An evidence-based definition of nutrition security: disparities in sociodemographic characteristics, dietary intake and cardiometabolic risk using the US Healthy Eating Index

Elise Sheinberg, MPH, RDN[1]; Laura A. Schmidt, PhD, MSW, MPH[2]; Jerold R. Mande, MPH[1, 3,4]; Euridice Martinez-Steele, PhD[5, 6]; Deirdre K. Tobias, ScD[1, 7]; Cindy W. Leung; ScD, MPH[1]

[1] Department of Nutrition, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, Boston, MA
[2] Philip R. Lee Institute for Health Policy Studies, School of Medicine, University of California, San Francisco, San Francisco, CA
[3] Nourish Science, Bethesda, MA
[4] Tisch College of Civic Life, Tufts University, Medford, MA
[5] Department of Nutrition, School of Public Health, University of Såo Paulo, Såo Paulo, Brazil
[6] Center for Epidemiological Studies in Health and Nutrition, University of Såo Paulo, Såo Paulo, Brazil
[7] Division of Preventive Medicine, Department of Medicine, Brigham and Women's Hospital and Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA

Corresponding Author:
Cindy Leung
Department of Nutrition
Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health
665 Huntington Avenue
Building 2, Room 321
Boston, MA 02115
Phone: 617-432-0166
E-mail: cindyleung@post.harvard.edu

Word count: 2963
Conflicts of interest: None
Financial disclosures: None

KEY POINTS

Question: Can the Healthy Eating Index (HEI)-2020 be used as an evidence-based measure of nutrition security?

Findings: Using nationally representative data, we created four categories of nutrition security using HEI-2020 scores: high (≥70), marginal (>60-70, low (>50-60), and very low (≤50). Less than 1 in 6 US adults had high nutrition security. High nutrition security was less prevalent among adults with greater socioeconomic disadvantage. High nutrition security was also associated with more favorable cardiometabolic risk profiles.

Meaning: The HEI can be directly linked to categories of nutrition security and used for national program and policy setting.

ABSTRACT

Importance: Establishing a universal metric for nutrition security, defined as, "consistent and equitable access to healthy, safe, affordable foods essential to optimal health and well-being," is a national priority. Understanding how the Healthy Eating Index-2020 (HEI-2020) could be used to measure and monitor nutrition security in the population can assist in surveillance and improve the design of nutrition programs and policies.

Objective: To examine the utility of the HEI-2020 as an evidence-based measure of nutrition security.

Design: This serial cross-sectional study used data from the 2009-2018 National Health and Nutrition Examination Surveys (NHANES).

Setting: Nationally representative, population-based survey

Participants: Data for N=22,168 US adults (≥20 years) were analyzed.

Main outcome: We derived HEI-2020 scores (0-100), commonly used to capture overall diet quality, from participants' two 24-hour dietary recalls. Nutrition security categories were established: high nutrition security (>70-100), marginal (>60-70), low (>50-60), and very low (0-50).

Results: Only 13% of US adults had high nutrition security while nearly two-thirds had low or very low nutrition security**.** Nutrition security was higher for adults who were older, female, "Other" race or ethnicity, born outside of the US, have higher education attainment, higher income, and food security. Compared to adults with high nutrition security, adults with very low nutrition security had the lowest intakes of unprocessed or minimally processed foods, fruits, vegetables, whole grains, and seafood and the highest intakes of ultra-processed foods, refined

grains, and red and processed meats (all *P-trends <0.01*). Similarly, adults with very low nutrition security were more likely to have elevated adiposity, lower HDL cholesterol, higher triglycerides, higher fasting glucose, and higher hemoglobin A1c (all *P-trends ≤0.01*).

Conclusions: The HEI is a robust measure of nutrition security that can be directly linked to the construct of nutrition security. Using evidence-based HEI cut-points as nutrition security categories would allow policy makers, public health practitioners and nutrition professionals to set benchmarks and nationwide targets for achieving nutrition security.

INTRODUCTION

Poor diet quality is a risk factor for chronic diseases including obesity, diabetes, cardiovascular disease, stroke, and some cancers.[1–3] Sociodemographic factors, including lower educational attainment, lower household income, minority racial and ethnic identity, and experiencing food insecurity, have been associated with poor diet quality and higher chronic disease prevalence.[4–12] Disparities due to these risk factors play a role in the inequitable burden of diet-related chronic diseases.

There is growing interest in the construct of nutrition security, defined by the US Department of Agriculture (USDA) as "consistent and equitable access to healthy, safe, affordable foods essential to optimal health and well-being." Nutrition security was a core focus of the 2022 White House Conference on Hunger, Nutrition, and Health and is a current priority for programs administered by the USDA.[13] However, there remains an ongoing debate on how nutrition security aligns with its complementary construct, food insecurity, an established risk factor for diet-related chronic diseases.[14,15] While new questionnaires are being developed and validated to assess nutrition security in the US population, [16,17] it is unclear how these measures of nutrition security relate to food insecurity or overall diet quality.[18,19]

An alternative approach to measuring nutrition security is leveraging an established diet quality index for population-level surveillance. The US Healthy Eating Index (HEI) is informed by the US Dietary Guidelines for Americans (DGA) and is used to gauge how closely Americans' diet aligns with its recommendations.[20] However, population based analyses of HEI have typically presented score means, and evidence to support the utility of specific thresholds (e.g. high vs. low quality) of risk for nutrition-related disease and mortality is warranted.[21–23]

Using nationally representative data, we created four nutrition security categories of HEI-2020 scores: high (≥70), marginal (>60-70, low (>50-60), and very low (≤50) that were predictive of sociodemographic disadvantage and cardiometabolic disease risk. Establishing an objective, evidence-based definition of nutrition security using the HEI can generate timely and critical data for policymakers, public health practitioners, and nutrition professionals to tackle the systemic drivers of poor diet quality and can promote nutrition security and long-term health for all Americans.

METHODS

Study Design and Population

We conducted our analyses using data from the 2009-2018 National Health and Nutrition Examination Surveys (NHANES). NHANES is an ongoing multistage, nationally representative survey conducted by the National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS). In this study, the analytic sample included 22,168 adults ≥20 years with two valid 24-hour recalls.

Dietary Assessment and the HEI-2020 scoring

Dietary intake was assessed via two 24-hour dietary recalls administered by trained interviewers using the USDA Automated Multi-Pass Method. One 24-hour recall is collected in-person, and a second recall is completed by telephone 3-10 days later. Methods and validation studies for conducting 24-hour recalls have been previously published.[24] Data from the two 24-hour recalls were converted into standard food groups and food pattern components using the Food Patterns Equivalents Database (FPED) to calculate individual HEI-2020 scores. Participants'

HEI-2020 scores were first calculated using the simple HEI scoring algorithm method and averaged across the two days of intake (i.e., observed HEI). We also used the National Cancer Institute (NCI) SAS Macros (version 2.1) in order to account for the within-person variability of dietary intake and to estimate predicted HEI scores (i.e., usual HEI).[26]

HEI cutpoints

The determination of the cut-points used to define categories of increasing nutrition security was informed on multiple criteria. First, we comprehensively reviewed prior findings from prospective observational studies that examined HEI scores in relation to major chronic disease outcomes (**Supplemental Table 1**).[2] Most studies derived population-specific quintiles of HEI scores as the exposure, [27] and individuals in the highest HEI quintile consistently had lower risks of cardiovascular disease, cancer, type 2 diabetes, and all-cause mortality compared to individuals in the lowest quintile.[2,28] Second, we examined the distributions of observed and usual HEI scores in NHANES to understand the extent to which US adults aligned with the cut points in the studies above (**Supplemental Figure 1**). Finally, we considered NCI's suggested HEI cut-points and corresponding grade.[29] Collectively, these evidence informed the following category definitions: high nutrition security (>70-100), marginal nutrition security (>60-70), low nutrition security (>50-60), and very low nutrition security (0-50). High nutrition security indicates a favorable adherence to the DGA and where the greatest risk reduction of morbidity and mortality from diet-related chronic diseases has been observed.[2,30–32]. In contrast, very low nutrition security indicates poor adherence to the DGA and is associated with the highest risks

of morbidity and mortality from diet-related chronic diseases. Marginal and low nutrition security are intermediate risk levels.

Other Dietary Components

All dietary variables were derived from the average of two days of dietary recalls and standardized to 1,000 kcal. Other dietary factors in the current analysis included total energy intake (kcal/day). whole fruits (cup equivalents/day), vegetables excluding white potatoes (cup equivalents), refined grains (ounce equivalents/day), whole grains (ounce equivalents/day), red and processed meats (ounce equivalents/day), and seafood (ounce equivalents/day). Nutrients of interest included saturated fat (g/day), dietary fiber (g/day), sodium (mg/day), potassium (mg/day), calcium (mg/day), and added sugar (tsp equivalents/day). We also applied the Nova Classification to derive intakes of unprocessed and minimally processed foods and ultra-processed foods (% energy/day).[33,34]

Adiposity and cardiometabolic markers

Height, weight, and waist circumference (WC) were measured by trained personnel in the Mobile Examination Center.[35] Body mass index was calculated as weight (kg) over height squared (m^2). Obesity was defined as a BMI ≥30 kg/m^2.[36] High waist circumference was defined as >88 centimeters for women and >102 centimeters for men.[37]

Cardiometabolic biomarkers in this analysis include blood levels of high-density lipoprotein cholesterol (HDL-c; mg/dL), low-density lipoprotein cholesterol (LDL-c; mg/dL), triglycerides (mg/dL), and glucose (mg/dL). Low HDL cholesterol was defined as <40 mg/dL and

elevated LDL cholesterol was defined as ≥100 mg/dL.[38] Elevated triglycerides were defined as ≥150 mg/dL.[39] Elevated fasting glucose was defined as >100 mg/dL.[40]

Sociodemographic Characteristics

Self-reported sociodemographic variables were ascertained at patient visits, including age, gender, race and ethnicity, place of birth, educational attainment, employment status, marital status, family income to poverty ratio. Household food security status was derived using the 18-item U.S. Food Security Survey Module.[41]

Statistical Analysis

Complex two-day dietary sampling weights were recalculated to reflect the 10-year analytic period and applied to all analyses to make nationally representative inferences. We first calculated the proportions US adults for each of our new HEI-based nutrition security categories cumulatively and separately for each NHANES 2-year cycle. We evaluated whether nutrition security categories differed over time and by sociodemographic characteristics using the Rao-Scott Chi-Square test. We generated radar plots to visualize the contribution of HEI-components across nutrition security categories, as a percentage of the maximum possible score for that component. For other individual dietary factors and cardiometabolic biomarkers, we estimated their least squared means across nutrition security categories using multivariable linear regression models adjusted for all sociodemographic characteristics. We estimate the predicted probabilities of the clinically significant cardiometabolic biomarkers in each nutrition security category with logistic regression models, adjusting for all sociodemographic characteristics. In

sensitivity analyses, statistical tests were repeated using nutrition security categories derived from usual HEI scores. Statistical analyses were performed with SAS 9.4 (SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC).

RESULTS

Between 2009 and 2018, 12.7% of US adults had high nutrition security (HEI ≥70), 19.9% had marginal nutrition security (HEI 60-<70), 26.9% had low nutrition security (HEI 50-<60), and 40.5% had very low nutrition security (HEI ≤50) (**Figure 1**). When usual dietary intakes were used, only 0.8% of US adults had high nutrition security, 12.9% had marginal nutrition security, 41.3% had low nutrition security, and 45.0% of adults had very low nutrition security. There were no significant differences over the 10-year NHANES cycles in the study period *(***Supplemental Figure 2**, *P>0.05)*

There were statistically significant differences in nutrition security categories by all sociodemographic characteristics except employment status (**Table 1**, *P-linear trend <0.01*). Adults ≥51 years were more likely to have high nutrition security (16.1%) than adults ≤30 years (8.0%). Females were more likely to have high nutrition security than males (14.9% vs. 10.4%, respectively). By race and ethnicity, 8.0% of non-Hispanic Black adults had high nutrition security compared to 11.0% of Hispanic adults, 13.1% of non-Hispanic white adults, and 19.4% of adults in another racial or ethnic group (i.e., “Other”). Adults born outside of the US were more likely to have high nutrition security (19.2%) than adults born in the US (11.5%). Adults with some college education or more were more likely to have high nutrition security (15.5%) than those with a high school education or less (8.0%). Married or partnered adults (13.7%)

were more likely to have high nutrition security than single adults (11.1%). Adults with household incomes >200% FPL were more likely to have high nutrition security (14.6%) than adults with household incomes ≤200% FPL (9.0%). Adults with high or marginal food security were more likely to have high nutrition security (13.9%) than adults with low or very low food security (6.3%).

A radar plot showing the proportion of the possible points for each HEI component for each nutrition security category is shown in **Figure 2**. Adults with high nutrition security scored at least half of possible points for all HEI components. Adults with very low nutrition security scored less than half of possible points for nine components. The greatest differences in HEI-2020 component scores between adults with high versus very low nutrition security were for whole grains (78.4%), whole fruit (72.5%), total fruit (70.9%), greens and beans (69.1%), seafood and plant protein (58.9%) and fatty acids (55.4%).

Multivariate-adjusted mean intakes of foods and nutrients of interest across nutrition security categories are shown in **Table 2**. Mean total energy intake was lowest among adults with high nutrition security (1976 kcal/day) and increased across nutrition security categories (marginal: 2031 kcal/day, low: 2102 kcal/day; and very low: 2106 kcal/day) (*P-linear trend<0.01*). Adults with high nutrition security had the highest intakes of unprocessed or minimally processed foods (41.4% energy) and adults with very low nutrition security had the lowest intakes (25.8% energy) – a difference of +15.6% (*P-linear trend<0.01*). Similarly, adults with high nutrition security had the lowest intakes of ultra-processed foods (42.5% energy) while adults with very low nutrition security had the highest intakes (61.7% energy)- a difference of -19.2% (*P-linear trend<0.01*).

Adults with high nutrition security consumed significantly more fruits, vegetables, whole grains, and seafood, and less refined grains and red and processed meats when compared to adults with marginal, low, and very low nutrition security (all *P-linear trends<0.01)* (**Table 2**). Adults with high nutrition security also consumed lower amounts of saturated fat, sodium, and added sugars and higher amounts of dietary fiber, potassium, and calcium than adults with marginal, low, and very low nutrition security (all *P-linear trends<0.01*). Nearly all comparisons between the high nutrition security group with marginal, low, and very low nutrition security were statistically significant, except for seafood consumption between high and marginal nutrition security groups. Sensitivity analyses examining multivariate-adjusted means of usual intakes relative to usual HEI categories showed identical patterns (**Supplemental Table 2**).

There were differences in BMI and obesity prevalence across nutrition security categories (**Table 3)**. After adjusting for sociodemographic factors, the mean BMI for adults with high nutrition security was lower (27.4 kg/m^2) compared to adults with marginal (28.2 kg/m^2), low (29.2 kg/m^2), and very low nutrition security (29.8 kg/m^2) (*P-linear trend<0.01*). Relatedly, 27.3% of adults with high nutrition security had obesity compared to 45.7% of adults with very low nutrition security – a difference of -18.4% (*P-trend<0.01*). Adults with high nutrition security had a mean waist circumference of 94.0 cm (49.3% with elevated waist circumference), compared to a mean waist circumference of 100.4 cm for adults with very low nutrition security (61.5% elevated waist circumference) (*P-linear trends<0.01*).

Cardiometabolic biomarkers predictive of diet-related disease also differed across nutrition security categories (**Table 3**). Mean HDL cholesterol was higher among adults with high nutrition security (56.6 mg/dL) and decreased across nutrition security categories (marginal:

54.1 mg/dL; low: 52.9 mg/dL; very low: 50.7 mg/dL) (*P-trend<0.01*). Clinically low HDL cholesterol was observed in 13.5% of adults with high nutrition security compared to 24.1% of adults with very low nutrition security – a difference of 10.6% (*P-linear trend<0.01*). Similarly, adults with high nutrition security had lower mean LDL cholesterol levels (107.8 mg/dL) compared to adults with marginal (111.9 mg/dL), low (111.6 mg/dL), and very low nutrition security (112.6 mg/dL) (*P-linear trend=0.01*). There was no difference in the proportion of adults with elevated LDL cholesterol by nutrition security category (*P-linear trend=0.14*). Adults with high nutrition security had a mean triglyceride level of 103.6 mg/dL and 18.6% had clinically elevated triglycerides; adults with very low nutrition security had a mean triglyceride level of 123.7 mg/dL and 25.7% had clinically elevated triglycerides (*P-linear trends<0.01*). Adults with high nutrition security had lower fasting glucose (101.7 mg/dL) compared to adults with very low nutrition security (mean fasting glucose 107.1 mg/dL) (*P-linear trends<0.01*). Approximately 43% of adults with high nutrition security had clinically elevated fasting glucose compared to 44.6% of adults with marginal, 48.6% with low, and 47.7% with very low nutrition security (*P-linear trend=<0.01*). In sensitivity analyses, multivariate-adjusted differences in adiposity and cardiometabolic biomarkers by usual HEI categories revealed consistent patterns (**Supplemental Table 3**)

DISCUSSION

In this nationally representative ten-year study, only 13% of adults had high nutrition security, and most (67%) had low or very low nutrition security. These proportions were more magnified when considering usual HEI scores. This indicates that few Americans consume a diet

aligned with the Dietary Guidelines for Americans at levels that protect against diet-related chronic disease morbidity and mortality, with notable disparities across sociodemographic factors. There were also no observable improvements in the proportion of adults achieving high nutrition security over time.[42]

We noted disparities in nutrition security categories by key sociodemographic characteristics. Non-Hispanic Black race/ethnicity, having a high school education or less, low household income, and food insecurity were all significantly associated with higher prevalence of very low nutrition security. Although these are cross-sectional data, prior evidence indicates structural factors contribute to disparities in diet quality such as racism, limited educational opportunities, inequitable food access, a lack of proper training, resources, or enough time to prepare healthy meals.[10,43–45]

In this study, more healthful nutrition security categories were associated with a healthy weight status, lipid profile, and glycemic control in a dose-response manner. This is consistent with meta-analyses of prospective observational studies which found that individuals who score at the top quintile of diet quality for their population have lower risks of all-cause mortality, cardiovascular disease, cancer, and type 2 diabetes compared to individuals who score in the bottom quintile.[2,32] This indicates that the proposed HEI cut-points reflect the underlying cardiometabolic risk profile of US adults.

Significant differences in all foods, food groups, and nutrients of interest were observed across nutrition security categories. Shifting to a higher nutrition security category can be achieved through incremental dietary improvements. For example, the difference between high and marginal nutrition security categories could be translated to a daily 6% kcal reduction from

ultra-processed foods, 0.5 cups more fruits, 0.3 cups more vegetables, 0.8 oz equivalents more whole grains, and 0.3 oz equivalents more seafood. Similarly, the difference between marginal and low nutrition security categories was, on average, a daily 5.5% kcal reduction from ultra-processed foods, 0.4 cups more fruits, 0.1 cups more vegetables 0.4 oz equivalents more whole grains and 0.7 oz equivalents more seafood. Finally, the difference between low and very low nutrition security was on average an 8.7% reduction of energy/day from ultra-processed foods, 0.4 cups/day more fruit, 0.1 cups/day more vegetables, 0.5 oz equivalents/day more whole grains, and 0.3-ounce equivalents/day more seafood.

There have been calls to supplement food security surveillance measures with diet quality or nutrition security measures.[14,15] USDA Secretary Tom Vilsack and leading members of Congress have called for making diet quality and nutrition security priorities alongside food security.[46,47] This study shows that defining cut-points of HEI-2020 scores adequately and comprehensively captures underlying differences in key dietary and social risk factors implicated in diet-related diseases and could be used to efficiently assess nutrition security of the population. Nutrition interventions that work with individuals who have risk factors for very low diet quality often monitor food insecurity status of participants, and using evidence-based diet quality targets may enhance efforts to monitor and improve nutrition security. This can reduce disparities in diet-related chronic diseases by raising participants into higher nutrition security categories, in combination with other program evaluations and benchmarks.

Strengths of this study include our use of data from a large nationally representative sample of US adults spanning recent years. Second, we informed the cut points for HEI categories through multiple sources of health outcome evidence. Third, we leveraged the rich

phenotyping available from NHANES questionnaire data, validated dietary recalls, physical measurements, and available biomarker data, to examine concurrent implications of the nutrition security categories at the individual level. However, this study is limited by its cross-sectional nature; prospective follow-up is needed to capture clinical outcomes. The 24-hour recall is a validated approach but is subject to measurement error and recall bias. Furthermore, we did not account for presence of chronic diseases or use of medications, as the goal was not to show causal effects of nutrition security categories and biomarker outcomes, but to characterize population-level differences across nutrition security categories.

Conclusion:

Given that the HEI is already used to monitor the nutritional status of the US, using HEI cut-points to establish nutrition security categories would be an efficient, evidence-based, and practical approach allow policy makers, public health practitioners and nutrition professionals to set benchmarks and targets for nutrition policies and interventions. Disaggregating continuous HEI scores into meaningful categories can better identify disparities in diet-related health outcomes and help tailor existing nutrition programs and policies to improve healthful food access, increase diet quality, and promote health for all Americans.

REFERENCES

1. Micha R, Peñalvo JL, Cudhea F, Imamura F, Rehm CD, Mozaffarian D. Association Between Dietary Factors and Mortality From Heart Disease, Stroke, and Type 2 Diabetes in the United States. *JAMA*. 2017;317(9):912-924. doi:10.1001/jama.2017.0947

2. Morze J, Danielewicz A, Hoffmann G, Schwingshackl L. Diet Quality as Assessed by the Healthy Eating Index, Alternate Healthy Eating Index, Dietary Approaches to Stop Hypertension Score, and Health Outcomes: A Second Update of a Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Cohort Studies. *J Acad Nutr Diet*. 2020;120(12):1998-2031.e15. doi:10.1016/j.jand.2020.08.076

3. Xu Z, Steffen LM, Selvin E, Rebholz CM. Diet quality, change in diet quality and risk of incident CVD and diabetes. *Public Health Nutr*. 2020;23(2):329-338. doi:10.1017/S136898001900212X

4. National Diabetes Statistics Report | Diabetes | CDC. Published November 20, 2023. Accessed November 24, 2023. https://www.cdc.gov/diabetes/data/statistics-report/index.html

5. Lopez-Neyman SM, Davis K, Zohoori N, Broughton KS, Moore CE, Miketinas D. Racial disparities and prevalence of cardiovascular disease risk factors, cardiometabolic risk factors, and cardiovascular health metrics among US adults: NHANES 2011–2018. *Sci Rep*. 2022;12(1):19475. doi:10.1038/s41598-022-21878-x

6. Schultz WM, Kelli HM, Lisko JC, et al. Socioeconomic Status and Cardiovascular Outcomes. *Circulation*. 2018;137(20):2166-2178. doi:10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.117.029652

7. Singh S, Sridhar P. A narrative review of sociodemographic risk and disparities in screening, diagnosis, treatment, and outcomes of the most common extrathoracic malignancies in the United States. *J Thorac Dis*. 2021;13(6):3827-3843. doi:10.21037/jtd-21-87

8. Agardh E, Allebeck P, Hallqvist J, Moradi T, Sidorchuk A. Type 2 diabetes incidence and socio-economic position: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Int J Epidemiol*. 2011;40(3):804-818. doi:10.1093/ije/dyr029

9. Gupta A, Wilson LE, Pinheiro LC, et al. Association of educational attainment with cancer mortality in a national cohort study of black and white adults: A mediation analysis. *SSM - Popul Health*. 2023;24:101546. doi:10.1016/j.ssmph.2023.101546

10. Leung CW, Tester JM. The Association between Food Insecurity and Diet Quality Varies by Race/Ethnicity: An Analysis of National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey 2011-2014 Results. *J Acad Nutr Diet*. 2019;119(10):1676-1686. doi:10.1016/j.jand.2018.10.011

11. Leung CW, Wolfson JA, Brandt EJ, Rimm EB. Disparities in Cardiovascular Health by Food Security Status and Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Participation Using Life's Essential 8 Metrics. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2023;6(6):e2321375. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2023.21375

12. Johnson AE, Herbert BM, Stokes N, Brooks MM, Needham BL, Magnani JW. Educational Attainment, Race, and Ethnicity as Predictors for Ideal Cardiovascular Health: From the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey. *J Am Heart Assoc Cardiovasc Cerebrovasc Dis*. 2022;11(2):e023438. doi:10.1161/JAHA.121.023438

13. U.S. Department of Agriculture. Food and Nutrition Security. Accessed November 26, 2023. https://www.usda.gov/nutrition-security

14. Seligman HK, Levi R, Adebiyi VO, Coleman-Jensen A, Guthrie JF, Frongillo EA. Assessing and Monitoring Nutrition Security to Promote Healthy Dietary Intake and Outcomes in the United States. *Annu Rev Nutr*. 2023;43(1):409-429. doi:10.1146/annurev-nutr-062222-023359

15. Thorndike AN, Gardner CD, Kendrick KB, et al. Strengthening US Food Policies and Programs to Promote Equity in Nutrition Security: A Policy Statement From the American Heart Association. *Circulation*. 2022;145(24):e1077-e1093. doi:10.1161/CIR.0000000000001072

16. Measuring And Addressing Nutrition Security To Achieve Health And Health Equity | Health Affairs Brief. Accessed December 3, 2023. https://www.healthaffairs.org/do/10.1377/hpb20230216.926558/full/

17. Development of new measures to assess household nutrition security, and choice in dietary characteristics. *Appetite*. 2022;179:106288. doi:10.1016/j.appet.2022.106288

18. Livings MS, Bruine de Bruin W, Wasim N, Wilson JP, Lee BY, Haye K de la. Food and nutrition insecurity: Experiences that differ for some and independently predict diet-related disease, Los Angeles County, 2022. *J Nutr*. Published online May 25, 2024. doi:10.1016/j.tjnut.2024.05.020

19. Tucker AC, Bresnahan C, John S, et al. Food (in)security in relation to nutrition (in)security in a national cross-sectional sample of Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program participants: considerations of an emerging construct. *Am J Clin Nutr*. 2024;119(6):1475-1484. doi:10.1016/j.ajcnut.2024.03.020

20. U.S. Department of Agriculture, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. *Dietary Guidelines for Americans, 2020-2025*. DietaryGuidelines.gov

21. Liu J, Micha R, Li Y, Mozaffarian D. Trends in Food Sources and Diet Quality Among US Children and Adults, 2003-2018. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2021;4(4):e215262. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.5262

22. Tao MH, Liu JL, Nguyen USDT. Trends in Diet Quality by Race/Ethnicity among Adults in the United States for 2011–2018. *Nutrients*. 2022;14(19):4178. doi:10.3390/nu14194178

23. Shan Z, Rehm CD, Rogers G, et al. Trends in Dietary Carbohydrate, Protein, and Fat Intake and Diet Quality Among US Adults, 1999-2016. *JAMA*. 2019;322(12):1178-1187. doi:10.1001/jama.2019.13771

24. Ahluwalia N, Dwyer J, Terry A, Moshfegh A, Johnson C. Update on NHANES Dietary Data: Focus on Collection, Release, Analytical Considerations, and Uses to Inform Public Policy12. *Adv Nutr*. 2016;7(1):121-134. doi:10.3945/an.115.009258

25. Shams-White MM, Pannucci TE, Lerman JL, et al. Healthy Eating Index-2020: Review and Update Process to Reflect the Dietary Guidelines for Americans, 2020-2025. *J Acad Nutr Diet*. 2023;123(9):1280-1288. doi:10.1016/j.jand.2023.05.015

26. Usual Dietary Intakes: Details of the Method | EGRP/DCCPS/NCI/NIH. Accessed December 19, 2023. https://epi.grants.cancer.gov/diet/usualintakes/details.html

27. Wingrove K, Lawrence MA, McNaughton SA. A Systematic Review of the Methods Used to Assess and Report Dietary Patterns. *Front Nutr*. 2022;9:892351. doi:10.3389/fnut.2022.892351

28. Schwingshackl L, Bogensberger B, Hoffmann G. Diet Quality as Assessed by the Healthy Eating Index, Alternate Healthy Eating Index, Dietary Approaches to Stop Hypertension Score, and Health Outcomes: An Updated Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Cohort Studies. *J Acad Nutr Diet*. 2018;118(1):74-100.e11. doi:10.1016/j.jand.2017.08.024

29. Krebs-Smith SM, Pannucci TE, Subar AF, et al. Update of the Healthy Eating Index: HEI-2015. *J Acad Nutr Diet*. 2018;118(9):1591-1602. doi:10.1016/j.jand.2018.05.021

30. Liese AD, Krebs-Smith SM, Subar AF, et al. The Dietary Patterns Methods Project: Synthesis of Findings across Cohorts and Relevance to Dietary Guidance. *J Nutr*. 2015;145(3):393-402. doi:10.3945/jn.114.205336

31. Hu EA, Steffen LM, Coresh J, Appel LJ, Rebholz CM. Adherence to the Healthy Eating Index–2015 and Other Dietary Patterns May Reduce Risk of Cardiovascular Disease, Cardiovascular Mortality, and All-Cause Mortality. *J Nutr*. 2020;150(2):312-321. doi:10.1093/jn/nxz218

32. Panizza CE, Shvetsov YB, Harmon BE, et al. Testing the Predictive Validity of the Healthy Eating Index-2015 in the Multiethnic Cohort: Is the Score Associated with a Reduced Risk of All-Cause and Cause-Specific Mortality? *Nutrients*. 2018;10(4):452. doi:10.3390/nu10040452

33. Monteiro CA, Cannon G, Levy RB, et al. Ultra-processed foods: what they are and how to identify them. *Public Health Nutr*. 2019;22(5):936-941. doi:10.1017/S1368980018003762

34. Steele EM, O'Connor LE, Juul F, et al. Identifying and Estimating Ultraprocessed Food Intake in the US NHANES According to the Nova Classification System of Food Processing. *J Nutr*. 2023;153(1):225-241. doi:10.1016/j.tjnut.2022.09.001

35. National Health and Examination Survey. *Anthropometry Procedures Manual*.; 2017.

36. CDC. Defining Adult Overweight and Obesity. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Published June 3, 2022. Accessed January 27, 2024. https://www.cdc.gov/obesity/basics/adult-defining.html

37. National Insitutes of Health, National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute. Clinical guidelines on the identification, evaluation, and treatment of overweight and obesity in adults: The evidence report. *Obes Res*. 1998;6(S2):S51-S210. doi:10.1002/j.1550-8528.1998.tb00690.x

38. 2018 AHA/ACC/AACVPR/AAPA/ABC/ACPM/ADA/AGS/APhA/ASPC/NLA/PCNA Guideline on the Management of Blood Cholesterol: A Report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Clinical Practice Guidelines. doi:10.1161/CIR.0000000000000625

39. Triglycerides and Cardiovascular Disease. doi:10.1161/CIR.0b013e3182160726

40. American Diabetes Association. *Standards of Care in Diabetes—2023* Abridged for Primary Care Providers. *Clin Diabetes*. 2023;41(1):4-31. doi:10.2337/cd23-as01

41. Bickel G, Nord M, Price C, Hamilton W, Cook J. *Guide to Measuring Household Food Security, Revised 2000*. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service; 2000.

42. ODPHP. White House Conference on Hunger, Nutrition and Health. Accessed May 20, 2024. https://health.gov/our-work/nutrition-physical-activity/white-house-conference-hunger-nutrition-and-health

43. Gregory CA, Coleman-Jensen A. *Food Insecurity, Chronic Disease, and Health Among Working-Age Adults*. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service; 2017.

44. Lee EK, Donley G, Ciesielski TH, et al. Health outcomes in redlined versus non-redlined neighborhoods: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Soc Sci Med*. 2022;294:114696. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2021.114696

45. Madlala SS, Hill J, Kunneke E, Lopes T, Faber M. Adult food choices in association with the local retail food environment and food access in resource-poor communities: a scoping review. *BMC Public Health*. 2023;23(1):1083. doi:10.1186/s12889-023-15996-y

46. United States Department of Agriculture. USDA Announces Actions on Nutrition Security | Food and Nutrition Service. Published online March 17, 2022. Accessed May 29, 2024. https://www.fns.usda.gov/news-item/usda-0062.22

47. Booker C, Rubio M. *SNAP Nutrition Security Act*.; 2023. https://www.booker.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/snap_nutrition_security_act_of_2023.pdf

Figure 1: Proportion of nutrition security categories using observed and usual HEI-2020 scores

Figure 2: HEI- 2020 component scores by nutrition security categories, 2009-2018 NHANES

Table 1: Sociodemographic characteristics of US adults (≥20 years) stratified by nutrition security categories, NHANES 2009-2018

	Overall	Nutrition security category				*P-linear trend*
		Very low (HEI 0-50)	Low (HEI >50-60)	Marginal (HEI >60-70)	High (HEI >70-100)	
Age						*<0.01*
≤30 years	3917 (20.3)	2040 (51.6)	994 (25.3)	574 (15.1)	309 (8.0)	
31-50 years	7396 (35.3)	3229 (42.8)	1949 (27.2)	1392 (18.7)	826 (11.2)	
≥51 years	10855 (44.4)	3640 (33.5)	2945 (27.3)	2458 (23.1)	1812 (16.1)	
Sex						*<0.01*
Male	10548 (48.1)	4616 (44.6)	2830 (27.1)	1943 (17.9)	1159 (10.4)	
Female	11620 (51.9)	4293 (36.7)	3058 (26.7)	2481 (21.8)	1788 (14.9)	
Race and ethnicity						*<0.01*
Hispanic	5331 (14.6)	1959 (40.9)	1488 (27.3)	1183 (20.8)	701 (11.0)	
Non-Hispanic Black	4849 (11.3)	2176 (47.9)	1331 (27.5)	847 (16.5)	495 (8.0)	
Non-Hispanic White	9219 (65.7)	3939 (40.0)	2376 (26.9)	1732 (20.0)	1172 (13.1)	
Other[a]	2769 (8.4)	835 (33.0)	693 (24.9)	662 (22.7)	579 (19.4)	
Birthplace						*<0.01*
United States	16599 (83.8)	7458 (42.7)	4407 (27.0)	2955 (18.8)	1779 (11.5)	
Outside of the United States	5569 (16.2)	1451 (28.8)	1481 (26.4)	1469 (25.5)	1168 (19.2)	
Educational attainment						*<0.01*
High school education or less	9723 (36.4)	4472 (49.4)	2615 (26.2)	1723 (16.4)	913 (8.0)	
Any college or college graduate	12445 (63.6)	4437 (35.4)	3273 (27.3)	2701 (21.9)	2034 (15.5)	
Employment status						*0.18*
Employed	12172 (61.2)	5007 (41.3)	3225 (26.6)	2382 (19.9)	1558 (12.2)	
Not employed	9996 (38.8)	3902 (39.2)	2663 (27.3)	2042 (20.0)	1389 (13.6)	
Marital status						*<0.01*

Married or living with partner	13214 (63.1)	5000 (38.3)	3528 (26.9)	2786 (21.1)	1900 (13.7)	
Single	8954 (36.9)	3909 (44.1)	2360 (26.8)	1638 (17.9)	1047 (11.1)	
Household income						*<0.01*
≤200% federal poverty level	9690 (33.0)	4504 (48.7)	2533 (25.7)	1690 (16.6)	963 (9.0)	
>200% federal poverty level	12478 (67.0)	4405 (36.4)	3355 (27.5)	2734 (21.6)	1984 (14.6)	
Household food security		4405 (36.4)	3355 (27.5)	2734 (21.6)	1984 (14.6)	*<0.01*
High/marginal food security	17534 (84.2)	6571 (37.8)	4745 (27.4)	3642 (20.9)	2576 (13.9)	
Low/very low food security	4634 (15.8)	2338 (54.9)	1143 (24.1)	782 (14.6)	371 (6.3)	

[a] Other included American Indiana or Alaskan Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, and Other

[b] Household food security assessed using the U.S. Household Food Security Survey Module

Table 2: Multivariate-adjusted observed daily intakes of total energy, Nova food groups, foods, and nutrients of interest of interest stratified by nutrition security categories (using observed HEI-2020 scores), NHANES 2009-2018

		Nutrition security category				*P-linear*
	Overall	**Very low[a]**	**Low[a]**	**Marginal[a]**	**High[a]**	***trend***
Total energy (kcal/day)	2085	2106[b]	2102[b]	2031[b]	1976	*<0.01*
Nova 1-2, Unprocessed/ minimally processed foods (% energy/day)	30.1	25.8[b]	32.4[b]	36.3[b]	41.4	*<0.01*
Nova 4, Ultra-processed foods (% energy/day)	55.2	61.7[b]	53.0[b]	48.5[b]	42.5	*<0.01*
Foods (cup or oz eq per 1000 kcal)						
Fruits, excluding juice (cup eq/day)	0.7	0.3[b]	0.7[b]	1.1[b]	1.6	*<0.01*
Vegetables, excluding white potatoes (cup eq/day)	0.6	0.5[b]	0.6[b]	0.7[b]	1.0	*<0.01*
Refined grains (oz eq/day)	5.5	6.8[b]	5.7[b]	4.7[b]	3.7	*<0.01*
Whole grains (oz eq/day)	0.9	0.4[b]	0.9[b]	1.3 [b]	2.1	*<0.01*
Red and processed meat (oz eq/day)	2.6	2.9[b]	2.5[b]	2.2[b]	1.6	*<0.01*
Seafood (oz eq/day)	0.6	0.4[b]	0.7[b]	1.4	1.7	*<0.01*
Nutrients per 1,000 calories						
Saturated fat (% energy/day)	26.3	29.1[b]	25.8[b]	22.1[b]	18.5	*<0.01*
Dietary fiber (g/day)	17.3	13.4[b]	17.4[b]	20.1[b]	25.5	*<0.01*
Sodium (mg/day)	3481	3663[b]	3528[b]	3307[b]	3007	*<0.01*
Potassium (mg/day)	2670	2249[b]	2676[b]	2907[b]	3221	*<0.01*
Calcium (mg/day)	967	908[b]	957[b]	982[b]	1049	*<0.01*
Added sugar (% energy/day)	16.4	20.3[b]	15.6[b]	13.2[b]	10.8	*<0.01*

[a] Values adjusted for age, sex, race and ethnicity, birthplace, educational attainment, employment status, marital status, household income, and household food security

[b] Significant difference compared to the high nutrition security category

Table 3: Multivariate-adjusted adiposity and cardiometabolic markers stratified by nutrition security categories (observed HEI-2020 scores), NHANES 2009-2018

	Nutrition security category					*P-linear trend*
	Overall	**Very low[a]**	**Low[a]**	**Marginal[a]**	**High[a]**	
BMI (kg/m2)	29.3	29.8[b]	29.2[b]	28.2[b]	27.4	*<0.01*
% with obesity	*38.8*	*45.7*[b]	*41.5*[b]	*33.8*[b]	*27.3*	*<0.01*
Waist circumference (cm)	99.7	100.4[b]	98.6[b]	94.5[b]	94.0	*<0.01*
% with high WC	*57.8*	*61.5*[b]	*60.2*[b]	*55.9*	*49.3*	*<0.01*
HDL cholesterol (mg/dL)	53.6	50.7[b]	52.9[b]	54.1[b]	56.6	*<0.01*
% <40 mg/dL	*18.6*	*24.1*[b]	*19.1*	*15.9*	*13.5*	*<0.01*
LDL cholesterol (mg/dL)	113.4	112.6[b]	111.6[b]	111.9[b]	107.8	*0.01*
% ≥100 mg/dL	*62.8*	*63.1*	*63.1*	*65.3*	*61.6*	*0.14*
Triglycerides (mg/dL)	120.4	123.7[b]	120.0[b]	118.4[b]	103.6	*<0.01*
% ≥150 mg/dL	*23.2*	*25.7*[b]	*25.8*[b]	*23.9*	*18.6*	*<0.01*
Fasting glucose (mg/dL)	106.8	107.1[b]	105.4[b]	106.1[b]	101.7	*<0.01*
% >100 mg/dL	*42.9*	*47.7*[b]	*48.6*[b]	*44.6*	*43.0*	*<0.01*

[a] Values adjusted for age, sex, race and ethnicity, birthplace, educational attainment, employment status, marital status, household income, and household food security

[b] Significant difference compared to the high nutrition security category


100.0
90.0
80.0
70.0
60.0
50.0
40.0
30.0
20.0
10.0
0.0
% of US adults
12.7
19.9
26.9
40.5
0.8
12.9
41.3
45.0
Observed HEI-2020 scores
Usual HEI-2020 scores
Very low nutrition security
Low nutrition security
Marginal nutrition security
High nutrition security


Unadjusted HEI-2020 Scores
Very low nutrition security
Low nutrition security
Marginal nutrition security
High nutrition security
Total vegetables
Greens and beans
Total fruit
Whole fruit
Whole grains
Dairy
Total protein foods
Seafood and plant proteins
Fatty acids
Sodium
Refined grains
Saturated fat
Added sugar
100
90
80
70
60
50
40
30
20
10
0