Association of Household Socioeconomic Status, Neighborhood Support System and Adherence to Dietary Recommendation among Persons with T2DM, a Facility-based Cross-sectional Study in Ghana

Be-lkuu Doglikuu

Tehran University of Medical Sciences

Abubakari Abdulai

University for Development Studies

Mehdi Yaseri

Tehran University of Medical Sciences

Elham Shakibazadeh

Tehran University of Medical Sciences

Abolghassem Djazayeri

Tehran University of Medical Sciences

Khadijeh Mirzaei (✉ mirzaei_kh@sina.tums.ac.ir)

Tehran University of Medical Sciences

Research Article

Keywords: Diabetes mellitus, Socioeconomic-status, Neighborhood support, Adherence, Dietary recommended, Ghana

Posted Date: December 9th, 2020

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-116519/v1>

License: © ⓘ This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

Abstract

Background: Dietary recommendation help persons with diabetes adopt healthy eating habits to achieve optimal glycemic control. Socioeconomic-status and neighborhood support system could influence adherence to dietary recommendation. The purpose of our study is to assess the association of household-socioeconomic status and neighborhood-support system with adherence to dietary recommendation among persons with type 2 diabetes mellitus (T2DM).

Methods: Facility-based cross-sectional-survey was conducted among 530 individuals with T2DM in Brong Ahafo region, Ghana. Six hospitals were randomly selected and persons with T2DM consecutively recruited from the selected hospitals into the study. Structured-questionnaires were used to collect socio-demographic variables. Adherence to dietary recommendation was the outcome -variable, and was assessed using perceived dietary adherence questionnaire.

Results: Age (years) (P-value=0.01), place of residence (P-value =0.01), educational level (P-value =0.01) and occupation (P-value =0.01) were significantly correlated with socioeconomic status (P-value 0.01). Age (years) regression coefficient (β) -0.089, 95%CI (-0.12, -0.001), Being married β 0.103, 95%CI (0.002, 0.02), moderate and low-social support system β 0.309, 95%CI(0.17, 0.38) and β 0.192, 95%CI(-0.26, -0.06) respectively, and high-socioeconomic status β 0.197, 95%CI(0.06, 0.25) were significantly associated with adherence to dietary recommendation.

Conclusion: We found that social-support system and socioeconomic-status could be associated with adherence to dietary recommendation. Therefore, health workers should consider that patients' social support system and socioeconomic status could be modifiable factors for optimum adherence.

Introduction

Diabetes Mellitus (DM) is a public health problem of which dietary recommendations forms integral part in its management[1]. Dietary Recommendation for diabetes management help persons with DM adopt healthy eating habits to achieve optimal glycemic control[2]. These dietary recommendations often focus on helping patients with DM control glycaemia by matching dietary carbohydrate intakes with medications [3]. Despite this, DM still contributes significant public health threat to individuals and society [4]. Sustaining complex array of lifestyle modifications and self-care behavior practices such as medications intake, adherence to dietary recommendations, regular physical activities and monitoring of blood glucose levels[5, 6] are important factors in DM management. However, adherence to dietary recommendations are considered corner stone in diabetes management[7]. Appropriate dietary recommendations for diabetes management emphasizes the intake of: Diets rich in whole grains, Fruits, Vegetables, Legumes and Nuts[8]. It also emphasize on the intakes of Moderate alcohol; Low refined grains, Low red and processed meats, and Low sugar-sweetened beverages[8]. Furthermore, it emphasizes on the intake of: Less fat, Less sodium, More fiber, and More foods such as fish and soy products that have health-promoting properties[8]. Research shows that improving adherence to dietary

recommendations help persons with DM reduce glycosylated hemoglobin (HbA1c) level by 1 to 2% absolute term with the greatest effect felt at initial stages of diabetes[9]. Despite these remarkable effects of dietary recommendation in diabetes management, variation in financial ability and social support (both from family and friends) could cause inappropriate adherence. Financial status and social support system are powerful variables for therapy adherence in stressful situations. Studies show that increasing appropriate social support system can act directly to encourage individuals with chronic non-communicable diseases like DM to adopt to healthier behaviors such as reducing unhealthy dietary intakes, participate in physical activities, or give up smoking which are risk factors for disease onset and progress[10]. Although it is known that socioeconomic status and social support system are strong predictors for therapy adherence in diabetes management, little is known about how these variables are associated with adherence to dietary recommendations among persons with type 2 diabetes mellitus (T2DM) in Ghana. Dieticians in Ghana often offered T2DM patients individualized dietary counseling based on the recommended dietary guidelines for diabetes management. However, it is unclear whether socioeconomic status and social support system play significant roles for adherence to these individualized nutrition care plans among patients. Ghanaian population lives in heterogeneous communities with diverse socioeconomic status cultural practices, ethnic grouping and educational level. Due to this there are variations in cultural practices, social support system and income levels among the peoples. Yet no study has been conducted to explore the association of these variables for adherence to dietary recommendations among persons with diabetes.

Method

The aim of our study is to investigate how household socioeconomic status and neighborhood support system are associated with adherence to dietary recommendation among persons with T2DM in Ghana. Hospital based cross-sectional survey was conducted among 530 persons living with DM in Brong Ahafo Region (BAR), Ghana. Single population proportion formula

$$(n = \frac{Z^2 P(1-P)}{e^2})$$
 was used to determine the sample size for this study. The letter 'n' in the formula denotes the study sample size, 'Z' denotes normal standard distribution of 1.96 for 95% confidence interval, 'P' is the true population proportion of adherence to dietary recommendation among DM persons in the study area (Brong Ahafo region) and 'e' is standard error (5%). Previous study in Brong Ahafo region Ghana, reported prevalence of adherence to dietary recommendation as 68.5% [11]. Substituting these values in the equation above, the sample size n was calculated as

$$n = \frac{1.96^2 * 0.685(1-0.685)}{0.05^2} = 332.$$

However, for the event of non-response and registration error, a contingency sample of 60% was considered in the sampling, therefore the final sample was increased to $0.6 * 332 = 531.2 \approx 532$.

Individuals 18 years and above who were diagnosed with T2DM by physicians, using the American diabetes association (ADA) diagnostic and classification guideline 2011[12], and counseled to follow recommended dietary guidelines for at least 3 months and over were recruited into the study. Participants' 70 years and above who could not answer interview questions, intellectually deficient, and severely ill were excluded from this study. Pregnant and lactating mothers were also excluded. Simple random sampling was used to select 6 hospitals, and the eligible participants consecutively recruited using systematic random sampling.

Ethical Approval

The study protocol was approved by Ghana Health Service Ethics Review Committee (GHS-ERC008/08/18) and Tehran University of Medical Sciences Ethics Review board (IR.TUMS.VCR.REC.1397.409). Each participant was requested to sign an informed consent form before participating. This research project was performed in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki.

Assessing Patients Demographic Characteristics Anthropometry Measurements and Clinical Parameters

Age, diabetes-duration, medications intakes and other demographic characteristics were assessed using structured questionnaires. Weight and height were measured and recorded to the nearest 0.5kg and 0.5m using adult weighing scale and stadiometer respectively. These measurements were taken while participants were in light clothes without shoes, and were in standing position. Body mass index (BMI, kg/m²) was calculated by dividing weight in kilograms with height in meters square. Systolic and diastolic blood pressures were measured using manual sphygmomanometer and stethoscope, and the reading recorded to the nearest 0.5mmHg after participants were allowed to relax for 5 or more minutes.

Assessing Socioeconomic Status

We assessed participants' socioeconomic status using composite wealth index. This proxy indicator was used because participants were unwilling to tell us their disposable household income they often earn through sales and salaries per month. Using this method, we asked participants to name items and properties they possess and use in their homes including fixed assets like land and building, and movable assets like vehicles. We then used principal component analysis (PCA) to extract participants' socioeconomic status from this wealth index. The extracted socioeconomic status was categorized into three quintiles: - poorest, middle and richest quintiles to represent participants' socioeconomic status. After the extraction, the percentage of total variance explained by the three factors was 35.6%

Neighborhood Support System

We assess neighborhood support system by using structured questionnaire. Participants were asked to self-report on a continue scale, how frequent they received support in the form of materials gifts, cash, in kind or volunteerism from friends, relatives, love ones, or from religious organizations like churches ,mosques, or from cooperate institutions in their societies. Participants who reported "very frequently" were classified to have high social support, those who reported "frequently" were said to have moderate social support, and those who reported "less frequently" were said to have low social support system.

Assessing Dietary Intakes

We assess dietary intakes using three separate 24-hour dietary recall questionnaires on three different days (Monday, Wednesday, and Saturday). This was done to accurately predict participants' dietary intakes in the three separate days and sum them up to form their average dietary intake. In the three different 24-hour dietary recalls, participants were asked to report details of all foods and beverages they took in each day preceding the interview. They were asked to report detail of the foods they ate, the preparation method, type of oil added, the portion size served and the actual amount they ate. The information obtained were summed up and analyzed with Ntri.IV software to obtain participants' average foods and nutrients intakes.

Assessing Participants' Alcohol intake

WHO 10-items alcohol use disorder identification scale (AUDITs-10)[13] was also used to assess Participants' alcohol intake level. Participants' were asked to respond to the 10 points in AUDITs scale, ranging from *'How often do you have drink containing Alcohol? To "Has a relative, friend, doctor, or other health care worker ever been concerned about your drinking and suggested that you cut it down?"*The responses obtained from them were also summed up to represent participants' alcohol intake status. These questionnaires were also pretested among 20 participants (chronbach alpha of 0.55).

Assessing Participants' Smoking status

Fagerström 6-iterms nicotine dependency test scale was used to assess participants smocking status[14]. Participants were asked to respond to 6-iterms in the Fagerström nicotine dependency test scale, *ranging from 'How soon after you wake up from bed do you smoke your first cigarette?' to 'Do you smoke even if you are so ill that you are in bed most of the day?'*The responses obtained were also summed up to form participants' total smocking status. These questionnaires were also pretested among 20 people (chronbach alpha of 0.55).

Assessing Physical Activity levels

Participants' physical activity (PA) level was measured using International Physical Activity short form Questionnaires (IPAQ). Response from participants' for IPAQ were also categorized into 'low' (<600 metabolic equivalent (MET)/h per week), 'moderate' (between 600 and 3000 MET/h per week) and 'high' physical activity level (>3000 MET/h per week) according to the IPAQ scores[15] to represent PA levels.

Assessing Adherence to Recommended Dietary Guidelines

Perceived Dietary Adherence Questionnaires (PDAQ) for Persons with T2DM was used to assess adherence to dietary recommendation [16]. These questionnaires consist of nine items and seven point likert's scale designed to generate information about adherence to recommended dietary guidelines among patients. These seven point likert's scale questionnaires have a range between 0 and 7. Zero point mean non-adherence to the PDAQ, and 7 point means highest adherence. Participants' responses from the nine items were summed up to form participants' total adherence to dietary recommendation score. These questionnaires were pretested among 20 participants (chronbach alpha of 0.95).

Statistical analysis

IBM SPSS version 22.0 (SPSS, Chicago, IL, USA) was used in all data analysis. Data normal distributions were checked with Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. Descriptive statistics were used to describe participants' demographic characteristics, while Pearson correlation used to test the correlation of these variables with socioeconomic status and adherence to dietary recommendation. Finally multiple linear regression models were used to assess the association of household socioeconomic status and neighborhood support system for adherence to dietary recommendation. Multiple linear regression model looks at the association between predictor variables on one dependent variable in an equation $Y = a + b_1X_1 + b_2X_2 + b_3X_3 + b_4X_4 + b_5X_5 + b_kX_k + e$, where 'a' is the regression constant, b is the regression coefficient, $X_1, \dots, X_k$ are the independent variables and 'e' is the variance of the population mean distributions. The assumption for using this statistic in our study is that our dependent variable (Adherence to dietary recommendation) is normally distributed and has equal variance around the mean. The independent variables also have linear relationships with no multicollinearity. Furthermore, our sample size is fairly large and could be said to have fair representation of the larger population. In our analysis, we set all variables significant at 0.05 alpha levels.

Results

Participants' anthropometry and general characteristics are presented in Table 1. Mean (SD) of total adherence to recommended dietary guideline was 32.56(9.61). Mean (SD) of age (years), and BMI (Kg/m^2) were 58.10(9.70) and 23.14(2.92) respectively. Majority of participants (70.9%) were females; married (64.2%); and live in small towns and villages (76.2%). More than 38% of participants have no

formal education; 1.9% has education up to polytechnic; 2.5% have it up to university level; and the rest have other form of education.

Table 1
Participants Anthropometry and General Characteristics

Variable	Means(SD)	N (%)
Adherence to dietary recommendation	32.56(9.61)	
Age(years)	58.10(9.70)	
BMI(Kg/m ²)	23.14(2.92)	
Duration lived with diabetes(years)	4.90(5.40)	
Sex		
Male		
Female		154(29.1)
		376(70.9)
Marital status		
Married		340(64.2)
Single		20(3.8)
Widow		107(20.2)
Divorce		63(11.9)
Place of Residence		
Village		39(7.4)
Town		404(76.2)
City		87(16.4)
Educational Level		
No education		202(38.1)
Primary		85(16.0)
Junior High		132(24.9)
Senior High		67(12.6)
Training College		21(4.0)

Polytechnic	10(1.9)
University	13(2.5)
<i>Means (SD) =mean (standard deviation); N (%) =number (percentage)</i>	

There were significant correlation between age (p-value= 0.005), marital Status (p-value=0.003), education level (p-value= 0.010), diabetes duration (p-value= 0.013), high socioeconomic status (p-value= 0.046), and receive moderate social support system (p-value= 0.004) with adherence to recommended dietary guidelines, table 2.

Table 2
Correlation of participants' demographic characteristics with adherence to dietary guideline

Variables	Correlation coefficient (r)	P-value
Age(years)	0.159	0.005
Sex	-0.014	0.411
Marital Status	-0.168	0.003
Place of residence	0.087	0.079
Education level	0.142	0.010
Diabetes duration(years)	0.137	0.013
High Socioeconomic status	0.104	0.046
Moderate Socioeconomic status	0.089	0.074
Low Socioeconomic status	0.035	0.284
Receive low social support	0.081	0.096
Receive moderate Social Support	-0.164	0.004
Receive high Social Support	0.075	0.111

The correlations of participants' demographic characteristics with socioeconomic status are presented in table 3. Sex negatively correlated with low socioeconomic status (P-value=0.01). Place of residence negatively correlated with low socioeconomic status (P-value=0.01), and positively correlated with moderate socioeconomic status (P-value=0.01) and high socioeconomic status (P-value=0.01). Furthermore, educational level positively correlated with moderate socioeconomic status (P-value=0.01), and high socioeconomic status (P-value=0.01). Finally, occupation negatively correlated with low socioeconomic status (P-value=0.05), but positively correlated with moderate socioeconomic status (P-value=0.01) and high socioeconomic status (P-value=0.01).

Table 3
Correlations of participants' demographic and clinical variables with socioeconomic status

Variables	Socioeconomic Status		
	Low (r)	Moderate (r)	High (r)
Age(years)	-0.204**	0.005	0.022
Sex	0.022	-0.050	0.029
Place of residence	-0.184**	0.250**	0.153*
Adherence to recommended dietary guideline	0.122*	-0.167**	0.122*
Neighborhood support system	0.110	0.025	-0.050
Diabetes duration(years)	-0.010	0.056	0.000
Marital status	-0.090	-0.057	-0.085
Education level	-0.013	0.277**	0.282**
Fasting blood sugar	-0.021	0.024	0.063
HbA1c%	-0.052	-0.082	0.003
Occupation	-0.121*	0.180**	0.182**
Alcohol intake	-0.001	0.090	0.053
Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed) **, Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)*			

Association of participants' socioeconomic status and neighborhood support system for adherence to dietary recommendation

The association of household socioeconomic status and neighborhood support system for adherence with dietary recommendations is presented in table 4. After adjusting for possible confounding factors (medication, smoking, alcohol intake physical activity level and BMI), Age(years) was statistically significant for adherence to dietary recommendation ([Standardized regression coefficient (β) -0.089, 95% confidence interval (-0.12,-0.001); P-value=0.045]; Marriage was statistically significant for adherence to dietary recommendation (β 0.103, 95CI: (0.002, 0.02); P-value=0.018) whereas Received moderate social support (β -3.185, 95%CI: (-0.26, -0.06); P-value<0.001) and low social support (β 5.097, 95%CI: (0.17, 0.38); P-value=0.002) were also statistically significant for adherence to dietary recommendation. Finally, high socioeconomic status was statistically significant for adherence to dietary recommendation (β

3.123, 95%CI: (0.06, 0.25); P-value=0.002) and moderate socioeconomic status (β 2.080, 95%CI: (0.01, 0.25); P-value=0.039).

Table 4

Association of participants' socioeconomic status and neighborhood support system for adherence to dietary recommendation

Variables	Unstandardized regression coefficient(β)	Standard error	Standardized regression coefficient(β)	t	P-value	95%CI
Age(years)	-0.058	0.029	-0.089	-2.009	0.045	(-0.12, -0.001)
Sex	0.117	0.080	0.065	1.463	0.144	(-0.04, 0.27)
Married	0.009	0.004	0.103	2.378	0.018	(0.002, 0.02)
Place of Residence (urban)	0.151	0.074	0.088	2.043	0.042	(0.01, 0.29)
Diabetes. Duration (years)	0.001	0.004	0.013	1.399	0.162	(-0.01, 0.04)
Education level	0.018	0.012	0.068	1.571	0.117	(-0.01, 0.04)
High Social Support	0.013	0.051	0.015	0.247	0.805	(-0.09, 0.11)
Moderate Social Support	0.271	0.053	0.309	5.097	0.000	(0.17, 0.38)
Receive low social support	-0.162	0.051	-0.192	-3.185	0.002	(-0.26, -0.06)
Socioeconomic High	0.154	0.049	0.197	3.123	0.002	(0.06, 0.25)
Socioeconomic Moderate	0.126	0.061	0.128	2.080	0.039	(0.01, 0.25)
Socioeconomic Low	0.034	0.049	0.041	0.689	0.491	(-0.06, 0.13)
The models were adjusted for medication intake, smoking, alcohol intake, physical activity and BMI,						

Discussion

Socioeconomic status and neighborhood support system are strong predictors for therapy adherence in diseases management[17]. Our first objective was to investigate whether participants' demographic characteristics were correlated with adherence to dietary recommendation. The second was to investigate whether there were significant correlations between participants' demographic characteristics and socioeconomic status using the Pearson correlation. The third objective was to assess whether household socioeconomic status and neighborhood support system were statistically significant for adherence to dietary recommendation using the multiple linear regression models. At the end of our study we realized that Age, Marital status, Education level, High socioeconomic status and Receiving moderate social support were statistically significantly correlated with adherence to dietary recommendation. We also noticed that age, place of residence, adherence to dietary recommendation, neighborhood support system, education level and occupation were statistically significantly correlated with socioeconomic statuses. Decreasing age(years) was shown to be statistically significant for adherence to dietary recommendation, while being married, and living in urban communities were statistically significant for adherence to dietary recommendation. Furthermore reducing moderate social support system was statistically significant for adherence to dietary recommendation while high socioeconomic status was statistically significant for adherence to recommended dietary guidelines.

The negative correlations we found for ages, place of residence and occupation with socioeconomic status in our analysis could not be by chance, as we recalled from the demographic analysis in table 1, we realized that majority of our participants were female, married, have no formal education, and lived in small towns and villages. In Ghana there are disparities in the distributions of wealth and resources across gender, age, location and educational achievement, of which, the less educated, rural dwellers, children, the aged and women are always the most vulnerable population. As wealth or income distributions and educational achievements play critical role in healthcare seeking behaviors and services utilization, rural dwellers, the less educated, aged, women and people at the lower quintile of the income brackets always turn to suffer disproportionately in service utilization. This could be partly due to lack means to purchase the services or ignorance. These findings are in line with other studies published elsewhere in literature [18-21].

We also saw that age was statistically significant for adherence to dietary recommendation. Increasing age (years) was shown to have negatively associated with adherence to dietary recommendation. This result could also be true because diabetes duration or age during diabetes have significant influence on adherence to therapy regimens[22]. Having DM in old age comes with many challenges. For instance, older people in general are less mobile and may have other health problems or conditions that affect how they care for themselves[23]. Again, older people with DM may also have other problems like memory loss, depression, and infections that take time to heal[24, 25]. The aged may also have trouble remembering what and when to eat meals and snacks[26]. When any one or more these conditions are present, adherence to therapy regimens among the aged could be compromised and thus affect diabetes management.

Marital status was also shown to be associated with adherence to dietary recommendation. Being married was shown to be statistically significant for adherence to dietary recommendation in our study. These results could also be true, because ideally, marriage people offer companionship and security to each other. Therefore, when one or both couple in a family is/are financially sound, in time of crisis they are better able to support each other than single individuals. Study conducted in South Africa indicates that family (husband or wife) support for patients with DM were the main predictors for adherence to dietary recommendation[27]. Other study in Niger confirmed this finding by reporting that significant association exists between marital status and adherence to dietary recommendation [28]. These results are in line with our finding. During crisis situation in every family, the first point of contact is either the husband or wife, therefore, having maximum spousal support in times of crisis like DM could significantly leads to improve adherence to therapy regimens as witness in our study.

We also found statistically significant association of social support system (families and friends support) for adherence to dietary recommendation. Increasing moderate social support system (families and friends support) was shown to be statistically significant for adherence to dietary recommendation. Social supports are also strong predictors for therapy adherence in diabetes management. Social support system provides patients with practical skills and morale to manage their condition through therapy adherence. Social supports also help patients buffer stresses that come with their illness[29]. When patients received maximum support from families and friends in time of disease, they are better able to manage these stresses. It has been reported that receiving social support from both families and friends in time of disease episodes, contributes to higher adherence to therapy regimens[28]. Persons with diabetes are still part of the wider society and therefore, need approval from both families and friends to successfully navigate through society. When families and friends do not understand the importance of helping parsons with diabetes stay healthy, but stigmatized them in terms of their foods selections and consumption habits, these patients may not be able to adhere to treatment protocols given to them and thus stand at increased risk of treatment non adherence. When parsons with DM are not stigmatized or discriminated by their love ones but instead encourage them, this will help them feel secured and thus optimized adherence to dietary recommendation. Patients with DM are faced with situational obstacles when it comes to food selections and consumptions on daily basis because of fear of social disapproval[30]. Study from Singapore indicates that lack of social support from families and friends of persons with diabetes were strong barriers to adherence in dietary recommendations [31] which is consistent with our results.

Socioeconomic status was also found statistically significant for adherence to dietary recommendation in our study. Moderate and high socioeconomic statuses were associated with adherence to dietary recommendation. Socioeconomic status is another strong predictor for therapy adherence in diabetes management[32]. Study in Ethiopia indicates that patients who reported low monthly income significantly reported non-adherence to dietary recommendation [33]. Other study conducted elsewhere also indicated socioeconomic limitations as strong factors militating against adherence to dietary recommendation [34]. This study found that persons who reported low socioeconomic status have difficulty in purchasing foods items prescribed to them in their dietary plan[34]. However, the authors suggested that adherence

to dietary recommendation could occur among persons with modest or moderate income status. These findings have been reflected in our results. In our study, we found that high and moderate socioeconomic statuses were statistically significant for adherence to dietary recommendation.

In this regard, we propose that when offering dietary counseling to patients with DM, dietitians should assess patients to identify their socioeconomic levels to better counsel them for optimum adherence. When patients' actual socioeconomic levels are established, dietitians can collaborate with them and design appropriate eating plan that will reflect their financially status, and thus fit well into their ability to afford which will consequently leads to optimize adherence. Although we found significant associations between our study variables and adherence to dietary recommendation, we cannot conclusion that causal associations exist between our study variables and adherence to dietary recommendation. This is because of possible biases and study limitations. Some of the limitations in our study are that: We used hospital-based cross sectional survey with relatively small sample size (530) to arrive at our findings. Since the cross sectional survey and relatively small sample size could not permit us to make strong conclusions that significant causal associations exist between our study variables and adherence to dietary recommendation, we therefore recommend that future studies should consider a relatively larger sample size and more powerful study designs like cohort study, case control or clinical trial to evaluate this phenomenon. Notwithstanding the poor study design and relatively small sample size, we strongly recommend that dietitians caring patients with DM should consider their social relation with their close friends and families, and also try to establish patients' socioeconomic status in order to giving appropriate dietary recommendation that will reflect their status for optimum adherence.

Conclusions

Adherence to recommended dietary guidelines is an important factor in diabetes management. In this study we found that living with diabetes between 6 and 11 years, being married and received social support from families and friends were significantly associated with adherence to dietary recommendation. We therefore recommend that health care workers caring for patients with diabetes should consider patients social relation with their close families and friends, and also consider their socioeconomic background because these variables could act as risk factors for therapy regimens non-adherence.

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate

Ethical approval was granted by Ghana Health Service Ethics Review Committee (GHS-ERC008/08/18) and Tehran University of Medical Sciences Ethics Review board (IR.TUMS.VCR.REC.1397.409). All participants were requested to sign a written informed concern before participating.

Consent for publication

Not applicable

Availability of data and materials

The datasets used and/or analyzed during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

Competing interests

All authors declare no competing interest in this study

Funding

This study was funded by Tehran University of Medical Sciences

Authors' contributions

All authors contributed equally

Acknowledgements

We acknowledge: The regional director of health services in Brong Ahafo region, all the medical superintendents, and laboratory scientists in the various hospitals who provided technical support in this study. We also acknowledge all the participants who took part in this study.

References

1. Snorgaard, O., et al., *Systematic review and meta-analysis of dietary carbohydrate restriction in patients with type 2 diabetes*. BMJ Open Diabetes Research and Care, 2017. **5**(1).
2. Asif, M., *The prevention and control the type-2 diabetes by changing lifestyle and dietary pattern*. Journal of education and health promotion, 2014. **3**.
3. Association, A.D., *Evidence-based nutrition principles and recommendations for the treatment and prevention of diabetes and related complications*. Diabetes care, 2002. **25**(suppl 1): p. s50-s60.
4. Kim, Y. and R. Schulz, *Family caregivers' strains: comparative analysis of cancer caregiving with dementia, diabetes, and frail elderly caregiving*. Journal of aging and health, 2008. **20**(5): p. 483-503.

5. Shrivastava, S.R., P.S. Shrivastava, and J. Ramasamy, *Role of self-care in management of diabetes mellitus*. Journal of diabetes & Metabolic disorders, 2013. **12**(1): p. 14.
6. Al-Khawaldeh, O.A., M.A. Al-Hassan, and E.S. Froelicher, *Self-efficacy, self-management, and glycemic control in adults with type 2 diabetes mellitus*. Journal of Diabetes and its Complications, 2012. **26**(1): p. 10-16.
7. Viana, L.V., J.L. Gross, and M.J. Azevedo, *Dietary intervention in patients with gestational diabetes mellitus: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized clinical trials on maternal and newborn outcomes*. Diabetes care, 2014. **37**(12): p. 3345-3355.
8. Salas-Salvadó, J., et al., *Dietary patterns emphasizing the consumption of plant foods in the management of type 2 diabetes: a narrative review*. Advances in Nutrition, 2019. **10**(Supplement_4): p. S320-S331.
9. Feinman, R.D., et al., *Dietary carbohydrate restriction as the first approach in diabetes management: critical review and evidence base*. Nutrition, 2015. **31**(1): p. 1-13.
10. Razee, H., et al., *Beliefs, barriers, social support, and environmental influences related to diabetes risk behaviours among women with a history of gestational diabetes*. Health Promotion Journal of Australia, 2010. **21**(2): p. 130-137.
11. Amaltinga, A.P.M., *Non adherence to diabetic medication among diabetic patients, a case study of Dormaa Hospital Ghana*. Science Journal of Public Health, 2017. **5**(2): p. 88-97.
12. Farrar, D., et al., *Risk factor screening to identify women requiring oral glucose tolerance testing to diagnose gestational diabetes: a systematic review and meta-analysis and analysis of two pregnancy cohorts*. PloS one, 2017. **12**(4): p. e0175288.
13. Dawson, D.A., et al., *Effectiveness of the derived Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test (AUDIT-C) in screening for alcohol use disorders and risk drinking in the US general population*. Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research, 2005. **29**(5): p. 844-854.
14. Meneses-Gaya, I.C.d., et al., *Psychometric properties of the Fagerström test for nicotine dependence*. Jornal Brasileiro de Pneumologia, 2009. **35**(1): p. 73-82.
15. Tierney, M., A. Fraser, and N. Kennedy, *Criterion validity of the International Physical Activity Questionnaire Short Form (IPAQ-SF) for use in patients with rheumatoid arthritis: comparison with the SenseWear Armband*. Physiotherapy, 2015. **101**(2): p. 193-197.
16. Asaad, G., et al., *The reliability and validity of the perceived dietary adherence questionnaire for people with type 2 diabetes*. Nutrients, 2015. **7**(7): p. 5484-5496.
17. Falagas, M.E., et al., *Socioeconomic status (SES) as a determinant of adherence to treatment in HIV infected patients: a systematic review of the literature*. Retrovirology, 2008. **5**(1): p. 13.
18. Abbass, M.M., et al., *The potential impact of age, gender, body mass index, socioeconomic status and dietary habits on the prevalence of dental caries among Egyptian adults: a cross-sectional study*. F1000Research, 2019. **8**.
19. Chaltiel, D., et al., *Adherence to the 2017 French dietary guidelines and adult weight gain: A cohort study*. PLoS medicine, 2019. **16**(12): p. e1003007.

20. Brassard, D., et al., *Poor adherence to dietary guidelines among french-speaking adults in the Province of Quebec, Canada: The PREDISE study*. Canadian Journal of Cardiology, 2018. **34**(12): p. 1665-1673.
21. Saneei, P., et al., *Adherence to the DASH diet and prevalence of the metabolic syndrome among Iranian women*. European journal of nutrition, 2015. **54**(3): p. 421-428.
22. Alhariri, A., F. Daud, and S.A.M. Saghir, *Factors associated with adherence to diet and exercise among type 2 diabetes patients in Yemen*. Diabetes Management, 2017. **7**(3): p. 264-271.
23. Lee, Y., *The predictive value of self assessed general, physical, and mental health on functional decline and mortality in older adults*. Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health, 2000. **54**(2): p. 123-129.
24. Barnes, D.E., et al., *Depressive symptoms, vascular disease, and mild cognitive impairment: findings from the Cardiovascular Health Study*. Archives of general psychiatry, 2006. **63**(3): p. 273-279.
25. Geerlings, M.I., et al., *Association between memory complaints and incident Alzheimer's disease in elderly people with normal baseline cognition*. American Journal of Psychiatry, 1999. **156**(4): p. 531-537.
26. Watson, R., *Eating difficulty in older people with dementia*. Nursing Older People, 2002. **14**(3).
27. Ebrahim, Z., A. De Villiers, and T. Ahmed, *Factors influencing adherence to dietary guidelines: a qualitative study on the experiences of patients with type 2 diabetes attending a clinic in Cape Town*. Journal of Endocrinology, Metabolism and Diabetes of South Africa, 2014. **19**(2): p. 76-84.
28. Uchenna, O., et al., *Contributory factors to diabetes dietary regimen non adherence in adults with diabetes*. World Acad Sci Eng Technol, 2010. **4**(9): p. 644-51.
29. Miller, T.A. and M.R. DiMatteo, *Importance of family/social support and impact on adherence to diabetic therapy*. Diabetes, metabolic syndrome and obesity: targets and therapy, 2013. **6**: p. 421.
30. Rendle, K.A., et al., *Persistent barriers and strategic practices: why (asking about) the everyday matters in diabetes care*. The Diabetes Educator, 2013. **39**(4): p. 560-567.
31. Han, C.Y., et al., *Diabetes-related nutrition knowledge and dietary adherence in patients with Type 2 diabetes mellitus: A mixed-methods exploratory study*. Proceedings of Singapore Healthcare, 2020: p. 2010105820901742.
32. Alsabbagh, M.W., et al., *Socioeconomic status and nonadherence to antihypertensive drugs: a systematic review and meta-analysis*. Value in health, 2014. **17**(2): p. 288-296.
33. Ayele, A.A., et al., *Level of adherence to dietary recommendations and barriers among type 2 diabetic patients: a cross-sectional study in an Ethiopian hospital*. Clinical Diabetes and Endocrinology, 2018. **4**(1): p. 21.
34. Pontieri, F.M. and M.M. Bachion, *Beliefs of diabetic patients about nutritional therapy and its influence on their compliance with treatment*. Ciência & Saúde Coletiva, 2010. **15**(1): p. 151-160.