**Table S1 -** Linear regression for discretionary food (DF) intake (%E) by energy-reporting status for different groups in the Australian National Nutrition and Physical Activity Survey determined with

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Model 1**  | **Model 2a** | **Model 2b** | **Model 3** |  |
| **Demographic** | **Estimate**  | *P-value*  | *Estimate* | *P-value*  | **Estimate** | *P-value*  | **Estimate**  | *P-value*  |
| **Energy reporting status** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LER | -4.4 |  | -4.816 |  | -4.82 |  | -5.01 |  |
| PR | 0 | <.0001 | 0 | <.0001 | 0 | <.0001 | 0 | <.0001 |
| **SEIFA** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Quintile 1) | 2.4 |  | 2.483 |  |  |  | 1.67 |  |
| Middle (Quintile 2-4) | 1.5 |  | 1.263 |  |  |  | 0.84 |  |
| Highest (Quintile 5) | 0 | 0.0017 | 0 | 0.0021 |  |  | 0 | 0.0711 |
| **Educational Attainment** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No tertiary education | 3.9 |  |  |  | 3.38 |  | 3.02 |  |
| Vocational education | 4.2 |  |  |  | 3.19 |  | 2.91 |  |
| University education | 0 | <.0001 |  |  | 0 | <.0001 | 0 | <.0001 |

LER, low energy-reporters; PR, plausible reporters; SEIFA, socio-economic index for area

|  |
| --- |
| Model 1: Univariate model |
| Model 2a adjusted for age, sex, BMI, country of birth, low energy or weight loss diet, energy-reporting status, SEIFA and educationModel 2b adjusted for age, sex, BMI, country of birth, low energy or weight loss diet, energy-reporting status and educational attainmentModel 2c adjusted for age, sex, BMI, country of birth, low energy or weight loss diet, energy-reporting status and SEIFA  |
| There was no significant effect modification between energy reporting status and SEIFA or educational attainment and the interaction terms were removed from the modelsAll estimates are weightedPlausible energy intakes were derived by comparing reported energy intakes to predicted energy intake. The predicted total energy intake (pTEE) was calculated for each individual, as the following equation and values were used to identify underreporters 1.A close up of a logo  Description automatically generated Where CVrEI was 35.0% (specific to the NNPAS dataset; n=5387); d, number of days of recalls was 2; CVpTEE was 17.5% (specific to the NNPAS dataset); and CVmTEE was 8.2% where mTEE is the technical error of measuring TEE using the doubly labelled water technique and biological variation. Using the above equation, the ±1SD cut-offs for the agreement between rEI and pTEE was ±0.31.1. Huang TT, Roberts SB, Howarth NC, McCrory MA. Effect of screening out implausible energy intake reports on relationships between diet and BMI. Obes Res. 2005 Jul;13(7):1205-17. doi: 10.1038/oby.2005.143.
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