eat right. American Dietetic Association

RESEARCH

Research and Practice Innovations

Change in Dietary Energy Density after Implementation of the Texas Public School Nutrition Policy

JASON A. MENDOZA, MD, MPH; KATHY WATSON, PhD; KAREN WEBER CULLEN, DrPH, RD

ABSTRACT

Consumption of energy-dense foods has been associated with rising obesity rates and the metabolic syndrome. Reducing dietary energy density is an important strategy to address obesity, but few studies have examined the effect of nutrition policies on children's energy density. The study's objective was to assess the impact of the Texas Public School Nutrition Policy on children's energy density by using a pre- and post-policy evaluation. Analysis of variance/covariance and nonparametric tests compared energy density after the Texas policy change to intakes at baseline. Two years of lunch food records were collected from middle school students in Southeast Texas at three public middle schools: baseline (2001-2002) and 1 year after implementation of the Texas Policy (2005-2006). Students recorded the amount and source of foods consumed. The Texas Public School Nutrition Policy was designed to promote a healthy school environment by restricting portion sizes of high-fat and high-sugar snacks and sweetened beverages, fat content of foods, and serving of high-fat vegetables like french fries. Energy density (kcal/g): energy density−1 was the energy of foods only (no beverages) divided by the gram weight and has been previously associated with obesity and insulin resistance; energy density−2 included all food and beverages to give a complete assessment of all sources of calories. Following implementation of the Texas policy, students' energy density−1 significantly decreased from 2.80±1.08 kcal/g to 2.17±0.78 kcal/g ($P<0.0001$). Similarly, energy density−2 significantly decreased from 1.38±0.76 kcal/g to 1.29±0.53 kcal/g ($P<0.0001$). In conclusion, the Texas Public School Nutrition Policy was associated with desirable reductions in energy density, which suggests improved nutrient intake as a result of student school lunch consumption.

J Am Diet Assoc. 2010;110:434-440.

J. A. Mendoza is assistant professor of pediatrics, US Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Research Service Children's Nutrition Research Center, Academic General Pediatrics, Department of Pediatrics, and Dan L. Duncan Cancer Center, Baylor College of Medicine, Houston, TX. K. Watson is instructor of pediatrics, US Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Research Service Children's Nutrition Research Center, Houston, TX. K. Weber Cullen is associate professor of pediatrics, USDA/ARS Children's Nutrition Research Center and Dan L. Duncan Cancer Center, Baylor College of Medicine, Houston, TX.

Address correspondence to: Jason A. Mendoza, MD, MPH, Children's Nutrition Research Center, Department of Pediatrics, Baylor College of Medicine, 1100 Bates St, Houston, TX 77030-2600. E-mail: jason.mendoza@bcm.edu

Manuscript accepted: August 21, 2009.

Copyright © 2010 by the American Dietetic Association.

0002-8223/10/11003-0010$36.00/0

doi: 10.1016/j.jada.2009.11.021

Dietary energy density is defined as the amount of energy for a given weight of food (kcal/g) (1). The two main influences on energy density are water, which adds weight but not energy, and thus, decreases energy density; and fat, which has high energy content and raises energy density (2). The World Health Organization recommended restricting children's intake of energy-dense foods for obesity prevention (3). Likewise, the Expert Committee convened by the American Medical Association recommended that consumption of low energy-dense foods was likely a useful strategy for pediatric weight management (4). A growing number of study findings have linked the consumption of energy-dense foods with obesity (5), the metabolic syndrome (6), and type 2 diabetes (7). Experimental feeding studies have reported that children who consumed higher energy-dense foods consumed more energy (8,9), and this effect was additive if portion size was also increased (8). Large-scale epidemiological studies among children have reported positive correlations between dietary energy density and daily energy intake (10,11). Some longitudinal, epidemiological studies among children have linked higher energy density with higher fat mass (12,13). Similarly, in large-scale cross-sectional epidemiological studies among adults, consumption of energy-dense foods was positively associated with weight status (6,14) and the metabolic syndrome (6). Short- and long-term studies have also reported that consuming low–energy-dense foods was associated with weight loss or maintenance among adults (15-20).

Schools provide an ideal setting to implement and evaluate policy interventions because they are an important venue for targeting large numbers of youth. Previous research has shown that school environments influenced children's dietary behavior (21). States and school districts have enacted policies to improve school nutrition (22). For example, improvements in food consumption (ie,

© 2010 by the American Dietetic Association

more milk, calcium, and vitamin A, and fewer sweetened beverages) were associated with a local school district policy on snack bars in middle schools (23).

The Texas Public School Nutrition Policy was an unfunded mandate designed to promote healthy school environments (24). The guidelines applied to all school food environments, including snack bars and vending. For middle schools, the policy restricted portion sizes of snacks and high-fat foods, sales of sweetened beverages, and the fat content of all foods (24). Implementation of the policy was associated with greater lunchtime consumption of vegetables, milk, and several nutrients and lower consumption of sweetened beverages, snack chips, and percentage energy from fat (25). These findings suggested that improvements in energy density were likely, because decreasing fat and increasing vegetable intakes were two important strategies to lower energy density (26). To date, no studies have examined the effectiveness of school policy interventions to reduce children's dietary energy density. This study seeks to fill this gap by reporting on the impact of the Texas Public School Nutrition Policy on the energy density of lunchtime meals consumed by middle school students in Houston, TX. This study uses data from a previously published study (25). Specifically, the research objectives were to examine the changes in energy density after the policy, determine whether socioeconomic status moderated the impact of the policy on energy density, identify changes in the contribution of individual food groups to energy intake after the policy was implemented, and determine whether socioeconomic status moderated changes by individual food groups to energy intake.

METHODS

The first year of the study was conducted during the 2001-2002 school year, and the schools were chosen and assessed as part of a convenience sample for an intervention study (27). The second year of the study encompassed the 2005-2006 school year. The Texas Public School Nutrition Policy was implemented statewide in the fall of the 2004-2005 school year. For years 1 and 2, school-level demographics were obtained from the school district. In year 2 only, individual-level demographics were obtained. Because students who qualify for the federal free/reduced lunch program must meet specific family-income eligibility criteria (<185% of the federal poverty level) (28), this indicator provides a school-level measure of socioeconomic status based on income. Data were collected by research assistants at three middle schools in the same school district in Southeast Texas from September to May during both academic years, as described previously (25). Research assistants received a 2-hour training on dietary data collection specifically for this study's instruments, which included survey logistics, sampling, and answering students' questions, and were observed monthly by the project manager. This research was approved by the Institutional Review Board of Baylor College of Medicine.

Briefly, all parents received study information and notified that their child could assent or refuse to provide data. Then, assented sixth- through eighth-grade students completed anonymous lunch food records immediately after lunch in the cafeteria, which has been shown to maximize accuracy of self-report (29). The lunch food records used were shown to be valid in a previous study (30). On each school day during the week, research assistants selected either one or two tables of students at each lunch period and asked students to complete a food record for lunch consumption only. Lunch tables were selected starting at one side of the cafeteria and then on subsequent days, tables closer to the opposite side of the cafeteria were selected until all tables had been sampled. This process was then repeated throughout the entire school year, September through May. Research staff did not collect data on refusals. Because records were anonymous, students could have completed more than one record during each school year. No individual demographic data were collected in year 1.

From the food records, data were entered into the Nutrition Data System (versions 4.2 [1999] and NDS-R-2005 [2005], Nutrient Coordinating Center, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis) to obtain average daily lunch intake of calories and the average gram weight of food at lunch. Because no standard definition of energy density exists (1), the energy density of students' lunch meals was defined by two calculation methods: energy density−1 as the total energy (kilocalories, where 1 kcal=4.184 kJ) of the lunch meal divided by the total weight (gram) of the lunch meal, excluding all beverages, and energy density−2 as the total energy (kilocalories) of the lunch meal divided by the total weight (grams) of the lunch meal, including all foods and beverages (water included) as described previously (1). Energy density−1 was calculated for comparative purposes and served as the primary outcome measure. Energy density−1 or food energy density (without beverages) has been previously associated with obesity (5,16,18,31) and the metabolic syndrome (6). Energy density−2 was a secondary outcome measure and calculated to provide useful information on the complete diet, including all food and all beverages, such as water, fruit juices/drinks, and soft drinks. All analyses were performed for each energy density definition separately.

Students' daily average lunch intake by food groups and the percentage of average daily intake by food groups were also calculated. Using the Nutrition Data System food file output, the foods were classified into food group−specific categories based on the Nutrient Coordinating Center code and description. The percentage of daily lunch intake per food group were secondary outcomes and calculated as the food group−specific kilocalories (energy) divided by the total kilocalories (excluding beverages) and multiplied by 100%. Beverages were excluded from the calculation of food group−specific percentage of total energy because this calculation would most closely resemble energy density−1, which excluded beverages. Energy density−1 was also the primary outcomes measure of this study and has been associated with health outcomes (5,6,16,18,31).

Statistical Methods

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to address the study objectives, using the Statistical Analysis Software (version 9.1.3, 2006, SAS Institute Inc, Cary, NC). Two-way ANOVAs, with year and school socioeconomic (SES) as factors, were used to identify differences in energy density between academic years and school SES (objective one). The inclusion of a study year×SES interaction

Table 1. Percentages for participant characteristics from the low, moderate, and high SES middle schools before (Year 1) and after (Year 2) implementation of the Texas Public School Nutrition Policy

	Low SES[a] (%)		Moderate SES (%)		High SES (%)	
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 1	Year 2	Year 1	Year 2
Year 1 school demographics[b]						
% Free/reduced lunch	68	75	50	66	26	38
Ethnicity						
African American	1	1	7	8	0	1
Hispanic	87	89	62	72	35	45
White	11	9	29	18	61	48
Other	1	1	2	3	4	6
Year 2 individual demographics						
Ethnicity						
African American	NA[c]	2	NA	10	NA	3
Hispanic		93		77		60
White		2		9		31
Other		3		4		6
Sex	NA		NA		NA	
Male		66		48		50
Female		34		52		50

[a]SES=socioeconomic status.
[b]Individual-level demographics were available for year 2 only.
[c]NA=not applicable.

served to assess whether SES moderated the effect of policy on energy density (objective two). A significance level of 0.05 was used for these analyses.

Although a significant interaction indicated moderation by SES, the global statistic did not indicate specifically how the change between years was moderated by SES. Therefore, subsequent to significant interactions, tests of simple effects were performed to more specifically identify significant moderation. The tests of simple effects consisted of stratifying by SES and then examining differences between years. The academic years (2001-2002; 2005-2006) were considered independent student cohorts and the schools were classified as low, moderate, or high SES based on the percent of students who qualified for the federal free/reduced lunch program using school level data. To control for inflated type I errors caused by multiple testing, the Bonferroni correction was used and the significance level was set to 0.0167.

Similarly, two-way ANOVAs, with year and school SES as factors, were used to identify differences between academic years for the food group-specific percentage of total energy (objective three). Analyses were performed for each food group separately. As mentioned here, the inclusion of a study year×SES interaction served to assess whether SES moderated the effect of policy on the food group−specific percentage of total energy (objective four). Because there were eight different food groups, a significance level of 0.00625 was used per the Bonferroni correction. For significant interactions, tests of simple effects were performed to more specifically identify significant moderation. The tests of simple effects consisted of stratifying by SES and then examining differences between years. The Bonferroni correction was used and the significance level was set to 0.002. Effect sizes were classified as small (d=0.25), medium (d=0.50), and large (d=0.80) as described previously by Cohen (32).

RESULTS

School-level sociodemographic characteristics obtained from the school district are shown in Table 1, stratified by school SES. The low-SES school had a higher proportion of Hispanic students, while the high-SES school had a higher proportion of non-Hispanic white students. In year 2, when individual-level sociodemographic data were assessed, the low-SES school had a higher proportion of males (66%) than females (34%), while the moderate-SES (52% female) and high-SES (50% female) SES schools were more evenly split by sex.

In year 1, 2,616 self-reported food records were collected, while in year 2, 10,172 records were collected. Data collection occurred in the schools about 50% of the time. Changes in the school-level demographics of the three schools for years 1 and 2 occurred. Enrollment increased from about 900 to 1,100 students per school. The percent of students eligible for free/reduced-price meals increased from 26% to 38%, 50% to 66%, and 68% to 75% in the high-, moderate-, and low-SES schools, respectively. The percentage of Hispanic students increased slightly (35% to 45%; 62% to 72%, 87% to 89%), while non-Hispanic white students decreased slightly (61% to 48%, 29% to 18%, 11% to 9%).

Results from the two-way ANOVAs yielded significant year and SES main effects and significant year×SES interactions (P<0.001 for all) for both measures of energy density (Table 2). Comparing the overall energy density−1 for the three schools before and after the policy, in year 1 foods consumed at school lunch had an energy density of 2.80±1.08 kcal/g (n=2,616), while in year 2 energy

Table 2. Mean (standard deviations) and results from two-way analyses of variance for lunchtime energy density by academic year and school socioeconomic status (SES) for the middle school students before (Year 2001-2002) and after (Year 2005-2006) implementation of the Texas Public School Nutrition Policy

	Academic Year				
	Year 2001-2002		Year 2005-2006		
Energy density	n	Mean±SD[a]	n	Mean±SD	ES[b]
Energy density without beverages[c]					
High SES (26%)	978	3.12±1.01	3,558	2.34±0.87	0.99
Moderate SES (50%)	937	2.97±1.19	3,458	2.09±0.72	1.07
Low SES (68%)	701	2.15±0.70	3,156	2.06±0.69	0.29
Total	2,616	2.80±1.08	10,172	2.17±0.78	0.87
Energy density with beverages[d]					
High SES (26%)	978	1.35±0.83	3,558	1.31±0.59	0.04
Moderate SES (50%)	937	1.42±0.85	3,458	1.26±0.49	0.22
Low SES (68%)	701	1.38±0.50	3,156	1.29±0.51	0.15
Total	2,616	1.38±0.76	10,172	1.29±0.53	0.12

[a]SD=standard deviation.
[b]Using Cohen's interpretation, the magnitude of the standardized effect sizes (ES) are small (0.25), moderate (0.50), and large (0.80).
[c]Significant year F(1,12782)=1029.67, $P<0.0001$; SES F(2,12782)=384.14, $P<0.0001$; and Year by SES F(2,12782)=166.38, $P<0.0001$ effects; simple effects yielded significant difference between years for all SES schools ($P<0.0001$).
[d]Significant year F(1,12782)=55.29, $P<0.0001$, and year by SES F(2,12782)=7.50, $P=0.0006$ effects. Simple effects yielded significant difference between years for moderate- and low-SES schools ($P<0.001$).

density−1 significantly declined to 2.1 ±0.78 kcal/g (n=10,172). Similarly, energy density–2 in year 1 was 1.38±0.76 kcal/g (n=2,616) and declined considerably to 1.29±0.53 kcal/g (n=10,172). The significant year×SES interactions were of primary interest as they signified the reduction in energy density was significantly moderated by SES, meaning that the change between years 1 and 2 was different for at least one SES group. When stratified by SES (with $P\leq0.0167$), significant reductions of energy density–1 occurred at all three schools. However, large reductions, based on standardized effect sizes, were observed for the moderate-and high-SES schools, whereas the low-SES school exhibited a small reduction in energy density−1. In contrast to significant reductions observed in energy density−1 at all three schools, only the moderate- and low-SES schools had significant reductions of energy density−2, although these reductions were small.

Nearly all food group−specific percentages of total energy differed significantly by year (year 1 vs year 2), school SES level, and the interaction of year×SES (Table 3; $P<0.00625$). Among all food groups, the year main effect was significant except for grains. The significant year×SES interactions indicated that school SES moderated the change in percentage from total energy. No significant ($P<0.002$) changes in year 2 were observed in the percentage of dessert for the high-SES school, grains and fat/oil for the moderate SES school, and fruit, vegetables, and candy for the low-SES school. With all schools combined, the percentage of energy for each food group changed from year 1 to year 2 for all food groups except grains. The following food groups increased: the National School Lunch Program (NSLP) mixed entrée, vegetables, fruit, and the NSLP dessert. The following food groups decreased: snack chips, fat/oil, and candy. Snack chips had the largest effect size (0.76), while the remaining food groups all had small or small-to-moderate effect sizes (0.04 to 0.36). The changes to percentage of total energy by food groups did vary by school SES, although most had small effect sizes. Exceptions included a moderate decrease from snack chips at the high-SES school, a moderate increase in the NSLP mixed entrée and a large decrease for snack chips at the moderate-SES school, and a moderate decrease in fat/oil at the low-SES school.

DISCUSSION

Implementation of the Texas Public School Nutrition Policy was associated with desirable decreases in the lunchtime energy density of middle school students, whether beverages were included or not. The overall reduction in energy density−1 (food only, no beverages) of 0.63 kcal/g was consistent with previous reports among adults who reduced their energy density and achieved long-term weight loss and maintenance (16,18). In addition, in year 2 (post-policy), mean energy density−1 declined to 2.17 kcal/g, which is closer to mean energy density−1 of 2.03±0.03 kcal/g (standard error) for an entire day, based on nationally representative data on 9- to 13-year-old children from National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey 1999-2004 (33). Substantial reductions in energy density−1 were seen at all three schools, but were greatest for the high- and moderate-SES schools. Those students had the highest lunchtime energy density−1 values in year 1, with values well above comparable mean daily energy density−1 values for 9- to 13-year-old US children (33) and, instead, were in the range of the highest energy density−1 tertile category for US adults. A caveat in these comparisons is that the students' energy density−1 values were from the lunch meal only, rather than the entire day's dietary intake (5). Nevertheless, it is plausible that students from the high- and moderate-SES

Table 3. Percentage of total lunchtime energy by food group, year, and school socioeconomic status (SES) for the middle school students before (Year 1) and after (Year 2) implementation of the Texas Public School Nutrition Policy

Food group[a]	Year 1	Year 2	ES[b]
	← *n* →		
High SES	978	3,558	
	← *mean± standard deviation* →		
Meat/cheese/mixed entrée	27.4±20.5	34.8±21.6	0.35
Fruit	2.0±6.0	5.0±9.4	0.34
Vegetables	7.9±11.5	10.8±13.7	0.22
Grains	17.2±14.4	19.1±13.4	0.14
Dessert	9.2±20.2	10.8±18.7	0.09[c]
Candy	5.7±16.1	4.3±9.2	0.13
Fat/oil	13.6±12.4	10.7±10.4	0.26
Snack chips	16.4±28.3	4.5±13.1	0.68
	← *n* →		
Moderate SES	937	3,458	
	← *mean± standard deviation* →		
Meat/cheese/mixed entrée	28.2±19.4	38.2±19.4	0.52
Fruit	3.8±8.1	7.9±10.6	0.41
Vegetables	4.6±6.7	8.5±10.8	0.39
Grains	21.1±15.2	19.8±12.7	0.10[c]
Dessert	5.4±14.5	9.2±18.8	0.21
Candy	6.9±18.1	4.0±8.2	0.27
Fat/oil	10.4±10.0	11.0±9.4	0.07[c]
Snack chips	18.9±30.9	1.2±7.3	1.13
	← *n* →		
Low SES	701	3,156	
	← *mean± standard deviation* →		
Meat/cheese/mixed entrée	37.2±16.9	39.7±19.1	0.13
Fruit	7.4±10.5	6.6±10.1	0.08[c]
Vegetables	10.6±11.3	11.7±13.8	0.09[c]
Grains	22.9±11.5	19.9±13.2	0.23
Dessert	2.8±7.8	9.7±20.1	0.37
Candy	2.0±6.9	2.2±5.8	0.03[c]
Fat/oil	13.9±10.0	9.4±8.4	0.52
Snack chips	2.3±10.5	0.9±6.7	0.19
	← *n* →		
Total	2,616	10,172	
	← *mean± standard deviation* →		
Meat/cheese/mixed entrée	30.3±19.6	37.5±20.2	0.36
Fruit	4.1±8.4	6.5±10.1	0.25
Vegetables	7.5±10.2	10.3±12.9	0.23
Grains	20.1±14.2	19.6±13.1	0.04[c]
Dessert	6.1±15.8	9.9±19.2	0.21
Candy	5.1±15.2	3.5±8.0	0.16
Fat/oil	12.5±11.1	10.4±9.5	0.21
Snack chips	13.5±26.8	2.3±9.7	0.76

[a]Level of significance ($P<0.00625$) for global effects; all global main effects and interactions were significant except for the year main effect for grains; all simple effects were significant ($P<0.002$), unless noted.
[b]Using Cohen's interpretation, the magnitude of the standardized effect sizes are small (0.25), moderate (0.50), and large (0.80).
[c]Not significant.

schools had more money to spend on snack foods or vending machine items in year 1, which resulted in higher lunchtime energy density−1. Because the Texas Public School Nutrition Policy restricted the purchase of these items in year 2, energy density−1 declined at all schools, but more substantially at the moderate- and high-SES schools. In support, the percentage of energy from snack chips decreased substantially from year 1 to year 2. These decreases had moderate or large effect sizes at the high- and moderate-SES schools, respectively, compared to the small effect size at the low-SES school.

The Texas Public School Nutrition Policy was also associated with desirable changes to lunchtime energy density−2, which included all foods and beverages. These

decreases in energy density−2 were significant only for the moderate- and low-SES schools. The baseline energy density−2 values were higher than comparable energy density−2 values (1.30±0.031) from a nationally representative sample of secondary school students participating in the NSLP (34). However, the decrease in energy density−2 associated with the policy resulted in energy density values similar to energy density−2 values for secondary school students participating in the NSLP from that same study (34).

Changes in lunchtime energy density were associated with greater percentages of energy from the following food groups: NSLP mixed entrée, NSLP dessert, vegetables, and fruit, although the effect sizes were small. Conversely, changes in energy density were associated with decreased percentages of energy from snack chips, fat/oil, and candy, with the effect size for snack chips being the largest. These findings were consistent with the previously published findings, which reported associations with increased intake of NSLP foods and decreased snack bar and vending machine item intake (25). These findings were generally consistent with national recommendations to improve fruit and vegetable consumption and decrease intake of fats, added sugars, and salt (35). They are also consistent with previously published recommendations for changing the energy density of diets for weight management, which included increasing water rich ingredients (ie, fruits and vegetables), and reducing the amount of added fat to mixed dishes in addition to simply eating more fruits and vegetables (26). Changes in energy density were also associated with greater consumption of foods prepared as part of the NSLP (mixed entrée and dessert). These are desirable changes since the NSLP mixed entrée and dessert are under the direct control of schools or school districts, rather than outside vendors.

The changes to the percentage of total energy by food groups differed by school SES, with most changes having small effect sizes. Although for all three schools combined the decrease in snack chips had the largest effect size, analyses stratified by school SES revealed that the policy was associated with high or moderate decreases, respectively, to snack chips at the moderate- and high-SES schools only. The decrease at the low-SES school had a small effect size. Because the students from the moderate- and high-SES schools may have had greater disposable income and had substantially higher percentages of total energy due to snack chips at baseline, the policy may have been able to have a greater impact on their consumption of snack chips by limiting in-school purchases of those items.

This study has several limitations, as reported previously (25). First, there was no control group, and individual students were not followed longitudinally; therefore, the changes in energy density may simply reflect a secular trend or be due, in part, to changing demographics at the schools. Second, the dietary intake data were by students' self-report, although this method was previously validated against direct observation (30). Third, individual-level sociodemographic data on students were collected only in year 2, and no data on nonresponders were collected. Fourth, it cannot be determined whether students completed multiple assessments, although this bias was minimized by aggregating the data at the weekly level. Also, the analyses did not account for potential bias from social clustering at lunch tables, nor the potential clustering effect by school because only three schools enrolled in the study. Although the schools varied by SES, their race/ethnicity makeup may not reflect other schools, limiting external generalizability. Fifth, no process evaluation was conducted to assess the degree of policy implementation at the schools. Finally, dietary intake was assessed only at lunchtime, which may not reflect consumption during a 24-hour period. It could be argued that decreasing students' lunchtime energy density may lead to higher energy density at home. However, a previous study (34) reported that among secondary school students, NSLP participants had higher energy density−2 at school than at home. This finding suggests that these students may not compensate for the lower energy density−2 at school by increasing energy density−2 outside of school. Additional research is necessary to clarify that important issue.

CONCLUSIONS

This study is the first to report on a successful school nutrition policy intervention that significantly reduced students' lunchtime energy density. The policy had different desirable effects to students' lunch intake, depending on school SES. Because consumption of higher–energy-dense foods has been linked to obesity and the metabolic syndrome, reducing energy density on a population level is a necessary strategy. This report is important because the Texas Public School Nutrition Policy has wide scope and implications. The policy provides school nutrition guidelines for the entire state of Texas and serves as a model for other states and school districts to follow. Of particular note, because the Texas Public School Nutrition Policy was associated with a greater percentage of energy consumed from the NSLP entrée and dessert, food and nutrition practitioners should provide guidance on optimizing the nutritional quality of these items. In addition, this report lends support to the idea that school lunch policies should extend to all food environments, including snack bars and vending machines, because the items from those areas were most highly impacted and associated with lower lunchtime energy density. Additional studies are needed to confirm these findings and determine their associations with overall daily energy density, energy balance, and weight status.

STATEMENT OF POTENTIAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST: No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

FUNDING/SUPPORT: This project has been funded in part by federal funds from the US Department of Agriculture (USDA) Economic Research Service (Cooperative Agreement 43-3AEM-2-80121) and USDA/Agricultural Research Service under Cooperative Agreements No. 143-3AEL-2-80121, 58-6250-6001, and 6250-51000-047. This work was also supported by a grant CA88511 from the National Cancer Institute (to K.W.C.). J.A.M. was supported in part by a career development award from the National Cancer Institute (1K07CA131178-01A1). The contents of this publication do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the US Department of Agriculture,

nor does mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the US Government.

References

1. Ledikwe JH, Blanck HM, Khan LK, Serdula MK, Seymour JD, Tohill BC, Rolls BJ. Dietary energy density determined by eight calculation methods in a nationally representative United States population. *J Nutr.* 2005;135:273-278.
2. Yao M, Roberts SB. Dietary energy density and weight regulation. *Nutr Rev.* 2001;59(8 Pt 1):247-258.
3. Joint WHO/FAO Expert Consultation on Diet, Nutrition and the Prevention of Chronic Diseases. *World Health Organ Tech Rep Series.* 2003;916.
4. Barlow SE. Expert committee recommendations regarding the prevention, assessment, and treatment of child and adolescent overweight and obesity: Summary report. *Pediatrics.* 2007;120(suppl 4): S164-S192.
5. Ledikwe JH, Blanck HM, Kettel Khan L, Serdula MK, Seymour JD, Tohill BC, Rolls BJ. Dietary energy density is associated with energy intake and weight status in US adults. *Am J Clin Nutr.* 2006;83:1362-1368.
6. Mendoza JA, Drewnowski A, Christakis DA. Dietary energy density is associated with obesity and the metabolic syndrome in US adults. *Diabetes Care.* 2007;30:974-979.
7. Wang J, Luben R, Khaw K-T, Bingham S, Wareham NJ, Forouhi NG. Dietary energy density predicts the risk of incident type 2 diabetes: The European Prospective Investigation of Cancer (EPIC)-Norfolk Study. *Diabetes Care.* 2008;31:2120-2125.
8. Fisher JO, Liu Y, Birch LL, Rolls BJ. Effects of portion size and energy density on young children's intake at a meal. *Am J Clin Nutr.* 2007;86:174-179.
9. Leahy KE, Birch LL, Rolls BJ. Reducing the energy density of an entree decreases children's energy intake at lunch. *J Am Diet Assoc.* 2008;108:41-48.
10. Drewnowski A, Almiron-Roig E, Marmonier C, Lluch A. Dietary energy density and body weight: Is there a relationship? *Nutr Rev.* 2004;62:403-413.
11. Mendoza JA, Drewnowski A, Cheadle A, Christakis DA. Dietary energy density is associated with selected predictors of obesity in US children. *J Nutr.* 2006;136:1318-1322.
12. Johnson L, Mander AP, Jones LR, Emmett PM, Jebb SA. A prospective analysis of dietary energy density at age 5 and 7 years and fatness at 9 years among UK children. *Int J Obes (Lond).* 2008;32: 586-593.
13. McCaffrey TA, Rennie KL, Kerr MA, Wallace JM, Hannon-Fletcher MP, Coward WA, Jebb SA, Livingstone MB. Energy density of the diet and change in body fatness from childhood to adolescence: Is there a relation? *Am J Clin Nutr.* 2008;87:1230-1237.
14. Murakami K, Sasaki S, Takahashi Y, Uenishi K. Dietary energy density is associated with body mass index and waist circumference, but not with other metabolic risk factors, in free-living young Japanese women. *Nutrition.* 2007;23:798-806.
15. de Oliveira MC, Sichieri R, Venturim Mozzer R. A low-energy-dense diet adding fruit reduces weight and energy intake in women. *Appetite.* 2008;51:291-295.
16. Greene LF, Malpede CZ, Henson CS, Hubbert KA, Heimburger DC, Ard JD. Weight maintenance 2 years after participation in a weight loss program promoting low-energy density foods. *Obesity.* 2006;14: 1795-1801.
17. Ledikwe JH, Rolls BJ, Smiciklas-Wright H, Mitchell DC, Ard JD, Champagne C, Karanja N, Lin PH, Stevens VJ, Appel LJ. Reductions in dietary energy density are associated with weight loss in overweight and obese participants in the PREMIER trial. *Am J Clin Nutr.* 2007;85:1212-1221.
18. Rolls BJ, Roe LS, Beach AM, Kris-Etherton PM. Provision of foods differing in energy density affects long-term weight loss. *Obes Res.* 2005;13:1052-1060.
19. Bes-Rastrollo M, van Dam RM, Martinez-Gonzalez MA, Li TY, Sampson LL, Hu FB. Prospective study of dietary energy density and weight gain in women. *Am J Clin Nutr.* 2008;88:769-777.
20. Savage JS, Marini M, Birch LL. Dietary energy density predicts women's weight change over 6 y. *Am J Clin Nutr.* 2008;88:677-684.
21. Kubik MY, Lytle LA, Hannan PJ, Perry CL, Story M. The association of the school food environment with dietary behaviors of young adolescents. *Am J Public Health.* 2003;93:1168-1173.
22. Greves HM, Rivara FP. Report card on school snack food policies among the United States' largest school districts in 2004-2005: Room for improvement. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act.* 2006;3:1.
23. Cullen KW, Watson K, Zakeri I, Ralston K. Exploring changes in middle-school student lunch consumption after local school food service policy modifications. *Public Health Nutr.* 2006;9:814-820.
24. Staples T. Texas Public School Nutrition Policy. 2004. http://www.squaremeals.org/vgn/tda/files/2348/14616_TPSNP%20SY%2007-08%20re.pdf. Accessed February 11, 2008.
25. Cullen KW, Watson K, Zakeri I. Improvements in middle school student dietary intake after implementation of the Texas Public School Nutrition Policy. *Am J Public Health.* 2008;98:111-117.
26. Rolls BJ, Drewnowski A, Ledikwe JH. Changing the energy density of the diet as a strategy for weight management. *J Am Diet Assoc.* 2005;105(suppl 1):S98-S103.
27. Thompson V, Cullen KW, Watson K, Zakeri I. The increased availability and marketing of fruit, juice, and vegetables to middle school students increases consumption. *J Child Nutr Manag.* 2007;31. http://docs.schoolnutrition.org/newsroom/jcnm/07spring/thompson/index.asp. Accessed June 1, 2008.
28. Food and Nutrition Service, US Department of Agriculture. *National School Lunch Program Fact Sheet*. Alexandria, VA: US Department of Agriculture; 2008.
29. Baxter SD, Thompson WO, Davis HC, Johnson MH. Impact of gender, ethnicity, meal component, and time interval between eating and reporting on accuracy of fourth-graders' self-reports of school lunch. *J Am Diet Assoc.* 1997;97:1293-1298.
30. Domel SB, Baranowski T, Leonard SB, Davis H, Riley P, Baranowski J. Accuracy of fourth- and fifth-grade students' food records compared with school-lunch observations. *Am J Clin Nutr.* Jan 1994;59(suppl): 218S-220S.
31. Kant AK, Graubard BI. Energy density of diets reported by American adults: association with food group intake, nutrient intake, and body weight. *Int J Obes Relat Metab Disord.* 2005;29:950-956.
32. Cohen J. *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*. 2nd ed. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum; 1988.
33. Cole N, Fox MK. Diet quality of American school-age children by school lunch participation status: Data from the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey, 1999-2004. Washington, DC: US Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service, Office of Research, Nutrition and Analysis; 2008.
34. Briefel RR, Wilson A, Gleason PM. Consumption of low-nutrient, energy-dense foods and beverages at school, home, and other locations among school lunch participants and nonparticipants. *J Am Diet Assoc.* 2009;109(suppl 1):S79-S90.
35. US Department of Health and Human Services, US Department of Agriculture. *Dietary Guidelines for Americans, 2005*. 6th ed. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office; January 2005.

eat right. American Dietetic Association Evidence Analysis Library®

For additional information on this topic, visit ADA's Evidence Analysis Library at www.adaevidencelibrary.com