

Fruit and Vegetable Intake, and Metabolic Syndrome Components: The Uganda NCD Risk Factor Survey [†]

Anthony Kityo ^{1,*} and Abraham Kaggwa ²

¹ Department of Preventive Medicine, Kangwon National University School of Medicine, Chuncheon 24341, Korea

² Lutheran World Federation, Plot 1401 Gaba Road, 5827 Kampala, Uganda; kaggwaabrahamaka@gmail.com

* Correspondence: akkityo@kangwon.ac.kr; Tel.: +82-10-9853-6633

† Presented at the 2nd International Electronic Conference on Nutrients, 15–31 March 2022; Available online: <https://sciforum.net/conference/IECN2022>.

Abstract: Metabolic syndrome (MetS) risk factors have been reported in Uganda, yet the role of dietary risk factors of MetS is rarely reported. This study examined the association between fruit and/or vegetable (FV) intake and MetS risk factors in adults aged 18–69 years. Data from the 2014 Uganda non-communicable diseases risk factor baseline survey was analyzed. The mean intake of FV according to the number of MetS components, and the odds ratios of each component according to quartiles (Q) of fruits and/or vegetable servings were computed. Overall, 1396 men and 1736 women were analyzed. The mean age was 34.4 years, mean daily servings of total FV was 2.6 ± 0.1 , and 77.7% of participants were diagnosed with at least a MetS risk factor whereas 2.6% had ≥ 3 risk factors. Men with ≥ 3 risk factors consumed less vegetable servings compared to those with 1 risk factor (0.9 ± 0.1 vs. 1.5 ± 0.1 , $p < 0.001$). Total FV, and vegetable intake were low in women with ≥ 3 risk factors than in those with none (total FV: 1.4 ± 0.3 vs. 2.2 ± 0.3 , $p = 0.003$; vegetables: 1.1 ± 0.1 vs. 1.4 ± 0.1 , $p = 0.005$). Regarding individual risk factors, higher total FV intake, and only fruit intake were unusually associated with higher odds of low HDL cholesterol in men (total FV: Q1- > Q4, p for trend = 0.025; fruits: Q1- > Q4, p for trend = 0.03). Increasing intake of total FV was inversely associated with abdominal obesity in women (Q1- > Q4, p for trend = 0.04). In conclusion, we found low consumption of vegetables in both genders, and low consumption of total FV in women with ≥ 3 risk factors. In addition, total fruits and vegetable intake was inversely associated with abdominal obesity in women. However, the controversial finding that a high risk of low HDL cholesterol is linked to higher FV or fruit intake in men deserves further research. Results suggest a favorable role of fruits and vegetable intake in metabolic syndrome risk factors in this population.

Citation: Kityo, A.; Kaggwa, A. Fruit and Vegetable Intake, and Metabolic Syndrome Components: The Uganda NCD Risk Factor Survey. *Proceedings* **2022**, *69*, x. <https://doi.org/10.3390/xxxxx>

Academic Editor: Nick Bellissimo

Published: date

Publisher's Note: MDPI stays neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.



Copyright: © 2022 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Keywords: fruits; vegetables; Metabolic Syndrome; abdominal obesity; adults; Uganda

1. Introduction

Low fruit and vegetable (FV) intake is a risk factor for cardiovascular (CVD) mortality and ischemic heart disease (IHD). The highest global burden of disease attributed to insufficient FV consumption is observed in low- and middle-income countries [1]. Metabolic syndrome (MetS), a cluster of abdominal obesity, hypertension, fasting hyperglycemia and dyslipidemia, increases the risk of CVD [2,3]. An increase in the global prevalence of MetS has been reported [4,5] and Uganda is not exceptional. Although nationwide data is lacking, a rural-based survey reported the prevalence of MetS at 19% in Uganda [6]. The prevalence of MetS components has also been reported, with low-high density lipoprotein cholesterol, hypertension, and abdominal obesity being the most prevalent metabolic risk factors [7].

Several epidemiological studies have reported the link between FV intake and MetS development. FV intake was inversely associated with MetS [8,9] and a reduction in

abdominal obesity [10,11]. The relationship between FV intake and MetS or its components has mostly been explored in countries outside Sub-Saharan Africa. Yet, FV intake varies considerably among countries [1]. In Uganda, only 12% of the population consumes 5 or more servings of FV per day [12]. Considering the low consumption of FV in Uganda, the relationship between FV intake and health outcomes warrants investigation. This study investigated the cross-sectional association between FV consumption and MetS risk factors using the 2014 Uganda non-communicable disease risk factor survey.

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Study Participants

The Uganda national non-communicable diseases (NCDs) risk factor baseline survey was conducted between March and July 2014 to determine the magnitude of NCDs and their risk factors in Uganda. The details of the survey methodology have been published elsewhere [7] and is briefly described here. The standard World Health Organization (WHO) STEPS tool for NCDs risk factor surveillance was used to collect data for this national survey [13]. STEPS involves a sequential process that starts with the gathering of information on key risk factors using a questionnaire (STEP 1), followed by simple physical measurements (STEP 2) and biochemical assessments (STEP 3). A multi-stage sampling design was used to select a nationally representative sample of participants aged 18–69 years. Of the 3987 individuals who were surveyed, we excluded participants with missing data on MetS ($n = 12$), covariates ($n = 22$), FV intake ($n = 5$), history of chronic diseases or being on treatment for chronic diseases ($n = 646$) and pregnant women ($n = 170$) yielding a final analytical sample of 3132 participants: 1396 men and 1736 women.

2.2. Metabolic Syndrome Components

Individuals were categorized based on the number of MetS components as 0, 1, 2 and ≥ 3 components. The following criteria was used to diagnose MetS components: (1) average systolic blood pressure of ≥ 140 mmHg or diastolic blood pressure of ≥ 90 mmHg or being on regular antihypertensive medicine; (2) Fasting high-density lipoprotein cholesterol (HDL-c) ≤ 40 for men and ≤ 50 mg/dL for women; (3) Fasting plasma glucose ≥ 100 mg/dL or drug treatment for elevated fasting blood glucose; (4) waist circumference (WC) ≥ 102 cm in men or ≥ 88 cm in women.

2.3. FV Consumption

FV intake was assessed by asking participants the number of days in a typical week when they ate fruits and/or vegetables, and the number of servings of fruit or vegetables eaten on one of those days. Serving sizes were illustrated using nutrition cards. The reported number of servings for each item were summed together to compute the average fruit and/or vegetable servings. Fruit, vegetable and combined FV intake (servings/day) were converted into quartiles.

2.4. Covariates

Covariates were evaluated as follows: educational level (no formal education, primary, secondary, or \geq university); alcohol use (current users: consumption of any type of alcohol during the 30 days preceding the survey, or past/never users); tobacco use (current users or past/never users). The short version of the WHO Global Physical Activity Questionnaire (GPAQ) v2.0 was used to assess physical activity [14]. Based on the GPAQ protocol, participants were categorised into low, moderate, and high physical activity.

2.5. Statistical Analysis

Data were analyzed using Proc survey procedures for complex survey data in SAS version 9.4 (SAS Institute, Cary, NC, USA). Results are means (SEM) for continuous variables, and percentages for categorical variables. The mean daily servings of fruits,

vegetables and total FV were compared across participant characteristics and number of MetS risk factors using the general linear model adjusted for multiple comparisons. Multivariable logistic regression models were used to estimate the odds ratios (ORs) and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) of the associations between FV intake and each MetS component. Statistical significance was tested using *p*-values < 0.05.

3. Results

The relationship between FV intake and participants' characteristics is displayed in Table 1. The intake of more vegetables was associated with old age, and employed women consumed less servings of fruits and total FV. Compared to Baganda, the Basoga and Lugbara/Madi/Iteso/Karimajong consumed more FV only in men while the Bagisu/Sabiny/other tribes consumed more vegetables among women. The Lugbara/Madi/Iteso/Karimajong consumed more fruits than the Baganda, but more vegetables were consumed by the rest of the ethnicities except Banyankole/Bakiga and Banyoro/Batooro among men. On the other hand, more vegetable intake was linked to never alcohol use in men and past alcohol use in women. Moreover, moderate physical activity was associated with consumption of more vegetable and total FV men.

Table 2 shows the average daily servings of FV according to the number of MetS components. Men with ≥3 components consumed less servings of vegetables than those with 1 and 2 components (≥3 vs. 1: LSM ± SE 0.9 ± 0.1 vs. 1.5 ± 0.1; ≥3 vs. 2: LSM ± SE 0.9 ± 0.1 vs. 1.4 ± 0.1, *p* < 0.001) while women with ≥3 components consumed less vegetables than those with 2 (LSM ± SE 1.1 ± 0.1 vs. 1.7 ± 0.1, *p* < 0.001). However, total FV intake was high in women that were diagnosed with no MetS components than those that were diagnosed with ≥3 components (LSM ± SE 2.2 ± 0.3 vs. 1.4 ± 0.3).

Table 1. Mean servings of total fruits and vegetables, fruits, and vegetables according to participant characteristics.

| Characteristic | Men (1396) | | | | Women (1736) | | | |
|----------------------------------|------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|--------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| | % | Total FV | Fruits † | Vegetables †† | % | Total FV | Fruits † | Vegetables †† |
| Age, years | | | | | | | | |
| 18–29 | 45.6 | 2.5 ± 0.1 | 1.5 ± 0.1 | 1.0 ± 0.1 ^a | 48.1 | 2.7 ± 0.1 | 1.5 ± 0.1 | 1.2 ± 0.1 ^a |
| 30–49 | 39.6 | 2.5 ± 0.2 | 1.3 ± 0.1 | 1.2 ± 0.1 | 38.3 | 2.8 ± 0.1 | 1.3 ± 0.1 | 1.5 ± 0.1 [*] |
| 50–69 | 14.8 | 2.7 ± 0.2 | 1.1 ± 0.2 | 1.6 ± 0.2 [*] | 13.5 | 3.2 ± 0.4 | 1.5 ± 0.3 | 1.7 ± 0.2 [*] |
| Highest education level attained | | | | | | | | |
| No formal education | 6.9 | 2.3 ± 0.3 | 0.9 ± 0.2 | 1.4 ± 0.2 | 22.0 | 2.5 ± 0.2 | 1.2 ± 0.2 | 1.2 ± 0.1 |
| Primary | 41.8 | 2.4 ± 0.2 | 1.4 ± 0.1 | 1.1 ± 0.1 | 40.3 | 3.0 ± 0.2 | 1.5 ± 0.2 | 1.5 ± 0.1 |
| Secondary | 39.4 | 2.5 ± 0.2 | 1.3 ± 0.1 | 1.2 ± 0.1 | 32.0 | 2.9 ± 0.2 | 1.4 ± 0.2 | 1.4 ± 0.1 |
| University and above | 12.0 | 2.7 ± 0.3 | 1.5 ± 0.2 | 1.3 ± 0.2 | 5.7 | 2.4 ± 0.3 | 1.2 ± 0.2 | 1.3 ± 0.2 |
| Employment in the past year | | | | | | | | |
| Unemployed | 29.7 | 2.5 ± 0.1 | 1.2 ± 0.1 | 1.1 ± 0.1 | 46.9 | 3.0 ± 0.2 ^a | 1.5 ± 0.2 ^a | 1.4 ± 0.1 |
| Employed | 70.3 | 2.5 ± 0.1 | 1.4 ± 0.1 | 1.2 ± 0.1 | 53.1 | 2.6 ± 0.1 ^b | 1.3 ± 0.1 [*] | 1.4 ± 0.1 |
| Ethnicity | | | | | | | | |
| Baganda | 15.7 | 2.0 ± 0.2 ^a | 1.2 ± 0.1 ^a | 0.8 ± 0.1 ^a | 13.5 | 2.7 ± 0.4 | 1.4 ± 0.2 | 1.3 ± 0.2 ^a |
| Banyankole/Bakiga | 23.0 | 1.7 ± 0.1 | 0.7 ± 0.1 [*] | 1.1 ± 0.1 | 23.8 | 2.0 ± 0.1 | 0.9 ± 0.1 | 1.1 ± 0.1 |
| Basoga | 10.7 | 3.0 ± 0.3 [*] | 1.7 ± 0.2 | 1.3 ± 0.1 [*] | 11.3 | 3.5 ± 0.3 | 1.9 ± 0.3 | 1.7 ± 0.1 |
| Banyoro/Batooro | 10.7 | 2.2 ± 0.2 | 0.9 ± 0.1 | 1.2 ± 0.2 | 11.9 | 2.1 ± 0.2 | 1.0 ± 0.1 | 1.1 ± 0.1 |
| Lango/Padhora/Alur | 15.0 | 2.1 ± 0.2 | 0.9 ± 0.1 | 1.4 ± 0.2 [*] | 17.7 | 2.4 ± 0.2 | 0.9 ± 0.1 | 1.6 ± 0.2 |
| Lugbara/Madi/Iteso/Karimajong | 18.2 | 3.8 ± 0.5 [*] | 2.7 ± 0.5 [*] | 1.2 ± 0.1 [*] | 14.7 | 4.1 ± 0.5 | 2.8 ± 0.5 | 1.4 ± 0.1 |
| Bagisu/Sabiny/others | 6.8 | 3.3 ± 0.3 | 1.3 ± 0.2 | 2.0 ± 0.2 [*] | 7.1 | 3.7 ± 0.5 | 1.6 ± 0.3 | 2.2 ± 0.3 [*] |
| Marital status | | | | | | | | |
| Single/divorced/separated | 34.2 | 2.6 ± 0.2 | 1.5 ± 0.2 | 1.1 ± 0.1 | 34.1 | 2.9 ± 0.2 | 1.5 ± 0.2 | 1.3 ± 0.1 |
| Married/cohabiting | 65.8 | 2.5 ± 0.1 | 1.2 ± 0.1 | 1.2 ± 0.1 | 65.9 | 2.8 ± 0.1 | 1.3 ± 0.1 | 1.4 ± 0.1 |
| Tobacco use | | | | | | | | |
| Never/past user | 83.0 | 2.5 ± 0.1 | 1.3 ± 0.1 | 1.2 ± 0.1 | 95.1 | 2.8 ± 0.1 | 1.5 ± 0.1 | 1.4 ± 0.1 |
| Current user | 17.0 | 2.5 ± 0.2 | 1.3 ± 0.2 | 1.3 ± 0.1 | 4.9 | 1.7 ± 0.2 | 0.5 ± 0.2 | 1.4 ± 0.2 |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|------|------------------------|-----------|------------------------|------|-----------|-----------|------------------------|--|
| Alcohol use | | | | | | | | | |
| Never user | 41.9 | 2.7 ± 0.2 | 1.3 ± 0.1 | 1.4 ± 0.1 ^a | 63.6 | 2.8 ± 0.1 | 1.5 ± 0.1 | 1.3 ± 0.1 ^a | |
| Current user | 38.2 | 2.3 ± 0.1 | 1.3 ± 0.1 | 1.1 ± 0.1 | 17.7 | 2.6 ± 0.2 | 1.2 ± 0.2 | 1.5 ± 0.1 | |
| Past user | 19.8 | 2.4 ± 0.2 | 1.5 ± 0.2 | 1.0 ± 0.1 [*] | 18.7 | 2.8 ± 0.3 | 1.2 ± 0.2 | 1.7 ± 0.2 [*] | |
| Moderate physical activity | | | | | | | | | |
| No | 5.2 | 1.7 ± 0.3 ^a | 1.0 ± 0.2 | 0.8 ± 0.1 ^a | 7.0 | 2.6 ± 0.3 | 1.3 ± 0.2 | 1.3 ± 0.1 | |
| Yes | 94.8 | 2.5 ± 0.1 [*] | 1.4 ± 0.1 | 1.2 ± 0.1 [*] | 93.0 | 2.8 ± 0.1 | 1.4 ± 0.1 | 1.4 ± 0.1 | |
| BMI category | | | | | | | | | |
| Underweight | 10.9 | 2.6 ± 0.3 | 1.5 ± 0.1 | 1.3 ± 0.2 | 7.4 | 2.3 ± 0.3 | 1.0 ± 0.1 | 1.5 ± 0.2 | |
| Normal weight | 76.9 | 2.5 ± 0.1 | 1.2 ± 0.2 | 1.2 ± 0.1 | 66.6 | 2.8 ± 0.1 | 1.5 ± 0.2 | 1.4 ± 0.1 | |
| Overweight/obese | 12.2 | 2.5 ± 0.3 | 1.2 ± 0.2 | 1.4 ± 0.2 | 26.0 | 2.6 ± 0.2 | 1.0 ± 0.2 | 1.4 ± 0.1 | |

Means were adjusted for age. Dunnett was used for multiple comparisons. * significantly different from ^a. FV: fruits and vegetables; [†] Analyzed: Men 1378; women 1719; ^{††} Analysed Men 1393; women 1732.

Table 2. Average daily servings of fruit and vegetables according to the number of MetS risk factors.

| | Men | | | | | Women | | | | |
|------------|---------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-----------------|
| | Number of MetS Components | | | | <i>p</i> -value | Number of MetS Components | | | | <i>p</i> -value |
| | 0 <i>n</i> = 415 | 1 <i>n</i> = 775 | 2 <i>n</i> = 200 | ≥3 <i>n</i> = 06 | | 0 <i>n</i> = 390 | 1 <i>n</i> = 925 | 2 <i>n</i> = 335 | ≥3 <i>n</i> = 86 | |
| Total FV | 1.9 ± 0.3 | 2.2 ± 0.2 | 2.5 ± 0.2 | 1.3 ± 0.3 | 0.12 | 2.2 ± 0.3 ^a | 2.4 ± 0.2 ^a | 2.6 ± 0.2 ^a | 1.4 ± 0.3 ^b | 0.003 |
| Vegetables | 1.3 ± 0.1 ^{ab} | 1.5 ± 0.1 ^a | 1.4 ± 0.1 ^a | 0.9 ± 0.1 ^b | <0.001 | 1.4 ± 0.1 ^{ab} | 1.6 ± 0.1 ^{ab} | 1.7 ± 0.1 ^a | 1.1 ± 0.1 ^b | 0.005 |
| Fruits | 1.1 ± 0.2 | 1.1 ± 0.2 | 1.5 ± 0.2 | 0.7 ± 0.2 | 0.49 | 1.5 ± 0.2 | 1.5 ± 0.2 | 1.5 ± 0.2 | 0.9 ± 0.2 | 0.070 |

Means were Adjusted for age, education, employment and race, smoking, alcohol intake and physical activity. Scheffe was used for multiple comparisons and values with different superscripts were significantly different.

Table 3 shows the association between FV intake and MetS components in men. The odds of low HDL-cholesterol increased with increasing intake of total FV servings (Q4 vs. Q1: OR = 1.73, 95% CI 1.04–2.87, *p* for trend 0.025) and fruit servings (Q4 vs. Q1: OR = 1.43, 95% CI 0.92–2.23, *p* for trend 0.037).

Table 3. Odds ratios and 95% confidence intervals of MetS risk factors by quartiles of fruit and vegetable intake in men.

| | Total FV | | | Fruits | | | Vegetables | | |
|---------------------|----------|------|--------------------------|--------|------|---------------------|------------|------|------------------|
| | Yes | No | OR (95% CI) [†] | Yes | No | OR (95% CI) | Yes | No | OR (95% CI) |
| Abdominal obesity | 08 | 1357 | | 08 | 1341 | | 08 | 1354 | |
| Q1 | 03 | 388 | 1.00 | 01 | 338 | 1.00 | 04 | 393 | 1.00 |
| Q2 | 02 | 321 | 1.48 (0.15–14.94) | 03 | 350 | 10.53 (0.56–197.77) | 01 | 418 | 0.55 (0.05–5.75) |
| Q3 | 01 | 341 | 0.15 (0.01–1.65) | 02 | 321 | 8.41 (0.39–183.08) | 02 | 261 | 0.2 (0.02–1.95) |
| Q4 | 02 | 307 | 0.33 (0.04–3.08) | 02 | 332 | 1.98 (0.09–45.68) | 01 | 282 | 0.36 (0.04–2.91) |
| <i>p</i> for trend | | | 0.223 | | | 0.486 | | | 0.294 |
| High blood pressure | 349 | 1018 | | 343 | 1008 | | 348 | 1016 | |
| Q1 | 102 | 288 | 1.00 | 89 | 249 | 1.00 | 106 | 293 | 1.00 |
| Q2 | 76 | 248 | 0.96 (0.58–1.6) | 80 | 273 | 1 (0.62–1.62) | 88 | 331 | 0.63 (0.4–1) |
| Q3 | 79 | 265 | 0.68 (0.42–1.1) | 84 | 240 | 1.01 (0.59–1.74) | 66 | 197 | 1.16 (0.72–1.86) |
| Q4 | 92 | 217 | 1.2 (0.73–1.97) | 90 | 246 | 1.14 (0.68–1.92) | 88 | 195 | 1.17 (0.73–1.86) |
| <i>p</i> for trend | | | 0.482 | | | 0.560 | | | 0.133 |
| High blood glucose | 55 | 1232 | | 55 | 1216 | | 55 | 1230 | |
| Q1 | 19 | 357 | 1.00 | 13 | 307 | 1.00 | 16 | 364 | 1.00 |
| Q2 | 09 | 287 | 0.47 (0.2–1.11) | 16 | 312 | 1.17 (0.4–3.41) | 13 | 384 | 0.56 (0.22–1.41) |
| Q3 | 17 | 315 | 1.02 (0.41–2.52) | 16 | 295 | 1.16 (0.43–3.15) | 17 | 229 | 1.17 (0.44–3.1) |
| Q4 | 10 | 273 | 0.56 (0.23–1.38) | 10 | 302 | 0.66 (0.23–1.94) | 09 | 253 | 0.81 (0.28–2.34) |
| <i>p</i> for trend | | | 0.357 | | | 0.286 | | | 0.974 |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|-----|-----|------------------|-----|-----|------------------|-----|-----|------------------|
| Low HDL-cholesterol | 782 | 505 | | 775 | 496 | | 780 | 505 | |
| Q1 | 220 | 156 | 1.00 | 183 | 137 | 1.00 | 72 | 46 | 1.00 |
| Q2 | 170 | 126 | 1.12 (0.74–1.69) | 192 | 136 | 0.87 (0.57–1.32) | 127 | 64 | 1.02 (0.69–1.52) |
| Q3 | 212 | 120 | 1.50 (0.96–2.36) | 198 | 113 | 1.23 (0.8–1.9) | 88 | 45 | 1.27 (0.81–2) |
| Q4 | 180 | 103 | 1.73 (1.04–2.87) | 202 | 110 | 1.43 (0.92–2.23) | 85 | 66 | 1.06 (0.66–1.69) |
| <i>p</i> for trend | | | 0.025 | | | 0.037 | | | 0.680 |

† Adjusted for age, education, employment, race, smoking, alcohol intake and physical activity.

Table 4 shows the association between FV intake and MetS components in women. Increased intake of FV was inversely associated with abdominal obesity (*p* for trend 0.044).

Table 4. Odds ratios and 95% confidence intervals of MetS risk factors by quartiles of fruit and vegetable intake in women.

| | Total FV | | | Fruits | | | Vegetables | | |
|---------------------|----------|------|------------------|--------|------|------------------|------------|------|------------------|
| | Yes | No | OR (95% CI)† | Yes | No | OR (95% CI) | Yes | No | OR (95% CI) |
| Abdominal obesity | 301 | 1395 | | 299 | 1383 | | 300 | 1392 | |
| Q1 | 86 | 330 | 1.00 | 76 | 381 | 1.00 | 62 | 283 | 1.00 |
| Q2 | 69 | 342 | 0.94 (0.61–1.45) | 91 | 349 | 1.26 (0.76–2.09) | 100 | 422 | 1.16 (0.74–1.81) |
| Q3 | 83 | 350 | 0.84 (0.55–1.30) | 69 | 309 | 0.78 (0.46–1.31) | 65 | 323 | 1.01 (0.61–1.69) |
| Q4 | 63 | 373 | 0.63 (0.39–1.02) | 63 | 344 | 0.76 (0.46–1.24) | 73 | 364 | 0.95 (0.58–1.56) |
| <i>p</i> for trend | | | 0.044 | | | 0.078 | | | 0.607 |
| High blood pressure | 364 | 1340 | | 364 | 1326 | | 364 | 1336 | |
| Q1 | 100 | 317 | 1.00 | 122 | 337 | 1.00 | 75 | 272 | 1.00 |
| Q2 | 86 | 328 | 0.67 (0.43–1.05) | 100 | 343 | 0.88 (0.58–1.34) | 109 | 416 | 0.98 (0.63–1.54) |
| Q3 | 87 | 348 | 0.71 (0.43–1.18) | 64 | 316 | 0.65 (0.41–1.03) | 74 | 315 | 0.72 (0.39–1.31) |
| Q4 | 91 | 347 | 0.82 (0.54–1.26) | 78 | 330 | 0.83 (0.51–1.34) | 106 | 333 | 1.01 (0.65–1.56) |
| <i>p</i> for trend | | | 0.728 | | | 0.550 | | | 0.962 |
| High blood glucose | 75 | 1551 | | 75 | 1535 | | 75 | 1548 | |
| Q1 | 17 | 384 | 1.00 | 18 | 418 | 1.00 | 16 | 315 | 1.00 |
| Q2 | 29 | 367 | 1.62 (0.69–3.79) | 27 | 404 | 0.98 (0.41–2.35) | 25 | 477 | 1.25 (0.59–2.64) |
| Q3 | 15 | 405 | 0.44 (0.16–1.2) | 19 | 343 | 0.91 (0.39–2.14) | 19 | 352 | 0.87 (0.37–2.05) |
| Q4 | 14 | 395 | 0.78 (0.32–1.88) | 11 | 370 | 0.45 (0.17–1.21) | 15 | 404 | 0.77 (0.31–1.95) |
| <i>p</i> for trend | | | 0.245 | | | 0.062 | | | 0.306 |
| Low HDL cholesterol | 1120 | 506 | | 1113 | 497 | | 1117 | 506 | |
| Q1 | 279 | 122 | 1.00 | 288 | 148 | 1.00 | 241 | 139 | 1.00 |
| Q2 | 268 | 128 | 0.86 (0.57–1.3) | 303 | 128 | 1.12 (0.78–1.61) | 239 | 158 | 1.18 (0.77–1.8) |
| Q3 | 290 | 130 | 1.01 (0.66–1.56) | 259 | 103 | 1.25 (0.81–1.93) | 153 | 93 | 0.98 (0.64–1.49) |
| Q4 | 283 | 126 | 1.1 (0.73–1.64) | 263 | 118 | 1.09 (0.74–1.59) | 147 | 115 | 1.34 (0.86–2.07) |
| <i>p</i> for trend | | | 0.416 | | | 0.881 | | | 0.283 |

† Adjusted for age, education, employment, race, smoking, alcohol intake and physical activity.

4. Discussion

We investigated the association between fruit and vegetable intake and MetS components using nation-wide survey data. We reported that having ≥3 MetS components was associated with low vegetable intake in men and women, but low total FV intake only in women. In addition, total FV intake was inversely associated with abdominal obesity in women, consistent with previous research [10,11]. However, FV intake, fruits in particular, was positively associated with low HDL-cholesterol in men.

The positive association of FV intake and low HDL-cholesterol in men could be explained by possible reverse causation, and residual confounding from total energy intake, urban/rural residence and menopausal status. This finding deserves further exploration. Notably, lack of data on triglycerides precluded MetS diagnosis. Nevertheless, the study provides preliminary data on the association FV intake and markers of MetS diagnosis in Uganda using population-based data.

5. Conclusions

These results suggest a benefit of FV intake in MetS, and a need to consider strategies for promotion of FV intake with particular attention to women. Studies with data on all MetS components and potential confounders are needed to confirm these results.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, A.K.; methodology, A.K.; validation, A.K. and A.K.; formal analysis, A.K.; writing—original draft preparation, A.K. and A.K.; writing—review and editing; supervision, A.K. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: This research received no external funding

Institutional Review Board Statement: The study was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki, and approved by the Institutional Review and Ethics Committee of St. Francis Hospital, Nsambya, Kampala, Uganda (approval number: IRC/PRJ/11/13/031).

Informed Consent Statement: Informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in the study.

Acknowledgments: This paper uses data from the Uganda 2014 STEPS survey, implemented by the Uganda Ministry of health with the support of the World Health Organization.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

1. World Health Organisation. Global Health Risks: Mortality and Burden of Disease Attributable to Selected Major Risks. 2009. Available online: <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/44203> (accessed on 2 February 2022).
2. Saely, C.H.; Rein, P.; Drexel, H. The metabolic syndrome and risk of cardiovascular disease and diabetes: Experiences with the new diagnostic criteria from the International Diabetes Federation. *Horm. Metab. Res.* **2007**, *39*, 642–650.
3. Nestel, P.; Lyu, R.; Low, L.P.; Sheu, W.H.-H.; Nitiyanant, W.; Saito, I.; Tan, C.E. Metabolic syndrome: Recent prevalence in East and Southeast Asian populations. *Asia Pac. J. Clin. Nutr.* **2007**, *16*, 362–367.
4. Ford, E.S.; Giles, W.H.; Dietz, W.H. Prevalence of the metabolic syndrome among US adults: Findings from the Third National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey. *JAMA* **2002**, *287*, 356–359.
5. Aguilar, M.; Bhuket, T.; Torres, S.; Liu, B.; Wong, R.J. Prevalence of the Metabolic Syndrome in the United States, 2003–2012. *JAMA* **2015**, *313*, 1973–1974.
6. Ben-Yacov, L.; Ainembabazi, P.; Stark, A.H.; Kizito, S.; Bahendeka, S. Prevalence and sex-specific patterns of metabolic syndrome in rural Uganda. *BMJ Nutr. Prev. Health* **2020**, *3*, 11–17.
7. Uganda Ministry of Health. Non-Communicable Disease Risk Factor Baseline Survey 2014. 2014. Available online: <https://www.health.go.ug/cause/non-communicable-disease-risk-factor-baseline-survey/> (accessed on March 2022).
8. Lim, M.; Kim, J. Association between fruit and vegetable consumption and risk of metabolic syndrome determined using the Korean Genome and Epidemiology Study (KoGES). *Eur. J. Nutr.* **2019**, *59*, 1667–1678.
9. Zhang, Y.; Zhang, D.Z. Associations of vegetable and fruit consumption with metabolic syndrome. A meta-analysis of observational studies. *Public Health Nutr.* **2018**, *21*, 1693–1703.
10. Schwingshackl, L.; Hoffmann, G.; Kalle-Uhlmann, T.; Arregui, M.; Buijsse, B.; Boeing, H. Fruit and Vegetable Consumption and Changes in Anthropometric Variables in Adult Populations: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Prospective Cohort Studies. *PLoS ONE* **2015**, *10*, e0140846.
11. Yu, Z.M.; Declercq, V.; Cui, Y.; Forbes, C.; Grandy, S.; Keats, M.; Parker, L.; Sweeney, E.; Dummer, T.J.B. Fruit and vegetable intake and body adiposity among populations in Eastern Canada: The Atlantic Partnership for Tomorrow's Health Study. *BMJ Open* **2018**, *8*, 18060.
12. Kabwama, S.N.; Bahendeka, S.K.; Wesonga, R.; Mutungi, G.; Guwatudde, D. Low consumption of fruits and vegetables among adults in Uganda: Findings from a countrywide cross-sectional survey. *Arch. Public Health* **2019**, *77*, 4.
13. Riley, L.; Guthold, R.; Cowan, M.; Savin, S.; Bhatti, L.; Armstrong, T.; Bonita, R. The World Health Organization STEPwise Approach to Noncommunicable Disease Risk-Factor Surveillance: Methods, Challenges, and Opportunities. *Am. J. Public Health* **2016**, *106*, 74–78.
14. Global Physical Activity Questionnaire (GPAQ). Available online: <https://www.who.int/ncds/surveillance/steps/GPAQ%20Instrument%20and%20Analysis%20Guide%20v2.pdf> (accessed on 2 February 2022).