

# 1 Meal Protein Quality Score: A novel tool to evaluate protein quantity and quality of 2 meals

3 Pol Grootswagers<sup>1</sup>, Sine Højlund Christensen<sup>2</sup>, Marielle Timmer<sup>3</sup>, William Riley<sup>3</sup>, Lisette de  
4 Groot<sup>1</sup>, Inge Tetens<sup>2</sup>

5 <sup>1</sup> Division of Human Nutrition and Health, Wageningen University, 6708 PB Wageningen,  
6 The Netherlands

7 <sup>2</sup> University of Copenhagen, 1958 Frederiksberg C, Denmark

8 <sup>3</sup> Wageningen Food and Biobased Research, 6708 WG Wageningen, The Netherlands

## 9 Corresponding author:

10 Pol Grootswagers, [pol.grootswagers@wur.nl](mailto:pol.grootswagers@wur.nl), Stippeneng 4, 6708 WE Wageningen

## 11 Abstract

12 **Background:** The recent shift towards increased plant-based protein consumption has  
13 necessitated the development of new tools to evaluate the quality and quantity of protein in  
14 meals, especially given the changing dietary guidelines and the adoption of plant-centric  
15 menus in healthcare and other settings.

16 **Objective:** To develop and test the feasibility of the Meal Protein Quality Score (MPQS), a  
17 novel metric that assesses the protein quality and quantity in meals based on essential amino  
18 acid (EAA) content, digestibility and requirements, with a focus on optimizing protein intake  
19 for vulnerable populations, particularly older adults.

20 **Methods:** The MPQS integrates digestibility-adjusted EAA intake with total protein  
21 consumed in a meal, that together with the EAA requirements provide a score from 0 to 100  
22 to reflect EAA coverage adequacy. The score was tested for feasibility by applying it to recipe  
23 data from real life hospital meals, and to dietary data from the NU-AGE trial, involving

**NOTE:** This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

24 detailed seven-day food records from 252 non-vegan participants analyzed over multiple meal  
25 moments.

26 **Results:** The analyses revealed that the higher the content of plant-protein in a meal, the  
27 lower the meal protein quality. Also, breakfast meals scored lowest on protein quality, mainly  
28 due to low contents of protein overall, and of lysine and methionine. The MPQS effectively  
29 highlighted the difference in protein quality between plant-based and animal-based meals, and  
30 across different meal types.

31 **Conclusion:** The MPQS appears to be a practical tool that facilitates the assessment of meal-  
32 based protein quality. The MPQS can be used to guide dietary transitions towards plant-rich  
33 diets, ensuring that such shifts do not compromise protein adequacy for at-risk populations.  
34 The score allows for guidance in meal-planning, leading to improvements in plant-rich meal  
35 formulation to meet both individual and public health nutritional needs.

36 **Keywords:** Protein Quality, Meal Protein Quality Score, Plant-based proteins, Plant-based  
37 diets, Veganism

38 **Abbreviations:**

EAA	Essential Amino Acid
DIAAS	Digestible Indispensable Amino Acid Score
MPQS	Meal Protein Quality Score
PDCAAS	Protein Digestibility-Corrected Amino Acid Score

39

## 40 **Introduction**

41 The shift in dietary protein intake towards more plant-based proteins instead of animal-based  
42 proteins is gaining traction in consumers, employees, hospital patients and dietary guidelines <sup>9</sup>.

43 While the beneficial effects of this transition on cardiometabolic outcomes and on  
44 environmental sustainability are much welcome, it does pose a health risk on some groups of  
45 consumers <sup>23</sup>. These are in general consumers with increased protein requirements, lower food  
46 intakes, at risk of malnutrition or at risk of sarcopenia, such as older adults and patients <sup>6</sup>. That  
47 risk stems from the lower anabolic properties of plant-based proteins, which are a result of the  
48 lower protein concentrations and quality.

49 Protein quality is a product of the digestibility, the essential amino acid contents of a protein  
50 source, and the amino acid requirement of the individual. In a diet high in animal protein,  
51 protein quality is almost never an issue <sup>14</sup>. Animal based protein sources typically contain all  
52 essential amino acids in proportions similar to our bodily proteins and are generally more than  
53 95% digestible. Hence, in typical Western dietary patterns where 60% of all proteins are  
54 consumed through animal sources <sup>30</sup>, information on digestibility and amino acid contents was  
55 not considered crucial for human health, which explains the paucity in these data. However,  
56 official dietary guidelines are shifting to more plant-centered diets, and hospitals and meal  
57 services are more frequently offering plant-based meals to their consumers, creating a need for  
58 data and scoring algorithms to assess the protein quality of meals <sup>4</sup>.

59 Calculating protein quality is not only important to plan meals, monitor the current intake, but  
60 also to formulate dietary advice to improve protein quality. The current Dutch recommendation  
61 for vegans to ensure adequate intake of all essential amino acids is to increase their protein  
62 intake with 30% above the recommendation for the general population <sup>9</sup>. For older adults, such  
63 an increased intake is challenging, as they are already encouraged to increase their protein  
64 intake and while being frequently faced with losses of appetite <sup>6</sup>. Also, for environmental

65 reasons that may underlie a shift to more plant-based foods, the advice to eat more is  
66 counterintuitive.

67 A more elegant solution to meet EAA requirements is to combine complementary plant-based  
68 protein sources, so that they together deliver all amino acids required by the body. When meals  
69 are constructed by taking into account the essential amino acid contents and digestibility of the  
70 meal components, a protein quality equal to that of an animal based meal can be achieved  
71 without significantly increasing the portion size<sup>13</sup>. The variation in essential amino acid profiles  
72 in plants is large, with some plant sources like pea contain significantly more lysine than the  
73 reference pattern and less methionine, while others like rice show the opposite trend<sup>10</sup>. That  
74 variation opens the possibility to mix and match sources that together deliver all essential amino  
75 acids that should be present in one meal. With data on amino acid profiles of all protein  
76 containing foods and their digestibility, together with data on amino acid requirements, and an  
77 algorithm to calculate the protein quality, many combinations of multiple plant sources that  
78 result in a high protein quality meal can be identified.

79 Currently, protein quality is calculated by PDCAAS or DIAAS. These scores take into account  
80 digestibility and amino acid patterns, and are useful in determining the quality of single protein  
81 sources. However, protein sources are rarely eaten individually, but normally as part of a meal  
82 with multiple protein sources<sup>3</sup>. Moreover, a PDCAAS or DIAAS score does not take into  
83 account protein quantity, while having a very low intake of a high-quality source can be  
84 physiologically meaningless, as it might still be unable to meet metabolic demands. Therefore,  
85 a score is needed that reflects both the quality and the quantity of all proteins consumed together  
86 within one meal.

87 In this paper, we present the development and feasibility testing of the Meal Protein Quality  
88 Score (MPQS), which includes protein quantity, targeted essential amino acid requirements,  
89 and digestibility-adjusted amino acid intakes in a score.

## 90 **Methods**

### 91 *Database development*

92 For the purpose of facilitating protein quality assessments based on Dutch dietary intake data,  
93 the food table NEVO<sup>19</sup> was augmented to include amino acid profiles and protein digestibility  
94 data for all food items containing more than 1% protein. When available, ileal digestibility data  
95 were given precedence over fecal values, and data derived from human studies were prioritized  
96 over those obtained from pig and rat studies. Furthermore, digestibility data from in vitro  
97 models were not considered. The full procedure of this food table extension has been published  
98 before<sup>11</sup>.

### 99 *Personalized EAA requirements*

100 The MPQS takes into account personalized requirements for essential amino acids that a meal  
101 should deliver to optimally meet the body's metabolic demand, which is based on a combination  
102 of a protein quantity requirement per meal and the amino acid reference patterns set by WHO  
103<sup>31</sup>.

104 For protein quantity, we use a requirement of 0.3 gram per kilogram body weight per meal  
105 moment, based on studies that show that this amount is sufficient to stimulate muscle protein  
106 synthesis<sup>32</sup>, and, with three main meals and snacks, will result in a total daily intake around  
107 1.0-1.2 g/kg/d which is in line with official recommendations for older adults<sup>2,22</sup>.

108 With this protein quantity, we have a target protein intake in grams, which we multiply by the  
109 reference amino acid patterns set by FAO/WHO<sup>31</sup> expressed in mg EAA per g protein, resulting  
110 in the requirements presented in **Table 1**.

111

**Table 1.** Essential Amino Acid Requirements

used to calculate personalized requirements.

Essential Amino Acid	Requirement (mg/kg bw)
His	4.5
Ile	9
Leu	17.7
Lys	13.5
Met	4.8
Cys	1.8
Phe+Tyr	11.4
Thr	6.9
Try	1.8
Val	11.7

Requirements are obtained by multiplying WHO/FAO <sup>31</sup> essential amino acid requirements (expressed in mg/g) by optimal total meal protein intake of 0.3 g/kg bodyweight.

112

113 *Meal Protein Quality Score*

114 Subsequently, we can score digestibility-adjusted amino acid intakes from a meal. The Meal  
115 Protein Quality Score (MPQS) is a composite score that assess protein quality and protein  
116 quantity from a meal by taking into account amount of protein, digestibility of protein, and  
117 amino acid requirement. MPQS can have values between 0 (where at least one essential amino  
118 acid is completely missing in the meal) and 100 (where all essential amino acids reach the

119 requirement). MPQS scores can score above 100 when each amino acid in the meal exceeds the  
 120 requirement.

$$121 \quad MPQS = \min_i \left( \frac{\sum_j (\text{intake of } EAA_i \text{ from food}_j \times \text{digestibility factor of food}_j)}{\text{personalised requirement of } EAA_i} \right)$$

122 As an example, **Table 2** presents a meal that has an MPQS of 44, meaning that the limiting  
 123 EAA meets 44% of the requirement. In this case, the digestibility-adjusted intake of methionine  
 124 is 148 mg, where the meal requirement for this person of 70 kilograms is (70\*4.8) 336 mg.

**Table 2.** Example calculation of Meal Protein Quality Score (MPQS). In this meal, the MPQS is 44 and the limiting essential amino acid is methionine.

	Digestibility	His	Ile	Leu	Lys	Met	Cys <sup>a</sup>	Phe+ Tyr	Thr	Try
Ingredient A	94%	204	368	628	517	102	107	653	312	103
Ingredient B	75%	30	62	91	97	23	14	99	56	26
Ingredient C	64%	29	58	84	92	22	6	73	63	17 +
<b>Total Digestibility-Adjusted EAA Intake</b>		<b>263</b>	<b>488</b>	<b>803</b>	<b>706</b>	<b>148</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>825</b>	<b>430</b>	<b>146</b>
Personalized Meal EAA Requirement <sup>b</sup>		315	630	1239	945	336	126	798	483	126 ÷
Requirement Met		83%	77%	65%	75%	<b>44%</b>	101%	103%	89%	116%

<sup>a</sup>Cysteine is topped up with all methionine consumed above the requirement, since methionine can be unidirectionally converted into cysteine. All amino acid intakes are adjusted for the shown digestibility factor before they are summed. <sup>b</sup>In this example, a bodyweight of 70 kilograms is used.

### 125 *Application of the score*

126 The practical application of the score was tested for recipes and for large epidemiological  
 127 datasets. First, recipes of meals that were provided by a hospital in the region of Copenhagen,  
 128 Denmark, were calculated for protein quality by applying MPQS. The selected meals were  
 129 developed to contain a higher-than-conventional proportion of plant protein.

130 Second, the functionality of the MPQS, the score was calculated for all meals consumed at  
 131 baseline by the Dutch participants of the NU-AGE trial<sup>1</sup>. The participants (n=252) of the  
 132 NU-AGE trial filled out 7 day food records, resulting in available data on 5121 meals eaten on

133 1757 days. The NU-AGE trial was a 1-year intervention aimed at improving the diet towards a  
134 more Mediterranean diet and had a high-quality dietary assessment<sup>1</sup>. Trained dietitians and  
135 nutritionists reviewed food records during home visits, ensuring completeness and accuracy  
136 through discussions with participants. Nutrients were calculated by using the NEVO food  
137 composition table (NEderlands VOedingsstoffenbestand 2016/5.0<sup>19</sup>).

138 For all meals, data on MPQS, limiting amino acid, (total, animal, and plant) protein intake, and  
139 energy intake were calculated.

#### 140 **Statistical methods**

141 All presented analyses were pre-specified. Descriptive statistics are presented as means  $\pm$  SD  
142 for normally distributed data, and medians with interquartile ranges [IQR; 25th percentile-75th  
143 percentile] for non-normally distributed data. The normality of the distribution was visually  
144 inspected for all variables, and analyses were conducted using methods appropriate to each  
145 distribution type. Differences between groups were evaluated using Analysis of Variance  
146 (ANOVA) followed by Tukey's post hoc test to identify specific differences between meal  
147 moments and types. For paired comparisons, such as assessing the impact of adjustments for  
148 digestibility, the Wilcoxon signed-rank test was applied. Linear regression analysis was utilized  
149 to explore the predictive value of meal characteristics on the MPQS, while Spearman's rank  
150 correlation was employed to develop a correlation matrix. All statistical analyses were  
151 conducted using SAS software, version 9.4 (SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC, USA), and GraphPad  
152 Prism, version 9.3.1 (GraphPad Software, San Diego, CA, USA).

153



154 **Results**

155 *Applying MPQS to assess protein quality of recipes*

156 A total of 22 real life hospital meals were analysed (**Table 3**). The meals were vegetarian or  
 157 traditional and had proportions of plant protein varying from 15% to 69%. In meals with plant  
 158 protein portions below 50%, either leucine or no essential amino acid was limiting. In meals  
 159 with greater proportions of plant protein, lysine and methionine were limiting.

**Table 3.** Meal Protein Quality Score of 22 real-world hospital meal recipes, sorted by plant portion proportion.

Recipe name	Portion size (g)	Plant / animal (mg AA /mg AA)	%AA from plant	MPQS	Limiting EAA
Focaccia with potato, and chanterelle lasagna	252	2908/1325	69	56	Methionine
Potatoes, and oxheart cabbage	241	1602/925	63	33	Methionine
Cauliflower soup, rye bread, potato, cream cheese	221	2345/2226	51	56	Methionine
Mini Danish pastry with cream cheese	81	774/772	50	18	Lysine
Tartlets, rye bread, eggs	262	2755/2839	49	75	Leucine
Mushroom gnocchi, cod roe, rye bread, cream cheese	338	3795/4998	43	116	-
White bread, salad, prawns, walnut- mushroom pâté	253	2267/3719	38	81	Leucine
Sponge cake	144	1391/2365	37	51	Leucine
Asparagus soup, prawns, and rye bread with potatoes	212	1750/3710	32	73	Leucine
Greek yogurt, granola, scrambled egg with tofu, and brioche with rhubarb	240	1926/4559	30	89	Leucine
Tartlets, smoked chicken, and rye bread with eggs	325	2755/7770	26	137	-
Focaccia with potato, chanterelle lasagna, salmon	319	2908/8183	26	149	-
Cauliflower soup, fish terrine, rye bread with potatoes and cream cheese	267	2345/6575	26	120	-
Pommes Macaire, ham, and with Ingrid peas salad	287	1849/5337	26	92	Leucine
Rye bread with egg, potatoes, and salmon	197	1834/5299	26	91	Leucine
Macaroni with cheese, ham, and vegetarian meatballs	241	2002/6114	25	106	-
Lupin beans with rice, chicken, and vegetarian meatballs in curry	209	2071/6895	23	116	-
Potatoes, roasted beef, and oxheart cabbage	281	1602/5711	22	97	Leucine
Cannelloni, vegetarian Bolognese, and Bresaola	319	2240/7789	22	136	-
Mashed potatoes with broad beans, ham, and stew	250	1679/6170	21	90	Cysteine
Spinach and parmesan egg, bun with cheese, muesli	251	2090/8826	19	151	-
Leek pie, salmon, and rye bread with eggs	269	2008/11453	15	180	-

AA, Amino Acid; EAA, Essential Amino Acid; MPQS, Meal Protein Quality Score.

160 *Applying MPQS to assess protein quality in a large dataset*

161 Data from n=252 participants were used, of which 56% were female, with a mean age of  $71 \pm$   
162 4 years (**Table 4**). The overall protein consumption was  $1.0 \pm 0.25$  g/kg/d, with plant-based  
163 protein accounting for  $40 \pm 8\%$  of the total protein intake. When comparing participants based  
164 on their MPQS scores, we identified a subset of 102 individuals who achieved the an MPQS of  
165 100 (indicating meeting all meal EAA requirements) in over half of their meals. This subgroup  
166 demonstrated similar demographic and physical activity levels to those who did not meet this  
167 criterion. Notable differences were observed in terms of body weight, and dietary intake, with  
168 the group scoring lower on the MPQS exhibiting higher body weights and consuming less  
169 protein and energy overall.


170 *Meal Protein Quality Score per main meal moment*

171 **Figure 1** shows the mean MPQS scores per main meal moment, before and after adjustment  
172 for digestibility. Clearly, MPQS increases over the meal moments, with the lowest score (at  
173 breakfast ( $57 \pm 1$ ) and the highest at dinner ( $149 \pm 2$ ). Digestibility adjustment significantly  
174 lowered the MPQS in all meal moments (median decrease in MPQS of 4 (6.5%), 8 (6.3%) and  
175 17 (10.1%) for breakfast, lunch and dinner, respectively). Most frequent limiting EAAs at  
176 breakfast were lysine (73%) and methionine (18%, Table 5).

**Table 4.** Baseline characteristics.

	Total sample (n=252)	Median MPQS <100 (n=150)	Median MPQS ≥100 (n=102)
Gender, % female	56	56	55
Age, y	71 ± 4	71 ± 4	71 ± 4
Height, cm	169 ± 8	170 ± 8	168 ± 8
Weight, kg	75 ± 13	77 ± 15	71 ± 10
BMI, kg/m <sup>2</sup>	26.0 ± 3.6	26.8 ± 4.0	25.0 ± 2.7
PASE score	137 ± 53	136 ± 54	136 ± 54
Protein intake, g/d	76 ± 16	69 ± 13	86 ± 15
Protein intake, g/kg/d	1.0 ± 0.25	0.92 ± 0.19	1.23 ± 0.23
Of which plant protein, %	40 ± 8	41 ± 9	39 ± 8
Energy intake, kcal/d	1908 ± 411	1800 ± 366	2070 ± 422
Percentage of meals > 100 MPQS	44 ± 18	33 ± 11	61 ± 12
Median MPQS score	91 [71-112]	74 [61-87]	119 [107-134]

MPQS, Meal Protein Quality Score; PASE, Physical Activity Scale for the Elderly



**Figure 1.** Meal Protein Quality Score by meal moment.


177 *Meal Protein Quality Score per plant protein proportion*

178 **Figure 2.** shows the mean (A) and distribution (B) of MPQS per plant protein proportion.  
179 MPQS decreases with increasing proportions of plant-based protein of total protein in a meal.  
180 From all n=357 fully vegan meals, no meal reached an MPQS of 100, indicating that all these  
181 meals are inadequate in some essential amino acid. The limiting EAAs of the vegan meals were  
182 (expressed as % of cases): lysine (79%), methionine (11%), cysteine (9%) and leucine (1%,  
183 **Table 5**). Inspection of these vegan meals showed that 71% of them were breakfast meals. The  
184 MPQS of all animal-rich meals frequently scored above 100, with extremes reaching 500,  
185 meaning that the consumption of the limiting essential amino acid is exceeding the requirement  
186 by 5 times.

187 Digestibility adjustment significantly reduced MPQS in all categories of plant protein  
188 proportion. **Figure 3** shows that the impact of digestibility adjustment is around 10% in the  
189 meals containing animal protein, but above 15% in the vegan meals.


190

**A**



MPQS crude  
MPQS adjusted for digestibility


**B**



**Figure 2. A.** Mean Meal Protein Quality Score by plant protein proportion. This figure illustrates that meals composed entirely of plant-based proteins tend to have lower protein quality scores. Notably, within the group of meals with 100% plant protein, breakfasts constitute 71% and are generally associated with lower protein quality scores. This differentiation highlights the influence of meal type on protein quality assessments in plant-based diets.

**B.** Meal Protein Quality Score Distributions by Plant Protein Proportion. This figure presents a violin plot illustrating the distribution of Meal Protein Quality Scores across different proportions of plant protein. It highlights that meals exclusively comprising plant proteins do not achieve a score of 100, whereas meals with a high proportion of animal proteins frequently exceed a score of 100, suggesting instances of protein overconsumption.

### Impact of digestibility adjustment per proportion of plant protein



**Figure 3.** Impact of digestibility adjustment on the Meal Protein Quality Score of meals by plant protein proportion. This figure demonstrates how the inclusion of a digestibility adjustment factor affects the Meal Protein Quality Scores, particularly as the proportion of plant protein in meals increases. The relevance of digestibility adjustment is accentuated in meals with higher plant protein content, illustrating the significant role that digestibility plays in evaluating the protein quality of plant-based meals.

**Table 5.** Frequency (%) of limiting essential amino acid per meal moment and type


	Breakfast	Lunch	Dinner	Plant protein 0-27%	Plant protein 27-65%	Plant protein 65-99%	Plant protein 100%
Cysteine	8	11	18	42	8	1	9
Leucine	2	10	27	22	10	2	1
Lysine	73	61	36	4	60	89	80
Methionine	17	16	18	31	21	7	11
Threonine	-	<1	-	-	<1	-	-
Valine	<1	1	<1	1	1	-	-

192

193

194 *Correlation of meal nutrients and MPQS*

195 **Figure 5A** shows the correlation matrix between MPQS and several meal nutrient  
 196 characteristics. MPQS showed to be positively correlated with amounts of total protein, plant  
 197 protein, animal protein and kilocalories in a meal, while percentage of meal plant protein  
 198 content showed a negative correlation. Linear regression showed that a model containing meal  
 199 moment information and nutritional composition information was able to predict MPQS with  
 200 an R2 of 0.77 (**Figure 5B**).



**Figure 5. A** Spearman’s Correlation matrix for Meal Protein Quality Score and nutritional characteristics.

**B.** Predicted vs Actual Meal Protein Quality Score. This figure illustrates that the Meal Protein Quality Score can be accurately predicted using a combination of factors, including meal timing, the quantity of plant and animal proteins, total kilocalories, and the percentage of plant protein.

201 *Inspection of missed proteins*

202 On average,  $11.1 \pm 10.9$  g of protein was consumed outside of the three main meals, and thus  
203 not considered in the calculation of median daily MPQS. Out of the 1757 days that were  
204 analyzed, on 263 days (15%), the amount of protein eaten outside of the main meals exceeded  
205 20 grams. Inspection of these 263 days revealed that the proteins mainly come from small  
206 snacks (cake, nuts, cheese etc.) and from milk. Only on 10 days (<1%), breakfast was consumed  
207 at the meal moment 'before breakfast' and thus missed in the analyses.



## 208 **Discussion**

209 This paper describes the development of a new protein quality score, that combines amino acid  
210 patterns, protein digestibility, timing of combinations and protein quantity. We show how the  
211 score can be applied to make protein quality of meals insightful, and use it as a starting point  
212 of meal improvement to ensure sufficient protein quality. Additionally, we show how it can be  
213 used to quantify protein quality of individual dietary intake, in large nutritional datasets, and in  
214 real-world recipes.

215 Our new score, the MPQS, is of added value in the field of protein quality. Several protein  
216 quality scores already exist, such as PDCAAS and DIAAS. These scores are suitable for protein  
217 quality assessment at the product level only, whereas in practice, people eat meals, in which  
218 specific combinations of protein products are made <sup>3</sup>. Other scores have been developed to  
219 address this limitation of PDCAAS and DIAAS, such as the EAA-9 score <sup>7</sup>, which enables  
220 protein quality calculations similar to our developed scoring algorithm. The EAA-9 scoring  
221 framework, however, does not strictly account for the timeframe within which protein  
222 combinations must occur, nor does it establish clear amino acid requirements per specific time  
223 intervals. As a result, while the EAA-9 remains highly flexible, the numerous decisions required  
224 of the user may impede practical implementation.

225 Our score relies on several assumptions. First, it assumes a meal protein recommendation of  
226 0.3 grams of perfect quality protein per kilogram body weight per meal. That number is based  
227 on several arguments. First, it seems that this protein amount per meal is sufficient to stimulate  
228 muscle protein synthesis <sup>32</sup>. There are studies suggesting that an even higher dose of proteins  
229 would be ideal for older consumers <sup>18</sup>, but we reason that we should err on the lower bound of  
230 the ideal protein range. That is because we optimize the protein quality within this quantity  
231 goal, meaning that we may achieve higher levels of muscle protein synthesis at lower levels of  
232 total protein quantity. Moreover, it seems inappropriate to try and find meal protein doses where

233 muscle protein synthesis is stimulated *optimally* or *maximally*<sup>5</sup>, as the latest evidence seems to  
234 point out such levels could very well exceed 100 grams of protein per meal<sup>29</sup>. Finally, with  
235 three meals of 0.3 grams of optimized protein per kilogram bodyweight, and some protein  
236 intake coming from snacks, we will achieve intakes of  $\geq 1$  gram of optimized protein per kg  
237 bodyweight. There is no indisputable evidence that a daily protein intake well above 1 gram per  
238 kilogram of body weight provides health benefits for older individuals<sup>12</sup>. Although moderately  
239 increased intakes do not appear to pose health risks, it is imprudent to recommend unnecessarily  
240 high intakes due to the environmental impact of protein production.

241 A second assumption is that combinations of protein sources should be made within one meal.  
242 The current state of research does not clearly point to a specific time frame in which protein  
243 sources should be combined to complement each other's amino acid profiles<sup>9</sup>. Some argue that  
244 this should be ideally done within a meal, especially on lower protein diets or when specific  
245 essential amino acids are limiting on sequential days<sup>15</sup>, while others assume protein  
246 combinations can be made over a whole day<sup>17</sup>. Although there are no strict storage pools for  
247 free amino acids, recent work from Pinckaers et al.<sup>20,21</sup> would suggest that the body is capable  
248 of correcting for a unbalanced amino acid composition at large doses of protein. While their  
249 results suggest that lacking amino acids may have been corrected for by plasma pools, the  
250 precise mechanism is insufficiently elucidated. In animals, so-called labile storage proteins  
251 have been discussed as another potential mechanism, supporting this amino acid buffering  
252 feature<sup>24,27</sup>. However, the capacity to correct for an amino acid disbalance was limited, as the  
253 released EAAs were still greater when comparing whey to gelatine<sup>27</sup>. Consequently, excessive  
254 amino acid disbalance will likely still result in suboptimal utilization of the ingested proteins,  
255 while the labile storage proteins have so far also not been identified in humans. Interestingly, a  
256 recent study explored the impact of daily supplementation with 50 grams of whey protein, pea  
257 protein, or collagen protein on muscle protein synthesis in older adults over a week<sup>16</sup>. The

258 findings revealed that unlike whey and pea proteins, collagen protein did not enhance muscle  
259 protein synthesis. The authors suspect that the low leucine content in collagen protein may be  
260 responsible for its inability to promote muscle protein synthesis. However, it is also plausible  
261 that the complete absence of the essential amino acid tryptophan in collagen (resulting in an  
262 MPQS of 0) contributes to its failure to stimulate muscle protein synthesis, thereby supporting  
263 the notion that a meal must contain all essential amino acids in the proper balance to effectively  
264 stimulate protein synthesis. Until the debate around the time window of protein  
265 complementation is settled, we err on the strict side and assume the meal moment is the time  
266 window in which protein sources should be combined. If needed, our scoring mechanism can  
267 be adapted into a Daily Protein Quality Score, by inputting all daily intake and using daily  
268 amino acid RDAs, or a combination of a daily protein target (such as 0.8 or 1.2 g/kg/d) with an  
269 amino acid reference pattern.

270 Thirdly, we assume that the amino acid reference patterns recommended by FAO and WHO  
271 represents ideal quantities for older adults. These reference patterns are established for the total  
272 population, while older adults may benefit from higher amounts of certain amino acids, such as  
273 leucine <sup>26</sup>. Moreover, where other scoring algorithms combine methionine and cysteine by  
274 simply using their sum, we use a more complex assumption where only methionine consumed  
275 above the recommendation will be converted into cysteine, and never the other way around <sup>25</sup>.  
276 That is justified based on metabolic possibilities. However, some studies suggest that the methyl  
277 donating capacities of the sulfuric amino acids are the main driver of their physiological role,  
278 suggesting that using their sum could be appropriate after all <sup>8</sup>.

279 In this study, we observed that more plant-based meals are often of lower quality. That is in line  
280 with many previous observations. Importantly, this study did not specifically include  
281 vegetarians and vegans, who may be experienced in making better combinations and thus  
282 achieve higher protein quality in their predominantly plant-based meals. Moreso, our study

283 sample tended to consume the majority of their animal proteins at dinner, and the lowest at  
284 breakfast. In our observations, over 70% of the vegan meals were breakfasts. Breakfasts are  
285 known to be the lowest scoring meals in term of protein quantity <sup>28</sup> and quality, therefore  
286 confounding the relationship between the plant protein proportion of a meal and its protein  
287 quality.

288 Moreover, dividing the study population in median MPQS above or below 100 revealed that  
289 the high MPQS group had a 15% higher energy intake and a 25% higher protein intake,  
290 suggesting generally higher consumption levels, particularly of protein. Interestingly, the BMI  
291 in the high MPQS group was 7% lower compared to the low MPQS group. This disparity  
292 suggests potential underreporting of energy intake, yet it does not account for the notably higher  
293 protein consumption observed in the high MPQS group. Possibly, a higher protein quality  
294 intake has an effect on body composition by a larger stimulation of fat free mass synthesis, but  
295 that hypothesis needs to be investigated.

296 In conclusion, we present a new scoring algorithm that enables the calculation of protein quality  
297 of meals and recipes: the Meal Protein Quality Score. This score is much needed to guide the  
298 protein transition towards plant-rich meals of high quality, so that vulnerable populations such  
299 as older adults and patients can safely transit to more plant-based diets as well. We show that  
300 the MPQS can be used to qualify and improve recipes, to calculate individual protein quality  
301 intake per meal, and to calculate protein quality of all meals in large epidemiological studies.

302

### 303 **Acknowledgements**

304 PG, SHC, MT, WR, LdG, IT designed research; PG conducted research, analyzed data and  
305 wrote the paper; SHC, MT, WR, IT, LdG provided essential materials.

306 The authors declare no conflict of interest.

307 Data described in the manuscript, code book, and analytic code will be made available upon  
308 request pending application and approval.

309 **Funding statement**

310 This work was supported by grants from the European Union (AAL, 2021-8-202-SCP),  
311 Cosun Nutrition Center, and Helsefonden.

- 312 1. Berendsen A, Santoro A, Pini E, Cevenini E, Ostan R, Pietruszka B, Rolf K, Cano N,  
313 Caille A, Lyon-Belgy N, Fairweather-Tait S, Feskens E, Franceschi C, de Groot CP. A  
314 parallel randomized trial on the effect of a healthful diet on inflammaging and its  
315 consequences in European elderly people: design of the NU-AGE dietary intervention  
316 study. *Mech Ageing Dev* 2013;134(11-12):523-30. doi: 10.1016/j.mad.2013.10.002.
- 317 2. Blomhoff R, Andersen R, Arnesen EK, Christensen JJ, Eneroth H, Erkkola M,  
318 Gudaviciene I, Halldórsson ÞI, Höyer-Lund A, Lemming EW. Nordic Nutrition  
319 Recommendations 2023: integrating environmental aspects: Nordic Council of  
320 Ministers, 2023.
- 321 3. Craddock JC, Genoni A, Strutt EF, Goldman DM. Limitations with the Digestible  
322 Indispensable Amino Acid Score (DIAAS) with Special Attention to Plant-Based  
323 Diets: a Review. *Curr Nutr Rep* 2021;10(1):93-8. doi: 10.1007/s13668-020-00348-8.
- 324 4. Dam Cv, Christensen S, Tetens I, Riley III W, Timmer M, Marin I, Groot Cd,  
325 Grootswagers P. The co-creation of a digital tool that ensures sufficient protein quality  
326 in plant-based meals of older adults; a User-Centered Design Approach. 2023.
- 327 5. Deutz NE, Wolfe RR. Is there a maximal anabolic response to protein intake with a  
328 meal? *Clin Nutr* 2013;32(2):309-13. doi: 10.1016/j.clnu.2012.11.018.
- 329 6. Domić J, Grootswagers P, van Loon LJ, de Groot LC. Perspective: vegan diets for  
330 older adults? A perspective on the potential impact on muscle mass and strength.  
331 *Advances in Nutrition* 2022;13(3):712-25.
- 332 7. Forester SM, Jennings-Dobbs EM, Sathar SA, Layman DK. Perspective: Developing a  
333 Nutrient-Based Framework for Protein Quality. *The Journal of Nutrition*  
334 2023;153(8):2137-46. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tjnut.2023.06.004>.

- 335 8. Fukagawa NK. Sparing of Methionine Requirements: Evaluation of Human Data  
336 Takes Sulfur Amino Acids Beyond Protein<sup>12</sup>. *The Journal of Nutrition*  
337 2006;136(6):1676S-81S. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1093/jn/136.6.1676S>.
- 338 9. Gezondheidsraad. Gezonde eiwittransitie. Den Haag, 2023.
- 339 10. Gorissen SHM, Crombag JJR, Senden JMG, Waterval WAH, Bierau J, Verdijk LB,  
340 van Loon LJC. Protein content and amino acid composition of commercially available  
341 plant-based protein isolates. *Amino Acids* 2018;50(12):1685-95. doi: 10.1007/s00726-  
342 018-2640-5.
- 343 11. Heerschop SN, Kanellopoulos A, Biesbroek S, van 't Veer P. Shifting towards  
344 optimized healthy and sustainable Dutch diets: impact on protein quality. *European*  
345 *Journal of Nutrition* 2023;62(5):2115-28. doi: 10.1007/s00394-023-03135-7.
- 346 12. Hengeveld LM, de Goede J, Afman LA, Bakker SJL, Beulens JWJ, Blaak EE,  
347 Boersma E, Geleijnse JM, van Goudoever JHB, Hopman MTE, Iestra JA, Kremers  
348 SPJ, Mensink RP, de Roos NM, Stehouwer CDA, Verkaik-Kloosterman J, de Vet E,  
349 Visser M. Health Effects of Increasing Protein Intake Above the Current Population  
350 Reference Intake in Older Adults: A Systematic Review of the Health Council of the  
351 Netherlands. *Adv Nutr* 2022;13(4):1083-117. doi: 10.1093/advances/nmab140.
- 352 13. Herreman L, Nommensen P, Pennings B, Laus MC. Comprehensive overview of the  
353 quality of plant- And animal-sourced proteins based on the digestible indispensable  
354 amino acid score. *Food Sci Nutr* 2020;8(10):5379-91. doi: 10.1002/fsn3.1809.
- 355 14. Katz DL, Doughty KN, Geagan K, Jenkins DA, Gardner CD. Perspective: The Public  
356 Health Case for Modernizing the Definition of Protein Quality. *Adv Nutr*  
357 2019;10(5):755-64. doi: 10.1093/advances/nmz023.
- 358 15. Mariotti F, Gardner CD. Dietary Protein and Amino Acids in Vegetarian Diets-A  
359 Review. *Nutrients* 2019;11(11). doi: 10.3390/nu11112661.


- 360 16. McKendry J, Lowisz CV, Nanthakumar A, MacDonald M, Lim C, Currier BS,  
361 Phillips SM. The effects of whey, pea, and collagen protein supplementation beyond  
362 the recommended dietary allowance on integrated myofibrillar protein synthetic rates  
363 in older males: a randomized controlled trial. *The American Journal of Clinical*  
364 *Nutrition* 2024. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajcnut.2024.05.009>.
- 365 17. Melina V, Craig W, Levin S. Position of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics:  
366 Vegetarian Diets. *J Acad Nutr Diet* 2016;116(12):1970-80. doi:  
367 10.1016/j.jand.2016.09.025.
- 368 18. Moore DR, Churchward-Venne TA, Witard O, Breen L, Burd NA, Tipton KD,  
369 Phillips SM. Protein ingestion to stimulate myofibrillar protein synthesis requires  
370 greater relative protein intakes in healthy older versus younger men. *J Gerontol A Biol*  
371 *Sci Med Sci* 2015;70(1):57-62. doi: 10.1093/gerona/glu103.
- 372 19. National institute for public health and environment. NEVO online version 2016/5.0  
373 2016. <https://www.rivm.nl/documenten/nevo-online-versie-50-2016-dat>. Published  
374 2018. 2016.
- 375 20. Pinckaers PJM, Kouw IWK, Hendriks FK, van Kranenburg JMX, de Groot L, Verdijk  
376 LB, Snijders T, van Loon LJC. No differences in muscle protein synthesis rates  
377 following ingestion of wheat protein, milk protein, and their protein blend in healthy,  
378 young males. *Br J Nutr* 2021;126(12):1832-42. doi: 10.1017/s0007114521000635.
- 379 21. Pinckaers PJM, Smeets JSJ, Kouw IWK, Goessens JPB, Gijsen APB, de Groot L,  
380 Verdijk LB, van Loon LJC, Snijders T. Post-prandial muscle protein synthesis rates  
381 following the ingestion of pea-derived protein do not differ from ingesting an  
382 equivalent amount of milk-derived protein in healthy, young males. *Eur J Nutr*  
383 2024;63(3):893-904. doi: 10.1007/s00394-023-03295-6.




- 384 22. Richter M, Baerlocher K, Bauer Jürgen M, Elmadfa I, Heseker H, Leschik-Bonnet E,  
385 Stangl G, Volkert D, Stehle P, on behalf of the German Nutrition Society Revised  
386 Reference Values for the Intake of Protein. *Annals of Nutrition and Metabolism*  
387 2019;74(3):242-50. doi: 10.1159/000499374.
- 388 23. Selinger E, Neuenschwander M, Koller A, Gojda J, Kühn T, Schwingshackl L,  
389 Barbaresko J, Schlesinger S. Evidence of a vegan diet for health benefits and risks –  
390 an umbrella review of meta-analyses of observational and clinical studies. *Critical*  
391 *Reviews in Food Science and Nutrition* 2023;63(29):9926-36. doi:  
392 10.1080/10408398.2022.2075311.
- 393 24. Soeters PB, de Jong CH, Deutz NE. The protein sparing function of the gut and the  
394 quality of food protein. *Clin Nutr* 2001;20(2):97-9. doi: 10.1054/clnu.2000.0376.
- 395 25. Stipanuk MH, Ueki I. Dealing with methionine/homocysteine sulfur: cysteine  
396 metabolism to taurine and inorganic sulfur. *J Inherit Metab Dis* 2011;34(1):17-32. doi:  
397 10.1007/s10545-009-9006-9.
- 398 26. Szwiega S, Pencharz PB, Rafii M, Lebaron M, Chang J, Ball RO, Kong D, Xu L,  
399 Elango R, Courtney-Martin G. Dietary leucine requirement of older men and women  
400 is higher than current recommendations. *Am J Clin Nutr* 2021;113(2):410-9. doi:  
401 10.1093/ajcn/nqaa323.
- 402 27. Ten Have GA, Engelen MP, Soeters PB, Deutz NE. Absence of post-prandial gut  
403 anabolism after intake of a low quality protein meal. *Clin Nutr* 2012;31(2):273-82.  
404 doi: 10.1016/j.clnu.2011.09.008.
- 405 28. Tieland M, Borgonjen-Van den Berg KJ, van Loon LJ, de Groot LC. Dietary protein  
406 intake in community-dwelling, frail, and institutionalized elderly people: scope for  
407 improvement. *Eur J Nutr* 2012;51(2):173-9. doi: 10.1007/s00394-011-0203-6.

- 408 29. Trommelen J, van Lieshout GAA, Nyakayiru J, Holwerda AM, Smeets JSJ, Hendriks  
409 FK, van Kranenburg JMX, Zorenc AH, Senden JM, Goessens JPB, Gijsen AP, van  
410 Loon LJC. The anabolic response to protein ingestion during recovery from exercise  
411 has no upper limit in magnitude and duration in vivo in humans. *Cell Rep Med*  
412 2023;4(12):101324. doi: 10.1016/j.xcrm.2023.101324.
- 413 30. Vellinga R, van Bakel M, de Valk E, Temme E. Wat eten we in Nederland (2012-  
414 2016): De verhouding dierlijk en plantaardig voedsel, eiwitten en milieubelasting.  
415 2023.
- 416 31. WHO J. Protein and amino acid requirements in human nutrition. World Health  
417 Organization technical report series 2007(935):1.
- 418 32. Yang Y, Breen L, Burd NA, Hector AJ, Churchward-Venne TA, Josse AR,  
419 Tarnopolsky MA, Phillips SM. Resistance exercise enhances myofibrillar protein  
420 synthesis with graded intakes of whey protein in older men. *Br J Nutr*  
421 2012;108(10):1780-8. doi: 10.1017/s0007114511007422.
- 422


# MPQS per proportion of plant protein




# Actual vs Predicted plot: Multiple lin. reg. of Total



# Impact of digestibility adjustment per proportion of plant protein



# MPQS per meal moment



# MPQS per proportion of plant protein

