Neighbourhood food environments in the Southeast Asian context: Profiling energy density and macronutrient exposure with overweightness in 15,614 adults in Singapore

Pei Ma MSc[1], Yi Zhen Chew BSc[1], Haolong Song BSc[1], Mary Foong-Fong Chong PhD[1], Falk-Müller- Riemenschneider PhD[1,2], Shihui Jin PhD[1,#], Borame Sue Lee Dickens PhD[1,#*]

[1]Saw Swee Hock School of Public Health, National University of Singapore and National University Health System, Singapore

[2]Digital Health Center, Berlin Institute of Health, Charité-Universitätsmedizin Berlin, 10117 Berlin, Germany

[#] These authors contributed equally

*Correspondence to: ephdbsl@nus.edu.sg

Abstract

Background:

Within Southeast Asia and the Western Pacific, rising overweightness driven by demographic and economic changes raises concerns for urban liveability. Existing food outlet classifications overlook nutritional content, requiring alternative analyses to assess how food environments are shaping urban living.

Methods:

We compiled geolocated data on 14,764 food outlets across 2655 postal addresses in Singapore. The analysis incorporated built environment features, including transport networks and green spaces. This dataset was linked to socio-demographic and BMI data from 15,614 participants in the Multi-Ethnic Cohort Phase 2 study. Average calorie, carbohydrate, total fat, and saturated fat content, along with the proportion of meals exceeding 10% saturated fat, were estimated for 234 residential zones. Multivariable logistic regression models assessed the impact of these nutritional exposures on overweightness, adjusting for socio-demographics and environmental factors.

Results:

Neighborhood environments with higher availability of calories, carbohydrates, total fat, and saturated fat were positively associated with being overweight. Specifically, a one-unit increase in scores for calories, carbohydrates, total fat, and saturated fat corresponded to 6% (95% CI: 1%–12%), 5% (0.01%–11%), 5% (0.3%–9%), and 5% (0.02%–9%) increased odds of being overweight, respectively. Reduced green space was also linked to higher overweight risk.

Conclusions:

Associations between nutrient-dense food environments and increased overweight risk underscores the critical importance of urban planning strategies that facilitate healthier dietary behaviors and better public health outcomes.

Key words: Food environment, Macronutrients, Physical health, Overweightness, Geospatial analysis

Introduction

Overweightness and obesity are growing global urban health concerns, posing serious risks for non-communicable diseases[1] and highlighting challenges in creating healthy and livable cities. According to the WHO, worldwide obesity rates are rapidly rising in most countries, with more than 1 billion people affected[2,3]. Whilst the causes of these are multifaceted and complex in aetiology, including non-modifiable risk factors such as age, gender and genetics, the worldwide doubling of obesity prevalence between 1980 to 2022[4–11] signifies more rapid drivers of weight change. A key contributor is the increasingly obesogenic food environment, created through constrained physical and income-related barriers to healthy food choices, the widespread availability and palatability of energy-dense yet nutrient poor ultra-processed foods, and overconsumption behaviours driven by social influences such as advertising that targets hedonic eating.

Within Southeast Asia, rapid urbanization and commercial development have reshaped food retail landscapes, with over 74,000 convenience stores emerging by 2018 and some countries experiencing a 10% annual growth[12,13], altering residents' access to nutritious food. These stores typically have more nutrient-poor food options when compared to traditional markets[14]. Within Thailand, a substantial proportion of the population regularly consume sugar sweetened beverages (76.2%), packaged ready-to-eat foods (59.3%), and savoury snacks (48.3%)[15,16]. Projections of expenditure for sauces, dressings and condiments, ready meals and other highly ultra processed foods in 2021–2026 show expected growths up to 122%, representing shifting dietary preferences for high sugar, sodium, and fatty foods[15]. In Indonesia, the nutrition transition has resulted in the highest percentage increase within the region for adults becoming overweight between 1980 to 2016[17,18]. The percentage of energy from fat in West Sumatra has also increased from 11% to 23% between 1983 and 1999[19,20]. In Singapore, average total dietary fat has increased from 94g in 2019 to 100g in 2022 where 36% consists of saturated fat, exceeding the 30% recommendation[21]. Mean calorie intake from National Nutrition Surveys has also shown an increase from 2360kcal in 2019 to 2410kcal in 2022 where 61% of individuals are exceeding their daily recommended calorie intake even after factoring for physical activity[21]. Overall, a shift has been occurring with increased fat intake and reduced carbohydrates, away from more traditional Asian diets[22].

With demographic factors and individual socio-economic status being well-documented influencers of physical health[23–27], the role of the food environment in shaping health outcomes is

often assessed after adjusting for potential socio-demographic confounders[28–30]. To quantify its geospatial impact, studies have typically used the locations of western fast-food establishments[31–35], supermarkets[36–38], unhealthy or healthy food outlets[39,40] to proxy for caloric intake but these studies have reported mixed findings in associations with obesity[41]. The proximity, availability and density of these outlets are frequently measured, with similarly mixed observations[36,42–45]. One potential explanation for these inconsistencies is the availability of healthier choices, such as salads, in the western fast-food chains[46]. However, it is important to note that non-western commercial fast food, traditionally prepared foods, and casual dining can be equally or more calorific[47,48]. For example, Kway Chap, a popular local dish in Singapore, contains approximately 650 kcal per portion and 12 grams of saturated fat[49], both of which are higher than many fast food burgers. Thus, no particular type or group of food establishment could necessarily be identified as being overall healthier[50], negating the use of any binary classification with presence of absence data, and requiring more consideration on the macronutrient content provided[51,52]. To summarise, food establishment classification type[47], particularly in Asian settings, has been shown not to reflect the caloric or macronutrient content of foods[53].

This study constructs a high-resolution, geospatially defined food environment to explore how neighborhood nutritional exposures and urban space contribute to inequalities in BMI among residents. These findings also contribute to finding new ways to visualise and evaluate food space, beyond rigid food outlet classification. Here we use Singapore as a case study using Multi-ethnic Cohort data[54] of 15,614 adults, 14,764 geolocated food establishments trawled from Google Maps and land use data from 234 spatial zones. By integrating geospatial data with individual-level health outcomes, the described methodology can be replicated for other cities where data on food intake and environments are limited to explore how the foodscape is potentially impacting healthy urban living.

Materials and Methods

Data

Food environment data

The spatial distribution of food outlets in Singapore were collected over the course of 2022 and 2023 covering all food outlets, documenting key information for each food retailer such as type, name, postal address, and categories of foods provided.

Data sources trawled for this information included Google Maps, StreetDirectory and the Singapore Food Agency where information on 14,764 geolocated food establishments was collected. Similar estimates of this total have been derived by Statista[55]. A database was formed where each outlet had their food products collated, which formed standalone entries or meals. For each meal, nutritional data were then derived from the USDA Nutritive Value Booklet[56], USDA FoodData Central online database[56] and the Health Promotion Board[57], Singapore, Energy and Nutrient Composition of Food Database. For example, a common meal of Hainanese chicken rice of 330g has 524.72 kcal, 21.78g of protein, 19.75g of total fat, 7.55 grams of saturated fat and 64.47g of carbohydrate. Two analysts (PM and YZC) independently collected establishment menu information before cross-checking their data for validation. In the event of any discrepancies, a consensus was reached.

For spatial zonation, we used sectors of 954 spatial units where we averaged the macronutrient values of establishments within each unit and allocated a score from 1 to 10 depending on which quantile they fell into, matching geospatial food environment exposures to individual cohort participants (Figure 1a-e). These spatial units correspond to discrete residential areas that encompass high rise block or low housing clusters which are typically separated by roads and commercial areas.

Built environment data

We collected point data on intersections, bus stops, MRT (train) stations and taxi stands, line data on outdoor paths and roads, and polygonal data on landuse types such as commercial areas, residential areas and green areas. The point and line data were collected from OpenStreetMap extracts via the proprietary data extraction website GEOFABRIK[58], while the polygonal data were obtained from the Master Plan 2019 Land Use decomposition, provided by Singapore's open data collective[59]. Point density, line length and polygonal area coverage for the above were calculated for each of the 954 spatial units.

Socio-demographic and anthropometry data

De-identified individual-level socio-demographic, anthropometric, and geospatial data were sourced from the follow-up study of Multi-Ethnic Cohort Phase 2 (MEC2)[54], conducted between 2017 and 2021 as part of the Singapore Population Health Studies by the National University of Singapore. The cross-sectional dataset comprises information for a total of 19,700 participants who were recruited through home visits across various regions of Singapore. Socio-demographic

variables encompassed age, gender, ethnicity, education level, number of education years, marital status, work status, average earnings, housing type, smoking status, hypertension status, and total physical activity level. Anthropometric variables, including height, weight, BMI, and blood pressure, were measured during physical examinations of the participants[60]. Overweightness was defined based on the Asian BMI cutoff threshold of 23 kg/m^2 [61], which also includes obesity, while a blood pressure of 140/90mm Hg[62] or higher indicated hypertension. The residential address of each participant was mapped to one of the 954 spatial units in Singapore. Participants who shared a spatial unit with at most one other participant (4086) were excluded due to limited representativeness and insufficient statistical power. This led to a final sample of 15,614 participants from 234 spatial zones across Singapore for our study.

Mapping

Maps of the food, and built environment were created. Additionally, the proportion of food retailers where the saturated fat intake exceeded 10% of total calorie supply for the majority of meals was calculated for each spatial unit (referred to as the saturated fat contribution) to reflect the abundance of the high-saturated-fat food choices in the area, following recommendations on maximum intake by the WHO[63,64]. For environmental variables, however, we computed the density or proportion of areas within each spatial unit, whichever applicable. Lastly, we assigned all the summarized values of food and built environment variables to participants residing in the corresponding units.

Statistical Analysis

We summarized the counts and proportions for each socio-demographic or anthropometric attribute among all the 15,614 study participants, and within the overweight and non-overweight groups. Chi-square tests were performed for each factor to assess the independence between these factors and overweight status.

We further constructed multivariable logistic regression models to evaluate the impacts of socio-demographic, anthropometric, and environmental factors on individual overweight status. A baseline model was first developed to focus on six socio-demographic and anthropometric factors including gender, age, ethnicity, education level, work status, and hypertension status； each with relatively low correlations with one another (Figure S1, Table S1–S2). We then explored six other model variants to evaluate the influences of environmental factors and macronutrient availability. Specifically, in addition to the predictors in the baseline model, we included the abundance of green space, which was categorized into three levels based on the proportion of green spacing in the spatial unit (0 to <5%, 5% to <19%, and 19%+). We further incorporated a set of ordinal scores from 1 to 10, based on 10 quantiles from raw values, for macronutrients including calories, carbohydrates, fat, protein, and saturated fat, along with saturated fat contribution measured on a scale from 0 to 100. Please refer to Table S1 for detailed definitions of these variables.

To account for potential spatial disparities in the risk of becoming overweight, mixed-effect models were employed, in which the intercept was allowed to vary for individuals residing in different spatial units. This was implemented utilizing the R package lme4[65]. All analyses were conducted using R software[66].

Results

Information of 14,764 retail outlets were collected across 2655 postal addresses in Singapore, with some addresses accommodating multiple outlets. The data were then utilized to generate geospatial quantile scores for the nutritional environment (Figure 1a–e, Figure S2). The average age of 15,614 individuals included in this study was 49 years. Over half of the participants were females (54.2%) and the majority were of Chinese ethnicity (66.8%). Most participants were married (71.7%) and/or working adults (73.1%). Additionally, 22.9% had attained higher education (i.e., attended a university) and 61.2% of the participants were classified as overweight with a BMI at least 23kg/m^2 (Table 1). Significant differences between the overweight and non-overweight groups were observed for all the socio-demographic factors except housing type. Characteristics associated with a higher overweight risk included middle age, male gender, ethnicities other than Chinese, lower income and lower education levels. A strong association was also observed between overweight status and individual physical health conditions. Individuals with a history of smoking, regardless of current smoking status, as well as those with hypertension or physical activity levels, were more susceptible to becoming overweight (Table 2).



Figure 1. Geospatial distributions of food and built environment scores in Singapore. These include scores based on average calorie (a), fat (b), saturated fat (c), and carbohydrates (d) based on averaged nutritional content from food providers in 10 quantiles, as well as saturated fat contribution (e) and abundance of green space (f).

Table 1. Summary of the socio-demographic and anthropometric characteristics of the 15,614 participants, stratified by overweight status.

	Total (N = 15,614)	Overweight (N = 9548)	Non-overweight (N = 6066)	P-value^
Demographics				
Age (years)				
18-24	264(1.7%)	110(1.2%)	154(2.5%)	<0.001
25-34	2149(13.8%)	1101(11.5%)	1048(17.3%)	
35-44	3282(21.0%)	2060(21.6%)	1222(20.1%)	
45-54	4235(27.1%)	2780(29.1%)	1455(24.0%)	
55-64	3503(22.4%)	2214(23.2%)	1289(21.2%)	
65+	2181(14.0%)	1283(13.4%)	898(14.8%)	
Gender				
Male	7151(45.8%)	4806(50.3%)	2345(38.7%)	<0.001
Female	8463(54.2%)	4742(49.7%)	3721(61.3%)	
Ethnicity				
Chinese	10429(66.8%)	5526(57.9%)	4903(80.9%)	<0.001
Malays	2365(15.1%)	1810(18.9%)	555(9.1%)	
Indians	2820(18.1%)	2212(23.2%)	608(10.0%)	
Marital status				
Single	2960(19.0%)	1445(15.2%)	1515(25.0%)	<0.001
Married	11201(71.7%)	7183(75.2%)	4018(66.2%)	
Divorced	72(0.5%)	41(0.4%)	31(0.5%)	
Separated	898(5.7%)	542(5.7%)	356(5.9%)	
Widowed	483(3.1%)	337(3.5%)	146(2.4%)	
Social Economic Status				
Monthly household income (SGD)				
0 to <2000	3976(25.5%)	2429(25.5%)	1547(25.5%)	<0.001
2000 to <4000	4368(27.9%)	2754(28.9%)	1614(26.6%)	
4000 to <6000	3131(20.1%)	1961(20.5%)	1170(19.3%)	
6000+	2703(17.3%)	1560(16.3%)	1143(18.8%)	
Refused/Don't know/Missing	1436(9.2%)	844(8.8%)	592(9.8%)	
Education level				
A-level, equivalent, or lower	12040(77.1%)	7538(78.9%)	4502(74.2%)	<0.001
University or above	3574(22.9%)	2010(21.1%)	1564(25.8%)	
Education duration (years)				
0–10	6242(40.0%)	4004(41.9%)	2238(36.9%)	<0.001
11+	9372(60.0%)	5544(58.1%)	3828(63.1%)	
Work status				
Working	11407(73.1%)	7067(74.0%)	4340(71.5%)	<0.001
Student	422(2.7%)	162(1.7%)	260(4.3%)	
Homemaker	2301(14.7%)	1474(15.4%)	827(13.6%)	
Retired	834(5.3%)	473(5.0%)	361(6.0%)	
Unemployed	650(4.2%)	372(3.9%)	278(4.6%)	
Housing type				
HDB# 1–2 room flat	1413(9.0%)	906(9.5%)	507(8.4%)	0.28
HDB# 3 room flat	3537(22.7%)	2129(22.3%)	1408(23.2%)	
HDB# 4 room flat	6028(38.6%)	3691(38.7%)	2337(38.5%)	
HDB# 5 room or executive flat	4445(28.5%)	2704(28.3%)	1741(28.7%)	
Private property	191(1.2%)	118(1.2%)	73(1.2%)	
Physical Health				
Smoking Status				
Never smoked	11933(76.4%)	7100(74.4%)	4833(79.7%)	<0.001
Ex-smoker	1224(7.9%)	877(9.2%)	347(5.7%)	
Current occasional smoker	457(2.9%)	305(3.2%)	152(2.5%)	
Current daily smoker	2000(12.8%)	1266(13.2%)	734(12.1%)	
Hypertension				
Yes	2668(17.1%)	2075(21.7%)	593(9.8%)	<0.001
No	12946(82.9%)	7473(78.3%)	5473(90.2%)	

Total physical activity level (met-hr/wk)				
0 to <50	2905(18.6%)	1615(16.9%)	1290(21.3%)	<0.001
50 to <100	5134(32.9%)	3055(32.0%)	2079(34.3%)	
100 to <150	3733(23.9%)	2362(24.7%)	1371(22.6%)	
150+	3842(24.6%)	2516(26.4%)	1326(21.8%)	

^Between-group comparisons were performed using chi-square tests.
#Public housing types in Singapore

After adjusting for potential spatial heterogeneities, the odds of being overweight was estimated to be 75% (95% confidence interval [CI]: 64%–89%) higher for males than that for females. Among the five age groups, the highest odds was observed among the middle-aged, with a 45% (95% CI: 25%–67%), 54% (95% CI: 35%–76%) and 33% (95% CI: 17%–51%) increase in odds among those aged 35–44, 45–54 and 55–64 years, respectively, compared to the oldest group of 65 years and above. Nevertheless, ethnicity emerged as the greatest contributing factor to being overweight, with the odds of being overweight 200% (95% CI: 169%–236%) and 240% (95% CI: 208%–277%) higher for Malays and Indians, assuming other factors were constant. By comparison, the influence of education level and work status on overweight risk was less prominent. Particularly, the reduced odds observed among students and retirees, who were 33% (95% CI: 15%–47%) and 20% (95% CI: 5%–33%) lower, respectively, were potentially related to their ages. Furthermore, hypertension was also significantly associated with increased odds of being overweight, contributing to a 172% (95% CI: 145%–204%) rise in the odds (Figure 2).



Figure 2. Odds ratios for being overweight. Estimates for the six socio-demographic and anthropometric factors, presented as means (points) and 95% CIs (lines), were derived from the baseline model. Please note the difference in the logarithmic scales between the two panels.

The strongest association was with the saturated fat contribution, in which per percentage point's increase corresponded to a 14% (95% CI: 12%–15%) rise in the odds of being overweight. Other

statistically significant factors include scores for calories, carbohydrates, total fat and saturated fat with a one-unit increase in each score (i.e., from a lower 10-percentile group to the next) raising the odds of being overweight by 6% (95% CI: 1%–12%), 5% (95% CI: 0.01%–11%), 5% (95% CI: 0.3%–9%) and 5% (95% CI: 0.02%–9%) respectively. These results applied to individuals who were of the same age, gender, ethnicity, education level, work status, and hypertension status, and residing in the same spatial unit. Notably, a higher proportion of green space in residential areas was associated with lower odds of being overweight. In models employing nutritional factors as predictors, the odds consistently decreased by approximately 47% and 17% for medium and high levels of green space, respectively, compared to the reference low green space level. However, after adjusting for the saturated fat contribution score in residential areas, the risk reduction increased to 99% and 88% for medium and high green space levels, respectively (Table 2). It is also worth noting that the estimates for the six socio-demographic factors remained largely consistent across different model variants (Table S3).

Table 2. Estimated odds ratios (mean and 95% CIs) for the food and built environment predictors in Model 1–6. These six models respectively incorporated calories, carbohydrates, fat, protein, saturated fat, and saturated fat contribution as predictors in addition to socio-demographic factors (presented in Figure 2) and abundance of green space.

Predictor	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6
Abundance of green space						
Low (baseline)	1	1	1	1	1	1
Medium	0.53*** [0.47,0.61]	0.53*** [0.46,0.61]	0.53*** [0.46,0.61]	0.54*** [0.47,0.62]	0.54*** [0.47,0.61]	0.01*** [0.00,0.02]
High	0.83** [0.70,0.98]	0.83** [0.70,0.98]	0.82** [0.70,0.97]	0.82** [0.70,0.97]	0.83** [0.70,0.98]	0.12*** [0.06,0.22]
Macronutrients						
Calories	1.06** [1.01,1.12]					
Carbohydrates		1.05** [1.00,1.11]				
Fat			1.05** [1.00,1.09]			
Protein				1.03 [0.99,1.07]		
Saturated fat					1.05** [1.00,1.09]	
Saturated fat contribution						1.14*** [1.12,1.15]

* P-value < 0.10, ** P-value < 0.05, *** P-value < 0.01

Discussion

We examined how geospatial variation in neighborhood-level macronutrient exposure, using high-resolution data from 14,764 food establishments, was associated with BMI across a cohort of 15,614 individuals in Singapore. The analysis accounted for heterogeneity by age, ethnicity, gender, education status, high blood pressure, work status, and features of the built environment. We found that overweightness was associated with middle age groups, Indian and Malay ethnicities, males, lower education or non-working status, and lower local green space density, of which the latter has been observed elsewhere[67]. Average estimated macronutrient contents including total fat, saturated fat and carbohydrate were associated with being overweight, as well as total estimated caloric content across 234 spatial units where cohort participants resided.

Increasing food portion sizes and calorie content of meals in food establishments has been observed globally[68], which has been associated with increasing overweightness in multiple populations. In a UK study of 27 restaurant chains and 6 fast food chains across 13,396 meals, the mean energy content was 977 kcal, excluding drinks, snacks and desserts[68]. In a study of 223 meals in 111 food outlets in 5 countries covering Brazil, India, Finland, Ghana, and China, 94% of full-service meals and 72% of fast-food meals were found to contain at least 600 kcal, excluding desserts, snacks, and drinks[69]. The total energy content of fast food was also found to be significantly lower than meals at full-service restaurants in Brazil (34%; $P=0.03$), China (46%; $P<0.001$), and the US (29%; $P<0.001$)[69], highlighting that focusing on fast food establishments may not capture the impact of the food environment on caloric intake. In a macronutrient analysis of 45 typical meals across three major ethnic groups in Singapore, it was found that all foods, if consumed three times a day, also exceeded recommended guidelines for energy intake[47]. One typical serving of laksa, a locally consumed coconut curry noodle dish, contains approximately 40% of the recommended daily caloric intake, 40% for fat, and 30% for carbohydrates. Maintaining calorie intake under WHO recommended thresholds can therefore be very challenging as food establishments are typically serving high calorie foods as typical meals with any new regulations designed to reduce this across the many establishments being very costly and manpower intensive to conduct.

The effects of increased calorie content are further compounded by the fact that many urban populations in Asia eat very frequently out of the home, perceiving commercial fast-food outlets as luxury food, and local foods or full-service restaurants to be healthier options[70]. In Singapore, 77.3% of individuals can eat at least one meal out of the home every day, but these meals would typically be at affordable establishments such as food courts, locally known as “hawker centres”. Convenient and low cost, these food businesses do not necessarily mass produce food for commercial resale yet due to the immense competition between businesses, can increase their food’s high saturated fat and calorie content to be appealing to customers[71].

Increasing consumption of saturated fats, commonly found in meat and dairy products, have been thought to contribute to weight gain and heightened metabolic risk[72], mainly due to the relative

energy density of fat at 9kcal/g compared to carbohydrate at 4kcal/g. In assessing the quantitative and long-term impact of such dietary changes in randomized trials on weight gain, issues in adherence to the intervention and diet quality have emerged, causing different conclusions to be reached on the impact of high carbohydrate, low fat and high fat diets on obesity or overweightness[73–75]. In a US study of 41 518 women with 8-year follow up, a weak positive association between total fat intake and weight gain was observed, and a stronger association with saturated fat where each percentage increase in caloric contribution resulted in a 0.34kg weight gain[76]. However, in a study of 136,432 participants with 4-year changes observed, an increase in 100g/day of starch, added sugar and total carbohydrate intake was associated with 1.5kg, 0.9kg and 0.4kg weight gain, respectively[77]. Our geospatial study found that the increased availability of both these food groups was associated with overweightness, alongside caloric intake. Theories in the Asian context could include the long history of dependence on carbohydrates and relatively high cost of meat consumption, making high fat and low carbohydrate diets uncustomary[78]. Diets have instead become high in both fat and carbohydrate with globalization contributing to the greater availability of high-fat and nutrient poor foods[78]. Furthermore, in an expert panel's evaluation of Singapore's food environment, it was found that there was a lack of robust local government policies and zoning laws for unhealthy foods, and a lack of food-related income support for healthy foods[79]. This is furthering the consumption of unhealthy foods as heavily discounted quick service restaurants have little to no incentive to focus on the nutritional content of their food and instead on palatability and quickness of production.

Our data highlights that Singapore's high caloric, carbohydrate and fat environments are positively associated (Table S4), showing that meals are becoming more energy dense. This likely represents an increasing trend in Asian cities where more investigation on this is warranted. Thailand has observed increasing intake of sugar in excess above Planetary Health Diet recommendations for sugar (+452%), saturated oils (+20%) while vegetables (–63%) have fallen below PHD's lower limits[80]. In Java, Indonesia, 81.1% of outdoor food and beverage advertisements were found to be advertising unhealthy foods, high in sugars or saturated fats[81]. In a study of 1173 Malaysian adults, 21.3% of respondents were obese but this was not associated with frequenting fast-food restaurants[82]. This high resolution geospatial analysis supplements measured intake studies which are typically restricted in their sampling scales and may face bias from self-reporting[83], caloric measuring of meals where samples can be limited in both size and geospatial coverage, cohort studies lacking detailed dietary intake data, and random controlled trials where sample sizes are often constrained with only the dietary intervention's short-term effects being assessed. New large scale geospatially driven approaches are being explored such as the analysis of 62 million people's visits to food outlets in the US where a 10% increase in exposure to fast food outlets in mobile environments increased an individual's odds of visitation by 20%[84], the development of a retail food activity index using tracking data of 94 million US participants to 359 thousand food retailers, and diet tracking of 1.16 million US participants in their food consumption behaviours in their environments[85]. Of note is that most high-resolution geospatial evidence lies within the Western

context such as the United States, United Kingdom, Australia and Sweden with a dearth of analyses in Southeast Asia[86].

There are several limitations in our study. Our analysis aims to assess the impact of large-scale patterns of food environment exposures on overweightness and does not capture individual food choices, snacking behaviours or specific diets being carried out at home. We also assume that the majority of meals are consumed within an individual's neighborhood food environment. Within food outlets, heterogeneity exists although many standard meals are likely to be very similar in caloric profile. Large-scale sampling of food outlets over an expansive area is unlikely to be feasible and our method serves as a proxy. Our measure of overweightness using BMI allows for comparison with other studies but further investigations are warranted for hip-waist and hip-height ratios, which are additional measures of obesity. BMI does however serve as an indicator of overconsumption of calories within a large majority of individuals, especially those who are physically inactive, representing a large proportion of the population[87]. Whilst we controlled for multiple confounders, there may be other external influences such as advertising, promotions and popularity of specific outlets in districts that cannot be accounted for without food outlet purchase data. Our macronutrient classification into quantiles may also neglect some heterogeneities within zones although it should be noted that the 954 zones match residential clusters and are representative of their local food environments. Our study also did not explore the impact of grocery stores and food purchase decisions within, instead focusing on the eating-out culture which is a common daily practice. The impact of changing food environments also warrants investigation with longer cohorts and the collection of food establishment information over time.

Our geospatial study highlights that higher caloric exposure within the local food environments plays a role in individuals developing overweightness as individuals are exposed to more energy dense foods that are higher in both carbohydrate, fat and saturated fat content. We demonstrate the urgent need to implement urban planning strategies to reduce energy intake in urban populations within cities in the region such as Singapore that are facing rising overweightness and obesity burdens. The greater integration of food environmental planning in urban spaces, considering green space accessibility and the nutritional value quality of food in tandem, could require zoning, regulations or considerations in improving physical activity to access such spaces among younger individuals. Addressing obesogenic food environments is an utmost priority for urban liveability and public health and is often neglected in urban planning where accessibility and food density is prioritised. We also highlight the importance of considering the macronutrient content of food rather than food establishment classification as Western definitions of unhealthy foods do not necessarily apply in Asian contexts.

References

1. Non communicable diseases [Internet]. [cited 2025 Feb 24]. Available from: https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/noncommunicable-diseases

2. Obesity and overweight [Internet]. [cited 2025 Feb 21]. Available from: https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/obesity-and-overweight

3. Murray CJL, Aravkin AY, Zheng P, Abbafati C, Abbas KM, Abbasi-Kangevari M, et al. Global burden of 87 risk factors in 204 countries and territories, 1990–2019: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2019. The Lancet. 2020 Oct 17;396(10258):1223–49.

4. Williams EP, Mesidor M, Winters K, Dubbert PM, Wyatt SB. Overweight and Obesity: Prevalence, Consequences, and Causes of a Growing Public Health Problem. Curr Obes Rep. 2015 Sep;4(3):363–70.

5. Mokdad AH, Ford ES, Bowman BA, Dietz WH, Vinicor F, Bales VS, et al. Prevalence of Obesity, Diabetes, and Obesity-Related Health Risk Factors, 2001. JAMA. 2003 Jan 1;289(1):76–9.

6. Mazidi M, Banach M, Kengne AP. Prevalence of childhood and adolescent overweight and obesity in Asian countries: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Arch Med Sci. 2018 Oct;14(6):1185–203.

7. Misra A, Jayawardena R, Anoop S. Obesity in South Asia: Phenotype, Morbidities, and Mitigation. Curr Obes Rep. 2019 Mar;8(1):43–52.

8. Berghöfer A, Pischon T, Reinhold T, Apovian CM, Sharma AM, Willich SN. Obesity prevalence from a European perspective: a systematic review. BMC Public Health. 2008 Jun 5;8:200.

9. Baskin ML, Ard J, Franklin F, Allison DB. Prevalence of obesity in the United States. Obes Rev. 2005 Feb;6(1):5–7.

10. Ogden CL, Carroll MD, Curtin LR, McDowell MA, Tabak CJ, Flegal KM. Prevalence of overweight and obesity in the United States, 1999-2004. JAMA. 2006 Apr 5;295(13):1549–55.

11. Filozof C, Gonzalez C, Sereday M, Mazza C, Braguinsky J. Obesity prevalence and trends in Latin-American countries. Obes Rev. 2001 May;2(2):99–106.

12. Convenience stores turn to food to fuel growth in Southeast Asia - Nikkei Asia [Internet]. [cited 2025 Feb 24]. Available from: https://asia.nikkei.com/Business/Retail/Convenience-stores-turn-to-food-to-fuel-growth-in-Southeast-Asia2

13. Indonesia [Internet]. Food Export Association of the Midwest USA and Food Export USA–Northeast. [cited 2025 Feb 24]. Available from: https://www.foodexport.org/export-insights/market-country-profiles/indonesia/

14. Hawkes C. Dietary Implications of Supermarket Development: A Global Perspective. Development Policy Review. 2008;26(6):657–92.

15. Phulkerd S, Thongcharoenchupong N, Dickie S, Machado P, Woods J, Mo-Suwan L, et al. Profiling ultra-processed foods in Thailand: sales trend, consumer expenditure and nutritional quality. Globalization and Health. 2023 Aug 31;19(1):64.

16. Kosulwat V. The nutrition and health transition in Thailand. Public Health Nutr. 2002 Feb;5(1A):183–9.

17. Lowe C, Kelly M, Sarma H, Richardson A, Kurscheid JM, Laksono B, et al. The double burden of malnutrition and dietary patterns in rural Central Java, Indonesia. Lancet Reg Health West Pac. 2021 Sep;14:100205.

18. Rachmi CN, Li M, Alison Baur L. Overweight and obesity in Indonesia: prevalence and risk factors-a literature review. Public Health. 2017 Jun;147:20–9.

19. Roemling C, Qaim M. Obesity trends and determinants in Indonesia. Appetite. 2012 Jun;58(3):1005–13.

20. Lipoeto NI, Wattanapenpaiboon N, Malik A, Wahlqvist ML. Nutrition transition in west Sumatra, Indonesia. Asia Pac J Clin Nutr. 2004;13(3):312–6.

21. NATIONAL HEALTH SURVEYS HIGHLIGHT NEED TO FOCUS ON HEALTHY DIETS AND LIFESTYLES [Internet]. Ministry of Health. [cited 2025 Feb 24]. Available from: https://www.moh.gov.sg/newsroom/national-health-surveys-highlight-need-to-focus-on-healthy-diets-and-lifestyles/

22. Choi H, Song S, Kim J, Chung J, Yoon J, Paik HY, et al. High carbohydrate intake was inversely associated with high-density lipoprotein cholesterol among Korean adults. Nutrition Research. 2012 Feb 1;32(2):100–6.

23. Contoyannis P, Jones AM. Socio-economic status, health and lifestyle. Journal of Health Economics. 2004 Sep 1;23(5):965–95.

24. Carroll D, Smith GD, Bennett P. Some Observations on Health and Socio economic Status. J Health Psychol. 1996 Jan;1(1):23–39.

25. Freitas D, Maia J, Beunen G, Claessens A, Thomis M, Marques A, et al. Socio-economic status, growth, physical activity and fitness: The Madeira Growth Study. Annals of Human Biology. 2007 Jan 1;34(1):107–22.

26. Jelinek GA, De Livera AM, Marck CH, Brown CR, Neate SL, Taylor KL, et al. Lifestyle, medication and socio-demographic determinants of mental and physical health-related quality of life in people with multiple sclerosis. BMC Neurol. 2016 Nov 22;16(1):235.

27. Wan GJ, Counte MA, Cella DF, Hernandez L, Deasy S, Shiomoto G. An Analysis of the Impact of Demographic, Clinical, and Social Factors on Health-Related Quality of Life. Value in Health. 1999 Jul 1;2(4):308–18.

28. Minaker LM, Raine KD, Wild TC, Nykiforuk CIJ, Thompson ME, Frank LD. Objective Food Environments and Health Outcomes. American Journal of Preventive Medicine. 2013 Sep 1;45(3):289–96.

29. Lytle LA. Measuring the Food Environment: State of the Science. American Journal of Preventive Medicine. 2009 Apr 1;36(4, Supplement):S134–44.

30. Sallis JF, Glanz K. Physical Activity and Food Environments: Solutions to the Obesity Epidemic. The Milbank Quarterly. 2009;87(1):123–54.

31. Fraser LK, Clarke GP, Cade JE, Edwards KL. Fast Food and Obesity: A Spatial Analysis in a Large United Kingdom Population of Children Aged 13–15. American Journal of Preventive Medicine. 2012 May 1;42(5):e77–85.

32. Jeffery RW, Baxter J, McGuire M, Linde J. Are fast food restaurants an environmental risk factor for obesity? Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act. 2006 Jan 25;3(1):2.

33. Currie J, DellaVigna S, Moretti E, Pathania V. The Effect of Fast Food Restaurants on Obesity and Weight Gain. American Economic Journal: Economic Policy. 2010 Aug;2(3):32–63.

34. Dunn RA. The Effect of Fast-Food Availability on Obesity: An Analysis by Gender, Race, and Residential Location. American Journal of Agricultural Economics. 2010;92(4):1149–64.

35. Dunn RA, Sharkey JR, Horel S. The effect of fast-food availability on fast-food consumption and obesity among rural residents: An analysis by race/ethnicity. Economics & Human Biology. 2012 Jan 1;10(1):1–13.

36. Drewnowski A, Aggarwal A, Hurvitz PM, Monsivais P, Moudon AV. Obesity and Supermarket Access: Proximity or Price? Am J Public Health. 2012 Aug;102(8):e74–80.

37. Aggarwal A, Cook AJ, Jiao J, Seguin RA, Vernez Moudon A, Hurvitz PM, et al. Access to Supermarkets and Fruit and Vegetable Consumption. Am J Public Health. 2014 May;104(5):917–23.

38. Lear SA, Gasevic D, Schuurman N. Association of supermarket characteristics with the body mass index of their shoppers. Nutr J. 2013 Aug 13;12(1):117.

39. van Erpecum CPL, van Zon SKR, Bültmann U, Smidt N. The association between the presence of fast-food outlets and BMI: the role of neighbourhood socio-economic status, healthy food outlets, and dietary factors. BMC Public Health. 2022 Jul 27;22(1):1432.

40. Myers CA, Denstel KD, Broyles ST. The context of context: Examining the associations between healthy and unhealthy measures of neighborhood food, physical activity, and social environments. Preventive Medicine. 2016 Dec 1;93:21–6.

41. Atanasova P, Kusuma D, Pineda E, Anjana RM, De Silva L, Hanif AAM, et al. Food environments and obesity: A geospatial analysis of the South Asia Biobank, income and sex inequalities. SSM - Population Health. 2022 Mar 1;17:101055.

42. Li F, Harmer P, Cardinal BJ, Bosworth M, Johnson-Shelton D. Obesity and the Built Environment: Does the Density of Neighborhood Fast-Food Outlets Matter? Am J Health Promot. 2009 Jan 1;23(3):203–9.

43. Prentice AM, Jebb SA. Fast foods, energy density and obesity: a possible mechanistic link. Obesity Reviews. 2003;4(4):187–94.

44. Shearer C, Rainham D, Blanchard C, Dummer T, Lyons R, Kirk S. Measuring food availability and accessibility among adolescents: Moving beyond the neighbourhood boundary. Social Science & Medicine. 2015 May 1;133:322–30.

45. Gordon-Larsen P. Food Availability/Convenience and Obesity. Advances in Nutrition. 2014 Nov 1;5(6):809–17.

46. Goffe L, Uwamahoro NS, Dixon CJ, Blain AP, Danielsen J, Kirk D, et al. Supporting a Healthier Takeaway Meal Choice: Creating a Universal Health Rating for Online Takeaway Fast-Food Outlets. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health. 2020 Jan;17(24):9260.

47. Yeo PLQ, Bi X, Yeo MTY, Henry CJ. Energy Content and Nutrient Profiles of Frequently Consumed Meals in Singapore. Foods. 2021 Jul 19;10(7):1659.

48. Rina-Yu-Chin-Quek, Hui-Jen G, Christiani-Jeyakumar-Henry. Energy density of ethnic cuisines in Singaporean hawker centres: a comparative study of Chinese, Malay and Indian foods. Malaysian Journal of Nutrition. 2019;171–84.

49. Best and Worst Singapore Hawker Chinese Food: Hokkien Mee, Lor Mee and More - HealthXchange [Internet]. [cited 2024 Oct 14]. Available from: https://www.healthxchange.sg:443/food-nutrition/food-tips/best-worst-singapore-hawker-chinese-food-hokkien-mee-lor-mee

50. Lobstein T, Davies S. Defining and labelling ‘healthy’ and ‘unhealthy’ food. Public Health Nutrition. 2009 Mar;12(3):331–40.

51. Flatt JP. Macronutrient Composition and Food Selection. Obesity Research. 2001;9(S11):256S-262S.

52. Simpson SJ, Raubenheimer D. Macronutrient balance and lifespan. Aging (Albany NY). 2009 Oct 22;1(10):875–80.

53. Wang P, Huang J, Sun J, Liu R, Jiang T, Sun G. Evaluating the Nutritional Properties of Food: A Scoping Review. Nutrients. 2022 Jun 5;14(11):2352.

54. Whitton C, Wong YHM, van Dam RM. Longitudinal Associations of Marital, Parenting, and Employment Transitions with Weight Gain in a Multi-Ethnic Asian Population Aged 21 Years and Above. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2021 Jul 31;18(15):8115.

55. Singapore: number of F&B services [Internet]. Statista. [cited 2025 Feb 24]. Available from: https://www.statista.com/statistics/1241463/number-of-food-and-beverages-establishments-in-singapore/

56. USDA FoodData Central [Internet]. [cited 2025 Feb 24]. Available from: https://fdc.nal.usda.gov/

57. Energy & Nutrient Composition Search [Internet]. [cited 2025 Apr 2]. Available from: https://focos.hpb.gov.sg/eservices/ENCF/

58. GEOFABRIK // Home [Internet]. [cited 2024 Oct 12]. Available from: https://www.geofabrik.de/

59. data.gov.sg [Internet]. data.gov.sg. [cited 2024 Oct 12]. Available from: https://data.gov.sg/

60. Multi Ethnic Cohort Phase 2 (MEC2) – Singapore Population Health Studies (SPHS) [Internet]. [cited 2025 Feb 24]. Available from: https://blog.nus.edu.sg/sphs/population-studies/multi-ethnic-cohort-phase-2-mec2/

61. Appropriate body-mass index for Asian populations and its implications for policy and intervention strategies. The Lancet. 2004 Jan 10;363(9403):157–63.

62. Tay JC, Sule AA, Chew EK, Tey JS, Lau T, Lee S, et al. Ministry of Health Clinical Practice Guidelines: Hypertension. Singapore Med J. 2018 Jan;59(1):17–27.

63. WHO updates guidelines on fats and carbohydrates [Internet]. [cited 2025 Feb 24]. Available from: https://www.who.int/news/item/17-07-2023-who-updates-guidelines-on-fats-and-carbohydrates

64. Maki KC, Dicklin MR, Kirkpatrick CF. Saturated fats and cardiovascular health: Current evidence and controversies. J Clin Lipidol. 2021;15(6):765–72.

65. Bates D, Mächler M, Bolker B, Walker S. Fitting Linear Mixed-Effects Models Using **lme4**. J Stat Soft [Internet]. 2015 [cited 2024 Oct 12];67(1). Available from: http://www.jstatsoft.org/v67/i01/

66. R: The R Project for Statistical Computing [Internet]. [cited 2024 Oct 12]. Available from: https://www.r-project.org/

67. Sharifi Y, Sobhani S, Ramezanghorbani N, Payab M, Ghoreshi B, Djalalinia S, et al. Association of greenspaces exposure with cardiometabolic risk factors: a systematic review and meta-analysis. BMC Cardiovascular Disorders. 2024 Mar 20;24(1):170.

68. Robinson E, Jones A, Whitelock V, Mead BR, Haynes A. (Over)eating out at major UK restaurant chains: observational study of energy content of main meals. BMJ. 2018 Dec 12;363:k4982.

69. Roberts SB, Das SK, Suen VMM, Pihlajamäki J, Kuriyan R, Steiner-Asiedu M, et al. Measured energy content of frequently purchased restaurant meals: multi-country cross sectional study. BMJ. 2018 Dec 12;363:k4864.

70. Mandracchia F, Tarro L, Llauradó E, Valls RM, Solà R. Interventions to Promote Healthy Meals in Full-Service Restaurants and Canteens: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. Nutrients. 2021 Apr;13(4):1350.

71. Lone TA, Pence D, Levi AE, Chan KK, Bianco-Simeral S. Marketing healthy food to the least interested consumers. Journal of Foodservice. 2009;20(2):90–9.

72. Schelbert KB. Comorbidities of obesity. Prim Care. 2009 Jun;36(2):271–85.

73. Tobias DK, Chen M, Manson JE, Ludwig DS, Willett W, Hu FB. Effect of low-fat diet interventions versus other diet interventions on long-term weight change in adults: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol. 2015 Dec;3(12):968–79.

74. Johnston BC, Kanters S, Bandayrel K, Wu P, Naji F, Siemieniuk RA, et al. Comparison of Weight Loss Among Named Diet Programs in Overweight and Obese Adults: A Meta-analysis. JAMA. 2014 Sep 3;312(9):923–33.

75. Gardner CD, Trepanowski JF, Del Gobbo LC, Hauser ME, Rigdon J, Ioannidis JPA, et al. Effect of Low-Fat vs Low-Carbohydrate Diet on 12-Month Weight Loss in Overweight Adults and the Association With Genotype Pattern or Insulin Secretion: The DIETFITS Randomized Clinical Trial. JAMA. 2018 Feb 20;319(7):667–79.

76. Field AE, Willett WC, Lissner L, Colditz GA. Dietary Fat and Weight Gain Among Women in the Nurses' Health Study. Obesity. 2007;15(4):967–76.

77. Wan Y, Tobias DK, Dennis KK, Guasch-Ferré M, Sun Q, Rimm EB, et al. Association between changes in carbohydrate intake and long term weight changes: prospective cohort study. BMJ. 2023 Sep 27;382:e073939.

78. Seo JH, Kim HD. Cultural challenges in using the ketogenic diet in Asian countries. Epilepsia. 2008 Nov;49 Suppl 8:50–2.

79. Ho I, Chng T, Kleve S, Choi T, Brimblecombe J. Exploration of the food environment in different socioeconomic areas in Hong Kong and Singapore: a cross-sectional case study. BMC Public Health. 2023 Jun 13;23(1):1127.

80. Beckmann A, Strassner C, Kwanbunjan K. Thailand – how far are we from achieving a healthy and sustainable diet? A longitudinal ecological study. The Lancet Regional Health - Southeast Asia [Internet]. 2024 Oct 1 [cited 2024 Oct 25];29. Available from: https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lansea/article/PIIS2772-3682(24)00128-8/fulltext

81. Puspikawati SI, Dewi DMSK, Astutik E, Kusuma D, Melaniani S, Sebayang SK. Density of outdoor food and beverage advertising around gathering place for children and adolescent in East Java, Indonesia. Public Health Nutr. 2021 Apr;24(5):1066–78.

82. Abdullah NN, Mokhtar MM, Bakar MHA, Al-Kubaisy W. Trend on Fast Food Consumption in Relation to Obesity among Selangor Urban Community. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences. 2015 Aug 22;202:505–13.

83. Bailey RL. Overview of dietary assessment methods for measuring intakes of foods, beverages, and dietary supplements in research studies. Curr Opin Biotechnol. 2021 Aug;70:91–6.

84. García Bulle Bueno B, Horn AL, Bell BM, Bahrami M, Bozkaya B, Pentland A, et al. Effect of mobile food environments on fast food visits. Nat Commun. 2024 Mar 14;15(1):2291.

85. Xu R, Huang X, Zhang K, Lyu W, Ghosh D, Li Z, et al. Integrating human activity into food environments can better predict cardiometabolic diseases in the United States. Nat Commun. 2023 Nov 13;14(1):7326.

86. den Braver NR, Lakerveld J, Rutters F, Schoonmade LJ, Brug J, Beulens JWJ. Built environmental characteristics and diabetes: a systematic review and meta-analysis. BMC Med. 2018 Jan 31;16(1):12.

87. National Academies of Sciences E, Division H and M, Board F and N, Solutions R on O, Callahan EA. The Science, Strengths, and Limitations of Body Mass Index. In: Translating Knowledge of Foundational Drivers of Obesity into Practice: Proceedings of a Workshop Series [Internet]. National Academies Press (US); 2023 [cited 2024 Oct 25]. Available from: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK594362/