

Sugar sweetened beverage consumption among WIC children in L.A. County

Implication: Sugar sweetened beverages (SSB) are closely linked to an increased risk of childhood obesity and other associated adult chronic diseases such as diabetes and heart disease.

Across time: SSB consumption is substantially lower than a decade ago.

Our role at WIC: WIC children are less likely to consume sugar-sweetened beverages (SSB) than other low-income children in Los Angeles County.

The consumption of sugar sweetened beverages (SSB) or sugary drinks has been closely linked to an increased risk of childhood obesity and other associated adult chronic diseases such as diabetes and heart disease.(1,2) SSBs are defined by the CDC as “any liquids that have been sweetened with any various forms of added sugars like brown sugar, corn sweetener, corn syrup, dextrose, fructose, glucose, high-fructose corn syrup, honey, lactose, malt syrup, maltose, molasses, raw sugar, and sucrose.”(3) Some examples of these beverages include but are not limited to regular soda, diet soda, sports drinks, energy drinks, fruit flavored drinks, and sweetened teas.(2,3)

Nationwide, there has been a decrease in the number of children who consume SSBs. This decrease has been largely driven by children 2-5 years old.(4) Despite the decline, rates of SSB consumption remain high among children in this age group.(4,5)

To study the extent of SSB consumption among 0- to 5- year-old Los Angeles County (LAC) children participating in the Special Supplemental Program for Women, Infants and Children (WIC), questions related to SSB consumption were included in the triennial telephone LAC WIC survey. The LAC WIC survey is conducted among a randomly selected sample of approximately 5000 LAC WIC participants. Since 2008, parents have been asked to recall the amount of SSB drinks their child consumes on an average day. For the purposes of this brief, SSB consumption is defined as the total number of reported SSBs such as Gatorade, Red Bull, or Sunny Delight on a typical day. WIC children have been grouped into two age groups, 0-2 year olds and 3-4 year olds, as the diet for children over the age of 2 is typically more varied than the diet for children aged 2 and under.




Figure 1 Consumption of SSB dropped considerably between 2008-2017. 24% for 0-2 year olds and 43% for 3-4 year olds. Since 2011, the rates of SSB consumption in WIC children in LAC have remained

The percentage of LAC WIC children consuming SSBs is much lower than the percentages reported in the overall county and state. The 2014 LA County Health Survey reported that 28% of children under the age of 5 consumed at least 1 SSB per day.(2) Comparatively, the 2013-14 California Health Interview Survey reported that 31% of children 2-11 years of age consumed at least 1 SSB per day.(6) While many studies have shown that low income children are more likely to consume SSBs starting at an earlier age, the results in this brief show that WIC children in LAC are less likely to consume SSB than their low income counterparts

References

1. Scharf, R. J., & DeBoer, M. D. (2016). Sugar-sweetened beverages and children's health. *Annual review of public health*, 37, 273-293.
2. California Center for Public Health Advocacy (2014). Sugary drinks: A big problem for little kids. Retrieved from https://www.first5la.org/files/Sugar-Sweetened_Drink_Policy_Brief.pdf.
3. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2017). Get the Facts: Sugar-Sweetened Beverages and Consumption. Retrieved from <https://www.cdc.gov/nutrition/data-statistics/sugar-sweetened-beverages-intake.html>
4. Bleich, S. N., & Vercammen, K. A. (2018). The negative impact of sugar-sweetened beverages on children's health: An update of the literature. *BMC obesity*, 5(1),6.
5. Bleich, S. N., & Wolfson, J. A. (2015). Trends in SSBs and snack consumption among children by age, body weight, and race/ethnicity. *Obesity*, 23(5), 1039-1046.
6. Wolstein, J., & Babey, S. H. (2018). Sugary Beverage Consumption Among California Children and Adolescents. Policy brief (UCLA Center for Health Policy Research), 2018(2), 1-8.