Reliability and Structure of Diabetes Diet Adherence Scale (D-DAS): A Follow-up Study among Type 2 Diabetes Patients of India

Authors:

1st author - Savitesh Kushwaha[1]
Highest Degree – M.Phil.
Email Id – savi_ku@outlook.com

2nd author – Rachana Srivastava[1]
Highest Degree – PhD

3rd author – Sanjay Kumar Bhadada[2]
Highest Degree – DM

4th author – Vivek Sagar[1]
Highest Degree – PhD

5th author – Poonam Khanna[1]
Highest Degree – PhD

Corresponding author – Poonam Khanna[1]
Email Id - poonamkhanna05@gmail.com

Affiliation/Address -
1 Department of Community Medicine and School of Public Health, Post Graduate Institute of Medical Education and Research, Chandigarh, India – 160012
2 Department of Endocrinology, Post Graduate Institute of Medical Education and Research, Chandigarh, India – 160012

Reliability and Structure of Diabetes Diet Adherence Scale (D-DAS): A Follow-up Study among Type 2 Diabetes Patients of India

Abstract

Introduction: Measuring dietary adherence is essential while prescribing a diet plan for type 2 diabetes. This study aims to develop and validate a diabetes diet adherence scale (D-DAS) among type 2 diabetes patients in India.

Methods: A four-month non-randomised follow-up study was conducted among (n=120) type 2 diabetes patients attending the outpatient clinic. The adherence to the prescribed diet plan was determined using the D-DAS scale, and the impact of the prescribed diet plan was assessed at the endline. Multiple correspondence analysis (MCA) was used to determine the underlying dimensions of the scale, and confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) with multiple reliability measures was used to determine the reliability and construct validity of the scale.

Results: Adherence was 53.85%, and no significant difference was observed in baseline and endline fasting blood glucose. MCA revealed dimensions explaining 68.4% of the variance. CFA showed high reliability (McDonald's ω and Guttman's λ2=0.836). D-DAS demonstrated a reliable underlying construct (composite reliability=0.90, average variance explained=0.56).

Conclusion: D-DAS is a reliable and valid scale for measuring dietary adherence among type 2 diabetes patients in India. Adherence was moderate, suggesting the need for targeted interventions to improve dietary compliance and diabetes management.

Keywords: Diabetes, Diet, Adherence, Scale, Validation

Introduction

Worldwide, a considerable amount of the healthcare budget goes towards paying for diabetic treatment. The quality and amount of diet impact the long-term prevention and control of diabetes and its consequences.[1] Nutrition therapy has always been a recognized cornerstone in the management of diabetes. Adopting diabetic dietary recommendations is essential for diabetic patients to maintain glucose control and achieve long-term health goals [2]. Dietary changes can reduce glycated haemoglobin (HbA1c) levels by 1% to 2%, making them one of the key treatment components.[3] WHO advises patients to maintain a healthy body weight, engage in regular physical activity for at least 30 minutes and moderate-intensity activity on most days, follow a healthy diet, abstain from tobacco products, and achieve and maintain a healthy weight to prevent type 2 diabetes and its complications. A good diet helps prevent non-communicable diseases (NCDs), such as diabetes, heart disease, stroke, and cancer, as well as malnutrition in all manifestations [4]. Following a diabetic diet has also been demonstrated to reduce blood pressure, normalize lipid irregularities, and enhance glucose levels, all connected to the micro- and macro-vascular issues of diabetes [5].

Although dietary modification has been anticipated as the keystone of type 2 diabetes management and is typically recommended as the first step, it is considered one of the most challenging aspects of diabetes management. Regularly implementing recommended dietary practices for individuals with type 2 diabetes requires collaboration between the patient and the healthcare provider. Despite the formulation of comprehensive guidelines for achieving optimal diabetes care, evidence indicates that most individuals with diabetes have difficulty incorporating nutrition recommendations into their everyday lives [6]. Factors identified for poor adherence to dietary recommendations include socioeconomic status, duration of diabetes, and diabetes severity [4]. However, switching to a healthy diet requires giving up decades-long learned eating habits and the numerous little behaviours associated with them throughout each day. The amorphous and intricate influences of the psychological, emotional, and societal difficulties related to diet adherence may be felt throughout the day [7].

The ICMR recommends six small meals daily for all diabetic patients, calorie distribution, up to 55–60% of energy from complex carbs, and proteins should make up 12–15% of a diabetic person's total energy consumption. Consuming proteins from lean meats, fish, low-fat dairy products, pulses, soy, grains, and peas is advised. 20 to 30 percent of daily energy intake should come from fats.[8] Adherence to dietary recommendations continues to be the weakest link in managing type 2 diabetes patients, despite the development of guidelines that have been widely disseminated to patients and their healthcare professionals [9]. Earlier studies also indicate that many patients do

not follow their recommended diets. Although the extent of T2D diet non-compliance is unknown, research indicates that this extent ranges from 2.2% to 87.5% [10]. Developing interventional programmes to encourage healthy eating might greatly benefit from understanding the dimensions of adherence to a healthy diet in diabetes patients, particularly from a healthcare professionals (HCPs) viewpoint.

The scale to measure adherence to a prescribed diet plan in diabetes was not available for the Indian population. Therefore, the present study aims to translate and validate the Diabetes Diet Adherence Scale [11] among the Indian population and determine the underlying dimensions of the scale contributing towards adherence and non-adherence.

Methods

The study was conducted among type 2 diabetes patients attending the outpatient clinic of the Endocrine Department of PGIMER, Chandigarh. The study uses a non-randomised design (following the TRENDS statement checklist [12]) with a single group (not blinded), which was followed for 4 months. We have determined the sample size using G-power software based on a previous study [13] among 218 Indian T2DM patients (effect size=0.564). The estimated sample size was 102. The final calculated sample size with 80% power, including 10% follow-up loss, was 120. One hundred twenty patients were recruited at the baseline, and at the endline, data from 104 patients were collected (14% follow-up loss).

Diabetes Diet Adherence Scale (D-DAS) and Intervention

The original (English) and translated (Hindi) diabetes diet adherence scale (D-DAS) (Mohammed et al., 2019) [11] was used to collect data on adherence. The scale consists of 10 questions about prescribed dietary adherence in diabetes (Suppl_File_Table_1). The permission to use these scales was obtained from the corresponding author of Mohammed et al., 2019. Three professionals reviewed the translated questionnaire items to test item clarity, and the D-DAS was pre-tested on ten healthy volunteers. Before applying the D-DAS to a research cohort, concerns indicated by the pre-test cohort were addressed. The diet plan prescribed to the patients was based on the recommendations for diabetes from the Indian Council of Medical Research [14]. The diet plan was made considering the accessibility and affordability of the food products and the minimum extra burden on pocket expenditure by expert dietitians. The patients diligently adhered to the diet plan, ensuring compliance throughout the study. Monthly phone calls were made to each patient to monitor their progress and provide support. These phone calls served as a means of check-ins, allowing the medical team to address any concerns or challenges faced by the patients and provide

guidance and motivation to stay on track. In addition to the phone calls, the patients also received regular text messages twice a month. These messages were carefully crafted to provide reminders, encouragement, and helpful tips related to their dietary requirements.

Statistical Analysis

The Mardia's test for multivariate normality was conducted to determine the normal distribution of the data. The descriptive analysis was used to report the percentages and Median with IQR. The Wilcoxon test was to compare the FBG between baseline and endline. The MCA (Multiple Correspondence Analysis) was performed using the "indicator" method to identify the underlying dimensions that structure the relationships between the several categorical variables. The dimension was selected using cos2 values as they display the quality of representation of observed variables in the extracted dimensions. The eta-squared was based on the analysis of variance (ANOVA) framework and represents the proportion of variance in the observed variables explained by the latent construct, similar to the explained variance in regression analysis. We have conducted Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) using a weighted least squares mean, and variance adjusted (WLSMV) estimator, which is useful in construct validation of categorical variables because it allows researchers to estimate the degree to which individual items are influenced by the general factor versus specific factors. Our data don't represent equal factor loadings (tau equivalence) and normality, so the reliability measurement using Cronbach's α coefficient might not be reliable. Therefore, we have also used McDonald's Omega (ω) and Gutmann's Lambda-2 to determine the reliability and internal consistency. The variables selected for analysis in Cronbach's α, McDonald Omega (ω) and Gutmann's Lambda-2 were selected based on factor loading value (>0.50) in CFA. The varimax rotation was used to maximise and simplify the loadings of factors. The AVE (Average Variance Explained) Composite Reliability (CR) values were calculated according to the equations given by Fornell and Larcker [15]:

$$CR = \frac{(\sum \lambda)^2}{(\sum \lambda)^2 + \sum var\,(\varepsilon)} \qquad AVE = \frac{\sum \lambda^2}{\sum \lambda^2 + \sum var\,(\varepsilon)}$$

Where, λ = factor loading, $\varepsilon = (1 - \lambda^2)$

The alpha $p<0.05$ was considered significant. All the analysis was conducted in R and JASP software. The ethical clearance for this study was obtained from the institute's ethical committee.

Results

The distribution of demographic variables includes 64.17% of males and 35.83% of females. 2.50% were smokers, and 23.23% consumed alcohol. The vegetarian (60.00%) group was highest compared to non-vegetarian (39.17%) and ovo-vegetarian (0.83%) groups (Suppl_File_Table_2). The Mardia's test suggests that in the skewness variable, the beta-hat (estimated population parameter) was 0.589, the kappa value was 10.214, and the p-value was 0.037. This suggests a non-normal distribution, as the p-value was below the typical significance threshold of 0.05. For the kurtosis variable, the beta-hat was 6.53, the kappa value was -1.874, and the p-value was 0.061. This result was less clear, as the p-value was above the 0.05 threshold but still relatively low. The positive value of beta-hat suggests that the distribution of this variable peaks more than a normal distribution. In contrast, the negative kappa value suggests that there may be some non-normality present. Overall, Mardia's test suggests that there may be some non-normality in the distribution of both variables, particularly for the skewness variable (Suppl_File_Table_3). The median age, FBG, HbA1c, and BMI value at the baseline was 59.90 years (IQR: 52.00-62.25), 130.00 mg/dL (IQR: 112.00-176.50), 8.40% (IQR:8.30-9.00) and 25.16 (IQR: 22.23-28.18), respectively (Suppl_File_Table_4). The median value of the D-DAS scale score (6.00 IQR: 3.00-8.00) obtained from the present study was used as a cut-off for diet adherence and non-adherence classification. A score greater than the median was considered adherence, and less than the median was considered non-adherence.

The adherence results show 53.85% of participants were adherent to the prescribed diet plan (Table 1). The adherence across gender, alcohol consumption, smoking and BMI was not significant. The median FBG value was increased at the endline (139.6 mg/dL) compared to the baseline (130.5 mg/dL); however, the difference was not significant (p=0.540) (Suppl_File_Table_5 & 6).

The Multiple Correspondence Analysis was conducted to identify the underlying dimensions that structure the relationships between the several categorical variables. The scree plot shows that dimension-1 to dimension-4 account for 68.4% of the total variance in the adherence scale (Figure 1). Based on the eigenvalues obtained in the scree-plot, we have retained four dimensions with explained variance between the dependent (questions) and independent variable (diet plan) (Suppl_File_Table_7). The variables D7, D3, D5, D4 and D2 were correlated with each other and moderately to strongly correlated with dimension 1, whereas the variable D9 was strongly correlated with dimension 2. The correlation between a variable and a dimension reflects how much of the variability can be explained by the corresponding dimensions (Suppl_File_Fig_1).

The squared cosine (cos2) assesses the quality of representation of the categories or levels of a categorical variable on the dimensions of the analysis. The "yes" variables have cos2 values less

than 0 on dimension 1, and all the "no" variables have cos2 values greater than 0 on dimension 1, which suggests that dimension 1 captures the difference between the "yes" and "no" variables. It indicates that dimension 1 was a valid dimension for the data set, as it was able to differentiate between the "yes" and "no" variables (Figure 2).

Reliability and Construct Validity

The one-factor solution was developed using the confirmatory factor analysis. The first factor contains D1 to D7 as in MCA analysis, the dimension-1 also has the highest eigenvalue, and the squared eta values were >0.20 for D1 to D7 (directly related to the prescribed diet plan) (Suppl_File_1_Table_7). In the CFA, question D2 has a high loading of 0.962, indicating that it is strongly related to the factor. Questions D1, D3, D4, D5, D6, and D7 also have moderate to strong loadings, indicating that they are also related to the factor. Questions D8, D9, and D10 have lower loadings, indicating weaker relationships with the factor (Table 2).

The reliability analysis results indicate that the scale has high internal consistency reliability, as assessed by all three measures. McDonald's omega (ω) was 0.836, which indicates that 83.6% of the variance in the observed scores was attributable to the true score variance after accounting for measurement error. Cronbach's alpha (α) was also high at 0.817, indicating that the average inter-item correlation among the items was high. Guttman's lambda-2 (λ2) was the same as McDonald's omega in this case, which suggests that the scale has a unidimensional factor structure and that the proportion of common variance accounted for by the single factor is high. The measures for Factor-1 show higher reliability and internal consistency than all variables of scale (Table 3).

The AVE coefficient of 0.56 suggests that the factor was able to explain about 56% of the variance in the manifest variables. The CR coefficient of 0.90 indicates that the factor is highly reliable and that the manifest variables are highly inter-correlated. The high AVE and CR suggest that the factor is a good representation of the underlying construct and that the manifest variables are reliable indicators of the construct (Table 4).

Discussion

Our study reveals that adherence to the diet plan was moderate among type 2 diabetes patients of India, and therefore, it may be difficult to control FBG based on prescribed MNT. The fundamental set of diabetes care includes self-management education and support (DSMES), medical nutrition therapy (MNT), physical activity, smoking cessation counselling, and psychological care [16]. The American Diabetes Association emphasises that MNT is the base of the diabetes management

plan, and the requirement for MNT should be re-evaluated regularly by healthcare personnel. Collaborating with people with diabetes and paying special attention to their changing health status and life stages can be a significant approach to managing type 2 diabetes [17]. In India, there is a propensity to consume calorie-dense foods at the expense of a variety of foods, which may lead to micronutrient shortages as well as the emergence of type 2 diabetes and other related metabolic illnesses [18]. An umbrella meta-analysis mentions no evidence to favour any specific macronutrient composition or dietary style over others in published meta-analyses of hypocaloric diets for weight management in adults with type 2 diabetes. The most successful methods seem to be very low-calorie diets and formula meal replacement, which often provide less energy than self-administered food-based diets [19]. Another meta-analysis suggests that whole grains positively impact glucose metabolism [20]. However, the food processing and preparation method was important to maintain the structural integrity of the whole grains [21, 22]. Working groups from India, including the Indian Council of Medical Research (ICMR) and the Research Society for the Study of Diabetes in India (RSSDI), have framed treatment recommendations for diabetes using nutritional principles. The RSSDI supports comprehensive lifestyle changes, including MNT, to help patients achieve their ideal glycemic and lipemic indexes and improve their general well-being [23, 24].

The impact of MNT on diabetes strongly depends on adherence and compliance with the MNT. There were several measurement scales available for different management components. The ADQ (Adherence in Diabetes Questionnaire) scale determines adherence to insulin injections [25]. Another scale determines adherence to the Mediterranean diet [26, 27], and Diet Quality Index-International (DQI-I) is applicable for diet quality comparisons across countries [28]. The Perceived Dietary Adherence Questionnaire (PDAQ) was developed based on a Canadian food guide [29] and was not validated in India [30]. The scales for adherence to lifestyle advice [31] and multiple scales for measuring medication adherence were available [32-34]. For physical activity, the Global Physical Activity Questionnaire (GPAQ) [35], International Physical Activity Questionnaire (IPAQ) [36], International Physical Activity Questionnaire-Short Form (IPAQ-SF) [37] and Exercise Adherence Rating Scale (EARS) [38] were used in different research fields. However, it has been observed that MNT adherence was medium to poor in most studies [39-41]. The scales for measuring dietary adherence among diabetes patients were available [42, 43], but no validated scale was available to measure the prescribed dietary adherence among diabetes patients in India. In the present study, the underlying dimensions and structure of the D-DAS scale suggest that dimension-1 consists of the questions from D1 to D7, which have a good quality of representation and strong correlation, suggesting similarity in the structure of the scale. The D8 to

D10 was not directly related to the prescribed diet plan, as it was related to fruit, vegetable and fat intakes. The confirmatory factor analysis also shows that the underlying construct follows the MCA dimensions, and factor-1, which includes D1 to D7, shows strong factor loadings. The measure of construct validity suggests that the D-DAS scale confers a valid underlying construct and can be used for measuring adherence to diabetes diet plan/MNT in the Indian population. Adherence to dietary restrictions, for instance, depends on the market's ongoing supply of affordable dietary alternatives, their accessibility and affordability to the patient, and the patient's motivation for adherence and the provision of appropriate dietary advice. The low dietary adherence might also be due to a lack of accessibility, cultural inappropriateness, or difficulty in preparation. The Knowledge, Attitude and Practice-based intervention models can help increase dietary adherence among diabetes patients [44, 45]. To ensure reduced costs and more access to good foods, as well as the contrary for those posing an increased risk to health, these will necessitate readjusting national or state policies for food procurement, pricing, and marketing.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the study highlights that adherence to the diabetes diet plan was moderate among patients with type 2 diabetes in India. This low adherence to MNT may make it challenging to control fasting blood glucose based on prescribed MNT. The D-DAS scale was developed, confirming a valid underlying construct for measuring adherence to diabetes diet plan/MNT in the Indian population. The study suggests that comprehensive lifestyle changes, including MNT, should be encouraged among patients to achieve their ideal glycemic and lipemic indexes and improve their general well-being. Future research and policy can focus on developing and evaluating effective interventions to improve adherence to MNT and policy-based measures to ensure food security among diabetes patients.

Acknowledgements: We would like to thank the participants involved in this study and the health workers who assisted in the data collection. We would like to thank the authors (Mohammed MA et al., 2019) of D-DAS scale for provide us permission to use the scale.

Funding and Assistance: This manuscript is not funded by any organisations or institutions.

Declaration of Interest: None.

Author Contributions Statement: PK and SK designed the manuscript. SK and VS did the data cleaning and sorting of variables. SK and RS performed all statistical analyses. PK and SB interpreted the results. RS and SK developed all the figures. PK and VS wrote the manuscript. SB and PK reviewed the manuscript. All the authors had the decision to submit for publication.

Data Sharing: Data described in the article will be made available upon reasonable request from the corresponding author. The D-DAS scale (English and Hindi Version) can be used after sending an email to any authors.

References

1. N. G. Forouhi AM, V. Mohan, R. Taylor, and W. Yancy, ". Dietary and nutritional approaches for prevention and management of type 2 diabetes. BMJ. 2018;361:k2234.
2. Raj GD HZ, Soria Contreras DC, Babwik S, Maxwell D, Bell RC, Chan CB. Adherence to Diabetes Dietary Guidelines Assessed Using a Validated Questionnaire Predicts Glucose Control in Adults With Type 2 Diabetes. Can J Diabetes. 2018;42:78-87. doi:doi: 10.1016/j.jcjd.2017.04.006. Epub 2017 Jun 22. PMID: 28648765.
3. M. J. Franz AM, B. Barry et al. Effectiveness of medical nutrition therapy provided by dietitians in the management of non-insulin-dependent diabetes mellitus: a randomized, controlled clinical trial. Journal of the American Dietetic Association,.95:1009-17.
4. Ayele AA, Emiru YK, Tiruneh SA, et al. Level of adherence to dietary recommendations and barriers among type 2 diabetic patients: a cross-sectional study in an Ethiopian hospital. Clinical Diabetes and Endocrinology. 2018;4:21. doi:10.1186/s40842-018-0070-7
5. Ganiyu AB ML, Malete NH, Govender I, Ogunbanjo GA. Non-adherence to diet and exercise recommendations amongst patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus attending Extension II Clinic in Botswana. . Afr J Prim Health Care Fam Med. 2013;5:457.
6. Monnier L, Grimaldi A, Charbonnel B, et al. Management of French patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus in medical general practice: Report of the Mediab observatory. Diabetes & Metabolism. 2004;30:35-42. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/S1262-3636(07)70087-3
7. Cook PF SS, Reeder B, Horton-Deutsch S, Lowe NK, Meek P. Temporal Immediacy: A Two-System Theory of Mind for Understanding and Changing Health Behaviors. Nurs Res 2018;67:108-21. doi: doi: 10.1097/NNR.0000000000000265. PMID: 29489632; PMCID: PMC8592031.
8. Anjana RM PR, Deepa M, Datta M, Sudha V, Unnikrishnan R, Nath LM, Das AK, Madhu SV, Rao PV, Shukla DK, Kaur T, Ali MK, Mohan V. . The Indian Council of Medical Research-India Diabetes (ICMR-INDIAB) study: methodological details. . . J Diabetes Sci Technol. 2011;5:906-14. doi:doi: 10.1177/193229681100500413. PMID: 21880233; PMCID: PMC3192597.
9. Association AD. Standards of Medical Care for Patients With Diabetes Mellitus. Diabetes Care. 2003;26:s33-s50. doi:10.2337/diacare.26.2007.S33 %J Diabetes Care
10. Parajuli J SF, Thapa N, Ali L. Parajuli J, Saleh F, Thapa N, Ali L. Factors associated with nonadherence to diet and physical activity among Nepalese type 2 diabetes patients; a cross sectional study. BMC Res Notes. 2014 Oct 24;7:758. doi: 10.1186/1756-0500-7-758. PMID: 25344089; PMCID: PMC4230343. BMC Res Notes. 2014;24:758. doi: doi: 10.1186/1756-0500-7-758. PMID: 25344089; PMCID: PMC4230343.
11. Mohammed MA, Sharew NT. Adherence to dietary recommendation and associated factors among diabetic patients in ethiopian teaching hospitals. Pan African Medical Journal. 2019. pp. 1-11.
12. Des Jarlais DC, Lyles C, Crepaz N, et al. Improving the reporting quality of nonrandomized evaluations of behavioral and public health interventions: the TREND statement. American journal of public health. 2004;94:361-6.
13. Joshi SR, Bhansali A, Bajaj S, et al. Results from a dietary survey in an Indian T2DM population: a STARCH study. BMJ Open. 2014;4:e005138. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2014-005138
14. Research ICoM. ICMR Guidelines for Management of Type 2 Diabetes 2018. 2018. pp. 1-70.
15. Fornell C, Larcker DF. Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. Journal of marketing research. 1981;18:39-50.
16. American Diabetes A. 5. Lifestyle Management: Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes-2019. Diabetes Care. 2019;42:S46-S60. doi:10.2337/dc19-S005
17. Evert AB, Dennison M, Gardner CD, et al. Nutrition therapy for adults with diabetes or prediabetes: A consensus report. Diabetes Care. 2019. pp. 731-54.
18. Sachdev M, Misra A. Heterogeneity of Dietary practices in India: current status and implications for the prevention and control of type 2 diabetes. European Journal of Clinical Nutrition. 2023;77:145-55. doi:10.1038/s41430-021-01067-1

19. Churuangsuk C, Hall J, Reynolds A, et al. Diets for weight management in adults with type 2 diabetes: an umbrella review of published meta-analyses and systematic review of trials of diets for diabetes remission. Diabetologia. 2022;65:14-36. doi:10.1007/s00125-021-05577-2
20. Xu D, Fu L, Pan D, et al. Role of Whole Grain Consumption in Glycaemic Control of Diabetic Patients: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials. Nutrients. 2021;14. doi:10.3390/nu14010109
21. Shobana S, Geetha G, Bai MR, et al. Carbohydrate profiling & glycaemic indices of selected traditional Indian foods. Indian J Med Res. 2022;155:56-65. doi:10.4103/ijmr.IJMR_1935_19
22. Salis S, Virmani A, Priyambada L, et al. 'Old Is Gold': How Traditional Indian Dietary Practices Can Support Pediatric Diabetes Management. Nutrients. 2021;13. doi:10.3390/nu13124427
23. Bajaj S. RSSDI clinical practice recommendations for the management of type 2 diabetes mellitus 2017. Int J Diabetes Dev Countries. 2018;38:1-115.
24. Madhu S, Saboo B, Makkar BM, et al. RSSDI clinical practice recommendations for management of type 2 diabetes mellitus, 2015. Springer; 2015.
25. Kristensen LJ, Thastum M, Mose AH, et al. Psychometric evaluation of the adherence in diabetes questionnaire. Diabetes Care. 2012;35:2161-6. doi:10.2337/dc11-2342
26. Bishop KS, Yi W, Piper-Jarrett I, et al. A Questionnaire-based Assessment of Dietary Adherence and Identification of Barriers to Healthy Eating. The Open Nutrition Journal. 2019.
27. García-Conesa MT, Philippou E, Pafilas C, et al. Exploring the Validity of the 14-Item Mediterranean Diet Adherence Screener (MEDAS): A Cross-National Study in Seven European Countries around the Mediterranean Region. Nutrients. 2020;12. doi:10.3390/nu12102960
28. Kim S, Haines PS, Siega-Riz AM, et al. The Diet Quality Index-International (DQI-I) Provides an Effective Tool for Cross-National Comparison of Diet Quality as Illustrated by China and the United States. The Journal of Nutrition. 2003;133:3476-84. doi:10.1093/jn/133.11.3476
29. Asaad G, Sadegian M, Lau R, et al. The reliability and validity of the perceived dietary adherence questionnaire for people with type 2 diabetes. Nutrients. 2015;7:5484-96.
30. Ravel V, Jayaseelan V, Rengaraj S, et al. Adherence to medical nutrition therapy and it's challenges among antenatal women with gestational diabetes mellitus in South India- A sequential explanatory mixed-method study. J Educ Health Promot. 2023;12:28. doi:10.4103/jehp.jehp_930_22
31. Dubasi SK, Ranjan P, Arora C, et al. Questionnaire to assess adherence to diet and exercise advices for weight management in lifestyle-related diseases. J Family Med Prim Care. 2019;8:689-94. doi:10.4103/jfmpc.jfmpc_338_18
32. Alsous M, Alhalaiqa F, Farha RA, et al. Reliability & validity of Arabic translation of Medication Adherence Report Scale (MARS) & Beliefs about Medication Questionnaire (BMQ)±specific for use in children & their Parents. PLoS ONE. 2017. pp. 1-14.
33. Fialko L, Garety PA, Kuipers E, et al. A large-scale validation study of the Medication Adherence Rating Scale (MARS). Schizophr Res. 2008;100:53-9.
34. Agala CB, Fried BJ, Thomas JC, et al. Reliability, validity and measurement invariance of the Simplified Medication Adherence Questionnaire (SMAQ) among HIV-positive women in Ethiopia: a quasi-experimental study. BMC Public Health. 2020;20:1-16.
35. Armstrong T, Bull F. Development of the world health organization global physical activity questionnaire (GPAQ). Journal of Public Health. 2006;14:66-70.
36. Hagströmer M, Oja P, Sjöström M. The International Physical Activity Questionnaire (IPAQ): a study of concurrent and construct validity. Public health nutrition. 2006;9:755-62.
37. Lee PH, Macfarlane DJ, Lam T, et al. Validity of the international physical activity questionnaire short form (IPAQ-SF): A systematic review. International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity. 2011;8:115. doi:10.1186/1479-5868-8-115
38. Newman-Beinart NA, Norton S, Dowling D, et al. The development and initial psychometric evaluation of a measure assessing adherence to prescribed exercise: the Exercise Adherence Rating Scale (EARS). Physiotherapy. 2017;103:180-5.

39. Lafta RK, Ula F, Abdul Hameed AK. Compliance of Diabetic patients. Mmj. 2009;8:17-22.
40. Mahfouz EM, Awadalla HI. Compliance to diabetes self-management in rural El-Mina, Egypt. Cent Eur J Public Health. 2011;19:35-41. doi:10.21101/cejph.a3573
41. Tony A, Jadhav Y, Shinde S, et al. A study to analysis barrier to compliance of self care practice among patient with diabetes in selected area of mumbai. Sigman repository. 2018:1-42.
42. Toobert DJ, Hampson SE, Glasgow RE. The summary of diabetes self-care activities measure: results from 7 studies and a revised scale. Diabetes Care. 2000;23:943-50. doi:10.2337/diacare.23.7.943
43. van Lee L, Geelen A, van Huysduynen EJ, et al. The Dutch Healthy Diet index (DHD-index): an instrument to measure adherence to the Dutch Guidelines for a Healthy Diet. Nutr J. 2012;11:49. doi:10.1186/1475-2891-11-49
44. Chandalia HB, Bagrodia J. Effect of nutritional counseling on the blood glucose and nutritional knowledge of diabetic subjects. Diabetes Care. 1979;2:353-6.
45. Malathy R, Narmadha MP, Alvin Jose M, et al. Effect of a Diabetes Counseling Programme on Knowledge, Attitude and Practice among Diabetic Patients in Erode District of South India. Journal of Young Pharmacists. 2011;3:65-72. doi:https://doi.org/10.4103/0975-1483.76422

Table 1. The overall mean, median and percent of adherence and non-adherence to the prescribed diet.

Measures	Score (Mean±SD)	Score (Median IQR)	n	Percent (%)
Diet Adherent	7.77±1.25	4.0 (3-4)	56	53.85
Diet Non-Adherent	3.37±1.33	7.5 (7-9)	48	46.15

Table 2. The factor loadings obtained for factor-1 in CFA.

No.	Questions	Factor 1
D1	Do you sometime forget to follow the recommended dietary approach for diabetes?	*0.569*
D2	Over the past two weeks, were there any days when you did not take your dietary plan properly?	*0.962*
D3	Did you missed the proper dietary plan yesterday?	*0.785*
D4	Have you ever cut back or stopped the recommended dietary plan without telling your doctor because you felt unnecessary to do so?	*0.807*
D5	When you feel like your diabetes is under control, do you sometimes stop taking your dietary plan?	*0.669*
D6	When you travel or leave home, do you sometimes forced to stop following your dietary plan?	*0.609*
D7	Do you ever feel hassled about sticking to your dietary plan?	*0.789*
D8	Did you have feelings of dietary deprivation?	0.456
D9	Do you forget to include fruits and vegetables in your dietary plan?	0.010
D10	Do you forget to cut down butter and fat intake in your food?	0.470

**The considered factor loadings were in italics*

Table 3. The assessment of reliability and internal consistency of the diet adherence scale.

Estimates	McDonald's ω	Cronbach's α	Guttman's λ2
Estimate (all vars)	0.836 (0.766-0.906)	0.817 (0.725-0.883)	0.836 (0.775-0.889)
Estimate (Factor-1)	0.870 (0.813-0.927)	0.867 (0.795-0.918)	0.870 (0.807-0.917)

Table 4. The AVE and CR measures for construct validation of the scale.

AVE (Average Variance Extracted)	0.56
CR (Composite Reliability)	0.90



Figure 1. Scree plot showing the percentage of explained variance in various identified dimensions.



Figure 2. Plot showing the cos2 distribution along dimension-1 and 2.