

How Are University Food Environment Assessments Conducted?: A Systematic Review Protocol

Alicia Anne Dahl, Lilian Ademu, Stacy Fandetti, Ryan Harris

Submitted to: JMIR Research Protocols
on: December 05, 2023

Disclaimer: © The authors. All rights reserved. This is a privileged document currently under peer-review/community review. Authors have provided JMIR Publications with an exclusive license to publish this preprint on its website for review purposes only. While the final peer-reviewed paper may be licensed under a CC BY license on publication, at this stage authors and publisher expressly prohibit redistribution of this draft paper other than for review purposes.

Table of Contents

Original Manuscript..... 5

Supplementary Files..... 20

 Multimedia Appendixes 21

 Multimedia Appendix 1..... 21

 Multimedia Appendix 2..... 21

 Multimedia Appendix 3..... 21

 Multimedia Appendix 4..... 21

How Are University Food Environment Assessments Conducted?: A Systematic Review Protocol

Alicia Anne Dahl¹ PhD, MS; Lilian Ademu¹ PhD; Stacy Fandetti¹; Ryan Harris¹

¹UNC Charlotte Charlotte US

Corresponding Author:

Alicia Anne Dahl PhD, MS
UNC Charlotte
9201 University City Blvd
College of Health and Human Services
Charlotte
US

Abstract

Background: While the retail food environment has been well studied, research surrounding the university food environment is still emerging. Existing research suggests that university food environments can influence behavioral outcomes such as students' dietary choices, which may be maintained long-term. Despite a growing interest in assessing university food environments, there is no standardized tool for completing this task. How researchers define 'healthy' when assessing university food environments needs to be clarified. This paper describes the protocol for systematically reviewing literature involving university food environment assessments.

Objective: This paper aims to describe the protocol for a systematic review of the assessments of university food environments. The review will summarize previously used tools or methods and their implications.

Methods: Electronic databases, including PubMed (NNLM), Cochrane Library (Wiley), Web of Science (Clarivate), APA PsycInfo (EBSCO), CINAHL Complete (EBSCO), ProQuest Nursing and Allied Health, and Google Scholar will be searched for articles published between 2012 and 2022 using combinations of related MeSH terms and keywords. The electronic databases will be supplemented by reviewing the reference list for all included articles and systematic reviews returned with our search results. The review will include all study types, including randomized controlled trials, observational studies, and other pre-post designs. Articles that examine at least one aspect of the university food environment, such as cafeterias, campus convenience stores, and vending machines, will be considered for inclusion. Two reviewers will independently screen titles and abstracts, complete a full-text review, extract data, and perform a quality assessment of included articles, with a third reviewer resolving any conflicts. The Quality Assessment for Diverse Studies (QuADS) tool will be used to determine the methodological quality of selected studies. A narrative and tabular summary of the findings will be presented. There will not be a meta-analysis due to the methodological heterogeneity of the included articles.

Results: The initial queries of 4502 records have been executed, and papers have been screened for inclusion. Data extractions are expected to be finished by December 2023. Results are expected in 2024. The systematic review generated from this protocol will offer evidence for using different assessment tools for examining the campus food environment.

Conclusions: This systematic review will summarize the tools and methods used to assess university food environments where many emerging adults spend a significant part of their young adult lives. The findings will highlight variations in practice and how 'healthy' has been defined globally. This review will provide an understanding of this unique organizational food environment with implications for practice and policy. Clinical Trial: PROSPERO (CRD42023398073)

(JMIR Preprints 05/12/2023:54955)

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2196/preprints.54955>

Preprint Settings

1) Would you like to publish your submitted manuscript as preprint?

Please make my preprint PDF available to anyone at any time (recommended).

Please make my preprint PDF available only to logged-in users; I understand that my title and abstract will remain visible to all users.

✓ **Only make the preprint title and abstract visible.**

No, I do not wish to publish my submitted manuscript as a preprint.

2) If accepted for publication in a JMIR journal, would you like the PDF to be visible to the public?

✓ **Yes, please make my accepted manuscript PDF available to anyone at any time (Recommended).**

Yes, but please make my accepted manuscript PDF available only to logged-in users; I understand that the title and abstract will remain visible to all users.

Yes, but only make the title and abstract visible (see Important note, above). I understand that if I later pay to participate in <http://www.jmir.org/preprint/54955>, my manuscript will be published in JMIR Publications.



Original Manuscript

Protocol

How Are University Food Environment Assessments Conducted? A Systematic Review Protocol

Abstract

Background: While the retail food environment has been well studied, research surrounding the university food environment is still emerging. Existing research suggests that university food environments can influence behavioral outcomes such as students' dietary choices, which may be maintained long-term. Despite a growing interest in assessing university food environments, there is no standardized tool for completing this task. How researchers define 'healthy' when assessing university food environments needs to be clarified. This paper describes the protocol for systematically reviewing literature involving university food environment assessments.

Objective: This paper aims to describe the protocol for a systematic review of the assessments of university food environments. The review will summarize previously used tools or methods and their implications.

Methods: Electronic databases, including PubMed (NNLM), Cochrane Library (Wiley), Web of Science (Clarivate), APA PsycInfo (EBSCO), CINHALL Complete (EBSCO), ProQuest Nursing and Allied Health, and Google Scholar will be searched for articles published between 2012 and 2022 using combinations of related MeSH terms and keywords. The electronic databases will be supplemented by reviewing the reference list for all included articles and systematic reviews returned with our search results. The review will include all study types, including randomized controlled trials, observational studies, and other pre-post designs. Articles that examine at least one aspect of the university food environment, such as cafeterias, campus convenience stores, and vending machines, will be considered for inclusion. Two reviewers will independently screen titles and abstracts, complete a full-text review, extract data, and perform a quality assessment of included articles, with a third reviewer resolving any conflicts. The Quality Assessment for Diverse Studies (QuADS) tool will be used to determine the methodological quality of selected studies. A narrative and tabular summary of the findings will be presented. There will not be a meta-analysis due to the methodological heterogeneity of the included articles.

Results: The initial queries of 4502 records have been executed, and papers have been screened for inclusion. Data extractions are expected to be finished by December 2023. Results are expected in 2024. The systematic review generated from this protocol will offer evidence for using different assessment tools to examine the campus food environment.

Conclusions: This systematic review will summarize the tools and methods used to assess university food environments where many emerging adults spend a significant part of their young adult lives. The findings will highlight variations in practice and how 'healthy' has been defined globally. This review will provide an understanding of this unique organizational food environment with implications for practice and policy.

Trial registration: PROSPERO CRD42023398073;

https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospéro/display_record.php?RecordID=398073

Keywords: Universities; Nutrition Assessment; Nutrition Policy; Health Behavior; Young Adult



Introduction

Rationale

An optimal time to encourage healthy lifestyle habits is during young adulthood, specifically between the ages of 18 and 25 [1-4]. This transitional period from adolescence to young adulthood is critical for developing self-identity, self-efficacy, and long-term behaviors and lifestyles [4]. Research suggests diet quality, activity patterns, and overall health decline during this transition with exposure to unfamiliar environments and routines [5-7]. For many emerging adults, this period also means transitioning to college and shifting interpersonal influences [8].

The obesity rate among young adults in the United States has risen in the past decade from 24% to 29% [9]. This increase is partially due to unhealthy dietary and physical activity behaviors [10-12], which are modifiable. Since college students make up a considerable proportion of the emerging adult population globally, university campuses may be an optimal intervention point. For instance, 38% of emerging adults in the United States attended college in 2021 [13]. Many studies suggest that the transition to college is associated with poor dietary intake and excess weight gain, especially in the first year [14-18].

Poor dietary behaviors among college students are associated with decreased health, lower academic outcomes, and lower socioeconomic outcomes [19-22]. Thus, college students are ideal for interventions designed to improve dietary choices and promote healthy lifestyles. Adopting healthy nutritional practices by young adults might persist throughout adulthood, resulting in a reduced risk of chronic disease later in life [23-24].

The Social Cognitive Theory (SCT) emphasizes reciprocal determinism and provides a valuable framework for exploring how environmental factors or changes influence the attitudes and behaviors of college students [25]. The SCT and other related theories, such as the Socioecological Model, have been applied in several initiatives implemented within higher education in an attempt to promote healthy and environmentally sustainable campus communities [15,26-27]. Research indicates that these interventions have a significant role in shaping health behaviors among students, and college administrators play a critical part in developing and implementing policies that encourage healthy choices [26].

Beyond the design and implementation of health promotion interventions, research in this domain has examined the healthfulness of food environments [28-30], dietary and food purchasing behaviors of college students [31-34], food security among college students [35], nutrition security [36-37], food accessibility [38], menu diversity [39], and food sustainability [14,40]. These studies cut across different countries and post-secondary school contexts, providing valuable insights for designing effective nutrition policies on university campuses. An overlapping objective of most of these studies is to improve the healthfulness of campus food environments and fight the obesity epidemic among young adults.

The existing evidence regarding campus food environments and their impact on healthy eating behavior is still emerging. Recent literature suggests that university food environments offer less nutritious food options [41-42] and college students suffer from food and nutrition insecurity [43]. Notably, the COVID-19 pandemic altered the student experience and increased food insecurity among young adults [44]. At an institutional level, many university campuses have yet to develop policies to encourage the consumption of sustainable food options [26,45] or fail to coordinate efforts

to improve access to safety net programs (e.g., SNAP enrollment) for students experiencing food insecurity with limited resources [46]. Further, opinions on improving the healthfulness of food environments, menu diversity, food security, and food accessibility are diverse and context-specific [47]. Studies on the effect of environmental changes on dietary choices provide mixed findings. For example, research on the impact of calorie posting and nutritional labeling on dietary behaviors and choices of college students suggests both significant and non-significant positive effects [48-52]. Despite the burgeoning body of literature on campus food environments, research on the methods employed to assess campus food environments and their healthfulness broadly is lacking.

Further investigation is warranted because of the increasing interest in emerging adult health [53], campus food security, and university food environment research [54]. Universities are a unique type of organizational food environment in which they function as a “mini-city” [55], [56]. Many students, typically first-year students, are required to buy meal plans to obtain food on campus. As a result, these students may be limited to the options available on campus [8]. Such factors set university campuses apart from other consumer food environments and provide a unique setting for understanding its relationship with the dietary behaviors of emerging adults.

Systematic reviews of the broad retail food environment, including vending machines, exist [57-64]. Additionally, researchers have conducted systematic reviews of the impact of the campus food environment or food environment interventions on students’ dietary behaviors [65-67]. However, no systematic review has investigated how universities assess their food environments, how ‘healthy’ is defined, and the behavioral and environmental implications of conducting this type of assessment. As a result, there is a need for a concise understanding of the methods currently employed to evaluate the healthfulness of university food environments to address variation in practice and understand how researchers define ‘healthy.’

Objectives

This paper aims to describe the protocol for a systematic review of the assessments of university food environments. The review will summarize previously used tools or methods and their implications. Researchers, practitioners, and policymakers can review these tools when determining how to evaluate their campus food environment best. Further, public health nutrition researchers and university administrators can better understand how to look at campus food environments and determine areas for improvement. The systematic review will answer the following questions:

- 1) How are university food environment assessments conducted?
- 2) How is ‘healthy’ being defined? What guidelines are researchers using to determine ‘healthy?’

This systematic review would help researchers assess their campus food environment and may support the development of policies to create healthier university food environments. These actions may positively impact students' dietary behaviors or food choices.

Methods

Registration and Reporting

The present protocol was registered with the international prospective register of systematic reviews (PROSPERO), registration number CRD42023398073, and was prepared following the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (PRISMA-P) [68]. The full systematic review will follow the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-

Analysis (PRISMA) 2020 Guidelines [69].

Eligibility Criteria

Types of Studies

In addition to papers that focus on reporting the development or validation of measures, there are no restrictions on the type of study to allow our research team to capture assessment results that may be included as a component of behavioral or experimental studies. The review may include randomized controlled trials, observational studies, cross-sectional, non-randomized studies, feasibility and acceptability trials, and other pre-post designs.

Types of Participants

The review will include studies that assess at least one aspect of the university food environment, including campus convenience stores, dining halls, quick-service restaurants, and vending machines. Additionally, it will include studies examining the perceptions of the food environment from students, university employees, and other campus dining stakeholders.

Types of Interventions

This review is not solely focused on interventional studies. Instead, it will synthesize evidence from peer-reviewed published literature on the assessments of university food environments over ten years.

Comparators

Given the proposed focus on a descriptive summary of existing literature on university food environment assessments, studies with any comparison group and no comparison group are eligible for inclusion.

Types of Outcomes

The proposed review will focus only on assessment methods. Studies will be included in the review if there is a tool or method detailed for how data on the campus food environment can be collected and if original research findings were included. Secondary outcomes will be the guidelines or standards used to define “healthy” within these assessments (e.g., federal guidelines) and any policy recommendations provided as part of the publication (e.g., added sugar limits on vending machine products). Studies with no nutritional focus will be excluded from the review.

Timing

The date range of published articles to be included in the review is 2012-2022.

Setting

The setting includes all university/college/campus food environments (i.e., public, private, multi-site, or unspecified). University medical centers may also be included. The country of origin will be unrestricted.

Language

We will include articles reported in the English language.

Exclusion criteria

Regarding the criteria listed above, articles may be excluded from the review if they do not describe an assessment of the food environment. Dissertations, theses, and conference abstracts without an associated peer-reviewed publication will also be excluded from the final review.

Information Sources

We will search the following databases: PubMed (NNLM), Cochrane Library (Wiley), Web of Science (Clarivate), APA PsycInfo (EBSCO), CINHAL Complete (EBSCO), ProQuest Nursing, and Allied Health. We will not have any restrictions when searching the databases. The electronic database searches will be supplemented by reviewing the reference list for all included articles and systematic reviews returned with our search results. We will also search the gray literature on Google Scholar by examining the first ten pages of results yielded from our search.

Search Strategy

Both qualitative and quantitative studies will be included in this systematic review search. No study design, date, or language limits will be imposed on the search. At the conception of the research question, a librarian (RH) with literature-searching expertise worked to identify appropriate concepts and terminology for the research question. Our team identified three main areas for the search: food choice and eating behaviors, food environment and caloric information, and the college environment. A variety of terms were included for each concept. For food choice and environments, meal behavior, food choice, and purchasing behaviors were some of the included terms. For the concept of the food environment, a sample of included terms were meal plans, nutrition information, and food access. The college environment search included terminology such as university, college, and post-secondary. Subject term and keyword searching were applied to all searches when appropriate, depending on the database being used. The database search strategies can be found in multimedia appendix 1.

Additionally, spelling variations, phrase searching, and truncation were applied to allow for a comprehensive search. The librarian conducted an initial search in November 2022 for the team to review and refine the search. All library database searches were completed in January 2023. The Google Scholar search was completed in July 2023 to capture publications that may have been indexed late for 2022.

Data Management

Literature search results will be uploaded to Covidence, an Internet-based software program for systematic reviews [70]. The team will use Covidence for the screening and full-text review process. At each stage, a team discussion will occur to review and revise the criteria as needed.

Two review authors will independently screen the titles and abstracts in Covidence to determine if they meet the inclusion criteria. A third author will resolve any conflicts that arise during the screening process. Next, the articles that meet the inclusion criteria will be downloaded for review. Then, all reviewing authors (AD, SF, LA) will first independently review six articles and discuss the rationale for inclusion or exclusion before moving through the full-text review process. Once the full-text review has been completed by two authors, a third author will resolve any conflicts through

discussion. None of the authors will be blind to the journal titles, study authors, or institutions.

Data Extraction

Based on quantitative and qualitative data, this review investigates the types of assessments used to determine the healthfulness of a university food environment. We are examining how assessments have been conducted (e.g., observational, focus groups) and how 'healthy' is defined/what they are using as a guide (e.g., USDA guidelines, menu labeling/best practices). Two reviewers will extract the following information: article title, DOI, author(s), year, geographic location, subjects included, setting, assessment type, study design, sample size, sample type, sample characteristics, duration, study objective, primary outcome, secondary outcome, type of assessment, benchmark criteria for 'healthy,' and summary of findings. A third review author will review the extracted data, and any adjustments or updates recommended will be discussed among the reviewers. The data extraction sample tables are provided in multimedia appendices 2 to 4.

Quality Assessment of Included Studies

The Quality Assessment for Diverse Studies (QuADS) tool will be used to assess the methodological quality of selected studies (ranked on a scale of 0-3) in each of the following areas: theoretical or conceptual underpinning to the research, statement of research aim/s, clear description of the research setting and target population, the study design is appropriate to address the stated research aim/s, appropriate sampling to address the research aim/s, the rationale for the choice of data collection tool/s, the format and content of data collection tool is appropriate to address the stated research aim/s, description of data collection procedure, recruitment data provided, justification for analytic method selected, the method of analysis was appropriate to answer the research aim/s, evidence that the research stakeholder have been considered in research design or conduct, and strengths and limitations critically discussed [71]. Two reviewers will conduct quality assessments and any discrepancies will be brought to a third reviewer for additional feedback to reach consensus. Also, these ratings will be presented in a table to aid in contextualizing the narrative summary.

Data Synthesis

A summary of findings will be provided in narrative and tabular format (multimedia appendices 2-4) based on the outcomes reported in the studies reviewed, along with an indication of the quality of the studies resulting from our use of the QuADS tool. Because the methods used to assess university campus food environments are considerably heterogeneous, we will not perform a meta-analysis of outcomes associated with the assessments.

Software to Be Used

Article screening will be completed using Covidence [70]. Data extraction and synthesis will be conducted using Google Sheets.

Results

The research protocol was registered with PROSPERO (CRD42023398073), on February 8, 2023. As per the protocol, the initial queries resulting in 4502 total records have been screened by two reviewers, with conflicts resolved by a third reviewer. Data extraction and analysis were completed by January 2024. This protocol will lead to a systematic review of findings that offer evidence about existing measurements and opportunities for assessing college food environments. The forthcoming

results may provide researchers and academic institutions with a report of best practices for examining the healthfulness of the organizational food environment. Potential implications include informing policy and programs to improve the overall campus food environment. The results will be disseminated through a peer-reviewed publication expected in 2024.

Discussion

The university campus food environment has been identified as a contributing factor to the emergence of an obesogenic generation [17, 26]. Existing research on university food environments has focused on describing their healthfulness or evaluating population interventions aimed at improving college students' food choices and dietary behaviors [26-27,72-73]. This study is unique in that it will provide a comprehensive picture of tools that have been employed in assessing food environments where emerging adults, specifically college students, spend a significant part of their young adult lives. Compared to other review papers that broadly assess the college food environment to understand its implications for young adults' individual dietary behaviors and risk for chronic health outcomes, this study would provide a more nuanced understanding of the tools employed for such assessments at an organizational level.

This systematic review will have many significant strengths. First, it will provide a broad spectrum of methodologies for assessing the healthfulness of university food environments, including validated and non-validated instruments within and outside the United States. Second, we partnered with an experienced university librarian to develop a comprehensive search strategy of peer-reviewed and gray literature to identify studies that meet our inclusion criteria. Third, the study also considered all relevant study designs; qualitative and quantitative designs were considered in the inclusion criteria. Studies from different countries and regions were included to provide a global perspective of methods employed for university food environment assessments. Fourth, two reviewers were utilized for every stage of the systematic review, from title screening to data extraction. A third reviewer resolved conflicts as the review progressed. Lastly, the study was registered with PROSPERO and followed the PRISMA protocol for systematic reviews [68].

Despite the many strengths highlighted above, an obvious limitation of the study is the use of an established time frame of publication dates as an inclusion criterion; only articles published between 2012-2022 were selected for the data extraction. As a result, articles that have not yet been indexed at the time of our search or more recent articles published with unique methodologies may be excluded. Further, the initial search results indicated that most of the studies included in the systematic review were conducted in developing countries. Thus, the generalizability of the findings may be limited globally.

Conclusions

This review will contribute helpful information to address variation in practice and improve our understanding of how researchers evaluate the campus food environment designed to influence the dietary behaviors of emerging adults. As a result, this systematic review will be informative for a broader and more nuanced understanding of these terms with implications for practice and policy. Finally, we plan to provide wide-ranging consequences or recommendations that would benefit practitioners and researchers in nutrition policy design and evaluation. Notably, there is an opportunity to digitize objective campus food environment assessments to improve the data collection procedures and expand efforts to collect and compare data across institutions [74]. While this review focuses on assessing the food environment offerings, there is an opportunity to develop

digital approaches to capture subjective perceptions of college students and food hall patrons [75]. Overall, this systematic review will provide a comprehensive and updated body of evidence that will contribute to designing, implementing, and evaluating interventions to improve the nutritional choices and behaviors of emerging adults, specifically college students.

Acknowledgments

Not applicable.

Funding Statement

Support for this project was made possible by the UNC Charlotte College of Health and Human Services-Atkins Library Systematic Review Collaboration Pilot program which provided access to COVIDENCE software to conduct the systematic review.

Data Availability

Data sharing is not applicable to this article as no data sets were generated or analyzed during this study.

Conflicts of Interest

None declared.

Author Contributions

Conceptualization, A.D., L.A., S.F.; Methodology, A.D., L.A., S.F.; Software, R.H.; Validation, A.D., L.A., S.F.; Formal Analysis, A.D., L.A., S.F.; Investigation, A.D., L.A., S.F.; Resources, A.D., R.H.; Data Curation, A.D., L.A., S.F.; Writing – Original Draft Preparation, A.D., L.A., S.F.; Writing – Review & Editing, A.D., L.A., S.F., R.H.; Visualization, A.D., L.A., S.F.; Supervision, A.D.; Project Administration, A.D.; Funding Acquisition, A.D.

Abbreviations

SCT: Social Cognitive Theory

QuADS: Quality Assessment for Diverse Studies

PRISMA: Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analysis

Multimedia Appendix 1: Search strategy for the databases included in the review.

Multimedia Appendix 2: Data extraction for descriptive statistics of articles included in the study.

Multimedia Appendix 3: Data extraction for methods or tools used for the assessment of university food environments.

Multimedia Appendix 4: Data extraction for healthfulness definitions or benchmarks used in included studies.

References

- [1] M. C. Nelson, M. Story, N. I. Larson, D. Neumark-Sztainer, and L. A. Lytle, "Emerging Adulthood and College-aged Youth: An Overlooked Age for Weight-related Behavior Change," *Obesity*, vol. 16, no. 10, pp. 2205–2211, Oct. 2008, doi: 10.1038/oby.2008.365.
- [2] Y. Lee, T. Kim, and H. Jung, "The Relationships between Food Literacy, Health Promotion Literacy and Healthy Eating Habits among Young Adults in South Korea," *Foods*, vol. 11, no.

- 16, p. 2467, Aug. 2022, doi: 10.3390/foods11162467.
- [3] J. J. Arnett, "Conceptions of the Transition to Adulthood: Perspectives From Adolescence Through Midlife," *J. Adult Dev.*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 133–143, 2001, doi: 10.1023/A:1026450103225.
 - [4] K. Corder, E. Winpenny, R. Love, H. E. Brown, M. White, and E. van Sluijs, "Change in physical activity from adolescence to early adulthood: a systematic review and meta-analysis of longitudinal cohort studies," *Br. J. Sports Med.*, vol. 53, no. 8, p. 496, Apr. 2019, doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2016-097330.
 - [5] D. Demory-Luce, M. Morales, T. Nicklas, T. Baranowski, I. Zakeri, and G. Berenson, "Changes in food group consumption patterns from childhood to young adulthood: The Bogalusa Heart Study," *J. Am. Diet. Assoc.*, vol. 104, no. 11, pp. 1684–1691, Nov. 2004, doi: 10.1016/j.jada.2004.07.026.
 - [6] N. Larson, M. N. Laska, M. Story, and D. Neumark-Sztainer, "Predictors of Fruit and Vegetable Intake in Young Adulthood," *J. Acad. Nutr. Diet.*, vol. 112, no. 8, pp. 1216–1222, Aug. 2012, doi: 10.1016/j.jand.2012.03.035.
 - [7] E. Llanaj, R. Ádány, C. Lachat, and M. D'Haese, "Examining food intake and eating out of home patterns among university students," *PLOS ONE*, vol. 13, no. 10, p. e0197874, Oct. 2018, doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0197874.
 - [8] E. F. Racine *et al.*, "A College Fast-Food Environment and Student Food and Beverage Choices: Developing an Integrated Database to Examine Food and Beverage Purchasing Choices among College Students," *Nutrients*, vol. 14, no. 4, p. 900, Feb. 2022, doi: 10.3390/nu14040900.
 - [9] M. J. Park, J. T. Scott, S. H. Adams, C. D. Brindis, and C. E. Irwin, "Adolescent and Young Adult Health in the United States in the Past Decade: Little Improvement and Young Adults Remain Worse Off Than Adolescents," *J. Adolesc. Health*, vol. 55, no. 1, pp. 3–16, Jul. 2014, doi: 10.1016/j.jadohealth.2014.04.003.
 - [10] S. B. Racette, S. S. Deusinger, M. J. Strube, G. R. Highstein, and R. H. Deusinger, "Weight Changes, Exercise, and Dietary Patterns During Freshman and Sophomore Years of College," *J. Am. Coll. Health*, vol. 53, no. 6, pp. 245–251, May 2005, doi: 10.3200/JACH.53.6.245-251.
 - [11] S. Boek, S. Bianco-Simeral, K. Chan, and K. Goto, "Gender and Race are Significant Determinants of Students' Food Choices on a College Campus," *J. Nutr. Educ. Behav.*, vol. 44, no. 4, pp. 372–378, Jul. 2012, doi: 10.1016/j.jneb.2011.12.007.
 - [12] M. V. Fedewa, B. M. Das, E. M. Evans, and R. K. Dishman, "Change in Weight and Adiposity in College Students," *Am. J. Prev. Med.*, vol. 47, no. 5, pp. 641–652, Nov. 2014, doi: 10.1016/j.amepre.2014.07.035.
 - [13] National Center for Education Statistics, "College Enrollment Rates." Accessed: Jun. 20, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator/cpb/college-enrollment-rate#:~:text=The%20overall%20college%20enrollment%20rate%20of%2018%2D%20to%2024%2Dyear,%2D%20or%204%2Dyear%20institutions>
 - [14] E. Llanaj and G. T. Hanley-Cook, "Adherence to healthy and sustainable diets is not differentiated by cost, but rather source of foods among young adults in Albania," *Br. J. Nutr.*, vol. 126, no. 4, pp. 591–599, Aug. 2021, doi: 10.1017/S0007114520004390.
 - [15] Z. Buyuktuncer, A. Ayaz, D. Dedebayraktar, E. Inan-Eroglu, B. Ellahi, and H. Besler, "Promoting a Healthy Diet in Young Adults: The Role of Nutrition Labelling," *Nutrients*, vol. 10, no. 10, p. 1335, Sep. 2018, doi: 10.3390/nu10101335.
 - [16] W. El Ansari *et al.*, "Health Promoting Behaviours and Lifestyle Characteristics of Students at Seven Universities in the UK," *Cent. Eur. J. Public Health*, vol. 19, no. 4, pp. 197–204, Dec. 2011, doi: 10.21101/cejph.a3684.
 - [17] C. Vadeboncoeur, N. Townsend, and C. Foster, "A meta-analysis of weight gain in first year university students: is freshman 15 a myth?," *BMC Obes.*, vol. 2, no. 1, p. 22, Dec. 2015, doi:

10.1186/s40608-015-0051-7.

- [18] J. E. Pelletier and M. N. Laska, "Campus Food and Beverage Purchases are Associated with Indicators of Diet Quality in College Students Living off Campus," *Am. J. Health Promot.*, vol. 28, no. 2, pp. 80–87, Nov. 2013, doi: 10.4278/ajhp.120705-QUAN-326.
- [19] M. C. Whatnall, A. J. Patterson, T. L. Burrows, and M. J. Hutchesson, "Higher diet quality in university students is associated with higher academic achievement: a cross-sectional study," *J. Hum. Nutr. Diet.*, vol. 32, no. 3, pp. 321–328, Jun. 2019, doi: 10.1111/jhn.12632.
- [20] M. C. Whatnall *et al.*, "Recruiting and retaining young adults: what can we learn from behavioural interventions targeting nutrition, physical activity and/or obesity? A systematic review of the literature," *Public Health Nutr.*, vol. 24, no. 17, pp. 5686–5703, Dec. 2021, doi: 10.1017/S1368980021001129.
- [21] T. Burrows, M. Whatnall, A. Patterson, and M. Hutchesson, "Associations between Dietary Intake and Academic Achievement in College Students: A Systematic Review," *Healthcare*, vol. 5, no. 4, p. 60, Sep. 2017, doi: 10.3390/healthcare5040060.
- [22] F. Merhout and J. Doyle, "Socioeconomic Status and Diet Quality in College Students," *J. Nutr. Educ. Behav.*, vol. 51, no. 9, pp. 1107–1112, Oct. 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.jneb.2019.06.021.
- [23] M. J. Christoph, N. I. Larson, M. R. Winkler, M. M. Wall, and D. Neumark-Sztainer, "Longitudinal trajectories and prevalence of meeting dietary guidelines during the transition from adolescence to young adulthood," *Am. J. Clin. Nutr.*, vol. 109, no. 3, pp. 656–664, Mar. 2019, doi: 10.1093/ajcn/nqy333.
- [24] A. Steptoe, "Trends in Smoking, Diet, Physical Exercise, and Attitudes toward Health in European University Students from 13 Countries, 1990–2000," *Prev. Med.*, vol. 35, no. 2, pp. 97–104, Aug. 2002, doi: 10.1006/pmed.2002.1048.
- [25] K. A. Strong, S. L. Parks, E. Anderson, R. Winett, and B. M. Davy, "Weight Gain Prevention: Identifying Theory-Based Targets for Health Behavior Change in Young Adults," *J. Am. Diet. Assoc.*, vol. 108, no. 10, pp. 1708–1715.e3, Oct. 2008, doi: 10.1016/j.jada.2008.07.007.
- [26] C. P. Bailey, S. Sharma, C. D. Economos, E. Hennessy, C. Simon, and D. P. Hatfield, "College campuses' influence on student weight and related behaviours: A review of observational and intervention research," *Obes. Sci. Pract.*, vol. 6, no. 6, pp. 694–707, Dec. 2020, doi: 10.1002/osp4.445.
- [27] D. A. Dingman, M. R. Schulz, D. L. Wyrick, D. L. Bibeau, and S. N. Gupta, "Does providing nutrition information at vending machines reduce calories per item sold?," *J. Public Health Policy*, vol. 36, no. 1, pp. 110–122, Feb. 2015, doi: 10.1057/jphp.2014.38.
- [28] C. A. Borges, K. T. Gabe, and P. C. Jaime, "Consumer Food Environment Healthiness Score: Development, Validation, and Testing between Different Types of Food Retailers," *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health*, vol. 18, no. 7, p. 3690, Apr. 2021, doi: 10.3390/ijerph18073690.
- [29] T. Horacek *et al.*, "Multilevel Structural Equation Modeling of Students' Dietary Intentions/Behaviors, BMI, and the Healthfulness of Convenience Stores," *Nutrients*, vol. 10, no. 11, p. 1569, Oct. 2018, doi: 10.3390/nu10111569.
- [30] I. S. Pulz, P. A. Martins, C. Feldman, and M. B. Veiros, "Are campus food environments healthy? A novel perspective for qualitatively evaluating the nutritional quality of food sold at foodservice facilities at a Brazilian university," *Perspect. Public Health*, vol. 137, no. 2, pp. 122–135, Mar. 2017, doi: 10.1177/1757913916636414.
- [31] M. J. Hutchesson, M. C. Whatnall, and A. J. Patterson, "On-campus food purchasing behaviours and satisfaction of Australian university students," *Health Promot. J. Austr.*, vol. 33, no. 3, pp. 649–656, Jul. 2022, doi: 10.1002/hpja.551.
- [32] R. Roy *et al.*, "Dietary contribution of foods and beverages sold within a university campus and its effect on diet quality of young adults," *Nutrition*, vol. 34, pp. 118–123, Feb. 2017, doi: 10.1016/j.nut.2016.09.013.
- [33] R. Roy, D. Soo, D. Conroy, C. R. Wall, and B. Swinburn, "Exploring University Food

- Environment and On-Campus Food Purchasing Behaviors, Preferences, and Opinions,” *J. Nutr. Educ. Behav.*, vol. 51, no. 7, pp. 865–875, Jul. 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.jneb.2019.03.003.
- [34] E. F. Sprake *et al.*, “Dietary patterns of university students in the UK: a cross-sectional study,” *Nutr. J.*, vol. 17, no. 1, p. 90, Dec. 2018, doi: 10.1186/s12937-018-0398-y.
- [35] A. Gaines, C. A. Robb, L. L. Knol, and S. Sickler, “Examining the role of financial factors, resources and skills in predicting food security status among college students,” *Int. J. Consum. Stud.*, vol. 38, no. 4, pp. 374–384, 2014, doi: 10.1111/ijcs.12110.
- [36] S. Murray *et al.*, “Prevalence of food insecurity and satisfaction with on-campus food choices among Australian university students,” *Int. J. Sustain. High. Educ.*, vol. 22, no. 4, pp. 731–746, Jul. 2021, doi: 10.1108/IJSHE-09-2020-0348.
- [37] T. D. Watson, H. Malan, D. Glik, and S. M. Martinez, “College students identify university support for basic needs and life skills as key ingredient in addressing food insecurity on campus,” *Calif. Agric.*, vol. 71, no. 3, pp. 130–138, Sep. 2017, doi: 10.3733/ca.2017a0023.
- [38] F. D. K. Brito-Silva *et al.*, “College Campus Food Pantry Program Evaluation: What Barriers Do Students Face to Access On-Campus Food Pantries?,” *Nutrients*, vol. 14, no. 14, p. 2807, Jul. 2022, doi: 10.3390/nu14142807.
- [39] J. P. Enriquez and J. C. Archila-Godinez, “Social and cultural influences on food choices: A review,” *Crit. Rev. Food Sci. Nutr.*, vol. 62, no. 13, pp. 3698–3704, May 2022, doi: 10.1080/10408398.2020.1870434.
- [40] E. Larner *et al.*, “Reaction to a low-carbon footprint food logo and other sustainable diet promotions in a UK University’s Student Union ‘Living Lab,’” Feb. 2021, doi: 10.17170/KOBRA-202011192217.
- [41] K. M. Lee, M. L. Marcinow, L. M. Minaker, and S. I. Kirkpatrick, “The Healthfulness of Eateries at the University of Waterloo: A Comparison across 2 Time Points,” *Can. J. Diet. Pract. Res.*, vol. 81, no. 2, pp. 72–79, Jun. 2020, doi: 10.3148/cjdpr-2019-031.
- [42] K. Leischner, L. McCormack, B. Britt, G. Heiberger, and K. Kattelman, “The Healthfulness of Entrées and Students’ Purchases in a University Campus Dining Environment,” *Healthcare*, vol. 6, no. 2, p. 28, Mar. 2018, doi: 10.3390/healthcare6020028.
- [43] S. D. Lee, M. Hanbazaza, G. D. C. Ball, A. Farmer, K. Maximova, and N. D. Willows, “Food insecurity among postsecondary students in developed countries: A narrative review,” *Br. Food J.*, vol. 120, no. 11, pp. 2660–2680, Oct. 2018, doi: 10.1108/BFJ-08-2017-0450.
- [44] J. Soldavini, H. Andrew, and M. Berner, “Characteristics associated with changes in food security status among college students during the COVID-19 pandemic,” *Transl. Behav. Med.*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 295–304, Feb. 2021, doi: 10.1093/tbm/ibaa110.
- [45] K. M. Lee *et al.*, “Toward a Healthy and Environmentally Sustainable Campus Food Environment: A Scoping Review of Postsecondary Food Interventions,” *Adv. Nutr.*, vol. 12, no. 5, pp. 1996–2022, Sep. 2021, doi: 10.1093/advances/nmab026.
- [46] M. Dickinson, “SNAP, campus food insecurity, and the politics of deservingness,” *Agric. Hum. Values*, vol. 39, no. 2, pp. 605–616, 2022, doi: 10.1007/s10460-021-10273-3.
- [47] M. Story, K. M. Kaphingst, R. Robinson-O’Brien, and K. Glanz, “Creating Healthy Food and Eating Environments: Policy and Environmental Approaches,” *Annu. Rev. Public Health*, vol. 29, no. 1, pp. 253–272, Apr. 2008, doi: 10.1146/annurev.publhealth.29.020907.090926.
- [48] C. Hoefkens, C. Lachat, P. Kolsteren, J. Van Camp, and W. Verbeke, “Posting point-of-purchase nutrition information in university canteens does not influence meal choice and nutrient intake,” *Am. J. Clin. Nutr.*, vol. 94, no. 2, pp. 562–570, Aug. 2011, doi: 10.3945/ajcn.111.013417.
- [49] K. Stran, L. Knol, K. Severt, and J. Lawrence, “College Students’ Intentions to Use Calorie Information on a Restaurant Menu: Application of the Theory of Planned Behavior,” *Am. J. Health Educ.*, vol. 47, pp. 215–223, Jul. 2016, doi: 10.1080/19325037.2016.1179142.
- [50] C. K. Nikolaou, C. R. Hankey, and M. E. J. Lean, “Preventing weight gain with calorie-labeling: Weight Gain and Calorie-Labeling,” *Obesity*, vol. 22, no. 11, pp. 2277–2283, Nov.

- 2014, doi: 10.1002/oby.20885.
- [51] S. N. Bleich *et al.*, “A Systematic Review of Calorie Labeling and Modified Calorie Labeling Interventions: Impact on Consumer and Restaurant Behavior: A Review of Menu Labeling,” *Obesity*, vol. 25, no. 12, pp. 2018–2044, Dec. 2017, doi: 10.1002/oby.21940.
- [52] J. Song *et al.*, “Impact of color-coded and warning nutrition labelling schemes: A systematic review and network meta-analysis,” *PLOS Med.*, vol. 18, no. 10, p. e1003765, Oct. 2021, doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1003765.
- [53] J. A. Swanson, “Trends in Literature About Emerging Adulthood: Review of Empirical Studies,” *Emerg. Adulthood*, vol. 4, no. 6, pp. 391–402, Dec. 2016, doi: 10.1177/2167696816630468.
- [54] D. A. Cleveland, “What’s to Eat and Drink on Campus? Public and Planetary Health, Public Higher Education, and the Public Good,” *Nutrients*, vol. 15, no. 1, p. 196, Dec. 2022, doi: 10.3390/nu15010196.
- [55] K. Glanz, J. F. Sallis, B. E. Saelens, and L. D. Frank, “Healthy nutrition environments: concepts and measures,” *Am. J. Health Promot. AJHP*, vol. 19, no. 5, pp. 330–333, ii, 2005, doi: 10.4278/0890-1171-19.5.330.
- [56] I. R. R. de Castro and D. S. Canella, “Organizational Food Environments: Advancing Their Conceptual Model,” *Foods*, vol. 11, no. 7, Art. no. 7, Jan. 2022, doi: 10.3390/foods11070993.
- [57] K. Glanz, L. Johnson, A. L. Yaroch, M. Phillips, G. X. Ayala, and E. L. Davis, “Measures of Retail Food Store Environments and Sales: Review and Implications for Healthy Eating Initiatives,” *J. Nutr. Educ. Behav.*, vol. 48, no. 4, pp. 280–288.e1, Apr. 2016, doi: 10.1016/j.jneb.2016.02.003.
- [58] M. A. Matthews and T. M. Horacek, “Vending machine assessment methodology. A systematic review,” *Appetite*, vol. 90, pp. 176–186, Jul. 2015, doi: 10.1016/j.appet.2015.03.007.
- [59] A. Martínez-García, E. M. Trescastro-López, M. E. Galiana-Sánchez, and P. Pereyra-Zamora, “Data Collection Instruments for Obesogenic Environments in Adults: A Scoping Review,” *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health*, vol. 16, no. 8, Art. no. 8, Jan. 2019, doi: 10.3390/ijerph16081414.
- [60] L. A. Lytle and R. L. Sokol, “Measures of the food environment: A systematic review of the field, 2007–2015,” *Health Place*, vol. 44, pp. 18–34, Mar. 2017, doi: 10.1016/j.healthplace.2016.12.007.
- [61] A. Gustafson, S. Hankins, and S. Jilcott, “Measures of the consumer food store environment: a systematic review of the evidence 2000–2011,” *J. Community Health*, vol. 37, no. 4, pp. 897–911, Aug. 2012, doi: 10.1007/s10900-011-9524-x.
- [62] H. Charreire *et al.*, “Measuring the food environment using geographical information systems: a methodological review,” *Public Health Nutr.*, vol. 13, no. 11, pp. 1773–1785, Nov. 2010, doi: 10.1017/S1368980010000753.
- [63] P. Ohri-Vachaspati and L. C. Leviton, “Measuring food environments: a guide to available instruments,” *Am. J. Health Promot. AJHP*, vol. 24, no. 6, pp. 410–426, 2010, doi: 10.4278/ajhp.080909-LIT-190.
- [64] R. A. McKinnon, J. Reedy, M. A. Morrisette, L. A. Lytle, and A. L. Yaroch, “Measures of the Food Environment. A Compilation of the Literature, 1990–2007,” *Am. J. Prev. Med.*, vol. 36, no. 4 SUPPL., pp. S124–S133, Apr. 2009, doi: 10.1016/j.amepre.2009.01.012.
- [65] O. T. Caruso, H. N. Schaafsma, L. W. McEachern, and J. A. Gilliland, “The campus food environment and postsecondary student diet: a systematic review,” *J. Am. Coll. Health*, vol. 0, no. 0, pp. 1–25, Jul. 2023, doi: 10.1080/07448481.2023.2227725.
- [66] R. Roy, B. Kelly, A. Rangan, and M. Allman-Farinelli, “Food Environment Interventions to Improve the Dietary Behavior of Young Adults in Tertiary Education Settings: A Systematic Literature Review,” *J. Acad. Nutr. Diet.*, vol. 115, no. 10, pp. 1647–1681.e1, Oct. 2015, doi: 10.1016/j.jand.2015.06.380.

- [67] X. Li, A. Braakhuis, Z. Li, and R. Roy, "How Does the University Food Environment Impact Student Dietary Behaviors? A Systematic Review," *Front. Nutr.*, vol. 9, p. 840818, Apr. 2022, doi: 10.3389/fnut.2022.840818.
- [68] D. Moher *et al.*, "Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement," *Syst. Rev.*, vol. 4, no. 1, p. 1, Dec. 2015, doi: 10.1186/2046-4053-4-1.
- [69] M. J. Page *et al.*, "The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews," *BMJ*, p. n71, Mar. 2021, doi: 10.1136/bmj.n71.
- [70] "Covidence Systematic Review Software," Covidence. Accessed: Aug. 12, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://www.covidence.org/>
- [71] R. Harrison, B. Jones, P. Gardner, and R. Lawton, "Quality assessment with diverse studies (QuADS): an appraisal tool for methodological and reporting quality in systematic reviews of mixed- or multi-method studies," *BMC Health Serv. Res.*, vol. 21, no. 1, p. 144, Dec. 2021, doi: 10.1186/s12913-021-06122-y.
- [72] S. Vandevijvere, S. Mackay, E. D'Souza, and B. Swinburn, *How healthy are New Zealand food environments? A comprehensive assessment 2014-2017*. Auckland, New Zealand: The University of Auckland, 2018.
- [73] D. Mann *et al.*, "Development of the University Food Environment Assessment (Uni-Food) Tool and Process to Benchmark the Healthiness, Equity, and Environmental Sustainability of University Food Environments," *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public. Health*, vol. 18, no. 22, p. 11895, Nov. 2021, doi: 10.3390/ijerph182211895.
- [74] E. J. McMahon, R. Jaenke, and J. Brimblecombe, "A Mobile App to Rapidly Appraise the In-Store Food Environment: Reliability, Utility, and Construct Validity Study," *JMIR MHealth UHealth*, vol. 8, no. 7, p. e16971, Jul. 2020, doi: 10.2196/16971.
- [75] K. G. Elliston, B. Schüz, T. Albion, and S. G. Ferguson, "Comparison of Geographic Information System and Subjective Assessments of Momentary Food Environments as Predictors of Food Intake: An Ecological Momentary Assessment Study," *JMIR MHealth UHealth*, vol. 8, no. 7, p. e15948, Jul. 2020, doi: 10.2196/15948.

Supplementary Files

Multimedia Appendixes

Search strategy for the databases included in the review.

URL: <http://asset.jmir.pub/assets/4c806739617fe8b778ba81378c602e46.docx>

Data extraction for descriptive statistics of articles included in the study.

URL: <http://asset.jmir.pub/assets/5504f6ef1ae6d18e27a030d88e952c97.docx>

Data extraction for methods or tools used for the assessment of university food environments.

URL: <http://asset.jmir.pub/assets/f3ccde11959a48683eb5c2be203c04c6.docx>

Data extraction for healthfulness definitions or benchmarks used in included studies.

URL: <http://asset.jmir.pub/assets/92130f3a5870efbe88374d78190f4bd3.docx>