



Question: What is the relationship between acculturation and body weight?

Table 2: Summary of cross-sectional studies examining the association between multidimensional or multiple proxy measures of acculturation and body weight in Latino/Hispanic Populations

Author, Year Sample Size Data Source, Location Risk of Bias*	Race/Ethnicity Age % Female	Description of Acculturation Measure/Proxy	Results
<p>Ahluwalia, 2007</p> <p>BMI Final N=964; Waist Circumference Final N=1,047</p> <p>2001-2002 National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES), USA</p> <p>Risk of Bias: 6/24</p>	<p>Mexican Americans (100%)</p> <p>35.7y (SD = 0.9)</p> <p>47.4% female</p>	<p>Proxy: English usage scale; parental nativity used in multivariable analysis</p> <p>Measured height and weight</p>	<p>Distribution of Body Mass Index (BMI) by high vs. low acculturation</p> <p>Overall:</p> <p><i>Healthy weight:</i> 34.2% (2.91) vs. 30.4 % (2.82) <i>Overweight:</i> 33.0% (2.30) vs. 45.1% (2.09) <i>Obese:</i> 31.7 % (2.60) vs. 24.2% (2.51); P<0.05</p> <p>Male: NS</p> <p>Female:</p> <p><i>Underweight:</i> NR <i>Healthy weight:</i> 36.5% (3.95) vs. 25.8% (5.34) <i>Overweight:</i> 27.7 % (3.05) vs. 36.6% (4.14) <i>Obese:</i> 33.8 % (4.2) vs. 36.9% (6.62); P<0.05</p> <p>Distribution of waist circumference by high vs. low acculturation</p> <p>Overall: <i>Higher and lower than recommendation:</i> Non-significant (NS) Male: <i>Higher and lower than recommendation:</i> NS Female: <i>Higher than recommendation:</i> 69.6% (4.22) vs. 78.3% (5.40), <i>Lower than recommendation:</i> 30.4% (4.22) vs. 21.7% (5.40), P<0.05</p>



Question: What is the relationship between acculturation and body weight?

Table 2: Summary of cross-sectional studies examining the association between multidimensional or multiple proxy measures of acculturation and body weight in Latino/Hispanic Populations

Author, Year Sample Size Data Source, Location Risk of Bias*	Race/Ethnicity Age % Female	Description of Acculturation Measure/Proxy	Results
<p>Creighton, 2012</p> <p>N=1,610</p> <p>L.A. Family and Neighborhood Survey-2 (2006-2008), California</p> <p>Risk of Bias: 4/24</p>	<p>Mexican Americans, African Americans, European Americans (distribution NR)</p> <p>39.9y (SD=0.76); 27.8-45.6</p> <p>51% female</p>	<p>Proxies: Immigrant generation, linguistic acculturation, social acculturation</p> <p>Predominately measured height and weight</p>	<p>Obesity: BMI ≥30</p> <p><i>Higher linguistic acculturation:</i> NS <i>Higher social acculturation:</i> OR=1.36, P<0.05</p> <p>Generation (Reference is 1st generation from Mexico <15y)</p> <p><i>1st generation Mexican (>15 y):</i> OR=1.72, P<0.01 <i>2nd generation Mexican:</i> OR=2.50, P<0.001 <i>3rd generation Mexican:</i> OR=2.04, P<0.05 <i>3rd generation white:</i> NS <i>3rd generation black:</i> OR=2.81, P<0.001</p>
<p>Garcia, 2012</p> <p>N=5,069</p> <p>1999-2008 NHANES, USA</p> <p>Risk of Bias: 4/24</p>	<p>Mexican descent (100%)</p> <p>20-85y</p> <p>NR</p>	<p>Proxies: Predominant language used and birthplace</p> <p>Measured height and weight</p>	<p>Birthplace, language, and weight status</p> <p>Overweight (Referent group: US born, English predominant)</p> <p><i>US born, Spanish predominant:</i> NS <i>Mexican Born, English predominate:</i> NS <i>Mexican Born, Spanish predominate:</i> PR=1.23 (95% CI=1.12-1.36)</p> <p>Obesity (Referent group: US born, English predominant)</p> <p><i>US born, Spanish predominant:</i> NS <i>Mexican Born, English predominate:</i> PR=0.76 (95% CI=0.65-0.89) <i>Mexican Born, Spanish predominate:</i> PR=0.70 (95% CI=0.64-0.76)</p>



Question: What is the relationship between acculturation and body weight?

Table 2: Summary of cross-sectional studies examining the association between multidimensional or multiple proxy measures of acculturation and body weight in Latino/Hispanic Populations

Author, Year Sample Size Data Source, Location Risk of Bias*	Race/Ethnicity Age % Female	Description of Acculturation Measure/Proxy	Results
<p>Hubert, 2005</p> <p>N=901</p> <p>Cancer-related risk factor and screening practices survey, California</p> <p>Risk of Bias: 4/24</p>	<p>Latino /Hispanic (predominantly Mexican origin)</p> <p>35.2y (SD=10.5)</p> <p>42.2% female</p>	<p>Proxies: Years of US residence, generational status, primary language spoken at home.</p> <p>Self-reported height and weight</p>	<p>BMI</p> <p>Generational status (0,1st, 2nd)</p> <p><i>Women:</i> $\beta=1.58$ (SE=0.35); $P<0.01$ <i>Non labor-camp men:</i> NS <i>Labor-camp men:</i> NS</p> <p>Years in US</p> <p><i>Women:</i> NS <i>Non labor-camp men:</i> $\beta=0.09$ (SE=0.02); $P<0.01$ <i>Labor camp men:</i> $\beta=-0.11$ (SE=0.05); $P<0.05$</p>
<p>van Rompay, 2012</p> <p>N=1,219</p> <p>Boston Puerto Rican Health Study, Massachusetts</p> <p>Risk of Bias: 0/24</p>	<p>Puerto Rican Descent</p> <p>45-75y</p> <p>72% female</p>	<p>Psychological Acculturation Scale (PAS), Bi-dimensional Acculturation Scale (BAS), length of stay (LOS)</p> <p>Measured height, weight, waist circumference</p>	<p>Central obesity (%) by BAS quartiles: Inverse association found between language based acculturation:Q1(69.5), Q2(68.4), Q3(61.0), Q4(60.3), P for trend 0.02</p> <p>Obesity (%) by BAS quartiles: P for trend NS</p> <p>Obesity/Central obesity by PAS or LOS quartiles: NS</p>

*Risk of Bias as determined using the Nutrition Evidence Library Bias Assessment Tool