Public Health for Paediatricians: Fifteen-minute guide to identify and address food insecurity.
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Abstract

Food insecurity is a major problem in the UK. It has been both highlighted and exacerbated by the COVID-19 pandemic, and particularly affects children. The effects of inadequate nutrition manifest themselves in all stages of child development and adversely affect health and educational outcomes. Healthcare professionals working with children can address food insecurity at individual, local community, organisational and national levels. The government plays an important role in monitoring and responding to food insecurity, supporting children most in need.

This paper summarises how food insecurity can be identified and approached by healthcare professionals in clinical consultations, including the use of screening tools and awareness of risk factors that signpost family food insecurity. Examples of services and clinician assisted referrals to support vulnerable patients are provided, alongside suggested methods to implement further education for the multi-disciplinary healthcare team.

Introduction

The United Nations (UN) Food and Agriculture Organisation defines food insecurity (FI) as a state whereby a person lacks ‘regular access to enough safe and nutritious food for normal growth and development and an active and healthy life’\(^1\). FI can manifest in different ways, and often follows seasonal or cyclical patterns. People may reduce their food intake, follow unhealthy dietary patterns, and consume nutritionally unbalanced meals to compensate.

The UN Convention on the Rights of the Child outline that children have the right to adequately nutritious food, and where parents and caregivers cannot provide this, State Parties should provide assistance to families\(^2\). In this article, we hope to raise awareness of FI among the families of children and young people, and the detrimental impacts it can have on health and development (box 1). We provide practical solutions for how child and young person FI can be prevented, identified, assessed, and addressed by healthcare professionals (HCPs).

Defining the problem of child and young person food insecurity in the UK

Children are particularly affected by FI in the UK. In 2016, 11.5% of households with children were estimated to have experienced FI and by September 2020, this figure was estimated to have risen to 14%\(^3\). This equates to 4 million people, including 2.3 million children\(^3\). Households were deemed food insecure if any household member had smaller meals, skipped meals, been hungry but not eaten, or gone a whole day without eating because they could not afford or access food. In 2019, 1.3 million children were eligible for free school meals (FSM), an indicator of FI\(^4\). However, a further 1 million children experiencing FI were ineligible to receive FSM\(^4\), suggesting the current eligibility criteria do not meet all children’s food requirements. The COVID-19 pandemic has contributed to increased financial insecurity and unemployment, not only highlighting but also exacerbating FI for families with children\(^5\).
The impact of food insecurity on health and educational outcomes

Box 1: The effects of FI in different stages of child development

Since eating behaviours are formed during early life, the effects of poor nutrition are transient and manifest themselves in all stages of child development. As FI is inextricably linked to other social issues such as poverty, it is challenging to isolate the effects of hunger on physical and mental wellbeing. Below we describe the main effects on key developmental stages:

- **In utero and early years**: faltering growth; delayed cognitive and behavioral development, diminished immunocompetence, vitamin A deficiency and anaemia.6
- **School years**: development of childhood asthma4 and iron deficiency, which is often associated with learning impairment and decreased productivity7.
- **Adolescence**: mental health risks (depression, suicidal thoughts), substance abuse disorders, behavioural consequences (hyperkinesia, reduced academic performance)7.
- **Adulthood**: adult disease, including COPD4,7, cardiovascular disease and cancers, asthma, autoimmune disease7. Survivors of malnutrition also suffer from diminished intellectual performance and low work capacity in adulthood7. Studies controlling for variables such as educational attainment and income have established associations of FI with hypertension and hyperlipidemia8.

Addressing food insecurity

During your clinical consultation

1. Growth should be assessed by recording and plotting weight, height and BMI on growth charts, comparing with previous measurements. This will enable the recognition of an abnormal Body mass index (BMI) or faltering growth9. Recognise that both a low and high BMI can be a sign of FI.
2. Patients should be assessed for associations or comorbidities of malnutrition such as iron deficiency anaemia, tooth decay and impaired cognitive or physical development.
3. Poor control of some long-term conditions such as asthma, diabetes and poor mental health could be related to FI10.
4. A history should address education, home environment, family background, family finances and parental factors. Be aware of risk factors of FI (Figure 1).
5. FI screening can aid in identification of FI14 (Box 2).
6. If FI risk factors are presented or FI is suspected, take a more detailed dietary history for the household. It is important to understand nutritional value of food (e.g. asking about fresh fruit and vegetable intake) and eating behaviours (e.g. asking about daily meal frequency and how many meals are homemade, frozen or a fast-food).
Figure 1: Food Insecurity Risk Factors

This figure outlines the main risk factors that predispose families to food insecurity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finance</th>
<th>Family background</th>
<th>Parental factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Unemployment and underemployment$^{10}$</td>
<td>• Immigrant families$^{10}$</td>
<td>• Families headed by single women$^{10,18}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Low-income households$^{18}$</td>
<td>• Families that are new to the community$^{18}$</td>
<td>• Poor parental mental health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Housing problems$^{18}$</td>
<td>• Families with lower levels of education$^{10}$</td>
<td>• Mothers who experienced childhood sexual abuse$^{16}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Receipt of benefits</td>
<td>• Children in large families ($&gt;4$ children)$^{15,18}$, especially with older children$^{18}$</td>
<td>• Parental separation or divorce$^{10}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Childhood disability</td>
<td>• Domestic violence$^{16}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Parental drug misuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Learning difficulties</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To approach food insecurity sensitively:

HCPs have reported difficulty in initiating FI conversations$^{21}$. Some suggested approaches are outlined:

1. Reassure that surveillance questions are asked routinely so that patients do not feel singled out$^{11}$.
2. Open-ended questions should be used to explore patient concerns. This could include: "Please let me know if either you or someone from your family has been feeling hungry in the past few weeks".
3. Written/electronic surveillance is preferred over verbal FI surveillance. These increase FI disclosure$^{12}$ as patients may feel less comfortable when sharing FI experiences verbally.
4. Resources such as posters can inform patients of the high prevalence of FI and normalise discussions$^{13}$.

Screening Tools

Screening tools could be implemented routinely for all children engaging with primary or secondary care services and can be administered by multi-disciplinary team members. To facilitate routine questioning, screening tool prompts can be added to electronic health records or documentation proformas. Alternatively, screening might be targeted at children presenting with conditions associated with, or risk factors for FI (Figure 1). Screening tools are especially significant given that children may not have physical signs, abnormal weight or BMI or abnormal investigations$^{15}$. We provide examples of the Hunger-Vital Signs and Household Food Insecurity Survey (HFSS), which are screening tools for FI in Box 2.

It is important for those delivering the screening tool to recognise its disadvantages. The screening tools do not acknowledge different household members may experience varying levels of FI and ignore non-economic reasons, such as availability of transportation to access food, neglect due to parental health problems, and the nature or schedule of parental occupation. Furthermore, frequency of FI experiences is used as a measure of severity$^{17}$, thus, one may be less likely to identify newly developed, seasonal, or marginal FI.
Box 2: Examples of Screening Tools

**Hunger-Vital Signs**
This is a 2-item screening tool\(^\text{15}\) that identifies household FI in a short and accurate manner. It can be adapted to capture FI in the past 30 days or 12 months

1. Within the past 12 months we worried whether our food would run out before we got money to buy more.
2. Within the past 12 months the food we bought just didn’t last and we didn’t have money to get more.

**Household Food Security Survey**
An 18-item screen used to assess household FI with the use of a numerical scale\(^\text{16}\). It can be shortened to six-items if needed, as shown below, however, it will not capture the more severe levels of food insecurity\(^\text{16}\).

Q1) “The food that (I/we) bought just didn’t last, and (I/we) didn’t have money to get more.” Was that often, sometimes, or never true for (you/your household) in the last 12 months?

Q2) “(I/we) couldn’t afford to eat balanced meals.” Was that often, sometimes, or never true for (you/your household) in the last 12 months?

Q3) In the last 12 months, since (date 12 months ago) did (you/you or other adults in your household) ever cut the size of your meals or skip meals because there wasn’t enough money for food? (YES/NO)

Q4) (Ask only if Q3 = YES) How often did this happen – almost every month, some months but not every month, or in only 1 or 2 months?
*Optional to repeat Q4, if Q1 and Q2 are affirmative

Q5) In the last 12 months, did you ever eat less than you felt you should because there wasn’t enough money to buy food? (YES/NO)

Q6) In the last 12 months, were you ever hungry but didn’t eat because you couldn’t afford enough food? (YES/NO)

*Food security status level can be categorised as “food secure”, “food insecure without hunger” or “food insecure with hunger” according to the number of affirmative responses\(^\text{16}\).*

**How can healthcare professionals address food insecurity among children and young people?**

**Individual level**
The consultation is a valuable interaction for HCPs to initiate conversations about FI in a non-judgemental manner and offer solutions for support. Facilitation of enrolment to relevant services is beneficial. HCPs in primary and secondary care can refer patients to social prescribing link workers or services. These are valuable in signposting to programmes focusing on financial support, provision of
meals, education, and community initiatives. An example of a local initiative which aims to increase food security is provided in Box 3.

Some of the most frequently selected interventions around the UK include benefit application support and food banks. The UK has approximately 2100 food banks, mostly operated by The Trussell Trust, and other charities offering free meals.\textsuperscript{18}

Box 3: Community Food Insecurity Services: Southwark community dietetic project\textsuperscript{19}

Southwark, like many other boroughs, is extensively affected by food insecurity as many residents, especially those who rely on benefits, are unable to afford basic food items. According to London’s first measure of food insecurity in 2018-2019, ‘1 in 4 Southwark residents over age 16 are likely to be food insecure’.\textsuperscript{18}

The borough decided to tackle this problem by encouraging food resilience and creating a strong community food network. To achieve this, they organised a community action project that runs six-week cook and eat well courses, teaching families the importance of budgeting and discussing the cost of different foods and how to prepare healthy meals on a budget. For families using food banks, the courses aim to instruct them on how to use the food they receive to prepare nutritious meals, hence promoting food security in the context of money management.

The Southwark community dietetic project is only one initiative out of many. The full action plan for food insecurity in Southwark consists of several actions noting significant achievements including the use of 23 tonnes of surplus food monthly by Southwark organisations who work with the food insecure, and the involvement of more than 60 member organisations in the Southwark Food Action Alliance.

The Southwark approach to creating food security (19, p.13)
Organisational level

Studies have shown HCPs show varied levels of FI knowledge and many perceive there is little in their power that can be done. An example of an organisation that has recognised this and implemented strategies to mitigate this can be found in Box 4.

Some practical ways to educate HCPs about FI could include:

- Allocate a member of the multi-disciplinary team to be responsible for FI. This includes having awareness of policy and programmes, introducing, and updating surveillance processes and organisation of education for staff.
- Multidisciplinary case-based discussions to raise awareness amongst staff and provide resources to support children and their families.
- Create or distribute a poster or infographic of the local available resources that HCPs can utilise when referring patients.

**Box 4: Kaiser Permanente Food Insecurity Intervention**

The team at Kaiser Permanente in Colorado (KPCO) started a 3-month pilot, where they introduced measures to target paediatric food insecurity in their practice. At the beginning of the pilot in 2011, food insecurity rate in Colorado was 13.9% and it ranked in the bottom 10 states for participation in federal nutrition programmes. It was designed to promote food security and improve health outcomes in KPCO and the community.

**Screening Programme**

KPCO used the Hunger-Vital signs screening tool by providing patients with a paper-form at check-in. The team has now focused their work on determining what factors enable their own and external practices to implement food insecurity screening most effectively (predictive modelling to target high-risk groups).

**Educational Intervention**

It had been established that the clinical teams at KPCO lacked awareness of the prevalence and health outcomes of food insecurity. Furthermore, they felt uncomfortable discussing food insecurity with patients. The educational intervention included educational handouts, case study presentations and educational discussions at departmental meetings. Communication skill-building exercises using simulation and written scripts were held to increase the comfort of staff in discussing food insecurity. At the end of the pilot, staff felt informed enough to be able to form a community and clinic integration committee to expand this programme into other clinical departments.

**Referral Process**

The team at KPCO developed an active referral process by asking parents' permission to share their necessary demographics with the non-profit, Hunger Free Colorado (HFC), so that a HFC representative could call them to discuss food resources. This increased the percentage of referred parents who spoke with an HFC representative from 5% to 75%.
National level

Although food banks across the UK hugely benefit food insecure households, there is a growing need for more support to be made available through the development of national policies addressing FI. Some examples of advocacy initiatives and evidenced-based policies that healthcare professionals working with children and young people can support are outlined below.

Universal Free School Meals

One approach to tackling paediatric FI could be to introduce universal FSM, whereby meals would be provided at no cost to all children wanting to participate. One systematic review analysing universal FSM found there to be significant evidence supporting its introduction\textsuperscript{21}, as below.

- Greater school meal participation amongst students both previously qualifying and non-qualifying for FSM\textsuperscript{21}, suggesting universal FSM may reduce stigma and reach children in need from non-qualifying families.
- Associated with improved diet quality, BMI and academic performance\textsuperscript{21}, indicating this policy could reduce diet-based disparities amongst school children.
- Schools reported spending less time processing applications for FSM, instead diverting time to nutritional education\textsuperscript{21}.

Although the evidence is promising, more research examining the total cost of universal FSM is needed to establish a) if such a policy would alleviate the societal costs associated with FI and b) if this policy would be feasible in the UK. In 2017, the Institute for Fiscal Studies (IFS) estimated providing universal FSM to all primary school children in the UK would cost £950 million each year, with potential upfront costs calculated as £270 million\textsuperscript{22}. As the pandemic continues to exert funding pressures on governments worldwide, the cost-effectiveness of a universal scheme should be evaluated before large-scale spending. The effectiveness of cheaper alternatives, such as universal breakfast clubs\textsuperscript{22}, should also be considered.

Advocacy

HCPs working with CYP can also use their voice, through social media and through national organisations, to advocate for a change in local and national policy, to improve the lives of CYP experiencing FI. An example of a successful advocacy campaign that was supported by paediatricians in the UK is provided in Box 5.

Box 5: Example of how paediatricians supported a national advocacy campaign in the UK\textsuperscript{23}

In 2014, the Universal Infant Free School Meals policy was introduced for state-funded schools for children aged 4-7 years entitling them to a free school lunch during term-times. For children older than seven years to continue receiving FSM, they must be from a qualifying low-income family or receiving certain benefits of their own. FSM were replaced by the food voucher scheme during the COVID-19 lockdown, which the UK Government announced to cease in July 2020.

Marcus Rashford worked alongside the food distribution charity FairShare to launch the #MakeTheUTurn campaign. He wrote to all MPs calling for an extension of the food voucher scheme to the summer of 2020. In 24 hours, 2200 members of the Royal College of Paediatrics and Child Health signed an open letter to the government in support of Marcus Rashford’s campaign\textsuperscript{23}. The scheme was successfully extended over the summer and a Winter Package to support vulnerable children until Easter 2021 was introduced.
Government policies

As FI is largely driven by financial insecurity, government policies should follow principles supporting those most at risk of financial burden. These principles include increasing wages to all workers receiving minimum wage to a real living wage, providing those out of work with adequate benefit allowances and supporting jobseekers with skills and employability programmes.

Examples of how these principles could be implemented into UK policy could be removing the two-child limit benefit cap and extending the Universal Credit uplift.

The impact of global determinants on food insecurity demonstrates the need for intersectoral working at a national level. Food security is put under direct risk from climate change as well as non-climate factors such as population growth, the meat industry and food wastage²⁴.

Conclusion

FI is a national crisis which has been exacerbated by the COVID-19 pandemic and particularly affects children and young people. This must be addressed on individual, organisational, and national levels to support those experiencing the detrimental effects of FI. We recommend the following points as next steps to prevent, identify, assess and address paediatric FI. Firstly, communities should explore interventions to address FI at a local population level. Secondly, adequate and accessible education on FI should be available to HCPs to increase awareness of paediatric FI. Thirdly, a screening tool specific to the UK population and children, and one which can be completed within the time restraints of clinical practice, should be developed. We hope this article serves as a prompt to initiate conversations around paediatric FI as an important step to de-stigmatise and appropriately address this issue.
References


