International Journal of Allied Medical Sciences and Clinical Research (IJAMSCR)

ISSN:2347-6567

IJAMSCR |Volume 4 | Issue 1 | Jan – Mar - 2016
www.ijamscr.com

Research article *Medical research*

Trend of obesity, socio-economic status and nutrient intake of overweight and obese working women

[1]Upasana*, [2]Archana Chakravarty, [3]Kailash Kumar Gupta, [4]Yamini Bhusan Tripathi

[1, 2]Department of Home Science (Food & Nutrition), Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi 221005, Uttar Pradesh, India.

[3]Department of General Medicine, I.M.S, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi 221005, Uttar Pradesh, India.

[4]Department of Medicinal Chemistry, I.M.S, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi 221005, Uttar Pradesh, India.

***Corresponding author: Upasana**

Email Id: me.upasana87@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Obesity is an important public health problem in today's era. Obesity occurs as a result of positive energy balance in the body. One of the reason for the obesity is the nutrition transition which is based on socio – economic conditions (such as education, occupation and per capita income) and sometimes in individual social background. The objective of the present study is to assess the trend of obesity in among different socio – economic status (SES) of overweight and obese working women and their nutrient intake. For this, cross – sectional study was conducted on 200 working women (respondents) and the respondents were selected by purposive sampling technique. Pretested and predesigned questionnaire – cum – interview schedule was used for data collection. Anthropometric measurements were taken by standard technique (Jelliffe, 1966). The values of percent body fat (PBF) and visceral fat (VF) were taken by Omron Body Composition Monitor; HBF 212. The result revealed that 85.7 percent of the overweight respondents belong to upper lower SES category and among obese grade I respondents 28 percent of the respondents come in upper middle SES category. Significant association was observed between health risk parameters like height ($F= 16.55$, $P < 0.01$), weight ($F= 17.33$, $P < 0.01$), BMI ($F= 3.97$, $P < 0.01$) and PBF ($F= 4.32$, $P < 0.01$) with different categories of SES. In context of dietary intake significant association of SES found with fat ($F= 5.67$, $P < 0.001$), calcium ($F= 10.43$, $P < 0.001$) and total fibre ($F = 3.14$, $P < 0.05$). Correlation between SES, health related risk parameters and nutrient intake was observed from the value of Pearson Correlation coefficient (r). In context of health risk parameters the SES shows positive correlation with height, weight, body mass index (BMI) and VF. In the arena of nutrient intake, SES shows positive correlation with protein, fat, calcium and negative correlation with total fibre. Therefore, it may be concluded that not only SES play role in adiposity but it may be due to sedentary lifestyle, changing eating pattern, lack of physical activity, hormonal imbalance, genetics factors etc be the reason for their overweight and obesity.

Keywords: Socioeconomic status, Overweight, Obesity, BMI, Percent body fat, Visceral fat.

INTRODUCTION

Obesity has reached threatened level all over the world, both in developed and developing countries. It is one of the biggest problems of today's era which affects the individual not only physically but physiologically and psychologically as well. According to recent report of WHO, more than 1.9 billion adults, 18 years and older, were overweight as well as 600 million were reported to be obese in year 2014 [1]. As India is passing through the transitional phase of both nutrition and socio - economic development, which has the potential for changing the nutritional status of the population, groups [2]. The SES is a complex parameter conceptualized by broad spectrum of variables by combining occupation, education and family income. Although these variables measure the same concept, it has been suggested that they cover different aspects of the socio – economic structure contributing individually to the relationship between socio – economic status and diet [3].

Occupation may affect the diet by creating environment or social networks that can influence behavioural health habits [4]. Inspite of this, it also measures prestige, responsibility, physical activity and work exposures in developed societies [5]. Education is considered as an important tool related to health outcomes as it influences the lifestyle behaviours (e.g. exercise and diet), problem solving capacity and values (e.g. importance of preventive health behaviours) [6]. Income is considered as a mirror of availability of economic and material resources and therefore influences the dietary quality by making healthy food more or less affordable and accessible [7].

The analysis of dietary intake (nutrient intake) is an approach to investigate a link between diet and socio – economic status in relation to health risks. It has received a lot of attention from researchers and is indeed important, since it recognizes that foods are consumed in many combinations that are likely to be complex and that nutrient intakes are often highly correlated with certain nutrients having interactive and synergistic effects [8]. Therefore, the aim of this research paper is to investigate the trend of obesity in different socio – economic status category as well as to find the association of SES with health risk parameters and nutrient intake among respondents.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Selection of respondents

The present study has been carried out on total 200 respondents between the ages of 23 – 64 years which were selected by purposive sampling technique from Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi, and Uttar Pradesh, India. The data were collected from all respondents with the help of well-designed questionnaire – cum – interview schedule.

Ethical considerations

The studies were conducted under the rules and regulation of Institute Ethical Committee, IMS, BHU (Ethical committee letter number - Dean /2012-13/183).

Socio – demographic characteristics

This section deals with the general characteristics of the respondent i.e. about their age, marital status, type of family, religion, education, occupation, family income per month, socio – economic status and body mass index (BMI).

Socio – economic information

For socio – economic status, information regarding occupation, education and family income was collected. For the measurement of socio – economic status of the respondents Kuppuswamy's scale was used [9]. The suggested critical limits of Kuppuswamy's scale are as follows:

Total Score	Socio – economic status
26 – 29	Upper (I)
16 – 25	Upper middle (II)
11 – 15	Lower Middle (III)
5 – 10	Upper lower (IV)
<5	Lower (V)

Anthropometrical parameters

The anthropometrical measurements of the respondents i.e. height and weight were measured by using standard technique [10]. BMI was calculated by dividing weight in kilograms by height in meters square [11]. BMI was then categorized based on standards i.e. NHLBI Obesity Education Initiative 2000 and Report of WHO Expert Consultation 2008 were utilized for the assessment of obesity as given below [12, 13].

World Body Mass Index (BMI) kg/m^2	Classification
>18.50	Underweight
18.50- 24.99	Normal
25.00-29.99	Overweight
30.00 – 34.99	Grade I obese
35.00 – 39.99	Grade II obese
> 40.00	Grade III obese

After that, waist and hip circumference were measured to assess the abdominal obesity. Waist hip ratio (WHR) was calculated by dividing the waist circumference and hip circumference. As per classification of WHO Expert Consultation 2008, the following cut off values used for WC and WHR for the assessment of central or abdominal obesity as given below [13].

Indicator	Cut off points	Risk of metabolic complications
Waist circumference	<80cm for women	Normal
	>80 cm for women	Increased risk
Waist- hip ratio	≥0.85 for women	Substantially increased
	< 0.85 for women	Normal

Visceral fat (VF) and percent body fat (PBF) were also measured by using Omron Body Composition Monitor (HBF 212). As per Omron Body Composition guidelines, the following cut off values used for VF and PBF for the assessment of abdominal obesity and percentage of fat in the body as given below [14]

Visceral fat level	Classification
1 – 9	Normal
10 – 14	High
15 – 30	Very high

Percent body fat	Classification
20.00 – 29.99	Normal
30.00 – 34.99	High
35.00 – 50.00	Very high

Dietary assessment

Nutrient intake of the respondents was recorded by 24 hour recall method with the help of nutritive value of Indian foods [15]. The respondents reported the type and quantity of meal (i.e. food and beverages) consumed over the past 24 hours. The quantities of food consumed were converted into raw equivalents by using household measurements to estimate the portion size of consumed food. The intake was then compared with recommended dietary allowances [16].

Statistical analysis of the data

Statistical analysis was performed by using trial version of Statistical Package of Social Sciences (SPSS) Version 20.0. The data was analyzed by using descriptive statistics such as frequency and percentage. For determining the significance between the variables chi square test and F- test were used. For calculating the X^2 test, the number of respondents comes in obese grade II category is combined together with obese grade I category. To find correlation between the parameters Pearson

correlation coefficient was used. Turkey HSD (post hoc) test was used to assess the significant pairs.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Obesity results from a positive calorie balance i.e. the intake of calories are greater than its expenditures. Inspite of this, lack of physical activity, faulty dietary pattern, genetic, hormonal imbalance and sedentary lifestyle may also be important factor for etiology of obesity. Nutrition plays a direct role in determining the caloric balance by being the sole variable accounting for the caloric intake [17].

Obesity increases the risk for a variety of chronic diseases including coronary artery diseases, strokes [18], glucose intolerance [19] and some forms of cancer. Obesity is not a direct cause of most of diseases, but unfavourably alters the risk factor profile. For example, obesity may lead to increase in blood pressure and blood cholesterol, which in turn lead to cardiovascular diseases and strokes [17].

From the present study, it was interpreted that about 45 percent of the respondents belongs to 36 – 50 years of age group and 32.5 percent of them lies in ≤ 35 years of age group. The mean age of the respondents was 42 years. It was found that 82.5 percent of the respondents were married and 7 percent of them were single. In context of type of family, 60 percent of the respondents live in nuclear type of family. In arena of educational qualification 62 percent of the respondents were graduate and above and 2.5 percent of among them have primary school of education. It was found that nearly half of the respondents were in education profession i.e. either they were assistant professor, associate professor, professor or teachers in BHU campus. It was found that 57 percent of the respondents have family income per month greater than Rs. 18,498. In context of socio – economic status, it was found that 35.5 percent of the respondents belong to upper socio – economic status category, 37 percent of them belong to middle and 28 percent of them belong to lower socio – economic status category. In the area of BMI, it was found that 80 percent of the respondents were overweight, 18 percent of them belong to obese grade I category and 2 percent of them in obese grade II category as shown in table 1.

Table 1: Distribution of respondents according to socio- demographic characteristics

Characteristics	Number (200)	Percentage (%)
Age Group		
≤35	65	32.5
36-50	90	45.0
>50	45	22.5
Average ± S.D = 42.01 ± 9.86		
Range = 23 - 64		
Marital Status		
Single	14	7.0
Married	165	82.5
Widow	21	10.5
Type of family		
Nuclear	120	60.0
Joint family	80	40.0
Religion		
Hindu	174	87.0
Muslim	16	8.0
Christian	10	5.0

Education		
Profession or Honors	34	17.0
Graduate or Post – Graduate	90	45.0
Intermediate	12	6.0
High School	7	3.5
Middle School	20	10.0
Primary School	5	2.5
Illiterate	32	16.0

Occupation		
Profession	72	36.0
Semi- Profession	24	12.0
Clerical	26	13.0
Skilled Worker	4	2.0
Semi-skilled Worker	12	6.0
Unskilled Worker	62	31.0

Income per month		
≥ 36,997	56	28.0
18,498 – 36,996	58	29.0
13,874 – 18,497	13	6.5
9,249 – 13,873	22	11.0
5,547 – 9,248	51	25.5

Socio-economic status		
Upper	70	35.5
Upper – middle	50	25.0
Lower middle	24	12.0
Upper lower	56	28.0

Worldwide Body mass index (BMI)		
Overweight	160	80.0
Obese Grade I	36	18.0
Obese Grade II	4	2.0

Socio – economic status is the one of the important parameter to assess the adiposity among women. In this connection, for measurement of obesity in different socio – economic classes BMI was used. BMI is considered as an important tool for measurement of overweight and obesity. It does not measure the body fat directly, but research has shown that BMI correlates to direct measures of body fat such as under water weighing and dual energy x – ray absorptiometry (DXA) [20]. It can be considered as an alternative for direct measures of body fat. Additionally, it is an inexpensive method and easy to perform for the screening of weight categories that may leads to health problems. Therefore, BMI is one of the best methods for population assessment of overweight and obesity [21]. Generally in developing countries, the level of obesity is greater in the higher socio – economic status segments of the society [22]. Evidences exist in Brazil, [23], Cameroon, [24] India, [25], Jordan, [23], and Madagascar [23]. However converse result is found in this cross sectional study that, 85.7 percent of the respondents were overweight come in upper lower category of socio – economic status and 72 percent of them come in upper – middle socio – economic status category. This may be due to lack of knowledge about food, nutrition and health (i.e. recommended dietary guidelines). In context of obese grade I category, it was found that 28 percent of the respondents lie in upper middle category and 20 percent of them come in upper socio – economic category. Through X^2 analysis, there is no significant association found between SES and

worldwide BMI (P > 0.05). From these data, it may be concluded that overweight and obesity are not totally dependent on socio – economic status but it may be due to faulty eating habits, sedentary lifestyle, genetic factor, lack of physical activity, hormonal problem or may be due to any other reason as shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Socio- economic status of the respondents according to worldwide BMI

Socio– economic status	**Overweight**		**Obese Grade I**		**Total**	
	No.	**%**	**No.**	**%**	**No.**	**%**
Upper (I)	56	80.0	14	20.0	70	100.0
Upper middle (II)	36	72.0	14	28.0	50	100.0
Lower middle (III)	20	83.3	4	16.7	24	100.0
Upper lower (IV)	48	85.7	8	14.3	56	100.0
Total	160	80.0	40	20.0	200	100.0

X2 =3.31, df =3, P > 0.05

In the present finding significant difference were found in height (F= 1.655, P < 0.01), weight (F= 17.33, P < 0.01), BMI (F= 3.97, P < 0.01) and PBF (F= 4.32, P < 0.01) with the different categories SES through F test. Turkey HSD (Post – hoc) test is used to see the significant pairs of health parameters and SES.

Table 3: Mean and standard deviation of health parameters of different socio – economic status of respondents

	Socio – economic status					
Health Parameters	**I (70)**	**II (50)**	**III (24)**	**IV (56)**	**Total** (200)	**Statistical significance**
Height (cm)	154.77±5.93	154.18±5.92	149.08±8.36	147.91±5.73	152.02±6.90	F=16.55, P<0.01
Weight (kg)	67.10±8.59	68.18±8.56	60.54±8.83	59.20±4.68	64.37±8.62	F=17.33, P<0.01
BMI (kg/m^2)	27.99±2.63	28.66±3.30	26.96±2.53	27.09±2.06	27.78±2.72	F=3.97, P<0.01
WC (cm)	87.20±8.47	87.98±7.63	86.54±6.53	88.70±8.97	87.74±8.18	F=0.54, P>0.05
WHR	0.89±0.06	0.88±0.06	0.89±0.06	0.87±0.05	0.88±0.06	F=1.23, P>0.05
VF	10.27±5.10	10.24±3.32	9.67±3.73	10.93±4.42	10.38±4.34	F=0.54, P>0.05
PBF	37.11±3.36	37.52±3.21	36.00±2.84	35.57±2.91	36.65±3.22	F=4.32, P<0.01

Here, BMI= body mass index, WC= waist circumference, WHR= waist hip ratio, VF= visceral fat and PBF= percent body fat. All values are in mean ± S.D and Turkey HSD (Post- hoc) test is used to assess the significant pairs. Height: I vs. III & IV, II vs. III & IV; Weight: I vs. III & IV, II vs. III & IV; BMI: II vs. IV; PBF: I vs. IV, II vs. IV.

Diet also plays a dramatic role in maintaining the nutritional status of the individual. It is well documented that SES can affect the food choices by structural, material, and economic factors, attitudes and beliefs towards health and food and knowledge about food, nutrition, and health [26]. The relationship between SES and dietary intakes has been investigated in recent years [27]. Some studies shows that high SES is associated with decreased risk of dietary inequalities and lower SES individual are more prone to diet and health disparities [28]. The lower SES seems to be the least likely to purchase or consume foods that are known as healthy foods i.e., consistent with dietary guideline recommendations [29]. As a long-term outcome of this situation, diet related diseases such as obesity has higher mortality and morbidity rates in low SES groups [30]. In this connection, the study states that protein, carbohydrate, calcium, phosphorus and total fibre intake of the respondents were higher in all the categories of SES as compared to RDA 2010. It was reported that lower socioeconomic status might limit adequate consumption of calcium intake and subsequently contribute to poor bone health [31]. But converse result is found in this study, the fat intake was slightly higher in upper SES category and the iron intake was lower in all the categories of SES. Through F – test, it was concluded that the fat (F= 5.67, P < 0.001), calcium (F= 10.43, P < 0.001) and total fibre (F= 3.14, P < 0.005) intake has significant association with different categories of SES. This may be considered as one of the reason

of obesity because excess intake of nutrient leads to storage of energy in form of glycogen in our body via metabolic pathway.

Table 4: Mean and standard deviation of nutrient intake of different socio – economic status of the respondents

	Socio– economic status					
Health Parameters	**I (70)**	**II (50)**	**III (24)**	**IV (56)**	**Total (200)**	**Statistical significance**
Protein (g)	62.64±14.56	61.10±11.74	58.63±11.31	60.54±12.68	60.54 ± 12.68	F=1.49,P> 0.05
Fat (g)	43.10±14.41	38.72±10.85	34.21±9.00	34.86±12.60	38.63±12.95	F=5.67,P< 0.001
Carbohydrate (g)	308.64±60.88	313.08±66.43	313.38±61.08	327.04±68.83	315.47±64.56	F= 0.89,P > 0.05
Energy (kcal)	1903.76±345.43	1879.00±358.19	1840.50±304.85	1871.95±353.78	1881.07±344.53	F=0.22,P> 0.05
Calcium (mg)	856.77±294.86	894.60±264.74	727.79±224.82	650.30±200.18	792.92±273.11	F=10.43,P <0.001
Phosphorus (mg)	1472.49±389.37	1535.02±329.67	1516.50±356.14	1447.32±283.00	1486.36±342.53	F=0.68,P > 0.05
Iron (mg)	18.2 ±5.46	18.54±4.85	19.50±6.08	17.82±4.58	18.34±5.14	F=0.63,P > 0.05
Total fibre (g)	43.30 ± 12.45	48.38 ± 13.09	48.50 ± 9.64	49.50 ± 12.88	46.93 ± 12.64	F= 3.14,P < 0.05

All values are in mean ± S.D and Turkey HSD (Post- hoc) test is used to assess the significant pairs: Fat: I vs. III & IV; Calcium: I vs. IV, II vs. III & IV; Total fibre: I & IV.

Table 5 depicts the Pearson Correlation coefficient (r) between health parameters with SES. The value of 'r' in this table reveals the significant association of height (r = 0.433, P < 0.001), weight (r = 0.433, P < 0.01), BMI (r = 0.198, P < 0.01) and VF (r= 0.251, P < 0.001) with SES.

Table 5: Correlation between socio-economic status and health parameters

	Socio – economic status	
Health parameters	**'r' value**	**P - value**
Height	0.433^{S}	< 0.001
Weight	0.433^{S}	< 0.001
BMI	0.198^{S}	< 0.01
WC	$- 0.041^{NS}$	> 0.05
WHR	0.086^{NS}	> 0.05
VF	0.251^{S}	<0.001
PBF	$- 0.036^{NS}$	> 0.05

Here, BMI = body mass index, WC= waist circumference, WHR= waist hip ratio, VF= visceral fat and PBF= percent body fat. S = significant and NS = non-significant. The Pearson Correlation coefficient 'r' value calculated between nutrient and socio – economic status. In table 6 reveals that there is significant positive association found between protein (r = 0.171, P = < 0.05), fat (r= 0.263, P < 0.001), calcium (r= 0.351, P < 0.001) and negative association was found between total fibre (r = - 1.63, P < 0.05) with SES.

Table 6: Correlation between socio – economic status and nutrient intake

Socio – economic status		
Nutrient intake	**'r' value**	**P - value**
Protein (g)	0.171^{S}	< 0.05
Fat (g)	0.263^{S}	< 0.001
Carbohydrate (g)	$- 0.094^{NS}$	> 0.05
Energy (kcal)	0.052^{NS}	> 0.05
Calcium (mg)	0.351^{S}	< 0.001
Phosphorus (mg)	0.064^{NS}	> 0.05
Iron (mg)	0.035^{NS}	> 0.05
Total fibre (g)	-1.63^{S}	< 0.05

Here, S = significant and NS = non-significant

CONCLUSION

Socio – economic status is a complex, multifaceted construct based on three parameters i.e. education, occupation and family income. The present study demonstrates that overweight respondents are more in lower SES category than in middle and high SES category. In spite of this it was also observed that the fat intake among the respondents decreases in SES from upper to lower. This may be due to nutrition transition .i.e. shift to high energy, high fat and low fibre diet. The respondents need to develop regular pattern of physical activity along with manipulation in their diet and lifestyle for leading a healthy life. Therefore, there is a need to evolve community based approach to develop strategies for combating the problem of weight gain of the nation.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We own our sincere thanks to Prof. I. J. Singh, for his guidance in statistical analysis. We are also deeply regretted if we are unable to cite the paper of all those authors who have contributed to our understanding about this topic. The present research received no grant from any funding agencies.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors of the manuscript have no conflict of interest to declare.

REFERENCES

[1]. Obesity and overweight Fact sheet N°311 Updated January 2015 (http://www.who.int/mediacentre/factsheets/fs311/en/).

[2]. Yadava S, Singh A. Some socio – demographic profile of overweight and obese females of Hathras city, Uttar Pradesh. Indian J. Prev. Soc. Med., 2011; 42 (1): 34 – 37.

[3]. Galobardes B, Morabia A, Bernstein M. Diet and socioeconomic position: does the use of different indicators matter? Int J Epidemiol., Apr 2001; 30(2):334-40.

[4]. Turrell G, Hewitt B, Patterson C et al. Measuring socio-economic position in dietary research: is choice of socio-economic indicator important? Public Health Nutr, Apr 2003; 6(2):191-200.

[5]. Winkleby MA, Jatulis DE, Frank E et al. Socioeconomic status and health: how education, income, and occupation contribute to risk factors for cardiovascular disease. Am J Public Health, Jun 1992; 82(6):816-20.

[6]. Liberatos P, Link BG, Kelsey JL. The measurement of social class in epidemiology. Epidemiol Rev., 1988; 10:87-121.

[7]. Turrell G, Kavanagh AM. Socio-economic pathways to diet: modeling the association between socio-economic position and food purchasing behaviour. Public Health Nutr, May 2006; 9(3):375-83.

[8]. Mishra G, Ball K, Arbuckle J et al. Dietary patterns of Australian adults and their association with socioeconomic status: results from the 1995 National Nutrition Survey. Eur J Clin Nutr., Jul 2002; 56(7): 687-93.

[9]. Oberoi SS. Updating Income Ranges for Kuppuswamy Socio – Economic Status Scale for the year 2014. Indian journal of Public Health, 2014; 59 (2).

[10]. Jelliffe DB. The assessment of nutritional status of the community: WHO monograph, No. 53, Geneva, 1966: 50 – 84.

[11]. Garrow JS, Webster J. Quetelet's index (W/H2) as a measure of fatness. Int J Obes, 1985; 9:147–153.

[12]. NHLBI Obesity Education Initiative. The practical guide: Identification, evaluation and treatment of overweight and obesity in adults, National Institutes of Health, 2000 (NIH Publication Number 00- 4084).
[13]. Waist circumference and Waist Hip Ratio: Report of a WHO Expert Consultation, Geneva, 8-11 December 2008.
[14]. Omron Body Composition monitor, Model HBF – 212 (HBF – 212- IN), Karada Scan.
[15]. Gopalan C, Sastri BVR, Balasubramanian SC et al. Nutritive value of Indian foods: Food composition tables (Reprinted revised edition), Hyderabad, National Institute of Nutrition 2007.
[16]. A Report of the Expert Group of the Indians Council of Medical Research. Final Draft: Nutrient Requirements and Recommended Dietary Allowances for Indians, National Institute of Nutrition, ICMR, Hyderabad 2009.
[17]. Gearhart RF, Gruber DM, Vanata DF. Obesity in the Lower Socio – Economic Status Segments of American Society. Forum of Public Policy 2008.
[18]. Pyle SA, Sharkey. J, Yetter G et al. Fighting an epidemic: The role of schools in reducing childhood obesity. Psychology in the Schools, 2006; 43(3): 361-376.
[19]. Swallen KC, Reither EN, Haas SA et al. Overweight, obesity, and health-related quality of life among adolescents: The national longitudinal study of adolescent health. Pediatrics, 2005; 115: 340-347.
[20]. Mei Z, Grummer-Strawn LM, Pietrobelli A et al. Validity of body mass index compared with other body-composition screening indexes for the assessment of body fatness in children and adolescents. Am J Clin Nutr, 2002; 7597–985.
[21]. World Health Organization. Physical status: The use and interpretation of anthropometry. Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organization, WHO Technical Report Series 1995.
[22]. Wang Y. Cross-national comparison of childhood obesity: The epidemic and the relationship between obesity and socioeconomic status. Int J Epidemiol, 2001; 30: 1129 - 1136.
[23]. Monteiro CA, Moura EC, Conde WL et al. Socioeconomic status and obesity in adult populations of developing countries: a review. Bulletin of the World Health Organization, 2004; 82(12): 940-946.
[24]. Fezeu L, Minkoulou E, Balkau B et al. Association between socioeconomic status and adiposity in urban Cameroon. Int J Epidemiol, 2006; 35(1): 105- 111.
[25]. Reddy KKR, Rao AP, Reddy TPK. Socioeconomic status and the prevalence of coronary heart disease risk factors. Asia Pac J Clin Nutr, 2002; 11(2): 98-103.
[26]. Barratt J. The Cost and Availability of Healthy Food Choices in Southern Derbyshire. J Hum Nutr Diet, 1997; 10: 63-69.
[27]. Lynch JW, Kaplan GA, Salonen JT. Why do poor people behave poorly? Variation in adult health behaviours and psychosocial characteristics by stages of the socioeconomic lifecourses. Soc Sci Med, 1997; 44: 809-819.
[28]. Adler NE, Snibbe AC. The role of psychosocial processes in explaining the gradient between socioeconomic status and health. Curr Dir Psychol Sci, 2003; 12(4): 119-123.
[29]. Irala-Estevez JD, Groth M, Johansson L et al. A systemic review of socioeconomic differences in food habits in Europe: consumption of fruit and vegetables. Eur J Clin Nutr, 2000; 54: 706-714.
[30]. Hulshof KF, Lowik MR, Kok FJ et al. Diet and other life-style factors in high and low socioeconomic groups (Dutch Nutrition Surveillance System). Eur J Clin Nutr, 1991; 45(9): 441-50.
[31]. Tajik E, Shariff ZM, Esfehani AJ et al. Dietary calcium intake and socio – economic status are associated with bone mineral density in post menopausal women. World Appl Sci J, 2014; 31(2): 244 – 252.

How to cite this article: Upasana, Archana Chakravarty, Kailash Kumar Gupta, Yamini Bhusan Tripathi, Trend of obesity, socio-economic status and nutrient intake of overweight and obese working women. Int J of Allied Med Sci and Clin Res 2016;4(1):01-09.
Source of Support: Nil. **Conflict of Interest:** None declared.