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Supplementary Table 1: Intentional activities lesson plan
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**Supplementary Table 2**. Median (IQR) baseline vegetable provision, waste and intake (g/day) \* (N=711)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Groups** | **n** | **Provision** | **Waste** | **Intake** |
| 1. Control | 96 | 57.9 (41.0-85.0) | 19.4 (10.0-35.4) | 31.5 (14.6-53.2) |
| 1. Curriculum | 79 | 54.4 (37.0-77.5) | 19.0 (11.2-29.4) | 26.4 (15.2-56.2) |
| 1. Curriculum+ Mealtime environment | 93 | 62.8 (19.8-108.8) | 14.4 (3.2-41.6) | 24.2 (6.4-68.9) |
| 1. Curriculum+ Food provision | 104 | 52.7 (33.8-70.7) | 18.1 (8.9-32.3) | 28.7 (12.4-47.1) |
| 1. Food provision | 88 | 58.3 (35.3-81.8) | 19.1 (9.3-33.8) | 32.5 (15.2-56.6) |
| 1. Food provision + Mealtime environment | 85 | 101.4 (65.4-127.1) | 29.7 (7.9-57.0) | 59.1 (22.8-95.9) |
| 1. Mealtime environment | 93 | 67.8 (47.9-105.1) | 21.0 (5.8-40.3) | 34.6 (11.8-73.7) |
| 1. Curriculum+ Food provision + Mealtime environment | 73 | 55.6 (26.6-72.3) | 22.6 (7.0-36.8) | 21.3 (4.7-59.0) |
| Total | 711 | 61.2 (37.0-95.8) | 19.0 (7.3-37.6) | 31.2 (12.0-61.7) |

IQR, Interquartile range.

\*not adjusted for cofounding variables of age or sex. Data not used in the final analysis due to 40% of the children at follow up not being present at baseline.

**Supplementary Table 3**: Main effects analyses of the initiatives compared to control (no initiative)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Comparison/control** | **Ratio of geometric mean** | **95% CI** | **p-value** |
| **Food provision/control** | 0.73 | (0.37, 1.43) | 0.34 |
| **Mealtime environment/control** | 1.77 | (0.90, 3.48) | 0.09 |
| **Curriculum/control** | 1.54 | (0.78, 3.04) | 0.21 |

**Supplementary Table 4**: Acceptability of the initiatives: Number of staff who completed or partially completed the Mealtime environment (n=38), Curriculum (n=16) and Food provision (n=11) initiatives who agree or strongly agree with the following LORI framework statements

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **LORI statements** | **Number agree/strongly agree** |
| **Curriculum** | **N=16** |
| **Content Quality** |  |
| The level of detail in the lesson outline was appropriate | 14 |
| The lesson outline was easy to understand and use | 15 |
| **Presentation design** |  |
| The presentation of the lesson outline was appealing | 13 |
| **Re-usability/Accessibility** |  |
| I would recommend the Curriculum to other educators | 13 |
| The Curriculum is suitable for educators with different levels of experience | 10 |
| The Curriculum is suitable for children of different ages | 8 |
| The Curriculum is suitable for children from different backgrounds (including cultural, religious etc) | 14 |
| **Motivation** |
| I found the Curriculum interesting | 13 |
| The Curriculum was engaging for children | 12 |
| The information provided in the lesson outline prepared me well to teach the curriculum | 14 |
| **Duration and other** |  |
| The amount of preparation for the Curriculum was reasonable | 11 |
| The number of lessons was appropriate | 8 |
| The number of snack time activities was appropriate | 10 |
| The duration of the lessons was appropriate | 12 |
| The duration of the snack time activities was appropriate | 13 |
| I used the vegetables that were suggested for the lessons | 13 |
| I used the vegetables that were suggested for the snack time activities | 13 |
| **Mealtime environment** | **Total N=38** |
| **Content Quality** |  |
| The content of the training was relevant to promoting vegetables at mealtimes | 36 |
| The level of detail in the training was appropriate | 33 |
| The training was useful | 34 |
| **Learning goal alignment** |  |
| The training provided me with practical strategies to promote vegetables at mealtimes | 30 |
| Using the strategies promoted in the training has improved children’s liking of vegetables | 23 |
| Using the strategies promoted in the training has helped children to taste new vegetables | 25 |
| **Motivation** |  |
| I found the training interesting | 30 |
| The training motivated me to promote vegetables at mealtimes | 29 |
| **Interaction useability** |  |
| The training was easy to navigate | 29 |
| It was easy to download the resources from the training | 26 |
| **Presentation design** |  |
| The design of the training supported the content well | 28 |
| There was a good mix of pictures, text, video, and audio in the training | 33 |
| **Re-usability /accessibility** |  |
| The training is suitable for educators with different levels of experience | 34 |
| The training is suitable for educators working in different childcare centre environments | 30 |
| I would recommend this training to other educators | 31 |
| **Duration** |  |
| The duration of the training was appropriate | 34 |
| The number of learning topics was appropriate | 34 |
| **Food provision** | **N=11** |
| **Content Quality** |  |
| The content of the training was relevant to providing more vegetables on the menu | 10 |
| The level of detail in the training was appropriate | 9 |
| The training was useful | 10 |
| \*FoodChecker was useful | 5 |
| **Learning Goal alignment** |  |
| The training improved my knowledge about how to provide more vegetables on the menu | 8 |
| \*FoodChecker supported me well to provide vegetables on the menu in line with the menu planning guidelines | 6 |
| \*FoodChecker improved my knowledge about how to provide more vegetables on the menu | 6 |
| \*FoodChecker helped me with the practical implementation of a menu aligned with guidelines | 7 |
| **Motivation** |  |
| The training motivated me to provide more vegetables on the menu | 9 |
| \*Using FoodChecker motivated me to provide vegetables on the menu in line with the menu planning guidelines | 7 |
| I found the training interesting | 9 |
| **Interaction Useability** |  |
| The training was easy to navigate | 5 |
| It was easy to download the resources from the training | 5 |
| \*FoodChecker was easy to navigate | 4 |
| \*It was easy to enter my centre menu into FoodChecker | 4 |
| \*It was easy to download the resources and recommendations from FoodChecker | 7 |
| **Presentation design** |  |
| The design of the training supported the content well | 8 |
| There was a good mix of pictures, text, video, and audio in the training | 9 |
| **Re-usability/Accessibility** |  |
| The training is suitable for cooks with different levels of experience | 9 |
| The training is suitable for cooks working in different childcare centre environments | 10 |
| I would recommend this training to other cooks | 7 |
| \*FoodChecker is suitable for cooks with different levels of experience | 6 |
| \*FoodChecker is suitable for cooks working in different childcare centre environments | 8 |
| \*I would recommend FoodChecker to other cooks | 6 |
| **Duration** |  |
| \*The amount of time it took me to complete the menu assessment using FoodChecker was reasonable | 3 |
| The duration of the training was appropriate | 8 |

\*N=10 respondents for the menu assessment component of the Food provision initiative