ORIGINAL RESEARCH



Mental health and sleep quality: are intuitive eating, hedonic hunger and diet quality, determinants? a cross-sectional study

Kevser Sare Ateş¹, Hande Bakırhan^{2*}, Indrani Kalkan³

Department of Nutrition and Dietetics, Graduate School of Health Sciences, Istanbul Medipol University, Istanbul, Türkiye
 Department of Nutrition and Dietetics, Faculty of Health Sciences, Kahramanmaraş Istiklal University, Kahramanmaraş, Türkiye
 Department of Nutrition and Dietetics, Faculty of Health Sciences, Istanbul Medipol University, Istanbul, Türkiye

*Corresponding Author: Hande Bakırhan; E-mail: handecekici@hotmail.com

Abstract

Background

Intuitive eating may predict better psychological and behavioral health. Intuitive eating, hedonic hunger, and diet quality may affect individuals' mental health and sleep quality.

Methods

Descriptive cross-sectional study developed with an online questionnaire for randomly selected volunteers (n=351) aged 19-64 years. Hedonic hunger status was evaluated by Power of Food Scale (PFS), intuitive eating by Intuitive Eating Scale-2 (IES-2), mental health status by Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Well-Being Scale (WEMWBS) and sleep quality by Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index (PSQI). Food consumption records were taken to evaluate individuals' dietary quality, using Healthy Eating Index (HEI)-2015.

Results

It was found that 50.7% of the participants exhibited intuitive eating behavior, while 65.0% experienced hedonic hunger. When the diet quality was examined, it was found that 65.2% of the participants had poor diet quality, while 33.6% needed to improve their diet quality. Sleep quality and mental health status of individuals exhibiting intuitive eating behavior were significantly better (p<0.05). Diet quality was not associated with mental health, intuitive eating, hedonic hunger and sleep quality scores (p>0.05). While there was a weak negative correlation between intuitive eating and PSQI score (r=-0.160, p<0.05), while a positive correlation was found between hedonic hunger and PSQI score (r=0.286, p<0.05). Intuitive eating was associated with better sleep quality, as lower PSQI scores indicate better sleep quality. Intuitive eating was also associated with better mental health (r=0.339, p<0.05).

Conclusion

This study reveals that intuitive eating behavior is associated with better sleep quality and mental health, while hedonic hunger behavior is associated with poor sleep quality.

Keywords: diet quality, hedonic hunger, intuitive eating, mental health, sleep quality

Introduction

Intuitive eating is defined as an approach to eating that judges the amount and timing of food intake according to the body's hunger and satiety signals¹. It has been suggested that nutritional approaches based on intuitive eating and mindful eating could be a solution in eliminating behavior problems related to eating². Hedonic hunger (hedonic hyperphagia), refers to one's preoccupation with and irresistible desire to consume foods for the purposes of pleasure and in the absence of physical hunger. Intuitive eating, expressed by an individual's feeding in response to physiological hunger and satiety signals as opposed to emotional and environmental stimuli, is suggested to be related to the concept of hedonic hunger³.

Unhealthy eating habits has been identified as a risk factor for mental health outcomes, such as disordered eating behaviors and depression. Dietary restriction reduces sensitivity to internal hunger cues and supports confidence in overeating, and a failed restricted dieting cyle leads to low self-esteem and depression. Taken together, adverse health consequences indicate the need for an alternative to dietary restriction⁴. Therefore, eating awareness may be a useful strategy to positively influence food intake for being healthy⁵. Intuitive eating which has received increased attention in the literature in recent years may be a promising alternative to dietary restriction⁴.

The Mediterranean diet is low in saturated fat and animal protein, rich in antioxidants and fiber, and exhibits an high ratio of omega-3/omega-6 fatty acids. In addition, the diet also contains plant sterols and probiotics and therefore, it is thought to have positive impacts on health⁶. While, western style diet has been indicated to increase the risk of behavioral disorders such as depression and anxiety, Mediterranean diet has been suggested to decrease the risk of mental problems. Furthermore, there are opinions that the Mediterranean diet can moderate depressive symptoms such as major depression⁷⁻⁹. Mediterranean diet which reflects sustainable good diet quality may be a supportive factor for better mental health, as reduced depression has been associated with "healthy diet," contains healthy food choices such as fish, fruits, vegetables and whole grains¹⁰.

Adequate and balanced nutrition and good quality sleep pattern were suggested to be the main determinants of physical and mental health. Poor sleep quality is associated with a number of health problems, especially obesity and mental diseases. Sleep restriction has been suggested to have negative effects on insulin sensitivity, insulin response and glucose tolerance. Furthermore, hunger-satiety pathways and food intake were affected in sleep deficiency¹¹. Sleep quality has been suggested to be related to hedonic hunger and indirectly to intuitive eating behavior. In view of the above, we perceived that there was a gap in the literature. There are two follow-up studies focusing on the relationship between intuitive eating and improving mental health outcomes^{12,13}. The possible effects of the intuitive eating approach on mental and behavioral health outcomes have not been examined in studies in the literature at a level to reach definitive conclusions⁴. Similarly, there are not enough studies in the literature examining intuitive eating and sleep quality. In particular, there seemed to be a need to assess the the relationship between intuitive eating, hedonic hunger, diet quality, mental health, and sleep quality. A holistic study is necessary to advance the understanding of how intuitive eating may be related to mental health and sleep. The purpose of the this study was to evaluate the relationship between intuitive eating, hedonic hunger, diet quality, mental health, and sleep quality, as a whole.

Methods

Participants and Recruitment

This descriptive, cross-sectional study was conducted between January 2021 and April 2021, by means of an online questionnaire to 351 volunteers between 19-64 years of age selected by random sampling method. When calculating for the minimum sample using Gpower (package 3.1.9.2), 84 volunteers were calculated for 80% power at a 95% confidence level. Google forms was used for the online survey and the survey was delivered to the participants via social media (Instagram, Facebook). All of the participants included in the study had read and approved the voluntary consent form. Individuals with a diagnosis of mental illness and sleep apnea, those with a history of cardiovascular disease, hypertension, diabetes, cancer, liver and kidney disease or other neurological disorders, on a special diet program, under the age of 19 and over the age of 64, pregnant and lactating individuals were not included in the study.

The participant recruitment flowchart according to criteria has been provided in Figure 1. The research protocol was approved by the Non-Interventional Clinical Research Ethics Committee of Istanbul Medipol University, with the approval number E-10840098-772.02-597 dated 08/01/2021. An online questionnaire was conducted in order to obtain information on sociodemographics and health status of the participants.

Evaluation of Intuitive Eating Status

The Turkish validated version of the Intuitive Eating Scale-2 (IES-2), comprising of 4 sub-components: unconditional permission to eat, eating for physical rather than emotional reasons, reliance on hunger and satiety cues and body-food choice congruence, was used to evaluate the intuitive eating status of individuals¹⁴. Intuitive eating behavior increased with the increase in total score obtained by the participants. Participants who scored below the median value did not exhibit intuitive eating behavior, and those who scored above the median and median value were evaluated to exhibit intuitive eating behavior^{14,15}.

Evaluation of Mental Health Status

The Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Well-Being scale (WEMWBS), used to evaluate mental health status of individuals, was developed by Tennant et al.¹⁶ The Turkish validated version by Keldal 17 consisted of 14 test items (sub-components). The WEMWBS was scored by summing the responses to each of the 14 test items on a 1 to 5 Likert scale (1=none of the time to 5=all of the time). All questions were equally weighted. Scores could range from a minimum of 14 to a maximum of 70 points. Higher scores were associated with higher levels of mental well-being¹⁷.

Evaluation of Hedonic Hunger Status

Power of Food Scale (PFS), used to determine the hedonic hunger status of individuals, was developed by Cappelleri et al.18 and validated in Turkish by Ulker et al.¹⁹ The scale measured appetite for, rather than consumption of, palatable foods at three levels of food proximity (food availability, food presence, and food tasted). The Turkish version of scale presented on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (don't agree at all) to 5 (strongly agree). Final score was obtained by summing up the responses of all the items and dividing it by the total number of items. An average PFS score of 2.5 and above indicated the presence of hedonic hunger. A higher score indicated a greater responsiveness to the food environment¹⁸.

Evaluation of Sleep Quality

The Turkish validated version of Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index (PSQI)20 originally developed by Buysse et al.²¹ was used to evaluate sleep quality of the participants. The scale comprised of seven components representing areas routinely assessed in clinical interviews of patients with sleep/wake complaints. The seven components, each scored between 0-3, were summed to yield a total PSQI score, having a range between 0-21; higher scores indicating worse sleep quality. A total PSQI score in the range of 0-4 was considered as "good sleep quality" whereas a score in the range of 5-21 was considered as "poor sleep quality"²².

Evaluation of Diet Quality

Food consumption records for 3 consecutive days (including one weekend) taken retrospectively from participants were used to determine their diet quality. The food consumption status of the participants was questioned by the researcher by telephone. A computer aided Nutrition Program, (Nutrition Information System-BeBIS) was used to calculate the energy and nutrient intakes of the participants, based on the food consumption records. The diet quality of the participants was evaluated by applying the Healthy Eating Index-2015 (HEI-2015)²³. As per the scale, a total score less than 51 was considered "poor diet quality", a score of 51-80 was considered "diet quality to be improved", and a score of 80 and above was considered as "good diet quality"²³.

Evaluation of Anthropometric Measurements

Participants' height was measured with a stadiometer, their bodyweight was measured with a digital health-care scale, and their waist and hip circumference was measured with an ergonomic circumference measuring tape by the researchers. Body mass index (BMI) was calculated with the formula (body weight (kg) / height (m)2) and the waist–hip and waist– height ratios were calculated. Waist circumference, BMI and waist–hip ratio were evaluated as risk factors according to the World Health Organization (WHO) criteria²⁴⁻²⁵.

Malawi Medical Journal 36 (2); 80-89 June 2024

Table 1: General characteristics and anthropometric measurements of participants

$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		Female (n=168)		Male (n=183)		Total (n=351)		2 ///	
Image: Constraint of the secondary school graduate A Image: Constraint of the secondary school graduate Constraint of the secondary school graduate <thconstraint graduate<="" of="" school="" secondary="" th="" the=""></thconstraint>		<u>")</u>	0/2	- <u>u</u>)	-105)	<u> </u>		$\chi^2/t/z$	р
Parametric developments exholog raduate 4 2.31 13 7.3 17 4.85 Secondary school graduate 4 2.31 8 4.49 12 3.42 High school graduate 54 31.21 47 26.4 101 28.77 University/postgraduate 111 64.16 110 61.8 221 62.96 <i>Income level*</i> Low 39 22.54 36 20.22 75 21.37 Middle 103 59.54 69 38.76 172 49 23.736 0.000 High 31 17.92 73 41.01 104 29.63 <i>Marited Status*</i> Single 99 57.23 67 37.64 166 47.29 Marited 74 42.77 111 62.36 185 52.71 <i>Michael Consumption*</i> 9 5.2 22 12.36 31 8.83 S.582 0.018 No 164 94.8 156 87.64 320 91.17 <i>Sinolog *</i> Yes 9 5.2 22 12.36 31 8.83 <i>S.582 0.018</i> <i>Soubing*</i> Yes 21 12.14 61 34.27 82 23.36 <i>More school for the </i>	Education loval*	11	70		70	п	/0		
$\begin{array}{ccccc} 1 & 1 & 1 & 3 & 1 & 3 & 4 & 3 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 3 & 4 & 3 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 3 & 1 & 3 & 4 & 3 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 3 & 4 & 3 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1$	Drimary school graduate	4	2 21	12	73	17	1 85		
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Secondary school graduate	4	2.51	0	1.5	17	4.05		
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	High school graduate	4 54	2.51	0 17	4.49 26.4	12	3.42 28.77	6.518	0.089
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Injversity/postgraduate	111	51.21 64.16	47	20.4 61.8	221	62.96		
Income termLow3922.543620.227521.37Middle10359.546938.761724923.7360.000High3117.927341.0110429.6313.5000.000Married7442.7711162.3618552.7113.5000.000Married7442.7711162.3618552.7113.5000.000Married7442.7711162.3618555.820.018No16494.815687.6432091.175.5820.018Smoking*Yes2112.146134.278223.3624.0000.000No15287.8611765.7326976.6424.0000.000No15287.8611765.7326976.6424.0000.000No15287.8611765.7326976.6424.0000.000Overweight105.8102.834.2800.000Overweight5531.89251.714741.90.000Wisk9355.46035.115345.145.1Moderate risk3118.43621.16719.815.5410.000Wisk9355.46035.115345.145.145.315.410.000 <td>Income level*</td> <td>111</td> <td>04.10</td> <td>110</td> <td>01.0</td> <td>221</td> <td>02.90</td> <td></td> <td></td>	Income level*	111	04.10	110	01.0	221	02.90		
Link D3 E2.54 69 20.72 12 49 23.736 0.000 High 31 17.92 73 41.01 104 29.63 23.736 0.000 Marital Status* Single 99 57.23 67 37.64 166 47.29 13.500 0.000 Married 74 42.77 111 62.36 185 52.21 1 14.00 Yes 9 5.2 22 12.36 31 8.83 5.582 0.018 Smoking* Yes 9 5.2 22 12.36 31 8.83 5.582 0.000 No 164 94.8 156 87.64 320 91.17 5.582 0.000 No 152 87.86 117 65.73 269 76.64 24.000 0.000 Matropometric Measurements Body Mass Index* Underweight 10 5.8 - - 10 2.8 Normal 87 50.3 49 27.5 136 38.8 16.5 -	Low	39	22.54	36	20.22	75	21.37		
Induct10050.540050.540010110429.63High3117.927341.0110429.63Marital Status*Single9957.236737.6416647.2913.5000.000Married7442.7711162.3618552.7113.5000.000Married7442.7711162.3618552.7113.5000.000Married7442.7711162.3618552.7113.5000.000Ves95.22212.36318.835.5820.018No16494.815687.6432091.17 0.000 No15287.8611765.7326976.64 24.000 0.000No15287.8611765.7326976.64 24.000 0.000Married8750.34927.513638.8 34.280 0.000Overweight105.8102.8Normal8750.34927.513638.8 34.280 0.000 Waist circumference*24.86 \pm 4.7027.44 \pm 4.2526.19 \pm 4.69-5.3910.000Waist circumference*24.86 \pm 4.7027.44 \pm 4.2526.19 \pm 4.69-5.3910.000Waist circumference*20.93 \pm 21.9310.940.909.81 \pm 22.5289.37 \pm 21.98-10.0940.	Middle	103	59 54	69	38.76	172	49	23.736	0.000
Inge11101101101101101101Marial Status*Single9957.236737.6416647.2913.5000.000Married7442.7711162.3618552.7113.5000.000Alcohol Consumption*00.000110.0014.00Yes95.22212.36318.835.5820.018Smoking*5.8223.3624.0000.000No15287.8611765.7326976.64Anthropometric Measurements5.8102.8Body Mass Index*Underweight105.8102.8Normal8750.34927.513638.834.2800.000Overweight5531.89251.714741.900.000Waist circumference*24.86 ± 4.7027.44 ± 4.2526.19 ± 4.69-5.3910.000Waist circumference*3118.43621.16719.815.5410.000Waist/hip ratio*73.72816.415144.7112.1480.000Waist/hip ratio*34.234.28010.000112.1480.000Waist/hip ratio*35.115345	High	31	17.92	73	41.01	104	29.63		
Single 99 57.23 67 37.64 166 47.29 13.500 0.000 Married 74 42.77 111 62.36 185 52.71 Alcohol Consumption* 0 0.00 1 10.00 1 4.00 Yes 9 5.2 22 12.36 31 8.83 5.582 0.018 Smoking* 7 22 12.14 61 34.27 82 23.36 24.000 0.000 No 152 87.86 117 65.73 269 76.64 24.000 0.000 No 152 87.86 117 65.73 269 76.64 24.000 0.000 Normal 87 50.3 49 27.5 136 38.8 6 34.280 0.000 Overweight 10 5.8 - 10 2.8 8 16.5 34.280 0.000 Waist circumference* 21 12.1 37 20.8 58 16.5 $x4SD ** 78.22 ± 16.43 99.81 ± 22.52$	Marital Status*		11.72		11.01	101	27.05		
Married7442.771116.3.618.552.71Alcohol Consumption*00.00110.0014.00Yes95.22212.36318.835.5820.018No16494.815687.6432091.175.5820.018Smoking*Yes2112.146134.278223.3624.0000.000No15287.8611765.7326976.6424.0000.000Anthropometric MeasurementsBody Mass Index*Underweight105.8102.8Normal8750.34927.513638.834.2800.000Overweight5531.89251.714741.90.000Waist circumference*2112.13720.85816.55.3910.000Waist circumference*118.43621.16719.815.5410.000Waist circumference*1110.1 ± 0.22 0.91 ± 0.20 12.3950.000Waist/hip ratio*73.72816.415144.7112.1480.000Waist/hip ratio*0.80 ± 0.11 1.01 ± 0.22 0.91 ± 0.20 12.3950.000High risk4426.314383.618755.3112.4480.000High risk148.46336.87722.812.3950	Single	99	57 23	67	37 64	166	47.29		
Alcohol Consumption* 0 0.00 1 10.00 1 4.00 Yes 9 5.2 22 12.36 31 8.83 5.582 0.018 Smoking* 9 5.2 22 12.36 31 8.83 5.582 0.018 Smoking* Yes 21 12.14 61 34.27 82 23.36 24.000 0.000 No 152 87.86 117 65.73 269 76.64 24.000 0.000 Mo 152 87.86 117 65.73 269 76.64 24.000 0.000 More derive ight 10 5.8 - 10 2.8 34.280 0.000 Overweight 10 5.8 - - 10 2.8 34.280 0.000 Waits circumference* 21 12.1 37 20.8 58 16.5 4.51 0.000 Waits circumference* 21 12.1 37 20.8 58 15.5 4.51 0.000 Waits circumference* <	Married	74	42.77	111	62.36	185	52.71	13.500	0.000
Yes95.22212.36318.835.5820.018Smoking*Yes2112.146134.278223.3624.0000.000No15287.8611765.7326976.6424.0000.000Anthropometric MeasurementsBody Mass Index*Underweight105.8102.8Normal8750.34927.513638.834.2800.000Overweight5531.89251.714741.90.000Obese2112.13720.85816.5 $\frac{1}{5}$ 5.5410.000Waist circumference*Low risk9355.46035.115345.10.000High risk4426.27543.811935.1 $\frac{1}{5}$ 55.312.00.000Waist/hip ratio*Not at risk12373.72816.415144.7112.1480.000High risk4426.314383.618755.312.3950.000Waist/hip ratio*Not at risk12373.72816.415144.7112.1480.000High risk148.46336.87722.860.6310.000High risk148.46336.87722.8740.7Increased risk5332.07041.0123 <t< td=""><td>Alcohol Consumption*</td><td>0</td><td>0.00</td><td>1</td><td>10.00</td><td>1</td><td>4.00</td><td></td><td></td></t<>	Alcohol Consumption*	0	0.00	1	10.00	1	4.00		
No16494.815687.6432091.17Smoking* Yes2112.146134.278223.36No15287.8611765.7326976.64Anthropometric Measurements Body Mass Index*105.8102.8Normal8750.34927.513638.834.2800.000Overweight105.8102.80.000Overweight5531.89251.714741.90.000Obese2112.13720.85816.50.000 $\bar{x}\pmSD$ **24.86 ± 4.7027.44 ± 4.2526.19 ± 4.69-5.3910.000Waist circumference*105.543.811935.115.5410.000High risk4426.27543.811935.112.198-10.0940.000Waist/hip ratio*0.80 ± 0.11 1.01 ± 0.22 0.91 ± 0.20 12.3950.000Waist/hip ratio*0.80 ± 0.11 1.01 ± 0.22 0.91 ± 0.20 12.3950.000Hip/height ratio*9959.63822.213740.7Increased risk5332.07041.012336.560.6310.000Hip/height ratio*0.65 ± 0.5127.4060.0007.4060.0007.4060.000	Yes	9	5.2	22	12.36	31	8.83		
Since in the intermediate in	No	164	94.8	156	87.64	320	91.17	5.582	0.018
Yes2112.146134.278223.3624.000.000No15287.8611765.7326976.6424.000.000Anthropometric MeasurementsBody Mass Index*Underweight105.8102.8Normal8750.34927.513638.834.2800.000Overweight5531.89251.714741.90.000Obese2112.13720.85816.5 $\bar{x}\pm SD **$ 24.86 ± 4.70 27.44 ± 4.25 26.19 ± 4.69 -5.3910.000Waist circumference*Low risk9355.46035.115345.1Moderate risk3118.43621.16719.815.5410.000Waist/hip ratio*Not at risk12373.72816.415144.7Mot at risk12373.72816.415144.7Mot at risk12373.72816.415144.7<	Smoking*						-		
No15287.8611765.7326976.64Anthropometric MeasurementsBody Mass Index*Underweight105.8102.8Normal8750.34927.513638.834.2800.000Overweight5531.89251.714741.90.000Obese2112.13720.85816.5 5.391 0.000Waist circumference*Underweight3118.43621.16719.815.5410.000Waist circumference*Underweight3118.43621.16719.815.5410.000Waist/hip ratio*Not at risk12373.72816.415144.7112.1480.000Waist/hip ratio*0.80 ± 0.111.01 ± 0.220.91 ± 0.2012.3950.000Hip/height ratio*9959.63822.213740.7112.1480.000Hip/height ratio*9959.63822.213740.710.02336.560.6310.000Hip/height ratio*9959.63822.213740.720.8740.60.000Hip/height ratio*9959.63822.213740.720.8740.720.8Increased risk5332.07041.012336.560.6310.000Hip/height ratio*9959.638<	Yes	21	12.14	61	34.27	82	23.36		
Anthropometric Measurements Body Mass Index* 10 5.8 - - 10 2.8 Underweight 10 5.8 - - 10 2.8 Normal 87 50.3 49 27.5 136 38.8 34.280 0.000 Overweight 55 31.8 92 51.7 147 41.9 0 0.000 Waist circumference* 24.86 ± 4.70 27.44 ± 4.25 26.19 ± 4.69 -5.391 0.000 Waist circumference* 24.86 ± 4.70 27.44 ± 4.25 26.19 ± 4.69 -5.391 0.000 Waist circumference* 2000 35.4 60 35.1 153 45.1 0.000 Waist circumference* 21 18.4 36 21.1 67 19.8 15.541 0.000 High risk 44 26.2 75 43.8 119 35.1 35.4 0.000 Waist/hip ratio* 0.80 ± 0.11 1.01 ± 0.22 0.91 ± 0.20 12.395 0.000 Maist/hip ratio* 0.80 ± 0.11 1.01 ± 0.22	No	152	87.86	117	65.73	269	76.64	24.000	0.000
Body Mass Index* Underweight 10 5.8 - - 10 2.8 Normal 87 50.3 49 27.5 136 38.8 34.280 0.000 Overweight 55 31.8 92 51.7 147 41.9 0.000 Obese 21 12.1 37 20.8 58 16.5 16.5 $\bar{x}\pm SD$ ** 24.86 ± 4.70 27.44 ± 4.25 26.19 ± 4.69 -5.391 0.000 Waist circumference* 10 2.2 7.74 41.9 7.531 0.000 Waist circumference* 10 7.8 21.1 67 19.8 15.541 0.000 High risk 44 26.2 75 43.8 119 35.1 5.541 0.000 Waist/hip ratio* 78.22 ± 16.43 99.81 ± 22.52 89.37 ± 21.98 -10.094 0.000 Waist/hip ratio* 80.80 ± 0.11 1.01 ± 0.22 0.91 ± 0.20 12.395 0.000 Maist/hip ratio* $8.80 \pm$	Anthropometric Measurements								
Underweight10 5.8 10 2.8 Normal87 50.3 49 27.5 136 38.8 34.280 0.000 Overweight 55 31.8 92 51.7 147 41.9 0.000 Obese 21 12.1 37 20.8 58 16.5 $\bar{x}\pm SD$ ** 24.86 ± 4.70 27.44 ± 4.25 26.19 ± 4.69 -5.391 0.000 Waist circumference*Low risk 93 55.4 60 35.1 153 45.1 Moderate risk 31 18.4 36 21.1 67 19.8 15.541 0.000 High risk 44 26.2 75 43.8 119 35.1 55.4 0.000 Waist/hip ratio* 78.22 ± 16.43 99.81 ± 22.52 89.37 ± 21.98 -10.094 0.000 Waist/hip ratio* 123 73.7 28 16.4 151 44.7 112.148 0.000 Maist risk 123 73.7 28 16.4 151 44.7 112.148 0.000 Mithigh ratio* 0.80 ± 0.11 1.01 ± 0.22 0.91 ± 0.20 12.395 0.000 High risk 53 32.0 70 41.0 123 36.5 60.631 0.000 High risk 14 8.4 63 36.8 77 22.8 7406 0.000	Body Mass Index*								
Normal8750.34927.513638.8Overweight5531.89251.714741.9Obese2112.13720.85816.5 $\bar{x}\pm SD **$ 24.86 \pm 4.7027.44 \pm 4.2526.19 \pm 4.69-5.3910.000Waist circumference*103118.43621.16719.815.5410.000High risk9355.46035.115345.145.144.26.215.815.5410.000High risk4426.27543.811935.135.135.135.135.135.135.112.3712.98-10.0940.000Waist/hip ratio*12373.72816.415144.7112.1480.000Mot at risk12373.72816.415144.7112.1480.000Hip/height ratio*0.80 \pm 0.111.01 \pm 0.220.91 \pm 0.2012.3950.000Hip/height ratio*111.01 \pm 0.220.91 \pm 0.2012.3950.000Hip/height ratio*0.80 \pm 0.111.01 \pm 0.2212.3950.000Hip/height ratio*0.48.46336.87722.8 $\bar{x} \pm SD ***0.40.40.46.40.46.30.65.40.100.55.40.10\bar{x} \pm SD ***0.40.40.400.55.40.120.55.40.100.000High risk148.46336.8$	Underweight	10	5.8	-	_	10	2.8		
Indust5531.89251.714741.934.2800.000Overweight5531.89251.714741.941.941.9Obese2112.13720.85816.5 $\overline{x}\pm SD * *$ 24.86 \pm 4.7027.44 \pm 4.2526.19 \pm 4.69-5.3910.000Waist circumference*3118.43621.16719.815.5410.000High risk3118.43621.16719.815.5410.000High risk4426.27543.811935.1 $\overline{x}\pm SD * *$ -10.0940.000Waist/hip ratio*Not at risk12373.72816.415144.7112.1480.000At risk4426.314383.618755.312.3950.000Hip/height ratio*0.80 \pm 0.111.01 \pm 0.220.91 \pm 0.2012.3950.000Hip/height ratio*33.207041.012336.560.6310.000High risk148.46336.87722.874060.000	Normal	87	50.3	49	27.5	136	38.8		
Obese21121111113Obese2112.13720.85816.5 $\bar{x}\pm SD **$ 24.86 \pm 4.7027.44 \pm 4.2526.19 \pm 4.69-5.3910.000Waist circumference*Low risk9355.46035.115345.1Moderate risk3118.43621.16719.815.5410.000High risk4426.27543.811935.115.110.0940.000Waist/hip ratio*78.22 \pm 16.4399.81 \pm 22.5289.37 \pm 21.98-10.0940.000Waist/hip ratio*12373.72816.415144.7112.1480.000Maist/hip ratio*0.80 \pm 0.111.01 \pm 0.220.91 \pm 0.2012.3950.000Hip/height ratio*9959.63822.213740.7Increased risk5332.07041.012336.560.6310.000Hip risk148.46336.87722.8740.60.000	Overweight	55	31.8	92	51.7	147	41.9	34.280	0.000
$\bar{x}\pm SD **$ 24.86 ± 4.70 27.44 ± 4.25 26.19 ± 4.69 -5.391 0.000 Waist circumference*Low risk9355.46035.115345.1Moderate risk3118.43621.16719.815.541 0.000 High risk4426.27543.811935.1 $x\pm SD **$ 78.22 ± 16.43 99.81 ± 22.52 89.37 ± 21.98 -10.094 0.000 Waist/hip ratio*Not at risk123 73.7 28 16.415144.7 112.148 0.000 Hip/height ratio* 0.80 ± 0.11 1.01 ± 0.22 0.91 ± 0.20 12.395 0.000 Hip/height ratio* 99 59.6 38 22.2 137 40.7 Increased risk53 32.0 70 41.0 123 36.5 60.631 0.000 High risk14 8.4 63 36.8 77 22.8 7406 0.000	Obese	21	12.1	37	20.8	58	16.5		
Waist circumference* Dot No. Dot No. <thd< td=""><td>x±SD **</td><td>24.8</td><td>36 ± 4.70</td><td>27.44</td><td>1 ± 4.25</td><td>26.19</td><td>9 ± 4.69</td><td>-5.391</td><td>0.000</td></thd<>	x±SD **	24.8	36 ± 4.70	27.44	1 ± 4.25	26.19	9 ± 4.69	-5.391	0.000
Low risk9355.46035.115345.1Moderate risk3118.43621.16719.815.5410.000High risk4426.27543.811935.1 $\bar{x}\pm SD **$ 78.22 \pm 16.4399.81 \pm 22.5289.37 \pm 21.98-10.0940.000Waist/hip ratio*12373.72816.415144.7Not at risk12373.72816.415144.7At risk4426.314383.618755.3 $\bar{x}\pm SD ***$ 0.80 \pm 0.111.01 \pm 0.220.91 \pm 0.2012.3950.000Hip/height ratio*Not at risk9959.63822.213740.7Increased risk5332.07041.012336.560.6310.000High risk148.46336.87722.874060.000	Waist circumference*	21.0		27.1		20.13			
Low histJSJSJSJSJSJSJSJSJSModerate risk3118.43621.16719.815.5410.000High risk4426.27543.811935.1 $\bar{x}\pm$ SD **78.22 ± 16.4399.81 ± 22.5289.37 ± 21.98-10.0940.000Waist/hip ratio*12373.72816.415144.7Not at risk12373.72816.415144.7At risk4426.314383.618755.3 $\bar{x}\pm$ SD ***0.80 ± 0.111.01 ± 0.220.91 ± 0.2012.3950.000Hip/height ratio*Not at risk9959.63822.213740.7Increased risk5332.07041.012336.560.6310.000High risk148.46336.87722.874060.000	Low risk	93	55.4	60	35.1	153	45.1		
High risk4426.27543.811935.1 $\bar{x}\pm SD **$ 78.22 ± 16.4399.81 ± 22.5289.37 ± 21.98-10.0940.000Waist/hip ratio*Not at risk12373.72816.415144.7112.1480.000Mot at risk12373.72816.415144.7112.1480.000At risk12373.72816.415144.7112.1480.000Mot at risk10.80 ± 0.111.01 ± 0.220.91 ± 0.2012.3950.000Hip/height ratio*Not at risk9959.63822.213740.7Increased risk5332.07041.012336.560.6310.000High risk148.46336.87722.874060.000	Moderate risk	31	18.4	36	21.1	67	19.8	15.541	0.000
$\bar{x}\pm SD **$ 78.22 ± 16.43 99.81 ± 22.52 89.37 ± 21.98 -10.094 0.000 Waist/hip ratio*Not at risk123 73.7 28 16.4 151 44.7 At risk123 73.7 28 16.4 151 44.7 At risk 44 26.3 143 83.6 187 55.3 $\bar{x}\pm SD ***$ 0.80 ± 0.11 1.01 ± 0.22 0.91 ± 0.20 12.395 0.000 Hip/height ratio*Not at risk 99 59.6 38 22.2 137 40.7 Increased risk 53 32.0 70 41.0 123 36.5 60.631 0.000 High risk 14 8.4 63 36.8 77 22.8 7406 0.000	High risk	44	26.2	75	43.8	119	35.1		
Waist/hip ratio* Not at risk 123 73.7 28 16.4 151 44.7 112.148 0.000 At risk 44 26.3 143 83.6 187 55.3 112.148 0.000 $\bar{x}\pm SD$ *** 0.80 \pm 0.11 1.01 \pm 0.22 0.91 \pm 0.20 12.395 0.000 Hip/height ratio* Not at risk 99 59.6 38 22.2 137 40.7 Increased risk 53 32.0 70 41.0 123 36.5 60.631 0.000 High risk 14 8.4 63 36.8 77 22.8 7.406 0.000	x±SD **	78.2	2 ± 16.43	99.81	+ 22, 52	89 37	± 21 98	-10.094	0.000
Not at risk 123 73.7 28 16.4 151 44.7 112.148 0.000 At risk 44 26.3 143 83.6 187 55.3 112.148 0.000 $\bar{x}\pm SD$ *** 0.80 \pm 0.11 1.01 \pm 0.22 0.91 \pm 0.20 12.395 0.000 Hip/height ratio* Not at risk 99 59.6 38 22.2 137 40.7 Increased risk 53 32.0 70 41.0 123 36.5 60.631 0.000 High risk 14 8.4 63 36.8 77 22.8 7.406 0.000	Waist/hip ratio*					07107			
At risk4426.314383.618755.3 $\bar{x}\pm SD ***$ 0.80 ± 0.11 1.01 ± 0.22 0.91 ± 0.20 12.395 0.000 Hip/height ratio*Not at risk9959.63822.213740.7Increased risk5332.07041.012336.560.6310.000High risk148.46336.87722.87.4060.000	Not at risk	123	73 7	28	16.4	151	44 7		
$\bar{x}\pm SD$ *** 0.80 ± 0.11 1.01 ± 0.22 0.91 ± 0.20 12.395 0.000 <i>Hip/height ratio*</i> 99 59.6 38 22.2 137 40.7 Increased risk 53 32.0 70 41.0 123 36.5 60.631 0.000 High risk 14 8.4 63 36.8 77 22.8	Atrick	44	26.3	143	83.6	187	55.3	112.148	0.000
Hip/height ratio* 99 59.6 38 22.2 137 40.7 Increased risk 53 32.0 70 41.0 123 36.5 60.631 0.000 High risk 14 8.4 63 36.8 77 22.8	<u></u> v +SD ***	0.8	20.5	1 01	+ 0.22	0.91	+ 0.20	12.395	0.000
Input gin ratioNot at risk9959.6 38 22.2 137 40.7 Increased risk53 32.0 70 41.0 123 36.5 60.631 0.000 High risk14 8.4 63 36.8 77 22.8	Hin/height ratio*	0.0	0 ± 0.11	1.01	+ 0.22	0.71	± 0.20		
Not at lisk 33 350 36 22.2 137 40.7 Increased risk 53 32.0 70 41.0 123 36.5 60.631 0.000 High risk 14 8.4 63 36.8 77 22.8 $=150$ *** 0.48 ± 0.10 0.56 ± 0.12 0.52 ± 0.12 7.406 0.000	Not at rick	00	59.6	38	<u>,,,,</u>	137	40.7		
High risk 14 8.4 63 36.8 77 22.8 0.48 + 0.10 0.55 + 0.12 0.52 + 0.12 7.406 0.000	Increased rick	52	32.0	70	<u>41</u> 0	172	36.5	60.631	0.000
= 190 *** 0.40 + 0.10 = 0.50 + 0.12 = 0.52 + 0.12 = 7.406 = 0.000	High rick	14	52.0 8 A	63	36.8	77	20.5 22.8		
(148 ± 0.10) (150 ± 0.17) (157 ± 0.17) (157 ± 0.17)	x±SD ***	0.4	8 ± 0.10	0.56	± 0.13	0.52	± 0.12	7.406	0.000

*Chi square test, ** Independent groups t-test, ***Mann Whitney U test, p<0.05

Table 2: HEI-2015, PFS, IES-2 scores of participants

Females (n=168) Males (n=183) Total (n=351) χ2 р n % % n % n HEI-2015 Categories* 87 50.3 142 79.8 229 Poor 65.2 82 47.4 36 20.2 118 33.7 35.078 0.000 Requires improvement Good 4 2.3 0 0.04 1.1 Intuitive Eating Behavior* Present 86 49.7 92 51.7 178 50.7 0.137 0.711 Absent 87 50.3 49.3 86 48.3 173 **PFS Category*** 0.658 0.417 Hedonic hunger present 116 67.1 112 62.9 228 65.0 57 37.1 35.0 Hedonic hunger absent 32.9 66 123 **x**±SD **x**±SD **x**±SD t/z р HEI-2015 total score** 50.57 ± 13.96 42.56 ± 12.57 46.51 ± 13.85 5.649 0.000 Sub-component scores Total fruits** 2.32 ± 1.85 1.96 ± 1.72 2.14 ± 1.79 1.933 0.054 Whole fruits** 2.75 ± 2.14 2.22 ± 2.25 2.48 ± 2.21 2.245 0.025 Total vegetables** 3.42 ± 1.40 2.96 ± 1.39 3.19 ± 1.41 3.098 0.002 Greens and beans** 2.82 ± 1.79 2.49 ± 1.63 2.65 ± 1.72 1.753 0.081 Whole grains** 3.83 ± 4.34 1.80 ± 3.36 2.80 ± 4.00 4.875 0.000 Dairy** 4.76 ± 3.15 4.30 ± 2.77 3.86 ± 2.26 3.083 0.002 Total protein foods*** 4.35 ± 1.38 4.34 ± 1.00 4.34 ± 1.20 -2.229 0.026 Sea food and plant proteins* 2.71 ± 2.22 2.47 ± 2.24 2.59 ± 2.23 0.9800.328 Fatty acids* 0.552 3.42 ± 3.22 3.24 ± 3.09 3.33 ± 3.15 0.581 Refined grains* 6.51 ± 4.00 4.78 ± 3.92 5.63 ± 4.05 4.083 0.000 Sodium* 2.90 ± 3.48 1.67 ± 2.82 2.27 ± 3.22 3.624 0.000 Added sugars*** 9.29 ± 1.89 9.01 ± 1.94 9.15 ± 1.92 -2.395 0.017 Saturated fats* 1.63 ± 2.62 -0.954 1.50 ± 2.49 1.76 ± 2.74 0.341 IES-2 total score 2.95 ± 0.61 2.93 ± 0.65 2.94 ± 0.63 0.228 0.820 Sub-component scores 2.74 ± 0.55 -1.333 0.184 Unconditional permission to eat** 2.70 ± 0.52 2.78 ± 0.58 Eating for physical rather than emotional reasons** 2.58 ± 0.65 2.56 ± 0.66 2.57 ± 0.66 0.322 0.748 Reliance on hunger and satiety cues** 3.37 ± 1.11 3.35 ± 1.13 3.36 ± 1.12 0.198 0.843 Body-food choice congruence** 3.57 ± 1.08 3.40 ± 1.05 3.48 ± 1.07 1.472 0.142 PFS total score** 2.97 ± 1.04 2.88 ± 1.06 2.92 ± 1.05 0.789 0.431 Sub-component scores 2.67 ± 1.07 Food availability 2.73 ± 1.09 2.70 ± 1.08 0.511 0.610 3.11 ± 1.17 2.96 ± 1.18 Food presence 3.03 ± 1.17 1.156 0.248 Food tasted 3.15 ± 1.10 3.07 ± 1.13 3.11 ± 1.11 0.660 0.510

*Chi square test, **Independent groups t-test, ***Mann Whitney U test, p<0.05. HEI-2015: Healthy Eating Index-2015, IES-

2: Intuitive Eating Scale-2, PFS: Power of Food Scale

Table III. Evaluation of WEMWBS and PSQI scores obtained by participants

	Females (n=168)		Males (n=183)		Total (n=351)		~~?	
-	n	%	n	%	n	%	· λ ²	Р
PSQI Category*								
Good quality sleep	77	44.5	90	50.6	167	47.6	1 280	0.256
Poor quality sleep	96	55.5	88	49.4	184	52.4	1.289	0.230
	π±	x±SD x±SD		SD	⊼±SD		t	р
PSQI score**		4.57 ± 3.25		4.86 ± 3.10		5.16 ± 3.18		0.071
WEMWBS score**	49.42 ± 12.18		50.83 ± 11.12		50.13 ± 11.66		-1.128	0.260

*Chi square, **Independent groups t-test, p<0.05. PSQI: Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index, WEMWBS: Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Well-Being Scale

The waist-height ratio, as an indicator of chronic disease risk, was calculated by dividing the waist circumference (cm) by the height (cm)²⁶. A waist-to-height ratio of <0.5was regarded as no cardiometabolic risk, 0.5 and 0.6 as an increased risk and 0.6 as a high risk²⁶.

Evaluation of Physical Activity

A validated short physical activity assessment tool was used to assess the physical activity levels of the participants. This assessment tool consists of 2 questions questioning the frequency of moderate and vigorous physical activities. If the total score calculated according to the answers to the two questions is in the range of 0-3 points, it is considered insufficient, and if it is \geq 4 points, it is considered active enough²⁷.

Statistical Analysis of Data

IBM SPSS 23.0 software was used for statistical analysis of the findings obtained from the research. Quantitative variables were expressed as mean and standard deviation and min-max values, and categorical data were interpreted with frequency and percentage values. Paired comparisons independent groups t-test was used for statistical comparisons, Kruskal Wallis-H and ANOVA tests were used for multiple comparisons, and Mann-Whitney U test was used to compare two groups. Cross tables for frequency comparisons were analyzed using the Chi-square test. Spearman correlation was used to derive statistical correlations from continuous data. All analyzes were interpreted at the 95% confidence interval.

Results

The general characteristics and anthropometric measurements of the participants have been provided in Table I. Of the participants, 52.1% (n=183) were males and 47.9% (n=168) were females. It was found that 2.8% of the participants were underweight, 38.8% were normal, 41.9% were overweight and 16.5% were obese. BMI values of males (27.4 \pm 4.25 kg/m2) were significantly higher (p<0.05) as compared to females (24.8 \pm 4.70 kg/m2). It was observed that the average physical activity score of the participants was 2.5 \pm 2.47 and the majority (70.9%) were insufficiently active.

The scores obtained by the participants on hedonic hunger (PFS), intuitive eating behavior (IES-2) and diet quality (HEI-2015) have been provided in in Table II. It was observed that 50.7% of the participants exhibited intuitive eating and 65.0% hedonic hunger behavior. When evaluated in terms of diet quality, it was determined that the majority of the participants (65.2%) had poor, 33.7% required improvement

and only 1.1% had good diet quality.

The scores obtained by participants on mental health status and sleep quality have been presented in Table III. The mean WEMWBS score of all participants was 50.1 ± 11.66 ; females (49.4±12.18) and males (50.8 ± 11.12). The mean PSQI score of the participants was 5.1 ± 3.18 and only 47.6% of all participants were found to have a good sleep quality.

The correlation between participants' PFS, PSQI, BMI, WEMWBS, IES-2 and HEI-2015 scores have been provided in Table IV. There was a significant negative correlation between the IES-2 total score and PSQI, BMI and PFS scores (r=-0.160, r=-0.112, r=-0.190 respectively, p<0.05). On the other hand, a significant positive correlation was found between the IES-2 total score and the WEMWBS score (r=0.339, p<0.05). A positive correlation was found between PFS total, all sub-component scores and PSQI (r=0.286, r=0.258, r=0.273 and r=0.278 respectively, p<0.05). PFS total and sub-component (food availability, food presence) scores had a negative correlation with IES-2 score (r=-0.190, r=-0.168 and r=-0.269 respectively, p<0.05). In addition, food availability sub-component of PFS, had a negative correlation with WEMWBS score (r=-0.130, p<0.05). No significant correlation was found between HEI-2015 total score and PSQI, BMI, WEMWBS, IES-2 and PFS scores (p>0.05). When examined in terms of sub-components, a negative correlation between greens and beans and PFS score (r=-0.118, p=0.026), and a positive correlation between whole grains, dairy and PSQI score (r =0.151 and r=0.122 respectively, p<0.05) was noted. In addition, a negative correlation was also found between fatty acids and IES-2 score (r=-0.117, p<0.05).

The PFS, HEI-2015, WEMWBS and PSQI scores obtained by participants, according to the IES-2 categories have been given in Table V. It was observed that individuals with intuitive eating behaviors exhibited lesser hedonic hunger as compared those who did not (PFS score 1.4±0.50 and 1.2 ± 0.44). Similarly, mental health status (WEMWBS score 53.2±9.7 and 47.0± 12.7) and sleep quality (PSQI score 4.6 ± 2.83 and 5.6 ± 3.44) was also found to be significantly better in individuals with intuitive eating behaviors (p<0.05). PSQI scores of individuals who experienced hedonic hunger were found to be significantly higher compared to those who did not $(5.6 \pm 3.22 \text{ and } 4.3 \pm 2.96, p < 0.05)$. WEMWBS, HEI-2015, IES-2 scores had no significant correlation with hedonic hunger (PFS) sub-components. Similarly, no significant difference was found between the HEI-2015 subcomponent scores and WEMWBS, PSQI, PFS and IES-2 scores (not shown in the table).

Table IV. Correlation between PFS, PSQI, BMI, WEMWBS, IES-2, HEI-2015 scores

	PS	QI	BN	ЛI	IES-2	2	WEM	IWBS	HEI-2	2015	P	FS
	r	р	r	р	r	р	r	р	r	р		
PFS total score	0.286	0.000*	-0.022	0.679	-0.190	0.000*	-0.097	0.071	0.001	0.991	-	-
Sub-component scor	res											
Food availibility	0.258	0.000*	-0.029	0.587	-0.269	0.000*	-0.130	0.015	0.029	0.584	-	-
Food presence	0.273	0.000*	0.003	0.954	-0.168	0.002*	-0.101	0.058	0.008	0.877	-	-
Food tasted	0.278	0.000*	-0.031	0.556	-0.083	0.120	-0.036	0.501	-0.039	0.463	-	-
HEI-2015 total score	0.046	0.387	-0.065	0.226	0.050	0.353	-0.030	0.575	-	-	0.001	0.991
Sub-component scor	res											
Total fruits	-0.047	0.380	-0.013	0.811	0.035	0.515	0.043	0.417	-	-	0.099	0.063
Whole fruits	-0.033	0.541	-0.021	0.699	0.023	0.673	0.056	0.293	-	-	0.094	0.080
Total vegetables	-0.084	0.115	0.069	0.198	-0.026	0.625	-0.025	0.641	-	-	-0.117	0.029*
Greens and beans	-0.007	0.898	0.037	0.489	0.028	0.604	-0.034	0.522	-	-	-0.118	0.026*
Whole grains	0.151	0.005*	-0.076	0.155	0.016	0.771	-0.078	0.142	-	-	-0.042	0.432
Dairy	0.122	0.022*	-0.075	0.159	0.051	0.339	-0.101	0.058	-	-	-0.040	0.456
Total protein foods	-0.076	0.153	-0.082	0.124	-0.002	0.971	0.031	0.557	-	-	-0.038	0.481
Sea and plant proteins	-0.046	0.389	-0.079	0.138	0.088	0.100	-0.040	0.459	-	-	-0.015	0.786
Fatty acids	-0.024	0.653	0.095	0.074	-0.117	0.029*	0.032	0.555	-	-	0.076	0.155
Refined grains	-0.010	0.859	-0.029	0.592	0.097	0.069	-0.008	0.879	-	-	-0.042	0.430
Sodium	0.061	0.257	-0.146	0.006*	0.060	0.261	0.023	0.670	-	-	0.049	0.364
Added sugars	0.020	0.711	-0.146	0.006*	0.016	0.767	0.020	0.703	-	-	-0.058	0.280
Saturated fats	0.022	0.683	0.088	0.099	-0.068	0.206	0.008	0.883	-	-	0.064	0.228
IES-2 total score	-0.160	0.003*	-0.112	0.035*	-	-	0.339	0.000*	0.050	0.353	-0.190	0.000*
Sub-component scor	res											
Unconditional permission to eat	-0.037	0.485	-0.151	0.005*	-	-	0.197	0.000*	-0.017	0.754	0.004	0.934
Eating for physical rather than emotional reasons	-0.155	0.004*	-0.071	0.183	-	-	0.228	0.000*	0.023	0.664	-0.189	0.000*
Reliance on hunger and satiety	-0.166	0.002*	-0.066	0.216	-	-	0.309	0.000*	0.055	0.301	-0.224	0.000*
Body-food choice congruence	-0.086	0.110	-0.096	0.072	- HEL2015+11	-	0.309	0.000*	0.088	0.100	-0.087	0.102

Food Scale, PSQI: Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index, WEMWBS: Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Well-Being Scale

Table V. PFS, HEI-2015, WEMWBS, PSQI scores obtained according to IES-2 Discussion categories

•				
	Intuitive Eating Behavior Behavior		t	p
-	x⊡± SD	x‼± SD		
PFS total score	1.43 ± 0.50	1.27 ± 0.44	3.319	0.001*
Sub-component scores				
Food availibility	2.35 ± 0.88	3.05 ± 1.15	-6.403	0.000*
Food presence	2.73 ± 1.00	3.34 ± 1.25	-5.014	0.000*
Food tasted	2.95 ± 1.00	3.27 ± 1.20	-2.656	0.008*
HEI-2015 total score*	46.40 ± 13.66	46.62 ± 14.08	-0.148	0.882
Sub-component scores				
Total fruits*	2.10 ± 1.82	2.18 ± 1.77	-0.437	0.662
Whole fruits*	2.42 ± 2.24	2.55 ± 2.18	-0.589	0.556
Total vegetables*	3.21 ± 1.36	3.17 ± 1.47	0.267	0.790
Greens and beans*	2.69 ± 1.69	2.62 ± 1.75	0.364	0.716
Whole grains*	2.69 ± 3.92	2.91 ± 4.09	-0.520	0.603
Dairy*	4.41 ± 2.87	4.20 ± 2.66	0.723	0.470
Total protein foods**	4.40 ± 1.14	4.28 ± 1.26	-0.774	0.439
Sea and plant proteins*	2.76 ± 2.25	2.40 ± 2.20	1.513	0.131
Fatty acids*	2.87 ± 3.02	3.80 ± 3.22	-2.814	0.005*
Refined grains*	5.89 ± 4.07	5.36 ± 4.02	1.224	0.222
Sodium*	2.43 ± 3.32	2.11 ± 3.11	0.939	0.348
Added sugars**	9.21 ± 1.87	9.08 ± 1.96	-0.734	0.463
Saturated fats*	1.33 ± 2.44	1.95 ± 2.77	-2.231	0.026*
WEMWBS score*	53.2 ± 9.70	47.0 ± 12.7	5.092	0.000*
PSQL score*	4 67 + 2 83	566 + 344	-2 939	0 004*

*Independent groups t-test, **Mann Whitney U test, p<0.05. HEI-2015: Healthy Eating Index-2015, PFS: Power of Food Scale, PSQI: Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index, WEMWBS: Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Well-Being Scale



Figure I. Flowchart showing participant recruitment process

- Intuitive Eating and Mental Health

Intuitive eating approach is suggested to be strongly related to psychological health, and may be useful for mental health problems, including self-esteem, anxiety, and depression^{28,29}. Intuitive eating can reduces depressive symptoms and has positive effects on physical health parameters^{28,29}. In a study, higher intuitive eating scores in elderly women (n=200) were associated with lower body and eating anxiety and lesser depressive symptoms³⁰. An eight-year follow-up study with 1491 individuals, having higher baseline and follow up intuitive eating score were associated with better self-esteem, lower depressive symptoms and body dissatisfaction⁴. In a meta-analysis (n=97), intuitive eating and eating pathology was negatively correlated with body image disorders and multiindices of psychopathology (rs =-.23 and -.58) and positively associated with positive body image, self-esteem and well-being (rs = .20 vs .58)³¹. In a study investigating the effects of intuitive eating on physical and psychological outcomes in women with small children (n=419), intuitive eating was associated with lower depressive symptoms $(\beta = -0.183)$ and lower negative body image $(\beta = (0.615)^{32}$. In this study, a positive and significant correlation (p=0.000) found between the IES-2 total and sub-component scores with WEMWBS scores (Table IV) conforms to the findings above. WEMWBS scores of those who fed intuitively were significantly higher than those who did not. Intuitive eating can suppress hedonic hunger and prevent unhealthy eating behaviors. Intuitive eating may have a mental health-supporting role, as unhealthy eating habits are a contributing factor to behavioral health problems, including depression and eating disorders. Intuitive eating may be a helpful strategy for a healthy body, positively influencing food intake. However, more studies are required in order to reach a clear conclusion regarding intuitive eating and mental health.

Intuitive Eating and Sleep Quality

It has been suggested that intuitive eating is a mediator of sleep patterns. Leptin levels decrease and ghrelin levels increase with shortening of sleeping period. Therefore, intuitive eating and sleep quality may be related through hunger and satiety signals trigerred by these hormones³³. Moreover, adequate and balanced nutrient intake is associated with good sleep quality and intuitive eating responding to body's requirements for optimal nourishment, highlights its effect on sleep quality. In this study, the individuals who fed intuitively was found to be have a better sleep quality than those who did not (p<0.05). Moreover, a negative correlation was found between PSQI score and IES-2 total score and two of its subcomponents, (eating for physical rather than emotional reasons & eating based on hunger and satiety signals) (r=-0.160, r=-0.155 and r=-0.166 respectively, p < 0.05) stressing on the effect of

intuitive eating on sleep quality. There is no study developed to enlighten this issue in the literature. This issue needs to be investigated in depth. Intuitive eating may be associated with better sleep quality by choosing healthy foods, as poorer self-assessed ability to recover and sleep problems were linked to more frequently choosing unhealthy foods³⁴.

Diet Quality and Intuitive Eating

Intuitively fed individuals have tendencies to prefer foods that support health and it is presumed that such approaches would affect diet quality³⁵. Strategies that focus on well-being and minimize emotional eating may be associated with higher diet quality in general. In a recent study with 307 individuals, the IES-2 total score was positively associated with higher diet quality³⁶. However, in another recent systematic review including 13 randomized studies of mindful and intuitive eating interventions, no significant difference was found between the groups in terms of energy intake and diet quality³⁷. In another study examining the intuitive nutritional status and diet quality of 758 university students, no significant correlation was found between the IES-2 total score and diet quality³⁸. Similarly, in this study, no significant relation was found between IES-2 (total and sub-component) scores and HEI-2015 sub-component scores (p>0.05). Contrary to this study, there are different perspectives. One of these perspectives is that intuitive eating promotes body harmony, which in turn helps improve diet quality due to increased awareness of physiological cues. Also, reducing emotional/ binge eating may improve diet quality³⁹. It is not possible to make a clear judgment as the results of the literature studies contradict each other.

Hedonic Hunger and Sleep Quality

Body's homeostatic system regulates energy metabolism by coordinating hunger and satiety by means of hormones as leptin, ghrelin and insulin. On the other hand, short sleep duration may lead to increases in food intake by disrupting the homeostatic system, causing changes in leptin and ghrelin release and activating the hedonic hunger behavior⁴⁰. In sleep deprivation, there is a faster transition from carbohydrates to fats as energy store for easy access. Sleep deprivation has been associated with hunger pathways, increased appetite, food intake, certain inflammatory markers and chronic diseases¹¹. In a recent cross-sectional study on 1144 individuals, an inverse relationship was found between increased hedonic hunger and sleep quality as well as ideal sleep duration. Therefore it may be suggested that, increasing sleep duration and quality may help prevent hedonic hunger and weight gain⁴¹. Vidafar et al.⁴² examined the relationship between sleep and hedonic hunger in 63 individuals and reported that poor sleep quality and shorter sleep duration were associated with a higher urge to eat delicious foods (greater hedonic urge). Supporting the above findings, in this study, sleep quality of individuals exhibiting hedonic hunger was found to be significantly lower than those who did not (p < 0.05). Furthermore, a positive correlation was found between the total PFS and sub-component scores with PSQI scores (p<0.05).

Hedonic Hunger and Mental Health

Hedonic hunger is a process associated with the activation of the neuronal reward system in response to any food that produces a pleasurable sensation, leading to unhealthy food selection^{43,44}. The ghrelinergic system has been suggested to mediate hedonic rewarding and motivational aspects

via the mesolimbic dopaminergic circuit. A connection between ghrelin and affective disorders such as depression and anxiety, has been suggested45. Neuroimaging data confirm a decreased perfusion in reward, motivation, and appetite regions in the brain, are associated with depressive symptoms^{46,47}. Furthermore, positive and negative moods are reported to precede the desire for food intake⁴⁸. In a recent observational cohort study in 373 pregnant females, severe stress and depressive symptoms during pregnancy and postpartum were associated with increased hedonic hunger $(\beta \pm SE = 1.17 \pm 0.57, p = 0.01 \text{ and } 1.71 \pm 0.76$ respectively, p<0.05).49 In this study, a negative nonsignificant relationship was found between hedonic hunger total score and mental health score. In addition, a negative significant relationship was found between a sub-component of hedonic hunger (food availability) and mental health (r=-0.130, p<0.05). Binge eating behaviors are an important risk factor for mental health. Hedonic hunger may negatively affect mental health because hedonistic behaviors causes overeating.

Diet Quality and Mental Health

A poor diet quality is a risk factor for common mental disorders, while optimal nutrition is critical to well-being and a healthy lifespan⁵⁰. Reduced depression was associated with increased intake of "healthy diet," defined as a diet high in fruits, vegetables, fish, and whole grains¹⁰. In a study conducted on 4249 students, individuals having a healthy diet pattern were found to have lesser emotional stress and a better emotional health as compared to others $(p < 0.001)^{51}$. Another study reported a positive correlation between adherence to a Mediterranean style diet and reduced risk of depression⁵². Individuals with high levels of stress and/or severe neuroticism may be more prone to unhealthy eating habits. Another study reported that general diet quality did not cause high stress levels or mediate neurotic processes leading to depression/anxiety pathways⁵³. In this study, no significant relationship was found between diet quality and mental health (p>0.05). This study has some limitations as it does not provide an opportunity to evaluate the direct impact of diet quality on mental health. Since determining the mental health and diet quality of individuals depends on their memory level and perception, the direct effect of diet quality on mental health cannot be evaluated. Evaluation of mental health and sleep quality with a scale is one of the limitations of this study. Since the evaluation of mental health by clinicians is a more reliable method, it would be useful for future studies to focus on this issue.

Diet and Sleep Quality

It has been suggested that sleep deprivation may change dietary choices and adequate sleep may be positively related to healthy lifestyle behaviors such as adopting a healthy diet pattern. Individuals who sleep less are more likely to consume high-energy foods, consume lower amounts of vegetables and fruits, have higher energy intakes from fat and processed grains, and have more irregular meals than those who sleep normally⁵⁴. The serotonin and melatonin synthesis pathways play a significant role in modulating the effects of eating/food on sleep. On the other hand, ingested food is known to induce local secretion of many intestinal peptides (especially cholecystokinin) known to mediate sleep. Bioactive peptides or the non-protein nitrogen fraction of the diet can promote sleep⁵⁴. A systematic review investigating 29 studies, reported that healthy food consumption was https://dx.doi.org/10.4314/mmj.v36i2.4

associated with better sleep quality, while higher intake of processed and sugar added foods were associated with poor sleep characteristics⁵⁵. In another study investigating the relationship between diet pattern and sleep quality in 495 female participants, poor sleep quality was associated with higher energy intake and low quality diet⁵⁶. Similarly, in a cross-sectional study evaluating 1548 participants, a high-quality diet was significantly associated with good sleep quality⁵⁷. In this study, however, no significant relationship was found between diet and sleep quality. This may be due to the fact that the majority of the participants had poor diet quality (65.2%) and the rest needed improvement. Since the percentage of participants with good diet quality (1.1%) was very low, a correlation between the two could not be formed.

Conclusion

According to the results of the study, the mental health status and sleep quality of those who fed intuitively were significantly better than those who did not. Intuitive eating was associated with good sleep quality, mental health, and low body mass index, while hedonic hunger status was associated with poor sleep quality. There are no studies that fully evaluate the relationship between intuitive eating, hedonic hunger, diet quality, mental health, and sleep quality. It is thought that this study will contribute to the literature as it provides an opportunity for holistic evaluation of these factors and may be an useful guidance for further studies conducted in this direction. The sample of the study may not be large enough and this may be a limitation. However, there is a need for comprehensive studies with larger samples and detailed investigation on the concepts of intuitive eating and hedonic hunger. Nevertheless, the authors recommended that clinicians take proactive role in raising awareness among individuals for adopting intuitive eating behavior and control their responsiveness to food environment, not only for mental health and sleep quality but also for a healthy lifestyle that would eventually have positive impact on general health of the society and decreased health care expenditures.

Disclosure statement

There is no potential conflict of interest declared by the authors.

References

1. Augustus-Horvath CL, Tylka TL. The acceptance model of intuitive eating: a comparison of women in emerging adulthood, early adulthood, and middle adulthood. J Couns Psychol. 2011;58(1):110-125.

2. Kerin JL, Webb HJ, Zimmer-Gembeck MJ. Intuitive, mindful, emotional, external and regulatory eating behaviours and beliefs: An investigation of the core components. Appetite. 2019;132:139-146.

3. Tylka TL, Wilcox JA. Are intuitive eating and eating disorder symptomatology opposite poles of the same construct? J Couns Psychol. 2006; 53(4): 474-485.

4. Hazzard VM, Telke SE, Simone M, Anderson LM, Larson NI, Neumark-Sztainer D. Intuitive eating longitudinally predicts better psychological health and lower use of disordered eating behaviors: findings from EAT 2010-2018. Eat Weight Disord. 2021; 26(1): 287-294.

5. Dogan BG, Tengilimoglu-Metin MM. Does mindful eating affect the diet quality of adults?. Nutrition. 2023; 110:112010.

6. Ventriglio A, Sancassiani F, Contu MP, Latorre M, Di Salvatore M, Fornaro M, et al. Erratum: Mediterranean Diet and its Benefits on Health and Mental Health: A Literature Review. Clin Pract Epidemiol Ment Health. 2021;17:9.

7. Jacka FN, O'Neil A, Opie R, Itsiopoulos C, Cotton S, Mohebbi M, et al. Correction to: A randomised controlled trial of dietary improvement for adults with major depression (the 'SMILES' trial). BMC Med. 2018;16(1):236.

8. Parletta N, Zarnowiecki D, Cho J, Wilson A, Bogomolova S, Villani A, et al. A Mediterranean-style dietary intervention supplemented with fish oil improves diet quality and mental health in people with depression: A randomized controlled trial (HELFIMED). Nutr Neurosci. 2019;22(7): 474-487.

9. Vicinanza R, Bersani FS, D'Ottavio E, Murphy M, Bernardini S, Crisciotti F, et al. Adherence to Mediterranean diet moderates the association between multimorbidity and depressive symptoms in older adults. Arch Gerontol Geriatr. 2020;88:104022

10. Lai JS, Hiles S, Bisquera A, Hure AJ, McEvoy M, Attia J. A systematic review and meta-analysis of dietary patterns and depression in community-dwelling adults. Am J Clin Nutr. 2014;99(1):181-197.

11. Klingenberg L, Chaput JP, Holmbäck U, Visby T, Jennum P, Nikolic M, et al. Acute sleep restriction reduces insulin sensitivity in adolescent boys. Sleep. 2013;36(7):1085-1090.

12. Gagnon-Girouard MP, Bégin C, Provencher V, Tremblay A, Mongeau L, Boivin S, Lemieux S. Psychological impact of a "Healthat-Every-Size" intervention on weight-preoccupied overweight/obese women. J Obes. 2010; 2010:928097.

13. Bacon L, Stern JS, Van Loan MD, Keim NL. Size acceptance and intuitive eating improve health for obese, female chronic dieters. J Am Diet Assoc. 2005;105(6):929-936.

14. Bas M, Karaca KE, Saglam D, Arttici G, Cengiz E, Köksal S, et al. Turkish version of the Intuitive Eating Scale-2: Validity and reliability among university students. Appetite. 2017;114:391-397.

15. Hawks S, Merrill RM, Madanat HN. The Intuitive Eating Scale: development and preliminary validation. Am J Health Educ. 2004;35(2): 90-99.

16. Tennant R, Hiller L, Fishwick R, Platt S, Joseph S, Weich S, et al. The Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Well-being Scale (WEMWBS): development and UK validation. Health Qual Life Outcomes. 2007;5:63.

17. Keldal G. Turkish version of the Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Well-Being Scale: A validity and reliability study. The Journal of Happiness and Well-Being. 2015; 3(1):103-115.

18. Cappelleri JC, Bushmakin AG, Gerber RA, Leidy NK, Sexton CC, Karlsson J, et al. Evaluating the Power of Food Scale in obese subjects and a general sample of individuals: development and measurement properties. Int J Obes (Lond). 2009;33(8):913-922.

19. Ulker I, Ayyildiz F, Yildiran H. Validation of the Turkish version of the Power of Food Scale in adult population. Eat Weight Disord. 2021;26(4):1179-1186

20. Agargun MY, Kara H, Anlar, O. The validity and reliability of the Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index. Turk Psikiyatri Derg. 1996; 7(2): 107-115.

21. Buysse DJ, Reynolds CF, Monk TH, Berman SR, Kupfer DJ. The pittsburgh sleep quality index: a new instrument for psychiatric practice and research. Psychiatry Res. 1989; 28(2): 193-213.

22. Kacaroğlu Vicdan A. Assessment of sleep quality in patients with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Hemşirelik Fakültesi Elektronik Dergisi. 2018;11(1): 14-18.

23. Krebs-Smith SM, Pannucci TE, Subar AF, Kirkpatrick SI, Lerman JL, Tooze JA, et al. Update of the Healthy Eating Index: HEI-2015. J Acad Nutr Diet. 2018;9: 1591-1602.

24. World Health Organization (WHO). (2008). Waist circumference and waist-hip ratio", Report of a WHO Expert Consultation, Geneva. available at: www.who.int/nutrition/publications/obesity/WHO_report_waistcircumference_and_waisthip_ratio/en/ (accessed 9 Feb 2022).

Malawi Medical Journal 36 (2); 80-89 June 2024

25. World Health Organization (WHO). (2022). Global database for body mass index", The international classification of adult underweight, overweight and obesity according to BMI. available at: http://apps.who. int/bmi/index.jsp?introPage=intro_3.html (accessed 9 Feb 2022).

26. Ashwell M, Gibson S. Waist-to-height ratio as an indicator of 'early health risk': simpler and more predictive than using a 'matrix' based on BMI and waist circumference. BMJ Open. 2016; 6(3):e010159.

27. Marshall AL, Smith BJ, Bauman AE, Kaur S. Reliability and validity of a brief physical activity assessmentfor use by family doctors. Br J Sports Med.2005;39:294–297

28. Lim SY, Kim EJ, Kim A, Lee HJ, Choi HJ, Yang SJ. Nutritional factors affecting mental health. Clin Nutr Res. 2016; 5(3): 143-152.

29. Van Dyke N, Drinkwater EJ. Relationships between intuitive eating and health indicators: literature review. Public Health Nutr. 2014; 17(8): 1757-1766.

30. Carrard I, Rothen S, Rodgers RF. Body image concerns and intuitive eating in older women. Appetite. 2021;164:105275.

31. Linardon J, Tylka TL, Fuller-Tyszkiewicz M. Intuitive eating and its psychological correlates: A meta-analysis. Int J Eat Disord. 2021;54(7):1073-1098.

32. Lee MF, Madsen J, Williams SL, Browne M, Burke KJ. Differential effects of intuitive and disordered eating on physical and psychological outcomes for women with young children. Matern Child Health J. 2022;26(2):407-414.

33. Taheri S, Lin L, Austin D, Young T, Mignot E. Short sleep duration is associated with reduced leptin, elevated ghrelin, and increased body mass index. PLoS Med. 2004;1(3):e62.

34. Hemiö K, Lindström J, Peltonen M, Härmä M, Viitasalo K, Puttonen S. High need for recovery from work and sleep problems are associated with workers' unhealthy dietary habits. Public Health Nutr. 2020;14(8):1–10.

35. Carbonneau E, Bégin C, Lemieux S, Mongeau L, Paquette MC, Turcotte M, et al. A Health at Every Size intervention improves intuitive eating and diet quality in Canadian women. Clin Nutr. 2017;36(3):747-754.

36. Tabatabai M, Holland J, Curtis L, Morris MN. The relationship between intuitive eating and diet quality in a college population. Calif J Health Promot. 2021; 19(1): 34-43

37. Grider HS, Douglas SM, Raynor HA. The influence of mindful eating and/or intuitive eating approaches on dietary intake: a systematic review. J Acad Nutr Diet. 2021;121(4):709-727.e1.

38. Lopez TD, Hernandez D, Bode S, Ledoux T. A complex relationship between intuitive eating and diet quality among university students. [published online ahead of print, 2021 Nov 17]. J Am Coll Health. 2021;1-7.

39. Hensley-Hackett K, Bosker J, Keefe A, Reidlinger D, Warner M, D'Arcy A, et al. Intuitive eating intervention and diet quality in adults: a systematic literature review. J Nutr Educ Behav. 2022;54(12):1099-1115

40. Gissoni NB, dos Santos Quaresma MVL. Short sleep duration and foodintake: an overview and analysis of the influence of the homeostatic andhedonic system" Nutrire 2020;45(1):1-8.

41. Açik M, Bozdag ANS, Cakiroğlu FP. The quality and duration of sleep are related to hedonic hunger: a cross-sectional study in university students. Sleep Biol Rhythms. 2021; 19:163-172.

42. Vidafar P, Cain SW, Shechter A. Relationship between sleep and hedonic appetite in shift workers. Nutrients. 2020; 12(9): 2835.

43. Lutter M, Nestler EJ. Homeostatic and hedonic signals interact in the regulation of food intake. J Nutr. 2009;139(3):629-632.

44. Santoso I, Wijana S, Ismawati A, Sunarharum WB. Relationship between hedonic hunger and health interest on habit and sodium intake patterns in food consumption. Int J Food Sci. 2019;2019:9517140.

45. Singh M. Mood, food, and obesity. Front Psychol. 2014; 5: 925.

46. Epstein J, Pan H, Kocsis JH, Yang Y, Butler T, Chusid J, et al. Lack of ventral striatal response to positive stimuli in depressed versus normal subjects. Am J Psychiatry. 2006;163(10):1784-1790.

47. Russo SJ, Nestler EJ. The brain reward circuitry in mood disorders [published correction appears in Nat Rev Neurosci. 2013 Oct;14(10):736]. Nat Rev Neurosci. 2013;14(9):609-625.

48. Blau LE, Lipsky LM, Dempster KW, Eisenberg Colman MH, Siega-Riz AM, Faith MS, et al. Women's experience and understanding of food cravings in pregnancy: a qualitative study in women receiving prenatal care at the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill. J Acad Nutr Diet. 2020;120(5):815-824.

49. Betts GM, Lipsky LM, Temmen CD, Siega-Riz AM, Faith MS, Nansel TR. Poorer mental health and sleep quality are associated with greater self-reported reward-related eating during pregnancy and postpartum: an observational cohort study. Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act. 2021;18(1):58.

50. Cebrino J, Portero de la Cruz S. Diet quality according to mental status and associated factors during adulthood in Spain. Nutrients. 2021;13(5):1727.

51. Kulkarni AA, Swinburn BA, Utter J. Associations between diet quality and mental health in socially disadvantaged New Zealand adolescents. Eur J Clin Nutr. 2015;69(1):79-83.

52. Psaltopoulou T, Sergentanis TN, Panagiotakos DB, Sergentanis IN, Kosti R, Scarmeas N. Mediterranean diet, stroke, cognitive impairment, and depression: A meta-analysis. Ann Neurol. 2013;74(4):580-591.

53. Schweren LJS, Larsson H, Vinke PC, Li L, Kvalvik LG, Arias-Vasquez A, et al. Diet quality, stress and common mental health problems: A cohort study of 121,008 adults. Clin Nutr. 2021;40(3):901-906

54. Peuhkuri K, Sihvola N, Korpela R. Diet promotes sleep duration and quality. Nutr Res. 2012;32(5):309-319.

55. Godos J, Grosso G, Castellano S, Galvano F, Caraci F, Ferri R. Association between diet and sleep quality: A systematic review. Sleep Med Rev. 2021;57:101430.

56. Zuraikat FM, Makarem N, Liao M, St-Onge MP, Aggarwal B. Measures of poor sleep quality are associated with higher energy intake and poor diet quality in a diverse sample of women from the go red for women strategically focused research network. J Am Heart Assoc. 2020;9(4):e014587.

57. Wu W, Zhao A, Szeto IM, Wang Y, Meng L, Li T, et al. Diet quality, consumption of seafood and eggs are associated with sleep quality among Chinese urban adults: A cross-sectional study in eight cities of China. Food Sci Nutr. 2019;7(6): 2091-2102.