



## 26 **Abstract**

27 This study investigated the availability, price, nutritional composition, and quality of PBMA  
28 in supermarkets and hypermarkets in Petaling, the most populated district in Malaysia. The  
29 survey covered 85 stores through on-site visits, identifying 251 unique PBMA products from  
30 42 brands. The PBMA were categorized into nine groups: Burgers/Patties, Coated Meat,  
31 Luncheon Meat, Minced Meat, Pastries, Pieces/Chunks/Fillets/Strips, Prepacked Cooked  
32 Meals, Sausages, and Seafood Balls/Cakes/Meatballs. The survey indicated widespread  
33 availability of PBMA in Petaling, with premium supermarkets offering the most extensive  
34 selection. The median prices of PBMA across categories were below MYR 7 (~USD 1.6) per  
35 100 grams, with Pieces/Chunks/Fillets/Strips being the most affordable. Nutritionally,  
36 PBMA exhibited lower energy, total fat, saturated fat, sodium, and protein levels than meat  
37 equivalents, while showing higher carbohydrate content. Nutri-Score profiling revealed  
38 generally favourable scores (Grade A to C), indicating moderate to good nutritional quality.  
39 These findings suggest that PBMA offer a viable alternative for consumers in Malaysia  
40 seeking healthier and more sustainable food options, particularly for those aiming to reduce  
41 their intake of fat and sodium. However, PBMA may not be recommended for individuals  
42 seeking a higher protein and lower carbohydrate diet. Further research is recommended to  
43 explore micronutrient profiles to enhance dietary decision-making.

44 *Keywords:* Plant-based meat alternatives; Malaysia; product availability; nutritional  
45 composition; nutritional quality; Nutri-Score; price analysis

46

## 47 **Introduction**

48 PBMA are designed to mimic the taste, texture, and nutritional profile of conventional meat  
49 products while being derived entirely from plant sources [1,2]. These products, including  
50 burgers, sausages, and minced meat, have become popular among vegetarians and vegans and

51 flexitarians - individuals who seek to reduce their meat consumption for various reasons [3].  
52 PBMA s are often formulated with specific ingredients aimed at replicating the texture and taste  
53 of meats. These ingredients typically include a blend of plant-based proteins such as legumes  
54 (e.g., soy, beans, peas) and cereals like wheat and quinoa [4]. Fats, commonly sourced from  
55 coconut oil, sunflower oil, or predominantly soy oil, are added to mimic the mouthfeel and  
56 juiciness associated with meat [4,5]. Additionally, ingredients such as mushrooms are used for  
57 their umami flavours, enhancing taste and aroma in PBMA s [6]. To ensure product cohesion  
58 during cooking, hydrocolloids like methylcellulose and gums are also used, aiding in  
59 replicating the texture of traditional meat products [5].

60

61 The global market for PBMA s has rapidly expanded, generating USD 11.38 billion in 2024,  
62 with an expected compound annual growth rate of 10.2% from 2024 to 2028 [7]. In Malaysia,  
63 demand is also rising, with projections of 1.5 million kg in volume and USD 23.22 million in  
64 revenue by 2028 [8]. This surge is mainly driven by the increasing awareness of the health  
65 benefits associated with plant-based diets, which are linked to lower risks of diabetes, cancer,  
66 cardiovascular diseases, and overall mortality, compared to omnivorous diets often featuring  
67 red and processed meats [9,10]. This is because plant-based foods are typically lower in  
68 saturated fats and cholesterol but higher in fibre, though they may lack certain nutrients like  
69 vitamin B12, protein, and calcium compared to meats and dairy products [9]. Beyond health  
70 concerns, environmental concerns, animal welfare, and consumer curiosity about new tastes  
71 and sensory experiences, along with the longer shelf life of PBMA s, also drive their popularity  
72 [11–13].

73

74 The growing popularity of PBMA s has sparked debates about their healthiness compared to  
75 traditional meat-based products. Most PBMA categories, including mince, meatballs, and

76 burgers, generally have better nutritional profiles than their meat equivalents [11]. PBMA  
77 often provide more dietary fibre and contain lower levels of calories, total fat, saturated fat,  
78 cholesterol, sodium, and salt compared to meat products [3,9,11]. Certain PBMA are also  
79 fortified with vitamins and minerals commonly found in red meat, like iron and zinc, enhancing  
80 their nutritional value [10]. However, concerns exist regarding the bioavailability of nutrients  
81 in PBMA, as the iron in meat is heme iron, which is more easily absorbed than the non-heme  
82 iron found in PBMA [10]. Furthermore, because anti-nutrients such as phytates, lectins, and  
83 tannins may limit the absorption of vitamins and minerals, their presence in PBMA must also  
84 be considered [3]. Critics argue that PBMA, despite being plant-based, are classified as ultra-  
85 processed foods, containing ingredients with little to no whole food content and frequently  
86 enhanced with additional tastes, colours, emulsifiers, and other additives [1–3,10,11].  
87 Consumption of ultra-processed foods is strongly linked to an increased risk of obesity and  
88 noncommunicable diseases [14,15]. While there are clear benefits and drawbacks to consuming  
89 PBMA, their health implications vary based on the specific product, consumption frequency,  
90 and overall dietary quality [3].

91  
92 In many markets, PBMA tend to be more expensive than conventional meat products, which  
93 often hinders consumer adoption [3,9,16,17]. This is because the cost of processing PBMA  
94 can drive up their final price for consumers [9]. Research indicates that if PBMA are less  
95 expensive, people are more likely to buy them [12]. However, another study contradicted these  
96 findings by reporting no significant price difference between PBMA and their meat  
97 equivalents [9]. Despite variable prices, the availability of PBMA is steadily increasing in  
98 supermarkets globally [1,18]. In Malaysia, the plant-based food market is also expanding,  
99 offering a wide variety of products [19]. The growing availability of PBMA in various retail

100 environments, from upscale grocery stores to more accessible supermarkets, reflects a broader  
101 trend toward integrating plant-based options into mainstream food choices.

102

103 Despite numerous studies assessing the nutritional profile and healthiness of PBMA, a  
104 quantitative analysis is currently unavailable in Malaysia. Therefore, the objectives of the study  
105 were: 1. To assess the availability and price of PBMA available in hypermarkets and  
106 supermarkets in Petaling District; 2. To compare the key nutrient contents (energy, protein,  
107 total fat, saturated fat, carbohydrates, and sodium) of these PBMA with their meat equivalents  
108 by their product categories; 3. To evaluate the nutritional profiles of these PBMA by their  
109 product categories using the Nutri-Score Nutritional Rating System to determine their relative  
110 healthiness.

111

## 112 **Methods**

### 113 **Sample Selection and Collection**

114 Petaling District is the most populated district in the country, registering the highest population  
115 in 2023 at 2.3 million [20]. This district is situated in the middle of the Klang Valley, adjacent  
116 to the capital of Malaysia – Kuala Lumpur, and has experienced tremendous urbanization.  
117 Supermarkets and hypermarkets in the Petaling District (covering Subang, Damansara, Shah  
118 Alam, Puchong, Kelana Jaya, and Petaling Jaya) were identified through Google Search.  
119 Searches such as "Supermarkets and Hypermarkets in Subang" were performed, followed by  
120 on-site visits to all identified locations from April to June 2024. The study focused exclusively  
121 on hypermarkets, supermarkets, and their chains, excluding small and medium-sized grocery  
122 stores. Out of 85 visited locations, 81 offered PBMA. PBMA selected for this study were  
123 defined as: products made from plant-based ingredients that are designed to replicate meat in  
124 taste, texture, and overall experience; available in chilled, frozen, or canned forms; labelled as

125 "vegan" or "vegetarian." Products like tofu and tempeh, which do not mimic meat, were  
126 excluded. During visits, photographs of the front packaging and nutrition labels (per 100g) of  
127 each PBMA were taken, and data on prices, packaging sizes, countries of origin, and  
128 availability were recorded.

129

### 130 ***Product Categorization***

131 The PBMA identified were categorized into nine groups: Burger/Patties, Coated Meat,  
132 Luncheon Meat, Minced Meat, Pastries, Pieces/Chunks/Fillets/Strips, Prepacked Cooked  
133 Meals, Sausages, and Seafood Balls/Cakes/Meatballs (Table S1). These categories were chosen  
134 based on previous studies that have established these groups as representative of the variety  
135 and forms in which PBMA are typically available in the market [11,21–24]. In this study, two  
136 additional categories, Pastries and Prepacked Cooked Meals, have been included. The inclusion  
137 of these categories was because PBMA products are increasingly diverse due to growing  
138 consumer demand for more varied and convenient options. As these items are now available in  
139 Malaysia, adding these categories ensures a comprehensive analysis of all available PBMA  
140 options in the market.

141

### 142 **Statistical Analysis**

143 Data extracted from the images were compiled into a Google Sheet, including product name,  
144 brand, price (MYR), packing size (g), product origin, energy (kcal/100g), and nutritional  
145 content per 100g (protein, total fat, saturated fat, cholesterol, carbohydrates, total sugars,  
146 dietary fibre, and sodium). All statistical tests were conducted in the R statistical environment,  
147 v4.0.3. Normality was assessed using the Shapiro-Wilk test. All hypothesis testing was  
148 two-sided, and a  $p$ -value  $< 0.05$  was considered statistically significant.

149

150 *Availability Assessment*

151 The supermarkets and hypermarkets ( $n = 81$ ) offering PBMA options were categorized as  
152 hypermarkets, supermarkets, and premium supermarkets (Table S2). Based on definitions  
153 provided by the Malaysian-German Chamber of Commerce and Industry (MGCC)[25], these  
154 categories are described as follows: Hypermarket: Large self-service stores with a sales floor  
155 area of at least 5,000 square meters, offering an extensive range of consumer goods, including  
156 both food and non-food items; Supermarket: Smaller self-service retail markets compared to  
157 hypermarkets but larger than traditional grocery stores, primarily selling food and household  
158 goods; Premium Supermarket: Upscale versions of typical supermarkets, providing high-  
159 quality and specialty products such as organic, gourmet, and imported foods.

160

161 A total of 2736 PBMA products were surveyed. We determined both the total number and  
162 variability of PBMA products available in each store category. The countries of origin of the PBMA  
163 product categories were analysed. The average number of PBMA products per store category was  
164 calculated. Differences in PBMA numbers across store categories were evaluated with Analysis  
165 of Variance (ANOVA) and Tukey's Honestly Significant Difference (HSD) tests.

166

167 *Price Analysis*

168 Prices per 100g of packing size were calculated to standardize product prices. Six items lacking  
169 price or packaging size data were excluded, resulting in a final sample size of  $n = 2730$ . Price  
170 data were reported in MYR by product category, and price variations across store types were  
171 analysed.

172

173 *Energy and Nutrient Content Comparison*

174 Due to the unavailability of saturated fat information in the Malaysian Food Composition  
175 Database (MyFCD) required for nutrient profiling, data for meat equivalents were sourced from  
176 Singapore's Energy & Nutrient Composition Database  
177 (<https://focos.hpb.gov.sg/eservices/ENCF/>). The meat equivalent products ( $n = 109$ ) were  
178 selected to correspond with the PBMA product categories. Each variable (energy, protein, total  
179 fat, saturated fat, carbohydrates, and sodium) was analysed across all product categories. To  
180 evaluate the differences in the energy and nutrient contents between PBMA and their meat  
181 equivalents, two-sample  $t$  tests were conducted.

182

### 183 *Nutrient Profiling*

184 PBMA were assessed using the Nutri-Score Nutritional Rating System, developed by the  
185 French Public Health Agency (Santé Publique France) [26]. The Nutri-Score grading and  
186 colour scheme for solid foods are as follows: A (Dark Green): -15 to -1 points; B (Light Green):  
187 0 to 2 points; C (Yellow): 3 to 10 points; D (Orange): 11 to 18 points; E (Red): 19 to 40 points  
188 [27]. The Nutri-Score calculation is based on an algorithm considering positive nutritional  
189 factors (fruits, vegetables, legumes, fibre, protein) and negative factors (energy, sugars,  
190 saturates, salt). Based on the definition of PBMA as stated in section 2.1, the fruits, vegetables,  
191 and legumes content for all PBMA were set at 100%. The Nutri-Score was reported as mean  
192  $\pm$  standard deviation (SD) by product category, and the frequencies of each Nutri-Score colour  
193 were reported for each product category (Table S4).

194

## 195 **Results**

### 196 **Availability of PBMA**

197 Across 81 surveyed supermarkets and hypermarkets in Petaling District, 34 were hypermarkets,  
198 10 supermarkets, and 37 premium supermarkets. A total of 251 unique PBMA from 42 brands



199 were identified. The most prevalent PBMA product category was Coated Meats, followed by  
200 Pieces/Chunks/Fillets/Strips, and Pastries (Figure 1A). Luncheon Meat, Minced Meat, and  
201 Sausages were the least available PBMA product categories (Figure 1A). Premium  
202 supermarkets offered the highest variety of PBMA product categories, averaging  
203 about 40 PBMA per store (Figure 1B), significantly higher than hypermarkets ( $p < 0.001$ ), but  
204 not supermarkets ( $p = 0.47$ ) Of the identified PBMA, 73.71% were locally produced, while  
205 26.29% were imported from eight countries: Thailand, Hong Kong, Singapore, Australia, the  
206 United Kingdom, Korea, China, and the United States (Figure 1C). Malaysia dominated the  
207 origins of PBMA across all categories, especially in Pieces/Chunks/Fillets/Strips. Most  
208 product categories feature PBMA items originating from three or more countries, except for  
209 Luncheon Meat (Malaysia and Hong Kong), and Sausages (Malaysia and UK) (Figure 1C).

210

### 211 **Price Analysis of PBMA**

212 Figure 2A presents the prices of PBMA product categories in terms of prices per 100g in MYR.  
213 The median prices per 100g for all categories were below MYR 7 (~USD 1.6), with  
214 Pieces/Chunks/Fillets/Strips being the most affordable category with a median price of  
215 approximately MYR 3 (~USD 0.7) per 100g. Burger/Patties and Minced Meat were the least  
216 affordable, slightly above MYR 6 (~USD 1.3) per 100g. The category with the highest price  
217 variability was Seafood Balls/Cakes/Meatballs, indicated by the widest IQR. Price comparison  
218 between store types (Figures 2B-J) showed that supermarkets and hypermarkets generally had  
219 lower and more consistent prices, while premium supermarkets had significantly higher mean  
220 prices than supermarkets and hypermarkets for Burger/Patties, Coated Meat, Minced Meat,  
221 Pieces/Chunks/Fillets/Strips, and Seafood Balls/Cakes/Meatballs (Figures 2B, 2C, 2E, 2G, and  
222 2J, respectively).

223

## 224 **Energy and Nutrient Content Comparison of PBMA**s

225 Out of 251 unique PBMA, 35 (14%) lacked nutritional labels and were therefore excluded  
226 from analysis (final  $n = 216$ ). Figure 3 and Table S3 compare the energy density and  
227 composition of key nutrients (protein, total fat, saturated fat, carbohydrates, and sodium) of  
228 PBMA and their meat equivalents across product categories. Five out of nine PBMA categories  
229 had lower mean energy density than their meat equivalents, with two significantly lower  
230 (Pastries, Sausages; Figure 3A). On the other hand, Pieces/Chunks/Fillets/Strips had  
231 significantly higher energy density than their meat equivalents (Figure 3A). Seven out of nine  
232 PBMA categories had lower protein content than their meat counterparts, with four  
233 significantly lower (Luncheon Meat, Minced Meat, Pieces/Chunks/Strips, Prepacked Meals;  
234 Figure 3B). Fat content-wise, seven out of nine PBMA categories had lower contents, with two  
235 significantly lower (Pastries, Sausages; Figure 3C). Six out of nine had lower saturated fat  
236 content compared to their meat equivalents, with two significantly lower (Pastries, Sausages;  
237 Figure 3D). Pieces/Chunks/Fillets/Strips had significantly higher saturated fat than its meat  
238 equivalents (Figure 3D). Notably, Coated Meat, Luncheon Meat, and Prepacked Cooked Meals  
239 had similar saturated fat levels with their meat equivalents. Conversely, eight out of nine  
240 PBMA categories had higher carbohydrate content, with four significantly higher  
241 (Burger/Patties, Pieces/Chunks/Fillets/Strips, Prepacked Meals, Seafood  
242 Balls/Cakes/Meatballs; Figure 3E). Five out of nine had lower sodium content compared to  
243 their meat equivalents, with three significantly lower (Luncheon Meat, Sausages, Seafood  
244 Balls/Cakes/Meatballs; Figure 3F). In contrast, PB Pieces/Chunks/Fillets/Strips had  
245 significantly higher sodium content than their meat equivalents (Figure 3F). Overall, there was  
246 a wide variation in the energy density and nutrient content per 100g among all PBMA and meat  
247 categories.

248

## 249 **Nutri-Score Evaluation of Nutritional Quality of PBMA**s

250 A total of 46 PBMA (21.3% of 216 products having nutritional labels) that were missing all  
251 the required nutritional factors were excluded from the analysis (final  $n = 170$ ). The mean  
252 Nutri-Score across all PBMA categories averaged 2.96, placing them in Grade C (Yellow),  
253 indicating moderate nutritional quality. Minced Meat had the lowest mean NutriScore at -9.25,  
254 placing it in the "healthiest" category (Grade A). Sausages and Pastries fell into Grade B. The  
255 remaining categories ranged from Nutri-Scores of 3 to 10, predominantly falling under Grade  
256 C, which denotes moderate nutritional quality. Among the categories, Prepacked Cooked Meals  
257 had the highest mean Nutri-Score at 7.88, indicating the least healthy among PBMA. Upon  
258 closer examination of individual products within each category (Figure 4; Table S4), Coated  
259 Meat, Pieces/Chunks/Fillets/Strips, and Prepacked Cooked Meals contained products classified  
260 under Grade E, although these represent less than 10% of the total products in each category.  
261 Most categories included products classified under Grade A, except for Luncheon Meat, where  
262 70% of its products were Grade C and 30% Grade D.

263

## 264 **Discussion**

265 Despite numerous studies assessing the nutritional profile and healthiness of PBMA, this study  
266 is the first to offer a quantitative analysis of the availability, price, nutritional composition, and  
267 nutritional quality of PBMA in Malaysian supermarkets and hypermarkets. Our survey  
268 indicates a significant presence of PBMA in Petaling District, with over 95% of visited  
269 supermarkets carrying these products. This aligns with global trends of increasing PBMA  
270 consumption, reflecting their acceptance and integration into both vegetarian/vegan and  
271 omnivorous diets [13]. Notably, premium supermarkets had greater PBMA variety compared  
272 to hypermarkets and regular supermarkets, primarily because they cater to a more affluent and  
273 health-conscious customer base, driving demand for a broader selection of PBMA. However,

274 all PBMA categories were still available in hypermarkets and supermarkets, indicating decent  
275 accessibility across store types. Although PBMA categories from nine countries were available, most  
276 products were produced locally in Malaysia. This is likely due to the advantages of local  
277 production, such as reduced transportation costs and import duties, leading to more competitive  
278 pricing and better alignment with local taste preferences and dietary habits [28].

279

280 The median prices per 100g for all PBMA categories were below MYR 7 (~USD 1.6). In 2023,  
281 Malaysians consumed approximately 50 kilograms of poultry meat per person [29]. Poultry,  
282 especially chicken, is the most popular meat in the country due to its affordability and versatility  
283 [30]. Compared to the median price per 100g of the least expensive PBMA category  
284 (Pieces/Chunks/Fillets/Strips at MYR 2.98 or ~USD 0.7), PBMA categories are at least twice as  
285 expensive as chicken, which has a ceiling price of MYR 1.14 (~USD 0.3) per 100g [31]. A  
286 study in Canada reported similar PBMA prices at USD 1.95 (~MYR 9.00) per 100g, with no  
287 significant price difference with their meat equivalents [9]. Categories such as Burger/Patties  
288 and Minced Meat were the most expensive, possibly due to a high percentage of imported  
289 products. Despite the higher cost of plant-based burgers, consumer surveys indicate a  
290 willingness to pay more for these items compared to other PBMA categories like sausages,  
291 chicken, and fish [32]. As expected, premium supermarkets which cater for a higher-income  
292 demographic, exhibited higher median prices and greater price variability.

293

294 When comparing PBMA categories in Malaysia with those in Europe (Table S5), both have similar  
295 energy densities, indicating similar caloric content, with slight variations depending on the  
296 product category. Malaysian PBMA categories generally have lower energy densities than European  
297 meat-based products, which can benefit consumers seeking to reduce caloric intake. Malaysian  
298 PBMA categories also consistently show lower protein content compared to European PBMA categories and meat-

299 based products. This indicates a potential area for improvement in the protein content of  
300 Malaysian PBMA. Malaysian PBMA also generally have comparable or lower total fat  
301 content than European PBMA. However, Malaysian PBMA often have higher saturated fat  
302 content. Compared to meat-based products, Malaysian PBMA tend to have lower total and  
303 saturated fat content, though some categories still need optimization. Malaysian PBMA  
304 generally have higher carbohydrate content compared to European PBMA and meat-based  
305 products. This higher carbohydrate content may result from more fillers and binding agents in  
306 Malaysian PBMA and could affect nutritional balance and glycaemic load. Finally, Malaysian  
307 PBMA typically have higher sodium content than European PBMA. Compared to meat-  
308 based products, Malaysian PBMA often have lower sodium content, although still high.

309

310 Over half of the PBMA categories in this study exhibited lower energy density compared to  
311 their meat equivalents, consistent with findings from other countries [5,9,11,22]. This is likely  
312 due to PBMA's lower fat and higher dietary fibre content, as they are often made from legumes  
313 and cereals [4]. Given the global obesity epidemic is linked to excessive caloric intake, PBMA  
314 could potentially aid in weight management and reduce obesity rates [23]. Supporting this, a  
315 randomized crossover trial showed significant weight loss when participants consumed  
316 PBMA instead of meat [33]. Additionally, consuming low energy density foods can help  
317 prevent secondary diseases such as cardiovascular diseases (CVDs) and cancer [23].

318

319 Our data also showed that most PBMA categories had lower total fat and saturated fat content  
320 compared to their meat equivalents. The fats in PBMA primarily come from vegetable oils,  
321 such as soybean, sunflower, and olive oils, which contain polyunsaturated and  
322 monounsaturated fats, unlike the saturated fats found in greater amounts in meat [5]. Although  
323 lower, excessive PBMA consumption could still lead to high fat diets, potentially affecting gut

324 microbiota and faecal metabolic profiles [13]. In Malaysia, the average daily intake of saturated  
325 fat exceeds the recommended 10% of total daily energy intake [34]. The World Health  
326 Organization recommends reducing saturated fat intake due to its effects on low-density  
327 lipoprotein cholesterol [11]. Therefore, substituting PBMA for meat could be a strategy to  
328 lower saturated fat intake and reduce CVD risks.

329

330 Most PBMA categories in this study had lower sodium content than their meat equivalents,  
331 except for Pieces/Chunks/Fillets/Strips, which had significantly higher sodium levels. This  
332 contradicts other studies that consistently found higher sodium content in PBMA [5,11,23,35].  
333 Following the UK's traffic light labelling scheme for sodium content [36], many PBMA  
334 products analysed here would fall under the medium sodium category, with levels typically  
335 ranging from 120 mg to 600 mg per 100g. While some product categories, like Luncheon Meat  
336 and Prepacked Cooked Meals may exceed this range, the majority exhibit moderate sodium  
337 content. Despite variations, it is essential to note that processed foods, both plant-based and  
338 meat-based, often contain elevated sodium levels to enhance taste and preserve shelf life [5].  
339 Given the World Health Organization's recommendation of limiting sodium intake to 2300 mg  
340 per day, a single 100g serving of certain PBMA categories could contribute up to 22% of this  
341 recommended daily limit. As the popularity of PBMA grows, there is a need for manufacturers  
342 to prioritize sodium reduction initiatives and refine product formulations, potentially targeting  
343 levels that qualify for the low sodium category (<120 mg per 100g) to align with health  
344 guidelines and consumer expectations.

345

346 While PBMA were generally favourable in terms of energy, total fat, saturated fat, and sodium  
347 contents, more than half of the categories had lower protein levels compared to their meat  
348 equivalents. Meat is a primary source of protein, comprising nearly 22% of its composition,

349 whereas plant-based products often have lower protein levels and may lack certain essential  
350 amino acids [5,23]. This poses a challenge for those on meatless diets, highlighting the need  
351 for health professionals to address protein intake concerns and develop public health policies  
352 accordingly. Nonetheless, plant protein intake has been associated with a reduced risk of type  
353 2 diabetes, cardiovascular diseases, and overall mortality [23].

354

355 All PBMA categories, except Pastries, had higher carbohydrate content than their meat  
356 equivalents. This aligns with other studies reporting higher carbohydrates in PBMA [5,22–  
357 24,35]. However, the higher carbohydrate content may not negatively impact diet quality. A  
358 study on a plant-based diet rich in carbohydrates from whole grains and legumes and low in fat  
359 found it effective for weight loss and improving quality of life [37]. Therefore, the  
360 carbohydrate content in PBMA, derived from legumes and cereals, may not be excessive in a  
361 balanced diet.

362

363 Malaysian PBMA may be suited for individuals, especially those with high cholesterol and  
364 hypertension, who seek to lower their fat and sodium intake. These products typically have  
365 lower levels of total fat, saturated fat, and sodium compared to meat-based alternatives, which  
366 can aid in managing cholesterol and blood pressure, thereby supporting cardiovascular health.  
367 Research indicates that vegetarian diets are linked to a lower risk of all-cause mortality, and  
368 specifically reduce the risk of cardiovascular and coronary artery diseases [38]. However,  
369 Malaysian PBMA may not be ideal for those following high-protein, low-carbohydrate diets  
370 such as the Atkins or Keto diets [39]. Due to their lower protein content and higher carbohydrate  
371 levels, these products may not align with the needs of those on low-carbohydrate diets, which  
372 are often used therapeutically for conditions like severe obesity and type 2 diabetes, with  
373 proven benefits for weight loss and metabolic control in the short to medium term [39].

374

375 The Nutri-Score was used to assess the healthiness of PBMA categories, similar to other studies  
376 [18,21–23]. The Nutri-Score, a common front-of-package label, has sparked debate over its  
377 effectiveness in evaluating nutritional quality [40]. Our results showed PBMA categories  
378 ranged from Grade A to Grade C, with more than half falling under Grade C and Nutri-Scores  
379 ranging from 3 to 10. Prepacked Cooked Meals had the highest mean Nutri-Score of 7.88, likely  
380 due to their higher energy density and sodium content from added oils and sauces. The Nutri-  
381 Score, while useful, does not account for the degree of food processing. Highly processed  
382 foods, often included in the Nutri-Score categories, have been linked to various health issues,  
383 including CVD, depressive symptoms, gastrointestinal disease, and higher mortality risk  
384 [23,41]. Therefore, Nutri-Score should be supplemented with labels indicating processing  
385 levels, such as the NOVA classification.

386

387 Nevertheless, this study had some limitations and uncertainties. First, we used data from the  
388 Singapore’s Energy & Nutrient Composition Database, which may not be ideal as most meat  
389 equivalents were raw/uncooked while PBMA were processed. This difference in preparation  
390 methods may have influenced the comparative nutritional analysis. Secondly, the Nutri-Score  
391 calculation assumed a uniform 100% content of fruits, vegetables, legumes, nuts, and oils  
392 across all PBMA, potentially leading to an overestimation of their nutritional quality. Lastly,  
393 the study did not include an evaluation of micronutrient content. Micronutrients, including  
394 vitamins and minerals such as zinc and iron, are crucial for overall health, and omitting their  
395 assessment limits a comprehensive understanding of the nutritional profile of PBMA products.

396

397 **Conclusions**



398 In summary, our results demonstrated that PBMA were widely available across most  
399 supermarkets and hypermarkets in the Petaling District, though the variety and number of  
400 products vary by store. The price analysis indicated that median prices for PBMA categories  
401 were generally below MYR 7 (~USD 1.6) per 100g, with Burger/Patties and Minced Meat  
402 identified as relatively less affordable options. Nutritionally, PBMA showed lower levels of  
403 energy, total fat, saturated fat, sodium, and protein compared to their meat equivalents, while  
404 exhibiting higher carbohydrate content. The Nutri-Scores assigned to these categories ranged  
405 from -15 to 10 (Grade A to C), indicating generally moderate nutritional profiles without falling  
406 into the "less healthy" orange or red zones. Considering these findings, PBMA present  
407 themselves as a viable choice for consumers in Malaysia in terms of availability, price, and  
408 nutritional composition (except carbohydrate). However, further research should include direct  
409 comparisons with local meat equivalents, encompassing both processed and unprocessed  
410 varieties, to better understand the complete nutritional benefits and limitations of PBMA.  
411 Additionally, a thorough assessment of micronutrient content is essential to fully assess the  
412 health implications of these products, ensuring that consumers are well-informed about their  
413 dietary choices.

414

#### 415 **Authors' contributions**

416 Katty Jia Qi Lou: Data curation, Formal analysis, Investigation, Validation, Visualization,  
417 Writing – original draft. Nadia Nantheni Rajaram: Formal analysis, Validation, Writing –  
418 original draft, Writing – review & editing. Yee-How Say: Conceptualization, Formal analysis,  
419 Methodology, Supervision, Validation, Visualisation, Writing – original draft, Writing –  
420 review & editing.

421

#### 422 **Declaration of competing interest**

423 The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal  
424 relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

425

#### 426 **Data availability**

427 Data will be made available on request.

428

#### 429 **Acknowledgments**

430 This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public,  
431 commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

432

#### 433 **Ethical Statement**

434 This paper does not involve any ethical issues, as we did not study any human or animal  
435 subjects, nor did we collect any personal information or sensitive data.

436

#### 437 **References**

- 438 1. Marchese LE, Hendrie GA, McNaughton SA, Brooker PG, Dickinson KM, Livingstone  
439 KM. Comparison of the nutritional composition of supermarket plant-based meat and  
440 dairy alternatives with the Australian Food Composition Database. *Journal of Food  
441 Composition and Analysis*. 2024;129: 106017. doi:10.1016/j.jfca.2024.106017
- 442 2. Petersen T, Hirsch S. Comparing meat and meat alternatives: an analysis of nutrient  
443 quality in five European countries. *Public Health Nutr*. 2023;26: 3349–3358.  
444 doi:10.1017/S1368980023001945
- 445 3. El Sadig R, Wu J. Are novel plant-based meat alternatives the healthier choice? *Food  
446 Research International*. 2024;183: 114184. doi:10.1016/j.foodres.2024.114184

- 447 4. Locatelli NT, Chen GFN, Batista MF, Furlan JM, Wagner R, Bandoni DH, et al. Nutrition  
448 classification schemes for plant-based meat analogues: Drivers to assess nutritional  
449 quality and identity profile. *Current Research in Food Science*. 2024;9: 100796.  
450 doi:10.1016/j.crfs.2024.100796
- 451 5. Romão B, Botelho RBA, Torres ML, Maynard DDC, De Holanda MEM, Borges VRP, et  
452 al. Nutritional Profile of Commercialized Plant-Based Meat: An Integrative Review with  
453 a Systematic Approach. *Foods*. 2023;12: 448. doi:10.3390/foods12030448
- 454 6. Ayimbila F, Keawsompong S. Nutritional Quality and Biological Application of  
455 Mushroom Protein as a Novel Protein Alternative. *Curr Nutr Rep*. 2023;12: 290–307.  
456 doi:10.1007/s13668-023-00468-x
- 457 7. Statista. Meat Substitutes – Worldwide. 2024. Available:  
458 <https://www.statista.com/outlook/cmo/food/meat/meat-substitutes/worldwide>
- 459 8. Statista. Meat Substitutes – Malaysia. 2024. Available:  
460 <https://www.statista.com/outlook/cmo/food/meat/meat-substitutes/malaysia>
- 461 9. Lee JJ, Srebot S, Ahmed M, Mulligan C, Hu G, L'Abbé MR. Nutritional quality and price  
462 of plant-based dairy and meat analogs in the Canadian food supply system. *Journal of*  
463 *Food Science*. 2023;88: 3594–3606. doi:10.1111/1750-3841.16691
- 464 10. Van Vliet S, Bain JR, Muehlbauer MJ, Provenza FD, Kronberg SL, Pieper CF, et al. A  
465 metabolomics comparison of plant-based meat and grass-fed meat indicates large  
466 nutritional differences despite comparable Nutrition Facts panels. *Sci Rep*. 2021;11:  
467 13828. doi:10.1038/s41598-021-93100-3
- 468 11. Alessandrini R, Brown MK, Pombo-Rodrigues S, Bhageerutty S, He FJ, MacGregor GA.  
469 Nutritional Quality of Plant-Based Meat Products Available in the UK: A Cross-Sectional  
470 Survey. *Nutrients*. 2021;13: 4225. doi:10.3390/nu13124225

- 471 12. Denver S, Nordström J, Christensen T. Plant-based food – Purchasing intentions, barriers  
472 and drivers among different organic consumer groups in Denmark. *Journal of Cleaner*  
473 *Production*. 2023;419: 138256. doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2023.138256
- 474 13. Rizzolo-Brime L, Orta-Ramirez A, Puyol Martin Y, Jakszyn P. Nutritional Assessment  
475 of Plant-Based Meat Alternatives: A Comparison of Nutritional Information of Plant-  
476 Based Meat Alternatives in Spanish Supermarkets. *Nutrients*. 2023;15: 1325.  
477 doi:10.3390/nu15061325
- 478 14. Dicken SJ, Batterham RL. Ultra-processed Food and Obesity: What Is the Evidence? *Curr*  
479 *Nutr Rep*. 2024;13: 23–38. doi:10.1007/s13668-024-00517-z
- 480 15. Jardim MZ, Costa BVDL, Pessoa MC, Duarte CK. Ultra-processed foods increase  
481 noncommunicable chronic disease risk. *Nutrition Research*. 2021;95: 19–34.  
482 doi:10.1016/j.nutres.2021.08.006
- 483 16. Abu Bakar AR, Mahzan NA, Tarmazi SAA, Tumin SA. Plant-base Meat as Future  
484 Alternative: A Study of Malaysian Consumers Purchase Intention. *MJSSH*. 2023;8:  
485 e002397. doi:10.47405/mjssh.v8i7.2397
- 486 17. Manickam HV. Purchase Intention Towards Plant-Based Food in Malaysia. UTAR  
487 Institutional Repository; 2022. Available:  
488 [http://eprints.utar.edu.my/4846/1/8.\\_Hephzibah\\_Victor\\_1901444.pdf](http://eprints.utar.edu.my/4846/1/8._Hephzibah_Victor_1901444.pdf)
- 489 18. De Las Heras-Delgado S, Shyam S, Cunillera È, Dragusan N, Salas-Salvadó J, Babio N.  
490 Are plant-based alternatives healthier? A two-dimensional evaluation from nutritional and  
491 processing standpoints. *Food Research International*. 2023;169: 112857.  
492 doi:10.1016/j.foodres.2023.112857
- 493 19. Mohd Azman NM, Muhammad R, Ramli N, Abu Bakar SK. A Review of Product  
494 Knowledge and Determinants of Consumer Purchase Intention on Plant-Based Meat  
495 Products In Malaysia. *E-BPJ*. 2023;8: 157–163. doi:10.21834/e-bpj.v8iSI15.5106

- 496 20. Department of Statistics Malaysia (DOSM). Current Population Estimates by  
497 Administrative District. 2023. Available: [https://www.dosm.gov.my/portal-main/release-](https://www.dosm.gov.my/portal-main/release-content/current-population-estimates-by-adminstrative-district)  
498 [content/current-population-estimates-by-adminstrative-district](https://www.dosm.gov.my/portal-main/release-content/current-population-estimates-by-adminstrative-district)
- 499 21. Bryngelsson S, Moshtaghian H, Bianchi M, Hallström E. Nutritional assessment of plant-  
500 based meat analogues on the Swedish market. *International Journal of Food Sciences and*  
501 *Nutrition*. 2022;73: 889–901. doi:10.1080/09637486.2022.2078286
- 502 22. Cutroneo S, Angelino D, Tedeschi T, Pellegrini N, Martini D, SINU Young Working  
503 Group. Nutritional Quality of Meat Analogues: Results From the Food Labelling of Italian  
504 Products (FLIP) Project. *Front Nutr*. 2022;9: 852831. doi:10.3389/fnut.2022.852831
- 505 23. Pointke M, Pawelzik E. Plant-Based Alternative Products: Are They Healthy  
506 Alternatives? Micro- and Macronutrients and Nutritional Scoring. *Nutrients*. 2022;14:  
507 601. doi:10.3390/nu14030601
- 508 24. Tonheim LE, Austad E, Torheim LE, Henjum S. Plant-based meat and dairy substitutes  
509 on the Norwegian market: comparing macronutrient content in substitutes with equivalent  
510 meat and dairy products. *J Nutr Sci*. 2022;11: e9. doi:10.1017/jns.2022.6
- 511 25. Malaysian-German Chamber of Commerce and Industry (MGCC). Food Distribution  
512 Channels in Malaysia & Recent Developments – Market Report 2016/2017. EU-Malaysia  
513 Chamber of Commerce and Industry.; Available:  
514 [https://www.eurocham.my/data/ckfinder/files/Publications/2\\_Food\\_Distribution\\_Chann](https://www.eurocham.my/data/ckfinder/files/Publications/2_Food_Distribution_Channels_in_Malaysia_and_Recent_Developments_2016.pdf)  
515 [els\\_in\\_Malaysia\\_and\\_Recent\\_Developments\\_2016.pdf](https://www.eurocham.my/data/ckfinder/files/Publications/2_Food_Distribution_Channels_in_Malaysia_and_Recent_Developments_2016.pdf)
- 516 26. Herberg S, Touvier M, Salas-Salvado J. The Nutri-Score nutrition label: A public health  
517 tool based on rigorous scientific evidence aiming to improve the nutritional status of the  
518 population. *International Journal for Vitamin and Nutrition Research*. 2022;92: 147–157.  
519 doi:10.1024/0300-9831/a000722

- 520 27. Brabants J. Nutri-Score Labelling Guide for Foodservice Operations. Apicbase; 2024.  
521 Available: <https://get.apicbase.com/nutri-score-science-based-nutritional-value->  
522 [labelling-system/](https://get.apicbase.com/nutri-score-science-based-nutritional-value-)
- 523 28. Lim Y. Factors that Affect the Food Production in Malaysia. UTAR Institutional  
524 Repository.; 2022. Available:  
525 [http://eprints.utar.edu.my/5230/1/Thesis\\_Full\\_Report\\_Lim\\_Yann\\_Torng\\_1802906.pdf](http://eprints.utar.edu.my/5230/1/Thesis_Full_Report_Lim_Yann_Torng_1802906.pdf)
- 526 29. Statista. Meat Consumption Per Capita in Malaysia in 2023, by Type. 2024. Available:  
527 <https://www.statista.com/statistics/756920/malaysia-meat-consumption-per-capita-by->  
528 [type/](https://www.statista.com/statistics/756920/malaysia-meat-consumption-per-capita-by-)
- 529 30. Credence Research. Malaysia Meat Market. 2024. Available:  
530 <https://www.credenceresearch.com/report/malaysia-meat-market>
- 531 31. Harun H, Sallehuddin Q. Chicken prices rise slightly, won't reach RM11.40 per kg. NST  
532 Online. 2024. Available:  
533 <https://www.nst.com.my/news/nation/2024/03/1025604/chicken-prices-rise-slightly->  
534 [wont-reach-rm1140-kg](https://www.nst.com.my/news/nation/2024/03/1025604/chicken-prices-rise-slightly-). Accessed 13 Aug 2024.
- 535 32. Estell M, Hughes J, Grafenauer S. Plant Protein and Plant-Based Meat Alternatives:  
536 Consumer and Nutrition Professional Attitudes and Perceptions. Sustainability. 2021;13:  
537 1478. doi:10.3390/su13031478
- 538 33. Crimarco A, Springfield S, Petlura C, Streaty T, Cunanan K, Lee J, et al. A randomized  
539 crossover trial on the effect of plant-based compared with animal-based meat on  
540 trimethylamine-N-oxide and cardiovascular disease risk factors in generally healthy  
541 adults: Study With Appetizing Plantfood—Meat Eating Alternative Trial (SWAP-  
542 MEAT). The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition. 2020;112: 1188–1199.  
543 doi:10.1093/ajcn/nqaa203

- 544 34. Mognard E, Sanubari TPE, Alem Y, Yuen JL, Ragavan NA, Ismail MN, et al. Breakfast  
545 Practices in Malaysia, Nutrient Intake and Diet Quality: A Study Based on the Malaysian  
546 Food Barometer. *Nutrients*. 2023;15: 2197. doi:10.3390/nu15092197
- 547 35. Curtain F, Grafenauer S. Plant-Based Meat Substitutes in the Flexitarian Age: An Audit  
548 of Products on Supermarket Shelves. *Nutrients*. 2019;11: 2603. doi:10.3390/nu11112603
- 549 36. Food Standards Agency UK. Guide To Creating A Front-Of-Pack Nutrition Label. 2013.  
550 Available:  
551 [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/207588/F](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/207588/FINAL_VERSION_OF_THE_2013_FOP_GUIDANCE_-_WEB.pdf)  
552 [INAL\\_VERSION\\_OF\\_THE\\_2013\\_FOP\\_GUIDANCE\\_-\\_WEB.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/207588/FINAL_VERSION_OF_THE_2013_FOP_GUIDANCE_-_WEB.pdf)
- 553 37. Kahleova H, Dort S, Holubkov R, Barnard ND. A Plant-Based High-Carbohydrate, Low-  
554 Fat Diet in Overweight Individuals in a 16-Week Randomized Clinical Trial: The Role of  
555 Carbohydrates. *Nutrients*. 2018;10: 1302. doi:10.3390/nu10091302
- 556 38. Cicero AFG, Veronesi M, Fogacci F. Dietary Intervention to Improve Blood Pressure  
557 Control: Beyond Salt Restriction. *High Blood Press Cardiovasc Prev*. 2021;28: 547–553.  
558 doi:10.1007/s40292-021-00474-6
- 559 39. Sukkar SG, Muscaritoli M. A Clinical Perspective of Low Carbohydrate Ketogenic Diets:  
560 A Narrative Review. *Front Nutr*. 2021;8: 642628. doi:10.3389/fnut.2021.642628
- 561 40. Sinu Scientific Board, Sinu Scientific Committee. “Front-of-pack” nutrition labeling.  
562 *Nutrition, Metabolism and Cardiovascular Diseases*. 2021;31: 2989–2992.  
563 doi:10.1016/j.numecd.2021.07.021
- 564 41. Romero Ferreiro C, Lora Pablos D, Gómez De La Cámara A. Two Dimensions of  
565 Nutritional Value: Nutri-Score and NOVA. *Nutrients*. 2021;13: 2783.  
566 doi:10.3390/nu13082783
- 567  
568

569 **Figure legends**

570 **Figure 1. Availability and origins of PBMA product categories sold in supermarkets and**  
571 **hypermarkets in Petaling District, Malaysia.** A. The percentages of PBMA product  
572 categories; B. The distribution of PBMA product categories across different store types:  
573 hypermarket, supermarket, and premium supermarket; C. The distribution of countries of  
574 origin for PBMA product categories.

575

576 **Figure 2. Price analysis of PBMA product categories sold in supermarkets and**  
577 **hypermarkets in Petaling District, Malaysia.** A. Boxplot of the median prices of PBMA  
578 product categories per 100g (MYR). Boxplot comparison of the median prices of PBMA  
579 product categories per 100g (MYR) across three store types: hypermarkets, supermarkets, and  
580 premium supermarkets: B. Burger/Patties; C. Coated Meat; D. Luncheon Meat; E. Minced  
581 Meat; F. Pastries; G. Pieces/Chunks/Fillets/Strips; H. Prepacked Cooked Meals; I. Sausages;  
582 J. Seafood Balls/Cakes/Meatballs. The left and right sides of the box are the lower and upper  
583 quartiles; the box covers the Interquartile Range (IQR); median is represented by the vertical  
584 line that split the box in two; cross represents the mean; whiskers at the bottom of box  
585 represents lower quartile, whiskers at the top of box represents upper quartile. \* indicates  $p <$   
586  $0.05$ , \*\* indicates  $p < 0.01$ ; by Mann-Whitney  $U$  test.

587

588 **Figure 3. Energy and nutrient content comparison of PBMA product categories sold in**  
589 **supermarkets and hypermarkets in Petaling District, Malaysia with meat-based**  
590 **equivalent product categories.** A. Energy Density (kcal); B. Protein (g); C. Total Fat (g); D.  
591 Saturated Fat (g); E. Carbohydrates (g); and F. Sodium (mg). PB: plant-based, MB: meat-  
592 based. Energy and nutrient contents were sourced from labels of PBMA products, or from the



593 Singapore's Energy & Nutrient Composition Database for the meat-based equivalent  
594 products. \* indicates  $p < 0.05$ , \*\* indicates  $p < 0.01$ ; by *t*-test.

595

596 **Figure 4. Nutri-Score nutritional quality analysis of PBMA product categories sold in**  
597 **supermarkets and hypermarkets in Petaling District, Malaysia.** The Nutri-Score grades,  
598 colours, and points are as follows: A (most healthy; dark green): -15 to -1 points; B (light  
599 green): 0 to 2 points; C (yellow): 3 to 10 points; D (orange): 11 to 18 points; E (least healthy,  
600 red): 19 to 40 points.

601

## 602 **Supporting Information**

603 **S1 Table:** PBMA Product Categories and Their Descriptions.

604 **S2 Table:** Distribution of PBMA's Across Visited Supermarkets and Hypermarkets in Petaling  
605 District, Malaysia.

606 **S3 Table.** Mean Energy Density and Nutritional Contents (per 100g)  $\pm$  Standard Deviations  
607 (Range) of Plant-Based vs. Meat-Based Product Categories.

608 **S4 Table.** Nutri-Score Classification across PBMA Product Categories.

609 **S5 Table.** Mean Energy Density and Nutritional Contents (per 100g) of Malaysian PBMA's  
610 vs. European PBMA's and Meat Equivalents.






Figure 1




Figure 2




Figure 3




Figure 4