

## **Overlap between ultra-processed food and food that is high in fat, salt or sugar: analysis of 11 annual waves of the UK National Diet and Nutrition Survey 2008/09-2018/19**

**Authors:** Viktorija Kesaite<sup>1</sup>, Yanaina Chavez-Ugalde<sup>1</sup>, Martin White<sup>1</sup>, Jean Adams<sup>1</sup>

### **Affiliations:**

1. MRC Epidemiology Unit, University of Cambridge School of Clinical Medicine, Cambridge, United Kingdom

**Corresponding author:** Viktorija Kesaite

**E-mail:** [Viktorija.Kesaite@mrc-epid.cam.ac.uk](mailto:Viktorija.Kesaite@mrc-epid.cam.ac.uk)

**Word count:** 3486

**Number of tables:** 4

**Number of figures:** 1

### **Orcid IDs:**

Viktorija Kesaite: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0053-7583>

Yanaina Chavez-Ugalde: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6191-2722>

Jean Adams: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5733-7830>

Martin White: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1861-6757>

**NOTE:** This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

1 **Abstract**

2 While many countries use guidance and policies based on nutrients and food groups to support  
3 citizens to consume healthy diets, fewer have explicitly adopted the concept of ultra-processed foods  
4 (UPF). UPF consumption is associated with many adverse health outcomes in cohort studies. In the  
5 UK, a nutrient profiling model (NPM) is used to identify foods high in fat, salt or sugar (HFSS) and  
6 several policies target these. It is not known how well the NPM also captures UPF. We aimed to  
7 quantify the proportion of food and drink items consumed in the UK that are HFSS, UPF, both or  
8 neither and describe the food groups making the largest contributions to each category. We analysed  
9 data from the National Diet and Nutrition Survey (NDNS), between 2008/09 and 2018/19, using  
10 descriptive statistics. We used three metrics of food consumption: all foods, % of energy in all foods  
11 (reflecting that different foods are consumed in different portion sizes and are of different energy  
12 densities), and % of food weight in all foods (reflecting that some UPFs have few calories but are  
13 consumed in large volumes). We found that, 33.4% of foods, 47.4% of energy, and 16.0% of food  
14 weight were HFSS; 36.2%, 59.8% and 32.9% respectively were UPFs; 20.1%, 35.1% and 12.6% were  
15 both; and 50.5%, 27.9% and 63.7% were neither. In total, 55.6% of UPF foods, 58.7% of energy from  
16 UPFs and 38.3% of food weight from UPF consumed were also HFSS. The most common food groups  
17 contributing to foods that were UPF but not HFSS were low calorie soft drinks and white bread. The  
18 UK NPM captures at best just over half of UPFs consumed in the UK. Expanding the NPM to include  
19 ingredients common in UPFs would capture a larger percentage of UPFs and could incentivise “de-  
20 formulation” of UPF products.

21

What is already known on this topic	<p>In many high-income countries, including the UK, consumption of ultra-processed food (UPF) and foods high in fat, salt or sugar (HFSS) constitute more than half of all calories consumed.</p> <p>Despite emerging evidence of the negative health impacts of UPF, current UK diet and obesity policy focuses on reducing consumption of HFSS foods. HFSS foods are identified using a Nutrient Profiling Model (NPM).</p>
What this study adds	<p>To our knowledge, this is the first study to examine the extent to which the UK NPM also identifies UPFs. We found that the NPM captures over half of UPFs based on all foods consumed and percent of energy, but only about a third based on food weight. Amongst all foods consumed, the most common food groups that were UPF but not HFSS were low calorie soft drinks and white bread. Other types of bread (e.g. brown, wholemeal) and high fibre breakfast cereals were also common.</p>
How this study might affect research, practice, or policy	<p>Further consideration and potential inclusion of those UPFs that are not under the scope of the current definition of HFSS (e.g. foods containing artificial sweeteners) could enable existing policies to have a wider reach.</p>

22

## 23 INTRODUCTION

24 Numerous studies have shown that diets high in some components (e.g. sodium, sugar, fat and  
25 calories) and low in others (e.g. whole grains and fruits) increase the risk of non-communicable  
26 diseases such as cardiovascular disease and cancer (1). Recent estimates suggest that food and drinks  
27 (hereafter: 'foods') high in fat, salt, or sugar (HFSS) constitute more than half of total energy intake  
28 among adults in the UK (2, 3). Similar estimates are observed in the consumption of ultra-processed  
29 foods (UPF) (4).

30 In the UK, a Nutrient Profiling Model (NPM) is used to identify HFSS foods and restrict advertising on  
31 television (5), out-of-doors in some local authorities and where foods can be placed in grocery stores  
32 (6). The NPM was originally developed in 2004/05, and defines foods as being HFSS based on energy,  
33 saturated fat, total sugar, sodium, fibre, protein, and fruit, vegetable, and nut content per 100g (7).  
34 An updated version was developed in 2018 (8), based on revised guidance on sugar and fibre intake  
35 (9) however, despite consultations, has not yet been adopted into practice (10).

36 High consumption of ultra-processed foods (UPF), as identified by the Nova classification (11), has also  
37 been negatively associated with adverse health outcomes (12). The Nova system is the most common  
38 method of classifying foods based on their degree of food processing used in the academic literature  
39 and has been identified as the most applicable to the UK (10). Recent Euromonitor statistics suggest  
40 that the highest volume of sales of UPFs globally are in Western Europe, North America, and  
41 Australasia, with increasing trends observed elsewhere (13, 14). Findings based on a systematic review  
42 indicate that the US and the UK had the highest proportion of energy intake from UPFs (>50%)(4).

43 The UK's approach to public health nutrition, where nutrients and food groups such as fruit and  
44 vegetables, are used to drive guidance and policy reflects similar approaches in many countries.  
45 However, a growing number of countries have now also included specific reference to avoidance of  
46 UPFs in their dietary guidance (15).

47 As policy makers contend with whether to focus policy and dietary guidance on UPFs, an important  
48 question is: how well do current approaches, such as the UK's NPM, also identify UPFs? If most UPFs  
49 are also HFSS then the benefits of introducing additional UPF-focused policy and guidance may be  
50 minimal. We are aware of only one other study examining the overlap between UPFs and other  
51 methods of identifying less-healthy foods (3). This recent US study found that around three-quarters  
52 of UPF foods purchased were also HFSS and that extending the HFSS definition to include non-  
53 nutritive sweeteners, flavourings, colours and additives would capture nearly 100% of UPFs (3). To  
54 the best of our knowledge no previous work has explored the overlap between HFSS, as identified by  
55 the UK NMP, and UPF in the UK.

56 In this study, our aim was to quantify the proportion of foods consumed in the UK that are HFSS, UPF,  
57 both or neither.

## 58 **METHODS**

59 We used data from eleven waves (2008/9 – 2018/19) of the UK National Diet and Nutrition Survey  
60 (NDNS).

### 61 **Data description**

62 NDNS is a continuous cross-sectional survey conducted every year in the UK. It collects data on food  
63 consumption, nutrient intake, and nutritional status of the general population aged 1.5 years and  
64 over residing in private UK households. Each year, a multistage probability design is used to generate  
65 a new random sample. Selected household addresses are clustered into small geographical units  
66 called Primary Sampling Units. Households are randomly selected from these units, and participants  
67 are randomly selected from each household. Full data is collected from about 500 children and 500  
68 adults each year.

69 In 2008-19, all NDNS participants self-reported their food and beverage consumption over three or  
70 four days using a written food diary, with portion sizes recorded using standard household measures  
71 and product labels. Parents and guardians reported on behalf of children under 11 years. Food diary  
72 data are entered into the Diets In Nutrients Out (DINO) database and food codes are used to link  
73 foods to the NDNS nutrient composition database, which includes nutritional information on more  
74 than 6000 foods (16). The response rate to food diaries is 50% or more. The NDNS provides sample  
75 weights to reduce the risk of non-random selection (16).

### 76 **Categorisation of foods as HFSS and UPF**

77 We categorised foods as HFSS or not based on the UK NPM 2004/5 and, in a sensitivity analysis, using  
78 the 2018 NPM. We used the Nova framework to classify foods as UPF or not, using assignments from  
79 previous work (17) (18). In this, two researchers independently classified foods into the four Nova  
80 groups. To assign Nova group, NDNS foods were coded where possible based on their NDNS main food  
81 group (n=56). If there was uncertainty about whether all foods in a main food group would have the  
82 same Nova category, foods were categorised where possible by food subgroups (n=136). In cases of  
83 further uncertainty, individual food items (n=4,555) were classified (e.g., composite dishes which  
84 include individual foods from more than one main or sub-group). Any disagreement between the  
85 researchers on the classifications were resolved through discussion. This process achieved a high  
86 degree of inter-rater reliability - 97% in the first and 99.8% in the second round after discussion (19).

87 Food supplements (i.e., vitamins and minerals) are not classified by the Nova system and we did not  
88 include them or alcoholic beverages.

## 89 **Data analyses**

90 Reflecting our aims, our analyses were descriptive. Firstly, we conducted a food-level analysis. This  
91 used all reported foods consumed by NDNS participants in 2008/09-2018/19 with foods reported  
92 multiple times being included multiple times, which effectively weights the findings for consumption.  
93 We described the percentage of foods that were UPF, HFSS, neither or both. We present this first as  
94 a food level analyses including all foods and, separately, the relative contribution of UPFs and HFSS to  
95 total food energy (kcal) and total food weight (g) intake. We then present examples of food groups  
96 making the greatest contributions to each category based on all foods, total food energy (kcal), and  
97 total weight (g), and finally present a person-day-level analysis which replicates the food level analysis  
98 adjusting for non-response bias. We include an analysis based on total food energy to reflect that  
99 different foods are consumed in different portion sizes and have different energy densities and so  
100 make different relative contributions to the diet. This enables comparisons with other studies (3). We  
101 also include a metric based on total food weight to reflect that some UPFs make little contribution to  
102 energy (e.g., artificially sweetened beverages), and list the NDNS main food groups making the largest  
103 contributions to each of these four categories (UPF, HFSS, both and neither).

104 Secondly, we conducted person-level analyses. These replicate the food level analyses but by including  
105 population survey weights we additionally account for non-response bias. As a robustness check, we  
106 replicated the food-level analyses of foods consumed for men and women separately. The study  
107 protocol is available at <https://osf.io/hr6f3/>, the code and the libraries for calculating HFSS scores and  
108 the analyses is available at <https://github.com/VKesaite/HFSS-and-UPF>. All calculations were carried  
109 out in Python version 3.11.4. There were no substantive changes to the protocol.

## 110 **RESULTS**

111 A total of 15,655 individuals (7,207 males and 8,448 females) were included in the analysis. They  
112 reported consuming 1,730,158 foods, representing 4,555 unique food names. We report findings  
113 based on the 2004/05 NPM here and on the 2018 NPM in supplemental material.


### 114 **Food-level analysis**

115 Figure 1 shows Venn diagrams describing the proportions of (a) foods, (b) food energy and (c) food  
116 weight that were HFSS (right inner circle), UPF (left inner circle), both (inner circle overlap) and neither  
117 (outer circle). The proportion of UPFs that are HFSS is also shown. In total, 33.4% of foods, 47.4% of

118 energy and 16.0% of food weight was HFSS, whilst 36.2% of food, 59.8% of energy and 32.9% of food  
119 weight was UPF. We found that 55.6% of UPFs, 58.7% of energy from UPFs, and 38.3% of UPF weight  
120 was also HFSS. Robustness checks in males and females separately showed similar findings (Table S1).  
121 Analysis using the 2018 version of the NPM led to broadly similar results, but in general a slightly  
122 smaller proportion of UPF was categorised as HFSS compared to the 2004/05 NPM (Table S1).

123 Table 1 lists the ten main food groups making the greatest contributions to the categories HFSS only,  
124 UPF only, both and neither for all foods. Tables 2 and 3 show similar data for food energy and food  
125 weight respectively. The most common main food groups contributing to foods and food energy that  
126 were HFSS but not UPF reflected products high in sugars (i.e. 'sugars, preserves and sweet spread')  
127 and dairy products (or replacements) such as cheese, butter, oil, butter and oil replacements and  
128 whole milk. When analysed by food weight, the most common food groups contributing to the HFSS  
129 only category were dairy products such as whole milk, cheese, butter, and cream products, and also  
130 sugars (i.e. 'sugars, preserves and sweet spread'), bacon and ham products, and starchy products (i.e.  
131 'pasta, rice & other cereals').

132 The most common main food groups contributing to foods in the category UPF but not HFSS often  
133 included non-nutritive sweeteners (i.e. 'soft drinks low calorie', 'artificial sweeteners') or were breads  
134 including white, brown, granary and wholemeal bread. Fried and roast potatoes and potato products  
135 were also a common food group in this category. When considering food weight and food energy, the  
136 most common food groups in the UPF only category were similar to total food category.



137

138  
139  
140  
141  
142

**Figure 1. The percentage of (a) all foods, (b) food energy in kcal, and (c) food weight in grams consumed that was derived from foods that are high in fat, salt or sugar, ultra-processed foods, both or neither; UK National Diet and Nutrition Survey 2008/9-2018**

*Note.* HFSS = high in fat, salt or sugar (using the 2004/05 Nutrient Profiling Model); UPF = ultra-processed food



143 **Table 1. The ten main food groups (% contribution) making the greatest contributions to the categories: high in fat, salt or sugar only, ultra-processed**  
 144 **food only, both and neither at the food level for all foods; UK National Diet and Nutrition Survey 2008/9-2018/19**

All foods consumed			
HFSS only	UPF only	HFSS and UPF	Neither HFSS nor UPF
Sugars, preserves & sweet spread (26.6%)	Soft drinks, low calorie (21.3%)	Miscellaneous* (14.0%)	Tea, coffee & water (31.0%)
Miscellaneous* (13.1%)	White bread (17.5%)	Biscuits (10.1%)	Vegetables not raw (13.0%)
Cheese (10.9%)	Miscellaneous* (5.9%)	Reduced fat spread (9.6%)	Semi-skimmed milk (12.3%)
Butter (10.4%)	Chips, fried & roast potatoes, potato products (5.8%)	Soft drinks, not low calorie (8.2%)	Fruit** (9.8%)
Other margarine, fats & oils† (9.2%)	High fibre breakfast cereals (5.5%)	Crisps & savoury snacks (6.1%)	Salad & other raw vegetables (7.9%)
Whole milk (7.9%)	Brown, granary & wheatgerm bread (5.5%)	Chocolate confectionery (6.1%)	Pasta, rice & other cereals (4.3%)
Bacon & ham (4.1%)	Yoghurt, fromage, frais, & dairy desserts (5.4%)	Buns, cakes, pastries & fruit pies (5.4%)	Miscellaneous* (3.4%)
Pufa margarine & oils (3.8%)	Wholemeal bread (5.3%)	Bacon & ham (3.6%)	Other potatoes, potato salads & dishes** (2.6%)
Nuts & seeds (2.9%)	Vegetables not raw (4.0%)	Other breakfast cereals** (3.5%)	Fruit juice (2.6%)
Other milk & cream† (2.7%)	Artificial sweeteners (3.5%)	Sugars, preserves & sweet spreads (3.5%)	Chicken & turkey dishes (2.3%)

145  
 146 *Note:* HFSS = high in fat, salt or sugar (using the 2004/05 Nutrient Profiling Model); UPF = ultra-processed food ; main food groups are those used in the National Diet and  
 147 Nutrition Survey; \*Miscellaneous includes e.g. mayonnaise, sour cream dip, soups; \*\*Fruit includes e.g. raw fruit, fruit stewed with and without sugar, fruit canned in fruit  
 148 and sugar syrup; †Other milk & cream includes e.g. plant-based milk alternatives, coffee creamer, crème fraiche; ††Other breakfast cereals includes e.g. special flakes, rice  
 149 crispies; ‡Other margarine, fats & oils includes e.g. vegetable suet, palm oil, chicken fat; †††Other potatoes, potato salads & dishes includes potato curry, mash potato with  
 150 butter and cream.

151 **Table 2. The ten main food groups (% contribution) making the greatest contributions to the categories: high in fat, salt or sugar only, ultra-**  
 152 **processed food only, both and neither at the food level for food energy (kcal); UK National Diet and Nutrition Survey 2008/9-2018/19**

Food energy (kcal) in all foods consumed			
HFSS only	UPF only	HFSS and UPF	Neither HFSS nor UPF
Cheese (22.2%)	White bread (27.8%)	Biscuits (11.2%)	Pasta, rice & other cereals (16.2%)
Butter (14.6%)	Chips fried & roast potatoes & potato products (12.7%)	Buns, cakes, pastries & fruit pies (10.0%)	Fruit** (11.9%)
Sugars, preserves & sweet spreads (12.9%)	Brown granary & wheatgerm bread (8.4%)	Chocolate confectionery (7.8%)	Semi skimmed milk (10.8%)
Whole milk (8.6%)	Wholemeal bread (7.3%)	Crisps & savoury snacks (7.2%)	Chicken & turkey dishes (9.3%)
Bacon and ham (8.2%)	High fibre breakfast cereals (6.9%)	Pasta, rice & other cereals (7.1%)	Other potatoes, potato salads & dishes** (7.7%)
Other margarine, fats & oils <sup>†</sup> (6.0%)	Pasta, rice & other cereals (5.5%)	Soft drinks, not low calorie (7.0%)	Vegetables not raw (7.0%)
Nuts & seeds (4.3%)	Vegetables not raw (4.3%)	Miscellaneous* (5.8%)	Beef, veal & dishes (5.5%)
Other milk & cream <sup>†</sup> (3.0%)	Yoghurt, fromage, frais & dairy desserts (3.9%)	Sausages (5.4%)	Eggs, and egg dishes (4.7%)
Buns, cakes, pastries (2.2%)	Miscellaneous* (3.5%)	Reduced fat spread (5.1%)	Fruit juice (4.3%)
Pufa margarine & oils (2.1%)	Coated chicken (3.3%)	Meat pies & pastries (4.1%)	Chips fried & roast potatoes, and potato products (4.1%)
Pasta, rice & other cereals (2.0%)	Other milk & cream <sup>†</sup> (1.9%)	Other breakfast cereals (3.8%)	Whole milk (4.0%)

153  
 154 *Note:* HFSS = high in fat, salt or sugar (using the 2004/05 Nutrient Profiling Model); UPF = ultra-processed food ; main food groups are those used in the National Diet and  
 155 Nutrition Survey; \*Miscellaneous includes e.g. mayonnaise, sour cream dip, soups; \*\*Fruit includes e.g. raw fruit, fruit stewed with and without sugar, fruit canned in fruit  
 156 and sugar syrup; <sup>†</sup>Other milk & cream includes e.g. plant-based milk alternatives, coffee creamer, crème fraiche; <sup>††</sup>Other breakfast cereals includes e.g. special flakes, rice  
 157 crispies; <sup>†</sup>Other margarine, fats & oils includes e.g. vegetable suet, palm oil, chicken fat; <sup>††</sup>Other potatoes, potato salads & dishes includes potato curry, mash potato with  
 158 butter and cream.

159 **Table 3. The ten main food groups (% contribution) making the greatest contributions to the categories: high in fat, salt or sugar only, ultra-processed**  
 160 **food only, both and neither at the food level for food weight (g); UK National Diet and Nutrition Survey 2008/9-2018/19**  
 161

Food weight (g) in all foods consumed			
HFSS only	UPF only	HFSS and UPF	Neither HFSS nor UPF
Whole milk (34.4%)	Soft drinks, low calorie (35.4%)	Soft drinks, not low calorie (34.3%)	Tea, coffee & water (57.3%)
Cheese (15.2%)	White bread (9.9%)	Pasta, rice & other cereals (6.2%)	Semi-skimmed milk (7.9%)
Sugars, preserves, & sweet spreads (9.3%)	Soft drinks, not low calorie (6.5%)	Miscellaneous* (5.7%)	Fruit** (6.7%)
Bacon and ham (9.1%)	Miscellaneous* (6.1%)	Buns, cakes, pastries & fruit pies (5.6%)	Vegetables, not raw (5.6%)
Butter (5.4%)	Chips fried & roast potatoes, & potato products (5.5%)	Biscuits (5.1%)	Fruit juice (3.7%)
Other milk & cream <sup>†</sup> (2.4%)	Yoghurt, fromage, frais & dairy desserts (4.7%)	Sausages (4.3%)	Pasta, rice, & other cereals (3.3%)
Pasta, rice & other cereals (2.0%)	Vegetables not raw (4.3%)	Yoghurt, fromage, frais & dairy desserts (3.4%)	Other potatoes, potato salads & dishes <sup>††</sup> (3.1%)
Nuts & seeds (2.0%)	Tea, coffee & water (3.4%)	Chocolate confectionery (3.3%)	Whole milk (2.1%)
Other margarine, fats & oils <sup>‡</sup> (1.8%)	Pasta, rice & other cereals (3.4%)	Crisps & savoury snacks (3.0%)	Salad & other raw vegetables (2.0%)
White fish coated or fried (1.7%)	Brown granary & wheatgerm bread (3.1%)	Ice cream (2.9%)	Chicken & turkey dishes (1.9%)

162  
 163 *Note:* HFSS = high in fat, salt or sugar (using the 2004/05 Nutrient Profiling Model); UPF = ultra-processed food ; main food groups are those used in the National Diet and  
 164 Nutrition Survey; \*Miscellaneous includes e.g. mayonnaise, sour cream dip, soups; \*\*Fruit includes e.g. raw fruit, fruit stewed with and without sugar, fruit canned in fruit and  
 165 sugar syrup; <sup>†</sup>Other milk & cream includes e.g. plant-based milk alternatives, coffee creamer, crème fraiche; <sup>‡</sup>Other margarine, fats & oils includes e.g. vegetable suet, palm  
 166 oil, chicken fat; <sup>††</sup>Other potatoes, potato salads & dishes includes potato curry, mash potato with butter and cream.

167 In the category of foods that were UPF and HFSS, the most common main groups reflected  
 168 miscellaneous foods (e.g., condiments and soups), bakery products (e.g. biscuits and ‘buns, cakes,  
 169 pastries & fruit pies’), reduced fat spread, and ‘soft drinks, not low calorie’. When considering by food  
 170 energy and food weight, products high in sugar (biscuits, ‘buns, cakes, pastries & fruit pies’, chocolate  
 171 confectionery), ‘crisps and savoury snacks’, and ‘pasta, rice & other cereals’ made substantial  
 172 contributions to the category that was both UPF and HFSS.

173 The most common main food group contributing to the category of foods that were neither HFSS nor  
 174 UPF was tea, coffee and water. Cooked and raw vegetables, semi-skimmed milk and fruit were also  
 175 were also prominent. Similar findings were seen for food weight. By food energy, the food groups  
 176 making the largest contribution to this category included pasta, rice & other cereals, fruit, semi-  
 177 skimmed milk, and chicken and turkey dishes.

### 178 **Person-level analysis**

179 The results of the person-level analysis are summarised in Table 4. Additionally adjusting for non-  
 180 response bias led to small changes compared to the estimates in Figure 1. At person-level, 55.1% of  
 181 UPF foods are also HFSS (c.f. 55.6% at food level), 53.8% of UPF energy is also HFSS (c.f. 58.7%), and  
 182 40.0% of UPF food weight is also HFSS (c.f. 38.3%).

183 **Table 4. The percentage of per capita daily foods, food energy in kcal, and food weight in grams**  
 184 **consumed that was derived from foods that are high in fat, salt or sugar, ultra-processed foods,**  
 185 **both and neither; UK National Diet and Nutrition Survey 2008/9-2018/19**  
 186

	All foods consumed; % (SD)	Food energy (kcal); % (SD)	Food weight (g); % (SD)
Neither UPFs nor HFSS	52.9 (14.4)	31.7 (13.6)	66.8 (18.6)
All UPF	33.6 (15.6)	54.9 (15.7)	29.7 (18.3)
UPF only	15.0 (8.9)	24.6 (10.5)	18.2 (13.4)
All HFSS	32.0 (10.6)	43.7 (13.2)	15.0 (10.9)
HFSS only	13.5 (8.1)	13.4 (8.7)	3.5 (4.3)
HFSS and UPFs	18.5 (10.0)	30.3 (13.8)	11.5 (10.0)
UPF that is also HFSS	55.1 (15.5)	53.9 (17.3)	40.0 (19.0)

187  
 188 *Note:* HFSS = high in fat, salt or sugar (using the 2004/05 Nutrient Profiling Model); UPF = ultra-processed food;  
 189 data are weighted to correct for non-random non-response of households.

190  
 191 Analysis using the 2018 version of the NPM led to broadly similar results, but overall a slightly smaller  
 192 proportion of UPF was categorised as HFSS compared to the 2004/05 NPM (Table S2).

## 193 **DISCUSSION**

### 194 **Summary of main findings**

195 This is the first study to assess the extent to which foods consumed in the UK are HFSS, UPFs, both or  
196 neither. Using 11 years of data from NDNS we found that around one third of all foods consumed  
197 (33.4%) were HFSS, one third (36.2%) were UPF, one fifth were both (20.1%) and half (50.5%) neither.  
198 We found that 55.6% of UPFs, 58.7% of food energy and 38.3% of food weight consumed were also  
199 HFSS. This means that policies focused on HFSS reduction also target between one third and just over  
200 a half of UPFs.

201 When considering all foods consumed, common foods that were UPF but not HFSS (and so would not  
202 be included in HFSS-focused policies) included low calorie soft drinks, manufactured breads, and high  
203 fibre breakfast cereals. Food groups making substantial contributions to all foods consumed in the  
204 category HFSS and UPF were miscellaneous (e.g., condiments and soups), biscuits, reduced fat spread,  
205 and 'soft drinks, not low calorie'.

### 206 **Strengths and limitations**

207 To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study to classify all foods consumed in the UK as both  
208 HFSS and UPF and compare these classifications. We used food-level dietary data, with 3 or 4 food  
209 diary days per person from the NDNS (20, 21). Food diaries reduce the recall bias common in food  
210 frequency questionnaires and 24-hour recalls (21, 22). We used three metrics of food consumption –  
211 total number of foods, food energy, and food weight. Analysing food energy recognises that different  
212 foods are consumed in different portion sizes while assessing food weight identifies, in particular,  
213 foods that have a high weight (e.g. drinks) but low energy ingredients (e.g. non-nutritive sweeteners).

214 Whilst the accuracy of food classification using the Nova system has been criticised as poorly replicable  
215 (23), we and others have achieved a high degree of inter-rater reliability (19, 24). Furthermore, by  
216 including all foods reported by NDNS participants (excluding alcohol and supplements), we effectively  
217 weighted by frequency of consumption. Additional adjustment for non-response bias by including  
218 survey weights in individual-level analyses did not change the overall pattern of findings indicating  
219 that our findings are likely to be generalisable to the UK population.

220 Despite their strengths, food diaries are self-reported leading to the potential for measurement error.  
221 Further, whilst we included 11 years of data, the most recent was from 2019. Given the increasing  
222 number of new foods commercially available (25), we may not have captured recent changes in food  
223 consumption. Moreover, combining 11 years of data might have masked important changes over time,

224 but ensured a large sample size. NDNS did not collect data from new participants in 2020 and  
225 subsequently changed dietary data collection method meaning that newer comparable data is not  
226 available.

227 There are also some potential limitations with the nutritional measures used in this study. The Nova  
228 classification has been criticised for its lack of consideration of nutritional content and quality. With  
229 some foods, ultra-processing might yield nutritional and health benefits such as micronutrient  
230 fortification, increased affordability, extended shelf life and reduced waste (26). A recent study  
231 indicated that while consumption of some UPFs, such as artificially and sugar-sweetened beverages,  
232 was associated with an increased risk of cancer and cardiometabolic diseases, no evidence of an  
233 association was found for others such as UPF bread and cereals (1). Our second measure of nutritional  
234 quality, HFSS has also been criticised as an oversimplified measure of nutritional quality (27).

### 235 **Interpretation and implications**

236 We found that, at best, 58.7% of UPFs consumed over 11 years of the UK NDNS were identified as  
237 HFSS. This is a lower degree of overlap than a recent US study which found that 75.4% of UPF were  
238 also HFSS (3). These differences may reflect the different food supply, purchase and consumption  
239 patterns seen in the UK and USA.

240 Our findings suggests that current UK policy which focuses on HFSS captures at best just over half of  
241 UPFs, but some key UPFs are not included. Amongst all foods consumed, common food groups that  
242 were UPF but not HFSS included 'low calorie soft drinks', bread, and miscellaneous products (e.g.,  
243 condiments and soups).

244 Extending the definition of HFSS to include non-nutritive sweeteners would increase the proportion  
245 of UPF captured by HFSS to just over two-thirds. Similar findings were reported by Popkin et al (2024)  
246 (3). Whilst some recent UK public health nutrition policies have increased the number of products  
247 available that contain non-nutritive sweeteners (28), the World Health Organization has recently  
248 noted that these may not be useful for weight loss (29). There may also be other ways that the HFSS  
249 algorithm could be adapted to capture more UPFs. However, there remains a lack of consensus among  
250 policymakers and scientists on whether the evidence on the health harms of UPF is strong enough to  
251 justify regulation (10).

252 When analysing by food energy, rather than total number of foods the 'other milk & cream' food group  
253 was among the top ten food groups contributing to the category of UPF but not HFSS. This includes  
254 plant-based milk alternatives. Some plant-based alternatives can be healthier than equivalent meat

255 and dairy products (30) and some plant-based alternatives are UPF. Whilst there is uncertainty about  
256 the environmental impacts of UPF as a category (31), reducing consumption of animal-based products  
257 at a population level will be essential to achieve net-zero (32). UPF plant-based alternatives could be  
258 a stepping stone to less processed plant-based alternatives (33, 34). This highlights the trade-offs  
259 common in individual dietary choices as well as policymaking and why simply dichotomising foods into  
260 those that should be consumed or avoided is challenging, however that dichotomisation is achieved.  
261 Nevertheless, food profiling methods that consider both human and planetary health would allow for  
262 a more holistic approach, and regulating foods on sustainability grounds is likely to have health-co-  
263 benefits (35).

264 We found that many food groups are common contributors to both HFSS only, UPF only, both and  
265 neither. For example, regardless of the metric of consumption (foods, food energy or food weight),  
266 the main food group ‘miscellaneous’ is in the top ten contributors to many categories. This reflects  
267 that not all foods within main food groups necessarily share the same UPF or HFSS status. For example,  
268 homemade soups could be HFSS whilst manufactured soups are likely to be UPF and may be HFSS.

269 Much policy in the UK has focused on food reformulation, whereby manufacturers are incentivised to  
270 change the composition of foods to ensure they are not HFSS (36). Other policies have focused  
271 specifically on reducing sugar and calorie content (37). Whilst there is evidence that some of these  
272 policies have prompted reformulation (e.g. removal of sugar from soft drinks) (38) and have been  
273 associated with overall reduction in sugar consumption(39) and health benefits (40), reformulated  
274 foods which are no longer HFSS often remain UPF (e.g. artificially sweetened soft drinks). An  
275 alternative approach using policies that incentivise de-formulation (41) (i.e. removing components  
276 and additives commonly used in UPFs, such as non-nutritive sweeteners) could help reduce  
277 production and consumption of UPF. Accompanying such policy approaches with those that  
278 incentivise whole food consumption could offer important synergies.

279 The difference in results we find by analysing the data by all foods, food energy and food weight reflect  
280 differences in the food energy and weight of different foods. For example, low calorie soft drinks make  
281 up a substantial proportion of UPF only foods and food weight, but not food energy. This reflects that  
282 these products are low in energy but may be consumed in large portions.

283 The 2018 NPM was developed to take account of updated guidance on sugar and fibre consumption  
284 (9). Whilst this generated broadly similar results to using the 2004/05 NPM, in most cases a slightly  
285 smaller proportion of UPF were categorised as HFSS (e.g. 55.6% of UPF foods consumed were HFSS

286 using the 2004/05 NPM and 54.4% using the 2018 NPM). These small differences are unlikely to be of  
287 policy relevance.

288 Our results reinforce the well-established finding that current UK diets are sub-optimal for health.  
289 After adjustment for non-response bias, we found that 54.9% of per capita daily energy was derived  
290 from UPFs and 43.7% from HFSS foods. This is comparable to previous findings. For instance, a  
291 previous study in the UK based on NDNS data from 2008-14 found that 56.8% of energy was derived  
292 from UPFs (42). Similarly, in Canada 47.7% of energy was derived from UPFs (43), and in the US 57.5%  
293 was derived from UPFs (44). Studies from other countries find a smaller proportion of energy  
294 attributable to UPFs. For example, a study from Italy found that 17.3% of energy was derived from  
295 UPFs (45). Current UK dietary guidance advises citizens to eat HFSS foods “less often and in small  
296 amounts” (46).

## 297 **CONCLUSION**

298 In this analysis of 11 years of data from the UK NDNS, we found that the NPM, used to identify foods  
299 that are HFSS for regulatory purposes identifies, at best, 58.7% of UPFs. If UK policymakers decide that  
300 regulation of UPFs is necessary, additional action will be required to extend current policy. This could  
301 involve extending the current NPM to include ingredients, such as non-nutritive sweeteners, that are  
302 common in foods that are UPF but not currently identified as HFSS. Further work is required to confirm  
303 that UPF consumption is causally associated with health harms and to determine the environmental  
304 impacts of UPF.

## 305 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

306 We are grateful to Birdem Amoutzopoulos and David Collins for reviewing the code for categorising  
307 foods high in fat, salt or sugar.

## 308 **FUNDING**

309 This research has been funded by the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC).

## 310 **COMPETING INTERESTS**

311 There are no competing interests.

## 312 **RESEARCH ETHICS APPROVAL**

313 No ethics approval was required.



## 314 REFERENCES

- 315 1. Cordova R, Viallon V, Fontvieille E, Peruchet-Noray L, Jansana A, Wagner K-H, et al.  
316 Consumption of ultra-processed foods and risk of multimorbidity of cancer and cardiometabolic  
317 diseases: a multinational cohort study. *The Lancet regional health Europe*. 2023;100771.
- 318 2. Mytton OT, Forouhi NG, Scarborough P, Lentjes M, Luben R, Rayner M, et al. Association  
319 between intake of less-healthy foods defined by the United Kingdom's nutrient profile model and  
320 cardiovascular disease: A population-based cohort study. *PLOS Medicine*. 2018;15(1):e1002484.
- 321 3. Popkin BM, Miles DR, Taillie LS, Dunford EK. A policy approach to identifying food and  
322 beverage products that are ultra-processed and high in added salt, sugar and saturated fat in the  
323 United States: a cross-sectional analysis of packaged foods. *The Lancet Regional Health - Americas*.  
324 2024;32:100713.
- 325 4. Marino M, Puppo F, Del Bo' C, Vinelli V, Riso P, Porrini M, Martini D. A systematic review of  
326 worldwide consumption of ultra-processed foods: Findings and criticisms. *Nutrients*.  
327 2021;13(8):2778.
- 328 5. Rayner M, Scarborough P, Lobstein T. The UK Ofcom Nutrient Profiling Model: Defining  
329 'healthy' and 'unhealthy' foods and drinks for TV advertising to children. London: OfCom. 2009.
- 330 6. Davies S. Time to solve childhood obesity. Department of Health Social Care. 2019.
- 331 7. Department of Health. Nutrient profiling technical guidance. 2011.
- 332 8. Public Health England. UK Nutrient Profiling Model 2018 review. London, UK: Public Health  
333 England; 2018.
- 334 9. Scientific Advisory Committee on Nutrition. Carbohydrates and health. London; 2015.
- 335 10. Office for Health Improvement and Disparities. The Scientific Advisory Committee on  
336 Nutrition (SACN) position statement on processed foods and health. UK, 2023.
- 337 11. Monteiro CA, Cannon, G., Lawrence, M., Costa Louzada, M.L. and Pereira Machado, P. Ultra-  
338 processed foods, diet quality, and health using the NOVA classification system. Rome, FAO. 2019.
- 339 12. Lane MM, Gamage E, Du S, Ashtree DN, McGuinness AJ, Gauci S, et al. Ultra-processed food  
340 exposure and adverse health outcomes: umbrella review of epidemiological meta-analyses. *Bmj*.  
341 2024;384:e077310.
- 342 13. Vandevijvere S, Jaacks LM, Monteiro CA, Moubarac JC, Girling-Butcher M, Lee AC, et al.  
343 Global trends in ultraprocessed food and drink product sales and their association with adult body  
344 mass index trajectories. *Obesity Reviews*. 2019;20:10-9.
- 345 14. Vandevijvere S, Jaacks LM, Monteiro CA, Moubarac JC, Girling-Butcher M, Lee AC, et al.  
346 Global trends in ultraprocessed food and drink product sales and their association with adult body  
347 mass index trajectories. *Obes Rev*. 2019;20 Suppl 2:10-9.
- 348 15. Koios D, Machado P, Lacy-Nichols J. Representations of Ultra-Processed Foods: A Global  
349 Analysis of How Dietary Guidelines Refer to Levels of Food Processing. *International journal of health  
350 policy and management*. 2022;11(11):2588-99.

- 351 16. Bates B, Lennox A, Prentice A, Bates C, Page P, Nicholson S, Swan G. National Diet and  
352 Nutrition Survey: results from years 1, 2, 3 and 4 (combined) of the Rolling Programme (2008/2009-  
353 2011/2012): a survey carried out on behalf of Public Health England and the Food Standards Agency.  
354 2014.
- 355 17. Chavez-Ugalde Y, De Vocht F, Jago R, Adams J, Ong KK, Forouhi N, et al. Manuscript title:  
356 Ultra-processed food consumption in UK adolescents: distribution, trends, and sociodemographic  
357 correlates using the National Diet and Nutrition Survey 2008/09 to 2018/19. medRxiv.  
358 2023:2023.06.05.23290977.
- 359 18. Chavez-Ugalde IY, de Vocht F, Jago R, Adams J, Ong KK, Forouhi NG, et al. Ultra-processed  
360 food consumption in UK adolescents: distribution, trends, and sociodemographic correlates using  
361 the National Diet and Nutrition Survey 2008/09 to 2018/19. European Journal of Nutrition. 2024:1-  
362 15.
- 363 19. Colombet Z., O’Flaherty M., Chavez-Ugalde Y. NOVA classification of the National Diet and  
364 Nutrition Survey, waves 1 to 11 (2008/09 to 2018/19): GitHub; 2023 [Available from:  
365 [https://github.com/zoecolombet/NOVA\\_NDNS\\_code](https://github.com/zoecolombet/NOVA_NDNS_code).
- 366 20. Black AE, Prentice AM, Goldberg GR, Jebb SA, Bingham SA, Livingstone MB, Coward WA.  
367 Measurements of total energy expenditure provide insights into the validity of dietary  
368 measurements of energy intake. Journal of the American Dietetic Association. 1993;93(5):572-9.
- 369 21. Bingham SA. Limitations of the Various Methods for Collecting Dietary Intake Data. Annals of  
370 Nutrition and Metabolism. 1991;35(3):117-27.
- 371 22. Park Y, Dodd KW, Kipnis V, Thompson FE, Potischman N, Schoeller DA, et al. Comparison of  
372 self-reported dietary intakes from the Automated Self-Administered 24-h recall, 4-d food records,  
373 and food-frequency questionnaires against recovery biomarkers. The American journal of clinical  
374 nutrition. 2018;107(1):80-93.
- 375 23. Gibney MJ. Ultra-processed foods: Definitions and policy issues. Current Developments in  
376 Nutrition. 2019;3(2).
- 377 24. Steele EM, O’Connor LE, Juul F, Khandpur N, Galastri Baraldi L, Monteiro CA, et al. Identifying  
378 and Estimating Ultraprocessed Food Intake in the US NHANES According to the Nova Classification  
379 System of Food Processing. The Journal of Nutrition. 2023;153(1):225-41.
- 380 25. Boukid F, Sogari G, Rosell C. Edible insects as foods: mapping scientific publications and  
381 product launches in the global market (1996-2021). Journal of Insects as Food and Feed.  
382 2023;9(3):353-68.
- 383 26. McClements DJ. Designing healthier and more sustainable ultraprocessed foods.  
384 Comprehensive Reviews in Food Science and Food Safety. 2024;23(2):e13331.
- 385 27. Volatier J-L, Biloft-Jensen A, De Henauw S, Gibney MJ, Huybrechts I, McCarthy SN, et al. A  
386 new reference method for the validation of the nutrient profiling schemes using dietary surveys.  
387 European journal of nutrition. 2007;46:29-36.
- 388 28. Luick M, Bandy LK, Harrington R, Vijayan J, Adams J, Cummins S, et al. The impact of the UK  
389 soft drink industry levy on the soft drink marketplace, 2017–2020: An interrupted time series  
390 analysis with comparator series. PloS one. 2024;19(6):e0301890.

- 391 29. World Health Organization. Use of non-sugar sweeteners: WHO guideline. Geneva: World  
392 Health Organization; 2023.
- 393 30. Crimarco A, Springfield S, Petlura C, Streaty T, Cunanan K, Lee J, et al. A randomized  
394 crossover trial on the effect of plant-based compared with animal-based meat on trimethylamine-N-  
395 oxide and cardiovascular disease risk factors in generally healthy adults: Study With Appetizing  
396 Plantfood-Meat Eating Alternative Trial (SWAP-MEAT). *Am J Clin Nutr.* 2020;112(5):1188-99.
- 397 31. Kesse-Guyot E, Allès B, Brunin J, Fouillet H, Dussiot A, Berthy F, et al. Environmental impacts  
398 along the value chain from the consumption of ultra-processed foods. *Nature Sustainability.*  
399 2023;6(2):192-202.
- 400 32. Willett W, Rockström J, Loken B, Springmann M, Lang T, Vermeulen S, et al. Food in the  
401 Anthropocene: the EAT–Lancet Commission on healthy diets from sustainable  
402 food systems. *The Lancet.* 2019;393(10170):447-92.
- 403 33. Northcott T, Lawrence M, Parker C, Baker P. Ecological regulation for healthy and  
404 sustainable food systems: responding to the global rise of ultra-processed foods. *Agriculture and*  
405 *Human Values.* 2023.
- 406 34. Anastasiou K, Baker P, Hadjikakou M, Hendrie G, Lawrence M. A conceptual framework for  
407 understanding the environmental impacts of ultra-processed foods and implications for sustainable  
408 food systems. *Journal of Cleaner Production.* 2022:133155.
- 409 35. Laine JE, Huybrechts I, Gunter MJ, Ferrari P, Weiderpass E, Tsilidis K, et al. Co-benefits from  
410 sustainable dietary shifts for population and environmental health: an assessment from a large  
411 European cohort study. *The Lancet Planetary Health.* 2021;5(11):e786-e96.
- 412 36. Gressier M, Swinburn B, Frost G, Segal AB, Sassi F. What is the impact of food reformulation  
413 on individuals' behaviour, nutrient intakes and health status? A systematic review of empirical  
414 evidence. *Obesity Reviews.* 2021;22(2):e13139.
- 415 37. Stanner S, Spiro A. Public health rationale for reducing sugar: Strategies and challenges.  
416 *Nutrition Bulletin.* 2020;45(3):253-70.
- 417 38. Scarborough P, Adhikari V, Harrington RA, Elhussein A, Briggs A, Rayner M, et al. Impact of  
418 the announcement and implementation of the UK Soft Drinks Industry Levy on sugar content, price,  
419 product size and number of available soft drinks in the UK, 2015-19: A controlled interrupted time  
420 series analysis. *PLoS medicine.* 2020;17(2):e1003025.
- 421 39. Rogers NT, Cummins S, Jones CP, Mytton O, Rayner M, Rutter H, et al. Estimated changes in  
422 free sugar consumption one year after the UK soft drinks industry levy came into force: controlled  
423 interrupted time series analysis of the National Diet and Nutrition Survey (2011–2019). *Journal of*  
424 *epidemiology and community health.* 2024;jech-2023-221051.
- 425 40. Cobiac LJ, Rogers NT, Adams J, Cummins S, Smith R, Mytton O, et al. Impact of the UK soft  
426 drinks industry levy on health and health inequalities in children and adolescents in England: An  
427 interrupted time series analysis and population health modelling study. *Plos Medicine.*  
428 2024;21(3):e1004371.
- 429 41. Srour B. Food processing and risk of non-communicable diseases: findings from the  
430 NutriNet-Santé cohort: Université Paris-Nord-Paris XIII; 2019.

- 431 42. Rauber F, Louzada MLdC, Steele EM, Millett C, Monteiro CA, Levy RB. Ultra-processed food  
432 consumption and chronic non-communicable diseases-related dietary nutrient profile in the UK  
433 (2008–2014). *Nutrients*. 2018;10(5):587.
- 434 43. Moubarac J-C, Batal M, Louzada ML, Martinez Steele E, Monteiro CA. Consumption of ultra-  
435 processed foods predicts diet quality in Canada. *Appetite*. 2017;108:512-20.
- 436 44. Martínez Steele E, Popkin BM, Swinburn B, Monteiro CA. The share of ultra-processed foods  
437 and the overall nutritional quality of diets in the US: evidence from a nationally representative cross-  
438 sectional study. *Population health metrics*. 2017;15:1-11.
- 439 45. Ruggiero E, Esposito S, Costanzo S, Di Castelnuovo A, Cerletti C, Donati MB, et al. Ultra-  
440 processed food consumption and its correlates among Italian children, adolescents and adults from  
441 the Italian Nutrition & Health Survey (INHES) cohort study. *Public Health Nutrition*.  
442 2021;24(18):6258-71.
- 443 46. England PH. *The Eatwell Guide: helping you eat a healthy, balanced diet*. Public Health  
444 England London, UK; 2016.  
445