

1 Causality or confounding? Applying E values to examine associations  
2 between ultra-processed food consumption and weight gain

3

4

## TECHNICAL REPORT ARTICLE

5

6

7

Eric Robinson<sup>1</sup> & Andrew Jones<sup>2</sup>

8

9

<sup>1</sup>Institute of Population Health, University of Liverpool, Liverpool, UK

10

<sup>2</sup>School of Psychology, Liverpool John Moores University, Liverpool, UK

11

12

Correspondence: Eric Robinson, email: [eric.robinson@liv.ac.uk](mailto:eric.robinson@liv.ac.uk)

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 **Short title:** Causality or confounding?

23 **Keywords:** UPF, ultra-processed food, weight gain, obesity, confounding

24 **Word count:** 2469/2500 limit

25 **Abstract**

26 **Background:** Ultra-processed food (UPF) consumption is associated prospectively with  
27 weight gain and obesity in observational studies of adults. Unaccounted for confounding is a  
28 risk when attempting to make causal inference from observational studies. Limited research  
29 has examined how feasible it is that unmeasured confounding may explain associations  
30 between UPF consumption and weight gain in observational research

31 **Methods:** We introduce the E value to obesity researchers. The E value is defined as the  
32 minimum strength of association that one or more unaccounted for confounding variables  
33 would need to have with an exposure (UPF consumption) and outcome (e.g., weight gain) to  
34 explain the association between the exposure and outcome of interest. We meta-analysed  
35 prospective studies on the association between UPF consumption and weight gain in adults.  
36 Next, we applied the E value approach and illustrated the potential role that unmeasured or  
37 hypothetical residual confounding variables could have in explaining associations.

38 **Results:** Higher consumption of UPFs was associated with increased weight gain in meta-  
39 analysis (RR=1.14). The corresponding E value = 1.55, indicating that unaccounted for  
40 confounding variables with small-to-moderate sized associations with UPF consumption and  
41 weight gain (e.g., depressive symptoms, trait overeating tendencies, access to healthy and  
42 nutritious food) could individually or collectively account for observed associations between  
43 UPF consumption and weight gain.

44 **Conclusions:** Unaccounted for confounding could plausibly explain the prospective  
45 association between UPF consumption and weight gain in adults. High quality observational  
46 research controlling for potential confounders and evidence from study types devoid of  
47 confounding are now needed.

48

49

50 Introduction

51 There is significant interest in the potential causal impact that ultra-processed food (UPF)  
52 consumption has on health. Observational studies have identified that higher UPF  
53 consumption tends to be associated with worse health outcomes, such as weight gain and  
54 obesity (1, 2). Prospective studies on this topic are particularly importance as they better  
55 allow for inferences on temporal order of associations.

56

57 A major challenge in all observational research are unmeasured confounding variables. In  
58 line with this, confounding (e.g., residual confounding by social class or lifestyle behaviours)  
59 has been discussed as a limitation in numerous studies and reviews on UPFs and health (3-5).  
60 To date, there have been limited attempts to quantify how feasible it is that unmeasured  
61 confounding could in part attenuate or fully explain prospective relationships between UPF  
62 consumption and health outcomes, such as weight gain. A rare exception is a negative control  
63 outcome analysis, which found some evidence to suggest that confounding could explain why  
64 UPF consumption and cancer were associated in a prospective observational study (4).

65

66 In the present article we introduce a recently developed analysis approach to obesity  
67 researchers - the E value (6) – to estimate the plausibility that unmeasured confounding could  
68 explain observational findings linking UPF consumption with weight gain. The E value is  
69 defined as the minimum strength of association that one or more (combined) unaccounted for  
70 confounding variables would need to have with an exposure (UPF consumption) and outcome  
71 (e.g., weight gain) to explain the association between the exposure and outcome of interest.

72

73 When an outcome is predicted using a risk ratio (RR), the E value is calculated as:

74 
$$E = RR + \sqrt{[RR \times (RR - 1)]}$$

75 For outcomes predicted using odds ratios and hazard ratios the same equation is used,  
76 although some adjustments are made, based on how common the outcome is (e.g. > 15% of  
77 individuals have an outcome at the end of follow-up).

78

79 Specific E values should not be considered as generically ‘likely’ vs. ‘unlikely’ evidence of  
80 confounding potentially explaining exposure-outcome observations, as inference should be  
81 based on a case-by-case basis. For example, Gaster et al.(7) conducted a meta-analysis on the  
82 association between anti-depressant use and miscarriage risk, concluding that risk of  
83 miscarriage was higher among anti-depressant users (RR=1.41). For this RR, the E value =  
84 2.17. Alcohol use was considered as a potential confounder because pregnant women who  
85 use anti-depressants are at much higher risk of excessive alcohol consumption than pregnant  
86 women who do not. The authors went on to conclude that alcohol use could explain the  
87 association between anti-depressant use and miscarriage risk because the relationship  
88 (expressed as a risk ratio) between anti-depressant use and alcohol, and alcohol and  
89 miscarriage risk are both known to be > 2.17. Yet, it is important to note that the strengths of  
90 the association between confounder and exposure and confounder and outcome do not both  
91 need to exceed an E-value to provide statistical evidence of potential ‘total’ confounding.

92

93 Used alongside the E-value, is the joint bounding factor, B:

$$94 \quad B = (RR_{UD} * RR_{EU}) / (RR_{EU} + RR_{UD} - 1)$$

95

96  $RR_{UD}$  is the size of association between the potential confounder and outcome and  $RR_{EU}$  is  
97 the size of association between the potential confounder and exposure. To explore how  
98 combinations of confounder exposure and outcome relationships could combine to create  
99 statistical conditions for ‘total’ confounding, one sets B (bounding factor) to the E value. In

100 simple language, if the likely size of association between the potential confounder and  
101 outcome (or exposure) is larger than E value but the potential confounder and exposure (or  
102 out outcome) association is smaller than the E value, the two may still combine to be equal to  
103 or exceed the E value and therefore contribute to ‘total’ confounding. For instance, if an E  
104 value is 2.00 (RR ~ 1.33), a stronger association between confounder and outcome (RR =  
105 3.00) and a weaker association between confounder and exposure could exist (RRs > 1.60) to  
106 produce ‘total’ confounding and explain away the effect (see Figure 1).

107

108 This equation can also be used to estimate by how much (% of effect) combinations of known  
109  $RR_{UD}$  and  $RR_{EU}$  could account for an observed effect (RR). B = the observed RR, would  
110 indicate combinations of  $RR_{UD}$  and  $RR_{EU}$  could feasibly create ‘total’ confounding and  
111 explain away the observed effect. B = 50% of observed RR, would indicate that combinations  
112 of  $RR_{UD}$  and  $RR_{EU}$  could feasibly explain half of the size of the observed effect (‘partial’  
113 confounding).

114

115 **INSERT**

116 Figure 1: Visualisation of the Bounding Factor. Red dotted lines show example associations  
117 between confounder and outcome ( $RR_{UD}$ ) and confounder and exposure ( $RR_{UE}$ ) needed to  
118 explain away an effect of RR=1.33. Number in brackets is E Value.

119

120 Here, we introduce the application of the E-value approach in estimating the potential role of  
121 confounding in the association between UPF consumption and weight gain, providing an  
122 illustrative example of how the E value approach can be used, as well as its limitations, in the  
123 context of obesity research.

124

125 UPF consumption and weight gain: identifying potential confounders

126 Higher UPF consumption has been identified as a potential causal contributor to weight gain  
127 and obesity on the basis of observational research. Because both UPF consumption and  
128 obesity have sociodemographic and personal characteristic patterning, variables such as age,  
129 gender, social class, physical activity and smoking status are typical control variables in study  
130 analyses (2, 8) due to concerns over potential confounding. Other potential confounders could  
131 be unmeasured. In the present analyses we consider a person's trait tendency to overeat and  
132 experience depression symptoms, as two examples of 'unmeasured' confounders.

133

134 Socioeconomic status (SES) is a particularly important control variable in diet and health  
135 studies. Standard SES measures like education level may not adequately capture the various  
136 ways by which social class could indirectly contribute to both UPF consumption and weight  
137 gain, resulting in 'residual' confounding(9). Residual confounding is typically very difficult  
138 to measure, but could be relevant to diet because low SES greatly increases likelihood of  
139 decreased access to healthy nutritious food, also known as food insecurity(10). SES measures  
140 are somewhat associated with food insecurity(10), but unlikely to capture the negative  
141 consequences of food insecurity, resulting in residual risk. Here we therefore treat food  
142 insecurity as a quantifiable example of 'residual' confounding.

143

144 Analyses

145 We identified prospective studies examining UPF consumption and change in body weight  
146 among adults from two recent systematic and one recent narrative review on the topic (1, 11,  
147 12). Five prospective studies were identified and meta-analysed. We focused on study effect  
148 estimates from analyses relating to weight gain from baseline. See Table 1. We extracted  
149 results from models that allowed for prospective weight gain to be accurately quantified and

150 adjusted for the most comprehensive collection of potential confounders, which included  
151 demographics (social class, age, sex) and personal characteristics (physical activity, sleep,  
152 smoking status) across studies.

153

154 Random effects meta-analysis using a Restricted Maximum Likelihood estimator were  
155 conducted using the ‘metafor’ package in R. Hazard Ratios were converted to Risk Ratios  
156 using the ‘toRR’ function from the ‘EValue’ package. We conducted separate meta-analyses  
157 to determine the effects of daily UPF intake on weight gain outcomes across different  
158 quartiles of UPF consumption (see table 1), with quartile 1 (lowest consumption of UPF)  
159 used as a comparator in each meta-analysis.

160

161 E values were calculated using the ‘evaluates.RR’ function from the EValue package (see table  
162 2). To convert Odds Ratios to Risk Ratios for the confounding effects we used the formula  
163  $RR = OR / (1 - p_0 + (p_0 * OR))$  where  $p_0$  is the baseline risk (6). To do this we used the  
164 ‘ORToRelRisk’ function from the ‘DescTools’ package (13). We used baseline risk estimates  
165 from relevant studies or conservative estimates if not available directly. Data and R code can  
166 be found here <https://osf.io/z89pa/> .

167

168

169

170

171

172

173

174

175 Table 1. Prospective studies included in meta-analysis

176

<i>Study</i>	<i>Sample</i>	<i>UPF characterisation</i>	<i>Outcome</i>
Mendonca(14)	Normal weight Spanish adults	Quartiles of UPF servings per day  FFQ measurement	Risk of developing overweight or obesity  8.9 year median follow-up
Canhada(2)	Brazilian adults	Quartiles of % total daily energy intake from UPF  FFQ measurement	Risk of large weight gain (>1/69kg per year)  3.8 year median follow-up
Rauber(8)	UK adults	Quartiles of % total daily energy intake from UPF  24 hour recall measurement	Risk of 5% BMI increase  5 year median follow-up
Beslay(15)	French adults	Quartiles of % total daily grams intake from UPF  24 hour recall measurement	Risk of developing overweight or obesity  4.1 year median follow-up
Cordobra(16)	European adults	Quintiles of UPF grams per day  Combination of FFQ and 24 hour recall measurements	Risk of developing overweight or obesity  5 year follow-up

177

178 Table 2 presents the meta-analysis estimates and E values. Figure 2 illustrates the  $RR_{UD}$  and  
 179  $RR_{EU}$  values that equate to E values. Meta-analysis revealed statistically significant and small  
 180 associations between UPF consumption and weight gain outcomes, based on effect size  
 181 interpretation guidance (17). For the largest effect estimate (UPF quartile 4 vs. 1), E values  
 182 for the point estimate and its lower confidence were 1.55 and 1.43, respectively, indicating  
 183 that unmeasured confounders associated with both UPF consumption and weight gain to a  
 184 similar degree (small to medium effect sizes) could nullify associations.

185

186



187 Table 2. Meta-analysis and corresponding E-values

	Meta-analysis effect estimate (Risk Ratio)	E value for point estimate	E value for lower 95% confidence interval
Quartile 2	1.035 (1.006, 1.065)	1.23	1.08
Quartile 3	1.088 (1.041, 1.041)	1.40	1.25
Quartile 4	1.144 (1.100, 1.189)	1.55	1.43

188 Lower and upper 95% confidence intervals in brackets. Reference category is quartile 1.

189

190 **INSERT**

191 Figure 2: Plot of  $RR_{UD}$  and  $RR_{EU}$  and the E-Value for highest amount of UPF consumption  
192 association with weight gain. Red line is RR for overeating and weight gain, and green line  
193 represents the RR between overeating and UPF consumption needed to fully explain the  
194 association between UPF consumption and weight gain.

195

196 *Potential unmeasured confounding*

197 No studies controlled for mental health or depression symptoms as potential confounders.

198 Meta-analysis indicates that higher depression symptoms are associated with UPF  
199 consumption(18) (OR = 1.44 ~ RR = 1.39) and predict development of obesity(19) (OR =

200 1.58 ~ RR = 1.48). The joint bounding factor ( $RR_{UD} * RR_{EU} / (RR_{UD} + RR_{EU} - 1)$ ) = 1.10,

201 suggesting that depressive symptoms could account for 71% (effect estimate) or as much as

202 100% (lower confidence interval of effect estimate) of the meta-analysed association between

203 the highest vs. lowest UPF consumption groups and weight gain.

204

205 No studies controlled for eating traits, such as overeating. Tendency to overeat has a genetic

206 basis and is typically characterised as either general disinhibited overeating or emotional-

207 based overeating is associated with risk of higher BMI across multiple meta-analyses and  
208 effect sizes are medium in size (20, 21). For instance, the pooled association between  
209 disinhibited overeating and BMI is  $r = .28$  (~ OR = 2.88 [95% CI: 2.02 to 4.44] ~ RR = 1.49  
210 [95% CI: 1.34 to 1.63). Prospective studies of the association between tendency to overeat  
211 and weight gain produce similar estimates (22, 23). A positive relationship between tendency  
212 to overeat and higher UPF consumption would seem plausible, but there is a lack of data to  
213 confidently estimate effect size with precision and therefore concluded E-value calculation  
214 was not feasible. However, as denoted in Figure 2, an RR=1.62 (small to medium in size)  
215 would be needed to fully explain the meta-analysed association between the highest vs.  
216 lowest UPF consumption groups and weight gain.

217

### 218 *Potential residual confounding*

219 All studies controlled for SES indicators, but not access to healthy nutritious food or food  
220 insecurity specifically. Food insecurity is associated with higher UPF consumption (24) and a  
221 recent epidemiological survey study estimates participants with the highest UPF consumption  
222 have a 60% higher prevalence of food insecurity (RR = 1.60)(25). Food insecurity is  
223 associated with elevated obesity risk in meta-analysis (OR = 1.53 ~ RR 1.42) (26) and effects  
224 appear similar when examined prospectively (27). Taken together, it suggests that residual  
225 confounding of this nature could account for ~86 % of the effect estimate, or 100 % based on  
226 the lower bound confidence interval.

227

### 228 Discussion

229 We provide an illustration of how the E value can be used to examine the plausibility of  
230 confounding in obesity research. Using this approach we show that confounding variables  
231 with small-to-moderate sized associations with UPF consumption and weight gain could

232 theoretically attenuate or completely nullify associations, and we identify a number of  
233 examples of potential confounding variables that could meet these conditions.

234

235 The present work also highlights some of the limitations of the E value. Accurate calculation  
236 is based on having sufficient statistical information about the potential confounders'  
237 association with both outcome ( $RR_{UD}$ ) and exposure ( $RR_{EU}$ ) variables of interest. Overeating  
238 tendencies were identified as partially meeting the conditions for total confounding ( $RR_{UD} >$   
239 lower bound E value confidence interval), but due to a lack of data to calculate a robust  
240 estimate  $RR_{EU}$ , we were unable to formally apply the E value approach with confidence,  
241 though we were able to estimate associations between UPF consumption and overeating  
242 tendencies which would create statistical conditions that could nullify UPF-weight gain  
243 associations. This observation underscores that appropriate use of the E value is contextually  
244 specific and reliant on various effect size estimations, which may not always be available.

245

246 As the most extreme E values we identified were relatively small in size and a number of  
247 plausible confounders were identified that we reason could collectively attenuate the meta-  
248 analysed UPF consumption – weight gain association observed to non-significance, we  
249 propose that unmeasured confounding is of significant concern. Yet, it is important to note  
250 that the E value approach provides evidence on whether unaccounted confounding factors  
251 could *hypothetically* explain away observed associations. It is also plausible that more  
252 complete measurement of potential confounding variables could increase size of the UPF and  
253 weight gain association. This highlights the need for further confirmatory high quality  
254 observational research that is better able to control for potential confounders of concern and  
255 evidence from study types devoid of confounding (e.g., randomized controlled trials).

256

257 There is debate about how UPFs could causally contribute to weight gain. One proposed  
258 explanation is that the unfavourable macronutrient profile of UPFs could promote weight  
259 gain. A different, but not mutually exclusive explanation is that UPF consumption may also  
260 harm health independent to macronutrient profile and this is supported by some observational  
261 studies finding an association between UPFs and weight gain remains when macronutrient  
262 factors are controlled for(15). Meta-analysed studies did not consistently control for  
263 macronutrient profile. Therefore, from the present analyses it is unclear the extent to which  
264 the macronutrient profile of diets higher in UPFs could in part explain the meta-analysed  
265 associations observed and/or in combination with confounding variables, fully explain  
266 association between higher UPF consumption and weight gain.

267

268 There are limitations to the present research and the E value approach. We examined a select  
269 number of example potential confounders for illustrative purposes and other potential  
270 confounders may warrant investigation (e.g. shared genetic risk for weight gain and  
271 unhealthy diet). Food insecurity was examined as a quantifiable hypothetical example of  
272 residual confounding from measurement of SES. Most residual confounding by its nature is  
273 due to measurement imprecision and therefore unquantifiable. Food insecurity (based on  
274 prevalence) is a relatively rare event (dependent on country) and therefore itself may be  
275 unlikely to fully explain UPF and weight gain associations, but less extreme limited access to  
276 healthy nutrition will be more common and therefore a more likely potential confounder.

277

278 We based meta-analysis study inclusion on recent systematic reviews and not a formal search  
279 procedure, as this was beyond the scope of this technical report. A small number of studies  
280 were suitable for meta-analysis and they may be prone to publication bias. If so, the size of  
281 association between UPF consumption and weight gain and E-values may be overestimated.

282 The E value approach provides information on hypothetical confounding and the accuracy of  
283 estimates are dependent on the underlying statistical assumptions, as well as assumptions  
284 made when converting effect sizes. Critiques of the statistical application of the E value (6,  
285 28) underscore that it can be at best considered as an analysis tool to inform thinking about  
286 potential confounding and not a blunt instrument to draw definitive conclusions from.

287

288 Unaccounted for confounding could plausibly explain the prospective association between  
289 UPF consumption and weight gain in adults. High quality observational research controlling  
290 for potential confounders and evidence from study types devoid of confounding are now  
291 needed.

292

### 293 **Acknowledgements**

294 *Contributions.* Both authors conceived and designed the study. ER and AJ were responsible  
295 for data collection. AJ analysed the data. ER drafted the manuscript. Both authors revised the  
296 manuscript, contributed to the intellectual content and approved the final version.

297 *Conflicts of interest.* ER has previously received funding from Unilever and the American  
298 Beverage Association for unrelated research. AJ has previously received funding from  
299 Camurus pharmaceuticals, unrelated to this project.

300 *Funding.* ER is funded by the National Institute for Health and Care Research (NIHR)  
301 Oxford Health Biomedical Research Centre (BRC). The views expressed are those of the  
302 author(s) and not necessarily those of the NIHR or the Department of Health and Social Care.

303

304

305

306

307 **Figure and Table headings**

308 Figure 1: Visualisation of the Bounding Factor. Red dotted lines show example associations

309 between confounder and outcome (RR<sub>UD</sub>) and confounder and exposure (RR<sub>UE</sub>) needed to

310 explain away an effect of RR=1.33. Number in brackets is E Value.

311 Figure 2: Plot of RR<sub>UD</sub> and RR<sub>EU</sub> and the E-Value for highest amount of UPF consumption

312 association with weight gain. Red line is RR for overeating and weight gain, and green line

313 represents the RR between overeating and UPF consumption needed to fully explain the

314 association between UPF consumption and weight gain.

315 Table 1. Prospective studies included in meta-analysis

316 Table 2. Meta-analysis and corresponding E-values

317

318 **References**

319 1. Moradi S, Entezari MH, Mohammadi H, Jayedi A, Lazaridi A-V, Kermani MaH, et  
320 al. Ultra-processed food consumption and adult obesity risk: a systematic review and dose-  
321 response meta-analysis. *Critical reviews in food science and nutrition*. 2022;63(2):249-60.

322 2. Canhada SL, Luft VC, Giatti L, Duncan BB, Chor D, Maria de Jesus M, et al. Ultra-  
323 processed foods, incident overweight and obesity, and longitudinal changes in weight and  
324 waist circumference: the Brazilian Longitudinal Study of Adult Health (ELSA-Brasil). *Public  
325 health nutrition*. 2020;23(6):1076-86.

326 3. Zhang Z, Jackson SL, Steele EM, Gillespie C, Yang Q. Relationship Between  
327 Ultraprocessed Food Intake and Cardiovascular Health Among U.S. Adolescents: Results  
328 From the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey 2007–2018. *Journal of  
329 Adolescent Health*. 2022;70(2):249-57.

330 4. Morales-Berstein F, Biessy C, Viallon V, Goncalves-Soares A, Casagrande C, Hémon  
331 B, et al. Ultra-processed foods, adiposity and risk of head and neck cancer and oesophageal  
332 adenocarcinoma in the European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition study: a  
333 mediation analysis. *Eur J Nutr*. 2023.

334 5. Poti JM, Braga B, Qin B. Ultra-processed Food Intake and Obesity: What Really  
335 Matters for Health-Processing or Nutrient Content? *Curr Obes Rep*. 2017;6(4):420-31.

336 6. VanderWeele TJ, Ding P. Sensitivity Analysis in Observational Research: Introducing  
337 the E-Value. *Ann Intern Med*. 2017;167(4):268-74.

338 7. Gaster T, Eggertsen CM, Støvring H, Ehrenstein V, Petersen I. Quantifying the  
339 impact of unmeasured confounding in observational studies with the E value. *BMJ medicine*.  
340 2023;2(1).

341 8. Rauber F, Chang K, Vamos EP, da Costa Louzada ML, Monteiro CA, Millett C, et al.  
342 Ultra-processed food consumption and risk of obesity: a prospective cohort study of UK  
343 Biobank. *European journal of nutrition*. 2021;60:2169-80.

- 344 9. Fewell Z, Davey Smith G, Sterne JAC. The Impact of Residual and Unmeasured  
345 Confounding in Epidemiologic Studies: A Simulation Study. *American Journal of*  
346 *Epidemiology*. 2007;166(6):646-55.
- 347 10. Gundersen C, Ziliak JP. Food insecurity and health outcomes. *Health affairs*.  
348 2015;34(11):1830-9.
- 349 11. Askari M, Heshmati J, Shahinfar H, Tripathi N, Daneshzad E. Ultra-processed food  
350 and the risk of overweight and obesity: a systematic review and meta-analysis of  
351 observational studies. *International Journal of Obesity*. 2020;44(10):2080-91.
- 352 12. Harb AA, Shechter A, Koch PA, St-Onge M-P. Ultra-processed foods and the  
353 development of obesity in adults. *European Journal of Clinical Nutrition*. 2023;77(6):619-27.
- 354 13. Viechtbauer W. Conducting Meta-Analyses in R with the metafor Package. *Journal of*  
355 *Statistical Software*. 2010;36(3):1 - 48.
- 356 14. Mendonça RD, Pimenta AM, Gea A, de la Fuente-Arrillaga C, Martinez-Gonzalez  
357 MA, Lopes AC, et al. Ultraprocessed food consumption and risk of overweight and obesity:  
358 the University of Navarra Follow-Up (SUN) cohort study. *Am J Clin Nutr*.  
359 2016;104(5):1433-40.
- 360 15. Beslay M, Srouf B, Méjean C, Allès B, Fiolet T, Debras C, et al. Ultra-processed food  
361 intake in association with BMI change and risk of overweight and obesity: A prospective  
362 analysis of the French NutriNet-Santé cohort. *PLOS Medicine*. 2020;17(8):e1003256.
- 363 16. Cordova R, Kliemann N, Huybrechts I, Rauber F, Vamos EP, Levy RB, et al.  
364 Consumption of ultra-processed foods associated with weight gain and obesity in adults: A  
365 multi-national cohort study. *Clinical Nutrition*. 2021;40(9):5079-88.
- 366 17. Olivier J, May WL, Bell ML. Relative effect sizes for measures of risk.  
367 *Communications in Statistics - Theory and Methods*. 2017;46(14):6774-81.
- 368 18. Lane MM, Gamage E, Travica N, Dissanayaka T, Ashtree DN, Gauci S, et al. Ultra-  
369 Processed Food Consumption and Mental Health: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis  
370 of Observational Studies. *Nutrients*. 2022;14(13):2568.
- 371 19. Luppino FS, de Wit LM, Bouvy PF, Stijnen T, Cuijpers P, Penninx BWJH, et al.  
372 Overweight, Obesity, and Depression: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis of  
373 Longitudinal Studies. *Archives of General Psychiatry*. 2010;67(3):220-9.
- 374 20. Dakin C, Beaulieu K, Hopkins M, Gibbons C, Finlayson G, Stubbs RJ. Do eating  
375 behavior traits predict energy intake and body mass index? A systematic review and meta-  
376 analysis. *Obesity Reviews*. 2023;24(1):e13515.
- 377 21. Vasileiou V, Abbott S. Emotional eating among adults with healthy weight,  
378 overweight and obesity: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Human Nutrition*  
379 *and Dietetics*. 2023;36(5):1922-30.
- 380 22. Hays NP, Bathalon GP, McCrory MA, Roubenoff R, Lipman R, Roberts SB. Eating  
381 behavior correlates of adult weight gain and obesity in healthy women aged 55–65 y<sup>123</sup>. *The*  
382 *American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*. 2002;75(3):476-83.
- 383 23. Hays NP, Roberts SB. Aspects of Eating Behaviors “Disinhibition” and “Restraint”  
384 Are Related to Weight Gain and BMI in Women. *Obesity*. 2008;16(1):52-8.
- 385 24. Chiong R, Figueroa R. Food Insecurity and the Association between Perceptions and  
386 Trust of Food Advertisements and Consumption of Ultra-Processed Foods among U.S.  
387 Parents and Adolescents. *Nutrients*. 2022;14(9):1964.
- 388 25. Coletro HN, Machado-Coelho GLL, Meireles AL, Mendonça RdD, Menezes MCd,  
389 Menezes-Júnior LAAd. The combined consumption of fresh/minimally processed food and  
390 ultra-processed food on food insecurity: COVID Inconfidentes, a population-based survey.  
391 *Public Health Nutrition*. 2023;26(7):1414-23.

- 392 26. Eskandari F, Lake AA, Rose K, Butler M, O'Malley C. A mixed-method systematic  
393 review and meta-analysis of the influences of food environments and food insecurity on  
394 obesity in high-income countries. *Food Science & Nutrition*. 2022;10(11):3689-723.  
395 27. Wilde PE, Peterman JN. Individual Weight Change Is Associated with Household  
396 Food Security Status<sup>12</sup>. *The Journal of Nutrition*. 2006;136(5):1395-400.  
397 28. Greenland S. Commentary: An argument against E-values for assessing the  
398 plausibility that an association could be explained away by residual confounding. *Int J*  
399 *Epidemiol*. 2020;49(5):1501-3.
- 400





