Development and evaluation of a nutrient-based method of classifying moderation foods

Abstract

Background: While dietary guidelines recommend limiting foods high in added sugars, saturated fat, refined grains, and sodium, there is no criteria for identifying foods high in these components.

Objective: To evaluate a novel nutrient-based method to classify moderation foods and compare with two alternative methods.

Design: Face validity was assessed by examining the proportion of recommended and non-recommended foods classified as moderation using the 2017-2018 Food and Nutrient Database for Dietary Studies (FNDDS, n=6909). Convergent validity was evaluated by comparing nutrient density in moderation vs. non-moderation foods in FNDDS, and investigating correlations of moderation food intake with diet quality from 2-day dietary recalls. Results were compared with the hyperpalatable food and NOVA ultra-processed food classifications.

Participants: National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (2017-2018) non-pregnant participants aged 2+ years (n=6136) were included.

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

Statistical Analyses: T-tests and ANOVA evaluated differences in NRF by moderation, hyperpalatable, and ultra-processed classifications. Fisher's z-transformation compared associations of HEI-2020 with intake (%kcal) from moderation, hyperpalatable, and ultra-processed foods.

Results: More non-recommended (e.g., 97% of snacks) than recommended (e.g., 18% of vegetables) food groups were classified as moderation. NRF was significantly lower in moderation foods than non-moderation foods (mean diff: -74.8, 95%CI:-70.6 -78.9). The difference in NRF between moderation vs. non-moderation foods was larger than that between ultra-processed vs. non-ultra-processed (mean diff=-29.7, 95%CI:-25.1-34.2) and hyperpalatable vs. non-hyperpalatable foods (mean diff=-53.2, 95%CI:-49.3-57.1)(p-diff<0.001). Moderation food intake (% kcal) was correlated with HEI-2020 (r=-0.72), and associations were stronger than those with hyperpalatable (r=-0.40) or ultra-processed food intake (r=-0.49).

Conclusions: The moderation food classification method demonstrated strong face and convergent validity, and may improve diet quality assessment and 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] These foods are often energy-dense and may displace intake of nutrient-rich foods needed to meet nutritional requirements (i.e., "core foods").[1] However, the DGA do not provide criteria for identifying foods high in nutrients to limit. Given that people select and consume foods, not nutrients, establishing objective criteria for identifying foods that are high in nutrients to limit would facilitate accessible, food-based dietary guidance, policy, and intervention targets to improve diet quality.[13]

No current methods for evaluating diet and food quality enable the classification of foods high in dietary components to limit as specified in the DGA. For example, the Healthy Eating Index (HEI) – 2020, a measure of alignment of overall diet quality with the DGA, includes four moderation component scores corresponding to recommended maximum intakes of refined grains, sodium, added sugars, saturated fat.[14] These component scores are calculated based on intake of refined grains and sodium per 1000 kcal consumed, while added sugars and fatty acids component scores are based on the percent of total energy intake.[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. Nutrient profiling methods, such as the Nutrient Rich Food Index and the Food Compass methods, score individual foods on continuous scales based on nutrient content, but do not provide cut-off values for discriminating between moderation foods versus others.[15-17] Additionally, several government bodies have developed nutrient profiling methods for categorizing unhealthy versus healthy foods, primarily

56 for the purpose of regulating food advertising to children.[18-24] However, these metrics generally
57 do not align with the current DGA and cannot be applied to diet and nutrition databases for
58 evaluating intakes in the U.S. population.

59 The NOVA food processing classification method[25] and the Hyperpalatable Food Score
60 (cite) represent alternative methods for identifying foods to limit. The NOVA method classifies
61 foods as minimally processed, processed, culinary ingredients, or ultra-processed,[25] and the
62 proportion of energy intake from ultra-processed foods has been used as the primary dietary
63 exposure in hundreds of analyses.[26] However, the NOVA method intentionally avoids using
64 nutrient content for classifying foods, given the authors' emphasis on categorizing foods
65 according to production methods. Consequently, while there is considerable overlap between
66 ultra-processed and nutrient-poor foods,[27,28] many ultra-processed foods are nutrient-dense (e.g.,
67 packaged whole grain breads, low-sugar cereal), and several foods not classified as ultra-
68 processed are nutrient-poor (e.g., homemade pastries).[27,28] As such, although intake of ultra-
69 processed foods is typically associated with lower diet quality,[29,30] diets high in ultra-processed
70 foods can also be of high diet quality.[31] Additionally, most nutrient databases do not include the
71 information needed to objectively classify foods by level of processing (e.g., processing
72 methods, preservatives, additives), necessitating the use of subjective criteria that can lead to
73 inconsistent application of the method across studies.[27,32] The recently-developed Hyperpalatable
74 Food classification[33] is based on thresholds of nutrient combinations thought to increase
75 palatability and activate the brain's reward system, including fat plus sodium, fat plus simple
76 sugars, and carbohydrates plus sodium.[33] These criteria were developed based on an evaluation
77 of the nutrient composition of approximately 75 foods from 14 peer-reviewed articles that
78 described these foods using one of eight terms (i.e., "palatable", "highly palatable",

79 “hyperpalatable”, “tasty”, “palatability”).[33] However, the method classified several nutrient-
80 dense foods (e.g. chives, arugula) as hyperpalatable, while classifying several nutrient-poor
81 foods (e.g. fried vegetables, gummy bears, high-sugar fruit snacks) as non-hyperpalatable,[33]
82 which would lead to misclassification if used to identify moderation foods.

83 A standardized, objective approach for identifying moderation foods at the food level
84 would enable consistent application across studies and facilitate direct translation of dietary
85 guidance into actionable intervention targets and public health initiatives aimed at improving diet
86 quality in the US. To address this gap, this study aimed to develop and evaluate a nutrient-based
87 method for classifying moderation foods corresponding to the DGA, using quantitative
88 thresholds for measurable nutritional components. The Food and Nutrient Database for Nutrition
89 Studies (FNDDS) was used to evaluate how well the method distinguishes between foods
90 according to nutrient density, and dietary recalls from the What We Eat In America (WWEIA)
91 component of the National Health and Nutrition Examination Study (NHANES) were used to
92 examine whether higher intake of moderation foods is related to overall diet quality.

93 **Methods**

94 **Data sources**

95 ***FNDDS***

96 The 2017-2018 United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) FNDDS[34] was used to evaluate
97 nutrient thresholds for classifying moderation foods. This dataset contains nutrient values for
98 7083 individual foods and beverages consumed in the United States. The accompanying Food
99 Patterns Equivalents Database (FPED)[35] converts the foods and beverages to their corresponding
100 USDA food patterns components (i.e., teaspoon equivalents of added sugars, gram equivalents of
101 saturated fat, and cup equivalents of grains).

102 ***NHANES***

103 The 2017-2018 NHANES[36,37] was used to evaluate percent energy intake from moderation foods
104 with respect to person-level diet quality. NHANES is a cross-sectional, nationally representative
105 survey of health and nutrition in the United States. Estimates based on weighted samples from
106 each NHANES cycle are representative of the U.S. civilian noninstitutionalized resident
107 population,[38] and analyses of recalls are suitable for estimating mean population level intakes
108 from foods and beverages.[37] The National Center for Health Statistics Ethics Review Board
109 approved the study,[39] and all participants provide written consent.[37] The dietary intake portion of
110 the survey, What We Eat in America (WWEIA), collects 24-hour dietary recalls from individuals
111 of all ages using the interviewer-administered five-step USDA Automated Multiple-Pass
112 Method.[37,40] Dietary recalls are proxy-reported for children 5 years and younger and proxy-
113 assisted for children ages 6-11 years. The sample used for this analysis includes all participants
114 aged two years and older who had two reliable dietary recalls from the 2017-2018 NHANES
115 cycle. Of 6502 participants with two reliable dietary recalls, pregnant individuals (n=44) and
116 participants under two years of age (n=322) were excluded. The final sample included 6136
117 participants.

118 **Development of the Moderation Food Classification Method**

119 Thresholds for defining moderation foods were based on scoring standards for the HEI – 2020,[41]
120 the 2020-2025 DGA,[1] the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) consumer guidance,[42,43] and the
121 2021 American Heart Association (AHA) Guidance for Cardiovascular Health Promotion and
122 Disease Reduction.[44] The primary dietary components considered included added sugars,
123 saturated and total fats, sodium, refined grains, and alcohol, based on guidance from the DGA
124 and AHA to limit intakes of these components. Initial cut-points were evaluated for face validity

125 with respect to food categorizations using FNDDS (described in detail below), and modifications
126 were applied as appropriate. Since the moderation food criteria are based on dietary
127 recommendations for people over age two years, infant formula and human milk were excluded
128 from these analyses.

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 moderation 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 not classified as
140 moderation foods since they contained primarily unsaturated fat. To address these weaknesses,
141 the saturated fat criterion was not applied to the vegetable food group, and several thresholds of
142 total fat were evaluated for classifying fried vegetables, high-fat snacks, and sweets as
143 moderation foods. A threshold of ≥9% total fat by weight aligned most closely with expected
144 classifications, and was, therefore, applied to these food groups. The threshold of ≥20% kcal
145 from saturated fat was 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.[41]

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).[42,43]
152 The food weight for "quantity not specified" in the FNDDS Portions and Weights[34] 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 moderation. However, this criterion resulted in misclassification of several grain-based
158 foods because sprouted grain bread, corn tortillas, and other foods made from masa are labeled
159 as refined grains in FNDDS, which resulted in their classification as moderation foods. Since this
160 labeling practice conflicts with guidance in WIC,[45] the National School Lunch Program,[46] and
161 the Child and Adult Care Food Program,[47] which define these foods as whole grains, an
162 additional threshold based on the American Heart Association whole grain definition[44] was
163 added, such that foods with a carbohydrate to fiber ratio of ≥10:1 and >50% of total grains from
164 refined grains were classified as moderation foods. Additionally, to avoid misclassifying mixed
165 dishes containing only a small amount of refined grains (e.g., soup thickened with cornstarch),
166 the grain criteria were applied only to foods containing at least 0.5 ounce-equivalents of total
167 grains.
168 **Alcohol.** Based on the DGA guidance to limit alcohol intake,[1] all alcoholic beverages were
169 classified as moderation.

170 **Final Criteria.** The final criteria for classifying moderation foods are presented in **Figure 1**. Any
171 food meeting at least one of the thresholds is classified as a moderation food. In addition to the
172 dichotomous moderation food classification system, an ordinal classification method was created
173 by summing the number of thresholds met.

174 Finally, based on the DGA core elements of a healthy diet[1] and HEI-2020 adequacy
175 components, it was determined that no whole plant foods (i.e. whole fruit, vegetables, whole
176 grains, legumes, nuts, or seeds) should be classified as a moderation food. Only three food items
177 (Brazil nuts, fresh coconut, and avocado [raw or for use on a sandwich]) were misclassified (due
178 to their naturally occurring fat), so these were recoded manually as not moderation foods.

Figure 1. Criteria for classification of foods as Moderation

	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	

179

180 **Evaluation of the moderation food classification method**

181 **Face validity.** Face validity of initial and revised criteria was assessed by examining the
182 proportion of foods classified as moderation in food groups consistently referred to in the
183 literature as moderation foods or nutrient-dense foods. For example, foods referred to as
184 moderation, discretionary, junk, or extra in the literature include sweets, salty snacks, sugar
185 sweetened beverages, high sugar cereal, processed meats, fried potatoes, and high-fat fast food
186 (e.g. pizza, chicken nuggets),[48-63] and therefore, a high proportion should be classified as

187 moderation foods. In contrast, foods referred to as nutrient-dense in the DGA include
188 "vegetables, fruits, whole grains, seafood, beans, peas, and lentils, unsalted nuts and seeds, eggs,
189 fat-free and low-fat dairy products, and lean meats and poultry" that are prepared with minimal
190 amounts of added sugars, saturated fats, and sodium,[1] and therefore few to none should be
191 classified as moderation foods. Criteria that effectively classified these key foods as moderation
192 or non-moderation, accordingly, were considered to have strong face validity.

193 **Convergent validity.** Convergent validity of nutrient profile methods involves examining
194 correlations with existing, theoretically related measures.[64] Convergent validity of the
195 moderation food classification method at the food level was evaluated by examining differences
196 in nutrient density between moderation and non-moderation foods. Additionally, convergent
197 validity of moderation food intake at the diet level was evaluated by examining associations with
198 diet quality.[36,37]

199 **Comparisons with other food classification methods.** Differences in nutrient density between
200 moderation and non-moderation foods, and correlations between intake of these foods and diet
201 quality, were compared across the moderation, NOVA ultra-processed, and hyperpalatable food
202 score classifications. Since the moderation food criteria were designed to identify foods high in
203 nutrients to limit, it should demonstrate greater precision in identifying moderation foods and
204 stronger associations with diet quality and nutrient density than the ultra-processed or
205 hyperpalatable food classifications.

206 **Measures**

207 ***Nutrient density.*** Nutrient density for foods in FNDSS was evaluated using the Nutrient Rich
208 Foods Index (NRF 9.3), which is calculated as the sum of the percent of the daily recommended
209 values of nutrients to encourage (protein, fiber, vitamin A, vitamin C, Vitamin E, calcium, iron,

210 magnesium, and potassium) minus the percent of the maximum recommended daily value for
211 nutrients to limit (saturated fat, added sugars, and sodium). Higher scores indicate higher nutrient
212 density.[65]
213 ***Diet quality.*** Diet quality was assessed using The Healthy Eating Index–2020 (HEI-2020), which
214 reflects adherence to the 2020-2025 Dietary Guidelines for Americans.[41] The HEI-2020 total
215 score is calculated as the sum of 13 component scores, including 9 adequacy components (for
216 which higher intake earns more points) and 4 moderation components (for which lower intake
217 earns more points). Scores are calculated using density standards (e.g., per 1,000 kilocalories) to
218 account for differences in energy requirements. Scores for each component are truncated,
219 whereby maximum scores are assigned when intake meets or exceeds the recommended level for
220 adequacy components, or when intake reaches or falls below a threshold for moderation
221 components. Conversely, a minimum score of zero is assigned when intake is at or below the
222 minimum threshold for adequacy components, or exceeds the maximum threshold for
223 moderation components. HEI-2020[41,66] total scores (range 0-100), HEI-2020 adequacy scores
224 (range 0-60), and HEI-2020 moderation scores (range 0-40) were calculated for each participant
225 in NHANES using the simple scoring algorithm.[67] The HEI-2020 adequacy score sums of the
226 components representing total fruit, whole fruits, total vegetables, greens and beans, whole
227 grains, dairy, total protein foods, seafoods and plant proteins, and fatty acids. The moderation
228 score sums the components representing refined grains, sodium, added sugars, and saturated fats.
229 Higher total, adequacy, and moderation scores represent closer alignment with the DGA.[41]
230 ***Ultra-processed Foods***. Ultra-processed foods were classified using a linkage database created
231 by researchers at the University de Sao Paulo and the NCI,[68,69] which assigns one of the four
232 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 moderation 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 score method 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.[33] The person-level percent of daily energy intake from hyperpalatable foods was calculated for each participant in NHANES.

Statistical Analysis

The statistical programming code used to implement the moderation food classification method and calculate percent intake from moderation foods is provided in the supplemental materials. All analyses were completed in SAS 9.4,[70] and statistical significance was set at $p<0.05$.

Food-level evaluation. The number, energy (kcal), added sugars (% kcal), refined grains (% grams), saturated fat (% kcal), and sodium (mg) content of moderation, hyperpalatable, and ultra-processed foods were summarized and compared using FNDDS. Convergent validity was assessed by comparing nutrient density between moderation and non-moderation foods. To compare moderation, hyperpalatable, and ultra-processed food classifications, radar charts were used to visualize differences in the percent of foods in each FNDDS food group classified by each method. Additionally, differences in nutrient density across the three methods were compared using t-tests; ANOVA was used to compare mean differences in food-level nutrient

density by food classification method, using Bonferroni correction to account for multiple comparisons.

Diet-level evaluation. Moderation food intake at the diet level was evaluated using the WWEIA dietary recall data from the 2017 – 2018 cycle of NHANES. The percent of intake of energy (kcal), added sugars (g), and sodium (mg) from moderation, hyperpalatable, and ultra-processed foods were calculated. Convergent validity at the diet-level was assessed by estimating correlations (Pearson's ρ) of moderation food intake (% kcal) with HEI-2020, HEI-2020-moderation, and HEI-2020-adequacy scores. Fisher's z-transformation compared correlations of diet quality across all three classification methods. Design-based statistical methods for all NHANES analyses accounted for the complex, multistage sampling design[71] and were weighted using the dietary recall 2 day sample weights.

Results

Food-level evaluation

The moderation food classification method identified 4555 (66%) of 6909 foods and beverages in FNDDS (excluding formula and human milk) as moderation foods. Of these, 60% met one threshold, 33% met two thresholds, and 7% met three or more thresholds. Sodium was the most frequent threshold classifying moderation foods (47%), followed by refined grains (41%), added sugars (24%), saturated fat (20%), and percent fat by weight (16%).

Face validity of the Moderation Food Classification Method

The number (%) of foods classified as moderation foods for each FNDDS food group and WWEIA food category description are presented in **Table 1**. Vegetables contained the smallest proportion of moderation foods (18%), while snacks contained the largest proportion (97%). The fruit and beverage food groups contained the smallest proportion of foods (<1%) that met two

nutrient thresholds, while sweets (50%) contained the highest. Only snacks (4%), mixed dishes (6%), and sweets (28%) contained more than 2% of foods that met three or more thresholds. Within the WWEIA categories, all milkshakes, frankfurters, pizza, nachos, potato chips, cookies and brownies, doughnuts, and soft drinks were classified as moderation foods. Conversely, none of the low-fat or non-fat milk, grapes, melon, broccoli, spinach, string beans, or tomatoes were classified as moderation foods.

Comparison of proportion of foods classified as moderation foods, ultra-processed foods, and hyperpalatable foods in FNDDS

Fewer FNDDS foods were classified as >50% ultra-processed (32%) or hyperpalatable (62%) than moderation (66%) (Table 1). Twenty percent of foods met the criteria for all three classification methods, 6% were classified as both moderation and >50% ultra-processed, 29% were classified as both moderation and hyperpalatable, and 11% were classified only as moderation (**Figure 2A**).

A.


Moderation
775
1975
404
1401
Ultra-processed
158
Hyperpalatable
639

B.


Moderation
>50% Ultra-processed
Hyperpalatable
Milk
Protein
Mixed Dishes
Grains
Fruit
Vegetables
Snacks
Sweets
Fats
Condiments
Sugars
Beverages
Alcohol and Water
Other
100.00
90.00
80.00
70.00
60.00
50.00
40.00
30.00
20.00
10.00
0.00

291

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

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

The percent of FNDDS foods in each WWEIA food group subcategory that were classified as moderation, hyperpalatable, and ultra-processed are presented in **Table 2**. Overall, more milk foods were classified as moderation than as ultra-processed. For example, 88% of cheeses, 92% of whole flavored milk, 64% of reduced fat flavored milk, and 100% of milkshakes and other dairy drinks were classified as moderation, while only 21% of cheeses, 8% of whole flavored milk, 14% of reduced fat flavored milk, and 54% of milk shakes and other dairy drinks were classified as ultra-processed. There were fewer differences in the percent of milk foods classified as moderation versus hyperpalatable, except that more low-fat (53% vs 7%) and nonfat flavored milks (53% vs 0%) were classified as moderation than as hyperpalatable, while more reduced fat milks (not flavored) were classified as hyperpalatable than as moderation (83% vs 17%).

The proportion of protein foods classified as moderation was greater than the proportion classified as ultra-processed, and smaller than the proportion classified as hyperpalatable. For example, more bacon (85% vs 8%), cold cuts (91% vs 51%), and ground beef (80% vs 0%) were classified as moderation than ultra-processed, while 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 moderation than as hyperpalatable.

Within the vegetable food group, a larger proportion of French fries (95% vs 75% or 64% respectively), fried vegetables (97% vs 73% or 20%), and coleslaw (58% vs 42% or 0%) were classified as moderation than as hyperpalatable or ultra-processed. Conversely, in nearly all the other vegetable subgroups, a larger proportion of foods were classified as hyperpalatable than the other two methods. For example, vegetables that met only the hyperpalatable criterion included baked sweet potato, canned lima beans, and cooked cabbage, carrots, chard, pumpkin, and kohlrabi.

A greater proportion of fruits were classified as moderation than the other two classification methods, including high sugar canned fruits, fried fruits (e.g. banana chips), and chocolate covered fruits. A larger proportion of snacks, sweets, and sugars were classified as moderation than as ultra-processed or hyperpalatable.

Nutrient Density

The nutrient and energy content of moderation, hyperpalatable, and ultra-processed foods is presented in **Table 3** in the supplemental materials.

Convergent validity. Mean nutrient density was significantly lower in moderation foods than non-moderation foods (mean diff: -74.8, 95% CI: -70.6-$^{-}$78.9) (**Figure 3A**). Mean nutrient density decreased linearly with increasing number of moderation thresholds met, although there was no significant difference between those meeting two versus three thresholds (**Figure 3B**).



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

340 *Comparisons across methods.* Nutrient density was significantly different between foods
341 meeting criteria for ultra-processed and hyperpalatable as compared with those that did not
342 (**Figure 3A)**. The mean difference in nutrient density by the moderation foods classification
343 (mean diff: -74.8, 95% CI: -70.6-¯78.9) was greater than by either the hyperpalatable (mean diff:
344 -53.2, 95% CI:-49.3-¯57.1) or ultra-processed (mean diff: -29.7, 95% CI: -25.1-¯34.2)
345 classifications (p-diff <0.001). Mean nutrient density was lower for foods classified as 0%-25%
346 ultra-processed versus those classified as 25-50% ultra-processed, but there was no difference in
347 mean nutrient density between foods 25 – 50% ultra-processed and those classified as >50%
348 ultra-processed (**Figure 3C**).

349 **Diet-level evaluation**

350 NHANES sample characteristics are presented in **Table 4**. Moderation foods contributed on
351 average 77% of total energy intake, whereas hyperpalatable foods contributed 71% and ultra-
352 processed foods contributed 58%. Foods meeting only one moderation food criterion contributed
353 42% of total energy intake, while foods meeting two criteria contributed 26% of energy intake,
354 and foods meeting three or more criteria contributed 9% of energy intake. Moderation foods
355 contributed 94% of total added sugars, while hyperpalatable foods contributed 49%, and ultra-
356 processed foods contributed 82%. Moderation foods contributed 78% of total sodium intake,
357 whereas hyperpalatable foods contributed 81% and ultra-processed foods contributed 56%.

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 moderation foods	76.9 ± 0.6
Percent intake from hyperpalatable foods	70.6 ± 0.2
Percent intake from ultraprocessed foods	56.3 ± 0.6

Convergent validity. Intake from moderation foods was negatively correlated with HEI-2020 total, HEI-moderation, and HEI-adequacy scores (**Table 5**).

Comparisons of classification methods. The magnitudes of the negative correlations of HEI-total, HEI-moderation scores, and HEI-adequacy scores with moderation foods (**Table 5**) were larger than those with hyperpalatable and ultra-processed foods (p-difference<0.0001).

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

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Moderation	-					
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***	-

***p<0.0001

Discussion

This study developed a nutrient-based method applying standardized thresholds for nutritional components to classify moderation foods, i.e., foods high in nutrients to limit. The classification method demonstrated high face validity, as evidenced by the large proportion of moderation foods in the snacks, sweets, and mixed dishes food groups, and the small proportion of moderation foods in the vegetable and fruit food groups. Additionally, a larger proportion of

372 sweets, snacks, and fried vegetables were classified as moderation foods than as hyperpalatable
373 or ultra-processed, suggesting the moderation food classification method more accurately
374 classifies unhealthy foods as compared with these alternative methods. The moderation food
375 classification method demonstrated strong convergent validity at the food level, as indicated by
376 the significant difference in nutrient density between moderation versus non-moderation foods,
377 and the negative relationship of the number of moderation thresholds met with nutrient density.
378 The difference in nutrient density between moderation versus non-moderation foods was also
379 larger than the difference between ultra-processed versus non-ultra-processed and hyperpalatable
380 versus non-hyperpalatable foods, suggesting the moderation food classification method
381 discriminates based on nutrient density more accurately than these alternative methods. The
382 measure also demonstrated strong convergent validity at the person level, as evidenced by the
383 negative association of moderation food intake with HEI-2020 scores. Furthermore, moderation
384 food intake (% kcal) was more strongly negatively correlated with HEI-2020 scores than
385 hyperpalatable food or ultra-processed food intake, demonstrating the closer alignment of the
386 moderation food classification method in identifying dietary patterns consistent with lower
387 adherence to the DGA.

388 Although the positive association of moderation food intake with the HEI-2020
389 moderation score indicates alignment with the DGA, the magnitude of the association suggests
390 non-overlapping variance between the two scores. Moderation food intake calculated using the
391 food-based method may more precisely reflect intake of nutrient-poor foods than the HEI-2020
392 moderation score,[41] as it does not truncate intake and accounts for some nutrients not explicitly
393 captured in the HEI-2020 moderation score, such as unsaturated fat from chips and many sweets.
394 Additionally, while the HEI-2020 moderation score includes nutrients to limits coming from core

395 foods (e.g., saturated fat from low-fat milk or lean meat[72]), these are not counted as moderation
396 food intake using the food-based method. Future research elucidating whether moderation food
397 intake and HEI-2020-moderation scores are differentially related to health outcomes would be
398 informative.

399 Although the moderation food classification method was compared to ultra-processed and
400 hyperpalatable food classifications given hypothesized overlap between these constructs, the
401 three classifications are conceptually distinct. The hyperpalatable food classification is nutrient
402 based, but specifies combinations of nutrients thought to increase palatability, rather than
403 thresholds for single nutrients or food groups to limit.[33] While the hyperpalatable food score
404 would be hypothesized to effectively classify foods that are high in nutrients to limit, findings
405 herein suggest that the thresholds do not demonstrate strong face validity, as demonstrated by the
406 classification of several core foods as hyperpalatable (e.g. starchy vegetables and legumes
407 cooked with salt) and some non-core foods as non-hyperpalatable (e.g. ices, sorbets, and candy).
408 In contrast to the hyperpalatable food classification method, the NOVA method classifies foods
409 based on processing without respect to nutrient content.[25] Since some ultra-processed foods are
410 nutrient dense (e.g., industrially-produced whole grain bread),[73] and some non-core foods are not
411 ultra-processed (e.g., homemade desserts), the moderation food classification method may help
412 inform whether associations of ultra-processed food intake with health outcomes are attributable
413 to their nutritional content or their industrial processing.[74-76]

414 The moderation food classification method has utility for research, practice, and policy.
415 The ability to classify individual moderation foods may facilitate actionable consumer guidance
416 and could improve product labeling and clinical dietary education.[13] For example, in 2016, the
417 Chilean government mandated warning labels on foods using nutrient thresholds similar to the

418 current moderation food classification. The policy led to decreased intake of sugar, sodium, and
419 saturated fat,[77,78] suggesting that clearly labeled foods can improve eating behaviors. In addition,
420 the moderation food classification method could be used to monitor and evaluate consumer
421 purchasing behaviors and the availability of moderation foods in the food supply, such as in
422 restaurants or schools. The moderation food classification method may also support Food is
423 Medicine[79] approaches by facilitating delivery of foods that contribute to positive health
424 outcomes. Finally, this objective, nutrient-based method can be applied across widely varying
425 diets and allows for comparison of findings across studies of diverse populations.

426 **Strengths and limitations**

427 Strengths of this study include the use of objective criteria applied to the FNDDS database,
428 which support the internal validity and generalizability of the classification method. The use of
429 FNDDS for classifying moderation foods is a strength, as it is a comprehensive database for
430 foods consumed by the U.S. population and is easily implemented with NHANES WWEIA data
431 or the National Cancer Institute Automated Self-Administered 24-hour dietary recall
432 (ASA24®).[80] However, as the criteria were developed for FNDSS, they will likely require
433 adaptation for use in studies based on other nutrient databases. Another strength is the use of a
434 large, nationally representative sample of the civilian, noninstitutionalized U.S. population to
435 estimate associations of moderation food intake with overall diet quality. Limitations include the
436 use of self-reported dietary intake data, which are susceptible to response bias. However, this is
437 not expected to impact comparisons of classifications of foods as reported (since classification is
438 applied after food reporting), unless misreporting is differential by processing level or nutrient
439 thresholds used by the classification methods. For example, if individuals misreport foods high

440 in sugars, saturated fat, and sodium, then all classification methods would be similarly affected
441 by misreporting.

442 **Conclusions**

443 These findings support the validity of the moderation food classification method for identifying
444 foods with lower nutrient density and for quantifying moderation food intake, which is inversely
445 related to adherence to dietary guidelines in the U.S. population. By establishing quantitative
446 nutrient-based criteria that effectively identify foods high in nutrients to limit, the moderation
447 food classification method has utility for diet quality assessment, behavioral nutrition
448 interventions, and food policy.

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

Food Group	WWEIA Category description	Moderation	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)
	Nuts and seeds	4 (5.1)	4 (5.1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-	1 (1.3)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Food Group	WWEIA Category description	Moderation	Added sugars	Refined grains	Sodium	Total fat	Saturated fat
Fats (n=120)	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)
	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)

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

Food Group	WWEIA Category description	Moderation	Added sugars	Refined grains	Sodium	Total fat	Saturated fat
Beverages (n=361)	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)
	Sugars and honey	8 (100.0)	8 (100.0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-	0 (0)
Alcohol and Water (n=111)	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)

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

Food Group	WWEIA Category description	Moderation	Added sugars	Refined grains	Sodium	Total fat	Saturated fat
	Wine	12 (100.0)	3 (25.0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-	0 (0)

449

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

Food group	Category description	Moderation	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
	Bagels and English muffins	76.7	76.7	100.0
	Biscuits, muffins, quick breads	98.0	64.7	94.1
Grains	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	-

450

451

Supplemental materials

Table 3. Comparison of Nutrients for Moderation, Hyperpalatable, and Ultra-processed foods in the FNDDS (mean±SD)

	Nutrient Rich Food Index	Energy per 100 g (kcal)	Percent Added Sugars	Sodium (mg)	Percent Saturated Fat	Percent Whole Grains	Carbohydrate to Fiber ratio
Moderation							
Yes	12.1 ±32.0	229±132	12.0 ±20.3	407.7±361.1	12.5 ±10.2	7.0±22.7	21.3±45.2
No	86.9±135.4	144±140	1.3 ±3.8	233.8±299.3	7.3±6.4	10.0±28.5	8.0±24.7
Moderation Categories							
1	16.8±37.7	199±132	12.3±23.1	388.3±393.5	10.9±10.5	8.2±25.1	18.4±49.9
2	7.2±18.9	261±119	10.3±14.8	440.6±321.4	14.1±9.4	5.7±19.6	24.3±38.2
3 or 4	-4.4±11.1	343±93.4	17.4±14.8	419.2±196.0	17.6±7.5	2.8±10.3	32.5±26.0
Ultra-processed[1]							
Yes (1)	17.2±88.3	266±148	15.3±21.5	416.7±71.5	10.7±9.8	12.5±28.7	23.6±59.1
No (0)	46.9±89.4	170±126	5.1 ±13.9	316.4±336.4	10.8±9.2	5.9 ±22.5	13.6 ±25.9
Hyperpalatable							
Yes (1)	17.4±37.2	242±127	6.7 ±11.8	457.2±303.4	13.1±9.1	9.3 ±25.8	17.4±30.0
No (0)	70.6±117.8	149±142	7.4 ±18.8	206.0±79.6	7.7±8.8	7.2 ±25.1	15.3±54.6

452 [1]Foods comprised of more than 50% ultra-processed ingredients were designated as ultra-processed.

453

454

455

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, Colditz GA, Stampfer MJ, Willett WC, Hu FB. 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, Mursu J, Hayashino Y, Bhupathiraju SN, Forouhi NG. 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, Rogers GT, Ma J, Saltzman E, McKeown NM. 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. 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
18. Australian Bureau of Statistics. *Australian Health Survey: Users' Guide, 2011–13—Discretionary Food List*. 2014.
19. National Health and Medical Research Council. *Australian Dietary Guidelines*. 2013.
20. Department of Health. *Nutrient profiling technical guidance*. 2011. https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5a7cdac7e5274a2c9a484867/dh_123492.pdf
21. Santé publique France. Nutri-Score Scientific and Technical Questions and Answers. Saint-Maurice: Santé publique France. Accessed 4/30, 2025. https://www.santepubliquefrance.fr/determinants-de-sante/nutrition-et-activite-physique/articles/nutri-score
22. World Health Organization. WHO Regional Office for Europe nutrient profile model. *WHO Regional Office for Europe nutrient profile model*. 2023.
23. Pan American Health Organization. *Pan American health organization nutrient profile model*. 2016. https://iris.paho.org/bitstream/handle/10665.2/18621/9789275118733_eng.pdf
24. Australian Government. Australia New Zealand Food Standards Code – Standard 1.2.7 – Nutrition, Health and Related Claims (F2015C00967). Accessed 4/30, 2025. https://www.legislation.gov.au/F2013L00054/latest/text
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, Haurogné T, Maillot M, Féart C, Darmon N. 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. O'Connor LE, Herrick KA, Papier K. Handle with care: challenges associated with ultra-processed foods research. *International Journal of Epidemiology*. 2024;53(5)doi:10.1093/ije/dyae106
33. 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
34. U.S. Department of Agriculture ARS. USDA Food and Nutrient Database for Dietary Studies 2017-2018. *Food Surveys Research Group Home Page*. 2020;
35. 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
36. 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*.
37. 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
38. National Center for Health Statistics. Weighting. Accessed 04/19/25, 2025. https://wwwn.cdc.gov/nchs/nhanes/tutorials/weighting.aspx?utm_source=perplexity
39. National Center for Health Statistics. Ethics Review Board Approval. Accessed 3/6, 2025. https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/nhanes/about/erb.html
40. 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;
41. 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
42. 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
43. 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
44. 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
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. 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
49. 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
50. 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
51. 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
52. 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
53. 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
54. 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
55. 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
56. 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
57. 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
58. 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
59. 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
60. 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
61. 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
62. 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

63. 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
64. Townsend MS. Where is the science? What will it take to show that nutrient profiling systems work?1234. *The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*. 2010/04/01/ 2010;91(4):1109S-1115S. doi:https://doi.org/10.3945/ajcn.2010.28450F
65. 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
66. 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
67. Program. NCIDoCCPSEaGR. Healthy Eating Index SAS Code. Accessed 4/10, 2024. https://epi.grants.cancer.gov/hei/sas-code.html
68. 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
69. 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/
70. *SAS Enterprise Miner 13.1*. SAS Institute Inc.;
71. 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*.
72. 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.
73. 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
74. 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
75. 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
76. PromSchmidt C, Villano D, Hess J. Perspectives on Ultraprocessed Food Research: Critical Questions and Next Steps. *Nutrition Today*. 2025;60(2):53-58. doi:10.1097/nt.0000000000000740
77. 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
78. 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
79. Volpp KG, Berkowitz SA, Sharma SV, et al. Food Is Medicine: A Presidential Advisory From the American Heart Association. *Circulation*. 2023/10/31 2023;148(18):1417-1439. doi:10.1161/CIR.0000000000001182

80. 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