.26	-1.76	-3.45, -0.06	0.04	0.35
Low-fat dairy	0.55	-7.57, 8.67	0.89	-0.01	-1.35, 1.33	0.99	-0.96	-2.76, 0.83	0.29	0.67
Polysaturated fat	-0.58	-1.22, 0.05	0.07	0.05	-0.30, 0.39	0.79	-0.18	-1.21, 0.85	0.73	0.18
100% fruit juices	-3.99	-8.07, 0.09	0.06	0.03	-1.05, 1.12	0.95	0.69	-0.33, 1.71	0.18	0.08
Refined grains	-0.85	-2.28, 0.58	0.24	0.35	-0.49, 1.20	0.41	0.34	-1.26, 1.93	0.68	0.28
Red and processed meat	-2.01	-3.3, -0.71	<0.01	-0.09	-0.76, 0.57	0.78	-1.04	-2.66, 0.57	0.21	0.01
Added sugars	-0.33	-0.75, 0.10	0.13	-0.001	-0.31, 0.30	0.99	-0.07	-0.45, 0.32	0.72	0.46
Sodium	-0.05	-0.46, 0.37	0.83	-0.003	-0.32, 0.31	0.98	-0.70	-1.36, -0.04	0.04	0.09
Saturated fat	0.07	-1.46, 1.59	0.93	0.75	0.05, 1.44	0.04	-0.27	-1.69, 1.15	0.71	0.43
MxAHEI score										
Total	-0.53	-0.75, -0.30	<0.01	-0.08	-0.25, 0.09	0.37	-0.22	-0.46, 0.02	0.07	0.01
Dietary components [†]										
Vegetables	-0.53	-1.66, 0.61	0.37	-0.81	-1.4, -0.22	0.01	1.03	-1.82, 3.87	0.48	0.47
Whole fruit	-0.86	-1.98, 0.26	0.13	0.26	-0.43, 0.94	0.46	1.64	-1.38, 4.66	0.29	0.12
Whole-grain cereals	-0.54	-1.47, 0.39	0.26	-0.04	-0.47, 0.38	0.84	-0.68	-1.47, 0.12	0.10	0.26
Legumes	-1.12	-2.34, 0.11	0.07	0.48	-0.38, 1.34	0.27	-0.50	-1.98, 0.97	0.50	0.04

	Education level										P-value interaction *
	No reading / writing skills			Reading / writing skills or 3-9y			10 y				
	β	95% CI	P-value	β	95% CI	P-value	β	95% CI	P-value		
Nuts	1.09	-0.97, 3.15	0.30	0.83	-0.90, 2.56	0.35	0.44	-0.98, 1.86	0.54	0.85	
Polyunsaturated fat	-1.01	-2.02, -0.01	0.05	-0.09	-0.81, 0.63	0.81	-1.26	-3.48, 0.95	0.26	0.17	
Long-chain (n-3) fats	-0.90	-1.83, 0.03	0.06	0.34	-0.35, 1.03	0.34	-0.64	-1.70, 0.43	0.24	0.06	
SSB	1.07	-0.40, 2.54	0.16	0.22	-0.52, 0.97	0.55	-0.48	-1.56, 0.59	0.38	0.15	
Red and processed meat	-1.14	-1.83, -0.45	<0.01	-0.23	-0.66, 0.20	0.30	-0.55	-1.44, 0.34	0.22	0.06	
Sodium	0.40	-0.29, 1.08	0.25	0.26	-0.30, 0.83	0.36	0.02	-0.94, 0.97	0.97	0.81	
Trans fat	42.06	23.61, 60.51	<0.01	1.94	-2.11, 5.99	0.35	-0.28	-5.20, 4.65	0.91	<0.01	
Alcohol	-0.76	-1.93, 0.41	0.21	-0.12	-0.84, 0.61	0.75	0.14	-0.43, 0.71	0.63	0.39	
Women											
n		165			910			281			
MxDQI score											
Total	-0.08	-0.25, 0.09	0.36	-0.003	-0.07, 0.07	0.92	-0.04	-0.18, 0.10	0.58	0.67	
Dietary components [†]											
Vegetables	-0.76	-1.51, -0.001	0.05	0.23	-0.11, 0.56	0.18	0.21	-0.33, 0.74	0.45	0.05	
Whole fruit	-0.87	-1.53, -0.21	0.01	0.22	-0.15, 0.58	0.24	0.41	-0.11, 0.92	0.12	0.01	
Whole-grain cereals	-1.55	-3.09, -0.02	0.05	0.04	-0.54, 0.62	0.89	0.54	-0.38, 1.46	0.25	0.06	
Legumes	-0.10	-0.85, 0.64	0.79	-0.03	-0.33, 0.26	0.83	-0.50	-1.08, 0.07	0.08	0.34	
Seafood, poultry, or eggs	-1.08	-2.50, 0.33	0.13	0.10	-0.40, 0.61	0.69	-1.08	-1.85, -0.30	0.01	0.01	
Low-fat dairy	2.84	1.06, 4.61	<0.01	0.18	-0.88, 1.25	0.73	0.92	-1.05, 2.89	0.36	0.03	
Polyunsaturated fat	0.14	-0.57, 0.85	0.70	0.15	-0.11, 0.42	0.27	0.03	-0.43, 0.48	0.90	0.89	
100% fruit juices	-1.50	-3.87, 0.87	0.22	0.48	-0.21, 1.16	0.17	-0.40	-1.45, 0.66	0.46	0.15	
Refined grains	0.50	-1.02, 2.02	0.52	0.05	-0.51, 0.61	0.87	0.25	-0.60, 1.09	0.57	0.82	
Red and processed meat	0.09	-2.10, 2.29	0.93	-0.07	-0.59, 0.45	0.79	-1.03	-1.83, -0.23	0.01	0.08	
Added sugars	0.05	-0.42, 0.52	0.83	-0.09	-0.26, 0.09	0.32	0.14	-0.15, 0.43	0.35	0.36	
Sodium	0.11	-0.44, 0.66	0.69	-0.05	-0.25, 0.15	0.66	-0.11	-0.38, 0.16	0.43	0.79	
Saturated fat	-0.35	-2.03, 1.33	0.68	-0.47	-1.00, 0.06	0.08	-0.17	-1.13, 0.79	0.73	0.83	
MxAHEI score											
Total	-0.11	-0.39, 0.17	0.46	0.003	-0.11, 0.11	0.95	-0.24	-0.41, -0.06	0.01	0.06	
Dietary components [†]											

	Education level								P-value interaction *	
	No reading / writing skills			Reading / writing skills or 3-9y			10 y			
	β	95% CI	P-value	β	95% CI	P-value	β	95% CI		P-value
Vegetables	-1.24	-2.50, 0.03	0.06	0.16	-0.31, 0.64	0.50	0.47	-0.27, 1.20	0.21	0.07
Whole fruit	-1.48	-2.59, -0.37	0.01	0.26	-0.31, 0.83	0.38	0.55	-0.18, 1.28	0.14	0.01
Whole-grain cereals	-0.91	-1.78, -0.04	0.04	0.02	-0.30, 0.35	0.89	0.24	-0.27, 0.75	0.35	0.06
Legumes	-0.51	-2.01, 0.98	0.50	-0.12	-0.65, 0.42	0.67	-0.96	-1.84, -0.09	0.03	0.23
Nuts	-4.15	-7.57, -0.73	0.02	2.05	-1.34, 5.44	0.24	-0.69	-2.09, 0.72	0.34	0.04
Polysaturated fat	0.48	-0.66, 1.62	0.41	0.26	-0.15, 0.68	0.21	0.06	-0.64, 0.76	0.87	0.78
Long-chain (n-3) fats	0.26	-1.52, 2.04	0.77	0.32	-0.17, 0.81	0.20	-1.10	-1.8, -0.40	<0.01	<0.01
SSB	0.06	-2.15, 2.28	0.96	0.002	-0.59, 0.60	1.00	0.18	-0.63, 1.00	0.66	0.94
Red and processed meat	0.03	-1.22, 1.28	0.96	-0.01	-0.30, 0.28	0.94	-0.59	-1.05, -0.13	0.01	0.06
Sodium	0.31	-0.55, 1.16	0.48	-0.19	-0.49, 0.10	0.19	-0.36	-0.80, 0.08	0.11	0.39
Trans fat	-12.4	-33.02, 8.22	0.24	-2.60	-6.68, 1.48	0.21	5.11	-4.23, 14.45	0.28	0.17
Alcohol [‡]	-	-	-	0.70	-0.04, 1.44	0.06	1.46	0.44, 2.48	0.01	0.21

ENSANUT, National Health and Nutrition Survey; MxDQI, Mexican Diet Quality Index; MxAHEI, Mexican Alternate Healthy Eating Index; SSB, sugar-sweetened beverages.

* The p-value for interaction represents the statistical significance of the interaction term to test whether the association between diet quality and body mass index is different for low vs. high educated individuals.

[‡] Adjusted for the other dietary components.

[§] Blank cells indicate variable was omitted from model.