

1 **Evaluation of the Nutritional Quality of Ultra-Processed Foods (Ready to Eat**
2 **+ Fast Food): Fatty Acid Composition**

3
4
5 Lisaura Maldonado-Pereira^{1,4}, Carlo Barnaba², Gustavo De los Campos³, Ilce Gabriela Medina-
6 Meza^{1,4} *

7
8
9
10
11
12
13 ¹Department of Chemical Engineering and Materials Science, Michigan State University, East
14 Lansing, MI, USA. *maldon60@msu.edu*

15 ²Institute of Quantitative Health Science and Engineering, Michigan State University, East
16 Lansing, MI, USA. *barnabac@msu.edu*

17 ³Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI,
18 USA. *gustavoc@msu.edu*

19 ⁴Department of Biosystems and Agricultural Engineering, East Lansing, MI, USA.
20 *ilce@msu.edu*

21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33 **Corresponding Author**

34 Medina-Meza, Ilce Gabriela, Ph.D.
35 Department of Biosystems and Agricultural Engineering
36 469 Wilson Rd. | Room 302C
37 East Lansing, MI
38 ilce@msu.edu
39 Phone: 517-884-1971
40
41

42 **Abstract**

43 Up to the 60% of the Western diet is characterized by consumption of high amounts of Ultra-
44 processed foods (UPFs). From a nutritional standpoint, the high consumption of UPFs, including
45 Fast-foods and Ready-to-Eat (RTE), emerges as a critical topic for public health linking
46 nutritional quality and food safety. In the present work, we provide a systematic database of fatty
47 acids composition of the most consumed UPFs in the US mid-western region. Saturate (SFA)
48 and monounsaturated (MUFA) fatty acids were predominant in both FF and RTE, while health-
49 beneficial polyunsaturated (PUFA) fatty acids were abundant only in seafood meals. Nutritional
50 and non-nutritional attributes were correlated, finding positive correlation between caloric and
51 sodium content. The significance of this study relies on providing new quantitative data for the
52 most consumed UPFs, with the opportunity to define priority interventions for more advanced
53 precision nutrition, especially for vulnerable populations.

54

55

56

57

58

59

60 **Keywords:** Ultra-processed foods, fatty acids, nutritional quality, salt, public health

61

62

63

64

65

66 **Introduction**

67 Dietary lipids provide up to 42% of the calories ingested in the Western diet, whereas
68 nutritional recommendations of fat for adults are 20–35% (Niot, Poirier, Tran, & Besnard,
69 2009). In the Western diet, ~95% of dietary lipids are comprised of triacylglycerols, (mainly
70 long-chain fatty acids (LCFA)), and the remaining includes phospholipids (4.5%) and cholesteryl
71 esters (0.5%). Adherence to a “Westernized” dietary pattern is characterized by the consumption
72 of high amounts of processed meats (Hu, 2002; Schulze & Hu, 2002). Nearly 60% of the calories
73 consumed in the Western diet come from the intake of ultra-processed foods (UPFs) (Martínez
74 Steele et al., 2016; Urban et al., 2016). Fast foods (FF) (including small, large, and non-chain
75 restaurants) and Ready to Eat (RTE) meals constitute the people’s top choices. A healthy human
76 with an average of 70 kg of body weight, stores around 141,000 kcal as fat as compared to
77 24,000 kcal as protein and 1,000 kcal as carbohydrate (Wang, Liu, Portincasa, & Wang, 2013).
78 Furthermore, dietary fat is the most calorically dense macronutrient, supplying 9 kcal/g, about
79 double of what is contributed by either protein or carbohydrate at 4 kcal/g. The increase of
80 consumption of dietary fat from UPFs associated with a qualitative imbalance (excess of
81 saturated fatty acids and cholesterol) has been associated with the increased risk in the
82 development of several chronic diseases such as obesity, diabetes, cancer, and cardiovascular
83 disease (Zinocker & Lindseth, 2018).

84 Food processing does not represent an issue for human nutrition, neither does it
85 inherently cause negative health outcomes. However, the over-processing of food can lead to the
86 accumulation of harmful substances formed because of thermal treatments, light exposure,
87 storage, and aging, the denaturalization of proteins, vitamins, and bioactive components,
88 compromising the overall nutritional quality.

89 UPFs are food items considered inexpensive, *highly processed*, rich in calories, but low
90 in some essential micronutrients such as minerals and vitamins. UPFs are mostly consumed away
91 from home and have been proposed as a major contributor to the energy intake rise (Urban et al.,
92 2016). A big group of meals highly consumed among the UPFs is the ready-to-eat (RTE) meals.
93 RTE meals are defined as any food that is either normally eaten in its raw state or has been
94 processed, for which it is reasonably foreseeable that the food will be eaten without further
95 processing that would significantly minimize biological hazards (FDA, 2020c). Usually, RTE
96 meals are packed processed products for sale which require minimum preparation at home.

97 Most foods from the Western diet, including FFs and RTE meals, belong to UPFs category
98 according to the NOVA (*not an acronym*) classification system (Monteiro, Cannon, Lawrence,
99 Costa Louzada, & Pereira Machado, 2019). These terms differ in the number of processing
100 techniques applied during the production of the food item. NOVA is recognized by the Food and
101 Agriculture Organization (FAO) and Pan-American Health Organization (PAHO) as a valid tool
102 for nutrition and public health research and “categorizes foods according to the extent and
103 purpose of food processing, rather than in terms of nutrients.” (Juul et al., 2018; Martínez Steele
104 et al., 2016; Moubarac et al., 2017). Since, consumers are continuously exposed to “new” UPFs
105 with more than 96% of persuasive advertisement strategies (Santana et al., 2020), from a
106 nutritional perspective, over-processing and chemical risk emerge as a critical topic for public
107 health linking nutritional quality and food safety.

108 This study aimed to determine the fat composition of a selection of the most consumed UPFs
109 in the Mid-West market. UPFs were analyzed based on fat sources, price, category of food,
110 sugars, salt, and calorie content. This study will establish a database useful not only for

111 nutritional and clinical interventions but also to improve food chemical safety and nutritional
112 food quality.

113 **2. Materials and Methods**

114 *2.1. Materials, Chemicals and Reagents*

115 Methanol was from Sigma-Aldrich (St. Louis, MO). Chloroform was obtained from
116 Omni Solv (Burlington, MA), hexane was purchased from VWR BDH Chemicals (Batavia, IL),
117 1-butanol, and potassium chloride (KCl) from J. T. Baker (Allentown, PA), and diethyl ether was
118 purchased from Fisher Chemical (Pittsburgh, PA). Sodium sulfate anhydrous (Na₂SO₄) and
119 sodium chloride (NaCl) were also purchased from VWR BDH Chemicals. Supelco 37 FAME
120 standard mixture was purchased from Sigma Aldrich (St Louis, MO).

121 *2.2. Sample collection*

122 Composite foods and food products of different categories of UPFs were collected from retail
123 stores, supermarkets, food chains, restaurants, and takeaway in the Lansing area (Michigan,
124 USA) between February 2018 and October 2019. Different brands and different retailers for the
125 same type of food were acquired to achieve a representative sample. A complete list of the food
126 meals, their respective test code, and the group is provided in Supplemental Information (**Table**
127 **S1**). Meals were classified into two main groups: Fast Food (FF) and Ready to Eat (RTE), where
128 23 FF meals were purchased from the eight most popular franchises in the state of Michigan
129 covering more than 75% of the national market (Dunford et al., 2017; Powell et al., 2019;
130 Rwithley, 2019; Tran et al., 2019). Also, food items and meals were grouped in subcategories
131 according to the fat source as follows: eggs and egg's derivatives (E), dairy products (D), meat
132 and poultry (MP), seafood (S), baby food (BF). Additional food items that did not fit in any of
133 the previous categories, such as potato-products (potato crisps with and without added flavors,

134 French fries from restaurants and takeaway, frozen potatoes pre-fried and fried, and homemade
135 French fries), pasta, salad dressings, and popcorn (sweet or salty) were grouped as other products
136 (O). Once the UPF arrived at the laboratory, an excel form was filled out with the following
137 information: (1) UPF's name; (2) price; (3) place of purchase, date, and time of collection; (4)
138 type of food (RTE or FF); (5) nutritional declaration (energy, fat, saturated fatty acids,
139 carbohydrates, sugars, fiber, protein, and salt); (6) portion size; (7) list of ingredients; (8)
140 expiring date; and (9) other relevant information.

141 *2.3. Sample preparation*

142 FF meals were purchased from several franchises and brought to the laboratory for
143 immediate analysis. RTE meals were purchased from different local supermarket stores, and
144 immediately brought to the laboratory. Storage conditions were followed according to the label
145 instructions (fresh foods were kept in a fridge at 4°C and frozen meals were kept at -20°C or the
146 temperature indicated in the label). All UPFs were analyzed before the expiration date. When
147 further cooking procedures were required, items were prepared following manufacturer's
148 instructions. Kitchen equipment available at the Michigan State University's Food Science
149 Laboratory was supplied and used for this study. All the samples were homogenized using an
150 Ultra-Turrax® (Tekmar TP 18/10S1 Cincinnati, OH) for 3 min at 5000 rpm, split, and stored
151 accordingly, depending on the food matrix.

152 *2.4. Lipid Extraction*

153 Lipid fraction was extracted according to the Folch cold extraction method (Folch, Lees,
154 & Sloane Stanley, 1957) with some modifications depending on the food matrix. Thirty grams of
155 sample were minced and placed in a 500 mL glass bottle with a screwcap where 200 mL of
156 chloroform:methanol solution (1:1, v/v) was added. The sample was mixed for 15 min at 300

157 rpm. Homogenization was performed using an Ultra-Turrax for 3 minutes. The bottle was kept in
158 an oven at 60°C for 20 min before adding 100 mL chloroform. After 2 min of vortex mixing the
159 sample, the content of the bottle was filtered. The filtrate was mixed thoroughly with 100 mL of
160 1 M KCl solution, and left overnight at 4 °C. Then, the lower phase containing lipids was
161 collected and dried at 60°C with a multi-vacuum solvent evaporator (Organomation S-EVAP-
162 RB, Berlin MA) at 25 inches of Hg. Total fat content was determined gravimetrically.

163 2.5. Fatty acid methyl esters (FAME)

164 Fatty acid methyl esters (FAME) were prepared according to the transesterification described
165 in Chen's procedure (Chen, Aluwi, Saunders, Ganjyal, & Medina-Meza, 2019). One μ L of the
166 methylated sample was injected into a gas chromatograph (GC 2010 Shimadzu, Kyoto Japan)
167 equipped with a DB-WAX capillary column (30 m \times 0.32 mm i.d. \times 0.25 μ m). The oven
168 temperature gradient was set as follows: 120 °C to 200°C with a rate of 3°C/min, then from 200
169 °C to 240°C with a rate of 2 °C/min and held for 2 min. Injector and detector were both set at
170 250°C. H₂ was used as carrier gas at 1mL/min and split ratio 5.0. Data acquisition was done by
171 Lab solutions software (Shimadzu, Kyoto, Japan) and peak areas were identified by comparing
172 their retention times to the pure standards. Standard curves of FAME 37 mixture were built with
173 different concentrations from 50 to 500 ug/mL. Fatty acid contents were reported as the weight
174 percentage of total fatty acid detected (% w/w) per g of fat.

175 Results on fatty acids contents were obtained using the sums: Σ saturated fatty acids (Σ SFA
176 = C8:0 + C10:0 + C11:0 + C12:0 + C13:0 + C14:0 + C15:0 + C16:0 + C17:0 + C18:0 + C20:0 +
177 C21:0 + C22:0 + C23:0 + C24:0); Σ monounsaturated fatty acids (Σ MUFA = C14:1, cis-9 +
178 C15:1, cis-10 + C16:1, cis-9 + C17:1, cis-10 + C18:1, cis-9 + C20:1, cis-11 + C22:1, cis-13 +
179 C24:1, cis-15); Σ polyunsaturated fatty acids (Σ PUFA = C18:2, cis-9,12 + C18:3, cis-6,9,12 +

180 C18:3, cis-9,12,15 + C20:2, cis-11,14 + C20:3, cis-8,11,14 + C20:3, cis-11,14,17 + C20:4, cis-
181 5,8,11,14 + C22:2, cis-13,16 + C20:5, cis-5,8,11,14,17 + C22:6, cis-4,7,10,13,16,19). and Σ trans
182 fatty acids (Σ TFA= C18:1, trans-9 + C18:2, trans-9,12).

183 *2.5 Statistical analysis*

184 Descriptive statistics were calculated overall and by category (RTE/FF) and food origin
185 (meat, dairy, baby foods, seafood, egg and eggs products, others). Both mean, and confidence
186 interval (95%) were computed. Since the data did not follow a normal distribution, when
187 comparing RTE vs FF items, a Mann-Whitney *U*-test was performed, at $p < 0.05$ significance
188 level. Statistical differences between food categories were evaluated by using the non-parametric
189 Kruskal-Wallis ANOVA by Ranks test, at $p < 0.05$ significance level. Spearman's correlation
190 across variables was also tested. All the statistical analyses were computed using SPSS v.27
191 (IBM).

192 **Results and discussion**

193 *3.1 Total Fat, Sugar and Sodium in UPFs*

194 The overall total fat ranges from 0.60 to 87.62 g/100 g of product with the dairy category
195 (n=11) being the group with the highest fat content followed by the eggs and egg's derivatives
196 category (n=2) with up to 77 g/100 g of product (**Table 1**).

197 **Figure 1A-D** shows a boxplot distribution of fat and FAME groups within each category.
198 UPFs meals and food products were grouped based on their fat source as described above. Some
199 food products like edible fats (olive, avocado, canola, etc.) were not included since they are
200 considered foods themselves with no additional components. Due to the large number of UPFs in
201 this study, total fat will be primarily discussed for each food category, detailing it for individual
202 meals only when a distinct result is statistically significant. FF and RTE meals are known to be

203 served in large portions, containing high levels of saturated fat and added sugars (Harris et al.,
204 2013; Rosenheck, 2008). Most of these meals are prepared with several ingredients such as oils,

205 **Table 1.** Food ID, Total fat, Sugar, Sodium and Calories per serving found in the different UPFs.
 206

Category	Food ID	Total Fat (g/100 g sample)	Total Fat Nutritional label ** (g/100 g sample)	Serving Size	Total Fat (g) per serving size	Sugar (g) per serving size	Sodium (mg) per serving	Calories per serving
Ready to Eat								
Dairy	D1 - RTE	17.67 ± 2.45	18.40	19.00 g	3.50	1.00	280	60
	D2 - RTE	26.92 ± 8.47	33.00	21.00 g	6.93	0	180	110
	D3 - RTE	49.71 ± 2.56	50.00	1 tbsp (14.15 g)	7.08	NR	100	60
	D4 - RTE	87.62 ± 1.91	78.57	14.00 g	11.00	0	90	100
	D5 - RTE	10.27 ± 0.38	10.00	30.00 mL (28.3 g)	2.83	1	25	40
	D6 - RTE	24.16 ± 6.98	28.00	28.00 g	7.84	1	240	60
	D7 - RTE	42.82 ± 1.68	35.00	28.00 g	9.80	2	95	90
	D8 - RTE	12.78 ± 3.04	23.40	0.50 cup (65.00 g)	15.21	14	40	130
	D9 - RTE	1.60 ± 0.31	3.03	1 container (99.00g)	3.00	20	90	150
	D10 - RTE	2.14 ± 0.54	0.96	414.03 g	0.60	37	230	250
	D11 - RTE	12.56 ± 0.38	0.69	1 scoop (9.00 g)	0.062	NR	0.32	44
Meat & Poultry	MP1 - RTE	23.45 ± 5.00	20.00	38.00 g	7.60	< 1	260	90
	MP2 - RTE	17.84 ± 2.65	26.00	32.00 g	8.30	0	260	50,000
	MP3 - RTE	0.60 ± 0.071	0.65	240.00 mL (226.40 g)	1.50	3	870	170
	MP4 - RTE	3.64 ± 0.018	3.30	1 can (236.59 g)	7.80	5	870	250
	MP5 - RTE	3.53 ± 0.55	5.65	11.00 oz (227.00 g)	12.80	5	500	270
	MP6 - RTE	1.37 ± 0.31	1.76	0.5 cup (113.40 g)	2.00	0	640	60
	MP7 - RTE	3.61 ± 0.013	0.61	0.5 cup (240.00 g)	1.50	1	600	70
	MP8 - RTE	2.91 ± 0.53	2.87	1 cup (249.00 g)	7.15	6	800	200
	MP9 - RTE	4.61 ± 0.097	4.28	1 cup (257.00 g)	11.00	8	800	260
Seafood	S1 - RTE	3.62 ± 0.25	3.38	18.80 oz (532.97 g)	18.01	1	890	180
Egg's Derivatives	E1 - RTE	77.68 ± 1.95	75.00	1 Tbsp (13 g)	9.75	NR	90	90
	E2 - RTE	14.64 ± 1.02	13.91	½ cup (115.00 g)	16.00	10	330	380
Baby Food	BF1 - RTE	1.80 ± 0.15	1.41	71.00 g	1.00	0	35	50

	BF2 - RTE	7.28 ± 0.19	4.40	4.00 oz (113.40 g)	4.99	NS	40	90
	BF3 - RTE	2.99 ± 0.06	4.40	4.00 oz (113.40 g)	4.99	3	30	70
	BF4 - RTE	3.25 ± 0.23	4.40	4.00 oz (113.40 g)	4.99	3	40	70
	BF5 - RTE	3.23 ± 0.14	4.40	4.00 oz (113.40 g)	4.99	3	45	80
	BF6 - RTE	2.12 ± 0.60	1.56	128.00 g	2.00	5	260	120
	BF7 - RTE	3.09 ± 0.16	4.40	4.00 oz (113.40 g)	4.99	5	20	80
	BF8 - RTE	6.00 ± 0.14	4.90	71.00 g	3.48	0	20	50
	BF9 - RTE	2.79 ± 0.44	4.40	4.00 oz (113.40 g)	4.99	11	50	100
	BF10 - RTE	4.63 ± 0.48	4.40	4.00 oz (113.40 g)	4.99	4	40	80
	BF11 - RTE	3.89 ± 0.23	4.40	4.00 oz (113.40 g)	4.99	4	80	120
	BF12 - RTE	2.90 ± 0.38	4.40	4.00 oz (113.40 g)	4.99	6	75	90
	BF13 - RTE	1.39 ± 0.25	2.35	85.00 g	2.00	1	170	80
Other	O1 - RTE	19.97 ± 1.85	26.60	2 tbsp (30.00 g)	7.98	0	290	140
	O2 - RTE	45.11 ± 6.32	50.00	2 tbsp (30.00g)	15.00	1	230	140
	O3 - RTE	8.70 ± 5.00	5.00	1 package (58.00 g)	2.90	6	570	250
	O4 - RTE	3.65 ± 1.51	5.00	2.5 oz (70.90 g)	3.55	4	500	220
Fast Food								
Meat & Poultry	MP10 - FF	33.13 ± 5.12	10.00	95.00 g	9.50	NR	510	250
	M11 - FF	19.52 ± 1.46	20.00	4 pieces (64.00 g)	12.80	NR	330	170
	MP12 - FF	23.59 ± 3.40	14.00	119.00 g	16.66	NR	720	300
	MP13 - FF	9.83 ± 0.45	11.40	1 taco (102.00 g)	11.63	1	306	269
	MP14 - FF	11.06 ± 2.09	7.60	1 quesadilla (170.00 g)	12.92	0	310	180
	MP15 - FF	9.95 ± 0.67	9.90	1 burrito (140.00 g)	13.86	1	1650	640
	MP16 - FF	12.48 ± 0.30	12.21	1 piece (75.00 g)	9.16	0	430	130
	MP17 - FF	19.39 ± 2.55	18.60	1 piece (60.00 g)	11.16	0	380	130
	MP18 - FF	6.26 ± 1.21	4.58	5.40 oz (153.09 g)	7.01	7.00	520	150
	MP19 - FF	8.19 ± 0.78	10.80	5.70 oz (161.69 g)	17.46	19.00	820	490
	MP20 - FF	14.23 ± 2.82	10.50	1 sandwich (187.00 g)	19.64	9.00	680	320
MP21 - FF	7.12 ± 1.18	6.51	1 sandwich (71.28 g)	4.64	3	2370	810	

	MP22 - FF	10.74 ± 4.18	8.79	1 sandwich (94.61 g)	8.32	2	1940	850
	MP23 - FF***	12.59 ± 1.35	11.50	1 slice (123.00 g)	14.15	3	950	370
	MP24 - FF	10.96 ± 2.70	11.50	1 slice (79.00 g)	9.09	2.00	740	380
Seafood	S2 - FF	22.82 ± 1.07	14.08	1 sandwich (131.00 g)	18.44	NR	580	380
	S3 - FF	21.70 ± 0.15	13.10	5.00 oz (141.75 g)	18.57	14.00	440	360
Other	O5 - FF	13.92 ± 1.58	20.00	1 medium serving (117.00 g)	23.40	NR	260	320
	O6 - FF	16.27 ± 2.86	16.00	1 biscuit (76.00 g)	12.16	NR	810	260
	O7 - FF	6.29 ± 1.34	6.00	3 hotcakes (149.00 g)	8.94	NR	550	580
	O8 - FF	18.16 ± 0.75	17.30	1 biscuit (49.00 g)	8.48	1	520	180
	O9 - FF	15.96 ± 0.21	15.00	1 order (34.99 g)	5.25	0	1100	320
	O10 - FF	1.46 ± 0.52	3.11	1 order (16.85 g)	0.52	0	520	130

207 **Information found in the USDA Food Database. www.fdc.nal.usda.gov/fdc-app.html/

208 ***Information found in Menuwithprice.com. Not available in neither USDA Food Database nor Marco's Pizza website.

209 NR = not reported

210 NS = not a significant source of the nutrient

211

212

213

214

215

216

217

218

219

220

221

222

223


224

225

226

227
 228
 229
 230
 231
 232
 233
 234
 235
 236
 237
 238
 239
 240
 241
 242
 243
 244
 245
 246
 247
 248
 249
 250
 251
 252
 253
 254
 255
 256
 257
 258
 259

Figure 1. Total fat, SFA, MUFA, PUFA, Calories per serving and Salt (as mg/100 g of Sodium) of each food category



260 eggs, high fat meats - all of them containing high-fat content themselves - resulting in a meal
261 with both high-fat and high caloric content. It is well known that UPFs are rich in fat, sugar, and
262 salt, additionally consumption of these macronutrients is high among the US population (USDA,
263 2020b). Four UPFs from the category of FF contain half or more mg of salt than the
264 recommended daily value (FDA, 2020b), being meat the major component of the meal
265 preparation. Sugar-sweetened beverages, snacks and desserts are the major sources of added
266 sugars in UPFs. In this study, the only beverage included exceeding the recommended daily
267 value (Health, 2020). Therefore, the reduction of fat, salt, and sugar is a challenge that should be
268 addressed without affecting the sensorial properties of the meals. Also, their reduction should be
269 promoted in any food/meal manufacture restaurants, food chains, and takeaway stores; thus, this
270 study serves as a database of the current content of fat and its relationship with salt and sugar in
271 most consumed UPFs.

272 *3.2 Fatty acid profile by food category*

273 Thirty-five fatty acids were identified and quantified. Short-chain fatty acids (SC-FA) were
274 not reported since C4 and C6 co-eluded with the solvent. Also, dihomo- γ -linolenic acid (C20:3n-
275 3, DGLA) and eicosatrienoic acid (C20:3n-6) were not chromatographically resolved for some
276 samples, therefore their area values were merged and reported as C20:3n-3 + C20:3n-6. **Table 2**
277 and **Table 3** show the percentage of saturated fatty acids (SFA), monounsaturated fatty acids
278 (MUFA), and polyunsaturated fatty acids (PUFA), respectively. For a better representation of the
279 overall distribution of FAME s (SFA, MUFA, PUFA) according to the fat source a boxplot per
280 food category is shown in **Figure 1**. No statistically significant differences were found between
281 FF and RTE groups, however, differences among food categories were observed such as the
282 meat and other categories.

283

284 **Table 2.** Saturated fatty acid composition in Ready to Eat and Fast Food meals.
285

SFA	Total	Ready-To-Eat	Fast-Food	Mann-Whitney U-test
C8:0	1.18 (0.08-1.59)	1.43 (0.08-2.03)	0.64 (0.49-0.80)	
C10:0	1.74 (1.49-2.00)	2.01 (0.17-2.36)	1.22 (1.03-1.41)	*
C11:0	0.06 (0.05-0.08)	0.07 (0.06-0.09)	0.04 (0.02-0.05)	***
C12:0	2.05 (1.63-2.46)	2.04 (1.57-2.51)	2.06 (1.22-2.89)	
C14:0	3.54 (2.99-4.09)	4.22 (3.43-5.02)	2.36 (1.81-2.91)	**
C15:0	0.42 (0.36-0.49)	0.51 (0.42-0.06)	0.28 (0.21-0.34)	*
C16:0	21.74 (20.52-22.96)	23.96 (22.34-25.57)	18.09 (16.57-19.60)	****
C17:0	0.35 (0.31-0.39)	0.39 (0.34-0.44)	0.29 (0.22-0.35)	**
C18:0	7.61 (7.10-8.12)	8.41 (7.69-9.13)	6.29 (5.76-6.82)	***
C20:0	0.29 (0.26-0.32)	0.24 (0.21-0.28)	0.35 (0.31-0.40)	***
C21:0	0.30 (0.24-0.35)	0.31 (0.22-0.40)	0.27 (0.23-0.32)	
C22:0	0.12 (0.08 -0.15)	0.12 (0.07-0.17)	0.11 (0.06-0.17)	
C23:0	0.05 (0.03-0.08)	0.03 (0.02-0.04)	0.07 (0.03-0.10)	***
C24:0	0.22 (0.13-0.32)	0.21 (0.06-0.35)	0.24 (0.10-0.37)	***
Σ SFA	35.57 (33.01-38.13)	40.88 (37.48-44.29)	29.88 (27.17-32.60)	****
Σ MC-SFA	3.66 (2.98-4.34)	3.94 (3.05-4.82)	3.08 (2.06-4.10)	
Σ LC-SFA	33.66 (31.59-35.72)	37.31 (34.48-40.15)	27.61 (25.36-29.86)	****

286
287 Σ SFA: Sum of saturated fatty acid, Σ MC-FA: sum of medium chain saturated fatty acid, Σ LC-FA long
288 chain saturated fatty acid.
289

290 **Table 3.** Monounsaturated and Polyunsaturated fatty acid composition in Ready to Eat and Fast
291 Food meals

MUFA	Total	Ready-To-Eat	Fast-Food	Mann-Whitney U-test
C14:1	0.55 (0.48-s0.62)	0.59 (0.52-0.67)	0.46 (0.32-0.60)	***
C15:1	0.18 (0.12-0.25)	0.18 (0.12-0.25)	ND	-
C16:1	1.76 (1.56-1.96)	1.83 (1.57-2.09)	1.63 (1.31-1.95)	
C17:1	0.26 (0.22-0.31)	0.26 (0.20-0.31)	0.28 (0.18-0.38)	
<i>t</i>C18:1	1.23 (0.77-1.70)	2.14 (0.53-3.75)	0.93 (0.59-1.27)	
C18:1 n-9	36.09 (34.65- 37.53)	33.64 (31.88-35.39)	40.15 (37.92- 42.38)	****

<i>C20:1</i>	0.40 (0.36-0.44)	0.33 (0.28-0.39)	0.49 (0.42-0.55)	****
<i>C22:1</i>	0.28 (0.20-0.36)	0.19 (0.15-0.24)	0.34 (0.21-0.47)	***
<i>C24:1</i>	0.19 (0.09-0.28)	0.14 (0.05-0.23)	0.27 (0.02-0.57)	***
<i>ΣMUFA</i>	37.82 (36.01-39.63)	36.57 (34.64-38.50)	43.17 (40.73-45.61)	****
<hr/>				
PUFA	Total	Ready-To-Eat	Fast-Food	Mann-Whitney U-test
<i>tC18:2</i>	0.35 (0.30-0.40)	0.39 (0.31-0.46)	0.31 (0.23-0.39)	
<i>C18:2 n-6</i>	20.88 (18.81-22.95)	19.59 (16.88-22.29)	23.02 (19.82-26.22)	*
<i>C18:3n-6</i>	0.10- (0.08-0.12)	0.11 (0.08-0.14)	0.09 (0.07-0.10)	
<i>C18:3n-3</i>	2.70 (2.37-3.03)	2.7 (2.21-3.14)	2.75 (2.31-3.19)	
<i>C20:3n3 + C20:3n6</i>	0.12 (0.10-0.13)	0.12 (0.10-0.15)	0.11 (0.10-0.13)	
<i>C20:4n-6</i>	0.11 (0.05-0.17)	ND	0.11 (0.05-0.17)	
<i>C20:5n-3</i>	0.27 (0.16-0.39)	0.21 (0.12-0.30)	0.32 (0.12-0.51)	***
<i>C22:2 n-6</i>	0.06 (0.00-0.13)	0.02 (0.01-0.04)	0.13 (-0.13-0.40)	****
<i>C22:6 n-3</i>	0.05 (0.04-0.07)	0.05 (0.03-0.07)	0.06 (0.04-0.07)	***
<i>ΣPUFA n-3</i>	0.17 (0.12-0.21)	0.16 (0.10-0.21)	0.18 (0.09-0.28)	
<i>ΣPUFA n-6</i>	23.88 (21.54-26.21)	22.55 (19.46-25.63)	26.07 (22.51-29.63)	*
<i>ΣPUFA</i>	23.62 (21.29-25.95)	22.85 (19.79-25.91)	26.95 (23.43-30.46)	*

292

293 ΣPUFA: Sum of polyunsaturated fatty acid, ΣPUFA n-6 sum of omega 6 polyunsaturated fatty acid,

294 ΣPUFA n-3: sum of omega 3 polyunsaturated fatty acid.

295 ΣMUFA: sum of monounsaturated fatty acid, MUFA are reported in %.

296

297 The meat and poultry category (n=24) which includes beef, chicken, pork, turkey, and
 298 combinations of these meats, had the third-largest amount of total fat (values ranging from 0.60
 299 to 33.13 g/100 g of product). The majority of UPFs showed a higher fat content compared to the
 300 values reported either in their nutritional label or website. Higher fat contents were observed in
 301 several dairy products containing butter as part of their use in their preparation process. Butter is
 302 the only processed food included in this study due to its extensive use in the manufacturing of
 303 several UPFs.

304 *3.2 Saturated fatty acids (SFA)*

305 Saturated fatty acid was the overall second major content of fatty acids between both FF and
306 RTE meals with 35.57%, just behind the monounsaturated fatty acids (37.82%). The total SFA
307 content was significantly different between RTE and FF with 40.88 and 29.88 g/100g of product,
308 respectively. C16:00 was the predominant SFA in both RTE and FF meals with a mean of 21.74
309 g/100 g, followed by C18:00 with 7.61 g/100g. Regarding the length of the saturated chain in the
310 fatty acid, long-chain fatty acid (LC-SFA) accounted for more than 90% of the total SFA
311 Content in comparison with 5.3% of the medium-chain saturated fatty acid (MC-SFA). Dietary
312 triacylglycerols are derived principally from two sources: animal fats and vegetable oils. Animal
313 fats contain a high proportion of SFA as for butter, which SFA content mostly consists of 4 SFAs
314 (C12:00, C14:00, C16:00, and C18:00) (Bobe et al., 2003; Ledoux et al., 2005; Lopes et al.,
315 2019). On the other hand, vegetable oils have a higher proportion of unsaturated fatty acids.
316 Since LCFA are hydrophobic nutrients, their intestinal absorption is a complex process. Fatty-
317 acid chain length and unsaturation number influence fat absorption. In the human diet,
318 approximately 95% of dietary lipids are triacylglycerols (TAG), mainly composed of long-chain
319 fatty acids (LCFA, number of carbons >16). Medium-chain fatty acids (MCFA) are better
320 absorbed than LCFA because they can be solubilized in the aqueous phase of the intestinal
321 contents, absorbed bound to albumin, and transported to the liver by the portal vein (Wang et al.,
322 2013). Further, the absorption in the stomach occurs after the hydrolysis of medium-chain
323 triglycerides (MCT) by gastric lipase, enhancing their solubilization in the intestine, where they
324 are absorbed bound to albumin and transported to the liver via the portal vein (Niot et al., 2009).
325 LCFA exerts basic functions in the cell as membrane components, metabolic fuel, precursors of
326 lipid mediators, regulators of ion channels, and modulators of gene expression (Linder &

327 Deschenes, 2007). They participate in several post-translational protein modifications (e.g.,
328 palmitoylation) affecting their cellular functions. Moreover, dietary lipid fecal loss remains
329 below 5% (w/w), still with a high fat intake in healthy individuals (Ramirez, Amate, & Gil,
330 2001). Hence, lipid uptake is not a rate-limiting step for intestinal fat absorption, and more
331 attention should be paid to the meal size portion and fat source to maintain a healthy diet.

332 Interestingly, albeit not surprising considering the lipid needs for infants, infant formula has
333 the overall highest SFA content from all UPFs with 56%. SFA content in infant formulas
334 containing dairy as their major source of fat is significantly higher in comparison with those
335 having plant oils as their main source (Kilvington, Barnaba, Rajasekaran, Laurens, & Gabriela
336 Medina-Meza, 2021; Sun, Wei, Su, Zou, & Wang, 2018).

337 Even though the majority of SFA in both RTE and FF meals were straight chain even-
338 numbered homologs (i.e., C12:00, C14:00, C16:00, etc.), C15:00, C17:00, and C23:00 were also
339 detected in UPFs, being C15:00 the only statistically significant. Dairy foods, comprised of RTE
340 items, contain the highest amount of C15:00 with 1.02 g/100g of product followed by the baby
341 foods category. All type of cheeses (American, Cheddar, and Swiss) showed a high SFA content
342 which agrees with the literature (Manuelian, Curro, Penasa, Cassandro, & De Marchi, 2017);
343 except for the cream cheese, which literature values were not available to confirm their high SFA
344 content. Mac & Cheese (boiled, prepared) showed a higher fat content than the Mac & Cheese
345 prepared by microwave heating. These results demonstrate that cooking techniques and
346 preparation are critical parameters that should be considered when evaluating the nutritional
347 quality of foods. Total fat content for butter and ice cream agreed with previous studies (Nielsen,
348 Olsen, Jensen, & Skibsted, 1996; Tavella et al., 2000) and the USDA food database (USDA,
349 2018).

350 The UPFs classified as “Others” (French fries, biscuits, hotcakes, mashed potato) contained
351 30.7% SFA, which was confirmed with their reference values in the USDA database (USDA,
352 2019r, USDA, 2019g, Huang et al., 2019). Palmitic acid (C16:0), lauric acid (C12:0), stearic acid
353 (C18:0), and myristic acid (C14:0) were the four leading FA between the “Other” category.

354 RTE and FF meals are the UPFs with a major contribution of fat accumulation in the human
355 body in the Western diet (Mohiuddin & Nasirullah, 2020), which is directly associated with
356 different chronic diseases such as obesity, diabetes, hypertension, atherosclerosis, among others
357 (Shori et al., 2017). Therefore, the quantification of total fat in RTE and FF meals is important to
358 evaluate the actual dietary fat intake of adults and children who consume a large amount of
359 UPFs.

360 *3.2 Monounsaturated fatty acids (MUFA)*

361 MUFA was the group with the highest content among all UPFs. FF values ranged from 40 to
362 45 (g/100 product) (**Table 3**) while RTE values range from 34 to 38 (g/100 product). It is worth
363 mentioning that RTE meals contain higher percentages of SFA (40.88 g/100 of product) than the
364 overall percentage of MUFA among UPFs. Conversely, the FF group contains the highest
365 percentage of MUFA than the overall amount of both SFA and MUFA in all UPFs. Furthermore,
366 the oleic acid (C18:1, cis-9, OA) was the dominant fatty acid in all UPFs with more than 90% of
367 the total MUFA. OA not only provides energy but also reduces the melting point of
368 triacylglycerides (Ramirez et al., 2001). Baby foods and meat & poultry were the categories with
369 the higher content of OA, followed by seafood. The high level of OA on these meals may be due
370 to the use of soybean and high oleic sunflower oil in their recipes. Palmitoleic acid (C16:1), oleic
371 acid (C18:1, cis-9), and elaidic acid (C18:1, trans-9) were the second, third, and fourth most
372 abundant MUFA in the meat & poultry category, respectively. Values are aligned with those

373 reported previously (Haak, De Smet, Fremaut, Van Walleghem, & Raes, 2008; Karakok, Ozogul,
374 Saler, & Ozogul, 2010) and with the information reported in their nutritional labels. Even though
375 the majority of the MUFA reported in the USDA database were detected in our samples, some of
376 them were present in small quantities in the USDA database and not detected in our samples and
377 vice versa.

378 Twelve UPFs containing beef as their major component showed the highest fat content
379 among the meat & poultry categories (**Table 4**). This abundant presence of fat in beef is also
380 observed in other food items such as roasted rib (style: large end) which contains 26 g per
381 serving size (3 oz) (USDA, 2019a), and also in ground beef which can contain a maximum 30%
382 fat allowed by the USDA (USDA, 2019b). Previous studies in beef have reported SFA and
383 MUFA as their dominating FAME group (Karakok et al., 2010; Wood, 1996). Beef with
384 vegetables from a FF restaurant reported a saturated fat content of 21.4% on their website, which
385 is slightly lower than our 26.94% of SFA, this confirms that our results could be more accurate.

386 Baby foods are RTE meals with the highest fat and MUFA contents, which are required to
387 fulfill the infants' growing needs. The main fat sources for baby foods are meat and poultry,
388 chicken broth, and canola oil.

389 MUFA was dominated by oleic acid (C18:1, cis-9), palmitoleic acid (C16:1), and 11-
390 eicosenoic acid (C20:1). PUFA in baby foods was led by linolenic acid, LA (C18:2cis), and γ -
391 linolenic acid (GLA, C18:3n6). Lastly, less than 1% of the total fat contained trans fatty acids.
392 Results agree with federal regulations about the total content of trans fatty acid in foodstuff
393 (Albuquerque, Santos, Silva, Oliveira, & Costa, 2018).

394
395

Table 4 Fatty acid profile of UPFs by food category (mean and range).

<i>SFA</i>	Meat & Poultry (n=24)	Dairy (n=11)	Eggs & Egg products (n= 2)	Seafood (n=3)	Baby Foods (n=13)	Others (n=12)	<i>p</i> - value [†]
<i>C8:0</i>	0.42 (0.32-0.52)	1.05 (0.97-1.12)	0.15 (0.06-0.24)	ND	2.43 (0.07-4.79)	2.05 (0.04-3.69)	****
<i>C10:0</i>	1.19 (0.96-0.14)	2.62 (2.34-2.90)	0.05 (0.04-0.07)	0.79 (-0.13-0.17)	2.50 (1.83-3.16)	1.55 (0.59-2.51)	****
<i>C11:0</i>	0.04 (0.02-0.05)	0.07 (0.06-0.09)	ND	ND	0.07 (0.05-0.10)	ND	***
<i>C12:0</i>	1.02 (0.77-1.28)	4.36 (3.38-5.35)	0.03 (0.01-0.04)	1.03 (-0.07-0.21)	1.25 (0.72-0.18)	2.93 (1.51-4.34)	****
<i>C14:0</i>	2.61 (2.10-3.13)	1.06 (0.98-1.15)	0.09 (0.08-0.10)	1.61 (0.10-0.31)	3.29 (2.10-4.49)	1.52 (0.97-2.08)	****
<i>C15:0</i>	0.37 (0.31-0.43)	1.02 (0.86-1.18)	ND	0.18 (0.05-0.30)	0.43 (0.29-0.58)	0.11 (0.06-0.15)	****
<i>C16:0</i>	20.77 (19.67-21.87)	34.29 (33.57-35.01)	10.99 (10.92-11.07)	13.63 (12.02-15.24)	20.32 (17.76-22.87)	19.80 (16.31-23.30)	****
<i>C17:0</i>	0.44 (0.36-0.51)	0.50 (0.42-0.57)	0.09 (0.08-0.10)	0.19 (0.14-0.24)	0.33 (0.27-0.40)	0.12 (0.10-0.14)	****
<i>C18:0</i>	8.43 (7.60-9.27)	11.37 (10.19-12.55)	4.08 (4.01-4.15)	4.99 (4.59-5.39)	6.78 (5.83-7.74)	5.32 (4.68-5.96)	****
<i>C20:0</i>	0.28 (0.23-0.34)	0.17 (0.12-0.22)	0.29 (0.27-0.31)	0.37 (0.33-0.41)	0.29 (0.23-0.36)	0.35 (0.30-0.39)	**
<i>C21:0</i>	0.11 (0.05-0.17)	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	-
<i>C22:0</i>	0.39 (0.19-0.59)	0.17 (0.16-0.19)	0.29 (0.24-0.34)	0.30 (0.23-0.37)	0.17 (0.11-0.23)	0.22 (0.18-0.27)	-
<i>C23:0</i>	0.02 (0.02-0.03)	0.08 (0.02-0.14)	ND	ND	0.03 (-0.08-0.14)	0.04 (0.02-0.05)	-
<i>C24:0</i>	0.31 (0.09-0.54)	0.13 (0.11-0.14)	ND	0.11 (0.11-0.12)	0.25 (0.02-0.47)	0.12 (0.10-0.15)	-
ΣSFA	34.33 (31.13-	66.06 (64.23-	16.07 (15.91-	22.23 (17.99-	33.64 (28.07-	30.71 (25.63-	****

	36.53)	67.89)	16.22)	26.46)	39.21)	35.79)	
MUFA	Meat & Poultry	Dairy	Eggs & Egg products	Seafood	Baby Foods	Others	p-value
<i>C14:1</i>	0.49 (0.39-0.60)	0.94 (0.89-0.99)	ND	0.48 (-0.45-1.43)	0.53 (0.38-0.67)	0.17 (0.07-0.27)	****
<i>C15:1</i>	ND	ND	ND	ND	0.18 (0.12-0.25)	ND	-
<i>C16:1</i>	2.49 (2.19-2.79)	1.33 (1.06-1.59)	0.12 (0.11-0.13)	0.75 (0.15-1.36)	2.25 (1.78-2.72)	0.43 (0.28-0.58)	****
<i>C17:1</i>	0.37 (0.27-0.48)	0.27 (0.18-0.36)	0.04 (0.02-0.07)	0.15 (0.03-0.27)	0.26 (0.19-0.34)	0.06 (0.05-0.07)	****
<i>tC18:1</i>	1.44 (0.82-2.06)	ND	ND	ND	0.14 (-0.09-0.36)	1.04 (0.19-1.89)	-
<i>C18:1 n-9</i>	39.83 (38.26-41.40)	25.86 (24.89-26.83)	21.41 (21.38-21.44)	30.21 (24.22-36.19)	40.30 (36.99-43.61)	33.58 (29.69-37.47)	****
<i>C20:1</i>	0.49 (0.43-0.55)	0.09 (0.07-0.10)	0.15 (0.14-0.16)	0.29 (0.16-0.43)	0.49 (0.39-0.59)	0.32 (0.23-0.41)	****
<i>C22:1</i>	0.06 (0.02-0.09)	ND	ND	0.21 (0.16-0.26)	0.12 (0.07-0.18)	ND	-
<i>C24:1</i>	0.03 (0.02-0.07)	0.17 (0.13-0.20)	ND	0.52 (0.34-0.71)	0.13 (0.07-0.26)	ND	***
ΣMUFA	44.00 (42.29-45.71)	28.31 (27.53-28.82)	21.73 (21.67-29.10)	31.37 (25.02-37.71)	43.71 (40.25-47.17)	34.67 (30.65-38.69)	****
PUFA	Meat & Poultry	Dairy	Eggs & Egg products	Seafood	Baby Foods	Others	p-value
<i>tC18:2</i>	0.34 (0.27-0.41)	0.53 (0.42-0.64)	0.04 (0.03-0.05)	ND	0.40 (0.30-0.49)	0.14 (0.07-0.29)	****
<i>C18:2 n-6</i>	18.42 (16.33-20.51)	4.40 (3.06-5.74)	54.95 (54.81-55.09)	40.57 (33.29-47.84)	18.86 (15.84-21.87)	31.22 (25.86-36.58)	****
<i>C18:3n-6</i>	0.12 (0.10-0.15)	0.04 (0.04-0.05)	ND	ND	0.10 (0.05-0.15)	0.10 (0.06-0.13)	-
<i>C18:3n-3</i>	2.12 (1.81-2.44)	0.52 (0.43-0.62)	7.13 (7.08-7.19)	5.07 (4.20-5.93)	3.13 (2.38-3.89)	0.03886 (0.02912-0.0486)	****
<i>C20:2n-6</i>	0.77 (0.34-0.12)	0.01 (0.01-0.01)	0.04 (0.03-0.04)	0.20 (-0.27-	0.11 (0.06-0.16)	0.70 (0.11-	***

				0.67)		1.51)	***
<i>C20:3n-3</i> + <i>C20:3n-6</i>	0.13 (0.12-0.14)	0.11 (0.09-0.13)	0.03 (0.02-0.04)	0.03 (0.02-0.05)	0.16 (0.09-0.23)	0.04 (0.01-0.06)	
<i>C20:4n-6</i>	0.34 (0.28-0.39)	0.21 (0.18-0.24)	0.03 (0.02-0.04)	0.58 (-0.60-1.76)	0.33 (0.21-0.46)	0.08 (0.05-0.10)	-
<i>C20:5n-3</i>	0.42 (0.20-0.63)	ND	ND	ND	0.15 (0.08-0.23)	0.07 (0.03-0.17)	-
<i>C22:2n-6</i>	0.13 (-0.13-0.39)	ND	ND	ND	0.02 (-0.01-0.04)	0.03 (0.03-0.06)	-
<i>C22:6n-3</i>	0.05 (0.03-0.07)	0.02 (0.02-0.03)	ND	ND	0.06 (0.03-0.08)	0.09 (0.05-0.13)	*
<i>ΣPUFA</i>	21.67 (19.37-23.98)	5.63 (4.21-7.04)	62.21 (62.02-62.40)	46.41 (38.80-54.02)	22.65 (19.28-26.02)	35.57 (29.35-41.79)	**

399

400 Σ SFA: sum of saturated fatty acid, Σ sum of MUFA: monounsaturated fatty acid, Σ Sum of PUFA: Polyunsaturated fatty acid. SFA,
 401 MUFA and PUFA are reported in %. [†]Independent-samples Kruskal-Wallis test.

402

403

404

405

406

407

408

409 *3.3 Polyunsaturated fatty acids (PUFA)*

410 Meals rich on PUFA are directly related to the use of vegetable oils and other ingredients
411 such a fish, avocado, among others, which contain high PUFA levels. PUFA was the third most
412 abundant group in all UPFs with no significant differences between FF and RTE. Linoleic acid
413 (C18:2 n-6, LA) was the most abundant followed by α -linolenic acid (C18:3 n-3, LNA). The egg
414 & egg's derivatives category has the highest content of LA followed by seafood. These results
415 agree with the literature (Bemrah, Sirot, Leblanc, & Volatier, 2009; Simopoulos & Salem, 1992).
416 The main ingredient of macaroni salad is mayonnaise, and both have a similar fatty acid profile
417 in agreement with those reported in literature (Tavella et al., 2000). Therefore, PUFA was also
418 the predominant group in macaroni salad, and traces of trans fatty acid (18:2, trans-9,12) was
419 detected just in mayonnaise.

420 Higher PUFA content was found in salad dressing, where results agree with previous studies
421 that reported similar values (Jacobsen, 2015; Let, Jacobsen, & Meyer, 2007). It is worth
422 mentioning that the effect of the cooking on FA profiles, for example, Mac & Cheese meals were
423 cooked using 2 different cooking methods (boiled and microwaved, **Table S1**). No reference
424 values were found in both types of cooking methods employed in this study, however, the major
425 ingredient on these meals is cheddar cheese which has been previously reported (Manuelian et
426 al., 2017) and used for comparison purposes of this RTE. The microwaved mac & cheese
427 showed a higher SFA content (55.6%) in comparison with the boiled sample (25.2 %), however
428 the boiled sample has higher PUFAs content (52.5%) versus 17.52% of the microwave
429 preparation, demonstrating the effect of temperature and type of cooking on variability on the
430 nutritional content.

431 Seafood is well known to be a great source of LCFA, especially omega 3 long-chain PUFA
432 (Abad, 2004; Bemrah et al., 2009; Costa et al., 2017; Neff, Bhavsar, Braekevelt, & Arts, 2014;
433 Sirot, 2008). LC n-3 FA is primarily found in organisms that live in cold water. These organisms
434 are especially dependent on the physicochemical properties of the FA. This is due to the high
435 number of double bonds in the molecule lowering the melting point of the compounds, which
436 means that, even at low temperatures, biological structures retain the fluidity necessary for life
437 processes. Sources of LC n-3 FA with the greatest nutritional significance for humans are cold-
438 water fish, such as salmon, mackerel, herring, and tuna. The USDA recommends fish
439 consumption of at least 8 oz (227 g) seafood per week in individuals two years old and older
440 (USDA, 2016). Seafood can be found in food retail (56%) and restaurants (31%); being shrimp,
441 clams, salmon, cod, and Alaskan Pollock the most consumed seafood in the US (Love et al.,
442 2020).

443 As expected, seafood meals contain the highest percentage of PUFA (46.41%) with minimal
444 differences when comparing to previous literature values (Awogbemi, Onuh, & Inambao, 2019;
445 Czech, Grela, & Ognik, 2015; Ekiz & Oz, 2019; Katan et al., 2020; Modzelewska-Kapituła,
446 Pietrzak-Fiećko, Tkacz, Draszanowska, & Więk, 2019; Rant et al., 2019; Shan et al., 2019). For
447 example, in fried shrimp from a FF restaurant, no C22:6 was detected as opposed to what its
448 reference values state; and instead of C18:3n3, we were able to identify just C18:3n6 (Czech et
449 al., 2015). Moreover, for the fish sandwich from another FF restaurant, PUFA was not the
450 dominating FA group as stated in references because of the significant abundance of C18:2cis in
451 our sample compared to the higher presence of C18:1cis reported by the USDA (USDA, 2020a).
452 Results from RTE clam chowder soup are aligned with its reference values, however, a
453 difference of 55.91% between PUFA and MUFA is reported in the USDA while our sample


454 shows only a 1.05% difference. This suggests that different formulations for the same product
455 may be available. RTE soups like the clam chowder is a canned product that usually needs
456 reconstitution and warming steps before consumption. Differences during homemade preparation
457 such as temperature changes, delay in warming, use of microwave vs boiling, etc. may increase
458 the lipid oxidation process promoting autooxidation of lipid molecules which in turn, alters the
459 overall fatty acid profile of the food item.

460 Differences in the PUFA content were observed between biscuits from two FF franchises.
461 For example, EPA was present in O8-FF instead of ALA which was seen in O6-FF
462 (**Supplementary Material – Table S1**). This could be the result of the use of milk as part of the
463 ingredients in O8-FF recipe which contains small amounts of EPA (USDA, 2018), in addition, to
464 crosscontamination of this FA by the use of the same equipment for the cooking procedure of
465 different food meals which could contain EPA. Lastly, even though 4 trans FAs were reported by
466 USDA, no trans FA was detected in O8-FF. Overall, FA profile was similar to the one reported
467 in the USDA database, and previous studies (Amrutha Kala, 2014; KFC, 2020; McDolnald's,
468 2017; Rutkowska, Adamska, Sinkiewicz, & Białek, 2012; Smith, 1985), even though traces of
469 trans FAs were reported by the USDA for French fries, none was detected in our sample. It is
470 noteworthy to mention that the variability in frying oils used as part of the French fries cooking
471 procedure in these 2 FF restaurants, may result in the presence of elaidic acid in item O9-FF, and
472 its absence in O5-FF. As Smith and co-workers explained in their study (Song et al., 2015) the
473 use of hydrogenated soybean oil for frying purposes caused the presence of high amounts of
474 elaidic acid (C18:1, trans-9), while the use of an animal-vegetable mix shortening (corn oil and
475 beef flavor) in O5-FF inhibited the formation of elaidic acid (C18:1, trans-9).

476 *3.4 Correlations between macronutrients and price per serving on UPFs*

477 One of the major objectives of this study was to evaluate correlations among evaluated
478 parameters. Thus, we performed Spearman's correlation among major FAME groups (SFA,
479 MUFA, PUFA), macronutrients (sugars, fat), sodium, calories per serving (**Figure 2**), and price
480 (total and per serving). Values of sugar and sodium were taken from the nutritional label,
481 whereas fat content values were from our quantified fat determinations (**Table 1**).

482 **Figure 2.** Correlations for price, calories per serving and sodium between RTE and FF and each
483 food category.
484



501 When the overall UPFs parameters were considered, positive correlations ($\rho = 0.748$, $p <$
502 0.01) between calories per serving and sodium content were observed. The US Food and Drug
503 Administration (FDA) estimates that Americans eat on average about 3,400 mg of sodium per
504 day, while the recommendation from the Dietary Guidelines for Americans limits the sodium
505 intake to less than 2,300 mg per day—that's equal to about 1 teaspoon of salt (FDA, 2020b). Salt
506 is widely present in the Western diet with over 70% of dietary sodium coming from UPFs.
507 Particular attention must be given to the consumption of foods rich in salt which has been
508 associated with the increased risk of developing hypertension, a major contributor of
509 cardiometabolic disorders, kidney failure, and premature mortality (FDA, 2020a). As expected,
510 inverse correlation were found between SFA and PUFA ($\rho = -0.848$, $p < 0.01$).

511 The most popular UPFs were used in this study, with prices ranging from 1 to 18 dollars
512 per individual serving. The total price and calories per serving were also positively correlated (ρ
513 $= 0.534$, $p < 0.01$). The price of the majority of the UPFs is below 5 dollars, having 2.5 dollars
514 per serving as mode value. Calorie content ranges from few calories up to 800 in UPFs that
515 contain meat as the major component. It is well known that UPFs are popular for being fast,
516 cheap, and convenient meals. It is important to note that price and accessibility are critical
517 factors for people facing food insecurity; which clearly may modify their dietary preferences and
518 nutritional patterns. More attention should be paid to the relationship between price and serving
519 size since cheaper meals are used to be also the most popular because of their big serving amount
520 which attracts consumers looking for the most affordable and available meals.

521 **Conclusions**

522 This study provides a systematic and novel assessment of the total fat, and fatty acid
523 composition of the most popular UPFs in the US Mid-West area. Convenience and palatability

524 are the main reasons to consume UPFs. However, nutritional quality and dietary patterns are
525 jeopardized by prices and popularity of UPF meals resulting in a public health issue that should
526 be addressed. The presented results revealed a positive trend in the use of plant-based oils in the
527 elaboration of UPFs showing an increase of PUFA content when are categorized as RTE and
528 FF; however, when UPFs are classified according to the fat source, dairy and baby foods are the
529 group with less PUFA content. UPFs are greatly appreciated by children and teenagers, but also
530 consumed by infants, which as a vulnerable population add additional concern from a public
531 health point of view. The significance of this study is to provide new data about fat, salt, and
532 sodium in the most consumed UPFs, with the opportunity to define priority interventions for a
533 more advanced precision nutrition, especially for vulnerable populations.

534 Concerning the sugar, salt, and saturated fat content, it was noticed that new challenges
535 have arisen, especially focusing on the food industry and policymakers. Some key changes may
536 have a great impact such as reformulation of menu items, including more vegetable and fruit
537 options as side and/o desserts, with the reduction of serving size especially in beverages, fatty
538 sides, and desserts.

539 The gradual reduction of the aforementioned components in most of the food categories
540 studied here should become a priority. It is possible to conclude that this subject remains present
541 and new challenges are being pointed out by several national and international organizations
542 aiming to improve the nutritional quality of ultra-processed foods.

543

544 **Acknowledgments:**

545 This study was funding by Center for Research Ingredient Safety (CRIS) through the
546 GR100229 grant. USDA National Institute of Food and Agriculture, Hatch project MICL02526 to

547 I.G.M.M. Authors are grateful with Nama Naseem, Nicole Urrea, and Lisa Zou for their
548 assistance during lipid extraction.

549

550 **Conflict of interest**

551 The authors have declared no conflict of interest.

552

553 **References**

- 554 Abad, J. O. a. A. J. P. a. D. M. n. a. S. N. a. J. L. S. a. M. (2004). Seasonal variation in weight
555 and biochemical composition of the tissues of *Ruditapes decussatus* in relation to the
556 gametogenic cycle. *Aquaculture*, *238*(1), 451-468.
557 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aquaculture.2004.05.022>
- 558 Albuquerque, T. G., Santos, J., Silva, M. A., Oliveira, M., & Costa, H. S. (2018). An update on
559 processed foods: Relationship between salt, saturated and trans fatty acids. *Food*
560 *Chemistry*, *267*, 75-82. doi:10.1016/j.foodchem.2018.01.029
- 561 Amrutha Kala, A. L. (2014). Studies on saturated and trans fatty acids composition of few
562 commercial brands of biscuits sold in Indian market. *J Food Sci Technol*, *51*(11), 3520-
563 3526. doi:10.1007/s13197-014-1421-8
- 564 Awogbemi, O., Onuh, E. I., & Inambao, F. L. (2019). Comparative study of properties and fatty
565 acid composition of some neat vegetable oils and waste cooking oils. *International*
566 *Journal of Low-Carbon Technologies*, *14*(3), 417-425. doi:10.1093/ijlct/ctz038
- 567 Bemrah, N., Sirot, V., Leblanc, J. C., & Volatier, J. L. (2009). Fish and seafood consumption and
568 omega 3 intake in French coastal populations: CALIPSO survey. *Public Health Nutrition*,
569 *12*(5), 599-608. doi:10.1017/s1368980008002681
- 570 Chen, Y. S., Aluwi, N. A., Saunders, S. R., Ganjyal, G. M., & Medina-Meza, I. G. (2019).
571 Metabolic fingerprinting unveils quinoa oil as a source of bioactive phytochemicals.
572 *Food Chem*, *286*, 592-599. doi:10.1016/j.foodchem.2019.02.016
- 573 Costa, R., Albergamo, A., Piparo, M., Zaccone, G., Capillo, G., Manganaro, A., . . . Mondello, L.
574 (2017). Multidimensional gas chromatographic techniques applied to the analysis of
575 lipids from wild-caught and farmed marine species. *European Journal of Lipid Science*
576 *and Technology*, *119*(2). doi:10.1002/ejlt.201600043
- 577 Czech, A., Grela, E. R., & Ognik, K. (2015). Effect of Frying on Nutrients Content and Fatty
578 Acid Composition of Muscles of Selected Freezing Seafoods. *Journal of Food and*
579 *Nutrition Research*, *3*(1), 9-14.
- 580 Ekiz, E., & Oz, F. (2019). The effects of different frying oils on the formation of heterocyclic
581 aromatic amines in meatballs and the changes in fatty acid compositions of meatballs and
582 frying oils. *Journal of the Science of Food and Agriculture*, *99*(4), 1509-1518.
583 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1002/jsfa.9325>
- 584 FDA. (2020a). Sodium in your diet. *Food facts*. Retrieved from
585 <http://www.fda.gov/educationresourcelibrary>
- 586 FDA. (2020b). Sodium in Your Diet. Retrieved from [https://www.fda.gov/food/nutrition-](https://www.fda.gov/food/nutrition-education-resources-materials/sodium-your-)
587 [education-resources-materials/sodium-your-](https://www.fda.gov/food/nutrition-education-resources-materials/sodium-your-)

- 634 composition and tenderness of semimembranosus muscle from Holstein-Friesian bulls.
635 *Meat Science*, 157, 107877. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2019.107877>
- 636 Monteiro, C. A., Cannon, G., Lawrence, M., Costa Louzada, M. L., & Pereira Machado, P.
637 (2019). *Ultra-processed foods, diet quality, and health using the NOVA classification*
638 *system*. Rome
- 639 Neff, M. R., Bhavsar, S. P., Braekevelt, E., & Arts, M. T. (2014). Effects of different cooking
640 methods on fatty acid profiles in four freshwater fishes from the Laurentian Great Lakes
641 region. *Food Chem*, 164, 544-550. doi:10.1016/j.foodchem.2014.04.104
- 642 Nielsen, J. H., Olsen, C. E., Jensen, C., & Skibsted, L. H. (1996). Cholesterol oxidation in butter
643 and dairy spread during storage. *J Dairy Res*, 63(1), 159-167.
- 644 Niot, I., Poirier, H., Tran, T. T. T., & Besnard, P. (2009). Intestinal absorption of long-chain fatty
645 acids: Evidence and uncertainties. *Progress in Lipid Research*, 48(2), 101-115.
646 doi:10.1016/j.plipres.2009.01.001
- 647 Ramirez, M., Amate, L., & Gil, A. (2001). Absorption and distribution of dietary fatty acids from
648 different sources. *Early Human Development*, 65, S95-S101. doi:10.1016/s0378-
649 3782(01)00211-0
- 650 Rant, W., Radzik-Rant, A., Świątek, M., Niżnikowski, R., Szymańska, Ż., Bednarczyk, M., . . .
651 Ślęzak, M. (2019). The effect of aging and muscle type on the quality characteristics and
652 lipid oxidation of lamb meat. *Arch Anim Breed*, 62(2), 383-391. doi:10.5194/aab-62-383-
653 2019
- 654 Rutkowska, J., Adamska, A., Sinkiewicz, I., & Białek, M. (2012). Composition of fatty acids in
655 selected sorts of biscuits, offered for children. *Acta Alimentaria*, 41(4), 433.
656 doi:10.1556/aalim.41.2012.4.5
- 657 Santana, M. O., Guimarães, J. S., Leite, F. H. M., Mais, L. A., Horta, P. M., Martins, A. P. B., &
658 Claro, R. M. (2020). Analysing persuasive marketing of ultra-processed foods on
659 Brazilian television. *International Journal of Public Health*, 65(7), 1067-1077.
- 660 Schulze, M. B., & Hu, F. B. (2002). Dietary patterns and risk of hypertension, type 2 diabetes
661 mellitus, and coronary heart disease. *Curr Atheroscler Rep*, 4(6), 462-467.
662 doi:10.1007/s11883-002-0051-1
- 663 Shan, Z., Rehm, C. D., Rogers, G., Ruan, M., Wang, D. D., Hu, F. B., . . . Bhupathiraju, S. N.
664 (2019). Trends in Dietary Carbohydrate, Protein, and Fat Intake and Diet Quality Among
665 US Adults, 1999-2016. *JAMA*, 322(12), 1178-1187. doi:10.1001/jama.2019.13771
- 666 Simopoulos, A. P., & Salem, N., Jr. (1992). Egg yolk as a source of long-chain polyunsaturated
667 fatty acids in infant feeding. *Am J Clin Nutr*, 55(2), 411-414.
- 668 Sirot, V. a. O. M. a. B. N. a. V. J.-L. a. L. J.-C. (2008). Lipid and fatty acid composition of fish
669 and seafood consumed in France: CALIPSO study. *Journal of Food Composition and*
670 *Analysis*, 21, 8-16. doi:10.1016/j.jfca.2007.05.006
- 671 Smith, B. (1985). The role of Chenopodium as a domesticated in pre-maize garden systems of the
672 eastern United State. *Southeastern Archaeology*, 4, 51-72.
- 673 Song, J., Park, J., Jung, J., Lee, C., Gim, S. Y., Ka, H., . . . Lee, J. (2015). Analysis of Trans Fat
674 in Edible Oils with Cooking Process. *Toxicol Res*, 31(3), 307-312.
675 doi:10.5487/TR.2015.31.3.307
- 676 Sun, C., Wei, W., Su, H., Zou, X. Q., & Wang, X. G. (2018). Evaluation of sn-2 fatty acid
677 composition in commercial infant formulas on the Chinese market: A comparative study
678 based on fat source and stage. *Food Chemistry*, 242, 29-36.
679 doi:10.1016/j.foodchem.2017.09.005

- 680 Tavella, M., Peterson, G., Espeche, M., Cavallero, E., Cipolla, L., Perego, L., & Caballero, B.
681 (2000). Trans fatty acid content of a selection of foods in Argentina. *Food Chemistry*,
682 69(2), 209-213. doi:10.1016/s0308-8146(99)00257-5
- 683 USDA. (2016). *Nutrient intakes from food and beverages: mean amounts consumed per*
684 *individual, by gender and age,*
685 *What We Eat in America, NHANES 2013–2014.*
- 686 USDA. (2018). USDA Food Composition Databases. Retrieved from
687 <https://ndb.nal.usda.gov/ndb/>
- 688 USDA. (2019a). *Beef, rib, large end (ribs 6-9), separable lean and fat, trimmed to 0" fat, choice,*
689 *cooked, roasted.* Retrieved from [https://fdc.nal.usda.gov/fdc-app.html#/food-](https://fdc.nal.usda.gov/fdc-app.html#/food-details/170619/nutrients)
690 [details/170619/nutrients](https://fdc.nal.usda.gov/fdc-app.html#/food-details/170619/nutrients)
- 691 USDA. (2019b). What's the difference between hamburger and ground beef? Retrieved from
692 [https://ask.usda.gov/s/article/Whats-the-difference-between-hamburger-and-ground-](https://ask.usda.gov/s/article/Whats-the-difference-between-hamburger-and-ground-beef#:~:text=Beef%20fat%20may%20be%20added,either%20hamburger%20or%20ground%20beef.&text=If%20products%20in%20retail%20stores,%22misbranded%22%20under%20federal%20law.)
693 [beef#:~:text=Beef%20fat%20may%20be%20added,either%20hamburger%20or%20grou](https://ask.usda.gov/s/article/Whats-the-difference-between-hamburger-and-ground-beef#:~:text=Beef%20fat%20may%20be%20added,either%20hamburger%20or%20ground%20beef.&text=If%20products%20in%20retail%20stores,%22misbranded%22%20under%20federal%20law.)
694 [nd%20beef.&text=If%20products%20in%20retail%20stores,%22misbranded%22%20un](https://ask.usda.gov/s/article/Whats-the-difference-between-hamburger-and-ground-beef#:~:text=Beef%20fat%20may%20be%20added,either%20hamburger%20or%20ground%20beef.&text=If%20products%20in%20retail%20stores,%22misbranded%22%20under%20federal%20law.)
695 [der%20federal%20law.](https://ask.usda.gov/s/article/Whats-the-difference-between-hamburger-and-ground-beef#:~:text=Beef%20fat%20may%20be%20added,either%20hamburger%20or%20ground%20beef.&text=If%20products%20in%20retail%20stores,%22misbranded%22%20under%20federal%20law.)
- 696 USDA. (2020a). *Fish sandwich, fried, from fast food, with cheese.* Retrieved from
697 <https://fdc.nal.usda.gov/fdc-app.html#/food-details/1099897/nutrients>
- 698 USDA. (2020b). What We Eat in America NHANES 2017-2018. Food Patterns equivalents
699 intakes from food: mean amounts consumed per individual. Retrieved from
700 https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/about/major/nhanes/nhanes2003-2004/dr1tot_c.xpt
- 701 Wang, T. Y., Liu, M., Portincasa, P., & Wang, D. Q. H. (2013). New insights into the molecular
702 mechanism of intestinal fatty acid absorption. *European Journal of Clinical*
703 *Investigation*, 43(11), 1203-1223. doi:10.1111/eci.12161
- 704 Wood, M. E. a. K. H. a. B. H. a. G. A. J. F. a. J. D. (1996). Fatty acid content and composition of
705 english beef, lamb and pork at retail. *Meat Science*, 42(4), 443-456.
706 doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/0309-1740\(95\)00037-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0309-1740(95)00037-2)
- 707 Zinocker, M. K., & Lindseth, I. A. (2018). The Western Diet-Microbiome-Host Interaction and
708 Its Role in Metabolic Disease. *Nutrients*, 10(3). doi:10.3390/nu10030365
- 709
710