Development of a nutrient-based method for classifying foods to be consumed in moderation

Authors: Amara Channell Doig, PhD, MPH; Leah M. Lipsky, PhD, MHS; Allison Choe, BS; Tonja R. Nansel, PhD

Abstract

Background: While the Dietary Guidelines for Americans recommend limiting foods high in added sugars, saturated fat, refined grains, and sodium, they do not provide criteria for classifying foods high in these components.

Objective: To develop a nutrient-based method to classify moderation foods based on the 2020-2025 DGA.

Design: The 2017-2018 Food and Nutrient Database for Dietary Studies (FNDDS, n=6909 foods) was used to evaluate content validity, by examining the proportion of moderation foods within recommended and non-recommended food groups, and convergent validity, by comparing nutrient density in moderation versus non-moderation foods. Dietary recall data from the cross-sectional, nationally representative National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (2017-2018) were used to assess convergent validity, by investigating correlations of moderation food intake (% kcal) with overall diet quality.

Participants: Participants aged 2+ years (n=6180) were included.

Main outcome measures: The Nutrient Rich Foods 9.3 index (NRF) measured food-level nutrient density; Healthy Eating Index-2020 scores (HEI-2020) measured person-level diet quality.

Statistical Analyses: T-tests and ANOVA evaluated differences in nutrient density by moderation food classification. Pearson's correlations estimated associations of moderation food intake (% kcal) with HEI-2020.

Results: More non-recommended (e.g., 97% of snacks, 97% of sweets) than recommended (e.g., 19% of vegetables, 23% of fruits) food groups were classified as moderation foods. Mean nutrient density was significantly lower in moderation foods than non-moderation foods (mean diff in NRF scores = -74.8, 95%CI:-70.6 to -78.9). Moderation food intake (% kcal) was negatively correlated with HEI-2020 (r=-0.72), HEI-moderation (r=-0.56), and HEI-adequacy (r=-0.67).

Conclusions: The moderation food classification method demonstrated strong content and convergent validity, and may facilitate diet quality assessment, surveillance, and public health interventions.

Funding. This research was supported by the *Eunice Kennedy Shriver* National Institute of Child Health and Human Development Intramural Research Program. The funding body had no role in the study design; collection, analysis, and interpretation of data; or writing of the manuscript.

Introduction

The 2020 – 2025 Dietary Guidelines for Americans (DGA) recommend limiting intake of foods and beverages high in added sugars, saturated fat, refined grains, and sodium, along with limiting alcoholic beverages[1] due to associations with adverse health outcomes.[2-12] These foods are often energy-dense and may displace intake of nutrient-rich foods needed to meet nutritional requirements ("core foods").[1] However, while the DGA specify recommended overall intake limits for these nutrients, they do not provide criteria for identifying foods high in nutrients to limit. Given that people select and consume foods, not nutrients, establishing evidence-based criteria for classifying foods that are high in nutrients to limit would facilitate accessible, food-based dietary guidance and nutrition surveillance, improve research on diet and health outcomes, and inform intervention targets to improve diet quality.[13]

Existing a priori metrics for assessing diet or food quality, such as diet quality indices and nutrient profiling methods, do not provide a standardized food-level approach to identify foods high in DGA nutrients to limit. For example, the Healthy Eating Index (HEI) – 2020, a measure of alignment of overall diet quality with the DGA, includes four moderation components for refined grains, sodium, added sugar, and saturated fat, which are scored at the overall intake level (per 1,000 kcal or as a percentage of total energy).[14] However, the HEI lacks food-level thresholds for moderation components, limiting the ability to identify foods that should be consumed in moderation, i.e., "moderation foods". Similarly, nutrient profiling methods, such as the Nutrient Rich Food Index (NRF) 9.3[15] and the Food Compass score,[16,17] calculate nutrient-based scores for the purpose of ranking individual foods by overall nutritional value, but these have been based on heterogeneous nutrient criteria, reference amounts, and weighting schemes, and not all methods designate cut-offs for categorizing foods.

62 Several approaches for categorizing foods by nutrients to limit have been developed to
63 assist charitable food organizations in procuring healthy foods;[18-21] however, since they were
64 developed for this specific purpose, several characteristics (e.g., different criteria for each food
65 group, some foods omitted, and required label reading or ingredient lists) limit their application
66 to dietary intake data. Additionally, regulatory and policy frameworks, including the U.S. Food
67 and Drug Administration (FDA) "healthy" or "high in" labeling criteria,[22,23] address most
68 nutrients to limit (excluding refined grains and alcohol), but were developed to regulate food
69 manufacturers' labeling practices and do not apply to the full range of food groups, non-
70 packaged foods, or mixed foods consumed by the U.S. population. Additionally, FDA thresholds
71 are based on the FDA-defined serving size and 20% daily values for a fixed 2,000-kcal reference
72 intake level, rather than food-specific nutritional profiles,[22,23] which may obscure nutrient density
73 and pose challenges for informing a consistent method to identify foods high in nutrients to limit.
74 For example, according to the FDA definition, plain sugar would not be considered high in added
75 sugar since a serving size of 1 tsp contains 16 kcal, which is less than 20% of the daily value for
76 a 2,000-kcal diet. Front-of-package labeling thresholds developed in other countries are informed
77 by country-specific dietary guidance and priorities and are not intended to align with DGA-based
78 recommendations.[24,25]
79 A standardized, evidence-based approach for identifying moderation foods that is
80 applicable to food- and dietary intake databases could enable consistent application across
81 studies and facilitate direct translation of dietary guidance into actionable intervention targets
82 and public health initiatives to improve diet quality in the US. Therefore, this study aimed to (1)
83 develop a quantitative, nutrient-based method for classifying moderation foods consistent with
84 the 2020 DGA that can be calculated using existing food and dietary intake databases for

research, and (2) evaluate its ability to differentiate foods according to nutrient density and distinguish between diets of high versus low quality.

Methods

Process for developing the Moderation Food Classification Method (MFCM)

Three guiding principles were used for developing the MFCM, including (1) alignment with the nutrient recommendations identified in the DGA 2020 – 2025, (2) alignment with food group categorizations in the DGA and peer-reviewed literature, (3) parsimony and applicability to the FNDDS food codes and dietary intake data collected in the What We Eat in America (WWEIA) National Health and Examination Survey (NHANES) dietary recalls or using the National Cancer Institute Automated Self-Administered 24-hour dietary recall application (ASA24). The first principle was operationalized by aiming to use DGA-based criteria to identify foods containing high amounts of dietary components to limit in the DGA[1] and referred to as moderation components in the HEI – 2020[14] (i.e., added sugars, saturated fat, sodium, and refined grains). The second principle was operationalized by aiming to classify as moderation foods those that are consistently described in the scientific literature as moderation, discretionary, junk, or extra (e.g., sweets, salty snacks, sugar sweetened beverages, high sugar cereal, processed meats, fried potatoes, high-fat fast food, as outlined in **Figure 1**),[26-41] while not classifying as moderation those foods described as nutrient-dense (e.g., "vegetables, fruits, whole grains, seafood, eggs, beans, peas, and lentils, unsalted nuts and seeds, fat-free and low-fat dairy products, and lean meats and poultry—when prepared with no or little added sugars, saturated fat, and sodium").[1] The third principle was operationalized by aiming to develop thresholds that can be calculated from variables currently available in the FNDDS and ASA24 data and applied across all food groups within these data sources, deviating from established thresholds or

creating food-group specific thresholds only if required to ensure consistency with the first two principles.

Threshold development

Aligned with the first principle, initial thresholds were selected in accordance with values of nutrients of to limit referred to in the DGA[1] and the HEI-2020[14] scoring algorithm. In alignment with the second principle, initial thresholds were evaluated with respect to their accuracy in classifying foods to limit and nutrient-dense foods within each food group. Since the HEI – 2020 and the 2020-2025 DGA[1] were developed for evaluating overall dietary intake, the initial thresholds based on these guidelines resulted in some misclassifications at the individual food level. The initial thresholds were then modified accordingly, by incorporating food-group specific thresholds or additional established criteria, where appropriate, in accordance with the third principle. Each of the thresholds tested and a summary of the findings are presented in **Figure 2**.

Added Sugars. Since individual foods that modestly exceed the DGA limit for individual nutrients may still contribute to a healthful diet in balance with overall intake, the initial threshold for added sugars in an individual food was set to ≥20% of kcal, which is twice the maximum recommended daily intake of added sugars for the whole diet (10% of total daily energy intake).[1] This threshold correctly classified the majority of the high sugar sweets and sugar sweetened beverages and resulted in no false positives, so was unchanged.

Fats. Using the same rationale as for added sugars, the initial threshold for saturated fat was set to ≥20% of kcal, which is twice the DGA maximum recommended daily intake of saturated fat for the overall diet.[1] Evaluation of this threshold resulted in misclassifications in the vegetables and snacks and sweets food groups based on the 2nd guiding principle, since several vegetables

131 cooked with a small amount of butter (e.g. broccoli, collards, or carrots cooked with butter)
132 exceeded the saturated fat threshold (false positive) due to the inherently low energy density of
133 vegetables, whereas fried vegetables (e.g., fries, onion rings, vegetable fritters) and several high-
134 fat snacks and sweets (e.g., potato chips, doughnuts) were not classified as moderation foods
135 since they contained primarily unsaturated fat (false negative). Although current dietary
136 guidelines do not limit unsaturated fat at the dietary level, the addition of oils to these foods
137 substantially reduces nutrient density and increases energy density; these foods are also
138 consistently referred to in the literature as discretionary, junk, extra, or moderation.[26-40] To
139 address these misclassifications, we evaluated multiple alternative approaches to incorporate
140 both saturated and unsaturated fat for the vegetable and snacks/sweets food groups only (**Figure**
141 **2**). The final thresholds that resulted in the strongest alignment with the guiding principles
142 included a ≥9% cut-off for total fat by weight, applied only to these food groups; and a threshold
143 of ≥20% kcal from saturated fat applied to all food groups except vegetables.
144 **Sodium.** An initial threshold of ≥2.0 grams of sodium per 1,000 kcal was evaluated, based on the
145 value corresponding to the minimum score for the HEI-2020 sodium component.[42] However,
146 because sodium has no energy value, using an energy density-based cut point developed for the
147 whole diet resulted in misclassifications (false positives) when applied to individual foods. For
148 example, several vegetables cooked with a small amount of salt exceeded this threshold due to
149 their low energy content (e.g. raw spinach, fresh kale, carrots, green beans, or broccoli cooked
150 with no added fat). After examining multiple alternative thresholds using energy or weight as the
151 referent value, the threshold was revised to align with the FDA definition of a high-sodium food
152 (460 mg per serving), which corresponds to 20% of the recommended maximum daily intake for
153 a 2,000-kcal diet (2300 mg).[43,44]

154 **Refined Grains.** The initial threshold of ≥50% of total grains from refined grains, based on the
155 DGA recommendation that half of grains consumed should be whole grains,[1] was selected for
156 classifying foods as moderation. However, this threshold resulted in misclassification of sprouted
157 grain bread, corn tortillas, and other foods made from masa as moderation foods (false positives).
158 While these foods are labeled as refined grains in the USDA Food Patterns Equivalents Database
159 (FPED), this contradicts guidance from WIC,[45] the National School Lunch Program,[46] and the
160 Child and Adult Care Food Program[47], which refers to these foods as whole grains. To address
161 this, the final refined grains threshold incorporated the American Heart Association whole grain
162 threshold[48] (carbohydrate to fiber ratio of < 10:1) in addition to the initial DGA-based threshold
163 of ≥50% total grains from refined grains. To avoid misclassifying mixed dishes containing only a
164 small amount of refined grains (e.g., soup thickened with cornstarch), the grain criteria were
165 applied only to foods containing at least 0.5 ounce-equivalents of total grains.
166 **Alcohol.** Based on the DGA guidance to limit alcohol intake,[1] all alcoholic beverages were
167 classified as moderation.
168 **Final Criteria.** The final criteria for classifying moderation foods are presented in **Figure 3**. Any
169 food meeting at least one component criterion is classified as a moderation food. In addition to
170 the dichotomous moderation food classification system, an ordinal classification value was
171 created by summing the number of component thresholds met.
172 Finally, in alignment with the first two guiding principles, it was determined that no whole plant
173 foods (i.e. whole fruit, vegetables, whole grains, legumes, nuts, or seeds) should be classified as
174 a moderation food.[1] Only three food items (Brazil nuts, fresh coconut, and avocado [raw or for
175 use on a sandwich]) were misclassified (due to their naturally occurring fat) using the established
176 criteria, so these were recoded manually as non-moderation foods.

177 **Evaluation of the MFCM**

178 The MFCM was evaluated by assessing its content and construct validity (**Figure 4**). Using
179 FNDDS, content validity was examined by evaluating the accuracy of the method for classifying
180 foods to limit versus foods to encourage as described in the literature, and convergent validity
181 was examined by evaluating the difference in mean nutrients to limit and nutrient density (NRF
182 9.3 score) of foods classified as moderation versus those classified as non-moderation. Internal
183 construct validity was assessed at the diet level by descriptively examining the proportion of total
184 daily intake of nutrients to limit from moderation foods. Convergent validity was also assessed
185 by examining the strength of the relationship of percent of daily energy intake from moderation
186 foods with overall diet quality measured using the HEI-2020.

187 **Data sources**

188 **Food-level nutrient data**

189 The 2017-2018 United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Food and Nutrient Database
190 for Dietary Studies (FNDDS)[49] was used to evaluate the MFCM at the food level. FNDDS is
191 released for each cycle of NHANES and provides nutrient values and gram amounts for foods
192 and beverages reported in the WWEIA dietary intake assessment. The accompanying Food
193 Patterns Equivalents Database (FPED)[50] converts the foods and beverages to their corresponding
194 USDA food patterns components (i.e., teaspoon equivalents of added sugars, gram equivalents of
195 saturated fat, and cup equivalents of grains). To facilitate analysis of food and beverage intake,
196 items in these databases are organized into WWEIA food categories based on typical usage and
197 nutrient content.[51]

198 The 2017-2018 FNDDS contains nutrient values for 7083 individual foods and beverages
199 consumed in the United States. However, since the moderation food criteria are based on DGA

200 dietary recommendations for individuals over age two years, infant formula and human milk
201 were excluded from these analyses (n=6909 foods and beverages). The food weight for "quantity
202 not specified" in the FNDDS Portions and Weights dataset, which reflects the most common
203 portion size[49] (similar in concept to the FDA reference amount customarily consumed), was used
204 to indicate serving size. For foods with multiple subcodes, serving size was defined as the mean
205 of the portion weights for all subcodes.

206 **Nationally Representative Dietary Data**

207 The 2017-2018 National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES)[52,53] was used to
208 evaluate percent energy intake from moderation foods in the US population. NHANES is a cross-
209 sectional, nationally representative survey of health and nutrition. Estimates based on weighted
210 samples from each NHANES cycle are representative of the US civilian noninstitutionalized
211 resident population,[54] and analyses of recalls are suitable for estimating mean population level
212 intakes from foods and beverages.[53] The National Center for Health Statistics Ethics Review
213 Board approves all protocols for NHANES.[55] Adult participants provide written consent for their
214 participation; for participants <18 years of age, parents or guardians provide written consent, and
215 documented assent is obtained from participants aged 7-17 years.[53] WWEIA collects 24-hour
216 dietary recalls from individuals of all ages using the interviewer-administered five-step USDA
217 Automated Multiple-Pass Method.[53,56] Dietary recalls are proxy-reported for children 5 years and
218 younger and proxy-assisted for children ages 6-11 years. NHANES participants also self-report
219 sociodemographic characteristics including age, race, ethnicity, gender, income, and household
220 size. Since the moderation food criteria are based on DGA dietary recommendations for
221 individuals over age two years, the analytic sample for validation included all participants aged
222 two years and older who had two reliable dietary recalls from the 2017-2018 NHANES cycle. Of

223 6502 participants with two reliable dietary recalls, 322 participants under two years of age were
224 excluded, resulting in a final sample of 6180 participants. Moderation food intake was calculated
225 as the percentage of total intake across both days.

226 **Measures**

227 ***Nutrient density.*** Nutrient density for foods in the 2017-2018 FNDDS was estimated using the
228 Nutrient Rich Foods Index (NRF 9.3), which is calculated as the sum of the percent of daily
229 recommended values of nutrients to encourage (protein, fiber, vitamin A, vitamin C, Vitamin E,
230 calcium, iron, magnesium, and potassium) minus the percent of the maximum recommended
231 daily value for nutrients to limit (saturated fat, added sugars, and sodium) per 100 kcal. Higher
232 scores indicate higher nutrient density.[57]

233 ***Diet quality.*** Person-level diet quality was assessed in NHANES participants using the Healthy
234 Eating Index–2020 (HEI-2020), which reflects adherence to the 2020-2025 Dietary Guidelines
235 for Americans.[1,14] The HEI-2020 total score is calculated as the sum of 13 component scores,
236 including 9 adequacy components (for which higher intake earns higher scores) and 4
237 moderation components (for which lower intake earns higher scores). HEI-2020[14] total scores
238 (range 0-100), HEI-2020 adequacy scores (range 0-60), and HEI-2020 moderation scores (range
239 0-40) were calculated for each NHANES participant using the simple scoring algorithm.[58] The
240 HEI-2020 adequacy score is calculated as the sum the component scores for total fruit, whole
241 fruits, total vegetables, greens and beans, whole grains, dairy, total protein foods, seafoods and
242 plant proteins, and fatty acids, while the moderation score is calculated as the sum of the
243 component scores for refined grains, sodium, added sugars, and saturated fats. Higher total,
244 adequacy, and moderation scores represent closer alignment with the DGA.[14] Scores are
245 calculated using density standards (e.g., per 1,000 kilocalories) to account for individual

differences in energy requirements. Scores for each component are truncated, whereby maximum scores are assigned when intake meets or exceeds the recommended level for adequacy components, or when intake reaches or falls below a threshold for moderation components; a minimum score of zero is assigned when intake is at or below the minimum threshold for adequacy components, or exceeds the maximum threshold for moderation components.

Statistical Analysis

The statistical programming code used to implement the MFCM and calculate percent intake from moderation foods is provided at https://github.com/amaracd/Moderation-Food-Classification-Method/. All analyses were completed in SAS 9.4,[59] and statistical significance was set at $p<0.05$. Design-based statistical methods for all NHANES analyses accounted for the complex, multistage sampling design[60] and were weighted using the dietary recall 2-day sample weights.

Content validity. To operationalize the second guiding principle, content validity at the food level was evaluated by examining how closely the MFCM food classifications aligned with literature-based characterizations of foods to limit or nutrient-dense foods (**Figure 1**). The percentage of foods classified as moderation foods and the percentage meeting each moderation criterion were summarized overall, by food group, and by WWEIA category in FNDDS. To indicate good content validity, a high proportion of foods referred to as foods to limit in the peer-reviewed literature, including sweets, salty snacks, sugar sweetened beverages, high sugar cereal, processed meats, fried potatoes, and high-fat fast food (e.g. pizza, chicken nuggets), [26-41] should be classified as moderation foods. In contrast, few to none of the foods referred to as nutrient-dense, including vegetables, fruits, whole grains, seafood, beans, peas, and lentils, unsalted nuts and seeds, eggs, fat-free and low-fat dairy products, and lean meats and poultry that are prepared

269 with minimal amounts of added sugars, saturated fats, and sodium,[1] should be classified as
270 moderation foods.
271 **Construct validity.** Aligned with the first guiding principle and the DGA recommendation to
272 select nutrient-dense versions of foods within each food category, convergent validity was
273 examined using FNDDS by comparing nutrient density (NRF 9.3 score) of foods classified as
274 moderation versus non-moderation in total and by food group (t-tests) and across foods meeting
275 1, 2, and ≥3 MFCM thresholds (ANOVA with Tukey's HSD post hoc test) (Figure 4). In
276 addition, convergent validity was examined by assessing differences in mean energy density and
277 nutrients to limit between moderation versus non-moderation foods using t-test and across foods
278 meeting 1, 2, and ≥3 MFCM thresholds using ANOVA with Tukey's HSD post hoc test for
279 multiple comparisons. Internal construct validity at the diet level was evaluated using NHANES
280 data to describe the proportion of total daily intake of nutrients to limit, and convergent validity
281 was evaluated by estimating correlations (Pearson's ρ) of moderation food intake (% kcal) with
282 overall diet quality (HEI-2020, HEI-2020-moderation, and HEI-2020-adequacy scores). A lower
283 nutrient density of moderation versus non-moderation foods and an inverse association of
284 moderation food intake with diet quality indicators reflect stronger convergent validity.

285 **Results**

286 **Food-level evaluation**

287 The MFCM classified 4555 (66%) of 6909 foods and beverages in the 2017-2018 FNDDS
288 (excluding formula and human milk) as moderation foods (data not shown in table). Of these,
289 60% met one threshold, 33% met two thresholds, and 7% met three or more thresholds. Sodium
290 was the most frequent threshold classifying moderation foods (47%), followed by refined grains
291 (41%), added sugars (24%), saturated fat (20%), and percent fat by weight (16%).

292 ***Content validity of the MFCM***

293 The number and percent of foods classified as moderation foods for each FNDDS food group
294 and WWEIA food category description are presented in **Table 1**. Vegetables contained the
295 smallest proportion of moderation foods (19%), while snacks contained the largest proportion
296 (97%). The fruit and beverage food groups contained the smallest proportion of foods that met
297 two nutrient thresholds (<1%), while sweets (50%) contained the highest. Only snacks (4%),
298 mixed dishes (6%), and sweets (28%) contained more than 2% of foods that met three or more
299 thresholds. Within the WWEIA categories, all milkshakes, frankfurters, pizza, nachos, potato
300 chips, cookies and brownies, doughnuts, and soft drinks were classified as moderation foods.
301 Conversely, none of the low-fat or non-fat milk, grapes, melon, broccoli, spinach, string beans,
302 or tomatoes were classified as moderation foods.

303 ***Convergent validity***

304 Mean energy density, sodium, carbohydrate to fiber ratio, and percent kcal from added
305 sugar and saturated fat were higher in moderation foods compared to non-moderation foods,
306 while percent grains from whole grain was lower in moderation foods than non-moderation
307 foods ($p<0.001$; **Table 2**). Mean energy density, carbohydrate to fiber ratio, and percent kcal
308 from saturated fat increased with the number of moderation thresholds met ($p<0.05$; **Table 2**).
309 Mean percent kcal from added sugar was higher for 1 and 3 thresholds met but lower for 2
310 thresholds met ($p<0.05$). Mean sodium increased and mean percent grains from whole grain
311 decreased with the number of moderation thresholds met, although there was no significant
312 difference between those meeting two versus three thresholds.

313 *Nutrient density.* Mean nutrient density was significantly lower in moderation foods than
314 non-moderation foods overall (mean diff: -74.8, 95% CI: -70.6 to -78.9) (**Figure 5A**) and for

315 each of the individual food groups (**Supplemental Figure 6**). Mean nutrient density decreased
316 linearly with increasing number of moderation thresholds met, although there was no significant
317 difference between those meeting two versus three thresholds (**Figure 5B**).

318 **Diet-level evaluation**

319 The 2017-2018 NHANES sample was majority non-Hispanic White and 51% female. The mean
320 age was 39 years (SE: 0.5) and mean IPR was 2.9 (SE:0.1) (**Table 3**).

321 ***Construct validity***

322 *Internal construct validity.* Moderation foods contributed on average 77% (SE:0.6) of
323 total daily energy intake in the sample (**Table 3**). Foods exceeding only one moderation food
324 threshold contributed 42% of total daily energy intake (SE: 0.3), while foods exceeding two
325 thresholds contributed 26% of total daily energy intake (SE:0.4), and foods exceeding three or
326 more thresholds contributed 9% of total daily energy intake (SE: 0.3). Moderation foods
327 contributed 94% of total daily added sugar intake (SE: 0.4), 78% of total daily sodium intake
328 (SE:0.5), 83% of total daily saturated fat (SE: 0.5), and 94% of total daily refined grains
329 (SE:0.3).

330 *Convergent validity.* Intake from moderation foods was negatively correlated with HEI-
331 2020 total, HEI-moderation, and HEI-adequacy scores (**Table 4**).

332 **Discussion**

333 This study developed a nutrient-based method applying standardized criteria to classify
334 moderation foods, i.e., foods that should be consumed in moderation due to containing high
335 amounts of nutrients to limit, aligned with the 2020-2025 DGA.[1] The MFCM demonstrated high
336 content validity, as evidenced by the large proportion of moderation foods in the snacks (97%),
337 sweets (96%), and mixed dishes (87%) food groups, and the small proportion of moderation

338 foods in the vegetable (19%) and fruit food groups (23%), consistent with the second guiding
339 principle. The MFCM demonstrated strong convergent validity at the food level, as indicated by
340 the significant difference in nutrient density between moderation versus non-moderation foods
341 overall and for each food group and the negative relationship of the number of moderation
342 thresholds met with nutrient density. The measure also demonstrated strong convergent validity
343 at the person level, as evidenced by the negative association of moderation food intake (% kcal)
344 with HEI-2020 scores.

345 Food classifications from the MFCM criteria closely align with foods to limit described
346 in prior literature, [26-41] and included the top food contributors to added sugar,[61,62] saturated
347 fat,[62,63] and sodium[64] in the U.S. diet. Of note, snack foods were more often categorized as
348 moderation foods based on the fat and refined grain thresholds than the sodium threshold. This
349 likely reflects their relatively small portion sizes, such that the sodium content per portion did not
350 exceed the threshold. However, this is consistent with national intake data showing that mixed
351 and main dishes contribute more dietary sodium than snacks, the latter accounting for
352 approximately 4% of total sodium intake.[64]

353 Although the positive association of moderation food intake with the HEI-2020
354 moderation components score indicates alignment with the DGA, the magnitude of the
355 association (r = -0.56) suggests non-overlapping variance between the two scores. Moderation
356 food intake calculated using this food-based method may more precisely reflect intake of
357 nutrient-poor foods than the HEI-2020 moderation score,[14] as it does not truncate intake and it
358 accounts for some nutrients not explicitly captured in the HEI-2020 moderation score, such as
359 unsaturated fat from chips and many sweets. Additionally, while the HEI-2020 moderation score
360 includes nutrients to limits coming from core foods (e.g., saturated fat from low-fat milk or lean

361 meat[65]), these are not counted as moderation food intake using the food-based method. Future
362 research elucidating whether moderation food intake and HEI-2020-moderation scores are
363 differentially related to health outcomes would be informative.

364 The MFCM was designed to classify foods that are major contributors to the excess
365 intake of nutrients of concern in the U.S. population and therefore should be consumed in
366 moderation. Classifying foods as moderation versus not may be useful for guiding consumer
367 behavior, product labeling, and quantifying the contribution of moderation food intake to overall
368 dietary intake when examining diet-disease relationships. However, any binary food
369 classification will include foods of varying nutritional value within each classification. The
370 inverse associated of nutrient density with the number of thresholds met indicates there is
371 variance in the nutritional value of moderation foods. Similarly, foods not classified as
372 moderation may also vary in their nutritional value and contribution to DGA guidelines, and
373 should be consumed within daily energy requirements across all recommended food groups.

374 The MFCM has utility for research, practice, and policy. This evidence-based, nutrient-
375 based method can be applied across widely varying diets and allows for comparison of findings
376 across studies of diverse populations. The ability to classify individual moderation foods may
377 also facilitate clinical dietary education,[13] actionable consumer guidance, and product labeling.
378 For example, in 2016, the Chilean government mandated warning labels on foods using nutrient
379 thresholds similar to the current moderation food classification. The policy led to decreased
380 intakes of sugar, sodium, and saturated fat,[66,67] suggesting that clearly labeled foods can improve
381 eating behaviors. In addition, the MFCM could be used to monitor and evaluate consumer
382 purchasing behaviors and the availability of moderation foods in the food supply, such as in
383 restaurants or schools.

384 **Strengths and limitations**

385 Strengths of this study include the use of evidence-based criteria applied to the FNDDS database,
386 which supports the internal validity and generalizability of the classification method. The use of
387 FNDDS for classifying moderation foods is a strength, as it is a comprehensive database for
388 foods consumed by the U.S. population and enables implementation of the classification method
389 with data from NHANES WWEIA or the National Cancer Institute Automated Self-
390 Administered 24-hour dietary assessment tool (ASA24®).[68] However, as the criteria were
391 developed for FNDSS, they will likely require adaptation for use in studies based on other
392 nutrient databases. Another strength is the use of a large, nationally representative sample of the
393 civilian, noninstitutionalized U.S. population to estimate associations of moderation food intake
394 with overall diet quality. Limitations include the use of self-reported dietary intake data, which
395 are susceptible to response bias. However, this is not expected to impact comparisons of
396 moderation food intake with HEI-2020 scores, as misreporting similarly impact the independent
397 and dependent variables. Food-level analyses are also limited to the foods included in FNDDS,
398 in which items represent generic food representations instead of specific brands. Consequently,
399 differences in recipe and preparation methods that alter nutrient content may not be fully
400 captured. However, these issues would similarly impact any classification based on nutrient
401 content. Additionally, there is variability in how the MFCM thresholds were established because
402 of the difficulty of directly applying HEI guidance to individual foods. Nevertheless, the
403 thresholds consistently identify lower nutrient-dense foods and demonstrate strong convergent
404 validity.

405 **Conclusions**

406 These findings support the validity of the MFCM for identifying foods with lower nutrient
407 density and for quantifying moderation food intake, which is inversely related to adherence to
408 dietary guidelines in the U.S. population. By establishing quantitative nutrient-based criteria that
409 effectively identify foods high in nutrients to limit, the MFCM has utility for diet quality
410 assessment, behavioral nutrition interventions, and investigations of diet-disease relationships.

	Foods to limit in the peer-reviewed literature[a]	Nutrient-dense foods as defined in the Dietary Guidelines for Americans[1]
Sweets	Cookies,[26-40] cakes,[26-38,40] pies,[29,34,36-38] pastries,[27-29,31-34,36-39] doughnuts[27,32,36,37,39] ice cream,[26-28,30-33,36-40] chocolate,[27,28,31-33,35,38,39] pudding,[34,36,39] custard,[27,34] mousse,[34,37,39] Jello,[34,36] candy[26,27,31-33,36,38,39]	
Snacks	Potato chips,[26-40] corn chips,[27,32-34,36-39] pretzels,[34,36,37,39] crackers,[27,29,35-37,39] snack mix,[34,37] popcorn[33,34,36-39] (excluding air-popped[37])	
Fruit	Fried fruit[37] toffee apple[37]	Fruit prepared with minimal added sugar, saturated fat, sodium
Vegetables	Fried potatoes[26-29,34,35,37,38,40]	Vegetables prepared with minimal added sugar, saturated fat, sodium
Protein	Processed meats[26-29,31,37-39] (including lunch meat,[39] bacon,[39] sausage,[26,28,39] and salami,[26,37-39]), fried or battered proteins[26,28,39,40]	Beans, peas, lentils, seafood, nuts, seeds, and lean meats and poultry prepared with minimal added sugar, saturated fat, sodium
Grain	High sugar cereals,[27,33,39] muffins,[27,34,35,38,39] waffles[34]	Whole grains
Mixed dishes	Pizza,[26,27,29,35,37-40] nachos,[39] fast food hamburgers,[26,27,37-39] hot dogs[27,39]	
Drinks	Soft drinks or sugar-sweetened beverages,[26,27,29-34,37-39] sports and energy drinks,[27,31-33,37,39] sweetened coffee and tea[32,34,37-39]	
Milk	Milkshakes,[37] cream,[31,37,38] sweetened yogurt[30]	Fat-free and low-fat dairy products
Alcoholic drinks	Alcoholic drinks[27,28,32,34,37,38]	

Figure 1. Foods defined as foods to limit or nutrient dense for measurement development and content validity.

Nutrient	Threshold	Source	Correct classifications	Misclassifications	Conclusion
Added Sugar	>20% of kcal	DGA	The added sugar threshold classified 68% of the sweets category as moderation foods. Sweets that did not meet the threshold included diet and light foods (e.g. light ice cream, diet carrot cake, sugar free caramels), cheese pastry, puff pastry, plain cake and yeast doughnuts, and applesauce and no-bake oatmeal cookies. The threshold also classified 100% of soft drinks, 79% of sports and energy drinks (all non-diet drinks), and 62% of coffee drinks (all sugar sweetened) as moderation. The added sugar threshold captured only 15% of reduced or lower sugar items. Items in this category that met the threshold included reduced sugar jelly, reduced sugar cola, and honey cluster cereal	None	A threshold of >20% kcal from added sugar correctly captured the majority of high sugar sweets and beverages.
Sodium	≥ 2.0 grams per 1,000 kcal	HEI	This threshold classified 100% of cold cuts and frankfurters, and 78% of sausage as moderation foods.	**False positives**: This threshold classified a large proportion of vegetables as moderation foods including 100% of spinach dishes, 80% of broccoli and cabbage, 88% of other dark green vegetables, and 70% of carrots. **False negatives**: No potato chips and only 5% of crackers, 3% of tortilla chips, and 7% of popcorn met the threshold.	A threshold of ≥ 2.0 grams of sodium per 1,000 kcal correctly identified high sodium processed meats but misclassified many vegetables.

Nutrient	Threshold	Source	Correct classifications	Misclassifications	Conclusion
	.3% sodium by weight	Hyperpalatable Food Classification	This threshold classified high sodium meat (e.g. bacon, cold cuts), soy- and tomato-based condiments, and mixed dishes (e.g. pizza, nachos, burgers) as moderation. The majority of fresh vegetables did not meet the threshold.	**False positives:** This threshold classified all of the beef, chicken, and game meat as moderation foods. **False negatives**: Only 38% of canned soups met the threshold.	A sodium threshold of >0.3% sodium by weight misclassified many of the proteins.
	>460 mg per serving	FDA	This threshold classified high sodium meats (e.g. 75% cold cuts, 100% frankfurters, 67% of chicken patties, nuggets, and tenders), and mixed dishes (e.g. 100% of nachos, pizza, and burritos and tacos, and 94% of soups, 99% of frankfurter sandwiches) as moderation foods. The sodium threshold classified 26% of reduced or lower sodium items as moderation foods. Those that met the threshold included lower sodium canned soups (e.g. cream of chicken soup), deli meats (e.g. bologna, pepperoni, and salami), and soy sauce.	**False negatives:** Only 7% of salty snacks met the threshold including 36% of pretzels, 2% of crackers, 3% of tortilla chips, and no potato chips or popcorn.	A sodium threshold of ≥460 mg per serving correctly identified high sodium meats and mixed dishes as moderation foods and did not capture the majority of the low sodium products.

Nutrient	Threshold	Source	Correct classifications	Misclassifications	Conclusion
Fat	>20% kcal from saturated fat	DGA	The saturated fat threshold classified higher fat proteins (beef or lamb with fat eaten, fried pork) as moderation foods, but not lean proteins (chicken, turkey, and lean beef, lamb, or ham). No fish was classified as a moderation food based on its fat content. This threshold classified 14% of the reduced fat and fat-free products as moderation foods. Those that met the threshold included reduced fat cheeses, sandwiches with reduced fat cheese and butter, and reduced fat beef sausages.	**False positives**: This threshold classified carrots, spinach, broccoli, green beans cooked with butter, and cooked watercress as moderation foods. **False negatives**: Only 9% of friend potatoes, 25% of doughnuts and pastries, and no fried vegetables, potato or corn chips met the threshold.	A threshold of >20% kcal from saturated fat correctly identified higher fat proteins as moderation. However, it misclassified several vegetables and did not classify most fried vegetables, snacks, and sweets as moderation foods.
	Fatty acid ratio <=1.2	HEI	This threshold classified some higher fat cuts of beef, including sirloin and ribeye, as moderation foods and did not classify poultry or fish as moderation foods.	**False positives:** This threshold classified raw vegetables (e.g., cauliflower, cucumber, onion, broccoli) and those cooked with a small amount of butter (e.g., spinach, broccoli) as moderation foods. Some lean meats were classified as moderation foods, including venison and caribou. In addition, all dairy milk and yogurt, including non and low-fat, were classified as moderation foods. **False negatives:** No fried vegetables, bacon, nachos, or corn and potato chips, and only 4% of sausages met the threshold.	A threshold of fatty acid ratio <=1.2 misclassified foods in several food groups.
	>16% kcal from total fatty acids	Modified HEI Threshold to include saturated	This threshold classified all fried potatoes and vegetables, potato chips, and 97% of doughnuts as moderation foods.	**False positives**: This threshold classified raw vegetables (e.g., carrots) and cooked vegetables with no fat added (e.g., peas, kale,	A threshold of >16% kcal from total fatty acids correctly classified fried snacks, sweets, and vegetables but misclassified

Nutrient	Threshold	Source	Correct classifications	Misclassifications	Conclusion
		and unsaturated fatty acids.		corn, and canned pumpkin) as moderation foods.	several vegetables as moderation foods.
	>32% kcal from total fatty acids	Alternative Modified HEI Threshold to include saturated and unsaturated fatty acids.	This threshold classified the majority of fried potatoes and vegetables, doughnuts, potato and tortilla chips as moderation foods and did not classify raw vegetables.	**False positives:** This threshold classified cooked vegetables (e.g. lettuce, watercress, celery, cucumber, fresh tomatoes, green or red peppers), lean meats, and baked or broiled fish with oil as moderation foods.	A threshold of >32% kcal from total fatty acids correctly classified high fat snacks, sweets, and vegetables but misclassified several vegetables and proteins as moderation foods.
	>9% total fat by weight	Alternative threshold based on qualitative evaluation of fat content of foods described in the literature as	This threshold classified 97% of fried vegetables, 95% of french fries, 100% of potato chips, 86% of doughnuts as moderation foods and did not classify any carrots, broccoli, lettuce, corn, or spinach as moderation foods.	Threshold applied only to vegetables and snacks/sweets food groups; no misclassifications identified.	A threshold of >9% total fat by weight correctly classified high fat snacks and sweets, fried vegetables, and vegetables cooked with a small amount of fat.
Refined grains	<50% whole grain	DGA	This threshold classified white breads and rolls as moderation foods and did classified whole-wheat bread or rolls or cooked whole grains (e.g. millet, oatmeal, buckwheat, brown or wild rice) as not moderation.	**False positives**: Several foods that can be considered whole grain were classified as moderation foods, including sprouted wheat bread and corn tortillas. Several foods with a very small amount of grain were classified as moderation foods; for example, meat or poultry with gravy, chicken with mushroom sauce, beef or chicken with vegetables, vegetable soups, and meatballs.	A <50% whole grain threshold misclassified some whole-grain and corn products as moderation foods. In addition, it identified some foods with only a minimal amount of grain as moderation foods, suggesting that the threshold should be applied only to foods with at least 0.5 serving of grain.
	≥ 4.3 oz equiv. per 1,000 kcal	HEI	This threshold classified white bread products as moderation foods and did classified whole-grain and wheat bread as not moderation.	**False positives**: Several foods that can be considered whole grain were classified as moderation foods, including sprouted wheat bread, wheat roti, corn tortillas, and bran flakes.	A ≥ 4.3 oz equiv. per 1,000 kcal threshold misclassified some whole-grain products as moderation foods.

Nutrient	Threshold	Source	Correct classifications	Misclassifications	Conclusion
	> 10:1 carbohydrate to fiber ratio	AHA	This threshold classified white bread products as moderation foods and classified foods such as whole-wheat pita, whole-wheat and corn tortillas, and cooked barley as not moderation.	**False positives**: This threshold classified several low-fiber whole-grain foods as moderation foods, including brown rice, millet, and oatmeal dishes.	A threshold of >10:1 carbohydrate-to-fiber ratio misclassified low-fiber whole-grain foods as moderation foods while correctly classifying high-fiber whole grains. An additional threshold based on the amount of whole grain is needed to ensure that low-fiber whole-grain foods are not classified as moderation foods.

Figure 2. Moderation Food Classification Method thresholds tested, classification findings, and decisions.

Component	Criteria	Applied to food groups
Added Sugars	≥ 20% of kcal from added sugar	All
Sodium	≥ 460 mg per serving	All
Fat	≥ 20% of kcal from saturated fat	All excluding snacks/sweets and vegetables
	≥ 9% total fat by weight	Vegetables
	≥ 20% of kcal from saturated fat OR ≥ 9% total fat by weight	Snacks/sweets
Refined grains	≤50% of total grains from whole grains AND >10:1 carbohydrate to fiber ratio	All with > 0.5 ounce equivalents of grain
Alcohol	All alcoholic beverages	Alcoholic beverages

Figure 3. Final criteria for the Moderation Food Classification Method. Foods are classified as moderation if they meet any of the criteria.

Property and question	Strategy	Data Source
Content Validity		
Are food classifications (moderation and not moderation) using the MFCM[a] consistent with literature-based characterizations of foods to limit and nutrient-dense foods?	Examined the percentage of foods classified as moderation for each food group and WWEIA[b] category.	FNDDS[c]
Construct Validity		
Internal Construct Validity		
Do moderation foods contribute a large proportion of total daily intake of nutrients to limit?	Descriptively examined proportion of total daily intake of nutrients to limit from moderation foods.	NHANES[e] WWEIA[b]
Convergent Validity		
Are nutrients to limit and energy density higher in foods classified as moderation versus non-moderation using the MFCM[a]?	Examined differences in mean energy density and nutrient density of foods classified as moderation vs. non-moderation, using t-tests. Examined differences across foods meeting 1, 2, and ≥3 MFCM[a] thresholds, using ANOVA.	FNDDS[c]
Is nutrient density lower in foods classified as moderation versus non-moderation using the MFCM[a]?	Examined mean nutrient density (NRF[d] 9.3 scores) of foods classified as moderation vs. non-moderation using t-tests and examined differences across foods meeting 1, 2, and ≥3 MFCM[a] thresholds, using ANOVA.	FNDDS[c]
Does overall intake of foods classified as moderation using the MFCM[a] correlate with overall diet quality?	Estimated Pearson correlations of moderation food intake (percent of energy intake) with HEI-2020, HEI-adequacy, HEI-moderation scores.	NHANES[e] WWEIA[b]

Figure 4. Approaches used to evaluate the Moderation Food Classification Method.



[a]Nutrient Rich Foods Index 9.3, higher scores indicate higher nutrient density.

[b,c,d] Different superscripts indicate mean nutrient density is significantly different between foods meeting different numbers of MFCM thresholds (p<0.05; Tukey's HSD post hoc test)

Figure 5. A) Nutrient density for moderation versus non-moderation foods (mean diff: -74.8, 95% CI: -70.6 to -78.9) according to the Moderation Food Classification Method. **B**) Nutrient density according to number of moderation thresholds met.



Nutrient density assessed using the Nutrient Rich Foods Index 9.3, higher scores indicate higher nutrient density.

Supplemental Figure 6. Nutrient density by moderation food classification for each food group.

Table 1. Number and percent of foods classified as moderation and meeting each Moderation Food Classification Method dietary component criterion by What We Eat in America (WWEIA) food category description.

Food Group	WWEIA Category description	Moderation Food Classification Method Dietary Component Criteria					
		Moderation n (%)	Added sugars n (%)	Refined grains n (%)	Sodium n (%)	Total fat n (%)	Saturated fat n (%)
Milk (n=239)	All items	159 (66.5)	82 (34.1)	1 (0.4)	4 (1.7)	-	86 (36.0)
	Cheese	50 (87.7)	0 (0)	1 (1.7)	2 (3.5)	-	49 (86.0)
	Cottage/ricotta cheese	6 (37.5)	2 (12.5)	0 (0)	2 (12.5)	-	3 (18.7)
	Flavored milk, lowfat	8 (53.3)	8 (53.3)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-	0 (0)
	Flavored milk, nonfat	9 (52.9)	9 (52.9)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-	0 (0)
	Flavored milk, reduced fat	14 (63.6)	13 (59.1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-	1 (4.5)
	Flavored milk, whole	11 (91.7)	6 (50.0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-	7 (58.3)
	Milk shakes and other dairy drinks	13 (100.0)	10 (76.9)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-	8 (61.5)
	Milk substitutes	21 (77.8)	20 (74.1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-	3 (11.1)
	Milk, lowfat	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-	0 (0)
	Milk, nonfat	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-	0 (0)
	Milk, reduced fat	1 (16.67)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-	1 (16.7)
	Milk, whole	9 (100.0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-	9 (100.0)
	Yogurt, Greek	9 (64.3)	7 (50.0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-	2 (14.3)
	Yogurt, regular	8 (47.1)	7 (41.2)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-	3 (17.6)
Protein (n=1325)	All items	732 (55.2)	9 (0.7)	257 (19.4)	449 (33.9)	-	238 (18.0)
	Bacon	11 (84.6)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-	11 (84.6)
	Beans, peas, legumes	10 (13.5)	3 (4.0)	0 (0)	9 (12.2)	-	0 (0)
	Beef, excludes ground	52 (68.4)	0 (0)	7 (9.2)	40 (52.6)	-	19 (25.0)
	Chicken patties, nuggets and tenders	11 (73.3)	0 (0)	9 (60.0)	10 (66.7)	-	0 (0)
	Chicken, whole pieces	58 (36.0)	0 (0)	16 (9.9)	54 (33.5)	-	5 (3.1)
	Cold cuts and cured meats	61 (91.0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	50 (74.6)	-	30 (44.8)
	Eggs and omelets	110 (72.9)	0 (0)	3 (2.0)	71 (47.0)	-	89 (58.9)
	Fish	244 (71.8)	1 (0.3)	160 (47.1)	140 (41.2)	-	10 (2.9)
	Frankfurters	12 (100.0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	12 (100.0)	-	6 (50.0)
	Ground beef	4 (80.0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-	4 (80.0)

Food Group	WWEIA Category description	Moderation Food Classification Method Dietary Component Criteria					
		Moderation n (%)	Added sugars n (%)	Refined grains n (%)	Sodium n (%)	Total fat n (%)	Saturated fat n (%)
	Lamb, goat, game	15 (33.3)	0 (0)	1 (2.2)	1 (2.2)	-	13 (28.9)
	Liver and organ meats	4 (26.7)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (13.3)	-	4 (26.7)
	Nuts and seeds	4 (5.1)	4 (5.1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-	1 (1.3)
	Pork	51 (61.5)	0 (0)	24 (28.9)	22 (26.5)	-	17 (20.5)
	Processed soy products	5 (23.8)	1 (4.8)	1 (4.8)	3 (14.3)	-	1 (4.8)
	Sausages	20 (74.1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	15 (55.6)	-	20 (74.1)
	Shellfish	47 (50.0)	0 (0)	35 (37.2)	12 (12.8)	-	2 (2.1)
	Turkey, duck, other poultry	13 (27.1)	0 (0)	1 (2.1)	8 (16.7)	-	4 (8.3)
Mixed dishes (n=1985)	All items	1734 (87.4)	16 (0.8)	787 (39.6)	1548 (78.0)	-	322 (16.2)
	Bean, pea, legume dishes	12 (50.0)	0 (0)	1 (4.2)	11 (45.8)	-	0 (0)
	Burgers (single code)	60 (95.2)	0 (0)	54 (85.7)	52 (82.5)	-	31 (49.2)
	Burritos and tacos	53 (100.0)	0 (0)	9 (17.0)	53 (100.0)	-	20 (37.7)
	Cheese sandwiches (single code)	50 (100.0)	0 (0)	18 (36.0)	50 (100.0)	-	31 (62.0)
	Chicken/turkey sandwiches (single code)	31 (96.9)	0 (0)	28 (87.5)	31 (96.9)	-	1 (3.1)
	Egg rolls, dumplings, sushi	23 (92.0)	0 (0)	20 (80.0)	20 (80.0)	-	1 (4.0)
	Egg/breakfast sandwiches (single code)	46 (100.0)	0 (0)	44 (95.6)	45 (97.8)	-	16 (34.8)
	Frankfurter sandwiches (single code)	97 (100.0)	0 (0)	40 (41.2)	96 (99.0)	-	32 (33.0)
	Fried rice and lo/chow mein	42 (93.3)	0 (0)	22 (48.9)	40 (88.9)	-	0 (0)
	Macaroni and cheese	17 (100.0)	0 (0)	14 (82.3)	12 (70.6)	-	3 (17.6)
	Meat mixed dishes	251 (84.0)	1 (0.3)	63 (21.1)	238 (79.6)	-	41 (13.7)
	Nachos	7 (100.0)	0 (0)	1 (14.3)	7 (100.0)	-	1 (14.3)
	Other Mexican mixed dishes	47 (77.1)	0 (0)	15 (24.6)	44 (72.1)	-	17 (27.9)
	Other sandwiches (single code)	60 (100.0)	1 (1.7)	58 (96.7)	56 (93.3)	-	9 (15.0)
	Pasta mixed dishes, excludes macaroni and cheese	175 (96.2)	0 (0)	107 (58.8)	148 (81.3)	-	48 (26.4)
	Peanut butter and jelly sandwiches (single code)	16 (57.1)	7 (25.0)	12 (42.9)	1 (3.6)	-	0 (0)

Food Group	WWEIA Category description	Moderation Food Classification Method Dietary Component Criteria					
		Moderation n (%)	Added sugars n (%)	Refined grains n (%)	Sodium n (%)	Total fat n (%)	Saturated fat n (%)
	Pizza	91 (100.0)	0 (0)	62 (68.1)	91 (100.0)	-	8 (8.8)
	Poultry mixed dishes	141 (97.2)	2 (1.4)	45 (31.0)	137 (94.5)	-	11 (7.6)
	Rice mixed dishes	91 (66.9)	1 (0.7)	76 (55.9)	48 (35.3)	-	2 (1.5)
	Seafood mixed dishes	83 (69.2)	0 (0)	27 (22.5)	75 (62.5)	-	6 (5.0)
	Seafood sandwiches (single code)	19 (95.0)	0 (0)	19 (95.0)	19 (95.0)	-	0 (0)
	Soups	221 (96.9)	2 (0.9)	9 (3.9)	215 (94.3)	-	21 (9.2)
	Stir-fry and soy-based sauce mixtures	40 (57.1)	0 (0)	3 (4.3)	40 (57.1)	-	0 (0)
	Turnovers and other grain-based items	43 (86.0)	0 (0)	38 (76.0)	15 (30.0)	-	12 (24.0)
	Vegetable dishes	18 (50.0)	2 (5.6)	2 (5.6)	4 (11.1)	-	11 (30.6)
Grains (n=624)	All items	400 (64.1)	119 (19.1)	316 (50.6)	66 (10.6)	-	11 (1.8)
	Bagels and English muffins	23 (76.7)	0 (0)	22 (73.3)	7 (23.3)	-	0 (0)
	Biscuits, muffins, quick breads	50 (98.0)	15 (29.4)	47 (92.2)	14 (27.5)	-	9 (17.6)
	Grits and other cooked cereals	38 (56.7)	5 (7.5)	33 (49.6)	11 (16.4)	-	2 (3.0)
	Oatmeal	13 (29.6)	13 (29.5)	0 (0)	1 (2.3)	-	0 (0)
	Pancakes, waffles, French toast	54 (72.0)	5 (6.7)	47 (62.7)	18 (24.0)	-	0 (0)
	Pasta, noodles, cooked grains	6 (24.0)	0 (0)	6 (24.0)	0 (0)	-	0 (0)
	Ready-to-eat cereal, higher sugar (>21.2g/100g)	75 (87.2)	75 (87.2)	28 (32.6)	0 (0)	-	0 (0)
	Ready-to-eat cereal, lower sugar (=<21.2g/100g)	17 (35.4)	5 (10.4)	11 (22.9)	1 (2.1)	-	0 (0)
	Rice	19 (63.3)	0 (0)	17 (56.7)	7 (23.3)	-	0 (0)
	Rolls and buns	31 (79.5)	0 (0)	31 (79.5)	3 (7.7)	-	0 (0)
	Tortillas	3 (42.9)	0 (0)	3 (42.9)	0 (0)	-	0 (0)
	Yeast breads	71 (58.2)	1 (0.8)	71 (58.2)	4 (3.3)	-	0 (0)
Fruit (n=119)	All items	28 (23.5)	27 (22.7)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-	2 (1.7)
	Apples	4 (57.1)	4 (57.1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-	0 (0)
	Bananas	1 (50.0)	1 (50.0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-	0 (0)
	Blueberries and other berries	2 (20.0)	2 (20.0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-	0 (0)
	Citrus fruits	1 (9.1)	1 (9.1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-	0 (0)

Food Group	WWEIA Category description	Moderation Food Classification Method Dietary Component Criteria					
		Moderation n (%)	Added sugars n (%)	Refined grains n (%)	Sodium n (%)	Total fat n (%)	Saturated fat n (%)
	Dried fruits	5 (26.3)	4 (21.0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-	1 (5.3)
	Grapes	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-	0 (0)
	Mango and papaya	1 (20.0)	1 (20.0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-	0 (0)
	Melons	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-	0 (0)
	Other fruits and fruit salads	8 (19.5)	8 (19.5)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-	1 (2.4)
	Peaches and nectarines	2 (33.3)	2 (33.3)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-	0 (0)
	Pears	2 (40.0)	2 (40.0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-	0 (0)
	Pineapple	1 (20.0)	1 (20.0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-	0 (0)
	Strawberries	1 (33.3)	1 (33.3)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-	0 (0)
Vegetables (n=645)	All items	122 (19.0)	6 (0.9)	14 (2.2)	34 (5.3)	100 (15.5)	-
	Broccoli	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-
	Cabbage	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-
	Carrots	1 (5.0)	1 (5.0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-
	Coleslaw, non-lettuce salads	14 (58.3)	4 (16.7)	0 (0)	1 (4.2)	10 (41.7)	-
	Corn	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-
	French fries and other fried white potatoes	42 (95.5)	0 (0)	0 (0)	9 (20.5)	42 (95.4)	-
	Fried vegetables	29 (96.7)	0 (0)	13 (43.3)	1 (3.3)	29 (96.7)	-
	Lettuce and lettuce salads	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-
	Mashed potatoes and white potato mixtures	19 (33.3)	0 (0)	1 (1.7)	8 (14.0)	16 (28.1)	-
	Onions	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-
	Other dark green vegetables	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-
	Other red and orange vegetables	1 (2.9)	1 (2.9)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-
	Other starchy vegetables	1 (2.2)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (2.2)	-
	Other vegetables and combinations	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-
	Spinach	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-
	String beans	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-
	Tomatoes	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-
	Vegetables on a sandwich	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-

Food Group	WWEIA Category description	Moderation Food Classification Method Dietary Component Criteria					
		Moderation n (%)	Added sugars n (%)	Refined grains n (%)	Sodium n (%)	Total fat n (%)	Saturated fat n (%)
	White potatoes, baked or boiled	15 (31.3)	0 (0)	0 (0)	15 (31.3)	0 (0)	-
Fats (n=120)	All items	71 (59.2)	28 (23.3)	0 (0)	2 (1.7)	-	46 (38.3)
	Butter and animal fats	14 (100.0)	1 (7.1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-	14 (100)
	Cream and cream substitutes	16 (84.2)	9 (47.4)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-	8 (42.1)
	Cream cheese, sour cream, whipped cream	12 (85.7)	2 (14.3)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-	12 (85.7)
	Margarine	8 (66.7)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-	8 (66.7)
	Mayonnaise	1 (10.0)	1 (10.0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-	0 (0)
	Salad dressings and vegetable oils	20 (39.2)	15 (29.4)	0 (0)	2 (3.9)	-	4 (7.8)
Snacks (n=249)	All items	241 (96.8)	46 (18.5)	117 (47.0)	18 (7.2)	180 (72.3)	12 (4.8)
	Cereal bars	33 (100.0)	25 (75.8)	9 (27.3)	0 (0)	24 (72.7)	3 (9.1)
	Crackers, excludes saltines	51 (89.5)	1 (1.7)	35 (61.4)	1 (1.8)	45 (78.9)	0 (0)
	Nutrition bars	13 (100.0)	8 (61.5)	3 (23.1)	0 (0)	8 (61.5)	0 (0)
	Popcorn	32 (97.0)	4 (12.1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	31 (93.9)	8 (24.2)
	Potato chips	30 (100.0)	0 (0)	1 (3.3)	0 (0)	30 (100.0)	0 (0)
	Pretzels/snack mix	45 (100.0)	8 (17.8)	45 (100.0)	16 (35.6)	13 (28.9)	1 (2.2)
	Saltine crackers	5 (100.0)	0 (0)	5 (100.0)	0 (0)	1 (20.0)	0 (0)
	Tortilla, corn, other chips	32 (97.0)	0 (0)	19 (57.6)	1 (3.0)	28 (84.8)	0 (0)
Sweets (n=602)	All items	577 (95.8)	413 (68.6)	356 (59.1)	11 (1.8)	437 (72.6)	141 (23.4)
	Cakes and pies	185 (99.5)	117 (62.9)	170 (91.4)	6 (3.2)	146 (78.5)	17 (9.1)
	Candy containing chocolate	69 (100.0)	65 (94.2)	8 (11.6)	0 (0)	68 (98.5)	41 (59.4)
	Candy not containing chocolate	60 (92.3)	55 (84.6)	1 (1.5)	0 (0)	34 (52.3)	16 (24.6)
	Cookies and brownies	107 (100.0)	73 (68.2)	93 (86.9)	0 (0)	95 (88.8)	16 (14.9)
	Doughnuts, sweet rolls, pastries	70 (100.0)	27 (38.6)	70 (100.0)	3 (4.3)	60 (85.7)	18 (25.7)
	Gelatins, ices, sorbets	11 (64.7)	11 (64.7)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	Ice cream and frozen dairy desserts	53 (86.9)	46 (75.4)	12 (19.7)	1 (1.6)	29 (47.5)	29 (47.5)
	Pudding	22 (81.5)	19 (70.4)	2 (7.4)	1 (3.7)	5 (18.5)	4 (14.8)
Beverages (n=361)	All items	182 (50.4)	172 (47.6)	2 (0.5)	1 (0.3)	-	8 (2.2)
	Apple juice	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-	0 (0)

Food Group	WWEIA Category description	Moderation Food Classification Method Dietary Component Criteria					
		Moderation n (%)	Added sugars n (%)	Refined grains n (%)	Sodium n (%)	Total fat n (%)	Saturated fat n (%)
	Citrus juice	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-	0 (0)
	Coffee	78 (69.0)	70 (61.9)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-	8 (7.1)
	Diet soft drinks	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-	0 (0)
	Diet sport and energy drinks	3 (25.0)	3 (25.0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-	0 (0)
	Fruit drinks	41 (74.6)	41 (74.5)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-	0 (0)
	Nutritional beverages	7 (43.8)	7 (43.7)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-	0 (0)
	Other diet drinks	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-	0 (0)
	Other fruit juice	2 (9.5)	2 (9.5)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-	0 (0)
	Smoothies and grain drinks	8 (32.0)	7 (28.0)	2 (8.0)	0 (0)	-	0 (0)
	Soft drinks	14 (100.0)	14 (100.0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-	0 (0)
	Sport and energy drinks	15 (79.0)	15 (78.9)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-	0 (0)
	Tea	13 (31.0)	13 (30.9)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-	0 (0)
	Vegetable juice	1 (11.1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (11.1)	-	0 (0)
Condiments (n=153)	All items	78 (51.0)	36 (23.5)	2 (1.3)	7 (4.6)	-	37 (24.2)
	Dips, gravies, other sauces	40 (65.6)	4 (6.6)	2 (3.3)	3 (4.9)	-	34 (55.7)
	Mustard and other condiments	8 (27.6)	6 (20.7)	0 (0)	1 (3.5)	-	1 (3.4)
	Olives, pickles, pickled vegetables	20 (66.7)	19 (63.3)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-	1 (3.33)
	Pasta sauces, tomato-based	1 (9.1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-	1 (9.1)
	Soy-based condiments	5 (50.0)	3 (30.0)	0 (0)	3 (30.0)	-	0 (0)
	Tomato-based condiments	4 (33.3)	4 (33.3)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-	0 (0)
Sugars (n=55)	All items	44 (80.0)	44 (80.0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-	4 (7.3)
	Jams, syrups, toppings	35 (94.6)	35 (94.6)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-	4 (10.8)
	Sugar substitutes	1 (10.0)	1 (10.0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-	0 (0)
	Sugars and honey	8 (100.0)	8 (100.0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-	0 (0)
Alcohol and Water (n=111)	All items	102 (91.9)	41 (36.9)	0 (0)	2 (1.8)	-	3 (2.7)
	Beer	9 (100.0	2 (22.2)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-	0 (0)
	Bottled water	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-	0 (0)
	Enhanced or fortified water	1 (20.0)	1 (20.0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-	0 (0)
	Flavored or carbonated water	2 (40.0)	2 (40.0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-	0 (0)
	Liquor and cocktails	78 (100.0)	33 (42.3)	0 (0)	2 (2.6)	-	3 (3.8)

Food Group	WWEIA Category description	Moderation Food Classification Method Dietary Component Criteria					
		Moderation n (%)	Added sugars n (%)	Refined grains n (%)	Sodium n (%)	Total fat n (%)	Saturated fat n (%)
	Tap water	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-	0 (0)
	Wine	12 (100.0)	3 (25.0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-	0 (0)

435

436

437 **Table 2.** Summary of dietary components to limit (mean±SD) by dichotomous and ordinal categories based on the Moderation Food Classification
438 Method (MFCM) in the 2017-2018 Food and Nutrient Database for Dietary Studies (FNDDS; n=6909).
439

	Moderation Food (dichotomous classification)			Number of MFCM thresholds met (ordinal classifications)			
	yes	no	p-value[a]	1	2	3 or 4	p-value[b]
Energy per 100 g (kcal)	229±132	144±140	p<0.001	199±132[c]	261±119[d]	343±93.4[e]	p<0.001
Percent kcal from added sugars	12.0 ±20.3	1.3 ±3.8	p<0.001	12.3±23.1[c]	10.3±14.8[d]	17.4±14.8[e]	p<0.001
Sodium (mg)	408±361	234±299	p<0.001	388±394[c]	441±321[d]	419±196[d]	p<0.001
Percent kcal from saturated fat	12.5 ±10.2	7.3±6.4	p<0.001	10.9±10.5[c]	14.1±9.4[d]	17.6±7.5[e]	p<0.001
Percent of grains from whole grains	7.0±22.7	10.0±28.5	p<0.001	8.2±25.1[c]	5.7±19.6[d]	2.8±10.3[d]	p<0.001
Carbohydrate to fiber ratio	21.3±45.2	8.0±24.7	p<0.001	18.4±49.9[c]	24.3±38.2[d]	32.5±26.0[e]	p<0.001

440

441 [a]p-values for t-tests comparing dichotomous category means.

442 [b] p-values for ANOVA comparing ordinal category means.

443 [c,d,e] Different superscripts indicate mean nutrient values are significantly different between foods meeting different numbers of MFCM thresholds
444 (p<0.05; Tukey's HSD post hoc test).

445

446

447 **Table 3.** Analytic Sample Characteristics (n=6180) in the 2017-2018 National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES)
448

Participant characteristic	Mean ± SE or n (%)[a]
Age (years)	39.4 ± 0.5
Race and Ethnicity	
Hispanic Mexican American	869 (11)
Hispanic other	512 (7)
Non-Hispanic Asian	700 (5)
Non-Hispanic Black	1514 (12)
Non-Hispanic White	2170 (59)
Other race - including multi-racial	415 (5)
Gender	
Male	2974 (49)
Female	3206 (51)
Family Income to Poverty Ratio[b]	2.9 ± 0.1
Moderation food intake (% kcal)	76.9 ± 0.6
Intake from foods meeting 1 MFCM threshold (% kcal)	42.0±0.3
Intake from foods meeting 2 MFCM thresholds (% kcal)	26.2±0.4
Intake from foods meeting 3 or 4 MFCM thresholds (% kcal)	8.7±0.3
Added sugar intake from moderation foods (% kcal)	94.3±0.4
Sodium intake from moderation foods (% kcal)	78.3±0.5
Refined grain intake from moderation foods (% kcal)	94.4±0.3
Saturated fat intake from moderation foods (% kcal)	82.6±0.5

449
450 [a]Means and weighted percentages were estimated accounting for the complex survey design.

451 [b]Family income to federal poverty threshold, with higher values reflecting higher income.

452

453

454

455

456 **Table 4**. Pearson correlation of moderation food intake (% kcal) with Healthy Eating Index-2020 (HEI) scores in participants 2 years of age and
457 older (n=6180) in the 2017-2018 National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES).

	1	2	3	4
1. Moderation food intake (% kcal)	-			
2. HEI[a,]	-0.72***	-		
3. HEI Moderation[b]	-0.56***	0.81***	-	
4. HEI Adequacy[c]	-0.67***	0.92***	0.51***	-

458 ***p<0.0001

459 [a]Healthy Eating Index-2020 total score, higher scores indicate greater adherence to 2020-2025 Dietary Guidelines for Americans.

460 [b]Healthy Eating Index moderation score, calculated as the sum of the 4 moderation components, higher scores indicate lower intake.

461 [c]Healthy Eating Index adequacy score, calculated as the sum of the 9 adequacy components, higher scores indicate higher intake.

462

463

References

1. U.S. Department of Agriculture and U.S. Department of Health and Human Services UaH. *Dietary Guidelines for Americans, 2020-2025*. 2020. December 2020. Accessed 9/2023. DietaryGuidelines.gov.
2. Hu H, Zhao Y, Feng Y, et al. Consumption of whole grains and refined grains and associated risk of cardiovascular disease events and all-cause mortality: a systematic review and dose-response meta-analysis of prospective cohort studies. *The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*. 2023/01/01/ 2023;117(1):149-159. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajcnut.2022.10.010
3. Graudal N, Jürgens G, Baslund B, Alderman MH. Compared With Usual Sodium Intake, Low- and Excessive-Sodium Diets Are Associated With Increased Mortality: A Meta-Analysis. *American Journal of Hypertension*. 2014;27(9):1129-1137. doi:10.1093/ajh/hpu028
4. Schulze MB, Manson JE, Ludwig DS, et al. Sugar-Sweetened Beverages, Weight Gain, and Incidence of Type 2 Diabetes in Young and Middle-Aged Women. *JAMA*. 2004;292(8):927-934. doi:10.1001/jama.292.8.927
5. Imamura F, O'Connor L, Ye Z, et al. Consumption of sugar sweetened beverages, artificially sweetened beverages, and fruit juice and incidence of type 2 diabetes: systematic review, meta-analysis, and estimation of population attributable fraction. *BMJ : British Medical Journal*. 2015;351:h3576. doi:10.1136/bmj.h3576
6. Bhupathiraju SN, Tobias DK, Malik VS, et al. Glycemic index, glycemic load, and risk of type 2 diabetes: results from 3 large US cohorts and an updated meta-analysis123. *The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*. 2014/07/01/ 2014;100(1):218-232. doi:https://doi.org/10.3945/ajcn.113.079533
7. Hunter RW, Dhaun N, Bailey MA. The impact of excessive salt intake on human health. *Nature Reviews Nephrology*. 2022/05/01 2022;18(5):321-335. doi:10.1038/s41581-021-00533-0
8. Breeze P, Sworn K, McGrane E, Abraham S, Cantrell A. Relationships between sodium, fats and carbohydrates on blood pressure, cholesterol and HbA1c: an umbrella review of systematic reviews. *BMJ Nutrition, Prevention & Health*. 2024:e000666. doi:10.1136/bmjnph-2023-000666
9. Kris-Etherton PM, Petersen K, Van Horn L. Convincing evidence supports reducing saturated fat to decrease cardiovascular disease risk. *BMJ Nutr Prev Health*. 2018;1(1):23-26. doi:10.1136/bmjnph-2018-000009
10. Yang Q, Zhang Z, Gregg EW, Flanders WD, Merritt R, Hu FB. Added Sugar Intake and Cardiovascular Diseases Mortality Among US Adults. *JAMA Internal Medicine*. 2014;174(4):516-524. doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2013.13563
11. DiNicolantonio JJ, Lucan SC, O'Keefe JH. The Evidence for Saturated Fat and for Sugar Related to Coronary Heart Disease. *Progress in Cardiovascular Diseases*. 2016/03/01/ 2016;58(5):464-472. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pcad.2015.11.006
12. Sawicki CM, Jacques PF, Lichtenstein AH, et al. Whole- and Refined-Grain Consumption and Longitudinal Changes in Cardiometabolic Risk Factors in the Framingham Offspring Cohort. *The Journal of Nutrition*. 2021/09/01/ 2021;151(9):2790-2799. doi:https://doi.org/10.1093/jn/nxab177
13. Tapsell LC, Neale EP, Satija A, Hu FB. Foods, Nutrients, and Dietary Patterns: Interconnections and Implications for Dietary Guidelines. *Advances in Nutrition*. 2016/05/01/ 2016;7(3):445-454. doi:https://doi.org/10.3945/an.115.011718
14. 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*. Sep 2023;123(9):1280-1288. doi:10.1016/j.jand.2023.05.015

15. Drewnowski A. The Nutrient Rich Foods Index helps to identify healthy, affordable foods1234. *The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*. 2010/04/01/ 2010;91(4):1095S-1101S. doi:https://doi.org/10.3945/ajcn.2010.28450D

16. Mozaffarian D, El-Abbadi NH, O'Hearn M, et al. Food Compass is a nutrient profiling system using expanded characteristics for assessing healthfulness of foods. *Nature Food*. 2021/10/01 2021;2(10):809-818. doi:10.1038/s43016-021-00381-y

17. Barrett EM, Shi P, Blumberg JB, O'Hearn M, Micha R, Mozaffarian D. Food Compass 2.0 is an improved nutrient profiling system to characterize healthfulness of foods and beverages. *Nature Food*. 2024/11/01 2024;5(11):911-915. doi:10.1038/s43016-024-01053-3

18. Schwartz M LR, Lott M, Arm K, Seligman H. *Healthy Eating Research Nutrition Guidelines for the Charitable Food System*. 2020. Accessed 12/15/2025. http://healthyeatingresearch.org

19. Caspi CE, Grannon KY, Wang Q, Nanney MS, King RP. Refining and implementing the Food Assortment Scoring Tool (FAST) in food pantries. *Public Health Nutr*. Oct 2018;21(14):2548-2557. doi:10.1017/s1368980018001362

20. Seidel M, Laquatra I, Woods M, Sharrard J. Applying a Nutrient-Rich Foods Index Algorithm to Address Nutrient Content of Food Bank Food. *Journal of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics*. 2015/05/01/ 2015;115(5):695-700. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jand.2014.11.009

21. America F. Feeding America's foods to encourage *Hunger and Health*. 2015;

22. U.S. Food and Drug Association F. Food Labeling: Front-of-Package Nutrition Information. In: Food and Drug Administration H, editor.: Federal Register; 2025.

23. U.S. Food and Drug Administration F. Food Labeling: Nutrient Content Claims; Definition of Term "Healthy". In: Food and Drug Administration H, editor. 21 CFR Part 101: Federal Register; 2024.

24. Afroza U, Abrar AK, Nowar A, Sobhan SMM, Ide N, Choudhury SR. Global overview of government-endorsed nutrition labeling policies of packaged foods: a document review. *Front Public Health*. 2024;12:1426639. doi:10.3389/fpubh.2024.1426639

25. Crosbie E, Gomes FS, Olvera J, Rincón-Gallardo Patiño S, Hoeper S, Carriedo A. A policy study on front-of-pack nutrition labeling in the Americas: emerging developments and outcomes. *Lancet Reg Health Am*. Feb 2023;18:100400. doi:10.1016/j.lana.2022.100400

26. Mauch CE, Golley RK, Hendrie GA. Variety Predicts Discretionary Food and Beverage Intake of Australian Adults: A Cross-Sectional Analysis of an Online Food Intake Survey. *Journal of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics*. 2024;124(4):509-520. doi:10.1016/j.jand.2023.07.019

27. James-Martin G, Baird DL, Hendrie GA. Strategies to Reduce Consumption of Unhealthy Foods and Beverages: Scenario Modeling to Estimate the Impact on the Australian Population's Energy and Nutrient Intakes. *Journal of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics*. 2021/08/01/ 2021;121(8):1463-1483. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jand.2020.12.003

28. Fayet-Moore F, McConnell A, Cassettari T, Tuck K, Petocz P, Kim J. Discretionary intake among Australian adults: prevalence of intake, top food groups, time of consumption and its association with sociodemographic, lifestyle and adiposity measures. *Public Health Nutrition*. 2019;22(9):1576-1589. doi:10.1017/S1368980018003361

29. Spence AC, Campbell KJ, Lioret S, McNaughton SA. Early Childhood Vegetable, Fruit, and Discretionary Food Intakes Do Not Meet Dietary Guidelines, but Do Show Socioeconomic Differences and Tracking over Time. *Journal of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics*. 2018/09/01/ 2018;118(9):1634-1643.e1. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jand.2017.12.009

30. Manohar N, Hayen A, Do L, Scott J, Bhole S, Arora A. Early life and socio-economic determinants of dietary trajectories in infancy and early childhood – results from the HSHK birth cohort study. *Nutrition Journal*. 2021/09/07 2021;20(1):76. doi:10.1186/s12937-021-00731-3

31. Sui Z, Wong WK, Louie JCY, Rangan A. Discretionary food and beverage consumption and its association with demographic characteristics, weight status, and fruit and vegetable intakes in Australian adults. *Public Health Nutrition*. 2017;20(2):274-281. doi:10.1017/S1368980016002305

32. Aburto TC, Pedraza LS, Sánchez-Pimienta TG, Batis C, Rivera JA. Discretionary Foods Have a High Contribution and Fruit, Vegetables, and Legumes Have a Low Contribution to the Total Energy Intake of the Mexican Population. *J Nutr*. Sep 2016;146(9):1881s-7s. doi:10.3945/jn.115.219121

33. Batis C, Barrientos-Gutierrez T, Basto-Abreu A. Associated substitution and complementation patterns of processed discretionary foods and drinks on total energy and added sugar intake. *Journal of Human Nutrition and Dietetics*. 2023/10/01 2023;36(5):1942-1950. doi:https://doi.org/10.1111/jhn.13175

34. An R. Beverage Consumption in Relation to Discretionary Food Intake and Diet Quality among US Adults, 2003 to 2012. *Journal of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics*. 2016/01/01/ 2016;116(1):28-37. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jand.2015.08.009

35. Liu Q, Wang L, Guo S, Allman-Farinelli M, Rangan A. Development and validation of an online tool to assess perceived portion size norms of discretionary foods. *European Journal of Clinical Nutrition*. 2023/08/01 2023;77(8):815-822. doi:10.1038/s41430-023-01290-y

36. Liu J, Lee Y, Micha R, Li Y, Mozaffarian D. Trends in junk food consumption among US children and adults, 2001–2018. *The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*. 2021/09/01/ 2021;114(3):1039-1048. doi:https://doi.org/10.1093/ajcn/nqab129

37. RANGAN A, HECTOR D, RANDALL D, GILL T, WEBB K. Monitoring consumption of 'extra' foods in the Australian diet: Comparing two sets of criteria for classifying foods as 'extras'. *Nutrition & Dietetics*. 2007;64(4):261-267. doi:https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1747-0080.2007.00161.x

38. Rangan AM, Randall D, Hector DJ, Gill TP, Webb KL. Consumption of 'extra' foods by Australian children: types, quantities and contribution to energy and nutrient intakes. *European Journal of Clinical Nutrition*. 2008/03/01 2008;62(3):356-364. doi:10.1038/sj.ejcn.1602720

39. Johnson BJ, Grieger JA, Wycherley TP, Golley RK. Theoretical Reductions in Discretionary Choices Intake via Moderation, Substitution, and Reformulation Dietary Strategies Show Improvements in Nutritional Profile: A Simulation Study in Australian 2- to 18-Year-Olds. *Journal of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics*. 2019/05/01/ 2019;119(5):782-798.e6. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jand.2018.10.016

40. Nansel TR, Schwedhelm C, Lipsky LM, Faith MS, Siega-Riz AM. Socioeconomic Characteristics and the Home Food Environment Are Associated With Feeding Healthful and Discretionary Foods During the First Year of Life in the Pregnancy Eating Attributes Study. *Journal of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics*. 2025;125(2):228-238.e1. doi:10.1016/j.jand.2024.05.011

41. Fernandez C, Kasper NM, Miller AL, Lumeng JC, Peterson KE. Association of Dietary Variety and Diversity With Body Mass Index in US Preschool Children. *Pediatrics*. 2016;137(3)doi:10.1542/peds.2015-2307

42. 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. *Journal of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics*. 2023/09/01/ 2023;123(9):1280-1288. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jand.2023.05.015

43. U.S. Food and Drug Association F. Sodium in Your Diet. U.S. Food & Drug Administration Updated 03/05/2024. Accessed 7/20, 2024. https://www.fda.gov/food/nutrition-education-resources-materials/sodium-your-diet

44. U.S. Food and Drug Association F. Daily Value and Percent Daily Value on the Nutrition and Supplement Facts Labels Updated 2024. Accessed 8/7, 2024. https://www.fda.gov/food/nutrition-facts-label/daily-value-nutrition-and-supplement-facts-labels

45. Food and Nutrition Service. WIC Food Packages - Regulatory Requirements for WIC-Eligible Foods. Accessed 01/15, 2024. https://www.fns.usda.gov/wic/food-packages/regulatory-requirements
46. Food and Nutrition Service. *Grain Requirements for the National School Lunch Program and School Breakfast Program*. Vol. 2024. Policy Memo. 2012. https://www.fns.usda.gov/cn/grain-requirements-national-school-lunch-program-and-school-breakfast-program
47. Food and Nutrition Service. Grain Requirements in the CACFP: Questions and Answers. United States Department of Agriculture (USDA). Accessed 01/14, 2024. https://www.fns.usda.gov/cacfp/grain-requirements-cacfp-questions-and-answers
48. Lloyd-Jones DM, Hong Y, Labarthe D, et al. Defining and Setting National Goals for Cardiovascular Health Promotion and Disease Reduction. *Circulation*. 2010;121(4):586-613. doi:doi:10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.109.192703
49. U.S. Department of Agriculture ARS. USDA Food and Nutrient Database for Dietary Studies 2017-2018. http://www.ars.usda.gov/nea/bhnrc/fsrg
50. Bowman SC, JC.; Friday, JE.; Moshfegh, AJ. *Food Patterns Equivalents Database 2017-2018: Methodology and User Guide*. 2020. http://www.ars.usda.gov/nea/bhnrc/fsrg
51. Rhodes DG, Adler ME, Clemens JC, Moshfegh AJ. What we eat in America food categories and changes between survey cycles. *Journal of Food Composition and Analysis*. 2017/12/01/ 2017;64:107-111. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfca.2017.07.018
52. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and National Center for Health Statistics. Data from: National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey Data 2017-2018. *Hyattsville, MD*.
53. 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 Policy. *Advances in Nutrition*. 2016/01/01/ 2016;7(1):121-134. doi:https://doi.org/10.3945/an.115.009258
54. National Center for Health Statistics. Weighting. Accessed 04/19/25, 2025. https://wwwn.cdc.gov/nchs/nhanes/tutorials/weighting.aspx?utm_source=perplexity
55. National Center for Health Statistics. Ethics Review Board Approval. Accessed 3/6, 2025. https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/nhanes/about/erb.html
56. Raper N, Perloff B, Ingwersen L, Steinfeldt L, Anand J. An overview of USDA's Dietary Intake Data System. *Journal of food composition and analysis*. 2004;
57. Fulgoni VL, Keast DR, Drewnowski A. Development and Validation of the Nutrient-Rich Foods Index: A Tool to Measure Nutritional Quality of Foods. *The Journal of Nutrition*. 2009/08/01/ 2009;139(8):1549-1554. doi:https://doi.org/10.3945/jn.108.101360
58. Program. NCIDoCCPSEaGR. Healthy Eating Index SAS Code. Accessed 4/10, 2024. https://epi.grants.cancer.gov/hei/sas-code.html
59. *SAS 9.4*. SAS Institute Inc.; 2017.
60. Akinbami LJ CT, Davy O, Ogden CL, Fink S, Clark J, et al. . *National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey, 2017–March 2020 prepandemic file: Sample design, estimation, and analytic guidelines*. Vol. 2(190). 2022. *Vital Health Stat*.
61. Lee SH, Zhao L, Park S, et al. High Added Sugars Intake among US Adults: Characteristics, Eating Occasions, and Top Sources, 2015–2018. *Nutrients*. 2023;15(2):265. doi:10.3390/nu15020265
62. Taylor CA, Madril P, Weiss R, et al. Identifying the Leading Sources of Saturated Fat and Added Sugar in U.S. Adults. *Nutrients*. 2024;16(15):2474. doi:10.3390/nu16152474
63. Wambogo EA, Ansai N, Terry A, Fryar C, Ogden C. Dairy, Meat, Seafood, and Plant Sources of Saturated Fat: United States, Ages Two Years and Over, 2017–2020. *The Journal of Nutrition*. 2023/09/01/ 2023;153(9):2689-2698. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tjnut.2023.06.040

651 64. Woodruff RCZ, Lixia; Ahuja, Jaspreet K.C.; Gillespie, Cathleen; Goldman, Joseph; Harris,
652 Diane M; Jackson, Sandra L.; Moshfegh, Alanna; Rhodes, Donna; Sebastian, Rhonda, S.; Terry, Ana;
653 Cogswell, Mary E. Top Food Category Contributors to Sodium and Potassium Intake — United
654 States, 2015–2016. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2020;69:1064–1069.
655 doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm6932a3
656 65. Täger M, Peltner J, Thiele S. Evaluation of diet quality by means of the Healthy Eating Index
657 and its modified variants. *Ernährungs Umschau*. 2016;63:110-118.
658 66. Taillie LS, Bercholz M, Popkin B, Rebolledo N, Reyes M, Corvalán C. Decreases in purchases
659 of energy, sodium, sugar, and saturated fat 3 years after implementation of the Chilean food
660 labeling and marketing law: An interrupted time series analysis. *PLOS Medicine*.
661 2024;21(9):e1004463. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1004463
662 67. Taillie LS, Bercholz M, Popkin B, Reyes M, Colchero MA, Corvalán C. Changes in food
663 purchases after the Chilean policies on food labelling, marketing, and sales in schools: a before
664 and after study. *The Lancet Planetary Health*. 2021;5(8):e526-e533. doi:10.1016/S2542-
665 5196(21)00172-8
666 68. Subar AF, Kirkpatrick SI, Mittl B, et al. The Automated Self-Administered 24-hour dietary
667 recall (ASA24): a resource for researchers, clinicians, and educators from the National Cancer
668 Institute. *J Acad Nutr Diet*. Aug 2012;112(8):1134-7. doi:10.1016/j.jand.2012.04.016

669