The development and evaluation of a novel measure of discretionary food intake

Authors: Amara Channell Doig, PhD, MPH[1]; Leah M. Lipsky, PhD, MHS[1]; Allison Choe, BS[1]; Tonja R. Nansel, PhD[1]

[1]Social and Behavioral Sciences Branch, Division of Population Health Research, Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development

Abstract

Background: While dietary guidelines recommend limiting foods high in added sugars, saturated fat, refined grains, and sodium, and all alcoholic beverages, there are no available methods for classifying discretionary foods or quantifying discretionary food intake using dietary intake data.

Objective: To develop and evaluate a nutrient-based method to classify discretionary foods and compare with two established methods for classifying foods to limit.

Design: Foods in the 2017-2018 USDA Food and Nutrient Database for Dietary Studies (FNDDS, n=6909) were classified as discretionary, hyperpalatable, and ultra-processed, and their nutrient values were compared. Correlations of discretionary, hyperpalatable, and ultra-processed food intakes with overall diet quality were evaluated using 2017-2018 National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES) data.

Participants: All non-pregnant NHANES participants age 2+ years with two valid 24-hour recalls (n=6136) were included.

Main outcome measures: Outcomes included food-level nutrient density (Nutrient Rich Foods 9.3 index) and person-level Healthy Eating Index-2020 scores (HEI total, HEI-adequacy, and HEI-moderation).

Statistical Analyses: Differences in nutrient density of FNDDS foods classified as discretionary, hyperpalatable, and ultra-processed vs. not were compared using t-tests and ANOVA. Fisher's z-transformation compared associations of HEI scores with intake (percent kcal) from discretionary, hyperpalatable, and ultra-processed foods.

Results: The difference in nutrient density ($p<0.001$) of discretionary vs. non-discretionary foods (mean diff=74.8, 95%CI:70.6-78.9) was larger than that of ultra-processed vs. non-ultra-processed (mean diff=29.7, 95%CI:25.1-34.2) and hyperpalatable vs. non-hyperpalatable (mean diff=53.2, 95%CI:49.3-57.1). Discretionary foods contributed 77% of energy intake in U.S. children and adults, while hyperpalatable foods and ultra-processed foods contributed 71% and 58%, respectively. Inverse associations of HEI-2020 total (r=-0.72) and HEI-adequacy scores (r=-0.67) with discretionary food intake were stronger than those with hyperpalatable (r=-0.40; -0.23) and ultra-processed food intake (r=-0.49; -0.43); associations with HEI-moderation scores were similar across all classifications.

Conclusions: The discretionary food classification method effectively distinguishes between low- and high-nutrient dense foods and is strongly associated with adherence to dietary

guidelines. The method may improve diet quality assessment and inform public health interventions.

Introduction

The 2020 – 2025 Dietary Guidelines for Americans (DGA) recommend limiting intake of food 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] While the DGA does not provide a term for these foods, the Australian Dietary Guidelines describes these foods as "discretionary."[13] These foods are often energy-dense, contain high amounts of nutrients to limit, and displace intake of nutrient-rich foods needed to meet nutritional requirements (i.e., "core foods").[13] However, the DGA do not provide specific nutrient-based standards for identifying discretionary foods. Given that people select and consume foods, not nutrients, establishing nutrient-based criteria for classifying discretionary foods would facilitate accessible, food-based dietary guidance, policy, and intervention targets to improve diet quality.[14]

Current methods for evaluating diet or food quality do not enable classifying individual foods as discretionary. For example, the Healthy Eating Index (HEI) 2020, a measure of alignment of overall diet quality with the DGA, includes component scores for total intakes of refined grains, sodium, added sugars, saturated fat relative to total intake, which lower the total HEI score.[15] The Nutrient Rich Food Index and the Food Compass methods score individual foods on continuous scales based on nutrient content, but do not provide guidance on specific cut-off values for discriminating between discretionary and non-discretionary foods.[16-18] While the Australian Guide to Healthy Eating discretionary food definition has been used to assess intake in multiple studies,[19-23] it does not provide a quantitative definition that can be applied across all food groups.[24]

Methods have been developed to designate foods as ultra-processed or hyperpalatable, although these attributes are distinct from discretionary foods. The NOVA method classifies

64 foods according to their level of industrial processing.[25] Foods are classified as either minimally
65 processed, processed, culinary ingredients, or ultra-processed; the proportion of energy intake
66 from ultra-processed foods has been used as the primary dietary exposure in hundreds of
67 analyses.[26] While there is overlap between foods that are ultra-processed and nutrient-poor,[27,28]
68 numerous ultra-processed foods are nutrient-dense (e.g., packaged whole grain breads, low-sugar
69 cereal), and several foods not classified as ultra-processed are nutrient-poor (e.g., homemade
70 pastries).[27,28] Additionally, although intake of ultra-processed foods is typically associated with
71 lower diet quality,[29,30] diets high in ultra-processed foods can also be of high diet quality.[31]
72 The recently-developed Hyperpalatable Food Score classifies foods based on thresholds
73 of nutrient combinations thought to increase palatability and activate the brain's reward system
74 (i.e., fat plus sodium, fat plus simple sugars, carbohydrates plus sodium),[32] as determined from a
75 overview of food reward survey measures and experimental studies that examined a small
76 number of foods thought to be hyperpalatable (e.g. fast foods or sweets).[32] However, the measure
77 classifies several nutrient-dense foods as hyperpalatable (e.g. chives, arugula), while classifying
78 several nutrient-poor foods as non-hyperpalatable (e.g. fried vegetables, gummy bears, high-
79 sugar fruit snacks), which may lead to misclassification if used to quantify intake of foods to
80 limit.[32]
81 To address current limitations in assessing discretionary food intake, this study develops
82 and evaluates a nutrient-based method for classifying discretionary foods in food databases and
83 dietary intake data. Identifying discretionary foods at the food-level, rather than the nutrient-
84 level, allows for direct translation to dietary guidance, intervention targets, and public health
85 initiatives.

Methods

Data sources

FNDDS

The 2017-2018 USDA Food and Nutrient Database for Dietary Studies (FNDDS)[33] was used to evaluate nutrient thresholds for classifying individual foods as discretionary. This dataset contains nutrient values for 7083 individual foods and beverages consumed in the United States. The accompanying Food Patterns Equivalents Database (FPED)[34] converts the foods and beverages to their corresponding USDA food patterns components (i.e., teaspoon equivalents of added sugars, gram equivalents of saturated fat, and cup equivalents of grains).

NHANES

The 2017-2018 National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES)[35,36] was used to evaluate the discretionary food score (percent energy intake from discretionary foods) with respect to person-level diet quality. NHANES is a cross-sectional, nationally representative survey of health and nutrition in the United States. The National Center for Health Statistics Ethics Review Board approved the study,[37] and all participants provide written consent.[36] The dietary intake portion of the survey, What We Eat in America (WWEIA), collects 24-hour dietary recalls from individuals of all ages using the interviewer-administered five-step USDA Automated Multiple-Pass Method.[36,38] Dietary recalls are proxy-reported for children 5 years and younger and proxy-assisted for children ages 6-11 years. The sample used for this analysis includes all participants aged two years and older who had two reliable dietary recalls from the 2017-2018 NHANES cycle. Of 6502 participants with two reliable dietary recalls, pregnant individuals (n=44) and participants under two years of age (n=322) were excluded. The final sample included 6136 participants.

109 **Development of the Discretionary Food Score**

110 Thresholds for defining discretionary foods were based on scoring standards for the Healthy
111 Eating Index – 2020 (HEI),[39] the 2020-2025 Dietary Guidelines for Americans (DGA),[1] the Food
112 and Drug Administration (FDA) consumer guidance,[40,41] and the 2021 American Heart
113 Association (AHA) Guidance for Cardiovascular Health Promotion and Disease Reduction.[42]
114 The primary dietary components considered included added sugars, saturated and total fats,
115 sodium, refined grains, and alcohol, based on guidance from the DGA and AHA to limit intakes
116 of these components. Initial cut-points were evaluated for face validity with respect to food
117 categorizations using the FNDDS, and modifications were applied as appropriate. Since the
118 discretionary food criteria are based on dietary recommendations for people over age two years,
119 infant formula and human milk were excluded from these analyses.

120 ***Face validity.*** Face validity of initial and revised criteria was assessed by examining how well
121 they classified foods consistently referred to in the literature as discretionary or non-
122 discretionary. For example, foods referred to as discretionary, junk, or extra in the literature
123 include sweets, salty snacks, sugar sweetened beverages, high sugar cereal, processed meats,
124 fried potatoes, and high-fat fast food (e.g. pizza, chicken nuggets).[19,43-52] Foods that are referred
125 to as nutrient-dense in the DGA include "vegetables, fruits, whole grains, seafood, beans, peas,
126 and lentils, unsalted nuts and seeds, eggs, fat-free and low-fat dairy products, and lean meats and
127 poultry" that are prepared with minimal amounts of added sugars, saturated fats, and sodium.[1]
128 Criteria that classified these key foods accordingly were considered to have strong face validity.

129 ***Added Sugars.*** Since individual foods that modestly exceed the DGA limit for individual
130 nutrients may still contribute to a healthful diet in balance with overall intake, the threshold for

131 added sugars used to classify discretionary foods was set to ≥20%, which is twice the maximum
132 recommended daily intake of added sugars (10% of total energy intake).[1]
133 ***Fats.*** Using the same rationale as for added sugars, the initial criterion for saturated fat was set to
134 ≥20% of kcal, which is twice the DGA maximum recommended intake of saturated fat in the
135 overall diet.[1] Implementation of this criterion resulted in misclassifications in the vegetables and
136 snacks and sweets food groups; several vegetables cooked with a small amount of butter (e.g.
137 broccoli, collards, or carrots cooked with butter) met the criterion due to the inherently low
138 energy content of vegetables, whereas fried vegetables (e.g., fries, onion rings, vegetable fritters)
139 and several high-fat snacks and sweets (e.g., potato chips, doughnuts) were classified as non-
140 discretionary since they contained primarily unsaturated fat. To address these weaknesses, the
141 saturated fat criterion was not applied to the vegetable food group, and several thresholds of total
142 fat were evaluated for classifying fried vegetables, high-fat snacks, and sweets as discretionary. A
143 threshold of ≥9% total fat by weight aligned most closely with expected classifications, and was,
144 therefore, applied to these food groups. The threshold of ≥20% kcal from saturated fat was
145 applied to all other food groups.
146 ***Sodium.*** An initial threshold of ≥2.0 grams of sodium per 1,000 kcal was evaluated, based on the
147 value corresponding to the minimum score of zero for the HEI-2020 sodium component.[39]
148 However, several vegetables cooked with a small amount of salt met this criterion due to their
149 low energy content. To allow for a small amount of sodium in low-calorie foods, the threshold
150 was revised to align with the FDA definition of a high-sodium food (460 mg per serving), which
151 corresponds to 20% of the recommended maximum daily intake (2300 mg per 2000 kcal).[40,41]
152 The food weight for "quantity not specified" in the FNDDS Portions and Weights[33] dataset was

153 used to indicate portion sizes of individual foods. For foods with multiple subcodes, the mean of
154 the portion weights for all subcodes was applied.
155 ***Refined Grains.*** The initial threshold of >50% of total grains from refined grains, based on the
156 DGA criterion that half of grains consumed should be whole grains,[1] was selected for classifying
157 foods as discretionary. However, this criterion resulted in misclassification of several grain-based
158 foods because FNDDS classifies sprouted grain bread, corn tortillas, and other foods made from
159 masa as refined grains, which resulted in their classification as discretionary. This conflicts with
160 guidance by WIC,[53] National School Lunch Program,[54] and Child and Adult Care Food
161 Program,[55] which defines these foods as whole grains. Therefore, an additional threshold based
162 on the American Heart Association whole grain definition[42] was added, such that foods with a
163 carbohydrate to fiber ratio of ≥10:1 and >50% of total grains from refined grains were classified
164 as discretionary. Additionally, to avoid misclassifying mixed dishes containing only a small
165 amount of refined grains (e.g., soup thickened with cornstarch), the grain criteria was applied
166 only to foods containing at least 0.5 ounce-equivalents of total grains.
167 ***Alcohol.*** Based on the DGA guidance to limit alcohol intake,[1] all alcoholic beverages were
168 classified as discretionary.
169 ***Final Criteria.*** The final criteria for classifying discretionary foods are presented in **Figure 1**.
170 Any food meeting at least one of the thresholds is classified as discretionary. In addition to the
171 dichotomous discretionary classification system, an ordinal classification was created by
172 summing the number of thresholds met.
173 Finally, based on the DGA core elements of a healthy diet[1] and HEI-2020 adequacy
174 components, it was determined that no whole plant foods (i.e. whole fruit, vegetables, whole
175 grains, legumes, nuts, or seeds) should be classified as discretionary. Only three food items

176 (Brazil nuts, fresh coconut, and avocado [raw or for use on a sandwich]) were misclassified (due
177 to their naturally occurring fat); these were recoded manually as non-discretionary.

Figure 1. Criteria for classification of foods as discretionary

	Threshold	Notes
Added Sugars	>20%	
Sodium	>460 mg	
Fat	>20% saturated fat	Excluding vegetables
	>9% total fat by weight	Applied only to snacks, sweets, and vegetables
Refined grains	<50% whole grain AND >10:1 carbohydrate to fiber ratio	
Alcohol	All alcoholic beverages	

178

179 **Evaluation of the discretionary food classification and score**

180 The discretionary food classification was evaluated at the food level by examining nutrient
181 density in discretionary versus non-discretionary foods. At both the food and person level, the
182 discretionary food classification method was compared with that of two alternative classification
183 methods used to identify foods to limit – ultra-processed foods and hyperpalatable foods. These
184 differ conceptually from, but have substantial overlap with, discretionary foods. Since the
185 discretionary food criteria were specifically intended to identify nutrient-poor foods, it should
186 demonstrate greater precision in identifying discretionary foods and stronger associations with
187 diet quality and nutrient density than the other two classification methods. The discretionary food
188 score was also evaluated at the person level by examining associations of discretionary food
189 intake with diet quality.[35,36]

190 ***Ultra-processed Foods***. Ultra-processed foods were classified using a linkage database created
191 by researchers at the University de Sao Paulo and the NCI,[56,57] which assigns one of the four
192 NOVA groups to the disaggregated (i.e. ingredient) food codes and calculates the corresponding

weight and energy for each group. To enable direct comparisons with the discretionary food classification method, foods classified at the ingredient level rather than the food level were considered ultra-processed if ultra-processed ingredients comprised >50% of the total food weight. Person-level intake of ultra-processed foods (NOVA group 4) was calculated as the percent of daily energy intake from ultra-processed food for each participant in NHANES.

Hyperpalatable foods. The hyperpalatable food measure defines foods meeting any of the following criteria as hyperpalatable: >25% kcal from fat and ≥0.30% sodium by weight, >20% kcal from fat and >20% sugar, or >40% kcal from carbohydrates and ≥0.20% sodium by weight.[32] These criteria were based on nutrient compositions that were thought to increase palatability, selected by evaluating the nutrient content of foods described as hyper-palatable in the literature.[32] The person-level percent of daily energy intake from hyperpalatable foods was calculated for each participant in NHANES.

Diet quality. HEI-2020[39,58] total scores (range 0-100), HEI-2020 adequacy scores (range 0-60), and HEI-2020 moderation scores (range 0-40) were calculated for each participant in NHANES using the simple scoring algorithm.[59] The adequacy score is calculated as the sum of 9 adequacy components (total fruit, whole fruits, total vegetables, greens and beans, whole grains, dairy, total protein foods, seafoods and plant proteins, and fatty acids), and the moderation score is calculated as the sum of the 4 moderation components (refined grains, sodium, added sugars, and saturated fats). The HEI-2020 total score is calculated as the sum of 13 components (the 9 adequacy components and 4 moderation components). Higher scores represent closer alignment with the DGA.[39]

Nutrient density. Nutrient density for food items in the FNDSS was calculated using the Nutrient Rich Foods Index (NRF 9.3), which is scored as a sum of the percent of the daily recommended

values of nutrients to encourage (protein, fiber, vitamin A, vitamin C, Vitamin E, calcium, iron, magnesium, and potassium) minus the percent of the maximum recommended daily value for nutrients to limit (saturated fat, added sugars, and sodium). Higher scores indicate higher nutrient density.[60]

Statistical Analysis

The statistical programming code used to create the discretionary food classification and score is provided in supplemental materials. All analyses were completed in SAS 9.4,[61] and statistical significance was set at $p<0.05$.

FNDDS. To compare food classification methods at the food level, descriptive statistics for the number of discretionary, hyperpalatable, and ultra-processed foods, and the energy, added sugars, refined grains, saturated fat, and sodium were calculated using FNDDS. The percent of foods in each FNDDS food group classified as discretionary, hyperpalatable, and ultra-processed were plotted on a radar chart to visualize differences in classification. Differences in nutrient density of discretionary vs. non-discretionary, hyperpalatable vs. non-hyperpalatable, and ultra-processed vs. non-ultra-processed foods were compared using t-tests; additionally, ANOVA was used to compare mean differences in food-level nutrient density by food classification method, using Bonferroni correction to account for multiple comparisons.

NHANES. The discretionary food score was evaluated at the person level using the NHANES dietary data. Descriptive statistics were used to summarize sociodemographic characteristics and the percent of daily energy (kcal), added sugars (g), and sodium (mg) from discretionary, hyperpalatable, and ultra-processed foods. Additionally, the correlations of percent of daily energy intake (kcal) from discretionary, hyperpalatable, and ultra-processed foods with HEI-2020, HEI-2020 moderation, and HEI-2020 adequacy scores were examined using Pearson's ρ.

239 Differences in the magnitude of the correlations were assessed using the fisher's z-
240 transformation. Design-based statistical methods for all NHANES analyses accounted for the
241 complex, multistage sampling design[62] and were weighted using the dietary recall day 2 sample
242 weights.

243 **Results**

244 **Face validity of the Discretionary Food Classification**

245 Of 6909 foods and beverages in the FNDDS (excluding formula and human milk), 4555 (66%)
246 were classified as discretionary based on the selected nutrient thresholds. Of these, 60% met one
247 threshold, 33% met two thresholds, and 7% met three or more thresholds. Sodium was the most
248 common threshold classifying discretionary foods (47%), followed by refined grains (41%),
249 added sugars (24%), saturated fat (20%), and percent fat by weight (16%). The number (%) of
250 foods classified as discretionary for each FNDDS food group and WWEIA food category
251 description are presented in **Table 1**. Vegetables contained the smallest proportion of
252 discretionary foods (18%), while snacks contained the largest proportion of discretionary foods
253 (97%). The fruit and beverage food groups had the smallest proportion of foods (<1%) that met
254 two nutrient thresholds, while sweets (50%) had the highest. Only snacks (4%), mixed dishes
255 (6%), and sweets (28%) had more than 2% of foods that met three or more thresholds. Within
256 the WWEIA categories, all milkshakes, frankfurters, pizza, nachos, potato chips, cookies and
257 brownies, doughnuts, and soft drinks were classified as discretionary. Conversely, none of the
258 low-fat or non-fat milk, grapes, melon, broccoli, spinach, string beans, or tomatoes were
259 classified as discretionary.

260 **Proportion of discretionary foods, ultra-processed foods, and hyperpalatable foods in**
261 **FNDDS**

The proportion of foods classified as >50% ultra-processed (32%) and hyperpalatable (62%) in the FNDDS were smaller than those classified as discretionary (66%). Twenty percent of foods met the criteria for all three classification methods, 6% were classified as both discretionary and >50% ultra-processed, 29% were classified as both discretionary and hyperpalatable, and 11% were classified only as discretionary (**Figure 2A**).



Figure 2. A) Venn diagram of the overlap between foods that meet the criteria to be classified as discretionary, hyperpalatable, and >50% ultra-processed. **B**) Radar plot showing the percent of

foods classified as discretionary, >50% ultra-processed, and hyperpalatable by FNDDS food group.

The percent of FNDDS foods classified as discretionary, hyperpalatable, and >50% ultra-processed by food group are displayed in **Figure 2B**. In each food group, more foods were classified as discretionary than ultra-processed. There was a smaller proportion of discretionary than hyperpalatable foods within the protein, grains, and vegetable groups, but a larger proportion of discretionary than hyperpalatable foods within the sugars, fats, snacks, and sweets groups.

The percent of FNDDS foods in each food group and category that were classified as discretionary, hyperpalatable, and ultra-processed are presented in **Table 2**. In the milk group, a substantially greater proportion of foods were classified as discretionary than ultra-processed, including most cheese, flavored milk, and milkshakes. Fewer differences were observed between discretionary and hyperpalatable classifications; however, a greater proportion of low-fat (53% vs 7%) and nonfat flavored milks (53% vs 0%) were classified as discretionary than hyperpalatable. Conversely, a greater proportion of reduced fat milks (not flavored) were classified as hyperpalatable than as discretionary (83% vs 17%). The discretionary classification method identified a greater proportion of protein foods than the ultra-processed classification, but a smaller proportion than the hyperpalatable classification. For example, more bacon (85% vs 8%), cold cuts (91% vs 51%), and ground beef (80% vs 0%) were classified as discretionary than ultra-processed. Conversely, a smaller proportion of legumes (13% vs 38%), beef (excluding ground) (68% vs 91%), chicken (whole pieces) (36% vs 94%), and nuts and seeds (5% vs 44%) were classified as discretionary than as hyperpalatable. Within the vegetable food group, a greater proportion of French fries (95% vs 75% or 64% respectively), fried vegetables

293 (97% vs 73% or 20%), and coleslaw (58% vs 42% or 0%) were classified as discretionary than
294 hyperpalatable or ultra-processed. Conversely, in nearly all the other vegetable subgroups, a
295 greater proportion of foods were classified as hyperpalatable than the other two methods. For
296 example, vegetables that met only the hyperpalatable criterion included baked sweet potato,
297 canned lima beans, and cooked cabbage, carrots, chard, pumpkin, and kohlrabi. A greater
298 proportion of fruits were classified as discretionary than the other two classification methods,
299 including high sugar canned fruits, fried fruits (e.g. banana chips), and chocolate covered fruits.
300 In snacks, sweets, and sugars food groups, a greater proportion of foods were classified as
301 discretionary than as ultra-processed or hyperpalatable.

302 ***Nutrient Density***

303 Differences in nutrient density by classification method are depicted in **Figure 3A.** Nutrient
304 density was significantly different between foods meeting criteria for discretionary, ultra-
305 processed, and hyperpalatable as compared with those that did not. The mean difference in
306 nutrient density by discretionary foods classification (mean diff: 74.8, 95% CI: 70.6-78.9) was
307 significantly greater than by either hyperpalatable (mean diff: 53.2, 95% CI:49.3-57.1) or ultra-
308 processed (mean diff: 29.7, 95% CI: 25.1-34.2) classification ($p<0.001$). Mean nutrient density
309 decreased linearly with increasing number of discretionary thresholds met, although there was no
310 significant difference between those meeting two versus three thresholds (**Figure 3B**). Foods
311 classified as 25-50% ultra-processed had a lower nutrient density than those that were 0-25%
312 ultra-processed, but did not differ from those that were greater than 50% ultra-processed (**Figure**
313 **3C**). A comparison of the nutrient and energy content for discretionary, hyperpalatable, and ultra-
314 processed foods is presented in **Table 3** in the supplemental materials.



Figure 3. A) Nutrient density according to food classification as discretionary, hyperpalatable, and >50% ultra-processed versus not. **B**) Nutrient density according to number of discretionary thresholds met. **C)** Nutrient density according to percent of food that is ultra-processed.

Evaluation of the association with diet quality in U.S adults and children ages 2 years and older

Table 4. Sample Characteristics	
	Mean ± SE or n (%)
Age (years)	39.4 ± 0.5
Race and Ethnicity	
Mexican American	863 (11)
Other Hispanic	509 (7)
Non-Hispanic White	2156 (60)
Non-Hispanic Black	1501 (12)
Non-Hispanic Asian	692 (5)
Other race - including multi-racial	415 (5)
Gender	
Male	2974 (49)
Female	3162 (51)
Family Income to Poverty Ratio	2.9 ± 0.1
Percent intake from discretionary foods	76.9 ± 0.6
Percent intake from hyperpalatable foods	70.6 ± 0.2
Percent intake from ultraprocessed foods	56.3 ± 0.6

Sample characteristics are presented in **Table 4**. Intake of discretionary foods contributed on average 77% of total energy, whereas intake of hyperpalatable foods contributed 71% and ultra-processed foods contributed 58%. Foods meeting only one discretionary food criterion contributed 42% of total energy intake, while foods meeting two criteria contributed 26% of energy intake, and foods meeting three or more criteria contributed 9% of energy intake. Discretionary foods contributed 94% of total added sugars, while hyperpalatable foods contributed 49%, and ultra-processed foods contributed 82%. Discretionary foods contributed 78% of total sodium intake, whereas hyperpalatable foods contributed 81% and ultra-processed foods contributed 56%.

Intake (% kcal) from discretionary, hyperpalatable, and ultra-processed foods was negatively correlated with HEI-2020 total, HEI-moderation, and HEI-adequacy scores (**Table 5**).

333 The magnitudes of the negative correlations of HEI-total and HEI-adequacy scores with
334 discretionary foods were larger than those with hyperpalatable and ultra-processed foods (p-
335 difference<0.0001). The magnitude of the negative correlation of HEI-moderation scores with
336 discretionary food intake was larger than that with hyperpalatable and ultra-processed intake (p-
337 difference <0.0001).

Table 5. Pearson Correlation of intake (% kcal) of Discretionary, Hyperpalatable, and Ultra-processed foods with Healthy Eating Index scores.

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Discretionary	-					
2. Hyperpalatable	0.38***	-				
3. Ultra-processed	0.53***	0.34***	-			
4. HEI	-0.72***	-0.40***	-0.49***	-		
5. HEI Moderation	-0.56***	-0.52***	-0.42***	0.81***	-	
6. HEI Adequacy	-0.67***	-0.23***	-0.43***	0.92***	0.51***	-

338 ***p<0.0001

339 **Discussion**

340 In this study, a new method for classifying discretionary foods demonstrated high face
341 validity, as evidenced by the high proportion of discretionary foods in the snacks, sweets, and
342 mixed dishes food groups (sensitivity), and the low proportion of discretionary foods in the
343 vegetable and fruit food groups (specificity). Additionally, more nutrient-poor foods, including a
344 greater proportion of sweets, snacks, and fried vegetables, were classified as discretionary than
345 as either hyperpalatable or ultra-processed, suggesting the discretionary food classification
346 method may have greater precision with respect to capturing unhealthy foods. In contrast, the
347 difference in nutrient density between non-discretionary versus discretionary foods was larger
348 than the difference between non-ultra-processed versus ultra-processed and non-hyperpalatable
349 versus hyperpalatable, suggesting the discretionary food classification method may also have
350 greater precision with respect to excluding healthy foods. The inverse associations of the

351 discretionary food score (reflecting percent energy intake from discretionary foods) with HEI-
352 2020 total, moderation, and adequacy components in U.S. children and adults further support the
353 construct alignment with respect to overall adherence to U.S. dietary guidelines.

354 Because foods may meet one or more of the discretionary food classification thresholds,
355 the method can be used categorically (discretionary versus non-discretionary) or ordinally
356 (number of thresholds met). Nutrient density was lower in discretionary versus non-discretionary
357 foods and decreased linearly with increasing number of thresholds met. Future research could
358 examine whether associations of discretionary food intake with health outcomes differ by the
359 number of discretionary thresholds met.

360 The moderate association of the discretionary food score with the HEI-2020 moderation
361 score suggests alignment with the DGA, but also indicates considerable non-overlapping
362 variance between the two scores. The discretionary food score may more precisely reflect intake
363 of nutrient-poor foods than the HEI-2020 moderation score,[39] as it accounts for nutrients not
364 fully captured in the HEI-2020 moderation score (e.g. unsaturated fat from chips and many
365 sweets), does not truncate intake, and does not capture nutrients from core foods (e.g., saturated
366 fat from low-fat milk or lean meat[63]). Future research elucidating whether these measures are
367 differentially related to health outcomes such as cardiometabolic risk factors would be
368 informative.

369 The discretionary food classification method was compared to food processing and
370 hyperpalatable food classifications given expected overlap in these constructs. However, the
371 three classifications are conceptually distinct. Although the hyperpalatable food definition is
372 nutrient based, it specifies combinations of nutrients thought to increase palatability, rather than
373 thresholds for single nutrients or food groups to limit.[32] While the hyperpalatable food measure

374 would be expected to effectively classify foods that are high in nutrients to limit, findings herein
375 suggest that the thresholds do not discriminate effectively between discretionary and non-
376 discretionary foods, as demonstrated by the classification of some non-discretionary foods as
377 hyperpalatable (e.g. starchy vegetables and legumes cooked with salt) and the classification of
378 some nutrient poor foods as non-hyperpalatable (e.g. ices, sorbets, and candy). In contrast to the
379 hyperpalatable food measure, ultra-processed foods are classified based on processing without
380 respect to nutrient value.[25] Since not all ultra-processed foods are nutrient poor (e.g.,
381 industrially-produced whole grain bread),[64] and not all discretionary foods are ultra-processed
382 (e.g., homemade desserts), the discretionary food score may help inform the extent to which
383 associations of ultra-processed food intake with health outcomes are attributable to their
384 nutritional properties or their industrial processing.[65,66]

385 The discretionary food classification method has utility for research, practice, and policy.
386 The ability to classify individual foods as discretionary or not may facilitate clearer consumer
387 guidance and could improve product labeling and clinical dietary education.[14] For example, in
388 2016, the Chilean government mandated warning labels on foods using similar nutrient
389 thresholds to the discretionary food classification. Evaluation of the policy showed that
390 consumers decreased overall intake of sugar, sodium, and saturated fat,[67,68] suggesting that
391 clearly labeled foods led to eating behavior changes. In addition, the discretionary food
392 classification method allows for monitoring and evaluating consumer purchasing behaviors and
393 the availability of discretionary foods in the food supply. For example, the discretionary food
394 classification can be used for surveilling the quality of restaurant foods. Finally, the discretionary
395 food score can be applied across widely varying diets using objective thresholds based on dietary
396 guidance and allows for comparison of findings across studies of diverse populations.

397 **Strengths and limitations**

398 Strengths of this study include the use of objective criteria from established dietary
399 guidelines to define discretionary foods and the application across the full U.S. food database.
400 The use of the FNDDS for classifying discretionary foods is easily implemented in any study
401 using NHANES WWEIA data or the National Cancer Institute Automated Self-Administered 24-
402 hour (ASA24®).[69] However, as the criteria were developed for FNDSS they will likely require
403 adaptation for use in studies based on other food and nutrient databases. Lastly, while self-
404 reported dietary intake data are susceptible to response bias, this may not impact comparisons of
405 classifications of foods as reported (since classification is applied after food reporting), unless
406 misreporting is differential by processing level or nutrient thresholds used by the classification
407 methods. For example, if individuals misreport foods high in sugars, saturated fat, and sodium,
408 then all classification methods would be similarly affected by misreporting.

409 **Conclusions**

410 These findings support the utility of the discretionary food classification method for
411 effectively identifying non-recommended foods with lower nutrient density and for quantifying
412 discretionary food intake, which is inversely related to adherence to dietary guidelines in the
413 U.S. population. By establishing nutrient-based criteria that effectively identify foods to limit,
414 the discretionary food measure has utility for diet quality assessment, behavioral nutrition
415 interventions, and food policy.

Table 1. WWEIA category description and n (%) of foods classified as discretionary and meeting each discretionary criterion by food group

Food Group	WWEIA Category description	Discretionary	Added sugars	Refined grains	Sodium	Total fat	Saturated fat
Milk (n=239)	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)	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)
	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)

Table 1. WWEIA category description and n (%) of foods classified as discretionary and meeting each discretionary criterion by food group

Food Group	WWEIA Category description	Discretionary	Added sugars	Refined grains	Sodium	Total fat	Saturated fat
Mixed dishes (n=1985)	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)
	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)

Table 1. WWEIA category description and n (%) of foods classified as discretionary and meeting each discretionary criterion by food group

Food Group	WWEIA Category description	Discretionary	Added sugars	Refined grains	Sodium	Total fat	Saturated fat
	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)
	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)
Grains (n=624)	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)	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)

Table 1. WWEIA category description and n (%) of foods classified as discretionary and meeting each discretionary criterion by food group

Food Group	WWEIA Category description	Discretionary	Added sugars	Refined grains	Sodium	Total fat	Saturated fat
Vegetables (n=645)	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)
	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)
	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)	-

Table 1. WWEIA category description and n (%) of foods classified as discretionary and meeting each discretionary criterion by food group

Food Group	WWEIA Category description	Discretionary	Added sugars	Refined grains	Sodium	Total fat	Saturated fat
Fats (n=120)	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)	-
	White potatoes, baked or boiled	15 (31.3)	0 (0)	0 (0)	15 (31.3)	0 (0)	-
	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)	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)	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)

Table 1. WWEIA category description and n (%) of foods classified as discretionary and meeting each discretionary criterion by food group

Food Group	WWEIA Category description	Discretionary	Added sugars	Refined grains	Sodium	Total fat	Saturated fat
Beverages (n=361)	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)
	Apple juice	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-	0 (0)
	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)	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)	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)

Table 1. WWEIA category description and n (%) of foods classified as discretionary and meeting each discretionary criterion by food group

Food Group	WWEIA Category description	Discretionary	Added sugars	Refined grains	Sodium	Total fat	Saturated fat
Alcohol and Water (n=111)	Sugars and honey	8 (100.0)	8 (100.0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-	0 (0)
	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)
	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)

416

Table 2. Heatmap showing percent of foods classified as discretionary, ultra-processed, and hyperpalatable by food category. The colors range from green (low percentage) to red (high percentage).

Food group	Category description	Discretionary	Ultra-Processed	Hyperpalatable
Milk	Cheese	87.7	21.1	82.5
	Cottage/ricotta cheese	37.5	18.8	37.5
	Flavored milk, lowfat	53.3	20.0	6.7
	Flavored milk, nonfat	52.9	29.4	0.0
	Flavored milk, reduced fat	63.6	13.6	86.4
	Flavored milk, whole	91.7	8.3	100.0
	Milk shakes and other dairy drinks	100.0	53.9	92.3
	Milk substitutes	77.8	55.6	55.6
	Milk, lowfat	0.0	0.0	28.6
	Milk, nonfat	0.0	0.0	14.3
	Milk, reduced fat	16.7	0.0	83.3
	Milk, whole	100.0	0.0	100.0
	Yogurt, Greek	64.3	64.3	50.0
	Yogurt, regular	47.1	64.7	47.1
Protein	Bacon	84.6	7.7	100.0
	Beans, peas, legumes	13.5	6.8	37.8
	Beef, excludes ground	68.4	0.0	90.8
	Chicken patties, nuggets and tenders	73.3	93.3	100.0
	Chicken, whole pieces	36.0	26.7	94.4
	Cold cuts and cured meats	91.0	50.8	92.5
	Eggs and omelets	72.9	6.6	57.6
	Fish	71.8	1.2	71.2
	Frankfurters	100.0	83.3	75.0
	Ground beef	80.0	0.0	80.0
	Lamb, goat, game	33.3	0.0	48.9
	Liver and organ meats	26.7	0.0	73.3
	Nuts and seeds	5.1	3.9	43.6
	Pork	61.5	0.0	90.4
	Processed soy products	23.8	33.3	61.9
	Sausages	74.1	92.6	100.0
	Shellfish	50.0	1.1	50.0
	Turkey, duck, other poultry	27.1	0.0	54.2
Mixed dishes	Bean, pea, legume dishes	50.0	8.3	91.7
	Burgers	95.2	87.3	98.4

	Burritos and tacos	100.0	18.9	92.5
	Cheese sandwiches	100.0	70.0	100.0
	Chicken/turkey sandwiches	96.9	62.5	81.3
	Egg rolls, dumplings, sushi	92.0	32.0	100.0
	Egg/breakfast sandwiches	100.0	82.6	100.0
	Frankfurter sandwiches	100.0	42.3	97.9
	Fried rice and lo/chow mein	93.3	2.2	86.7
	Macaroni and cheese	100.0	17.7	52.9
	Meat mixed dishes	84.0	9.4	79.3
	Nachos	100.0	28.6	100.0
	Other Mexican mixed dishes	77.1	29.5	73.8
	Other sandwiches	100.0	43.3	85.0
	Pasta mixed dishes, excludes macaroni and cheese	96.2	20.9	76.9
	Peanut butter and jelly sandwiches	57.1	82.1	100.0
	Pizza	100.0	82.4	100.0
	Poultry mixed dishes	97.2	13.8	82.8
	Rice mixed dishes	66.9	2.9	47.8
	Seafood mixed dishes	69.2	3.3	61.7
	Seafood sandwiches	95.0	30.0	100.0
	Soups	96.9	45.2	52.2
	Stir-fry and soy-based sauce mixtures	57.1	2.9	47.1
	Turnovers and other grain-based items	86.0	24.0	94.0
	Vegetable dishes	50.0	0.0	41.7
Grains	Bagels and English muffins	76.7	76.7	100.0
	Biscuits, muffins, quick breads	98.0	64.7	94.1
	Grits and other cooked cereals	56.7	3.0	23.9
	Oatmeal	29.6	22.7	13.6
	Pancakes, waffles, French toast	72.0	40.0	93.3
	Pasta, noodles, cooked grains	24.0	0.0	40.0

	Ready-to-eat cereal, higher sugar (>21.2g/100g)	87.2	98.8	76.7
	Ready-to-eat cereal, lower sugar (=<21.2g/100g)	35.4	95.8	79.2
	Rice	63.3	0.0	96.7
	Rolls and buns	79.5	84.6	100.0
	Tortillas	42.9	100.0	85.7
	Yeast breads	58.2	61.5	98.4
Fruit	Apples	57.1	14.3	14.3
	Bananas	50.0	0.0	0.0
	Blueberries and other berries	20.0	10.0	0.0
	Citrus fruits	9.1	0.0	0.0
	Dried fruits	26.3	5.3	5.3
	Grapes	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Mango and papaya	20.0	0.0	0.0
	Melons	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Other fruits and fruit salads	19.5	9.8	22.0
	Peaches and nectarines	33.3	0.0	0.0
	Pears	40.0	0.0	0.0
	Pineapple	20.0	0.0	0.0
	Strawberries	33.3	0.0	0.0
Vegetables	Broccoli	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Cabbage	0.0	0.0	36.4
	Carrots	5.0	0.0	65.0
	Coleslaw, non-lettuce salads	58.3	0.0	41.7
	Corn	0.0	5.0	40.0
	French fries and other fried white potatoes	95.5	63.6	75.0
	Fried vegetables	96.7	20.0	73.3
	Lettuce and lettuce salads	0.0	0.0	7.1
	Mashed potatoes and white potato mixtures	33.3	14.0	64.9
	Onions	0.0	0.0	25.0
	Other dark green vegetables	0.0	0.0	20.0
	Other red and orange vegetables	2.9	0.0	50.0
	Other starchy vegetables	2.2	0.0	17.4
	Other vegetables and combinations	0.0	0.0	21.9

	Spinach	0.0	0.0	26.7
	String beans	0.0	0.0	15.0
	Tomatoes	0.0	0.0	66.7
	Vegetables on a sandwich	0.0	0.0	0.0
	White potatoes, baked or boiled	31.3	0.0	14.6
Fats	Butter and animal fats	100.0	28.6	85.7
	Cream and cream substitutes	84.2	84.2	57.9
	Cream cheese, sour cream, whipped cream	85.7	50.0	57.1
	Margarine	66.7	66.7	91.7
	Mayonnaise	10.0	100.0	100.0
	Salad dressings and vegetable oils	39.2	56.9	62.8
Snacks	Cereal bars	100.0	84.9	75.8
	Crackers, excludes saltines	89.5	93.0	87.7
	Nutrition bars	100.0	100.0	69.2
	Popcorn	97.0	84.9	87.9
	Potato chips	100.0	86.7	86.7
	Pretzels/snack mix	100.0	75.6	100.0
	Saltine crackers	100.0	100.0	100.0
	Tortilla, corn, other chips	97.0	90.9	87.9
Sweets	Cakes and pies	99.5	31.2	91.4
	Candy containing chocolate	100.0	81.2	92.8
	Candy not containing chocolate	92.3	69.2	47.7
	Cookies and brownies	100.0	82.2	89.7
	Doughnuts, sweet rolls, pastries	100.0	60.0	81.4
	Gelatins, ices, sorbets	64.7	76.5	0.0
	Ice cream and frozen dairy desserts	86.9	90.2	88.5
	Pudding	81.5	44.4	81.5
Condiments	Dips, gravies, other sauces	65.6	19.7	96.7
	Mustard and other condiments	27.6	34.5	48.3
	Olives, pickles, pickled vegetables	66.7	20.0	36.7
	Pasta sauces, tomato-based	9.1	72.7	81.8

Sugars	Soy-based condiments	50.0	60.0	30.0
	Tomato-based condiments	33.3	83.3	33.3
	Jams, syrups, toppings	94.6	59.5	24.3
	Sugar substitutes	10.0	60.0	20.0
	Sugars and honey	100.0	0.0	0.0
Beverages	Apple juice	0.0	0.0	-
	Citrus juice	0.0	0.0	-
	Coffee	69.0	15.9	-
	Diet soft drinks	0.0	84.6	-
	Diet sport and energy drinks	25.0	66.7	-
	Fruit drinks	74.6	76.4	-
	Nutritional beverages	43.8	100.0	-
	Other diet drinks	0.0	100.0	-
	Other fruit juice	9.5	4.8	-
	Smoothies and grain drinks	32.0	20.0	-
	Soft drinks	100.0	85.7	-
	Sport and energy drinks	79.0	73.7	-
	Tea	31.0	40.5	-
	Vegetable juice	11.1	0.0	-
Alcohol and Water	Beer	100.0	0.0	-
	Bottled water	0.0	0.0	-
	Enhanced or fortified water	20.0	100.0	-
	Flavored or carbonated water	40.0	100.0	-
	Liquor and cocktails	100.0	61.5	-
	Tap water	0.0	0.0	-
	Wine	100.0	8.3	-

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. 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. National Health and Medical Research Council. *Australian Dietary Guidelines*. 2013.
14. 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
15. 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*. Sep 2023;123(9):1280-1288. doi:10.1016/j.jand.2023.05.015

16. 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
17. 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
18. Ortenzi F, Kolby M, Lawrence M, et al. Limitations of the Food Compass Nutrient Profiling System. *The Journal of Nutrition*. 2023/03/01/ 2023;153(3):610-614. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tjnut.2023.01.027
19. 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
20. 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
21. 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
22. 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
23. 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
24. Australian Bureau of Statistics. *Australian Health Survey: Users' Guide, 2011–13—Discretionary Food List*. 2014.
25. Monteiro CA, Cannon G, Levy RB, et al. Ultra-processed foods: what they are and how to identify them. *Public Health Nutrition*. 2019;22(5):936-941. doi:10.1017/S1368980018003762
26. Lane MM, Gamage E, Du S, et al. Ultra-processed food exposure and adverse health outcomes: umbrella review of epidemiological meta-analyses. *BMJ*. Feb 28 2024;384:e077310. doi:10.1136/bmj-2023-077310
27. Braesco V, Souchon I, Sauvant P, et al. Ultra-processed foods: how functional is the NOVA system? *European Journal of Clinical Nutrition*. 2022/09/01 2022;76(9):1245-1253. doi:10.1038/s41430-022-01099-1
28. Dicken SJ, Batterham RL, Brown A. Nutrients or processing? An analysis of food and drink items from the UK National Diet and Nutrition Survey based on nutrient content, the NOVA classification and front of package traffic light labelling. *British Journal of Nutrition*. 2024;131(9):1619-1632. doi:10.1017/S0007114524000096
29. Liu J, Steele E, Karageorgou D, Micha R, Monteiro C, Mozaffarian D. Consumption of Ultra-Processed Foods and Diet Quality Among U.S. Adults and Children. *Current Developments in Nutrition*. 2020/06/01/ 2020;4:nzaa046_043. doi:https://doi.org/10.1093/cdn/nzaa046_043
30. Rossato SL, Khandpur N, Lo C-H, et al. Intakes of Unprocessed and Minimally Processed and Ultraprocessed Food Are Associated with Diet Quality in Female and Male Health Professionals in the United States: A Prospective Analysis. *Journal of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics*. 2023;123(8):1140-1151.e2. doi:10.1016/j.jand.2023.03.011

31. Hess JM, Comeau ME, Casperson S, et al. Dietary Guidelines Meet NOVA: Developing a Menu for A Healthy Dietary Pattern Using Ultra-Processed Foods. *The Journal of Nutrition*. 2023/08/01/ 2023;153(8):2472-2481. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tjnut.2023.06.028
32. Fazzino TL, Rohde K, Sullivan DK. Hyper-Palatable Foods: Development of a Quantitative Definition and Application to the US Food System Database. *Obesity*. 2019/11/01 2019;27(11):1761-1768. doi:https://doi.org/10.1002/oby.22639
33. U.S. Department of Agriculture ARS. USDA Food and Nutrient Database for Dietary Studies 2017-2018. *Food Surveys Research Group Home Page*. 2020;
34. 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
35. 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*.
36. 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
37. National Center for Health Statistics. Ethics Review Board Approval. Accessed 3/6, 2025. https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/nhanes/about/erb.html
38. 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;
39. 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*. 2023/09/01/ 2023;123(9):1280-1288. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jand.2023.05.015
40. 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
41. 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
42. 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
43. 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
44. 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
45. 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
46. 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
47. 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

48. 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
49. 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
50. 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
51. 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
52. 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
53. 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
54. 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
55. 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
56. 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. *The Journal of Nutrition*. 2023/01/01/ 2023;153(1):225-241. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tjnut.2022.09.001
57. National Cancer Institute Division of Cancer Control & Population Sciences. Linking ASA24 and NHANES Data with the Nova Classification System for Industrial Food Processing. https://epi.grants.cancer.gov/nova/
58. Kennedy ET, Ohls J, Carlson S, Fleming K. The Healthy Eating Index: Design and Applications. *Journal of the American Dietetic Association*. 1995/10/01/ 1995;95(10):1103-1108. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/S0002-8223(95)00300-2
59. Program. NCIDoCCPSEaGR. Healthy Eating Index SAS Code. Accessed 4/10, 2024. https://epi.grants.cancer.gov/hei/sas-code.html
60. 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
61. *SAS Enterprise Miner 13.1*. SAS Institute Inc.;
62. 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*.
63. Täger M, Peltner J, Thiele S. Evaluation of diet quality by means of the Healthy Eating Index and its modified variants. *Ernährungs Umschau*. 2016;63:110-118.

64. Derbyshire E. Are all 'ultra-processed' foods nutritional demons? A commentary and nutritional profiling analysis. *Trends in Food Science & Technology*. 2019/12/01/ 2019;94:98-104. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tifs.2019.08.023
65. Astrup A, Monteiro CA, Ludwig DS. Does the concept of "ultra-processed foods" help inform dietary guidelines, beyond conventional classification systems? NO. *The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*. 2022/12/01/ 2022;116(6):1482-1488. doi:https://doi.org/10.1093/ajcn/nqac123
66. Visioli F, Del Rio D, Fogliano V, Marangoni F, Ricci C, Poli A. Ultra-processed foods and health: are we correctly interpreting the available evidence? *European Journal of Clinical Nutrition*. 2024/09/26 2024;doi:10.1038/s41430-024-01515-8
67. Taillie LS, Bercholz M, Popkin B, Rebolledo N, Reyes M, Corvalán C. Decreases in purchases of energy, sodium, sugar, and saturated fat 3 years after implementation of the Chilean food labeling and marketing law: An interrupted time series analysis. *PLOS Medicine*. 2024;21(9):e1004463. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1004463
68. Taillie LS, Bercholz M, Popkin B, Reyes M, Colchero MA, Corvalán C. Changes in food purchases after the Chilean policies on food labelling, marketing, and sales in schools: a before and after study. *The Lancet Planetary Health*. 2021;5(8):e526-e533. doi:10.1016/S2542-5196(21)00172-8
69. Subar AF, Kirkpatrick SI, Mittl B, et al. The Automated Self-Administered 24-hour dietary recall (ASA24): a resource for researchers, clinicians, and educators from the National Cancer Institute. *J Acad Nutr Diet*. Aug 2012;112(8):1134-7. doi:10.1016/j.jand.2012.04.016