

# 1                    FooDOxS: A Database of Oxidized Sterols Content in Foods

2

3                    Ilce Gabriela Medina-Meza<sup>1,¶,\*</sup>, Yashasvi Vaidya<sup>1,¶,\$</sup>, Carlo Barnaba<sup>2,\*</sup>

4                    <sup>1</sup>*Department of Biosystems and Agricultural Engineering, Michigan State University, East*

5                    *Lansing, 48824*

6                    <sup>2</sup>*Department of Pharmaceutical Chemistry, University of Kansas, Lawrence, 66045*

7

8

9

10

11

12

13                    ¶Authors I.G.M.M. and Y.V. contribute equally to this paper.

14                    \$Current affiliation: *Department of Molecular, Cellular, and Developmental Biology, University*  
15                    *of Michigan, Ann Arbor, USA*

16

## 17                    \*Corresponding Authors

18                    Medina-Meza Ilce Gabriela, PhD.

19                    Department of Biosystems and Agricultural Engineering, Michigan State University

20                    469 Wilson Rd. | Room 302C

21                    East Lansing, MI

22                    [ilce@msu.edu](mailto:ilce@msu.edu)

23                    Phone: 517-884-1971

24                    Carlo Barnaba, Ph.D.

25                    Department of Pharmaceutical Chemistry, University of Kansas

26                    2030 Becker Dr. | Room 320D

27                    Lawrence, KS

28                    [barnaba@ku.edu](mailto:barnaba@ku.edu)

29

30

31 **ABSTRACT**

32 This research addresses the knowledge gap regarding dietary oxidized lipids (DOxS) in foods  
33 classified under the NOVA and WWEIA systems. We present the FooDOxS database, a  
34 comprehensive compilation of DOxS content in over 1,680 food items from 120 publications  
35 across 25 countries, augmented by internal lab data. Our analysis discerns DOxS exposure in  
36 diverse diets, differentiating between plant-based and animal-based sources. Notably, we  
37 evaluate the efficacy of NOVA and WWEIA classifications in capturing DOxS variations across  
38 food categories. Our findings provide insights into the strengths and limitations of these systems,  
39 enhancing their utility for assessing dietary components. This research contributes to the  
40 understanding of DOxS in food processing and suggests refinements for classification systems,  
41 holding promise for improved food safety and public health assessments.

42

43

44

45

46 **Keywords:** Dietary oxysterols; cholesterol oxidation products; phytosterol oxidation products;  
47 NOVA; WWEIA; food nutritional database

48

49

50

51

52

53

## 54 1. INTRODUCTION

55 Consumer awareness of food ingredients is a fundamental pillar in the quest for healthier eating  
56 habits and maintaining overall well-being. Consumers conceptualize ‘healthy’ foods based on  
57 food characteristics, specifically food groups, nutrients, production or processing, or lack of  
58 specific ingredients<sup>1</sup>. This awareness has the potential for individuals to make informed  
59 decisions, navigate dietary preferences, and take control of their health<sup>2,3</sup>. Nutrient databases  
60 serve as an invaluable tool in enhancing both consumer awareness and nutritional interventions.  
61 Such databases aid in dietary analysis for individuals and groups, intervention material  
62 development, and menu planning for studies<sup>4</sup>. Above all, the accuracy of food composition  
63 information within the database is paramount<sup>5</sup>. Comprehensive nutrient databases, mainly  
64 focusing on macronutrients, are relatively widespread<sup>6</sup>. However, databases for essential  
65 micronutrients, particularly those with established nutritional and biological significance, remain  
66 scarce<sup>7</sup>. In the context of food safety, public health, and regulatory oversight, establishing  
67 comprehensive food contaminant databases is of paramount importance. These databases play a  
68 pivotal role in monitoring and mitigating potential risks associated with contaminants entering  
69 the food supply chain<sup>6</sup>. For example, databases specifically addressing compounds like  
70 acrylamide have driven the development and implementation of strategies aimed at controlling  
71 its formation and reducing its presence in a variety of food products<sup>8</sup>. Our laboratory has  
72 extensively studied dietary oxysterols (DOxS), a group of molecules derived from their parent  
73 compound -cholesterol or phytosterol-, with an additional hydroxyl, ketone, or epoxy group<sup>9-11</sup>.  
74 Oxysterols can be enzymatically produced in the body by the cytochrome P450 family, serving  
75 as intermediaries and activators of cell-signaling pathways<sup>9</sup>. Alternatively, non-enzymatic  
76 production can occur due to oxidative stress<sup>9</sup>. DOxS are known to exert pro-inflammatory, pro-

77 oxidant, pro-fibrogenic, and pro-apoptotic toxic effects, leading to chronic diseases like  
78 atherosclerosis, hypertension, Huntington's disease, Parkinson's disease, multiple sclerosis,  
79 Alzheimer's disease, and some cancers, among others<sup>9,12-14</sup>. DOxS derived from phytosterols are  
80 suspected to have a similar effect due to the structural similarity of phytosterol and cholesterol<sup>15-</sup>  
81 <sup>17</sup>.

82 There is a consensus that the formation of DOxS is induced by processing, primarily due to  
83 temperature and the presence of radical species, which undeniably influence their formation  
84 kinetics<sup>10</sup>. Light exposure, radiation, excessive storage, and other agents that lower the activation  
85 energy of the reaction unintentionally contribute to DOxS generation. Consequently, the  
86 prevalence of DOxS in processed foods has become a significant concern<sup>9,18,19</sup>. The high levels  
87 of processing facilitate DOxS formation, thereby increasing consumer exposure to them. For  
88 instance, our laboratory has conducted assessments of DOxS dietary exposure in infants fed with  
89 various milk formulas, revealing that exposure levels are contingent on the extent of food  
90 processing applied to the formula. Thus, the relationship between processing and DOxS  
91 formation underscores the need for improved control measures and awareness in food production  
92 to mitigate potential health risks.

93 Little is known about the presence of dietary oxidized lipids (DOxS) in foods categorized  
94 under the NOVA food classification system, which is a widely accepted framework used for  
95 classifying foods based on the nature and extent of their processing<sup>20</sup>. This classification method,  
96 introduced in 2009 by Monteiro's group, has become a crucial tool for investigating the health  
97 impacts of food processing on various chronic diseases. While NOVA has revolutionized our  
98 perspective on food by emphasizing the level of processing involved, it has also faced critiques  
99 from various quarters, particularly in its characterization of ultra-processed foods (UPFs)<sup>21,22</sup>.

100 This research aims to address the existing gaps in knowledge by constructing FooDOxS, a  
101 comprehensive database detailing the content of dietary oxidized lipids (DOxS) in more than  
102 1,680 food items, each meticulously classified under the NOVA and WWEIA systems. Drawing  
103 on data from 120 publications across 25 countries and supplementing it with information from  
104 the lab's internal database, the resulting FooDOxS database provides a nuanced understanding of  
105 DOxS exposure in diverse diets, allowing for discernment based on food sources—whether  
106 plant-based or animal-based. This holistic approach not only contributes to our understanding of  
107 DOxS in relation to food processing but also facilitates a critical examination of NOVA's and  
108 WWEIA's effectiveness in capturing variations in DOxS content across different food categories.  
109 By shedding light on the strengths and limitations of these classification systems, the research  
110 underscores the potential for refining and optimizing them to better serve as tools for assessing  
111 dietary components and their implications for public health.

112

## 113 **2. MATERIALS AND METHODS**

### 114 **2.1 Literature Search and Data Collection**

115 DOxS data was obtained from an extensive literature search using the terms “cholesterol  
116 oxidation products”, “COPs”, “oxysterols”, “phytosterols oxidation products”, and “dietary  
117 oxysterols”. Data search and entry were conducted from 2018 to 2022, with studies performed  
118 between 1984-2022. The database also includes data from our group previously published<sup>23,24</sup>.  
119 In the FooDOxS database, we included studies that specifically analyzed **a)** foods from animal  
120 and plant sources; **b)** commercially available foods, **c)** experimentally prepared samples. We  
121 took into consideration studies published in 3 languages including English, French, and German,  
122 performed in 27 countries including Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, China, Denmark,

123 Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, India, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Mexico, Poland, South  
124 Korea, Spain, Sweden, The Netherlands, Switzerland, Taiwan, United Kingdom, and the United  
125 States. Excluded studies from this database consisted of **i)** literature reviews; **ii)** those reporting  
126 DOxS concentration per gram of cholesterol without providing the amount of cholesterol used  
127 for analysis; **iii)** papers reporting concentrations as a graph only (not quantitative amounts); **iv)**  
128 papers reporting DOxS concentrations as a range.

129 All values were converted into uniform units to facilitate comparison:  $\mu\text{g/g}$  of sample for  
130 DOxS and  $\text{mg/g}$  of sample for phytosterols. These units were the most encountered in the  
131 analyzed studies, but some studies also reported DOxS concentrations per gram of lipids or per  
132 gram of cholesterol. In this case, the reported quantity of lipids used, or the concentration of  
133 cholesterol measured, was used for calculation respectively.


## 134 **2.2 Application of NOVA Criterion**

135 The FoodDOxS database follows the NOVA classification as shown in **Figure 1**. The NOVA  
136 classification categorizes foods into four groups: 1) unprocessed or minimally processed foods,  
137 2) processed culinary ingredients, 3) processed foods, and 4) ultra-processed foods.<sup>25,26</sup>  
138 Compared to the original NOVA decision flowchart<sup>25,27</sup> our criterion **a)** highlights individual unit  
139 operations as they contribute to processing level and **b)** distinguishes between group 2 additives  
140 and industrial additives in the classification of processed vs ultra-processed foods. One of the  
141 key questions pertains to the categorization of food as 'convenience foods.' This category  
142 encompasses any food item in which, as per Scholliers, 'the degree of culinary preparation has  
143 been taken to an advanced stage, and these items are typically purchased as labor-saving  
144 alternatives to less highly processed products'<sup>28</sup>. This initial step facilitates the distinction  
145 between homemade and industrial foods.

## 146 2.3 Assignment of food categories according to What We Eat In America (WWEIA)

147 We also used The What We Eat in America (WWEIA) food categorization scheme as

148 referenced to assign a category to each food item (**Supplement 2**). This scheme is designed to be



**Figure 1. NOVA classification.** Flowchart for classifying food items according to the NOVA classification criteria.

149 applied to foods consumed in the American diet<sup>29</sup>. Since the FoodOxS database contains foods

150 from all around the world, the specific WWEIA codes did not accommodate every food item.

151 However, the main and sub-categories serve as an adequate general search criterion for the user

152 and were thus implemented. All items are categorized by source (animal- or plant-based),

153 WWEIA food group, and WWEIA main food category. WWEIA codes pertaining to sub-food  
154 categories are assigned to each item.

## 155 **2.4 Navigating the FooDOxS database.**

156 The FooDOxS database is organized as a spreadsheet in which row represents an  
157 individual food item, and column representing either a group variable or dependent variable (i.e.,  
158 DOxS specie). Specifically:

- 159 • *Column A*: a detailed description of each item including processing time and/or  
160 temperature, storage time and/or temperature, and any other relevant details reported by  
161 the original study.
- 162 • *Column B*: the NOVA classification of each food item.
- 163 • *Column C*: Serving size if reported in the original study.
- 164 • *Column D*: WWEIA food code corresponding to sub-food categories.
- 165 • *Column E*: In text-citation of references.
- 166 • *Column F*: Additional notes on the food item if present

167 From *Column G*, DOxS concentration is reported as mean and standard deviation in separate  
168 columns. Users can filter the data by a selected column to view food items assigned to a specific  
169 Food Group, Main Food Category, NOVA group, or reference. The database has been deposited  
170 in the FHEL GitHub page: <https://github.com/FHELMSU/FooDOxS>.

## 171 **2.5 Statistical analyses**

172 For comparing DOxS content across group categories, a Kruskal-Wallis ANOVA was  
173 performed, followed by a Dunn test to estimate mean rank differences, with a significance level  
174 set at  $p = 0.05$ . Statistical tests were performed in OriginPro v.2023 (OriginLab).



### 175 3. RESULTS

#### 176 3.1 The FooDOxS database. The aim of

177 this study is to establish a database of

178 DOxS contents in food items classified

179 under the NOVA food classification

180 system. These data were collected from

181 various sources, combining the results of

182 these studies into a single repository, the

183 FooDOxS database. This database contains

184 DOxS data from n = 120 studies dating

185 from 1984 to 2022. Food items were

186 categorized according to the NOVA

187 flowchart (Fig. 1), resulting in a total of

188 1,676 items. These items were distributed

189 as follows: Group 1, 31.1%; Group 2,

190 19.3%; Group 3, 15.0%; Group 4, 34.6%.

191 Seventy-three percent were of animal

192 origin, while the remaining 27% originated


193 from plants (Fig. 2A). We further classified food items using the What We Eat in America

194 classification chart (Fig. 2B)<sup>30</sup>. The main categories included protein-based foods (35.1%), fats

195 and oils (26.4%), and dairy (17.2%), reflecting the extent of DOxS research in these categories.

196 A total of 81 different compounds were reported, including parental sterols (i.e., cholesterol,  $\beta$ -

197 sitosterol, campesterol) and DOxS (Table 1). In early studies on cholesterol oxidation, it was



**Figure 2.** Insights into the FooDOxS database. (A) Percentage distribution of food items according to NOVA classification and source (animal vs plant). (B) Percentage distribution of food items according to food source.

198 often challenging to distinguish between oxysterol isomers. For example, this challenge was  
199 evident in cases such as  $7\alpha$ -OH/ $7\beta$ -OH and  $5\alpha,6\alpha$ -epoxy/ $5\beta,6\beta$ -epoxy, which were frequently  
200 reported as mixtures of isomers. To account for this discrepancy, we provided an additional entry  
201 that sums those isomers. It is worth noting that we obtained DOxS content data for various items,  
202 including 30 infant formulas and over 60 ultra-processed foods, in our laboratory, and these  
203 results were previously published<sup>23,24</sup>.


204

205 **Table 1.** List of compounds included in the FooDOxS database, including common name, abbreviations used in the database, IUPAC  
 206 systematic name and EPA CompTox ID<sup>31</sup>. N/A = CompTox entry not available.  
 207

Name	Abbreviation	ACD/IUPAC name	CompTox ID
Cholesterol	cholesterol	(3 $\beta$ )-Cholest-5-en-3-ol	DTXSID3022401
7-ketocholesterol	7-keto	(3 $\beta$ )-3-Hydroxycholest-5-en-7-one	DTXSID901033744
25-hydroxycholesterol	25-OH	(3 $\beta$ )-Cholest-5-ene-3,25-diol	DTXSID5044023
7 $\alpha$ -hydroxycholesterol	7 $\alpha$ -OH	(3 $\beta$ ,7 $\alpha$ )-Cholest-5-ene-3,7-diol	DTXSID40903965
7 $\beta$ -hydroxycholesterol	7 $\beta$ -OH	(3 $\beta$ ,7 $\beta$ )-Cholest-5-ene-3,7-diol	DTXSID60862207
5 $\alpha$ ,6 $\alpha$ -epoxycholesterol	5 $\alpha$ ,6 $\alpha$ -epoxy	(3 $\beta$ ,5 $\alpha$ ,6 $\alpha$ )-5,6-Epoxycholestan-3-ol	DTXSID80921305
5 $\beta$ ,6 $\beta$ -epoxycholesterol	5 $\beta$ ,6 $\beta$ -epoxy	(3 $\beta$ ,5 $\beta$ ,6 $\beta$ )-5,6-Epoxycholestan-3-ol	DTXSID501314152
6-ketocholestanol	6-keto	(3 $\beta$ ,5 $\alpha$ )-3-Hydroxycholestan-6-one	DTXSID10922441
20-hydroxycholesterol	20-OH	(3 $\beta$ )-Cholest-5-ene-3,20-diol	DTXSID70862096
Cholestane-3,5,6-triol	triol	(3 $\beta$ ,5 $\alpha$ ,6 $\beta$ )-Cholestane-3,5,6-triol	DTXSID70862612
4 $\beta$ -hydroxycholesterol	4 $\beta$ -OH	(3 $\beta$ ,4 $\beta$ )-Cholest-5-ene-3,4-diol	N/A
27-hydroxycholesterol	27-OH	(25R)-cholest-5-ene-3 $\beta$ ,26-diol	DTXSID40864941
22-ketocholesterol	22-keto	(3 $\beta$ )-3-Hydroxycholest-5-en-22-one	DTXSID70940904
19-hydroxycholesterol	19-OH	(3 $\beta$ )-Cholest-5-ene-3,19-diol	N/A
3 $\beta$ ,5-dihydroxy-5 $\alpha$ -cholesten-6-one	cholesten-6-one	(3 $\beta$ ,5 $\alpha$ )-3,5-Dihydroxycholestan-6-one	DTXSID80926658
4-cholesten-3-one	cholesten-3-one	Cholest-4-en-3-one	DTXSID90872379
4-cholesten-3,6-dione	cholesten-3,6-dione	Cholest-4-ene-3,6-dione	DTXSID20913305
3,5-cholestadien-7-one	cholestadien-7-one	(20R)-Cholesta-3,5-dien-7-one	DTXSID10972143
3-keto-5-cholestene	3-keto-5-cholestene	Cholest-5-en-3-one	DTXSID40208841
$\beta$ -sitosterol	$\beta$ -sitosterol	(3 $\beta$ )-Stigmast-5-en-3-ol	DTXSID5022481
Campesterol	Campesterol	(3 $\beta$ ,24R)-Ergost-5-en-3-ol	DTXSID801009891
$\Delta$ 7-avenasterol	Avenasterol	(3 $\beta$ ,5 $\alpha$ ,24Z)-Stigmasta-7,24(28)-dien-3-ol	DTXSID10177858
$\Delta$ 5-avenasterol	$\Delta$ 5-avenasterol	(24Z)-Stigmasta-5,24(28)-dien-3-ol	N/A
Brassicasterol	brassicasterol	(3 $\beta$ ,22E)-Ergosta-5,22-dien-3-ol	DTXSID80197124
Campestanol	campestanol	(3 $\beta$ ,5 $\alpha$ ,24R)-Ergostan-3-ol	DTXSID3040988
Stigmasterol	stigmasterol	(3 $\beta$ ,20R,22E,24S)-Stigmasta-5,22-dien-3-ol	DTXSID801015733
Stigmastanol	stigmastanol	(3 $\beta$ )-Stigmastan-3-ol	DTXSID8051835
Fucosterol	fucosterol	(3 $\beta$ ,20R,24E)-Stigmasta-5,24(28)-dien-3-ol	DTXSID701033229

Desmosterol	desmosterol	(3 $\beta$ )-Cholesta-5,24-dien-3-ol	DTXSID10878676
6 $\beta$ -hydroxybrassicastanol	6 $\beta$ -OH-brassicastanol	N/A	N/A
6 $\beta$ -hydroxycampesterol	6 $\beta$ -OH-campesterol	N/A	N/A
6 $\beta$ -hydroxycampestanol	6 $\beta$ -OH-campestanol	(3 $\beta$ ,5 $\alpha$ ,6 $\alpha$ ,24R)-Ergostane-3,6-diol	N/A
6 $\beta$ -hydroxysitostanol	6 $\beta$ -OH-sitostanol	5 $\alpha$ -Stigmast-3 $\beta$ ,6 $\alpha$ -diol	N/A
7 $\beta$ -hydroxycampesterol	7 $\beta$ -OH-campesterol	(3 $\beta$ ,7 $\alpha$ ,24R)-Ergost-5-ene-3,7-diol	N/A
7 $\beta$ -hydroxystigmasterol	7 $\beta$ -OH-stigmasterol	(3 $\beta$ ,7 $\alpha$ ,22E)-Stigmasta-5,22-diene-3,7-diol	N/A
7 $\beta$ -hydroxysitosterol	7 $\beta$ -OH-sitosterol	(3 $\beta$ ,7 $\alpha$ )-Stigmast-5-ene-3,7-diol	N/A
7 $\beta$ -hydroxycampesterol	7 $\beta$ -OH-campesterol	(3 $\beta$ ,7 $\beta$ ,24R)-Ergost-5-ene-3,7-diol	N/A
7 $\beta$ -hydroxystigmasterol	7 $\beta$ -OH-stigmasterol	(3 $\beta$ ,7 $\beta$ ,22E)-Stigmasta-5,22-diene-3,7-diol	N/A
7 $\beta$ -hydroxysitosterol	7 $\beta$ -OH-sitosterol	(3 $\beta$ ,7 $\beta$ )-Stigmast-5-ene-3,7-diol	N/A
24-ethylcholest-4-ene-6 $\beta$ -ol-3-one	24-ethylcholest-4-ene-6 $\beta$ -ol-3-one	6 $\beta$ -Hydroxystigmast-4-en-3-one	N/A
24-ethylcholest-4-ene-6 $\beta$ -ol-3-one	24-ethylcholest-4-ene-6 $\beta$ -ol-3-one	6 $\beta$ -Hydroxystigmast-4-en-3-one	N/A
24-hydroxystigmasterol	24-OH-stigmasterol	(3 $\beta$ ,22E)-Stigmasta-5,22-diene-3,24-diol	N/A
24-hydroxycampesterol	24-OH-campesterol	(3 $\beta$ ,22S,24R)-Ergost-5-ene-3,22-diol	N/A
24-hydroxysitosterol	24-OH-sitosterol	(3b,24R)-24-Ethylcholest-5-ene-3,24-diol	N/A
25-hydroxysitosterol	25-OH-sitosterol	(3b,24R)-24-Ethylcholest-5-ene-3,25-diol	N/A
Campesterol-5 $\beta$ ,6 $\beta$ -epoxide	campesterol-5 $\beta$ ,6 $\beta$ -epoxide	(24R)-5 $\beta$ ,6 $\beta$ -Epoxy-24-methylcholestan-3 $\beta$ -ol	N/A
Campesterol-5 $\beta$ ,6 $\beta$ -epoxide	campesterol-5 $\beta$ ,6 $\beta$ -epoxide	(24R)-5 $\alpha$ ,6 $\alpha$ -Epoxy-24-methylcholestan-3 $\beta$ -ol	N/A
Stigmasterol-5 $\beta$ ,6 $\beta$ -epoxide	stigmasterol-5 $\beta$ ,6 $\beta$ -epoxide	(24S)-5 $\alpha$ ,6 $\alpha$ -Epoxy-24-ethylcholest-22-en-3 $\beta$ -ol	N/A
Stigmasterol-5 $\beta$ ,6 $\beta$ -epoxide	stigmasterol-5 $\beta$ ,6 $\beta$ -epoxide	(24S)-5 $\beta$ ,6 $\beta$ -Epoxy-24-ethylcholest-22-en-3 $\beta$ -ol	N/A
Sitosterol-5 $\beta$ ,6 $\beta$ -epoxide	sitosterol-5 $\beta$ ,6 $\beta$ -epoxide	(24R)-5 $\alpha$ ,6 $\alpha$ -Epoxy-24-ethylcholestan-3 $\beta$ -ol	N/A
Sitosterol-5 $\beta$ ,6 $\beta$ -epoxide	sitosterol-5 $\beta$ ,6 $\beta$ -epoxide	(24R)-5 $\beta$ ,6 $\beta$ -Epoxy-24-ethylcholestan-3 $\beta$ -ol	N/A
Campestanetriol	campestanetriol	(24R)-Methylcholestan-3 $\beta$ ,5 $\alpha$ ,6 $\beta$ -triol	N/A
Stigmastetriol	stigmastetriol	(24S)-Ethylcholest-22-en-3 $\beta$ ,5 $\alpha$ ,6 $\beta$ -triol	N/A
Sitostanetriol	sitostanetriol	(24R)-Ethylcholestan-3 $\beta$ ,5 $\alpha$ ,6 $\beta$ -triol	N/A
Brassicastanetriol	brassicastanetriol	(24S)-Methylcholest-22-en-3 $\beta$ ,5 $\alpha$ ,6 $\beta$ -triol	N/A
7-ketobrassicasterol	7-ketobrassicasterol	(24S)-Methylcholest-5,22-dien-3 $\beta$ -ol-7-one	N/A
7-ketocampesterol	7-ketocampesterol	(24R)-Methylcholest-5-en-3 $\beta$ -ol-7-one	N/A
7-ketostigmasterol	7-ketostigmasterol	(24S)-Ethylcholest-5,22-dien-3 $\beta$ -ol-7-one	N/A
7-ketositosterol	7-ketositosterol	(24R)-Ethylcholest-5-en-3 $\beta$ -ol-7-one	N/A
6-ketositosterol	6-ketositosterol	(24R)-Ethylcholest-5-en-3 $\beta$ -ol-6-one	N/A

208 **3.2 DOxS content in animal and plant-based foods under NOVA classification.** The creation  
209 of an expanded food database opens avenues for a more comprehensive estimation of compound  
210 levels across various food categories. Databases become particularly compelling for molecules  
211 with recognized bioactive properties, enabling in-depth toxicological and epidemiological  
212 studies. These studies include critical aspects like dietary exposure and risk assessment. We  
213 examined DOxS concentrations in both animal-based and plant-based foods (**Fig. 3**), stratified  
214 according to the NOVA flowchart (**Fig. 3A**) Our initial analysis involved the concentration of all  
215 DOxS, achieved either by aggregating all individual oxidative derivatives reported within a food  
216 item or by utilizing the total reported DOxS, within NOVA classification. In animal-based foods  
217 (**Fig. 3B**), DOxS concentrations varied significantly, ranging from less than 1 ng/g to over 4  
218 mg/g. Surprisingly, when employing a non-parametric ANOVA to compare food categories  
219 based on NOVA classifications, group 4 (ultra-processed foods) exhibited lower DOxS amounts  
220 compared to all other groups ( $p < 0.001$ ). Next, our attention turned to the 7-OH isomers, 7-keto,  
221 and 5,6-epoxy isomers. Due to limitations in some older reports that could not distinguish  
222 between these isomers, we opted to combine them. Intriguingly, ultra-processed foods (group 4)  
223 exhibited significantly lower amounts of 7-OH and 7-keto compared to minimally processed  
224 foods (group 1) and processed culinary products (group 2) (**Fig. 3C,D**). In the case of 5,6-epoxy,  
225 the notable distinction was between groups 4 and 1, with the former being richer in these  
226 compounds ( $p < 0.05$ ) (**Fig. 3E**). We then focused on plant-based foods, constituting  
227 approximately a quarter of the total food items in the FooDOxS database (**Fig. 2A**). Our initial  
228 exploration involved mapping phytosterols' content, the parent compounds of DOxS in plants  
229 (**Fig. 3F**). Notably, both processed culinary ingredients (group 2) and ultra-processed foods  
230 (group 4) exhibited higher concentrations of phytosterols compared to minimally processed



**Figure 3. DOxS abundance in FoodDOxS database according to NOVA classification. (A)** NOVA groups. **(B)** Left: dots plot showing total DOxS content in animal-based foods according to NOVA classification. Red line represent median. Right: Kruskal-Wallis mean rank differences between groups at  $p = 0.05$  significance level. **(C)** Left: dots plot showing 7-OH isomers content in animal-based foods according to NOVA classification. Red line represent median. Right: Kruskal-Wallis mean rank differences between groups at  $p = 0.05$  significance level. **(D)** Left: dots plot showing 7-keto content in animal-based foods according to NOVA classification. Red line represent median. Right: Kruskal-Wallis mean rank differences between groups at  $p = 0.05$  significance level. **(E)** Left: dots plot showing 5,6-epoxy isomers content in animal-based foods according to NOVA classification. Red line represent median. Right: Kruskal-Wallis mean rank differences between groups at  $p = 0.05$  significance level. **(F)** Left: dots plot showing total phytosterols content in plant-based foods according to NOVA classification. Right: dots plot showing total DOxS content in plant-based foods for Groups 2 and 4 according to NOVA classification. Red line represent median.

231 foods. Unfortunately, insufficient sampling for group 3 hindered a fair statistical comparison  
 232 among the NOVA categories. Similarly, the scarcity of data in the literature regarding plant-

233 based DOxS, commonly denominated as 'phytosterols oxidation products' or 'POPs,' limits a  
234 comprehensive comparison. For the available data in groups 2 and 4, where the majority of  
235 DOxS data exist, ultra-processed foods exhibited higher DOxS content compared to processed  
236 culinary ingredients (**Fig. 3F**, right panel). This suggests that processing has a more pronounced  
237 impact on DOxS accumulation in plant-based foods than in animal-based ones. However, the  
238 lack of studies for plant-based processed foods (NOVA group 3) emphasizes the need for further  
239 research to better understand their DOxS accumulation.

240 **3.3 DOxS content in animal and plant-based foods under WWEIA classification.** This initial  
241 assessment demonstrates that, when large datasets are considered, ultra-processed foods contain  
242 a lower amount of DOxS compared to other NOVA groups. We, therefore, stratified animal-  
243 based foods according to the food source as per the WWEIA classification (**Fig. 4**). In WWEIA  
244 there are more than 160 unique categories assigned by a 4-digit number and description<sup>32</sup>. The  
245 Dietary Guidelines Advisory Committees (DGAC) has regrouped WWEIA categories in major  
246 categories according for analyses of contributions of food category intake to energy, nutrient and  
247 food group intakes<sup>33</sup> (see Appendix E-2.7 in DGAC 2015 Advisory Report) (**Fig. 4A**). The  
248 FoodDOxS database allows the stratification of DOxS data according to both grouping strategies.  
249 For this analysis, we focused on animal-based foods, since we have a higher number of reported  
250 data (**Fig. 2A**). Groups 6 (vegetables) and 3 (mixed dishes) showed the lowest amount of DOxS,  
251 compared to the high values observed for Groups 8 (condiments and dressings), Group 1 (dairy),  
252 as well as Group 7, which, for animal-based foods, consisted of protein-based nutritional  
253 beverages (category 7208 in the WWEIA classification) (**Fig. 4B**). Similar consideration can be  
254 made for 7-keto, a cholesterol derivative that has been considered a biomarker of food  
255 manufacturing, particularly thermal processes such as pasteurization and sterilization<sup>24,34</sup>. Group

256 8 (condiments and dressings) have significantly higher amount of 7-keto than Group 3 (mixed  
257 dishes) and Group 5 (snacks and sweets). It is worth noting that many ultra-processed foods fall  
258 into Groups 3 and 5 in the DGAC classification, which includes fast foods, ready-to-eat,  
259 restaurant items, and snacks. In summary, our findings suggest that, concerning DOxS  
260 accumulation, the influence of food processing appears to be less pronounced compared to the  
261 impact of food formulation. This implies that the specific composition and preparation of food  
262 play a more significant role in determining DOxS levels than the extent of processing.

263




**A**


**WWEIA Classification**

- |                                   |   |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| <b>Group 1: Dairy</b>             | <b>Group 6: Fruit (non-juice) and vegetables</b>                  |
| <b>Group 2: Protein foods</b>     | <b>Group 7: 100% fruit juice, beverages</b>                       |
| <b>Group 3: Mixed dishes</b>      | <b>Group 8: Condiments, gravies, spreads, dressings, toppings</b> |
| <b>Group 4: Grains</b>            | <b>Group 9: Baby foods (Including formula)</b>                    |
| <b>Group 5: Snacks and sweets</b> |   |

**B**



**C**



**Figure 4. DOxS abundance in FoodDOxS database according to WWEIA classification. (A)** WWEIA macro-groups as simplified by the Dietary Guidelines Advisory Committees. **(B)** Left: Box plot showing total DOxS content in animal-based foods according to WWEIA classification. Box represents 25-75 confidence interval; red line represent median. Right: Kruskal-Wallis mean rank differences between groups at  $p = 0.05$  significance level. **(C)** Left: Box plot showing 7-keto content in animal-based foods according to WWEIA classification. Box represents 25-75 confidence interval; red line represent median. Right: Kruskal-Wallis mean rank differences between groups at  $p = 0.05$  significance level.

264

265

## 266 **DISCUSSION**

267 **NOVA Classification and Criticisms.** Industrial processing plays a pivotal role in ensuring both  
268 food safety and specific food characteristics. Processed foods have been integral to the human  
269 diet since the early stages of evolution, coinciding with the discovery of cooking, an original and  
270 fundamental processing technique<sup>35</sup>. However, in recent years, there has been a perceptible shift  
271 in consumer attitudes towards processed foods, with negative perceptions gaining traction<sup>21</sup>. This  
272 shift is influenced by several factors, including inadequate scientific understanding of food  
273 manufacturing, potentially misleading advertising, and recommendations from public health  
274 officials<sup>21,36</sup>. A defining moment in reshaping consumer awareness of food processing occurred  
275 in 2009 when Monteiro's group in Brazil introduced the NOVA classification method<sup>25</sup>. This  
276 method, grounded in the degree of food processing, led to the identification of 'ultra-processed  
277 foods', commonly abbreviated as UPFs. Over the years, various definitions for UPFs have  
278 emerged, with one of the latest emphasizing that these are formulations primarily composed of  
279 substances derived from foods and additives, with little to no intact Group 1 foods<sup>26,37</sup>.  
280 Monteiro's group subsequently advocated for the adoption of NOVA by the UN Sustainable  
281 Development and its Decade of Nutrition initiative, using it as a guide for their food and health  
282 initiatives<sup>20</sup>.

283 The NOVA classification, particularly its characterization of UPFs, has faced criticism  
284 within the field of food science by prominent scientists<sup>21,22,36,38</sup>. Numerous critiques have been  
285 put forth regarding the classification criteria. Notably, products such as pasteurized milk, ultra-  
286 high temperature milk (UHT), and pasteurized juices are categorized as unprocessed or  
287 minimally processed (Group 1) foods according to NOVA. However, these items undergo high-  
288 energy-demanding processing conditions, including pasteurization and homogenization,

289 challenging the notion of being unprocessed or minimally processed<sup>36</sup>. Regarding the definition  
290 of UPFs, one of the prominent criticisms lies in the association made by NOVA's proponents  
291 between UPFs and low nutritional quality, leading to explicit recommendations to avoid their  
292 consumption<sup>21</sup>. This critique gains complexity when considering that UPFs encompass  
293 traditional foods like cheese and infant formulas, which are indispensable for infants not  
294 breastfed<sup>36</sup>.

295 **The FoodOxS database demystifies NOVA's claims.** The data presented in this paper  
296 challenges the prevailing notion that food processing, particularly within the framework of 'ultra-  
297 processing' as defined by NOVA, has universally negative effects on food components. To  
298 scrutinize this hypothesis, we introduced FoodOxS, an extensive database encompassing  
299 oxidized sterols (DOxS) data for both animal- and plant-based foods. This is the largest database  
300 for DOxS in food products to date. The pivotal characteristic of DOxS lies in their predominantly  
301 processing-induced accumulation<sup>9,23,24,34,39</sup>. Various factors such as heat treatment, light  
302 exposure, and exposure to radical species derived from non-thermal processes, including light  
303 and non-thermal technologies, have the capacity to trigger the formation of DOxS<sup>9,10,39</sup>.  
304 Therefore, the accumulation of DOxS in foods serves as a distinctive signature of food  
305 processing, as extensively demonstrated by our group over the last decade. For instance, this is  
306 notably observed in infant formulations, where the spray-drying process to obtain powder  
307 formulas significantly enhances the occurrence of 7-ketocholesterol compared to liquid  
308 formulations<sup>15,24</sup>. Our database strongly demonstrates that, according to NOVA classification,  
309 animal-based ultra-processed foods contain less amounts of DOxS compared to all the other  
310 categories (**Fig. 3**). Particularly, UPFs contain less amounts of 7-ketocholesterol than  
311 unprocessed or minimally processed foods (**Fig. 3C**): this result is particularly interesting

312 considering that 7-ketocholesterol is one of the most studied cholesterol-derived DOxS, with  
313 well-established bioactivity in humans<sup>12,14,40</sup>.

314 These findings prompt the question of whether the lower content of DOxS found in UPFs  
315 is a result of misattributed food items due to the superficial criteria of NOVA, as previously  
316 suggested<sup>21,22</sup>. To discern if DOxS content depends on the food source rather than processing, we  
317 stratified food items according to the WWEIA classification criteria, as simplified by the Dietary  
318 Guidelines Advisory Committees (DGAC) (**Fig. 4**). In WWEIA, processed foods are now  
319 distributed across several categories, with Group 3 (mixed dishes), Group 5 (sweets and snacks),  
320 and Group 8 (condiments and dressings) being the more representative. When grouped according  
321 to WWEIA, DOxS were more abundant in Group 2 (meat and seafood), Group 8 (condiments  
322 and dressings), and Group 1 (dairy), consistent with several reports obtained over several  
323 decades of DOxS research<sup>9</sup>. These results strongly suggest that the accumulation of sterols  
324 oxidative species is not strictly dependent on processing but rather on the formulation of the final  
325 food product.

326 **The FoodDOxS database unveils gaps in DOxS data for specific food categories.** We  
327 presented an extensive DOxS database featuring over 1,600 food items spanning various  
328 categories (**Fig. 2**). However, a notable discrepancy exists, with animal-based foods dominating,  
329 constituting over 75% of the total itemized foods (**Fig. 2A**). In contrast, plant-based food data are  
330 limited, primarily focusing on parental sterols, particularly phytosterols, with scant information  
331 on phytosterols-derived DOxS. This data gap is surprising given the ubiquity of vegetable oils  
332 rich in phytosterols in various foods, including infant formulas<sup>15</sup>. Multiple factors contribute to  
333 this data deficiency. Traditionally, cholesterol oxidation products have garnered more attention  
334 due to the prevalent belief in their significant role in human health and potential links to chronic

335 diseases<sup>9,39</sup>. Additionally, the vast number of phytosterols, potentially yielding hundreds of  
336 oxidation products, poses challenges in their identification through analytical and spectroscopic  
337 methods<sup>41</sup>. Despite these challenges, the authors emphasize the urgency to address this data gap,  
338 especially considering the growing evidence of potential health effects associated with plant  
339 based DOxS, even at low concentrations<sup>15–17,42</sup>. The authors anticipate that the availability of  
340 pure standards for some of these oxidation derivatives will spur new data generation, leading to a  
341 more comprehensive understanding of their presence in foods.

342

## 343 **CONCLUSION**

344 FooDOxS is an extensive dataset on oxidized sterols (DOxS) in both animal- and plant-based  
345 foods, compiled from literature and our laboratory. Using FooDOxS, we critically examine the  
346 NOVA classification, challenging the widely accepted notion that all processed foods,  
347 particularly ultra-processed foods (UPFs), universally have negative effects on food components.  
348 FooDOxS demonstrates that DOxS accumulation is more dependent on food formulation than  
349 the degree of processing, challenging NOVA's claims, especially in its characterization of UPFs.  
350 Additionally, FooDOxS highlights a significant data gap in plant-based foods, with the majority  
351 of the over 1,600 presented food items being animal-based. This underscores the urgency for  
352 more comprehensive data on plant-based DOxS, especially considering the potential health  
353 effects associated with these compounds. In conclusion, FooDOxS serves as an open-access  
354 resource, offering valuable insights into the effects of food processing on DOxS content. Its  
355 implications extend to guiding food industry practices, informing policymakers, and aiding  
356 researchers in further understanding the exposure to DOxS in our diets.

357

358 **Acknowledgements:** The author would like to thank Lisa Zou, Ashley Xu, Lisaura Maldonado-  
359 Pereira, and Grant Gmitter for their valuable input. This study was partially funded by the Center  
360 for Research Ingredients Safety (CRIS) of Michigan State University with the GR100229 grant,  
361 and the USDA National Institute of Food and Agriculture, Hatch project MICL02526 to  
362 I.G.M.M.

363 Y.V. was partially funded by the EnSURE program (2022 and 2023) from Michigan State  
364 University.

365 **Authors contribution:** Y.V., Data curation, Visualization, Writing – Original Draft; C.B.,  
366 Formal Analysis, Visualization, Writing – Original Draft, Writing – Review and Editing;  
367 I.G.M.M., Conceptualization, Project Administration, Resources, Supervision, Funding  
368 Acquisition, Writing – Review and Editing.

369

## 370 REFERENCES

- 371 1 Machín L, Antúnez L, Curutchet MR, Ares G. The heuristics that guide healthiness perception  
372 of ultra-processed foods: a qualitative exploration. *Public Health Nutrition* 2020;**23**:2932–40.
- 373 2 Brown KA, Timotijevic L, Barnett J, Shepherd R, Lähteenmäki L, Raats MM. A review of  
374 consumer awareness, understanding and use of food-based dietary guidelines. *British Journal*  
375 *of Nutrition* 2011;**106**:15–26.
- 376 3 Bolhuis D, Mosca AC, Pellegrini N. Consumer Awareness of the Degree of Industrial Food  
377 Processing and the Association with Healthiness—A Pilot Study. *Nutrients* 2022;**14**:4438.
- 378 4 Møller A, Unwin ID, Becker W, Ireland J. EuroFIR’s food databank systems for nutrients and  
379 bioactives. *Trends in Food Science & Technology* 2007;**18**:428–33.
- 380 5 McCullough ML, Karanja NM, Lin P-H, Obarzanek EVA, Phillips KM, Laws RL, *et al.*  
381 Comparison of 4 nutrient databases with chemical composition data from the dietary  
382 approaches to stop hypertension trial. *Journal of the American Dietetic Association*  
383 1999;**99**:S45–53.
- 384 6 Delgado A, Issaoui M, Vieira MC, Saraiva de Carvalho I, Fardet A. Food composition  
385 databases: Does it matter to human health? *Nutrients* 2021;**13**:2816.
- 386 7 Marconi S, Durazzo A, Camilli E, Lisciani S, Gabrielli P, Aguzzi A, *et al.* Food composition  
387 databases: Considerations about complex food matrices. *Foods* 2018;**7**:2.
- 388 8 Mousavi Khaneghah A, Fakhri Y, Nematollahi A, Seilani F, Vasseghian Y. The  
389 Concentration of Acrylamide in Different Food Products: A Global Systematic Review, Meta-  
390 Analysis, and Meta-Regression. *Food Reviews International* 2022;**38**:1286–304.  
391 <https://doi.org/10.1080/87559129.2020.1791175>.
- 392 9 Maldonado-Pereira L, Schweiss M, Barnaba C, Medina-Meza IG. The role of cholesterol  
393 oxidation products in food toxicity. *Food and Chemical Toxicology* 2018;**118**:908–39.
- 394 10 Medina-Meza IG, Barnaba C. Kinetics of cholesterol oxidation in model systems and foods:  
395 Current status. *Food Engineering Reviews* 2013;**5**:171–84.
- 396 11 Kilvington A, Barnaba C, Rajasekaran S, Leimanis ML, Medina-Meza IG. Lipidomics and  
397 Dietary Assessment of Infant Formulas Reveal High Intakes of Major Cholesterol Oxidative  
398 Product (7-ketocholesterol). *medRxiv* 2020:2020–11.
- 399 12 Wang M, Long W, Li D, Wang D, Zhong Y, Mu D, *et al.* Plasma 7-ketocholesterol levels and  
400 the risk of incident cardiovascular events. *Heart* 2017;**103**:1788–94.
- 401 13 Liu Y, Yang X, Xiao F, Jie F, Zhang Q, Liu Y, *et al.* Dietary cholesterol oxidation products:  
402 Perspectives linking food processing and storage with health implications. *Comp Rev Food*  
403 *Sci Food Safe* 2022;**21**:738–79. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1541-4337.12880>.
- 404 14 Anderson A, Campo A, Fulton E, Corwin A, Jerome III WG, O’Connor MS. 7-  
405 Ketocholesterol in disease and aging. *Redox Biology* 2020;**29**:101380.
- 406 15 Kilvington A, Maldonado-Pereira L, Torres-Palacios C, Medina-Meza I. Phytosterols and  
407 their oxidative products in infant formula. *J Food Process Engineering* 2020;**43**:e13151.  
408 <https://doi.org/10.1111/jfpe.13151>.
- 409 16 Hovenkamp E, Demonty I, Plat J, Lütjohann D, Mensink RP, Trautwein EA. Biological  
410 effects of oxidized phytosterols: a review of the current knowledge. *Progress in Lipid*  
411 *Research* 2008;**47**:37–49.
- 412 17 Scholz B, Guth S, Engel K, Steinberg P. Phytosterol oxidation products in enriched foods:  
413 Occurrence, exposure, and biological effects. *Molecular Nutrition Food Res* 2015;**59**:1339–  
414 52. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mnfr.201400922>.

- 415 18Canzoneri F, Leoni V, Rosso G, Risso D, Menta R, Poli G. Oxysterols as reliable markers of  
416 quality and safety in cholesterol containing food ingredients and products. *Frontiers in*  
417 *Nutrition* 2022;**9**:853460.
- 418 19Sottero B, Leonarduzzi G, Testa G, Gargiulo S, Poli G, Biasi F. Lipid Oxidation Derived  
419 Aldehydes and Oxysterols Between Health and Disease. *Euro J Lipid Sci & Tech*  
420 2019;**121**:1700047. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejlt.201700047>.
- 421 20Monteiro CA, Cannon G, Moubarac J-C, Levy RB, Louzada MLC, Jaime PC. The UN  
422 Decade of Nutrition, the NOVA food classification and the trouble with ultra-processing.  
423 *Public Health Nutrition* 2018;**21**:5–17.
- 424 21Knorr D, Watzke H. Food processing at a crossroad. *Frontiers in Nutrition* 2019;**6**:85.
- 425 22Gibney MJ, Forde CG, Mullally D, Gibney ER. Ultra-processed foods in human health: a  
426 critical appraisal. *The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition* 2017;**106**:717–24.
- 427 23Maldonado-Pereira L, Barnaba C, Medina-Meza IG. Oxidative Status of Ultra-Processed  
428 Foods in the Western Diet. *medRxiv* 2023:2023–07.
- 429 24Kilvington A, Barnaba C, Rajasekaran S, Leimanis MLL, Medina-Meza IG. Lipid profiling  
430 and dietary assessment of infant formulas reveal high intakes of major cholesterol oxidative  
431 product (7-ketocholesterol). *Food Chemistry* 2021;**354**:129529.
- 432 25Monteiro CA, Levy RB, Claro RM, Castro IRR de, Cannon G. A new classification of foods  
433 based on the extent and purpose of their processing. *Cadernos de Saude Publica*  
434 2010;**26**:2039–49.
- 435 26Monteiro CA, Cannon G, Levy RB, Moubarac J-C, Louzada ML, Rauber F, *et al.* Ultra-  
436 processed foods: what they are and how to identify them. *Public Health Nutrition*  
437 2019;**22**:936–41.
- 438 27Botelho AM, Camargo AM de, Mazzone AC, Fiates GMR. Decision flowchart for food  
439 classification by the extension and purpose of industrial processing: update and practical  
440 application. *Revista de Nutrição* 2022;**35**:
- 441 28Scholliers P. Convenience foods. What, why, and when. *Appetite* 2015;**94**:2–6.  
442 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2015.02.017>.
- 443 29Steinfeldt LC, Martin CL, Clemens JC, Moshfegh AJ. Comparing two days of dietary intake  
444 in what we eat in America (WWEIA), NHANES, 2013–2016. *Nutrients* 2021;**13**:2621.
- 445 30Parker E, Goldman J, Moshfegh A. America’s nutrition report card: comparing WWEIA,  
446 NHANES 2007–2010 usual nutrient intakes to dietary reference intakes (384.2). *FASEB j*  
447 2014;**28**:. [https://doi.org/10.1096/fasebj.28.1\\_supplement.384.2](https://doi.org/10.1096/fasebj.28.1_supplement.384.2).
- 448 31Williams AJ, Lambert JC, Thayer K, Dorne J-LC. Sourcing data on chemical properties and  
449 hazard data from the US-EPA CompTox Chemicals Dashboard: A practical guide for human  
450 risk assessment. *Environment International* 2021;**154**:106566.
- 451 32Rhodes DG, Adler ME, Clemens JC, Moshfegh AJ. What we eat in America food categories  
452 and changes between survey cycles. *Journal of Food Composition and Analysis* 2017;**64**:107–  
453 11.
- 454 33McGuire S. Scientific report of the 2015 dietary guidelines advisory committee. Washington,  
455 DC: US Departments of Agriculture and Health and Human Services, 2015. *Advances in*  
456 *Nutrition* 2016;**7**:202–4.
- 457 34Rodriguez-Estrada MT, Garcia-Llatas G, Lagarda MJ. 7-Ketocholesterol as marker of  
458 cholesterol oxidation in model and food systems: When and how. *Biochemical and*  
459 *Biophysical Research Communications* 2014;**446**:792–7.



- 460 35 Wollstonecroft MM. Investigating the role of food processing in human evolution: a niche  
461 construction approach. *Archaeol Anthropol Sci* 2011;**3**:141–50.  
462 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12520-011-0062-3>.
- 463 36 Petrus RR, do Amaral Sobral PJ, Tadini CC, Gonçalves CB. The NOVA classification  
464 system: a critical perspective in food science. *Trends in Food Science & Technology*  
465 2021;**116**:603–8.
- 466 37 Cotter T, Kotov A, Wang S, Murukutla N. ‘Warning: ultra-processed’—A call for warnings  
467 on foods that aren’t really foods. *BMJ Global Health* 2021;**6**:e007240.
- 468 38 Jones JM. Food processing: criteria for dietary guidance and public health? *Proceedings of the*  
469 *Nutrition Society* 2019;**78**:4–18.
- 470 39 Liu Y, Yang X, Xiao F, Jie F, Zhang Q, Liu Y, *et al.* Dietary cholesterol oxidation products:  
471 Perspectives linking food processing and storage with health implications. *Comp Rev Food*  
472 *Sci Food Safe* 2022;**21**:738–79. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1541-4337.12880>.
- 473 40 Ghzaïel I, Sassi K, Zarrouk A, Ghosh S, Dias IH, Nury T, *et al.* Sources of 7-ketocholesterol,  
474 metabolism and inactivation strategies: Food and biomedical applications. *Redox*  
475 *Experimental Medicine* 2022;**2022**:R40–56.
- 476 41 Dutta PC. Chemistry, analysis, and occurrence of phytosterol oxidation products in foods.  
477 *Phytosterols as Functional Food Components and Nutraceuticals* 2004:397–418.
- 478 42 O’Callaghan Y, McCarthy FO, O’Brien NM. Recent advances in phytosterol oxidation  
479 products. *Biochemical and Biophysical Research Communications* 2014;**446**:786–91.  
480