

TITLE PAGE

Manuscript title: Ultra-processed food consumption in UK adolescents: distribution, trends, and sociodemographic correlates using the National Diet and Nutrition Survey 2008/09 to 2018/19

Authors: Yanaina Chavez-Ugalde^{1,2,3}, Frank De Vocht^{2,3,4}, Russell Jago^{2,3,4,5}, Jean Adams^{1,3}, Ken K. Ong¹, Nita Forouhi¹, Zoé Colombet⁶, Luiza I.C. Ricardo¹, Esther Van Sluijs^{1,3,*}, Zoi Toumpakari^{5,*},

¹ MRC Epidemiology Unit, University of Cambridge School of Clinical Medicine, UK

² Population Health Sciences, Bristol Medical School, University of Bristol, UK

³ NIHR School for Public Health Research, Newcastle, UK

⁴ NIHR Applied Research Collaboration West (NIHR ARC West), University Hospitals Bristol and Weston NHS Foundation Trust, Bristol, UK

⁵ Centre for Exercise, Nutrition and Health Sciences, School for Policy Studies, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK

⁶ Department of Public Health and Policy, University of Liverpool, Liverpool, UK

*: joint last authors

***Corresponding Author:**

Name: Yanaina Chavez-Ugalde

Mailing address: MRC Epidemiology Unit, University of Cambridge, School of Clinical Medicine
Cambridge Biomedical Campus, Cambridge, United Kingdom, CB2 0QQ

Email: yanaina.chavez-ugalde@mrc-epid.cam.ac.uk

Competing interests: The authors have no competing interests to declare.

ABSTRACT

Background

The consumption of ultra-processed foods (UPF) has been proposed as a key driver of the global rise in non-communicable diseases. Evidence from several countries suggests that adolescents are the highest consumers. This study examined UPF consumption in a representative sample of UK adolescents.

Methods

We used data from 4-day food diaries from adolescents (11-18y) in the UK National Diet and Nutrition Survey (2008/09-2018/19) (n=3,270). UPF were identified using the NOVA classification. We estimated the percentage of Total Energy Intake (%TEI) and the absolute weight (grams). Linear regression models quantified differences in UPF consumption across survey years and its association with participant's individual characteristics.

Results

Mean UPF consumption was 861 (SD 442) g/d and this accounted for 65.9% (SD 13.4%) of TEI. Between 2008 and 2019, mean UPF consumption decreased from 996 to 776 g/d [-211 (95%CI: -302;-120)] and from 67.7% to 62.8% of TEI [-4.8% (95%CI:-8.1;-1.5)]. Higher %TEI was consumed by adolescents with lower socioeconomic status; white ethnicity and living in England North. A higher weight of UPF consumption was associated with being male, white, age 18y, having parents with routine or manual occupation, living in England North, and living with obesity.

Discussion and conclusion

Average energy intake from UPF has decreased over a decade in UK adolescents. We observed a social and regional patterning of UPF consumption, with higher consumption among adolescents from lower socioeconomic backgrounds, from a white ethnicity and living in England North. Our findings suggest a relationship between individual characteristics and UPF consumption by UK adolescents.

Keywords

Ultra-processed food, adolescents, National Diet and Nutrition Survey, food consumption

1. Background

The consumption of ultra-processed foods (UPF) has been proposed as one of the key drivers of the global rise in chronic diet-related diseases (1). UPF are often manufactured from cheap industrial substances extracted or derived from foods, such as fats and oils, free sugars, and amino acids, which are then mixed with cosmetic additives, like colours, stabilisers, humectants, emulsifiers which are not used in domestic kitchens. UPF are often defined as nutritionally unhealthy due to their high content of sugar, salt and saturated fats (2). Some examples of UPF are soft drinks, breakfast cereals, reconstituted meat products, packaged breads, ready-to-eat foods. UPF are durable, convenient, ready-to-eat, hyper-palatable, have attractive packaging and are strongly marketed to children and adolescents (3). There is a growing body of evidence linking the consumption of UPF with poor dietary quality, and diet related diseases such as obesity in children, adolescents and adults (4), and chronic non-communicable diseases, such as cardiovascular disease and cancer (5) and all-cause mortality in adults (6).

Adolescence is a key transitional stage when major changes in practices that influence health occur (7). Additionally, adolescents' search for novelty and openness to change makes them a vulnerable group for commercial marketing (3). Adolescents' food patterns and practices are strongly driven by their food environments and eating contexts, their autonomy, peer influence and social norms (8). These can all be influenced by commercially targeted activities, such as marketing and advertising, product placement, and pricing strategies such as food promotions and discounts (9).

Evidence across different countries suggests that adolescents are the highest consumers on average of UPF compared to other age groups (10). In Canada it is estimated that UPF contribute approximately 55% of the total caloric intake in children and adolescents (2-18y) versus 45% in adults (11). In the USA, children (6-11y) (69.0%) and adolescents (12-19y) (67.7%) consumed a significantly higher percentage of energy from UPF than those aged 2-5 years (61.1%). (12).

Although consumption of UPF is becoming more prevalent worldwide (1, 13), there are notable cross-country and socioeconomic status (SES) differences (14). In nationally representative samples from high-income countries UPF contribute more than 50% of energy intake (15), and up to 30% in middle-income countries (16). Even though consumption of UPF is much higher in high-income compared to upper-middle income countries, within these latter countries adolescents are still the highest UPF consumption age group. Evidence from high- and upper-middle income countries signals a distinction in social patterning of UPF consumption according to the nutritional transition stage of each country (1).

33 Globally, the availability and sales of UPF have increased over time (2006-2019) (1), and evidence from
34 the USA (2010-2018) and Korea (1999-2018) suggests that consumption of UPF among adolescents
35 has also increased over time (12, 17). However, evidence from a representative sample of UK
36 population (>1.5 years) did not find evidence for an increase in the energy share of UPF between 2008
37 and 2019 (18), however changes in weight consumption from UPF were not explored. Exploring UPF
38 consumption over time could help us theorise behavioural patterns within a changing food
39 environment. Given that adolescents are the highest consumers of UPF and evidence from other
40 countries suggest that consumption in this age group has increased over time, investigating if and how
41 UPF consumption in UK adolescents has changed over time remains an important question.

42 Using UPF as a descriptor of dietary patterns could potentially assist in the understanding of
43 adolescents' diet composition and inform the development of dietary guidelines and nutrition policy
44 actions to improve diet quality and prevent diet-related chronic-diseases (14, 19).

45 Previous studies on UPF consumption have mostly expressed UPF as percentage of energy intake.
46 However, the French NutriNet-Santé study (20) proposed expressing UPF by weight (grams) given that
47 this can capture non-nutritional factors relating to processing of food and foods and drinks that
48 contribute little to energy intake (e.g., additives, non-sugar sweeteners, neo-formed contaminants
49 and endocrine-disrupting chemicals from packaging materials (21).

50 We used population-based individual level data from the UK to address the gaps in existing knowledge
51 mentioned above. Specifically, the aims of this study were to: calculate UPF consumption and its
52 contribution to relative energy intake (% kcal/day) and absolute food weight intake (g/day); describe
53 UPF consumption across the 11 NDNS survey waves (2008-2019); and investigate if there are
54 sociodemographic characteristics associated with UPF consumption in a representative sample of UK
55 adolescents.

56

57 **2. Methods**

58 We conducted an analysis using repeat cross-sectional data from 11- to 18-year-old participants
59 (adolescents) in the UK National Diet and Nutrition Survey Rolling Programme (NDNS) waves 1-11
60 (2008/09-2018/19). Data were downloaded from the UK Data Service (22). This study is reported
61 according to the Strengthening the Reporting of Observational studies in Epidemiology – Nutritional
62 Epidemiology (STROBE-nut). Parental consent was obtained for participants aged 11 to 15 and direct
63 consent was obtained for participants aged 16 to 18 years. Additional ethical approval for this
64 secondary analysis of anonymised data was not required.

65

66 **2.1 Study design and population**

67 The NDNS is an annual rolling programme (RP) of cross-sectional surveys conducted in the UK
68 (England, Wales, Scotland, and Northern Ireland) assessing the food consumption, nutrient intake and
69 nutritional status of the general UK population aged 1.5 years and above living in private households.
70 NDNS survey year starts in April and data collection runs from April until March the following year.
71 Population, sampling and recruitment are described in detail elsewhere (23). Briefly, NDNS's
72 continuous rolling programme seeks to collect data from a representative sample of the UK population
73 with 1,000 participants every year (500 adults, 500 children) with provision of an additional sample to
74 achieve country-level representativeness.

75 Sampling follows a multistage probability design to generate a new random sample of private
76 households in the UK every year. Each year a random sample from small geographical areas [(i.e.,
77 primary sampling units (PSUs))] is selected. Within these PSUs, private addresses are randomly selected
78 from the Postcode Address File and the selected households receive a visit by the study team. Within
79 the participating household one child and one adult are randomly selected to take part. Participants
80 within households are then asked to complete a food diary across 4 days to record all foods and
81 beverages consumed inside and outside of the house. Those who record at least 3 days are then
82 invited for further physical measurements.

83 Inclusion criteria

84 Individuals were included in the analysis if they took part in NDNS waves 1 to 11, were aged between
85 ≥ 11 and ≤ 18 years at data collection and completed at least three out of four food diary days.

86 The current study combines NDNS data from waves 1 to 11 (2008/09 to 2018/19). Overall, at an
87 individual level, 53% of those selected to take part, including adults and children, completed at least
88 three food diary days. From the sample of included individuals, 3,270 were adolescents (11- to 18-
89 year-olds).

90 **2.2 Dietary data collection & processing**

91

92 Dietary assessment in NDNS waves 1-11 was designed to provide full description, detail and
93 quantification of all food and drink consumed during the dietary assessment period, with the ability
94 to capture habitual consumption when conducted over a number of days. Seasonal variations in food
95 and drink consumption are addressed by the continuous fieldwork design.

96 Trained interviewers collected sociodemographic information through interviews and administered
97 the food diaries to adolescent participants. Adolescents were instructed (in the case of 11- and 12-
98 year-olds, their parent or carer) by the trained interviewer to record location, time and quantity of all
99 the food and drink they consumed inside and outside of the home over four consecutive days.
100 Recording of the four-day food diary would start on selected days to ensure even representation of
101 all days of the week across the whole sample. After the food diaries were completed, the interviewer
102 returned to collect the diary, reviewed the data with the participant and added missing details to
103 improve completeness. Participants received monetary gift vouchers following completion of at least
104 three of the four dietary recordings. Household measures and nutritional information from labels
105 were used to estimate portion sizes consumed. Food diaries were entered in the Dietary assessment
106 system DINO (Diet In Nutrients Out) that uses food composition data from the NDNS Nutrient
107 Databank (24, 25). Additional details of the coding of food intake data and calculation of energy
108 intakes and food composition in NDNS data are described in detail elsewhere (24-27).

109 Across the 11 years of data collection, NDNS participants reported on 60 main food groups, 154
110 subsidiary food groups and 4,944 food items. Classification of foods and beverages according to their
111 level of processing was conducted using the NOVA food classification system which considers the
112 nature, extent and purpose of industrial food manufacturing processing (28). The NOVA classification
113 includes four categories: 1) unprocessed or minimally processed foods, 2) processed culinary
114 ingredients, 3) processed foods and 4) UPF. Figure 1 shows these four classifications and examples of
115 each food group. More details on the NOVA classification can be found elsewhere (2, 28).

1. Unprocessed/ minimally processed foods

Foods which are fresh or processed without adding any substances to the original food.

E.g., Beans, rice, frozen meat, pasteurized or power milk, plain yogurt, fresh, dried or frozen vegetables, grains, flour or pasta.

2. Processed culinary ingredients

Substances obtained directly from group 1 or products found in nature and that are used to prepare or cook group 1 foods.

E.g., Sugar, salt, vegetable oils, butter and vinegar.

3. Processed foods

Foods that have added substances from group 2 that have been added to group 1.

E.g., Vegetables in brine, cheese, breads made only with flour, water and salt, fruits in syrup, canned fish.

4. Ultra-processed foods

Industrial formulations that result from a sequence of physical and chemical processes applied to foods and their constituents or products synthesised in a laboratory based on organic materials.

E.g., Soft drinks, sweetened fruit drinks, sweet or savoury packaged snacks, packaged breads and buns, cookies, confectionery, ice cream, sweetened yogurts, dairy beverages, breakfast cereals, ready-to-eat / - heat meals, sausages or other reconstituted meats, and prepared frozen or shelf-stable dishes.

116

117 *Figure 1. The 4 groups in the NOVA food classification system [based on information from (29)]*

118

119 All foods and drinks in the NDNS Nutrient Databank were coded and grouped independently double-
120 coded by two researchers (YCU and ZC) based on main food group first (e.g., 'Pasta rice and other
121 cereals'), then coded according to subsidiary food groups (e.g., pasta, manufactured products and
122 ready meals) and then by individual food item (e.g., pasta, spaghetti, canned in tomato sauce) based
123 on their recipe information and the ingredient list if the classification of a whole main or subgroup
124 was not possible (e.g., composite dishes). This allowed us to classify each underlying or main
125 constituent ingredient into the corresponding NOVA group as previously suggested on how to
126 disaggregate composite food codes in NDNS data (26, 27). Food supplements (i.e., vitamins and
127 minerals) were not coded. Previous studies that have used either the NOVA classification system
128 and/or NDNS data served as a useful coding framework to classify dietary data in this study (4, 30, 31).

129 This study was specifically interested in the consumption of UPF. Thus, we classified group 1, 2 and 3
130 as non-UPF, and group 4 as UPF and focused on the UPF category (NOVA 4) to describe UPF
131 consumption among UK adolescents.

132 *NOVA classification level of agreement*

133 The level of agreement between both coders was 97% after independently classifying all food and
134 drink items using the full NOVA classification system (NOVA 1, 2, 3 and 4). Most of this disagreement
135 (152 of 4,784 food and drink items, 3.1%) was between NOVA categories 1, 2 and 3. Only 10 of 4,784
136 (0.2%) food items caused a disagreement in UPF classification (NOVA 4). These 10 UPF were mainly
137 composite dishes (i.e., beef curry takeaway, cottage pie with instant mash potato, black pudding in
138 batter takeaway, fish pie with crust flaky pastry, vegetable pie with crust, *vol au vents* made with
139 mushroom sauce and pastry), sauces (i.e., chilli pickle sweet, golden syrup), and ice-cream (i.e., ice-
140 cream with double cream and purchased sorbet). These 10 food items categorised as NOVA 4 (UPF)
141 by the first researcher (YCU) based on the individual food name and searches for lists of ingredients
142 in branded products, whilst the second researcher (ZC) classified them based on the food name
143 without searching for list of ingredients in branded items. Once the lists of ingredients were reviewed
144 and discussed both researchers reached a 100% agreement.

145

146 **2.3 Variables of interest**

147

148 The outcomes of interest were the relative energy intake from UPF (NOVA 4) (% kcal/d) and the
149 absolute weight of UPF consumed (g/d). These were calculated based on the relative energy and total
150 absolute weight of foods and drinks classified as UPF in the NDNS food individual level dietary dataset
151 reported by each participant. Individual-level sociodemographic characteristics included sex at birth,
152 age, parent's occupation social class, ethnic group and UK region. Other individual characteristics
153 included weight categories derived from standardised body mass index (zBMI), survey year, and
154 moderate-to-vigorous-physical activity (MVPA).

155 BMI was calculated from nurse measured height and weight. BMI values were standardised for sex
156 and age and categorised [normal weight (≤ 1 standard deviation (sd)), overweight (> 1 sd) and obese
157 (> 2 sd)] based on the 1990 British Growth Reference (UK90).

158 MVPA data was self-reported using the Recent Physical Activity Questionnaire (RPAQ) (32), which
159 assessed type, amount of physical activity and screen time, and is validated for use in older
160 adolescents and adults. Data was therefore collected only in 16–18-year-olds, and within these, only
161 56% provided MVPA data (18% of the entire sample, $n = 575$ out of $n = 3,270$). Daily time spent in MVPA
162 was summed in each individual (min/day). As MVPA was not normally distributed we created quartiles
163 (< 21 min/day; 21-52 min/day; 52-124 min/day; > 124 min/day).

164 Other sociodemographic variables were categorised as follows: sex (male and female), age in
165 completed whole years (8 categories from 11 to 18 years), parent's occupation social class (higher
166 managerial, administrative, and professional occupations; intermediate occupations; routine and
167 manual occupations; we used the three level National Statistics Socioeconomic classification (NS-
168 SEC)(33)), ethnic group (white, non-white), and region [England North, England Central/Midlands,
169 England South (including London), Scotland, Wales, and Northern Ireland].

170

171 **2.4 Statistical analysis**

172 Study weights were provided by NDNS, and datasets were re-scaled and adjusted for the adolescent
173 subsample based on NDNS study weights guide documentation (34). These weights were used using
174 the svy prefix in Stata for all analysis to account for non-response and sampling error and to provide
175 estimates representative of the UK adolescent population.

176 For the description of the sample, we reported weighted percentages (with 95% CIs) of the distribution
177 of individual sociodemographic characteristics alongside the distribution and means of relative UPF
178 energy consumption (%kcal/day) and absolute weight of UPF consumption (g/d) in the overall sample
179 and for each sociodemographic characteristic. We display the mean of all available days of food diary
180 for each individual.

181 We pooled all survey years and used multivariable linear regression models to test if dietary
182 contribution of UPF (%kcal/d and g/d) differed across each of the variables of interest by doing
183 individual stepwise models (i.e., sociodemographic categories and individual characteristics
184 separately) adjusting for age, sex and survey year as covariates. Each category within a variable was
185 compared to the reference group (i.e., sex (male), age (11 years) parent's occupation social class
186 (higher managerial, administrative, and professional occupations), ethnic group (white), and region
187 (England North). We also used linear regression analysis to evaluate if mean UPF consumption
188 (%kcal/d and g/d) changed across NDNS survey years by comparing each survey year (2 to 11) vs year
189 1 (2008/09) and adjusting for age and sex. Given the clustered regional sampling design of NDNS, we
190 used survey analysis procedures to incorporate sample weights in these models.

191 Missing data

192 Variables with complete data (n=3,270) were sex, age, survey year, and region. Variables with missing
193 data were ethnicity (0.1%), parents' occupation (4.5%), BMI z-score (4.3%), and MVPA (82.4%). We
194 used a complete case analysis for all analyses (n=2,991 for all variables, except for MVPA n=534, for
195 which a separate analysis was done using this subsample).

196 *Additional analysis*

197 We ran an analysis adjusting for total energy intake in addition to the primary analysis to explore
 198 whether individual characteristics were associated with relative energy (%kcal/d) and absolute weight
 199 (g/d) independently from total energy intake.

200 All data analysis was conducted in Stata Statistical Software: Release 17.0 (StataCorp LP., College
 201 Station, TX, USA).

202

203 **3. Results**

204 Table 1 presents descriptive data of the 2,991 participants with complete data for the variables of
 205 interest except MVPA (n=534). Of all adolescents, 51.3% were females, 42.9% had parents with a
 206 higher managerial, administrative and professional occupation, 66% had normal weight, 83.3% were
 207 from a white ethnic group, 43.7% lived in England South (including London), and of participants with
 208 physical activity data (16 to 18 year olds) 26.7% reported more than 124 min/day of MVPA.

209

210 *Table 1. Descriptive characteristics of a weighted sample in the NDNS adolescents' sample waves 1-*
 211 *11 (2008/09–2018/19) (n=2,991)*

Individual characteristics		%N (weighted) ^a	95%CI
Sex	Male	51.3	(49.0, 53.6)
	Female	48.7	(46.4, 51.0)
Age	11	12.3	(10.9, 13.9)
	12	12.8	(11.3, 14.5)
	13	12.8	(11.3, 14.5)
	14	12.6	(11.1, 14.2)
	15	11.4	(10.1, 12.8)
	16	14.6	(13.0, 16.4)
	17	13.7	(12.0, 15.5)
	18	9.9	(8.6, 11.3)
Parent's occupation social class^b	Higher managerial, administrative, and professional	42.9	(40.6, 45.3)
	Intermediate	22.8	(20.9, 24.8)
	Routine and manual	34.3	(32.1, 36.6)
Survey year (survey wave for data collection)	(1) 2008/09	8.0	(6.5, 9.9)
	(2) 2009/10	10.1	(8.2, 12.4)
	(3) 2010/11	9.7	(7.7, 12.1)
	(4) 2011/12	8.4	(6.8, 10.4)
	(5) 2012/13	8.6	(6.8, 10.9)

	(6) 2013/14	9.2	(7.4, 11.4)
	(7) 2014/15	9.4	(7.5, 11.7)
	(8) 2015/16	8.6	(6.8, 10.9)
	(9) 2016/17	9.7	(7.7, 12.2)
	(10) 2017/18	9.0	(7.1, 11.3)
	(11) 2018/19	9.2	(7.3, 11.5)
Weight category^c	Normal weight	66.0	(63.6, 68.3)
	Overweight	13.7	(12.1, 15.4)
	Obese	20.3	(18.4, 22.4)
Ethnic group	White	83.3	(81.2, 85.1)
	Non-white	16.8	(14.9, 18.8)
Region	England North	22.9	(21.2, 24.7)
	England Central/Midlands	17.7	(16.1, 19.3)
	England South (including London)	43.7	(41.8, 45.7)
	Scotland	7.7	(6.4, 9.3)
	Wales	4.7	(4.2, 5.3)
	Northern Ireland	3.2	(2.9, 3.5)
MVPA^d	<21 min/day	26.9	(21.9, 32.6)
	21-52 min/day	22.4	(18.0, 27.5)
	52 -124 min/day	24.0	(19.3, 29.4)
	>124 min/day	26.7	(21.1, 33.2)

^a Percentages and means are weighed based on non-selection and non-response survey weights provided by NDNS year 2008-2019.

^b Parents occupation is based on the three-class NS-SEC. A small number of households were excluded from this classification where the household has never worked or was classified under other.

^c BMI z-score was created by standardising BMI for sex and age based on the 1990 British Growth Reference (UK90).

^d MVPA: There was self-reported data available only for 16–18-year-olds, n=534.

Abbreviations: BMI z-score: standardised body mass index; MVPA: Moderate-to-vigorous physical activity; NDNS: National Diet and Nutrition Survey; NS-SEC: National Statistics Socioeconomic Class; UPF: ultra-processed food, NOVA4 classification group.

212

213 Table 2 shows the percentage of energy from UPF and grams per day of UPF consumed by adolescents
 214 by individual characteristics. Overall, adolescents reported a mean total energy intake per day of 1,741
 215 kcal/day (SD 500.3) and 65.9% (SD 13.4%) of these calories come from UPF. In terms of food weight,
 216 adolescents consumed a mean of 2,004 (SD 727.3) g/day, of which 861 g/day (SD 442) was UPF (43%
 217 of total food weight consumed).

218

Table 2. Description of UPF consumption (%kcal and grams per day) of a weighted sample in the NDNS adolescents' sample waves 1-11 (2008/09–2018/19)

		% energy from UPF per day ^a	95%CI	Grams of consumption of UPF per day ^a	95%CI
Sex	Male	66.0	(65.0, 66.9)	941.5	(911.9, 971.2)
	Female	65.8	(64.8, 66.7)	776.3	(748.6, 804.0)
Age	11	65.6	(63.9, 67.3)	797.0	(741.8, 852.3)
	12	66.1	(64.3, 67.8)	824.9	(770.1, 879.7)
	13	68.0	(66.1, 69.8)	842.9	(794.5, 891.4)
	14	67.2	(65.5, 68.8)	860.1	(803.3, 916.9)
	15	66.0	(64.4, 67.7)	862.9	(807.0, 918.8)
	16	66.0	(64.4, 67.5)	878.3	(821.3, 935.2)
	17	64.4	(62.1, 66.6)	908.8	(852.2, 965.4)
	18	63.4	(61.3, 65.5)	918.7	(849.0, 988.3)
Parents' occupation social class^b	Higher managerial, administrative, and professional	63.8	(62.8, 64.8)	826.3	(796.3, 856.2)
	Intermediate	65.9	(64.6, 67.3)	838.4	(796.9, 879.9)
	Routine and manual	68.4	(67.3, 69.6)	919.6	(883.4, 955.7)
Survey year (survey wave for data collection)	(1) 2008/09	67.7	(65.6, 69.8)	995.5	(928.1, 1,063.0)
	(2) 2009-2010	68.1	(66.2, 69.9)	948.9	(889.4, 1008.5)
	(3) 2010-2011	67.9	(66.4, 69.4)	915.8	(845.4, 986.2)
	(4) 2011-2012	67.5	(65.5, 69.5)	880.8	(814.9, 946.7)
	(5) 2012-2013	67.0	(65.0, 69.1)	907.0	(846.5, 967.6)
	(6) 2013-2014	67.0	(64.8, 69.2)	876.7	(816.1, 937.3)
	(7) 2014-2015	67.3	(65.4, 69.1)	913.2	(826.8, 999.5)
	(8) 2015-2016	62.0	(59.8, 64.2)	746.0	(680.8, 811.3)
	(9) 2016-2017	62.8	(60.2, 65.4)	700.7	(640.7, 760.6)
	(10) 2017-2018	62.8	(60.1, 65.4)	820.7	(745.6, 895.9)
	(11) 2018-2019	64.6	(62.1, 67.0)	775.9	(710.7, 841.0)
Weight category^c	Normal weight	65.8	(64.9, 66.6)	841.5	(816.3, 866.8)
	Overweight	66.3	(64.7, 67.9)	861.4	(810.8, 912.1)
	Obese	65.9	(64.5, 67.4)	924.1	(873.0, 975.2)
Ethnic group	White	67.3	(66.6, 67.9)	905.8	(883.2, 928.5)
	Non-white	59.0	(57.3, 60.8)	638.4	(596.4, 680.3)
Region	England North	67.4	(66.1, 68.8)	910.8	(866.6, 954.9)
	England Central/Midlands	66.8	(65.3, 68.2)	923.7	(866.2, 981.3)
	England South (including London)	64.1	(62.9, 65.2)	803.9	(771.2, 836.6)

	Scotland	67.8	(65.7, 69.9)	891.6	(830.0, 953.2)
	Wales	67.1	(65.5, 68.8)	882.9	(822.3, 943.5)
	Northern Ireland	67.9	(66.6, 69.1)	833.9	(792.5, 875.3)
MVPA ^d	<21 min/day	65.1	(61.4, 68.8)	865.1	(776.1, 954.1)
	21-52 min/day	65.5	(62.7, 68.3)	921.4	(820.8, 1,022.0)
	52 -124 min/day	65.3	(62.1, 68.5)	845.8	(725.5, 966.2)
	>124 min/day	66.5	(63.7, 69.3)	1,052.2	(962.7, 1,141.7)

^a Results are weighed based on non-selection and non-response survey weights provided by NDNS year 2008-2019.

^b Parents occupation is based on the three-class NS-SEC. A small number of households were excluded from this classification where the household has never worked or was classified under other.

^c BMI z-score was created by standardising BMI for sex and age based on the 1990 British Growth Reference (UK90).

^d MVPA: There was data available only for 16–18-year-olds, n=534.

Abbreviations: BMI z-score: standardised body mass index; CI: Confidence Interval; MVPA: Moderate-to-vigorous physical activity; NDNS: National Diet and Nutrition Survey; NS-SEC: National Statistics Socioeconomic Class; UPF: ultra-processed food, NOVA4 classification group.


221

222 Associations of UPF consumption with time and sociodemographic variables

223 *UPF consumption across NDNS survey years*

224 Figure 2 and Figure 3 (and Supplementary Table S1) show mean UPF consumption and CI's across
 225 NDNS survey years (2009/09 – 2018/19) (adjusted for age and sex). There was evidence for a
 226 difference in relative energy (%kcal/day) and absolute weight (g/day) consumption from UPF across
 227 survey years ($p < 0.001$).

228 In Figure 2 we observed that comparing survey year 2 (2009/10) through 7 (2014/15) versus survey
 229 year 1 (i.e., reference year) there was no evidence of a difference in the absolute UPF as percentage
 230 of total energy intake (%TEI). However, %TEI from UPF was significantly lower from survey year 8
 231 (2015/16) through 10 (2017/19) (vs year 1 – 2008/09) with the largest reduction in survey year 8 (-5.8
 232 %kcal/day).




233

234 *Figure 2. Mean relative energy consumption (%kcal/day) and CI's from UPF across NDNS survey years*
 235 *(adjusted for age and sex)*

236

237 In Figure 3 we observed that the highest absolute weight from UPF consumed (g/d) was seen in year
 238 1 (2008/09) (993.7 g/d). Similar to relative energy intake (%kcal/d), we observed a steady decline with
 239 some random variation in UPF weight across survey years.



240


241 *Figure 3. Mean grams of UPF consumption (plus 95% confidence interval) across NDNS survey years*
 242 *(adjusted for age and sex)*

243

244 *Individual characteristics and %TEI from UPF*

245 After adjusting for age, sex and survey year, results show (Figure 4 and Supplementary Table S1) that
 246 parents' occupation, ethnic group and UK region were associated with percentage of energy
 247 consumption from UPF. A higher %TEI from UPF was consumed by adolescents whose parents had
 248 routine and manual occupations or intermediate occupations compared to adolescents with parents
 249 who had higher managerial occupations [intermediate: 2.0% (95%CI: 0.4; 3.5); routine and manual
 250 parental occupation: 4.6% (95%CI: 3.2; 6.1)]. Adolescents from a non-white ethnicity (vs white)
 251 reported lower %TEI from UPF [-8.0% (95%CI: -9.8; -6.1)] as well as those living in England South
 252 (including London) (vs England North) [-3.2% (95%CI: -4.9; -1.5)].

% Kcal/day vs. Reference



254

255 *Figure 4. Linear regression of the adjusted associations between participants' characteristics (vs*
 256 *reference category) and consumption of UPF defined as relative energy (%kcal/day) (adjusted for*
 257 *age, sex and survey year)*

258

259


260 *Individual characteristics and absolute weight from UPF*

261 Figure 5 (and Supplementary Table S1) shows that higher weight of UPF consumption was associated
 262 with age between 17 and 18 years (vs 11-year-olds), with the highest consumption observed in 18-
 263 year-olds [115.1 g/day, (95%CI: 26.6; 203.5)]. Adolescents whose parents had a routine and manual

264 occupation (vs higher managerial) [78.9 g/day, (95%CI: 34.6; 123.3)], and adolescents living with
 265 obesity (vs normal weight) [90.3 g/day (95%CI: 39.0; 141.5)] reported a higher UPF weight
 266 consumption. In contrast, lower weight of UPF consumption was associated with female sex (vs male)
 267 [-169.2 g/day, (95%CI: -206.8;-131.7)], non-white ethnicity (vs white) [-247.2, (95%CI: -292.8;-201.6)],
 268 and living in South England and Northern Ireland (vs. North England) [-99.2, (95%CI: -150.6;-47.8); -
 269 76.8, (95%CI: -135.0; -18.6)].

270

Grams/day vs. Reference



271

272 *Figure 5. Linear regression of the adjusted associations between participants' characteristics (vs*
 273 *reference category) and consumption of UPF defined as absolute weight (g/day) (adjusted for age,*
 274 *sex and survey year)*

275

276

277 *Additional analysis*

278 After additionally adjusting for total energy intake, all associations with %TEI from UPF persisted and
279 in addition 18-year-olds (vs. 11-year-olds) had a lower %TEI (-3.0 %TEI, 95%CI: -5.7, -0.3). For UPF
280 weight consumption, after adjusting for total energy intake associations were attenuated for age,
281 survey years 4, 5, 6 and 10, and for MVPA >124 min/day (Supplementary Table S2).

282

283 **4. Discussion**

284 In this repeat cross-sectional study of a nationally representative sample of UK adolescents, we found
285 that mean UPF among 11- to 18-year-olds was 861 g/day and accounted for 65.9% of their TEI. After
286 adjusting for age and sex, mean consumption of UPF (both %TEI and weight) declined between
287 2008/09/ and 2018/19. Percentage of energy from UPF was lower by 3% and weight consumption
288 from UPF was lower by 211.2 grams per day when comparing the first vs last NDNS survey waves
289 (wave 1: 2008/09 vs wave 11:2018/19). After adjusting for age, sex and survey year, adolescents with
290 lower socioeconomic status (having parents in an intermediate or routine and manual occupations),
291 from a white ethnicity, and living in England North had higher %TEI from UPF. Additionally, being male,
292 being between 17 and 18 years, having a lower socioeconomic status (having parents in a routine and
293 manual occupation), living with obesity, from a white ethnicity, and living in England North were
294 associated with a higher weight of UPF consumption. In additional analysis, adjusting for total energy
295 intake, patterns of association with UPF weight became more consistent to those with %TEI from UPF.

296 These findings are consistent with previous analyses of the same NDNS data in 11 to 18-year-olds
297 using survey years 2008/16 and 2008/17 (68% contribution of UPF to total energy intake (31, 35) and
298 with analyses of data from adolescents living in other high-income countries (55% in Canada (11), and
299 68% in USA (12)). Although UPF are becoming more prevalent worldwide (1, 13, 14), there are cross-
300 country differences that should be acknowledged. A recent multi-country study assessing adolescents'
301 UPF consumption in upper-middle and high-income countries found that consumption across these
302 countries ranged between 19% to 36% in upper-middle-income countries (i.e., Argentina, Brazil,
303 Colombia, and Mexico), and from 34% to 68% in high-income countries (i.e., Australia, Chile, USA and
304 UK) with UK adolescents being the highest consumers of UPF (36). The high consumption of UPF within
305 HIC such as the UK may be partly explained by a combination of social, cultural, economic, and
306 marketing factors (14). Urbanisation in the UK, as in other HIC, can increase access to a greater
307 diversity of and cheaper foods, including UPF, and increased exposure to commercial marketing with
308 a wide offer of ready-to-eat products (37). These offer convenient solutions to longer working hours,
309 changes in family structure and contribute to shifting from home food preparations to more ready-to-

310 consume foods (38). An analysis of household availability of UPF in nineteen European countries
311 showed that in the UK 50.4% of total purchased dietary energy comes from UPF, in contrast with
312 10.2% in Portugal, 13.4% in Italy and 46.2% in Germany (39).

313 Our findings suggest a decline of UPF consumption (%TEI and weight) between survey years 1 and 11
314 in the NDNS (2008/09 – 2018/19). Time trend analysis in NDNS (years 1 to 9) show a decline in total
315 energy intake in this age group, especially between survey years 7 and 8 (2014/15). Additionally, the
316 general downward trend in energy consumption from UPF is consistent with other study findings; a
317 study using a controlled interrupted time series analysis between 2014 and 2019 found a 10%
318 reduction in free sugars purchased per household per week from SSBs between 2014 and 2019 (40),
319 however they did not find a reduction in volume (mL) purchased from SSBs. Another study using data
320 from adults and children in NDNS found a reduction in energy share by 1.4% from sweetened
321 beverages between 2008/09 to 2018/19, also without a reduction in volume (mL) consumed (18). This
322 reduction could be partly explained by an increased public awareness and health concerns associated
323 with sugar consumption, government-led campaigns and SSB reformulation to reduce sugar content.
324 However, in this study we did not analyse UPF subgroup consumption and cannot attribute this drop
325 in consumption exclusively to SSBs or free sugars. The reduction in UPF weight consumption in this
326 study might be attributable to other UPF subgroups, or alternatively to a methodology change in NDNS
327 dietary data collection.

328 Interestingly, in our sample UPF contributed proportionately more to TEI (65%) than to food weight
329 (43%), which reflects the overall higher energy density of UPF. Energy density is associated with weight
330 gain, type 2 diabetes, and obesity (41). Some associations were apparent with food weight but not
331 with %TEI from UPF, for example with sex (higher in males vs. females) and age (higher in older
332 adolescents). These differences largely reflect the higher TEI consumed by males and older
333 adolescents. However, after accounting for TEI we still observed an independent significant effect. We
334 need to understand mechanisms of harm, if any, to help guide finding a correct metric of exposure.

335 Similar to other findings, we observed that being from a white ethnicity is associated with a
336 significantly higher consumption of UPF and less minimally processed foods (12, 35). However, the
337 relationship between ethnicity and UPF is complex and multifactorial, and the observed higher UPF
338 consumption among white ethnicity adolescents could be due to other factors associated with
339 ethnicity, for example, cultural and other economic factors (42) .

340 Our findings add to the body of knowledge that in HIC, lower socioeconomic groups consume higher
341 levels of UPF (1). This may be partly due to the greater affordability (i.e., price per calorie) of less vs
342 healthier foods across country incomes and regions (43) alongside targeted marketing to specific

343 population subgroups (44). Additionally, reduced at-home facilities for food preparation and lack of
344 cooking skills may lead to an increased consumption of more processed and convenience foods (e.g.,
345 pre-prepared meals) (45). Whilst in HIC most UPF are relatively cheaper than less processed foods, the
346 opposite patterns are seen in LMIC. As an example, soft drinks are relatively inexpensive in HIC, whilst
347 they are relatively expensive in LMIC (1, 14).

348 There is currently no universally agreed “safe” levels of dietary share from UPF. Therefore, future
349 research to understand the mechanisms of harms to health may substantially improve nutritional
350 quality of adolescent diets and contribute to the prevention of diet related NCDs.

351

352 **4.1 Strengths and limitations**

353 To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study to characterise and present data associating to
354 both %TEI and weight of UPF consumption in a representative sample of UK adolescents.

355 This study has several additional strengths. Due to the consistent methods of data collection over
356 time, the data across waves could be mixed resulting in a relatively large sample size. This study used
357 individual-level dietary data, had 3 or 4 food diary days for each individual and had relatively high
358 numbers of individuals within each group, which is likely to give a more accurate assessment of total
359 dietary intake versus other methods (46, 47). For example, food records allow researchers to have
360 high levels of detail on dietary intake, they were completed in real-time, which avoids reliance on
361 recall, a common limitation of food frequency questionnaires and 24-hour recalls . Additionally, food
362 records, when compared to direct observation and doubly labelled water, perform much better than
363 other self-reported methods and capture about 80% of energy intake (46, 48). Weighting of the
364 sample was applied to reduce non-response and sampling bias, therefore, the study results can be
365 generalisable to the UK adolescent population. Additionally, this study included a weight measure of
366 UPF to capture non-nutritional factors relating to processing of food (i.e., additives, non-sugar
367 sweeteners, neo-formed contaminants), and foods and drinks that do not contribute to energy intake
368 (e.g., artificially sweetened beverages). Our results show that there were more individual
369 characteristics associated with weight of UPF consumption than UPF contribution to TEI. The inclusion
370 of this measure could further enhance our knowledge about the risks involved by diets high in UPF
371 beyond their contribution to TEI, but this should be systematically tested in studies of UPF and health
372 outcomes.

373 To assess the variability and potential misclassification of UPF two researchers blindly classified all
374 food and drink items in the food files within NDNS. We reached a 97% agreement in classification

375 across all NOVA groups, and 99.8% agreement for classification of UPF. The variability of our
376 classification of UPF showed that the energy contribution ranged from 65.9% under the current more
377 conservative approach (YCU) to 70% when we applied the more liberal approach. Other studies that
378 have assessed the variability and potential misclassification of UPF showed that <10% of individual
379 foods and beverages reported in NHANES in the US (24-hr recall) were at risk of misclassification (49).
380 This up to 4% variation range provides confidence in the current approach used to classify foods within
381 NDNS according to the degree of processing using the NOVA classification system using food diaries.

382 Some limitations should be considered. We could not include a measure of household income due to
383 the way this variable was collected in waves 9 to 11 limiting our knowledge of the impact of household
384 income on UPF consumption among adolescents. However, other proxy for SES (i.e., parent's social
385 occupation social class) showed higher UPF consumption among lower SES groups.

386 Classification of food items according to the NOVA system was time-consuming because NDNS food
387 diaries were not designed to capture UPF. Some of the main groups and subsidiary food groups were
388 classified easily. However, composite food dishes had to be classified on an individual basis. Based on
389 previous studies that have used either the NOVA classification system and/or NDNS data served as a
390 practical coding framework (4, 5, 30, 31). Since the food records utilised were not designed to classify
391 or evaluate foods according to their industrial processing, some items may have been misclassified.
392 MVPA was self-reported was only available for a limited number of participants, which limited our
393 ability to explore the associations of UPF and MVPA in a larger sample of adolescents.

394 **5. Conclusion**

395 This study showed that UK adolescents aged 11 to 18 years, living in England North, from the lowest
396 SES group and with white ethnicity have the highest energy and weight intakes of UPF. Additionally, a
397 higher weight consumption from UPF was observed in adolescents who were male, aged 17 to 18
398 years, and living with obesity. We found that the average energy intake and food weight from UPF has
399 decreased in UK adolescents between year 1 and 11 of NDNS survey waves. However, it remains
400 among the highest levels across high-income countries (e.g., Canada 55.0% and USA 67.7% of TEI).
401 Estimating "safe" levels of dietary share from UPF and understanding the mechanisms of harms to
402 health may substantially improve nutritional quality of adolescent diets and contribute to the
403 prevention of diet-related NCDs.

404

405 **Abbreviation list**

406 CI – Confidence interval

407 HIC – High income country
408 LMIC – Low-middle-income country
409 MVPA – moderate-to-vigorous physical activity
410 NDNS – National Diet and Nutrition Survey
411 NS-SEC – National Statistics Socioeconomic Class
412 RPAQ- Recent physical activity questionnaire
413 TEI – Total energy intake
414 UK – United Kingdom
415 UPF – Ultra-processed food(s)
416 USA – United States of America
417 zBMI – Standardised Body mass index
418 ZC – Zoe Colombet

419

420 Acknowledgements

421 **Funding:** This study was part of YCU PhD studentship funded by the NIHR School for Public Health
422 Research (Grant Reference Number PD-SPH-2015), supervised by Frank de Vocht, Russell Jago, Zoi
423 Toumpakari and Martin White. The views expressed are those of the author(s) and not necessarily
424 those of the NIHR or the Department of Health and Social Care. The NIHR School for Public Health
425 Research is a partnership between the Universities of Sheffield; Bristol; Cambridge; Imperial; and
426 University College London; The London School for Hygiene and Tropical Medicine (LSHTM); LiLaC – a
427 collaboration between the Universities of Liverpool and Lancaster; and Fuse - The Centre for
428 Translational Research in Public Health a collaboration between Newcastle, Durham, Northumbria,
429 Sunderland and Teesside Universities. YCU is now a postdoctoral research associate at the Medical
430 Research Council (MRC) to the MRC Epidemiology Unit, University of Cambridge [grant number
431 MC_UU_00006/5] and this study received funding for publication by the MRC Epidemiology Unit.

432 EVS acknowledge support from the MRC Epidemiology Unit (MC_UU_00006/5). NGF acknowledges
433 support from the MRC Epidemiology Unit (MC_UU_00006/3), the National Institute of Health and Care
434 Research (NIHR) Cambridge Biomedical Research Centre (NIHR203312), and she is an NIHR Senior
435 Investigator. The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the NIHR or
436 the Department of Health and Social Care. JA is supported by the MRC Epidemiology Unit, University
437 of Cambridge [Medical Research Council grant number MC/UU/00006/7] mrc.ukri.org. KO is
438 supported by the Medical Research Council (MC_UU_00006/2). FDV and RJ are partially funded by the
439 National Institute for Health Research Applied Research Collaboration West (NIHR ARC West).

440 The funder had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation
441 of the manuscript.

442 **Author contributions:** YCU data collection, processing, design, data analysis, writing – first draft; FdV,
443 ZT, RJ – conceptualisation, data processing; EVS, JA, KO, NF, ZT, FdV, RJ– editing, reviewing and
444 supervision; ZC – coding and data processing; LICR – data visualisation. All authors have read and
445 agreed to the final manuscript version.

446

447 **References**

- 448 1. Baker P, Machado P, Santos T, Sievert K, Backholer K, Hadjidakou M, et al. Ultra-processed
449 foods and the nutrition transition: Global, regional and national trends, food systems
450 transformations and political economy drivers. *Obesity reviews : an official journal of the*
451 *International Association for the Study of Obesity*. 2020;21(12):e13126.
- 452 2. Monteiro CA, Jaime PC, Cannon G, Levy RB, Louzada MLC, Rauber F, et al. Ultra-processed
453 foods: What they are and how to identify them. *Public Health Nutrition*. 2019;22(5):936-41.
- 454 3. Norman J, Kelly B, Boyland E, McMahon A-T. The Impact of Marketing and Advertising on
455 Food Behaviours: Evaluating the Evidence for a Causal Relationship. *Current Nutrition Reports*.
456 2016;5(3):139-49.
- 457 4. Chang K, Khandpur N, Neri D, Touvier M, Huybrechts I, Millett C, et al. Association Between
458 Childhood Consumption of Ultraprocessed Food and Adiposity Trajectories in the Avon Longitudinal
459 Study of Parents and Children Birth Cohort. *JAMA pediatrics*. 2021;175(9):e211573.
- 460 5. Rauber F, da Costa Louzada ML, Steele EM, Millett C, Monteiro CA, Levy RB. Ultra-Processed
461 Food Consumption and Chronic Non-Communicable Diseases-Related Dietary Nutrient Profile in the
462 UK (2008-2014). *Nutrients*. 2018;10(5).
- 463 6. Kim H, Hu EA, Rebholz CM. Ultra-processed food intake and mortality in the USA: results
464 from the Third National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES III, 1988-1994). *Public*
465 *health nutrition*. 2019;22(10):1777-85.
- 466 7. Olstad DL, Kirkpatrick SI. Planting seeds of change: reconceptualizing what people eat as
467 eating practices and patterns. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*.
468 2021;18(1):32.
- 469 8. Patton GC, Sawyer SM, Santelli JS, Ross DA, Afifi R, Allen NB, et al. Our future: a Lancet
470 commission on adolescent health and wellbeing. *Lancet (London, England)*. 2016;387(10036):2423-
471 78.
- 472 9. Chavez-Ugalde Y, Jago R, Toumpakari Z, Egan M, Cummins S, White M, et al. Conceptualising
473 the commercial determinants of dietary behaviors associated with obesity: A systematic review
474 using principles from critical interpretative synthesis. *Obesity science & practice*. 2021;7(4):473-86.
- 475 10. Leonie E, Machado P, Zinöcker M, Baker P, Lawrence M. Ultra-Processed Foods and Health
476 Outcomes: A Narrative Review. *Nutrients*. 2020;12(7).
- 477 11. Moubarac J-C, Batal M, Louzada ML, Martinez Steele E, Monteiro CA. Consumption of ultra-
478 processed foods predicts diet quality in Canada. *Appetite*. 2017;108:512-20.
- 479 12. Wang L, Martínez Steele E, Du M, Pomeranz JL, O'Connor LE, Herrick KA, et al. Trends in
480 Consumption of Ultraprocessed Foods Among US Youths Aged 2-19 Years, 1999-2018. *JAMA*.
481 2021;326(6):519-30.
- 482 13. Monteiro CA, Moubarac JC, Cannon G, Ng SW, Popkin B. Ultra-processed products are
483 becoming dominant in the global food system. *Obesity Reviews*. 2013;14(S2):21-8.
- 484 14. Moodie R, Bennett E, Kwong EJJ, Santos TM, Pratiwi L, Williams J, et al. Ultra-Processed
485 Profits: The Political Economy of Countering the Global Spread of Ultra-Processed Foods - A
486 Synthesis Review on the Market and Political Practices of Transnational Food Corporations and
487 Strategic Public Health Responses. *Int J Health Policy Manag*. 2021;10(12):968-82.
- 488 15. Martínez Steele E, Baraldi LG, Louzada ML, Moubarac JC, Mozaffarian D, Monteiro CA. Ultra-
489 processed foods and added sugars in the US diet: evidence from a nationally representative cross-
490 sectional study. *BMJ Open*. 2016;6(3):e009892.
- 491 16. Marrón-Ponce JA, Sánchez-Pimienta TG, Louzada M, Batis C. Energy contribution of NOVA
492 food groups and sociodemographic determinants of ultra-processed food consumption in the
493 Mexican population. *Public Health Nutr*. 2018;21(1):87-93.
- 494 17. Shim JS, Shim SY, Cha HJ, Kim J, Kim HC. Socioeconomic Characteristics and Trends in the
495 Consumption of Ultra-Processed Foods in Korea from 2010 to 2018. *Nutrients*. 2021;13(4).

- 496 18. Madruga M, Martínez Steele E, Reynolds C, Levy RB, Rauber F. Trends in food consumption
497 according to the degree of food processing among the UK population over 11 years. *Br J Nutr.*
498 2022;1-8.
- 499 19. Neufeld LMP, Andrade EBP, Ballonoff Suleiman AD, Barker MP, Beal TP, Blum LSP, et al. Food
500 choice in transition: adolescent autonomy, agency, and the food environment. *The Lancet.*
501 2022;399(10320):185-97.
- 502 20. Julia C, Martinez L, Allès B, Touvier M, Hercberg S, Méjean C, et al. Contribution of ultra-
503 processed foods in the diet of adults from the French NutriNet-Santé study. *Public Health Nutr.*
504 2018;21(1):27-37.
- 505 21. Lustig RH, Collier D, Kassotis C, Roepke TA, Kim MJ, Blanc E, et al. Obesity I: Overview and
506 molecular and biochemical mechanisms. *Biochemical Pharmacology.* 2022;199:115012.
- 507 22. National Diet and Nutrition Survey Years 1-8, 2008/09-2015/16. [data collection] [Internet].
508 UK Data Service. 2018. Available from:
509 [https://beta.ukdataservice.ac.uk/datacatalogue/studies/study?id=6533&type=Data%20catalogue#!/](https://beta.ukdataservice.ac.uk/datacatalogue/studies/study?id=6533&type=Data%20catalogue#!/details)
510 [details.](https://beta.ukdataservice.ac.uk/datacatalogue/studies/study?id=6533&type=Data%20catalogue#!/details)
- 511 23. Public Health England. Appendix A. Dietary data collection and editing. In *National Diet and*
512 *Nutrition Survey. Results from Years 1–4 (Combined) of the Rolling Programme (2008/2009–*
513 *2011/2012).* London, UK: Public Health England; 2014.
- 514 24. Fitt E, Cole D, Ziauddeen N, Pell D, Stickley E, Harvey A, et al. DINO (Diet in Nutrients Out)-An
515 integrated dietary assessment system. *Public Health Nutrition.* 2015;18(2):234-41.
- 516 25. Public Health England. McCance and Widdowson's the composition of foods integrated
517 dataset 2015. In: Public Health England, editor. London, UK2015.
- 518 26. Fitt E, Mak TN, Stephen AM, Prynn C, Roberts C, Swan G, et al. Disaggregating composite
519 food codes in the UK National Diet and Nutrition Survey food composition databank. *European*
520 *journal of clinical nutrition.* 2010;64(SUPP/3):S32-S6.
- 521 27. MRC Human Nutrition Research. Food Standards Agency Standard Recipes Database, 1992-
522 2012 [data collection]. In: UK Data Service, editor. 2017.
- 523 28. Monteiro CA, Jaime PC, Cannon G, Moubarac JC, Levy RB, Louzada MLC. The UN Decade of
524 Nutrition, the NOVA food classification and the trouble with ultra-processing. *Public Health*
525 *Nutrition.* 2018;21(1):5-17.
- 526 29. Monteiro CA, Cannon, G., Lawrence, M., Costa Louzada, M.L. and Pereira Machado, P. Ultra-
527 processed foods, diet quality, and health using the NOVA classification system. Rome, FAO. 2019.
- 528 30. Martines RM, Machado PP, Neri DA, Levy RB, Rauber F. Association between watching TV
529 whilst eating and children's consumption of ultraprocessed foods in United Kingdom. *Maternal and*
530 *child nutrition.* 2019;15(4):n/a-n/a.
- 531 31. Rauber F, Martins CA, Azeredo CM, Leffa PS, Louzada MLC, Levy RB. Eating context and
532 ultraprocessed food consumption among UK adolescents. *The British journal of nutrition.* 2021:1-11.
- 533 32. Golubic R, May AM, Benjaminsen Borch K, Overvad K, Charles M-A, Diaz MJT, et al. Validity
534 of Electronically Administered Recent Physical Activity Questionnaire (RPAQ) in Ten European
535 Countries. *PLoS ONE.* 2014;9(3):e92829.
- 536 33. Rose D., Pevalin D., K. OR. *The National Statistics Socio-economic Classification: origins,*
537 *development and use:* Palgrave Macmillan UK; 2005.
- 538 34. UK Data Archive Study. *Weights Guide: Combining data from Years 1-4, Years 5&6, Years*
539 *7&8 and Years 9-11, National Diet and Nutrition Survey.* 2020.
- 540 35. Parnham JC, Chang K, Rauber F, Levy RB, Millett C, Laverty AA, et al. The Ultra-Processed
541 Food Content of School Meals and Packed Lunches in the United Kingdom. *Nutrients.* 2022;14(14).
- 542 36. Neri D, Steele EM, Khandpur N, Cediél G, Zapata ME, Rauber F, et al. Ultraprocessed food
543 consumption and dietary nutrient profiles associated with obesity: A multicountry study of children
544 and adolescents. *Obesity Reviews.* 2022;23(S1).
- 545 37. Popkin BM, Adair LS, Ng SW. Global nutrition transition and the pandemic of obesity in
546 developing countries. *Nutrition Reviews.* 2012;70(1):3-21.

- 547 38. Smith LP, Ng SW, Popkin BM. Trends in US home food preparation and consumption:
548 analysis of national nutrition surveys and time use studies from 1965-1966 to 2007-2008. *Nutr J.*
549 2013;12:45.
- 550 39. Monteiro CA, Moubarac JC, Levy RB, Canella DS, Louzada M, Cannon G. Household
551 availability of ultra-processed foods and obesity in nineteen European countries. *Public Health Nutr.*
552 2018;21(1):18-26.
- 553 40. Pell D, Mytton O, Penney TL, Briggs A, Cummins S, Penn-Jones C, et al. Changes in soft drinks
554 purchased by British households associated with the UK soft drinks industry levy: controlled
555 interrupted time series analysis. *BMJ.* 2021;372:n254.
- 556 41. Wang J, Luben R, Khaw K-T, Bingham S, Wareham NJ, Forouhi NG. Dietary Energy Density
557 Predicts the Risk of Incident Type 2 Diabetes: The European Prospective Investigation of Cancer
558 (EPIC)-Norfolk Study. *Diabetes Care.* 2008;31(11):2120-5.
- 559 42. Poti JM, Mendez MA, Ng SW, Popkin BM. Is the degree of food processing and convenience
560 linked with the nutritional quality of foods purchased by US households? *Am J Clin Nutr.*
561 2015;101(6):1251-62.
- 562 43. Headey DD, Alderman HH. The Relative Caloric Prices of Healthy and Unhealthy Foods Differ
563 Systematically across Income Levels and Continents. *J Nutr.* 2019;149(11):2020-33.
- 564 44. Kelly B, Vandevijvere S, Freeman B, Jenkin G. New Media but Same Old Tricks: Food
565 Marketing to Children in the Digital Age. *Curr Obes Rep.* 2015;4(1):37-45.
- 566 45. Adams J, White M. Characterisation of UK diets according to degree of food processing and
567 associations with socio-demographics and obesity: cross-sectional analysis of UK National Diet and
568 Nutrition Survey (2008–12). *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity.*
569 2015;12(1):160.
- 570 46. Black AE, Prentice AM, Goldberg GR, Jebb SA, Bingham SA, Livingstone MB, et al.
571 Measurements of total energy expenditure provide insights into the validity of dietary
572 measurements of energy intake. *Journal of the American Dietetic Association.* 1993;93(5):572-9.
- 573 47. Bingham SA. Limitations of the Various Methods for Collecting Dietary Intake Data. *Annals of*
574 *Nutrition and Metabolism.* 1991;35(3):117-27.
- 575 48. Park Y, Dodd KW, Kipnis V, Thompson FE, Potischman N, Schoeller DA, et al. Comparison of
576 self-reported dietary intakes from the Automated Self-Administered 24-h recall, 4-d food records,
577 and food-frequency questionnaires against recovery biomarkers. *The American journal of clinical*
578 *nutrition.* 2018;107(1):80-93.
- 579 49. Steele EM, O'Connor LE, Juul F, Khandpur N, Galastri Baraldi L, Monteiro CA, et al. Identifying
580 and Estimating Ultraprocessed Food Intake in the US NHANES According to the Nova Classification
581 System of Food Processing. *The Journal of Nutrition.* 2023;153(1):225-41.

582