

# 1 **A methodological framework for deriving the German** 2 **food-based dietary guidelines 2024: food groups, nutrient** 3 **goals, and objective functions**

4

5 Anne Carolin Schäfer<sup>1, 2\*</sup>, Heiner Boeing<sup>3</sup>, Rozenn Gazan<sup>4</sup>, Johanna Conrad<sup>1</sup>, Kurt Gedrich<sup>5</sup>,  
6 Christina Breidenassel<sup>1</sup>, Hans Hauner<sup>6</sup>, Anja Kroke<sup>7</sup>, Jakob Linseisen<sup>8</sup>, Stefan Lorkowski<sup>9,10</sup>,  
7 Ute Nöthlings<sup>2</sup>, Margrit Richter<sup>1</sup>, Lukas Schwingshackl<sup>11</sup>, Florent Vieux<sup>4</sup>, Bernhard Watzl<sup>12</sup>

8

9 <sup>1</sup> German Nutrition Society, Bonn, Germany

10 <sup>2</sup> Department of Nutrition and Food Sciences, Nutritional Epidemiology, University of Bonn,  
11 Bonn, Germany

12 <sup>3</sup> Department of Epidemiology (closed), German Institute of Human Nutrition Potsdam-  
13 Rehbruecke, Nuthetal, Germany

14 <sup>4</sup> MS-Nutrition, Marseille, France

15 <sup>5</sup> Research Group Public Health Nutrition, ZIEL – Institute for Food & Health, Technical  
16 University of Munich, Freising, Germany

17 <sup>6</sup> Institute of Nutritional Medicine, Else Kröner Fresenius Center for Nutritional Medicine,  
18 School of Medicine and Health, Technical University of Munich, Munich, Germany

19 <sup>7</sup> University of Applied Sciences, Department of Nutritional, Food and Consumer Sciences,  
20 Fulda, Germany

21 <sup>8</sup> Epidemiology, University of Augsburg, University Hospital Augsburg, Augsburg, Germany

22 <sup>9</sup> Institute of Nutritional Sciences, Friedrich Schiller University Jena, Jena, Germany

23 <sup>10</sup> Competence Cluster for Nutrition and Cardiovascular Health (nutriCARD) Halle-Jena-  
24 Leipzig, Germany

25 <sup>11</sup> Institute for Evidence in Medicine, Medical Center - University of Freiburg, Faculty of  
26 Medicine, University of Freiburg, Freiburg, Germany

27 <sup>12</sup> Department of Physiology and Biochemistry of Nutrition, Max Rubner-Institut, Karlsruhe,  
28 Germany

29 \* Corresponding author

30 **NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.**  
E-mail: [corresponding\\_author@dge.de](mailto:corresponding_author@dge.de) (ACS)

## 31 Abstract

32 **Background:** For a growing number of food-based dietary guidelines (FBDGs), diet  
33 optimization is the tool of choice to account for the complex demands of healthy and  
34 sustainable diets. However, decisions about such optimization models' parameters are rarely  
35 reported nor systematically studied.

36 **Objectives:** The objectives were to develop a framework for (i) the formulation of decision  
37 variables based on a hierarchical food classification system; (ii) the mathematical form of the  
38 objective function; and (iii) approaches to incorporate nutrient goals.

39 **Methods:** To answer objective (i), food groups from FoodEx2 levels 3-7 were applied as  
40 decision variables in a model using acceptability constraints (5<sup>th</sup> and 95<sup>th</sup> percentile for food  
41 intakes of German adults ( $n=10,419$ )) and minimizing the deviation from the average  
42 observed dietary intakes. Building upon, to answer objectives (ii) and (iii), twelve models  
43 were run using decision variables from FoodEx2 level 3 ( $n=255$ ), applying either a linear or  
44 squared and a relative or absolute way to deviate from observed dietary intakes, and three  
45 different lists of nutrient goals (allNUT-DRV, incorporating all nutrient goals; modNUT-  
46 DRV excluding nutrients with limited data quality; modNUT-AR using average requirements  
47 where applicable instead of recommended intakes).

48 **Results:** FoodEx2 food groups proved suitable as diet optimization decision variables.  
49 Regarding deviation, the largest differences were between the four different objective  
50 function types, e.g. in the linear-relative modNUT-DRV model, 46 food groups of the  
51 observed diet were changed to reach the model's goal, in linear-absolute 78 food groups,  
52 squared-relative 167, and squared-absolute 248. The nutrient goals were fulfilled in all  
53 models, but the number of binding nutrient constraints was highest in the linear-relative  
54 models (e.g. allNUT-DRV: 11 vs. 7 in linear-absolute).

55 **Conclusion:** Considering the various possibilities to operationalize dietary aspects in an  
56 optimization model, this study offers valuable contributions to a framework for developing  
57 FBDGs via diet optimization.

## 58        **1 Introduction**

59        Food-based dietary guidelines (FBDGs) are typically developed to advice the public by which  
60        food intake dietary reference values (DRVs) can be met, and more recently, to reduce their  
61        risk of diet-related non-communicable diseases [1]. Nowadays, more advanced FBDGs  
62        integrate additional dimensions such as ecological sustainability [2], which increases the  
63        complexity of defining optimal intakes of different food groups [3,4].

64        The most holistic approach to manage the complex task of evaluating multiple dimensions of  
65        a sustainable diet is diet optimization, also referred to as diet modeling or linear/quadratic  
66        (squared) programming [5,6]. It aims to find the optimal quantitative combination of food  
67        groups (the decision variables), that may have both conflicting and/or complementary  
68        features, and that fulfills a set of constraints while minimizing or maximizing an objective  
69        function. Such a tool has been successfully applied in the context of FBDG development, for  
70        example in Australia, France, and the Netherlands [4,7–10].

71        However, each parameter in the optimization model can be represented in different  
72        (mathematical) options [11]. The food groups considered for FBDGs, and thus as decision  
73        variables for mathematical optimization, are often determined on an ad hoc basis [1,3,12,13].

74        The European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) has set up a detailed food classification system,  
75        FoodEx2, which is used to analyze and report survey data for European countries [14–17],  
76        what makes its use as decision variables favorable. However, it is unclear how such  
77        hierarchically organized food coding systems perform in optimization models. The objective  
78        function defines indicator(s), which should be minimized or maximized. In the literature using  
79        diet optimization, the most frequent indicator is the observed diet from which the deviation is  
80        minimized and thereby maximizes cultural acceptability of the model's solution [18–20]. This  
81        fulfills the requirement that FBDGs should take the habitual diet of the population into

82 account [1]. Constraints define the solution space in which the model can operate. When  
83 designing nutritionally adequate diets using diet optimization, they are usually set to fulfill  
84 nutrient recommendations using nationally available DRVs and to adhere to acceptability  
85 limits, where food group quantities are limited to realistic consumption levels observed in the  
86 population, e.g., the 95<sup>th</sup> percentile of consumption [5,8].


87 Although mathematical optimization has become an established method in nutritional  
88 sciences, hardly any systematic methodological analyses has been reported. With the goal of  
89 updating and expanding the German FBDG methodology, we undertook thorough analyses of  
90 these methodological choices. The present paper aimed to describe the use of FoodEx2 as  
91 decision variables for optimization models, the implication of the objective function's  
92 mathematical form taking the observed dietary intake from the latest German nutrition survey  
93 as example, and the impact of different choices of nutrient goals based on DRVs on  
94 optimization results.

## 95 **2 Methods**

### 96 **2.1 Decision variables**

97 The decision variables are the variables that will be optimized. Optimization models for  
98 FBDGs typically focus on observed dietary intakes for a list of food groups as decision  
99 variables. For Germany, the food classification of EFSA, FoodEx2, provides internationally  
100 comparable food intake data and was therefore selected as the basis of our decision variables  
101 (version MTX 12.1, Exposure hierarchy [21]). Following a parent–child hierarchy, the  
102 FoodEx2 food groups are ordered into seven levels, with level 1 being the most aggregated  
103 (e.g., “Fruit and fruit products”) and the lower levels being more detailed (e.g., “Pome fruits”  
104 on level 3) (see Figure 1). Level 7 is the level at which intake data from surveys such as the

105 most recent German National Nutrition Survey II [16,22] had been initially coded before  
106 being further aggregated for communication and comparisons. FoodEx2 facets, which further  
107 describe attributes of a food group, e.g., processing information, were not considered in this  
108 study.



109  
110 *Figure 1: Example of the hierarchical structure of FoodEx2 showing food groups from level 1 “Fruit*  
111 *and fruit products”*

112 However, FoodEx2 does not allow a clear distinction between whole grain and other grain  
113 products without the use of FoodEx2 facets. To work with well-defined food groups for whole  
114 grains, the food groups that belong to level 1 “Grains and grain-based products” were  
115 relabeled to obtain the food groups “whole grain” and “refined grain” as displayed in  
116 S1 Table. The relabeling was conducted by duplicating the initial “Grains and grain-based  
117 products” food group to create two different categories (“Whole grains” and “Refined  
118 grains”) that still adhered to the parent–child hierarchy. All initial food groups at level 7 were  
119 categorized as whole grain or refined grain and then aggregated until level 1.

120 Processed meat is also not clearly defined in the hierarchy of FoodEx2, as several level 2 food  
121 groups of the parent group “Meat and meat products” are a mix of processed meat products  
122 and unprocessed meat. Here, a new parent food group called “Processed meat” was

123 established and the respective FoodEx2 food groups were assigned to this group. To  
124 differentiate between poultry and red meat for the food group “Mammals and birds meat”  
125 (level 3, food code A0EYH), the food code was duplicated, reassigned to either red meat or  
126 poultry, and the mean intake split between the two new variables. The percentiles used as  
127 acceptability constraints (chapter 2.2) were kept as observed.

128 The FoodEx2 level 1 groups “Other ingredients” and “Food products for young population”  
129 were excluded for their irrelevancy and low intakes by adults. After these adjustments, the  
130 number of food groups, and therefore decision variables, was 927 at level 7, which were  
131 aggregated into 926 at level 6, 857 at level 5, 593 at level 4, 255 at level 3, and 83 at level 2.

### 132 **2.1.1 Reporting the whole diet**

133 Considering that FoodEx2 level 2 already has 83 different food groups, the optimization  
134 results would be too detailed for establishing and communicating FBDGs. Thus, we decided  
135 that the reporting of results from our optimization models should be condensed into a defined  
136 list of food groups. This list was agreed upon by the working group of the German Nutrition  
137 Society responsible for the development of the scientific basis for the German FBDG  
138 (S2 Table). This list included the following groups: water, coffee and tea, vegetables, fruits,  
139 fruit and vegetable juices, legumes, nuts and seeds, potatoes, grain (products) and wholegrain  
140 (products) thereof, milk and dairy products, eggs, fish and seafood, poultry, red meat,  
141 processed meat, vegetable oils, and spreadable fats.

142 These 18 FBDG food groups were matched to their most aggregated respective FoodEx2 food  
143 groups. Eight of the 18 food groups matched FoodEx2 level 1 food groups, six matched level  
144 2 food groups, and four matched level 3 food groups (Table 1).

145 *Table 1: Food-based dietary guidelines (FBDG) food groups and respective FoodEx2 food group*  
146 *names and codes.*

<i>FBDG food group</i>	<i>FoodEx2 food group name</i>	<i>FoodEx2 code</i>	<i>FoodEx2 level</i>
<i>Drinking water</i>	Drinking water	A03DK	2
<i>Coffee and tea</i>	Ingredients for coffee, cocoa, tea, and herbal infusions	A03GH	2
<i>Vegetables</i>	Vegetables and vegetable products	A00FJ	1
<i>Fruit</i>	Fruit and fruit products	A01BS	1
<i>Fruit and vegetable juices</i>	Fruit and vegetable juices and nectars (including concentrates)	A039K	1
<i>Vegetable fats and oils</i>	Vegetable fats and oils, edible	A036N	3
<i>Legumes</i>	Legumes	A04RG	2
<i>Nuts and seeds</i>	Nuts, oilseeds and oilfruits	A04RH	2
<i>Potatoes</i>	Potatoes and similar	A0DPP	3
<i>Whole grains*</i>	Grains and grain-based products	A000J_WG*	1
<i>Refined grains**</i>	Grains and grain-based products	A000J_RG**	1
<i>Eggs and egg products</i>	Eggs and egg products	A031E	1
<i>Fish and seafood</i>	Fish, seafood, -amphibians, reptiles and invertebrates	A026T	1
<i>Milk and dairy products</i>	Milk and dairy products	A02LR	1
<i>Poultry</i>	Birds meat	A0EYG	3
<i>Red meat</i>	Mammals meat	A0EYF	3
<i>Processed meat***</i>	Processed meat products	A01QR_P***	2
<i>Spreadable fats</i>	Fat emulsions and blended fats	A039B	2

147 \* All grain food groups that contain “wholemeal,” “bran,” “brown,” or “oat” in their name (based on [23]) and  
148 individual case decisions as noted in S1 Table

149 \*\* All grain food groups except food groups that contain “wholemeal,” “bran,” “brown,” or “oat” in their name  
150 (based on [23]) and individual case decisions as noted in S1 Table

151 \*\*\* Generated from the food groups “Processed whole meat products,” “Sausages,” “Meat specialities,” and  
152 “Canned-tinned meat”

153 The FoodEx2 level 1 food groups “Products for young population” and “Other ingredients” were excluded

154



155 Many FBDGs aim to limit the intake of so-called discretionary foods [1], such as sweets and  
 156 sugar-sweetened beverages. These food groups contribute to total energy intake and the intake  
 157 of nutrients that should be limited, such as free sugars and saturated fatty acids. These  
 158 heterogeneous and unfavorable food groups were reported as the summary of their energy  
 159 share in addition to the 18 FBDG food groups. Discretionary food groups and their respective  
 160 FoodEx2 food groups are displayed in Table 2.

161 *Table 2: Discretionary food groups according to FoodEx2 food group names and codes.*

<i>Food group</i>	<i>FoodEx2 food group name</i>	<i>FoodEx2 code</i>	<i>FoodEx2 level</i>
<i>Seasoning and sauces</i>	Seasoning, sauces and condiments	A042N	1
<i>Composite dishes</i>	Composite dishes	A03VA	1
<i>Sugar-sweetened beverages</i>	Water-based beverages	A04PY	2
<i>Alcoholic beverages</i>	Alcoholic beverages	A03LZ	1
<i>Sweets</i>	Sugar and similar, confectionary and water-based sweet desserts	A032F	1
<i>Others</i>	Products for non-standard diets, food imitations and food supplements FoodEx2 food groups not able to be matched to other groups	A03RQ	1

162

### 163 **2.1.2 Selection of the appropriate FoodEx2 level for optimization**

164 To determine which level of FoodEx2 should be selected as the source of decision variables  
 165 for the optimization of the German FBDG, we concluded that the level should provide  
 166 sufficient details to create a specific result for each food group reported in the FBDG. For  
 167 example, if the FBDG should report the optimal consumption quantity of vegetable oils, as  
 168 distinguished from other fats at level 3 (Table 1), level 3 of FoodEx2 would need to be  
 169 selected as the source of decision variables. We found that FoodEx2 level 3 (255 decision

170 variables) provided a list of food groups with sufficient detail for reporting in the German  
171 FBDG (Table 1). The list of decision variables at level 3 is shown in S3 Table.

### 172 **2.1.3 Linking food groups to consumption and nutrient composition data**

173 In the EFSA Comprehensive European Food Consumption Database, the FoodEx2 food codes  
174 are already linked to dietary intake data from various national surveys [15,16]. For our  
175 purpose, we retrieved data for adults (18–65 years) in Germany. The German intake data is  
176 based on two non-consecutive 24-hour dietary recalls from 10,419 men and women from the  
177 German National Nutrition Survey II (NVS II) (2005-2007) [24]. The data was weighted as  
178 described in Heuer et al. for age, sex, residential area, and other socioeconomic factors to  
179 represent the adult German population [25]. For each FoodEx2 food group and level, the  
180 mean intake and distribution percentiles in g/d were calculated, either for those individuals  
181 who consume the food group (consumers only) or among all individuals.

182 Information on nutrient and energy content was obtained from the German Nutrient Database  
183 (Bundeslebensmittelschlüssel (BLS) version 3.02 [26]). The BLS uses a different food group  
184 classification system than FoodEx2. To match the intake data with the national nutrient  
185 database, a matching of 1,288 foods from the BLS to FoodEx2 food groups, mainly on level  
186 7, was applied (personal communication of Katja Sandfuchs from the Max Rubner-Institut,  
187 Karlsruhe, Germany). As the BLS lacks data for free sugars, this information was completed  
188 using mean values from 80 generic food categories of the LEBTAB database [27] that were  
189 matched to BLS food groups.

190 The nutrient values for all food groups (decision variables) were calculated following the  
191 parent–child hierarchy of FoodEx2 (see Figure 1). For a specific food group, the nutritional  
192 content was either the nutritional content of a BLS food if a direct matching existed, or an  
193 average nutritional content of its related food groups according to the FoodEx2 hierarchy that

194 had a matching with the BLS database, weighted by intake data, as described by Gazan et al.  
195 [28].

## 196 **2.2 Acceptability constraints**

197 Acceptability constraints frame the solution space of the optimization model to ensure that  
198 optimized food intakes remain within the range observed in the target population. They were  
199 defined as follows: the 5<sup>th</sup> (minimum constraint) and 95<sup>th</sup> percentiles (maximum constraint) of  
200 the observed intake for all individuals for each food group at level 1 (see S4 Table) and,  
201 additionally, for each food group on level 3, the 5<sup>th</sup> (minimum constraint) among all  
202 individuals and 95<sup>th</sup> percentiles (maximum constraint) for consumers only.

203 For “Composite dishes” and “Seasoning and sauces,” which are part of the discretionary food  
204 groups, we made exceptions from the aforementioned rules. These food groups are not clearly  
205 described (e.g. potato-based dishes), but supply various nutrients within one decision variable,  
206 posing a very attractive group for the linear models which strive to achieve the best solution  
207 by changing least decision variables. Therefore, the optimized intake for these food groups  
208 could not exceed the corresponding observed mean intakes on level 3. Because the energy  
209 goal of the optimized diet is lower than the observed diet, the observed intakes used as upper  
210 acceptability constraints were matched to the energy goal of the optimized diet.

## 211 **2.3 Objective function and nutrient goals**

### 212 **2.3.1 Different implementations of deviation from the observed diet**

213 Four different mathematical implementations for minimizing deviation from observed dietary  
214 intakes in the objective function were investigated: linear as a percentage from the observed  
215 diet (linear-relative), linear in absolute quantities (linear-absolute), squared differences of the

216 percentage from the observed diet (squared-relative), and squared differences of the absolute  
217 quantities (squared-absolute).

218 The mathematical formulas were as follows:

Linear-relative 
$$Dev_{lr} = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\|(x_i^{opt} - x_i^{obs})\|}{x_i^{obs}}$$

Linear-absolute 
$$Dev_{la} = \sum_{i=1}^n \|(x_i^{opt} - x_i^{obs})\|$$

Squared-relative 
$$Dev_{sr} = \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{x_i^{opt} - x_i^{obs}}{x_i^{obs}}\right)^2$$

Squared-absolute 
$$Dev_{sa} = \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i^{opt} - x_i^{obs})^2$$

219 where  $Dev$  is the deviation from the observed diet composed of  $n$  food groups, with  $x_i^{obs}$  the  
220 observed quantity of food group  $i$  and  $x_i^{opt}$  the optimized quantity of the same food group.

### 221 2.3.2 Three approaches to incorporate nutrient goals

222 The nutrient goals were based on the dietary reference values (DRVs) for Germany [29] and  
223 complemented by EFSA's tolerable upper intake levels for nutrients [30]. DRVs are classified  
224 as either recommended intakes (RI), estimated values, or guiding values. Nutrients with an RI  
225 cover the nutrient requirements of 97.5% of the population [29]. The average requirement  
226 (AR) for these nutrients covers the requirements of 50% of the population. Three different  
227 lists of nutrient goals were defined by setting lower bounds, upper bounds, or specific target  
228 values. If not differently specified, reference values for adults (18–65 years, normal weight  
229 with moderate physical activity level (PAL) 1.4) were taken and subsequently weighted

230 according to the proportion of sex and distribution of age groups in the German population  
231 (S5 Table).

232 The first list applied all nutrient goals (DRVs und EFSA upper intake levels) and where  
233 available the RI (allNUT-DRV). Selenium, chromium, and molybdenum were not included  
234 because there is no data in the nutrient database used (BLS version 3.02). Vitamin D was not  
235 included because the requirement is not to be covered by diet, but provided by the  
236 endogenous synthesis through exposure to sunlight or by supplements.

237 The second list (modNUT-DRV) built upon allNUT-DRV, but was modified in three different  
238 ways: (i) iodine, fluoride, copper, and manganese were not applied due to limited data quality  
239 in the nutrient database. Their contents vary greatly depending on their fortification in  
240 foodstuffs or animal feed or are not assessed at all; the contribution of other sources, e.g.,  
241 fluoride intake from toothpaste, is unknown; and/or the bioavailability fluctuates (manganese)  
242 or is homeostatically regulated (copper). As the quantities tend to be underestimated rather  
243 than overestimated, the upper bounds were nevertheless used. (ii) Regarding total fat, an  
244 upper bound was applied (40% of energy intake) [31,32]. It was assumed that lower and upper  
245 bounds of fatty acids (saturated fatty acids (SFA), monounsaturated fatty acids (MUFA), and  
246 polyunsaturated fatty acids (PUFA)) would ensure adequate quality and intake of fat [29,32].  
247 (iii) For iron, the DRV for premenopausal women was used for the entire population instead  
248 of a weighted mean for both sexes because this is the only DRV with a higher value for  
249 women and a higher risk for insufficient supply. For similar reasons, the upper limit for  
250 alcohol was taken from the women's DRVs.

251 The third list of nutrient goals applied goals for the same nutrients as modNUT-DRV, except  
252 that here the AR was used instead of the RI (modNUT-AR). The remaining DRVs (11  
253 estimated values, 5 guiding values, and 4 other recommended intakes) remained the same. A  
254 detailed overview of all lists is provided in Table 4 in the Results section.

### 255 2.3.3 Mathematical implementation of nutrient goals in the optimization model

256 In addition to minimizing deviation from observed dietary intakes, the objective function of  
257 models considering nutrient goals had an additional component that only became active when  
258 a nutrient goal could not be fulfilled:

$$Dev_k^- = \begin{cases} \frac{DRV_k^{min} - Intake_k^{opt}}{DRV_k^{min}} & \text{if } Intake_k^{opt} \leq DRV_k^{min} \\ 0 & \text{if } Intake_k^{opt} > DRV_k^{min} \end{cases}$$

$$Dev_l^+ = \begin{cases} \frac{Intake_l^{opt} - DRV_l^{max}}{DRV_l^{max}} & \text{if } Intake_l^{opt} \geq DRV_l^{max} \\ 0 & \text{if } Intake_l^{opt} < DRV_l^{max} \end{cases}$$

259 where for nutrients  $k$  with a minimum nutrient goal, only the inadequate intake (negative  
260 deviations)  $Dev_k^-$  is minimized (a), and for nutrients  $l$  having a maximum nutrient goal, only  
261 excess (positive deviations)  $Dev_l^+$  is minimized (b). For nutrients with a target goal (e.g., a  
262 target of 2,000 kcal/d), the sum of negative and positive deviations is minimized. This allows  
263 deviation from nutrient goals if the model would otherwise find no feasible solution, which  
264 helps to identify the source of infeasibility. It should be noted that in the case of the squared  
265 function  $Dev_l^+$  and  $Dev_k^-$  are squared.

### 266 2.3.4 Complete objective function and technical aspects

267 The objective function used for investigations in the present work aims to minimize  $F_j$ , which  
268 is the sum of the total deviation from each specific objective:

$$269 \quad Min F_j = Dev + W^N \left[ \sum_{k=1}^{k=nutrients} Dev_k^- + \sum_{l=1}^{l=nutrients} Dev_l^+ + \sum_{m=1}^{m=nutrients} (Dev_m^- + Dev_m^+) \right]$$

270 A high weight  $W^N$  was assigned to penalize the objective function value if the solution  
271 deviated from nutrient goals.

272 The diet optimization models were developed using R version 4.1.3 [33], with an R package  
273 specifically designed for this project using the ROI (R Optimization Infrastructure) package  
274 version 0.3-3 [34], the solver lpsolve [35] for linear optimization, and quadprog version 1.5.8  
275 [36] for quadratic/squared optimization. The data of the descriptors were stored in an SQL  
276 database and edited using MySQL Workbench version 8.0.

## 277 **2.4 Analysis**

278 To study the impact of the use of the hierarchical food code FoodEx2 as decision variables, a  
279 simple optimization model was used that only included the minimization from the observed  
280 diet in the objective function, acceptability constraints, and no nutrient constraints. To study  
281 the impact of the mathematical type of objective function ( $Dev_{lr,la,sr,sa}$ ) and varying nutrient  
282 goals, 12 scenarios of the complete optimization model were run using decision variables  
283 from FoodEx2 level 3 with all four objective function types, acceptability constraints, and the  
284 allNUT-DRV, modNUT-DRV, and modNUT-AR lists for nutrient goals. To study how the  
285 mathematical implementation type used for objective function affected the results, the  
286 following indicators were used to measure deviation from the observed diet:

287 - The absolute sum of changes in food groups (grams/day):

288 
$$\text{Sum of absolute changes} = \sum_{i=1}^n \|(x_i^{opt} - x_i^{obs})\|$$

289 - The sum of relative changes in food groups (%):

290 
$$\text{Sum of relative changes} = \sum_{i=1}^n \|(x_i^{opt} - x_i^{obs})\| / x_i^{obs} \times 100$$

291 - The number of food groups that increased in the optimized diet

292 - The number of food groups that decreased in the optimized diet

- 293 - The number of food groups that disappeared in the optimized diet
- 294 - The number of food groups that did not change in the optimized diet
- 295 - The number of level 1 groups that were binding acceptability constraints.

296 Another criterion for the comparison between the models was the number of binding nutrient  
297 constraints defined as those constraints where the nutrient quantity in the optimized diet was  
298 equal to the imposed upper or lower bound [6].

## 299 **3 Results**

### 300 **3.1 Use of a hierarchical food code as decision variables**

301 Intuitively, a food code constructed according to a parent–child hierarchy will generate  
302 similar solutions for the decision variables independent of the applied level. We validated this  
303 principle by running optimization models with decision variable sources ranging from level 7  
304 to level 2 (S6 Table). In this context, a low level of aggregation in FoodEx2 meant a higher  
305 number of decision variables was used for optimization; this was counterbalanced by uniform  
306 reporting of results, often on a highly aggregated level (see the Methods section). The  
307 optimization program had no difficulties in processing the 927 decision variables of level 7 or  
308 other levels and generated equal amounts for each reported food group regardless of the  
309 applied level. These findings suggest that the selected R programs represent a powerful tool  
310 for detailed food consumption data, such as those categorized in FoodEx2.

311 However, whether food group level affects the results when further parameters are applied  
312 (such as nutrient constraints) was not investigated, but was rated according to the experience  
313 with optimization models as minor. The relative independence of level may be explained by  
314 the fact that due to the clear parent–child relationship from level to level, each level contains  
315 the same information but is subdivided differently.



## 316 **3.2 Different types of objective functions**

317 With the outlined metrics we compared the optimized diet with the observed diet for four  
318 different optimization functions and three nutrient goal lists (see Table 3). In the allNUT-  
319 DRV models, the absolute and relative sum of changes in food groups was higher than those  
320 in the modNUT-DRV and modNUT-AR models. However, the largest differences in the  
321 deviation indicators were between the four different objective function types. As defined in  
322 the objective function, the sum of absolute quantitative changes was higher in the relative  
323 models than in the absolute models: for example, a total of 5,158 g of food for the linear-  
324 relative allNUT-DRV model vs. 493 g for the linear-absolute allNUT-DRV model.  
325 Consequently, the relative changes were considerably higher in the absolute models than in  
326 the relative ones (e.g., an average of 965% per variable for the linear-absolute modNUT-DRV  
327 model vs. 23% for the linear-relative modNUT-DRV model).

328 The absolute models for allNUT-DRV, modNUT-DRV, and modNUT-AR reached none of  
329 the acceptability limits on FoodEx2 level 1 (limits shown in S4 Table). All relative models  
330 except for the modNUT-AR squared-relative model reached one to three acceptability limits.  
331 In the squared-relative allNUT-DRV model, for example, these were maximum limits for  
332 “Vegetables,” “Drinking water,” and “Coffee and tea.” The linear-relative modNUT-DRV  
333 model, which used high quantities of beverages as energy-independent variables to increase  
334 nutrient content, did not reach the acceptability constraints for these groups, but did for  
335 “Potatoes” and “Legumes and nuts.”

336 The linear models generated results that left the largest number of decision variables  
337 unchanged (relative ( $Dev_{lr}$ ): 206–218; absolute ( $Dev_{la}$ ): 177–182 out of 255 decision  
338 variables), whereas the squared-relative models left less than half of the variables (85–100)  
339 unchanged and the squared-absolute models left only 7–8 food groups unchanged. The latter

340 also showed the highest number of food groups disappearing from the diet (96–106 food  
341 groups).

342 *Table 3: Results of the deviation indicators between the observed diet and optimized models for the allNUT-DRV, modNUT-DRV, and modNUT-AR models in all*  
 343 *four objective function types.*

Deviation indicator	allNUT-DRV				modNUT-DRV				modNUT-AR			
	Linear		Squared		Linear		Squared		Linear		Squared	
	Rel.	Abs.	Rel.	Abs.	Rel.	Abs.	Rel.	Abs.	Rel.	Abs.	Rel.	Abs.
Sum of absolute changes in food groups (g/day)	5,158	493	5,468	729	2,784	464	3,413	673	3,191	427	2,003	576
Sum of relative changes in food groups (%) expressed as average per variable (n=255)	35	1,234	51	20,763	23	965	35	20,421	16	3785	24	15,275
No. of food groups (n=255) that increased in the optimized diet	14	8	90	108	11	7	81	116	8	6	70	114
No. of food groups (n=255) that decreased in the optimized diet	16	11	55	34	15	13	68	31	16	13	74	37
No. of food groups (n=255) that disappeared in the optimized diet	19	54	25	106	20	58	18	101	13	55	11	96
No. of food groups (n=255) that did not change in the optimized diet	206	182	85	7	209	177	88	7	218	181	100	8
No. of level 1 groups (n=18) that reached maximum acceptability constraints	2	0	3	0	2	0	1	0	2	0	0	0

344

### 345 **3.3 Nutrient goals**

346 Table 44 shows the nutrient contents of the optimized diets for the linear-relative objective  
347 function. The optimized nutrient contents across the other objective function forms were  
348 similar and are shown in S6 Table. All nutrient goals were met in all models. In the allNUT-  
349 DRV, modNUT-DRV, and modNUT-AR models, the constraints for the six nutrients SFA  
350 and free sugars (upper limits), and MUFA, fiber, potassium, and calcium (lower limits) were  
351 binding, meaning that they reached exactly their upper or lower bound. In the allNUT-DRV  
352 model (15 upper and 33 lower bounds), cholesterol, sodium, iodine, fluoride, and zinc were  
353 also binding constraints. In the modNUT-DRV approach, there were four additional binding  
354 nutrient constraints (cholesterol, sodium, PUFA, and iron) from a total of 16 upper bounds  
355 and 28 lower bounds. The modNUT-AR model had the same number of nutrient goals, but  
356 only PUFA as another binding constraint. After excluding nutrient goals due to limited data  
357 quality in the modNUT-DRV and modNUT-AR models, the DRV was no longer reached for  
358 iodine and fluoride, and even the AR [29] was not reached for iodine in the modNUT-AR  
359 model. For copper and manganese, the DRV was met despite exclusion of their intake goals.

360 Table 4: Nutrient goals for all analyses and nutrient contents for the observed diet and optimized diet in the linear-relative model for all nutrient goals (allNUT-  
 361 DRV), the modified list of nutrient goals (modNUT-DRV), and the modified list of nutrient goals using the AR (modNUT-AR).

Nutrient (unit)	Type	Obs.	allNUT-DRV			modNUT-DRV			modNUT-AR		
			Lower bound	Upper bound	Opt.	Lower bound	Upper bound	Opt.	Lower bound	Upper bound	Opt.
Fat (% of energy)	GV	39	-	-	30	-	40**	29	-	40**	29
Saturated fatty acids (% of energy)	n.a.	17	-	10	10	-	10	10	-	10	10
Monounsaturated fatty acids (% of energy)	n.a.	13	10	-	10	10	-	10	10	-	10
Polyunsaturated fatty acids (% of energy)	n.a.	6	7	10	8	7	10	7	7	10	7
Linoleic acid (% of energy)	RI	4.8	2.5	-	6.7	2.5	-	6	2	-	6
Linolenic acid (% of energy)	EST	0.7	0.5	-	0.8	0.5	-	0.8	0.5	-	0.7
EPA plus DHA (mg/d)	EST	289	250	-	674	250	-	274	250	-	334
Cholesterol (mg/d)	GV	318	-	300	300	-	300	300	-	300	218
Protein (g/d)	RI	78	52	-	76	52	-	82	43	-	67
Carbohydrates (% of energy)	n.a.	43	-	-	52	-	-	52	-	-	55
Free sugars (% of energy)	n.a.	15	-	10**	10	-	10**	10	-	10**	10
Fiber (g/d)	GV	18	30	-	30	30	-	30	30	-	30
Alcohol (ethanol) (g/d)	GV	12	-	15	6	-	10	6	-	10	6
Vitamin A (µg RAE/d)	RI	1,534	776	-	1,144	776	-	1,025	550	-	1,196
Vitamin D (µg/d)	EST	2.6	-	100*	5	-	100*	2.4	-	100*	1.7
Vitamin E (mg/d)	EST	13	13	300*	20	13	300*	16	13	300*	20
Vitamin K (as phylloquinone) (µg/d)	EST	83.1	68	-	105	68	-	81.7	68	-	104.4
Thiamin (mg/d)	RI	1.7	1.1	-	1.8	1.1	-	2	0.9	-	1.8
Riboflavin (mg/d)	RI	2	1.2	-	1.8	1.2	-	1.9	1	-	1.5
Niacin (mg/d)	RI	37	13	-	36	13	-	38	11	-	34
Pantothenic acid (mg/d)	EST	5.9	5	-	6.4	5	-	6.4	5	-	5.9
Vitamin B6 (mg/d)	RI	2	1.5	25*	2.3	1.5	25*	2.3	1.3	25*	2.5
Biotin (µg/d)	EST	70	40	-	86	40	-	75	40	-	78
Folate (µg/d)	RI	278	300	1,000*	377	300	1,000*	349	220	1,000*	331

Cobalamin (Vitamin B12) (µg/d)	EST	6.5	4	-	5.5	4	-	5.2	4	-	4.5
Vitamin C (mg/d)	RI	128	103	-	210	103	-	136	84	-	237
Sodium (mg/d)	EST	2,507	1,500	2,400**	2,400	1,500	2,400**	2,400	1,500	2,400**	2,215
Chloride (mg/d)	EST	3,873	2,300	-	4,539	2,300	-	4,036	2,300	-	3,620
Potassium (mg/d)	EST	3,191	4,000	-	4,000	4,000	-	4,000	4,000	-	4,000
Calcium (mg/d)	RI	1,015	1,000	2,500*	1,000	1,000	2,500*	1,000	741	2,500*	741
Phosphorus (mg/d)	RI	1,375	700	-	1,312	700	-	1,445	580	-	1,093
Magnesium (mg/d)	EST	360	325	-	426	325	-	490	325	-	382
Iron (mg/d)	RI	11.3	12	-	13.1	15	-	15	11	-	12.5
Iodine (µg/d)	RI	106	193	600*	193	-	600*	111.3	-	600*	87.9
Fluoride (mg/d)	GV	1.1	3.5	7*	3.5	-	7*	1.9	-	7*	1.5
Zinc (middle phytate intake) (mg/d)	RI	11.3	11	25*	11	11	25*	12.3	9.2	25*	9.9
Copper (mg/d)	EST	1.7	1	5*	2	-	5*	2.3	-	5*	1.9
Manganese (mg/d)	EST	5.1	2	-	9.9	-	-	7.1	-	-	5.5
Water (mL/d)	GV	2,946	2,156	-	5,803	2,156	-	4,623	2,156	-	4,185

362

363 Obs. = observed diet, Opt. = optimized diet, RI = recommended intake, EST = estimated value for an adequate intake, GV = guiding value, EPA = eicosapentaenoic acid, DHA =  
364 docosahexaenoic acid, RAE = retinol activity equivalent

365 DRVs from [29], unless differently indicated; \*European Food Safety Authority Dietary Reference Value/Upper Intake Level; \*\*German Nutrition Society (Deutsche  
366 Gesellschaft für Ernährung) recommendation [37–39].

367 The only target values applied were for energy, a guiding value with a target value of 2,029 kcal per day for every model, and fat with a target of 30% of energy per day in the  
368 allNUT-DRV model. In all analyses, vitamin D was not considered due to its mainly endogenous synthesis.

## 369 **4 Discussion**

370 In the present study, we showed different ways food groups as decision variables, the  
371 objective function, and nutrient goals of optimization models used for deriving FBDGs can be  
372 defined, and explored their implications on optimization results. We also investigated the  
373 implications of using a hierarchical food code as the source of decision variables for FBDG  
374 development, showing that selecting an appropriate food code, based on the desired level of  
375 detail for the FBDGs, is essential for the model. Further, we revealed the impact of using  
376 different mathematical forms of the objective function on dietary changes and provided  
377 reasons for making decisions about objective function types in the future. Lastly, we clarified  
378 which nutrient goals are suitable for use in the model. These analyses paved the way for  
379 constructing an optimization model that forms the basis of Germany's FBDG 2024.

380 The described optimization model could handle several hundred food groups (ranging from  
381 255 at level 3 to 927 at level 7) without interfering with the internal parent–child hierarchy of  
382 the FoodEx2 food code (S6 Table). Subsequently, deciding on which level of FoodEx2 the  
383 optimization should be run is vital. We showed that the same optimized food intake  
384 quantities, independent of which food group level was initially selected, were obtained in an  
385 optimization model minimizing the distance from the observed intake data only and without  
386 nutritional constraints (S2 Table), demonstrating the hierarchical consistency of the food code  
387 data.

388 Previous studies on optimization have mostly used national food codes, selected codes of  
389 intake survey data, or a predefined food list to generate a list of decision variables  
390 [8,13,40,41]. The food classification system in this study supports a harmonized approach of  
391 data extrapolation, expansion, and use; it matches various food data sources, striving to  
392 harmonize nutritional research not only in European countries but also worldwide [42,43].

393 There are several reasons why a well-accepted and internationally used hierarchical system  
394 like FoodEx2 is useful for diet optimization: (i) it provides clearly defined food groups at each  
395 level; (ii) it provides representative and regularly updated food intake data, which can be  
396 easily incorporated and compared; (iii) gaps in the data can be calculated using dietary intake  
397 as weighting factors (see Methods section, [28]); and (iv) solutions can be evaluated by  
398 researchers of different disciplines working with such food code data [42]. One challenge in  
399 the application of FoodEx2 with regards to FBDGs is that the exposure-rooted classification  
400 does not always fit with a nutritional–physiological perspective (e.g., no clear distinction  
401 between whole grain and refined grain products); therefore, adjustments, like those described  
402 in the methods section, may be needed.

403 Another question addressed the selection of an appropriate aggregation level of food groups  
404 as decision variables. In this analysis, using FoodEx2 level 3 as the source of decision  
405 variables was adequate to calculate optimized intakes with the required detail to quantify each  
406 of the 18 food groups reported as output of the optimization model and basis of the FBDG,  
407 while also allowing for the highest possible level of aggregation. In the type of parent–child  
408 hierarchy seen in FoodEx2, the aggregated characteristics of food groups are similar across  
409 levels but have different degrees of detail. Therefore, the largest possible aggregation of food  
410 groups is required to minimize the chance of single food groups biasing the representativeness  
411 of the food group. As an example, increasing the intake of the nutrient-dense food group liver  
412 could lead to a significantly smaller amount of total meat than would have been the case  
413 without this variable. The preference for more aggregated food groups that better represent a  
414 general group over variables with specific properties has been described previously [44]. If a  
415 different degree of detail is required, e.g., if differences in citrus fruit intake needed to be  
416 addressed, choosing a different food group level would be necessary. Therefore, the food



417 groups about which statements are to be made define the ideal FoodEx2 level of decision  
418 variables for optimization.

419 Further use of optimization results, e.g., for the development of FBDGs, usually target generic  
420 food groups that reflect the public's understanding and are suited for easily understandable  
421 communication [12]. These food groups are in general much broader than the single estimates  
422 for food groups generated by the optimization model. Thus, we decided on a uniform  
423 reporting schema of the optimization results independent of the level and details of the model  
424 itself. We decided to also report the optimal intake of discretionary foods. In our case, they  
425 were essential to remain consistent with the FoodEx2 classification system in our  
426 optimization model. Some nutrient goals, especially upper limits for SFA, alcohol, and free  
427 sugars, particularly focus on discretionary food groups. These food groups are often not  
428 considered in diet modeling for FBDG derivation [9,45]. However, there are also examples of  
429 the integration of discretionary foods in food guides from the Netherlands and Belgium  
430 [9,46].

431 Above, we mentioned the tendency of the model to select specific foods that favor the  
432 fulfillment of optimization functions such as nutritional constraints due to their  
433 characteristics. Thus, it is important to set appropriate constraints for each food group at all  
434 levels. In our case, similar to earlier studies, the 5<sup>th</sup> and 95<sup>th</sup> percentiles of observed food  
435 intakes were selected as minimum and maximum constraints to keep optimized quantities  
436 within acceptable intake ranges [47]. To date, no other study has provided rational criteria to  
437 assess the acceptability of these limits [5,48,49]. Borgonjen et al. [41] found that the  
438 application of the 10<sup>th</sup> and 90<sup>th</sup> percentiles increased the number of nutrients that were difficult  
439 to fulfill and recommended the use of the 5<sup>th</sup> and 95<sup>th</sup> percentiles, while also stating that a  
440 narrower range of percentiles would more closely represent average food patterns, making the  
441 recommendations easier to adopt. A narrow range acceptability constraints can also limit the

442 flexibility of the model to derive healthy diets, once indicators for diet–health relations are  
443 incorporated: using the 90<sup>th</sup> percentile for all individuals as acceptability constraints, the  
444 model could, for example, only use a maximum of 202 g/d for “Vegetables,” whereas the 95<sup>th</sup>  
445 percentile cutoff is 263 g/d (applied in this study), which is closer to an optimal vegetable  
446 intake regarding health [23]. Therefore, for our model we selected the 5<sup>th</sup> and 95<sup>th</sup> percentiles  
447 as a compromise between limiting unrealistic results and providing flexibility to fulfill the  
448 model’s goals and, in the future, health-oriented goals.

449 Regarding the mathematical form of the objective function, while linear approaches seem to  
450 be the most common choice for most optimization problems, the reasoning for this choice of  
451 objective function is rarely found [5]. Some studies claim that quadratic functions are superior  
452 in terms of cultural acceptability because smaller changes in more food groups would be  
453 easier to accept [9]. In the present study, we compared both relative and absolute linear and  
454 quadratic objective functions. However, our modeling could only partly confirm these  
455 theoretical considerations. The number of unchanged food groups was the highest in the  
456 linear-relative model, demonstrating that this model produces larger changes in fewer food  
457 groups, in accordance with the literature [5,9]. As expected, the quadratic approaches led to  
458 smaller changes in more food groups, but the sums of these changes, when considered both  
459 absolutely and relatively, were similar to or greater than the sums of changes from the linear  
460 models. Furthermore, particularly in the squared-absolute models, the quadratic functions led  
461 to several food groups being excluded from the diet on the decision variable level, which  
462 mostly affected food groups with dietary intakes <1 g/d. Previously, where a quadratic  
463 approach was used, the smallest observed intakes were a priori rounded down to 0 g/d [50].  
464 When deviations from observed diets in absolute quantities were compared with relative  
465 quantities, the absolute models were expected to make smaller changes. The absolute model  
466 does not consider the scales of food group quantities, whereas the relative model gives each

467 decision variable a similar weight and therefore tends to favor food groups consumed in high  
468 quantities. The results showed that these assumptions held true and indeed the deviation for  
469 the absolute models was smaller. However, a relative approach can assure that popular foods  
470 are used to meet the model's requirements: in the linear-absolute allNUT-DRV model, "Tea  
471 leaves derivatives and tea ingredients," as a dried and concentrated component, was used to  
472 fulfill the goal for fluoride. By contrast, large amounts of coffee beverages were used in the  
473 linear-relative model. Therefore, a lower deviation from the observed diet does not  
474 necessarily mean that the optimized diet is more practicable.

475 We observed that each type of objective function had specific properties that directed the  
476 model to find the optimal solutions. Which model performs best is therefore subject to the  
477 stated hypothesis and context of the analyses. In our case, we wanted to use the model results  
478 to guide the development of the new FBDGs for Germany. Therefore, we hypothesized that  
479 larger changes to often-used food groups would be the best strategy to communicate the new  
480 guidelines, rather than focusing on small changes to many food groups or eliminating some  
481 rarely used food groups. The type of function that met these criteria best was the linear-  
482 relative function, which was selected as our approach.

483 Considering the observed dietary intake via the objective function and as acceptability  
484 constraints fulfilled the EFSA framework's requirement to consider this aspect for the  
485 derivation of FBDGs [1] and increases the acceptability of the optimization results. However,  
486 the term acceptability should be handled carefully: the acceptability of a diet in a population is  
487 not only represented by the smallest possible deviation from the mean observed diet, but can  
488 also be displayed in other characteristics such as financial cost [49]. Without application in  
489 real-life studies, as done previously [51], it is impossible to define which objective function is  
490 most acceptable. Further, the observed diet represents no single individual's dietary pattern,  
491 but an average of all survey participants. Hence, even the starting point may not be acceptable

492 to many people: the most acceptable option for an individual will always be a personal  
493 decision [6,44].

494 The fulfillment of specific nutrient goals strongly drives optimization results and hence the  
495 scientific basis for FBDGs. Therefore, a thorough investigation of the selection and impact of  
496 different nutrient goals was undertaken. All nutrient goals could be fulfilled in the allNUT-  
497 DRV, modNUT-DRV, and modNUT-AR models. However, with more and higher nutrient  
498 goals (allNUT-DRV > modNUT-DRV > modNUT-AR), a greater number of binding  
499 nutrients constraints appeared. Binding nutrients are most difficult for the model to fulfill and  
500 strongly drive the optimization results. Most often, they appear when the observed diet failed  
501 to meet a nutrient goal. On the other hand, due to the mutual influence of the model's  
502 parameters with rising complexity can also apparently uncritical nutrients or constraints cause  
503 challenges for the model: E.g., the upper bound for SFAs forced the model to change fat-  
504 providing foods to fulfil both the nutrient goal constraints for MUFAs and SFAs. Thereby, the  
505 lower bound for MUFAs became a binding constraint, although this goal was initially met in  
506 the observed diet. Another optimization study found that constraints for SFAs were difficult  
507 to fulfill with subsequent changes in fatty acid profile [52]; similar observations were found  
508 for vitamin E and sodium combined with potassium DRVs in the US [53–55].

509 Comparing the three different approaches to incorporate nutrient goals regarding deviation  
510 from the observed diet, we found the biggest difference between the modified lists and the  
511 first list using all nutrient goals. The latter led to solutions with higher deviations from the  
512 observed diet. These findings were expected because the first list is more restrictive. This is in  
513 line with other optimization studies that tend to exclude or adapt single nutrients that drive  
514 strong deviations [44,56]; modifying the list of nutrient goals ensures optimized diets do not  
515 increase rarely consumed food groups for nutrients that are not well-represented in the data  
516 anyways [6]. Furthermore, there often is a trade-off between incorporating a more restrictive

517 nutrient constraint and acceptability. Less acceptable results can also stem from limited data  
518 quality for certain nutrients (see Chapter 2.4), which in this study was resolved by excluding  
519 the affected nutrient goals in the modNUT-DRV and modNUT-AR lists.

520 The allNUT-DRV models showed the largest deviations from the observed diet, especially in  
521 their high beverage intakes. Often, optimization studies suggest major increases in beverages  
522 like water and tea, as these food groups provide nutrients without contributing to energy or  
523 fats and sugars. This issue can be dealt with by constraining the total quantity of all foods or  
524 beverages [44,52,57]. Excluding nutrient goals from allNUT-DRV in the modified lists  
525 (modNUT-DRV and modNUT-AR), especially for nutrients frequently enriched (e.g., salt  
526 with iodine) or poorly represented in the data (e.g., fluoride), improved this acceptability issue  
527 without a constraint on total quantity.

528 The RI covers the individual needs of 97,5% of the healthy population but also overestimates  
529 the needs of half the individuals. The AR, on the other hand, only meets the needs of 50% of a  
530 defined group of people, meaning that its population-wide application may increase the risk of  
531 deficiencies or malnutrition [58]. Regarding diet modeling, the advisory committee of the US  
532 Dietary Guidelines 2020 concluded that the RI is preferred for planning individual dietary  
533 recommendations and the AR is preferred at the population level, but needs to be adjusted  
534 appropriately and subsequently evaluated [59]. By contrast, in France, the Netherlands, and  
535 the Nordic Nutrition Recommendations, the RI was used to derive FBDGs [8,9,60].

536 Another strategy can be to apply the AR for specific nutrients only. With regards to iron,  
537 Nordman et al. compared the AR and RI and found that “initial optimizations indicated a  
538 difficulty in fulfilling the high iron recommendations of pre-menopausal women without  
539 imposing large changes in the diet [...]” [44]. To avoid compromising diet acceptability, a  
540 separate dietary pattern only for premenopausal women was calculated. This kind of target  
541 group segregation does not fit the goal of the German FBDG, which is supposed to include a

542 dietary pattern applicable to the general adult population. Hence, the iron value for  
543 premenopausal women was used as the nutrient goal in the present model. Furthermore, the  
544 share of plant-based foods has increased in these simple models; the potential of lower iron  
545 absorption in a more plant-based dietary pattern [61] is another argument in favor of using the  
546 higher target (RI), especially for this critical nutrient.

547 Overall, excluding nutrient goals not well represented in the data led to more realistic results  
548 and gave greater flexibility to the model. This allowed to take other relevant aspects for  
549 FBDGs into account, such as diet–health relationships or environmental aspects [2]. However,  
550 a nutrient supply sufficient to meet the requirements of the population should be provided  
551 irrespective of these additional aspects. The modNUT-DRV approach seemed to provide the  
552 best compromise between the different requirements for nutrient goals in the German FBDG.  
553 The nutrients that were not regarded in the modified lists should still be considered in the final  
554 formulation of the FBDG, for example, recommendations for the use of salt fortified with  
555 iodine and fluoride.

## 556 **Strengths and limitations**

557 A variety of options are available to carry out diet modeling for FBDGs [62]; here, a  
558 systematic investigation of optimization options was undertaken. The main strength of the  
559 study is that it provides a rationale for decisions regarding the German FBDGs 2024 and  
560 could also guide other research using similar approaches. The study therefore adds to the body  
561 of data on the use of diet optimization for FBDGs. Although this simple model accounts only  
562 for nutrients and acceptability, these are the most common components of diet optimization  
563 studies [5] and this framework can easily be expanded and applied to other use cases.

564 However, this study could only address some of the options in the context of diet modeling  
565 for FBDGs. With increasing model complexity, further decisions about the (mathematical)

566 options need to be made, which were not addressed here. Whether such decisions challenge  
567 the current conclusions is unknown. In this work, we introduced various indicators for  
568 deviation from the observed diet. Data in the literature on this aspect is scarce and further  
569 investigation of the indicators is needed to confirm which ones give robust and meaningful  
570 results to compare various objective functions. Next, there are limitations of databases  
571 themselves, whether it is the age of the data (e.g., the NVS II was conducted 2005-2007) or  
572 their methodologies (e.g., under-reporting in dietary surveys, variations in nutrient  
573 compositions).  
574 Nonetheless, a diet optimization model may be easily updated whenever further or new data is  
575 available.

## 576 **5 Conclusions**

577 In this study, a novel diet optimization model was developed investigating crucial parameters  
578 such as the choice of decision variables, the mathematical form of the objective function, and  
579 nutrient goals. These insights will contribute to the framework not only for the German FBDG  
580 but also for decisions other FBDG-makers may face when using a diet modeling approach.  
581 To answer the study objectives, only the nutritional and acceptability aspects for one target  
582 group of the German adult population were addressed. The integration of indicators for other  
583 dimensions of a sustainable diet, e.g., diet–health relations and environmental aspects, as a  
584 basis for the German FBDG 2024 will be part of a follow-up article.

## 585 **Short title**

586 Framework for Germany's FBDG update: Food groups, nutrient goals, and objective  
587 functions

## 588 **Author contributions**

589 ACS ran the analyses and wrote the first draft of the manuscript. ACS, HB, JC, UN, and BW  
590 conceptualized the optimization algorithm and analyses. RG and FV developed the code for  
591 the optimization algorithm. ACS and RG compiled the database. CB, JC, KG, AK, JL, UN,  
592 MR, SL, HH, LS, and BW contributed to the manuscript development, conceptualization, and  
593 interpretation of results. All authors discussed the procedure and results outlined in this  
594 manuscript and carefully revised the manuscript.

## 595 **Acknowledgments**

596 We thank Arno Lellmann for the thorough compilation of DRV values into a database,  
597 Theresa Maria Ting for her contribution to the calculation of the metrics for the deviation of  
598 dietary habits, and Julia Haardt for her contribution to the classification of whole grains food  
599 groups in FoodEx2. We also thank Ute Alexy for her support with the LEBTAB data, Maike  
600 Benz for support in the dietary intake data analyses, and Katja Sandfuchs for support with the  
601 BLS-FoodEx2 matching.

## 602 **References**

603 1. EFSA (European Food Safety Authority). Scientific opinion on establishing food-based  
604 dietary guidelines. EFSA J. 2010; 8:1460. doi: 10.2903/j.efsa.2010.1460.



- 605 2. FAO (Food and Agriculture Organization), WHO (World Health Organization), editors.  
606 Sustainable healthy diets - Guiding principles. Rome; 2019.
- 607 3. Bechthold A, Boeing H, Tetens I, Schwingshackl L, Nöthlings U. Perspective: food-  
608 based dietary guidelines in Europe-scientific concepts, current status, and perspectives.  
609 Adv Nutr. 2018; 9:544–60. doi: 10.1093/advances/nmy033 PMID: 30107475.
- 610 4. Schäfer AC, Schmidt A, Bechthold A, Boeing H, Watzl B, Darmon N, et al. Integration  
611 of various dimensions in food-based dietary guidelines via mathematical approaches  
612 Report of a DGE/FENS Workshop in Bonn, Germany, 23-24 September 2019. Br J  
613 Nutr. 2020:1–18. doi: 10.1017/S0007114520004857 PMID: 33272337.
- 614 5. van Dooren C. A review of the use of linear programming to optimize diets, nutritiously,  
615 economically and environmentally. Front Nutr. 2018; 5:48.  
616 doi: 10.3389/fnut.2018.00048 PMID: 29977894.
- 617 6. Gazan R, Brouzes CMC, Vieux F, Maillot M, Lluch A, Darmon N. Mathematical  
618 optimization to explore tomorrow’s sustainable diets: a narrative review. Adv Nutr.  
619 2018; 9:602–16. doi: 10.1093/advances/nmy049 PMID: 30239584.
- 620 7. Australian Government, National Health and Medical Research Council. A modelling  
621 system to inform the revision of the Australian guide to healthy eating. 2011 [cited 5  
622 May 2022]. Available from:  
623 [https://www.eatforhealth.gov.au/sites/default/files/files/public\\_consultation/n55a\\_dietar](https://www.eatforhealth.gov.au/sites/default/files/files/public_consultation/n55a_dietary_guidelines_food_modelling_111216.pdf)  
624 [y\\_guidelines\\_food\\_modelling\\_111216.pdf](https://www.eatforhealth.gov.au/sites/default/files/files/public_consultation/n55a_dietary_guidelines_food_modelling_111216.pdf).
- 625 8. Mariotti F, Havard S, Morise A, Nadaud P, Sirot V, Wetzler S, et al. Perspective:  
626 modeling healthy eating patterns for food-based dietary guidelines-scientific concepts,  
627 methodological processes, limitations, and lessons. Adv Nutr. 2021; 12:590–9.  
628 doi: 10.1093/advances/nmaa176 PMID: 33508130.

- 629 **9.** Brink E, van Rossum C, Postma-Smeets A, Stafleu A, Wolvers D, van Dooren C, et al.  
630 Development of healthy and sustainable food-based dietary guidelines for the  
631 Netherlands. *Public Health Nutr.* 2019; 22:2419–35. doi: 10.1017/S1368980019001435  
632 PMID: 31262374.
- 633 **10.** Ferguson EL, Darmon N, Briend A, Premachandra IM. Food-based dietary guidelines  
634 can be developed and tested using linear programming analysis. *J Nutr.* 2004; 134:951–  
635 7.
- 636 **11.** Banciu M. Dual simplex. In: Cochran JJ, Cox LA, Keskinocak P, Kharoufeh JP, Smith  
637 JC, editors. *Wiley Encyclopedia of Operations Research and Management Science.*  
638 Hoboken: Wiley; 2010.
- 639 **12.** Herforth A, Arimond M, Álvarez-Sánchez C, Coates J, Christianson K, Muehlhoff E. A  
640 global review of food-based dietary guidelines. *Adv Nutr.* 2019; 10:590–605.  
641 doi: 10.1093/advances/nmy130 PMID: 31041447.
- 642 **13.** Monteiro JS, Botelho RBA, Zandonadi RP, Araujo WMC. Is there a convergence  
643 between the food classification adopted by food-based dietary guidelines and food  
644 science and technology. *Foods.* 2023; 12:3824. Epub 2023/10/18.  
645 doi: 10.3390/foods12203824 PMID: 37893716.
- 646 **14.** EFSA (European Food Safety Authority). The food classification and description system  
647 FoodEx2 (revision 2). 2015 [cited 25 Oct 2021]. Available from:  
648 <https://efsa.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.2903/sp.efsa.2015.EN-804>.
- 649 **15.** Merten C, Ferrari P, Bakker M, Boss A, Hearty A, Leclercq C, et al. Methodological  
650 characteristics of the national dietary surveys carried out in the European Union as  
651 included in the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) Comprehensive European Food  
652 Consumption Database. *Food Addit Contam Part A Chem Anal Control Expo Risk*  
653 *Assess.* 2011; 28:975–95. doi: 10.1080/19440049.2011.576440 PMID: 21732710.

- 654 **16.** EFSA (European Food Safety Authority). Use of the EFSA comprehensive European  
655 food consumption database in exposure assessment. *EFSA J.* 2011; 9:2097.  
656 doi: 10.2903/j.efsa.2011.2097.
- 657 **17.** EFSA (European Food Safety Authority), Nikolic M, Ioannidou S. FoodEx2  
658 maintenance 2020. EFSA Supporting publication. 2021:EN-6507.  
659 doi: 10.2903/sp.efsa.2021.EN-6507.
- 660 **18.** Gedrich K, Hensel A, Binder I, Karg G. How optimal are computer-calculated optimal  
661 diets. *Eur J Clin Nutr.* 1999; 53:309–18. doi: 10.1038/sj.ejcn.1600727 PMID: 10334657.
- 662 **19.** Maillot M, Darmon N, Drewnowski A. Are the lowest-cost healthful food plans  
663 culturally and socially acceptable. *Public Health Nutr.* 2010; 13:1178–85.  
664 doi: 10.1017/S1368980009993028 PMID: 20105388.
- 665 **20.** Eustachio Colombo P, Patterson E, Schäfer Elinder L, Lindroos AK, Sonesson U,  
666 Darmon N, et al. Optimizing school food supply: integrating environmental, health,  
667 economic, and cultural dimensions of diet sustainability with linear programming. *Int J*  
668 *Environ Res Public Health.* 2019; 16:3019. Epub 2019/08/21.  
669 doi: 10.3390/ijerph16173019 PMID: 31438517.
- 670 **21.** Niforou K, Livaniou A, Ioannidou S. FoodEx2 maintenance 2023. EFSA Supporting  
671 publications. 2024:EN-8813. doi: 10.2903/sp.efsa.2024.EN-8813.
- 672 **22.** Krems C, Walter C, Heuer T, Hoffmann I. Lebensmittelverzehr und Nährstoffzufuhr -  
673 Ergebnisse der Nationalen Verzehrsstudie II. In: Deutsche Gesellschaft für Ernährung e.  
674 V., editor. 12. Ernährungsbericht 2012. Bonn; 2012. pp. 40–85.
- 675 **23.** Schwingshackl L, Knüppel S, Michels N, Schwedhelm C, Hoffmann G, Iqbal K, et al.  
676 Intake of 12 food groups and disability-adjusted life years from coronary heart disease,  
677 stroke, type 2 diabetes, and colorectal cancer in 16 European countries. *Eur J Epidemiol.*  
678 2019; 34:765–75. doi: 10.1007/s10654-019-00523-4 PMID: 31030306.

- 679 **24.** Max Rubner-Institut, Bundesforschungsinstitut für Ernährung und Lebensmittel (MRI).  
680 Nationale Verzehrsstudie II. Ergebnisbericht, Teil 2. Die bundesweite Befragung zur  
681 Ernährung von Jugendlichen und Erwachsenen. Karlsruhe; 2008.
- 682 **25.** Heuer T, Krems C, Moon K, Brombach C, Hoffmann I. Food consumption of adults in  
683 Germany: results of the German National Nutrition Survey II based on diet history  
684 interviews. *Br J Nutr.* 2015; 113:1603–14. Epub 2015/04/13.  
685 doi: 10.1017/S0007114515000744 PMID: 25866161.
- 686 **26.** Hartmann B, Vasquez-Calcedo A-L, Bell S, Krems C, Brombach C. The German  
687 nutrient database basis for analysis of the nutritional status of the German population. *J*  
688 *Food Compost Anal.* 2008; 21:S115-S118.
- 689 **27.** Sichert-Hellert W, Kersting M, Chahda C, Schäfer R, Kroke A. German food  
690 composition database for dietary evaluations in children and adolescents. *J Food*  
691 *Compost Anal.* 2007; 20:63–70. doi: 10.1016/j.jfca.2006.05.004.
- 692 **28.** Gazan R, Barré T, Perignon M, Maillot M, Darmon N, Vieux F. A methodology to  
693 compile food metrics related to diet sustainability into a single food database:  
694 application to the French case. *Food Chem.* 2016; 238:125–33.  
695 doi: 10.1016/j.foodchem.2016.11.083 PMID: 28867082.
- 696 **29.** Deutsche Gesellschaft für Ernährung e. V. (DGE), Österreichische Gesellschaft für  
697 Ernährung, Schweizerische Gesellschaft für Ernährung, editors. Referenzwerte für die  
698 Nährstoffzufuhr. 2nd ed. Bonn; 2021.
- 699 **30.** EFSA (European Food Safety Authority). Overview on tolerable upper intake levels as  
700 derived by the Scientific Committee on Food (SCF) and the EFSA Panel on Dietetic  
701 Products, Nutrition and Allergies (NDA). 2018 [cited 22 Oct 2021]. Available from:  
702 [https://www.efsa.europa.eu/sites/default/files/assets/UL\\_Summary\\_tables.pdf](https://www.efsa.europa.eu/sites/default/files/assets/UL_Summary_tables.pdf).

- 703 **31.** Yu-Poth S, Zhao G, Etherton T, Naglak M, Jonnalagadda S, Kris-Etherton PM. Effects  
704 of the national cholesterol education program’s step I and step II dietary intervention  
705 programs on cardiovascular disease risk factors: a meta-analysis. *Am J Clin Nutr.* 1999;  
706 69:632–46.
- 707 **32.** Wolfram G, Bechthold A, Boeing H, Ellinger S, Hauner H, Kroke A, et al. Evidence-  
708 based guideline of the German Nutrition Society: fat intake and prevention of selected  
709 nutrition-related diseases. *Ann Nutr Metab.* 2015; 67:141–204. doi: 10.1159/000437243  
710 PMID: 26414007.
- 711 **33.** R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. Vienna,  
712 Austria: 2022 [cited 25 Apr 2022]. Available from: <https://www.R-project.org/>.
- 713 **34.** Theußl S, Schwendinger F, Hornik K. ROI : an extensible R optimization infrastructure.  
714 *J Stat Soft.* 2020; 94. doi: 10.18637/jss.v094.i15.
- 715 **35.** Berkelaar M. lpSolve: Interface to ‘Lp\_solve’ v. 5.5 to Solve Linear/Integer Programs.  
716 2023 [cited 3 May 2024]. Available from: <https://rdrr.io/cran/lpSolve/>.
- 717 **36.** Berwin A, Turlach R, Weingessel A. quadprog: functions to solve quadratic  
718 programming problems. Comprehensive R Archive Network (CRAN) 2019 [updated 30  
719 Jun 2023; cited 12 Jul 2023]. Available from: [https://cran.r-](https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/quadprog/index.html)  
720 [project.org/web/packages/quadprog/index.html](https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/quadprog/index.html).
- 721 **37.** Deutsche Gesellschaft für Ernährung e. V. (DGE). Fettkonsum und Prävention  
722 ausgewählter ernährungsmitbedingter Krankheiten - Evidenzbasierte Leitlinie. Bonn;  
723 2006.
- 724 **38.** Strohm D, Boeing H, Leschik-Bonnet E, Hesecker H, Arens-Azevêdo U, Bechthold A, et  
725 al. Sonderdruck: Speisesalzzufuhr in Deutschland, gesundheitliche Folgen und  
726 resultierende Handlungsempfehlung. *Ernährungs Umschau.* 2016; 63:2–12.  
727 doi: 10.4455/eu.2016.012.

- 728 **39.** Ernst JB, Arens-Azevêdo U, Bitzer B, Bosy-Westphal A, Zwaan M de, Egert S, et al.  
729 Quantitative Empfehlung zur Zuckerzufuhr in Deutschland. Kurzfassung des  
730 Konsensuspapiers der Deutschen Adipositas-Gesellschaft e. V. (DAG), der Deutschen  
731 Diabetes Gesellschaft e. V. (DDG) und der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Ernährung e. V.  
732 (DGE). Ernährungs Umschau. 2019; 66:26–34. doi: 10.4455/eu.2019.006.
- 733 **40.** Parlesak A, Tetens I, Dejgård Jensen J, Smed S, Gabrijelčić Blenkuš M, Rayner M, et al.  
734 Use of linear programming to develop cost-minimized nutritionally adequate health  
735 promoting food baskets. PLoS One. 2016; 11:e0163411.  
736 doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0163411 PMID: 27760131.
- 737 **41.** Borgonjen-van den Berg KJ, Vries JHM de, Chopera P, Feskens EJM, Brouwer ID.  
738 Sensitivity of food-based recommendations developed using linear programming to  
739 model input data in young Kenyan children. Nutrients. 2021; 13:3485. Epub 2021/09/30.  
740 doi: 10.3390/nu13103485 PMID: 34684486.
- 741 **42.** FAO (Food and Agriculture Organization), WHO (World Health Organization).  
742 FAO/WHO Global Individual Food consumption data Tool (FAO/WHO GIFT). Project  
743 brief updated as per August 10<sup>th</sup>, 2017. 2017 [updated 20 Sep 2017]. Available from:  
744 [http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/user\\_upload/nutrition/docs/assessment/2017-08-10\\_FAO-](http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/user_upload/nutrition/docs/assessment/2017-08-10_FAO-WHO_GIFT_Briefing_document_mod.pdf)  
745 [WHO\\_GIFT\\_Briefing\\_document\\_mod.pdf](http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/user_upload/nutrition/docs/assessment/2017-08-10_FAO-WHO_GIFT_Briefing_document_mod.pdf).
- 746 **43.** Tufts University. GDD 2018 Dietary Data Harmonization. Global Dietary Database.  
747 2019 [updated 3 Sep 2021; cited 3 Sep 2021]. Available from:  
748 <https://www.globaldietarydatabase.org/foodex2-data-harmonization>.
- 749 **44.** Nordman M, Lassen AD, Stockmarr A, van 't Veer P, Biesbroek S, Trolle E. Exploring  
750 healthy and climate-friendly diets for Danish adults: an optimization study using  
751 quadratic programming. Front Nutr. 2023; 10:1158257. doi: 10.3389/fnut.2023.1158257.

- 752 **45.** Ministry of Agriculture Zambia. Zambia Food-Based Dietary Guidelines. Technical  
753 recommendations. 2021 [cited 13 Jul 2023]. Available from:  
754 [https://www.nfnc.org.zm/download/zambia-food-based-dietary-guidelines-technical-](https://www.nfnc.org.zm/download/zambia-food-based-dietary-guidelines-technical-recommendations-2021-produced-by-the-ministry-of-agriculture/?wpdmdl=2526&refresh=64afbf813ae801689239425)  
755 [recommendations-2021-produced-by-the-ministry-of-](https://www.nfnc.org.zm/download/zambia-food-based-dietary-guidelines-technical-recommendations-2021-produced-by-the-ministry-of-agriculture/?wpdmdl=2526&refresh=64afbf813ae801689239425)  
756 [agriculture/?wpdmdl=2526&refresh=64afbf813ae801689239425](https://www.nfnc.org.zm/download/zambia-food-based-dietary-guidelines-technical-recommendations-2021-produced-by-the-ministry-of-agriculture/?wpdmdl=2526&refresh=64afbf813ae801689239425).
- 757 **46.** Rubens K, Neven L, Jonckheere J. Food and environmentally responsible consumption:  
758 towards healthy food patterns for a healthy planet. Background document for the food  
759 triangle recommendations. 2021 [cited 6 Jan 2023]. Available from:  
760 <https://www.gezondleven.be/files/Background-food-and-environment-EN.pdf>.
- 761 **47.** Maillot M, Vieux F, Ferguson EF, Volatier J-L, Amiot MJ, Darmon N. To meet nutrient  
762 recommendations, most French adults need to expand their habitual food repertoire. *J*  
763 *Nutr.* 2009; 139:1721–7. doi: 10.3945/jn.109.107318 PMID: 19625703.
- 764 **48.** Babb AM, Knudsen DC, Robeson SM. A critique of the objective function utilized in  
765 calculating the Thrifty Food Plan. *PLoS One.* 2019; 14:e0219895.  
766 doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0219895 PMID: 31329629.
- 767 **49.** Perignon M, Darmon N. Advantages and limitations of the methodological approaches  
768 used to study dietary shifts towards improved nutrition and sustainability. *Nutr Rev.*  
769 2022; 80:579–97. doi: 10.1093/nutrit/nuab091 PMID: 35142357.
- 770 **50.** Broekema R, Tyszler M, van ‘t Veer P, Kok FJ, Martin A, Lluch A, et al. Future-proof  
771 and sustainable healthy diets based on current eating patterns in the Netherlands. *Am J*  
772 *Clin Nutr.* 2020; 393:447. doi: 10.1093/ajcn/nqaa217 PMID: 32766880.
- 773 **51.** Hlaing LM, Fahmida U, Htet MK, Utomo B, Firmansyah A, Ferguson EL. Local food-  
774 based complementary feeding recommendations developed by the linear programming  
775 approach to improve the intake of problem nutrients among 12-23-month-old Myanmar

- 776 children. *Br J Nutr.* 2016; 116, Suppl 1:S16-S26. Epub 2015/12/23.  
777 doi: 10.1017/S000711451500481X PMID: 26696232.
- 778 **52.** Maillot M, Issa C, Vieux F, Lairon D, Darmon N. The shortest way to reach nutritional  
779 goals is to adopt Mediterranean food choices: evidence from computer-generated  
780 personalized diets. *Am J Clin Nutr.* 2011; 94:1127–37. doi: 10.3945/ajcn.111.016501.  
781 PMID: 21900460.
- 782 **53.** Gao X, Wilde PE, Lichtenstein AH, Bermudez OI, Tucker KL. The maximal amount of  
783 dietary alpha-tocopherol intake in U.S. adults (NHANES 2001-2002). *J Nutr.* 2006;  
784 136:1021–6. doi: 10.1093/jn/136.4.1021 PMID: 16549468.
- 785 **54.** Maillot M, Monsivais P, Drewnowski A. Food pattern modeling shows that the 2010  
786 Dietary Guidelines for sodium and potassium cannot be met simultaneously. *Nutr Res.*  
787 2013; 33:188–94. doi: 10.1016/j.nutres.2013.01.004 PMID: 23507224.
- 788 **55.** Maillot M, Drewnowski A. A conflict between nutritionally adequate diets and meeting  
789 the 2010 dietary guidelines for sodium. *Am J Prev Med.* 2012; 42:174–9.  
790 doi: 10.1016/j.amepre.2011.10.009 PMID: 22261214.
- 791 **56.** Mazac R, Meinilä J, Korkalo L, Järviö N, Jalava M, Tuomisto HL. Incorporation of  
792 novel foods in European diets can reduce global warming potential, water use and land  
793 use by over 80%. *Nat Food.* 2022; 3:286–93. doi: 10.1038/s43016-022-00489-9.
- 794 **57.** Perignon M, Masset G, Ferrari G, Barre T, Vieux F, Maillot M, et al. How low can  
795 dietary greenhouse gas emissions be reduced without impairing nutritional adequacy,  
796 affordability and acceptability of the diet? A modelling study to guide sustainable food  
797 choices. *Public Health Nutr.* 2016; 19:2662–74. doi: 10.1017/S1368980016000653  
798 PMID: 27049598.



- 799 **58.** Yates AA. Which dietary reference intake is best suited to serve as the basis for nutrition  
800 labeling for daily values. *J Nutr.* 2006; 136:2457–62. doi: 10.1093/jn/136.10.2457  
801 PMID: 16988109.
- 802 **59.** Dietary Guidelines Advisory Committee, editor. Scientific Report of the 2020 Dietary  
803 Guidelines Advisory Committee: Advisory Report to the Secretary of Health and Human  
804 Services and the Secretary of Agriculture. Washington, D.C.; 2020.
- 805 **60.** Blomhoff R, Andersen R, Arnesen EK, Christensen JJ, Eneroth H, Erkkola M, et al.  
806 Nordic Nutrition Recommendations 2023. Copenhagen: Nordic Council of Ministers;  
807 2023.
- 808 **61.** van Wonderen D, Melse-Boonstra A, Gerdessen JC. Iron bioavailability should be  
809 considered when modeling omnivorous, vegetarian, and vegan diets. *J Nutr.* 2023;  
810 153:2125–32. Epub 2023/05/12. doi: 10.1016/j.tjnut.2023.05.011 PMID: 37182693.
- 811 **62.** FAO (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations). Food-based dietary  
812 guidelines. Third webinar: Diet modelling for food-based dietary guidelines. 2019  
813 [updated 26 Oct 2020; cited 26 Oct 2020]. Available from:  
814 [http://www.fao.org/nutrition/education/food-dietary-guidelines/capacity-](http://www.fao.org/nutrition/education/food-dietary-guidelines/capacity-development/webinar-series/third-webinar/en/)  
815 [development/webinar-series/third-webinar/en/](http://www.fao.org/nutrition/education/food-dietary-guidelines/capacity-development/webinar-series/third-webinar/en/).

## 816 **Supporting information captions**

- 817 S1 Table. Classification of whole grain and refined grain on all levels of FoodEx2
- 818 S2 Table. Working group of the German Nutrition Society for the development of the  
819 scientific basis for the German food-based dietary guideline 2024.
- 820 S3 Table. All decision variables (food groups) on level 3 with according parent terms.
- 821 S4 Table. Acceptability constraints on level 1.

- 822 S5 Table. Share of population sub-groups used to calculate mean DRVs for adults aged 18-64.
- 823 S6 Table. Optimisation results for all analyses including food group quantities for the FBDG
- 824 food groups, deviation indicators, and energy and nutrient contents.