

1 **Nutrients or processing? An analysis of food and drink items from the UK National Diet and**  
2 **Nutrition Survey based on nutrient content, the NOVA classification, and front of package**  
3 **traffic light labelling.**

4

5 Samuel J. Dicken<sup>1</sup>, Rachel L. Batterham<sup>1,2,3</sup>, Adrian Brown<sup>1,2,3</sup>

6

7 *1 Centre for Obesity Research, Department of Medicine, University College London (UCL),*  
8 *London WC1E 6JF, UK*

9 *2 Bariatric Centre for Weight Management and Metabolic Surgery, University College London*  
10 *Hospital (UCLH), London NW1 2BU, UK*

11 *3 National Institute for Health Research, Biomedical Research Centre, University College*  
12 *London Hospital (UCLH), London W1T 7DN, UK*

13

14 **Corresponding Author:** Dr Adrian Brown, Centre for Obesity Research, University College  
15 London, London, UK; Email: [a.c.brown@ucl.ac.uk](mailto:a.c.brown@ucl.ac.uk) Telephone: 02076790788

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24 **NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.**

25 **Abstract**

26

27 **Objective:** To compare food and drink in the UK National Diet and Nutrition Survey (NDNS)  
28 database based on their front of package label multiple traffic light (FOPL MTL) score, nutrient  
29 content and NOVA classification.

30

31 **Design:** National cross-sectional nutrient profiling analysis.

32

33 **Setting:** The UK food and drink supply. Food and drink items were obtained from Intake24,  
34 the electronic dietary assessment method used in NDNS Year 12 (2019-20).

35

36 **Main outcome measures:** Nutrient content, FOPL MTL and the NOVA classification of each  
37 item. Items were coded into minimally processed food (MPF), processed culinary ingredients  
38 (PCI), processed food (PF) and ultra-processed food (UPF) according to the NOVA  
39 classification, and coded into green, amber and red FOPL traffic lights according to Food  
40 Standards Agency guidance on fat, saturated fat, total sugar and salt content per 100g.

41

42 **Results:** Out of 2,980 items, 55.4% were UPF, 33.1% were MPF, 9.5% were PF, and 2.0% were  
43 PCI. UPFs contained greater fat, saturated fat, total sugar, and salt per 100g than MPFs, and  
44 had a higher energy density and greater proportion of hyper-palatable items ( $p < 0.001$ ). PFs  
45 contained more fat, saturated fat, salt and energy per 100g than MPFs (all  $p < 0.001$ ), but a  
46 similar amount of total sugar. UPFs had higher odds of containing red FOPL (odds ratio (OR):  
47 4.59 [95%CI: 3.79 to 5.57]), lower odds of containing green FOPL (OR: 0.05 [95%CI: 0.03,  
48 0.10]), and higher odds of an unhealthier overall FOPL MTL score (OR: 7.0 [95%CI: 6.1 to 8.2],

49 compared with MPFs. When considering items without any red traffic lights, UPF still  
50 contained more fat, saturated fat, total sugar and salt than MPFs, and had a higher energy  
51 density and greater proportion of hyper-palatable items ( $p < 0.001$ ). However, a number of  
52 UPFs have healthier FOPL MTL scores.

53

54 **Conclusions:** Most items in the UK are UPF. UPFs have an unhealthier nutritional profile than  
55 MPFs, are more likely to have an unhealthier FOPL MTL score and be more energy-dense and  
56 hyper-palatable. When considering items without any red FOPL, UPFs still have a poorer  
57 nutritional profile than MPFs, with a higher energy density and hyper-palatability. But, not all  
58 UPFs were unhealthy according to FOPL. The results have important implications for  
59 understanding how consumers may interpret the healthiness of UPFs or FOPL MTLs, and  
60 updating UK food and drink labelling.

61

62

63

64

65

66 What is known:

- 67 • Nutrient content is an important determinant of diet-related health. Nutrient content  
68 is reflected in UK national dietary guidelines, and at point of purchase through front  
69 of package label multiple traffic light (FOPL MTL) scores for nutrients of concern.
- 70 • Higher intakes of ultra-processed food (UPF), as defined by the NOVA classification,  
71 are associated with higher risks of adverse health outcomes including obesity and  
72 cardiometabolic disease.

73       • The overlap between the nutrient content and FOPL MTLs of the UK food and drink  
74           supply with food processing is unknown. How FOPL MTLs might be used to guide  
75           consumer purchasing behaviour of UPFs is unclear.

76

77   What this study adds:

78       • This is the first study to compare the nutritional characteristics of food and drink items  
79           representative of the UK supply with the NOVA classification.

80       • There is partial overlap between FOPL MTL and NOVA; UPFs tend to have an  
81           unhealthier nutrient profile, but a considerable number of UPFs are considered  
82           healthy, based on their FOPL MTL score.

83       • UPFs also tend to be more energy dense and hyper-palatable than MPFs, even when  
84           considering only 'healthy' items (without any red FOPL traffic lights).

85

86

87

88

89

90

91

92

93

94

95

96

97 **Introduction**

98

99 Diets high in saturated fat, added sugar and salt are associated with increased risks of obesity  
100 and non-communicable disease (1–3). As such, UK dietary guidelines recommend that the  
101 public reduces their intake of these nutrients, to lower the risk of developing non-  
102 communicable disease, including type 2 diabetes, cardiovascular disease and all-cause  
103 mortality (4,5).

104

105 Dietary advice is communicated to the public through multiple strategies including the Eatwell  
106 Guide (EWG), and front of package labelling (FOPL), which is used to help guide consumer  
107 choice at the point of purchase (6,7). FOPL systems differ across countries, from simple non-  
108 interpretive nutrient information, to interpretive semi-directive colour coded nutrient  
109 information (e.g. multiple traffic light (MTL) system in the UK), to interpretive directive advice  
110 to support consumer choices (e.g. Nutri-Score in Europe) (8). Current FOPLs focus on the  
111 energy and nutrient content of products. Compared with no label, FOPL systems help  
112 consumers to better rank the healthiness of food products (9). In the UK, the EWG advice is  
113 provided through the semi-directive MTL system, which assigns a green, amber or red colour  
114 on a FOPL based on whether the content of fat, saturated fat, salt or sugar is low, medium or  
115 high, respectively (6).

116

117 Besides nutrient content, mounting evidence shows that processing may also impact on  
118 health. The NOVA classification categorises food and drink into four groups: minimally  
119 processed food (MPF), processed culinary ingredients (PCI), processed food (PF) and ultra-  
120 processed food (UPF) (10). Of particular interest are UPFs, which are industrially reformulated

121 products, typically with five or more ingredients resulting in highly palatable, long lasting,  
122 readily accessible, cheap products. UPF now constitutes a significant proportion of adult daily  
123 energy intake (11), with nearly 60% of intake in UK adults (12). Such a large intake from UPF  
124 is of concern, due to the fact that greater UPF consumption is associated with increased risk  
125 of obesity, non-communicable disease and all-cause mortality (13,14).

126

127 Indeed, high-UPF diets tend to display poorer nutritional profiles, being higher in fat,  
128 saturated fat, free sugar, and lower in fibre, protein and micronutrients (11). However,  
129 evidence suggests that the associations between UPF and negative health outcomes appears  
130 to be independent of the nutrient content of the diet, or the overall diet pattern (13,14). In  
131 the Italian Moli-Sani cohort, both lower dietary nutritional quality (measured as Nutri-score)  
132 and greater UPF intake were independently associated with increased risks of cardiovascular  
133 and all-cause mortality (15). Further joint analyses showed an attenuated effect of Nutri-  
134 Score with mortality, but not of UPF (15). Such findings indicate that dietary nutritional quality  
135 and the extent and purpose of processing may capture different, but complimentary  
136 components/aspects of diet on health.

137

138 A number of potential mechanisms have been suggested to explain the adverse impacts of a  
139 high-UPF diet, relating to their typically poorer nutritional quality and aspects of their  
140 processing. In particular, UPFs may be more energy dense (16) and have addictive-like,  
141 hyperpalatable properties that may encourage increased energy intake (14,17,18), which may  
142 be linked to their negative impact on health. The lower protein content of an ultra-processed  
143 diet has also been suggested to be a factor driving excess consumption (14,19).

144

145 Studies outside of the UK have compared the NOVA classification with nutrient indices such  
146 as the Nutrient Rich Food Index (20), FOPL tools such as Nutri-Score or MTL, or nutrient  
147 profiling models such as those by the World Health Organization (21–26). Such studies find  
148 an inverse, partial association between UPF intake and dietary quality, or typically poorer  
149 FOPL profiling in UPFs compared with MPFs, but also find that not all UPFs are nutritionally  
150 inferior. No study, however, has examined how the nutrient content of a nationally  
151 representative sample of foods and drinks in the UK and their FOPL MTL score varies, based  
152 on the NOVA classification. In addition, the overlap between indices of hyper-palatability and  
153 the NOVA classification has not been fully determined (18), nor has the energy density profile  
154 of UK food and drinks across the NOVA classification This is important to determine whether  
155 FOPL MTLs adequately capture aspects of food processing, and whether food processing  
156 groups differ nutritionally in the UK. The aim of this study was to examine the association  
157 between the extent and purpose of processing of UK food and drinks, their nutrient content,  
158 and FOPL MTL scoring. The objective was to compare the NOVA classification of food and  
159 drink items from the National Diet and Nutrition Survey (NDNS) Rolling Programme Year 12  
160 database with their FOPL MTL scoring and nutritional characteristics.

161

## 162 **Methods**

163

### 164 **Data sources**

165 NDNS is a repeated cross-sectional survey, providing detailed dietary intake from a nationally  
166 representative sample of the UK population, aged 1.5 years and older and living in private  
167 households, since 2008 (27). Years 1 to 11 (2008/9 to 2018/19) of the survey were assessed  
168 using food records across four consecutive days. In Year 12 (2019 to 2020), four-day food

169 records were replaced with four non-consecutive, multiple-pass, 24-hour recalls as the  
170 dietary assessment method in the NDNS survey (28). Recalls were conducted using Intake24,  
171 a web-based, automated, self-administered 24-hour dietary recall tool  
172 (<https://intake24.co.uk>) (29). Food and drink item names and subgroups used in Intake24  
173 were obtained from the Intake24 team. The corresponding NDNS nutrient databank with the  
174 most up-to-date public nutrient information for each food item was obtained from the UK  
175 Data Service (<https://beta.ukdataservice.ac.uk>). Further details on Intake24 and NDNS Year  
176 12 have been published elsewhere (28).

177

#### 178 **NOVA classification**

179 Food and drink items were coded according to the NOVA classification (10) (see  
180 Supplementary Materials). Years 1 to 11 of NDNS included a nutrient database with mixed  
181 dishes separated into their constituent ingredients (e.g. lettuce, mushrooms and mayonnaise  
182 from a salad mixed dish), which has been previously coded (30). In NDNS Year 12, the food  
183 database was updated by removing redundant items and the nutrient databank was updated  
184 to reflect the most current food composition data (28). Food items were no longer  
185 disaggregated. For example, the nutrient databank contains sandwiches and salads, rather  
186 than the individual components of sandwiches and salads, as in previous NDNS assessments.

187

188 Initial coding of the Year 12 dataset was conducted by SD. Each food and drink item was  
189 individually coded. Classification was determined based on the NOVA classification definitions  
190 (10), item name, subgroup code, best representation from products available in leading UK  
191 supermarkets, and the NOVA group of the corresponding item in the NDNS Year 1 to 11  
192 database. The coding, alongside ambiguous food items and food groups were discussed and



193 checked with a Registered Senior Specialist Dietitian (AB), and both authors agreed on the  
194 classification. Where it was unspecified or ambiguous as to whether a food item was home-  
195 made or ready-made, the authors agreed on the most appropriate classification based on the  
196 most likely method of obtaining or preparing the food, by reflecting on the range of, and  
197 ingredients within, corresponding products sold from leading UK supermarkets. Further  
198 details on the coding of items are provided in the supplementary materials.

199

### 200 **FOPL classification**

201 The NDNS nutrient databank was coded into FOPL MTLs according to Department of Health  
202 and Food Standards Agency guidance for fat, saturated fat, total sugar and salt content (6).  
203 Items with low content for a given nutrient are coded green, moderate content as amber, and  
204 high content as red. The nutrient cut-offs are provided in the Supplementary Materials. To  
205 allow for comparability, items were coded per 100g of food or drink. As per FOPL guidance,  
206 drink items included lower cut-offs for amber or red colour coding per 100g of drink, which  
207 was assumed equivalent to 100ml of drink.

208

### 209 **Statistical analysis**

210 Normally distributed variables were described using means and confidence intervals, and  
211 variables that were not normally distributed were described using medians and interquartile  
212 ranges (IQR). Categorical variables were described using counts and percentages.  
213 Comparisons of non-parametrically distributed nutrient variables between NOVA groups  
214 were analysed using Kruskal-Wallis analysis of variance, with Bonferroni correction for  
215 multiple comparisons. Categorical variables were analysed using chi-square tests.

216

217 The number of products within each NOVA group, the average nutrient and energy content  
218 per 100g and distribution of FOPL traffic lights were described. The average nutrient content  
219 per 100g and the distribution of individual traffic lights for each nutrient was then compared  
220 between NOVA groups. FOPL traffic lights for all four nutrients (fat, saturated fat, total sugar  
221 and salt) combined (i.e., MTLs), were then compared. The presence of any red or green FOPL  
222 traffic lights (vs. no red or green FOPL traffic lights), the number of red FOPL traffic lights and  
223 the number of green FOPL traffic lights (none, one, two, three or four), and the distribution  
224 of the overall FOPL MTL score (an 8-level categorical measure ranging from four green to four  
225 red FOPL traffic lights (four reds, and three reds and one amber were combined due to few  
226 items in these categories)) was then compared across NOVA groups. Due to small numbers of  
227 items across categorical levels, PF and PCI were grouped for the ordinal analyses, and for the  
228 binary green vs. no green FOPL traffic light analysis.

229

230 Unadjusted regression analyses were then conducted to examine the relationship between  
231 NOVA groups as the categorical independent variable, and FOPL traffic lights or nutrient  
232 content as the dependent variables. Binary regression was used to analyse the odds of  
233 containing at least one red traffic light (vs. no red traffic light) and the odds of containing at  
234 least one green traffic light (vs. no green traffic light). Ordinal logistic regression was used to  
235 model the odds of containing a higher number of red traffic lights, the odds of containing a  
236 higher number of green traffic lights, and to model the odds of having a better overall FOPL  
237 MTL score.

238

239 Subgroup analyses then compared the nutrient and energy content of products with healthier  
240 vs. less healthy FOPL MTLs, firstly within UPFs (i.e., healthy vs. unhealthy products), and then

241 between NOVA food groups (i.e., healthy products across NOVA groups). Based on previous  
242 evidence suggesting that UK consumers more readily avoid red traffic lights over choosing  
243 green traffic lights when choosing healthier products (31,32), items were stratified by the  
244 presence or absence of a red FOPL traffic light across the four nutrients. Comparisons  
245 between UPFs with or without a red FOPL traffic light were analysed using Mann-Whitney U  
246 tests.

247

248 To consider the wider nutritional characteristics of food items proposed as potential  
249 mechanisms of UPFs in the NDNS database, items were characterised by previously defined  
250 quantifiable definitions of hyper-palatable foods (HPF) based on a systematic review of  
251 descriptive definitions of hyper-palatability (33). Items were classified into three clusters,  
252 containing: (1) fat and sodium (>25% kcal from fat,  $\geq 0.30\%$  sodium content by weight); (2) fat  
253 and simple sugars (>20% kcal from fat, >20% kcal from sugar); and (3) carbohydrates and  
254 sodium (>40% kcal from carbohydrates,  $\geq 0.20\%$  sodium by weight) (33). The proportions of  
255 HPFs were then compared across NOVA groups. Drinks items were excluded from the HPF  
256 analysis, as the definition is only applicable to food items.

257

258 Items outside of the NOVA classification were removed prior to analysis.

259

### 260 **Sensitivity analysis**

261 The nutrient and energy content of items across NOVA groups were analysed with a binary  
262 regression modelling the odds of containing above average nutrient content across the  
263 database (i.e., an above median vs. median or below nutrient content. Linear regression was  
264 also used to determine the association between NOVA group and the number of red or green

265 FOPL traffic lights. The full FOPL MTL score analysis was repeated using linear regression  
266 (where a green FOPL traffic light scored 1, amber scored 2, and red scored 3, for a combined  
267 continuous score ranging from 4 (four greens) to 12 (four reds)) and repeated using binary  
268 regression to model the odds of an above average (above median vs. median or below) overall  
269 FOPL MTL score.

270

271 In subgroup analyses, comparisons of nutrient and energy content between subgroups with  
272 or without a red FOPL traffic light were repeated with a binary regression, to model the odds  
273 of an above average nutrient or energy content (above median vs. median or below value).  
274 Subgroup analyses were also repeated by further stratifying products based on the presence  
275 of two or more green and no red FOPL traffic lights. Statistical significance was set at a p-value  
276 <0.05. Data were analysed in SPSS V29.0.

277

## 278 **Results**

279 The Intake24 dataset contained 3105 items; 109 items were designated outside of the NOVA  
280 classification (e.g., fish oil supplements and multivitamins). When aligned with the NDNS  
281 nutrient databank, a further 16 did not contain a number corresponding to a respective item  
282 in the latest version of the databank, leaving a total of 2,980 items in the final analysis. Over  
283 half of the food and drink items were UPFs (n=1650, 55.4%), around a third of the items were  
284 MPF (n=986, 33.1%), 9.5% were PF (n=283), and 2.0% (n=61) were PCI.

285

286 Table 1 presents the average nutrient and energy content of all items, and within each NOVA  
287 group. The median content of fat, saturated fat, total sugar, salt and energy per 100g was  
288 5.1g [IQR: 0.8, 13.5], 1.3g [IQR: 0.2, 4.2], 3.2g [IQR: 1.1, 11.1], 0.3g [IQR: 0.05, 0.86] and 181.0

289 kcal [IQR: 77.0, 320.0], respectively. MPFs had significantly lower average fat, saturated fat  
290 and energy content per 100g than other NOVA groups (all  $p < 0.001$ ) (Figure 1a-e). UPFs  
291 contained significantly more fat, saturated fat, total sugar, salt and energy per 100g than  
292 MPFs (all  $p < 0.001$ ). UPFs had significantly greater average total sugar content per 100g than  
293 other NOVA groups (all  $p < 0.001$ ). PCIs had significantly greater energy content per 100g than  
294 other NOVA groups (vs. UPF:  $p = 0.009$ , vs. MPF or PCI:  $p < 0.001$ ). PFs contained significantly  
295 more fat, saturated fat, salt, and energy per 100g than MPFs (all  $p < 0.001$ ), but a similar  
296 amount of total sugar ( $p = 0.167$ ). The fat, saturated fat, and salt content of PFs did not differ  
297 to UPFs, but the energy density was significantly lower ( $p < 0.001$ ). PCIs tended to have the  
298 highest average fat and saturated fat per 100g of all NOVA groups, but was not significantly  
299 different from UPFs. Sensitivity analysis with binary regression showed similar findings  
300 (Supplementary Table 1). UPFs contained a similar amount of protein as MPFs and PFs, and a  
301 similar quantity of fibre as MPFs, but more fibre than PFs ( $p < 0.001$ ), but this was not  
302 meaningfully different. UPFs also had a significantly lower water content than MPFs  
303 (75.9g/100g [IQR: 63.0, 87.7] vs. 49.3g/100g [IQR: 16.1, 72.7],  $p < 0.001$ ) (Supplementary Table  
304 2).

305

### 306 **Traffic light labelling**

307 Items were then coded according to FOPL traffic lights. The total number of red FOPL traffic  
308 lights was 18.3% ( $n = 545$ ) for fat, 22.3% ( $n = 665$ ) for saturated fat, 15.7% ( $n = 467$ ) for total sugar  
309 and 8.7% ( $n = 259$ ) for salt (Supplementary Table 3). The number of green FOPLs in the  
310 database was 40.4% ( $n = 1203$ ) for fat, 50.6% ( $n = 1509$ ) for saturated fat, 59.5% ( $n = 1773$ ) for  
311 total sugar and 51.5% ( $n = 1534$ ) for salt. Figure 2a-d presents the percentage of red, amber,  
312 and green FOPL traffic lights across fat, saturated fat, total sugar and salt, by NOVA group (PCI

313 not shown). The proportions of green, amber, and red FOPL traffic lights for fat, saturated fat,  
314 total sugar, salt significantly differed across NOVA groups (all  $p < 0.001$ ). MPFs had a greater  
315 proportion of green FOPL traffic lights and a lower proportion of red FOPL traffic lights,  
316 whereas UPFs had a lower proportion of green FOPL traffic light, and a higher proportion of  
317 red FOPL traffic light.

318

### 319 **Combined FOPL traffic lights**

320 When considering the presence of any red or green FOPL traffic lights per item, approximately  
321 two thirds of items contained no red FOPL traffic lights ( $n=1846$ , 61.9%), whereas only 9.1%  
322 ( $n=270$ ) of items contained no green FOPL traffic light (Supplementary Table 4). Stratifying by  
323 NOVA group, the proportions of items with no red or green FOPL traffic lights significantly  
324 differed ( $p < 0.001$ ). Most MPFs contained no red FOPL traffic lights (83.2%; 820 out of 986)  
325 with only 16.8% containing one or more red FOPL traffic lights, compared with 51.8% of UPFs  
326 containing no red FOPL traffic lights (855 out of 1650), and nearly half with at least one red  
327 FOPL traffic light (48.2%; 795 out of 1650). Less than 1% of all MPFs contained no green FOPL  
328 traffic light for fat, saturated fat, total sugar, or salt (8 out of 986), compared with 14.0% of  
329 UPFs (231 out of 1650). 99.2% of MPFs contained at least one green traffic light, compared  
330 with 86.0% of UPFs. In binary regression analyses (Table 2), UPFs had a higher odds of  
331 containing one or more red FOPL traffic lights compared with MPFs (OR: 4.59 [95%CI: 3.79,  
332 5.57]), as did PFs (OR: 3.69 [95%CI: 2.77, 4.92] and PCIs (OR: 28.54 [95%CI: 13.80, 59.05])  
333 ( $p < 0.001$ ). Similarly, UPFs had a lower odds of containing one or more green FOPL traffic light  
334 compared with MPFs (OR: 0.05 [95%CI: 0.03, 0.10]), as did PCIs and PFs (combined, OR: 0.08  
335 [95%CI: 0.04, 0.18]  $p < 0.001$ ).

336

337 **Ordinal FOPL MTL score**

338 When considering the number of items with at least one red FOPL traffic light (n=1134, 38.1%  
339 of items), 18.6% (n=555) items had one red traffic light, 12.1% (n=360) with two, 7.2% (n=215)  
340 with three, and 0.1% (n=4) with four red traffic lights (Supplementary Table 5). When  
341 considering the number of items with at least one green traffic light (n=2710, 90.9% of items),  
342 32.9% (n=980) contained one, 19.8% (n=589) contained two, 23.6% (n=703) contained three  
343 and 14.7% (n=438) contained four green traffic lights.

344  
345 Figure 3a-d shows the number and percentage of items with none, one, two, three or four  
346 red or green FOPL traffic lights, stratified by NOVA group (PCI not shown) (by MPF and UPF  
347 only, in Supplementary Figure 1a-b). The majority of items with one (67.0%, 370 out of 555),  
348 two (67.0%, 242 out of 360) or three (84.0%, 181 out of 215) red traffic lights were UPFs.  
349 Nearly half of all UPFs (42.8%, 706 out of 1650) contained one green traffic light, followed by  
350 two green traffic lights (19.9%, 329 out of 1650), then three (18.4%, 304 out of 1650), then  
351 zero green traffic lights (14.0%, 231 out of 1650), with the fewest having four green traffic  
352 lights (4.8%, 80 out of 1650). In contrast, most MPFs contained four (33.8%, 333 out of 988),  
353 then three (30.9%, 305 out of 986), then two (20.4%, 201 out of 986), and then one green  
354 traffic light (14.1%, 139 out of 986).

355  
356 The proportions of the number of red or green FOPL traffic lights significantly differed  
357 according to NOVA group (both  $p < 0.001$ ) (Supplementary Table 5). UPFs had a higher  
358 proportion of one, two or three/four red traffic lights, whereas MPFs had a lower proportion  
359 of one, two or three/four red traffic lights. UPFs had a lower proportion of three or four green  
360 traffic lights, and a higher proportion of one green or no green traffic lights, whereas MPFs

361 had a higher proportion of three or four green traffic lights, and a lower proportion of one  
362 green or no green traffic lights.

363

364 Ordinal regression showed that UPFs had a significantly higher odds of containing a greater  
365 number of red FOPL traffic lights compared with MPFs ( $p < 0.001$ , Table 3). UPFs had a 4.84  
366 times [95%CI: 4.00, 5.86] higher odds of containing a greater number of red FOPL traffic lights  
367 compared with MPFs. For the number of green FOPL traffic lights, UPFs had a lower odds of  
368 containing a greater number of green FOPL traffic lights compared with MPFs. MPFs had 7.30  
369 times [95%CI: 6.25, 8.55] higher odds of containing a greater number of green FOPL traffic  
370 lights compared with UPFs. PCIs and PFs (combined) also had a higher odds of containing a  
371 greater number of red and a lower number of green traffic lights compared with MPFs (both  
372  $p < 0.001$ ). In sensitivity analyses, results were similar when the number of red or green FOPL  
373 traffic lights was modelled as a 5-level continuous score (Supplementary Table 6), where UPFs  
374 had 1.25 [95%CI: -1.34, -1.16] fewer green FOPL traffic lights, and 0.63 [95%CI: 0.56, 0.70]  
375 more red FOPL traffic lights.

376

### 377 **Full FOPL MTL score**

378 As a total FOPL MTL score (ranging from 4 (four green traffic lights) to 12 (four red traffic  
379 lights)), the median score was 6.0 [IQR: 5.0, 8.0], corresponding to a FOPL with either two  
380 amber and two green traffic lights, or three green traffic lights and one red traffic light (AAGG  
381 or GGGR). The profile of FOPL MTLs stratified by NOVA group is presented in Figure 4 (by  
382 MPFs and UPFs only, in Supplementary Figure 2). The proportions of FOPL MTLs significantly  
383 differed across NOVA groups ( $p < 0.001$ , Supplementary Table 7). Ordinal regression of the  
384 FOPL MTL score showed that UPFs had 7.06 times [95%CI: 6.06, 8.24] higher odds of having



385 an unhealthier FOPL MTL score compared with MPFs ( $p < 0.001$ , Table 4). PFs and PCIs  
386 combined also had a higher odds of an unhealthier FOPL MTL score compared with MPFs (OR:  
387 5.95 [95%CI: 4.74, 7.46]). In sensitivity analyses, results were similar when the FOPL MTL score  
388 was modelled as an 8-level continuous outcome ranging from four greens to four reds/three  
389 reds and one amber (a score from 4 to 11) (Supplementary Table 8), where UPFs had a FOPL  
390 MTL score that was 1.89 [95%CI: 1.75, 2.02] points higher than MPFs (equivalent to nearly  
391 two green traffic lights replaced with two amber traffic lights, or one green traffic light  
392 replaced with one red traffic light), and when modelled as a binary outcome (above median  
393 vs. median and below FOPL MTL score), where UPFs had 6.03 times [5.03, 7.24] higher odds  
394 of having an unhealthier FOPL MTL score (Supplementary Table 9).

395

#### 396 **Items with no red FOPL traffic light**

397 Subgroup analyses then considered food and drink items containing no red FOPL traffic lights  
398 ( $n=1846$ , 61.9%), i.e., 'healthy' items. 855 (46.3%) were UPFs, 820 (44.4%) were MPFs, 162  
399 (8.8%) were PFs and 9 (0.5%) were PCIs (Supplementary Table 4). The most common UPFs  
400 with no red FOPL traffic lights included sandwiches ( $n=65$ , 7.6%), high fibre breakfast cereals  
401 ( $n=43$ , 5.0%), other milks (e.g., plant-based milk alternatives, milkshakes) ( $n=38$ , 4.5%) and  
402 white bread (not high fibre, not multiseed) ( $n=35$ , 4.1%) (Supplementary Table 10).

403

404 UPFs with no red FOPL traffic lights contained lower amounts of fat, saturated fat, total sugar,  
405 and salt per 100g than UPFs containing at least one red FOPL traffic light (all  $p < 0.001$ ,  
406 Supplementary Table 11). UPFs with no red FOPL traffic lights also had a significantly lower  
407 energy density (1.52kcal/g [IQR: 0.77, 2.43] vs. 3.53kcal/g [IQR: 2.51, 4.43],  $p < 0.001$ ). There  
408 was no significant difference in protein content (6.4g/100g [IQR: 2.1, 10.7] vs. 5.5g/100g [IQR:

409 3.1, 9.2],  $p = 0.761$ ), or fibre content ( $p = 0.435$ ), between UPFs with or without a red FOPL  
410 traffic light.

411

412 Compared with MPFs with no red FOPL traffic lights, UPFs with no red FOPL traffic lights  
413 contained greater quantities of fat, saturated fat, total sugar, and salt ( $p < 0.001$ ) per 100g  
414 (Supplementary Table 12). UPFs had a significantly higher energy density than MPFs  
415 ( $1.52\text{kcal/g}$  [IQR: 0.77, 2.43] vs.  $0.75\text{kcal/g}$  [IQR: 0.32, 1.34],  $p < 0.001$ ) and PFs ( $1.08\text{kcal/g}$   
416 [IQR: 0.59, 1.75]  $p < 0.001$ ). There was no significant difference in protein ( $p = 0.184$ ) or fibre  
417 ( $p = 0.231$ ) content between MPFs and UPFs with no red FOPL traffic lights, but the water  
418 content of UPFs was significantly lower than that of MPFs ( $p < 0.001$ ). PFs with no red FOPL  
419 traffic lights also contained significantly more saturated fat, total sugar, salt, and energy than  
420 MPFs with no red FOPL traffic lights. In sensitivity analyses, binary regressions with median  
421 cut-off showed similar associations between NOVA groups and nutrient content  
422 (Supplementary Table 13). Sensitivity analyses further considered items with no red FOPL  
423 traffic lights and two or more green FOPL traffic lights ( $n = 1403$ , 47.1%) (corresponding to an  
424 item with a median or lower FOPL MTL score with no red FOPL traffic lights). 738 (52.6%) were  
425 MPFs, 554 (39.5%) were UPFs, 102 (7.3%) were PFs and 9 (0.6%) were PCIs. UPFs with no reds  
426 and at least two greens had lower fat, saturated fat, total sugar and salt content per 100g  
427 than UPFs with reds or less than two green FOPL traffic lights (all  $p < 0.001$ ) (Supplementary  
428 Table 14). UPFs with no reds and at least two greens contained greater quantities of fat,  
429 saturated fat, total sugar, and salt than MPFs with no reds and at least two green FOPL traffic  
430 lights ( $p < 0.001$ ), and had a significantly higher energy density ( $1.07\text{kcal/g}$  [IQR: 0.48, 2.21] vs.  
431  $0.71\text{kcal/g}$  [IQR: 0.29, 1.24],  $p < 0.001$ ) and PFs ( $0.74\text{ kcal/g}$  [IQR: 0.40, 1.02],  $p < 0.001$ )  
432 (Supplementary Table 15).

433

### 434 **Hyper-palatable food**

435 When stratified by hyper-palatability, 46.8% (n=1246) of all food items (n=2665) were  
436 classified as being hyper-palatable based on their fat, sodium, sugar and carbohydrate  
437 content. Of which, 79.8% were UPFs (994 out of 1246). Across each cluster, the majority of  
438 HPFs defined by: (1) fat and sodium (78.5%, 504 out of 642), (2) fat and simple sugars (75.5%,  
439 318 out of 421), or (3) carbohydrates and sodium (93.7%, 342 out of 365), were UPFs (Figure  
440 5). Across all items, a significantly greater proportion of UPFs than MPFs were classed as HPF  
441 for: (1) fat and sodium, (2) fat and simple sugars, or (3) carbohydrates and sodium, and overall  
442 (combining all clusters) (all  $p < 0.001$ ) (Supplementary Table 16). When considering 'healthy'  
443 food items (i.e. with no red FOPL traffic lights, n= 1620), there was still a significantly greater  
444 proportion of UPFs than MPFs that were defined as HPF, based on: (1) fat and sodium, and  
445 (3) carbohydrates and sodium, and overall (all  $p < 0.001$ ), but there was no significant  
446 difference for (2) fat and simple sugars ( $p = 0.367$ ).

447

### 448 **Discussion**

449

450 The findings from this analysis indicate that UPFs tend to have an unhealthier nutritional  
451 profile than MPFs, but not PFs. UPFs contained greater amounts of fat, saturated fat, total  
452 sugar, and salt than MPFs, were more energy dense, and were more likely to be classed as  
453 hyper-palatable. Compared with PFs, UPFs contained similar amounts of fat, saturated fat and  
454 salt, but greater amounts of sugar, and were more energy dense. UPFs were more likely to  
455 have fewer green FOPL traffic lights, a greater number of red FOPL traffic lights, and be rated  
456 as unhealthier based on their overall FOPL MTL score. However, not all UPFs had an unhealthy

457 nutrient profile. Over half of UPFs had no red FOPL traffic lights, and a significant number of  
458 UPFs had a FOPL MTL score similar to MPFs, with nearly half of items with no red FOPL traffic  
459 lights being classed as UPFs. However, UPFs with no red FOPL traffic lights still had a worse  
460 nutritional profile and higher energy density than MPFs with an equivalent FOPL MTL score,  
461 and were still more likely to be classed as hyper-palatable. These results suggest that the FOPL  
462 MTL system does not fully differentiate between UPFs and MPFs, only partially capturing the  
463 extent and purpose of food processing.

464

465 Aspects of ultra-processing, such as changes to the food matrix, greater energy density and  
466 the combination of nutrients not usually found in MPFs have been suggested to alter oro-  
467 sensory exposure time, increasing eating rates and resulting in overconsumption (16,18,34).  
468 In this study, UPFs were more energy dense than MPFs and PFs. Even when considering only  
469 'healthy' items with no red FOPL traffic lights, UPFs still had double the energy density of  
470 MPFs (1.52kcal/g vs. 0.75kcal/g). Lowering energy density can lower daily energy intake in a  
471 strong and linear fashion (36), with an average 223kcal reduction in energy intake when  
472 lowering meal energy density from 1.5 kcal/g to 1.1 kcal/g (37). In a metabolic ward crossover  
473 study comparing a 2-week UPF diet (1.36 kcal/g) versus a 2-week MPF diet (1.09 kcal/g)  
474 matched for presented energy and macronutrients, participants consumed ~500kcal per day  
475 more on the UPF than MPF diet, resulting in 0.9kg weight gain on the UPF diet, but 0.9kg of  
476 weight loss on the MPF diet (14). Hyper-palatability has also been suggested to be important  
477 for food choice and consumption (33). Many UPFs have hyper-palatable properties, which  
478 have been proposed to have addictive-like qualities by inducing a greater hedonic response  
479 when consumed, increasing reward-driven eating (18,33,38). In the metabolic ward study,  
480 both energy density ( $45.1 \pm 13.6\%$ ) and hyper-palatability ( $41.9 \pm 6.5\%$ ) explained large

481 proportions of the greater daily non-beverage energy intake on the UPF versus MPF diet (35).  
482 In addition, UPFs have also been described by their extensive matrix degradation, which can  
483 make them softer and easier to consume at a faster rate (34). Therefore, UPFs may capture  
484 several characteristics that may predispose to overconsumption that are not sufficiently  
485 reflected in current FOPL guidance. These findings suggest that within the UK food and drink  
486 supply, choosing healthier UPF items based on the FOPL MTL score may still predispose to  
487 increased energy intake, compared with MPFs with a similar FOPL MTL score.

488

489 The NOVA classification does not explicitly differentiate food and drink based on their  
490 nutrient content. But, high-UPF diets tend to be nutritionally poorer (11), evident by the  
491 partial overlap with the FOPL MTL score. However, although UPFs tend to have an unhealthier  
492 nutritional profile than MPFs, not all do. This finding is in line with studies from other  
493 countries using different nutrient indices (21,26). Given the adverse impacts of high intakes  
494 of nutritionally poor foods high in fat, sugar and salt (39–41), transnational corporations have  
495 reformulated their products to contain less fat, saturated fat, added sugar or salt (42).  
496 Previous analyses based on nutrient profiling have suggested that UPFs with better nutritional  
497 profiles may be considered healthy (43), particularly if they carry a nutrient or health claim.  
498 Notably, a large proportion of UPFs in this study contained one green FOPL traffic light, such  
499 as low-fat ready meals, sauces and puddings, which could carry nutrient claims. However, to  
500 what extent a diet high in UPF but consisting of items with better nutritional quality and  
501 containing nutrition/health claims can constitute a healthy diet remains to be seen.

502

503 Whether the inclusion of the NOVA classification and avoidance of UPFs should be  
504 recommended in dietary guidelines is currently debated (44). However, the most up-to-date

505 scientific guidance from the American Heart Association and American Society for Preventive  
506 Cardiology includes advice to choose MPF and/or minimise UPF intake, alongside standard  
507 dietary guidance to limit foods high in fat, sugar and salt (2,3). Such recommendations  
508 indicate that consumers should consider not just the nutrient content, but also the processing  
509 of their food purchases. FOPLs encourage healthier in-supermarket food purchases (45), and  
510 previous studies suggest Nutri-Score to be most effective in improving consumer  
511 understanding of the healthfulness of food products in the UK and in Europe (9,46,47).  
512 Current FOPLs in the UK use reductive approaches to provide consumers with guidance  
513 regarding which products to consume more of, and those to consume less of. FOPLs do not  
514 take into account the extent and purpose of food processing, and may be insufficient to help  
515 inform consumers to choose MPFs over UPFs. In addition, PFs and UPFs had similar nutrient  
516 content and would be expected to carry similar FOPL MTLs. But, UPFs were still more energy  
517 dense, potentially due to the significantly lower water content of UPFs. It is therefore  
518 important to consider whether current FOPLs provide adequate information to guide  
519 consumers towards making healthy in-store food choices. However, the results here also  
520 highlight that FOPL MTL scores carry important information not captured by the NOVA  
521 classification. Exclusively using the NOVA classification to choose food and drinks might lack  
522 the granularity to identify the nutrient quality of items, excluding potentially healthy food  
523 choices unnecessarily. Therefore, a combined approach to dietary guidelines and food  
524 labelling that considers both the extent and purpose processing and existing indicators of  
525 dietary quality may provide the most informative guidance (48). How best to communicate  
526 this combined guidance needs to be deliberated, to avoid presenting a complex public health  
527 message. Policy makers must also consider the financial implications and abilities of the UK

528 public to shift towards an MPF diet, and away from UPFs particularly with the current cost of  
529 living crisis.

530

### 531 **Strengths and limitations**

532 There are several strengths of this study, including the use of a large UK database of nationally  
533 representative food and drink items, with a matching nutrient database using average  
534 nutrient compositions. Products were compared not only on their nutrient content, but also  
535 their FOPL coding used at consumer point of purchase and wider characteristics that influence  
536 food intake. Limitations include the analysis per 100g, which although allows for  
537 comparability between food and drink items, does not reflect nutrient intakes of actual  
538 portions that may be consumed. Other limitations include the categorisation of items into  
539 NOVA groups; despite agreement amongst authors on classification, a small number of items  
540 could have been entered into more than one group. It was also not possible to assess other  
541 properties of items that may influence eating rate and energy intake in this analysis, such as  
542 textural properties (34).

543

### 544 **Conclusion**

545 The NOVA classification partially overlaps with the nutrient content of food and drink items  
546 available in the UK. UPFs tend to have an unhealthier nutritional profile according to FOPL  
547 and a higher energy density compared to MPFs, with a greater number of red FOPL traffic  
548 lights, and fewer green FOPL traffic lights. UPFs tended to be nutritionally similar to PFs, but  
549 were still more energy dense. However, many UPFs contain no red FOPL traffic lights and  
550 multiple green FOPL traffic lights, which have an improved nutritional profile equivalent to  
551 many MPFs. However, 'healthy' UPFs still tend to contain more fat, saturated fat, total sugar

552 and salt than MPFs with an equivalent FOPL traffic light score, are more energy dense and  
553 more likely to be hyper-palatable. These results have important implications for  
554 understanding how consumers may interpret the relative healthiness of MPFs and UPFs, and  
555 for updating UK food and drink labelling.

556

## 557 **Acknowledgements**

558

559 The authors would like to thank the Intake24 team for their administrative support in  
560 obtaining the relevant datasets, Fernanda Rauber and her team for sharing their full NOVA  
561 classification of food and drink items from NDNS rolling programme Years 1-11, and Helen  
562 Croker for providing insightful comments on a draft of the manuscript.

563

## 564 **Patient and Public Involvement**

565 Patients and the public were not involved in the design, conduct, reporting or dissemination  
566 of the analysis.

567

## 568 **Author Contributions**

569

570 S.J.D., data collection and processing, design, data analysis, writing—first draft; R.L.B.,  
571 writing—editing and reviewing, supervision; A.B. conceptualisation, data processing,  
572 writing—editing and reviewing, supervision. All authors have read and agreed to the final  
573 manuscript version.

574

## 575 **Funding**



576

577 S.J.D. is funded by a Medical Research Council grant (MR/N013867/1). R.L.B. is funded by the  
578 National Institute for Health and Care Research, Sir Jules Thorn Charitable Trust and Rosetrees  
579 Trust. A.B is funded by Rosetrees Trust.

580

## 581 **Conflicts of interest**

582

583 All authors have completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure form  
584 at <http://www.icmje.org/disclosure-of-interest/> and declare: S.J.D receives royalties from  
585 Amazon for a self-published book that mentions ultra-processed food, and payments from  
586 Red Pen Reviews. R.L.B reports honoraria from Novo Nordisk, Eli Lilly, Medscape, ViiV  
587 Healthcare Ltd and International Medical P and advisory board and consultancy work for Novo  
588 Nordisk, Eli Lilly, Pfizer, Gila Therapeutics Ltd, Epitomee Medical Ltd and ViiV Healthcare Ltd.  
589 A.B. reports honoraria from Novo Nordisk, Office of Health Improvement and Disparity,  
590 Johnson and Johnson and Obesity UK outside the submitted work and is on the Medical  
591 Advisory Board and shareholder of Reset Health Clinics Ltd.

592

## 593 **Data availability**

594

595 Data can be made available upon request to the authors. For access to Intake24 datasets,  
596 please contact the Intake24 team directly: [support@intake24.co.uk](mailto:support@intake24.co.uk); <https://intake24.co.uk>.

597

## 598 **References**

599

- 600 1. Mozaffarian D. Dietary and Policy Priorities for Cardiovascular Disease, Diabetes, and  
601 Obesity – A Comprehensive Review. *Circulation*. 2016 Jan 12;133(2):187–225.
- 602 2. Lichtenstein AH, Appel LJ, Vadiveloo M, Hu FB, Kris-Etherton PM, Rebholz CM, et al. 2021  
603 Dietary Guidance to Improve Cardiovascular Health: A Scientific Statement From the  
604 American Heart Association. *Circulation*. 2021;CIR.0000000000001031.
- 605 3. Belardo D, Michos ED, Blankstein R, Blumenthal RS, Ferdinand KC, Hall K, et al. Practical,  
606 Evidence-Based Approaches to Nutritional Modifications to Reduce Atherosclerotic  
607 Cardiovascular Disease: An American Society For Preventive Cardiology Clinical Practice  
608 Statement. *Am J Prev Cardiol*. 2022 Mar 2;10:100323.
- 609 4. Kebbe M, Gao M, Perez-Cornago A, Jebb SA, Piernas C. Adherence to international dietary  
610 recommendations in association with all-cause mortality and fatal and non-fatal  
611 cardiovascular disease risk: a prospective analysis of UK Biobank participants. *BMC Med*.  
612 2021 Jun 23;19(1):134.
- 613 5. Scheelbeek P, Green R, Papier K, Knuppel A, Alae-Carew C, Balkwill A, et al. Health impacts  
614 and environmental footprints of diets that meet the Eatwell Guide recommendations:  
615 analyses of multiple UK studies. *BMJ Open*. 2020 Aug 1;10(8):e037554.
- 616 6. GOV.UK. Front of Pack nutrition labelling guidance [Internet]. GOV.UK. [cited 2022 Nov  
617 21]. Available from: [https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/front-of-pack-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/front-of-pack-nutrition-labelling-guidance)  
618 [nutrition-labelling-guidance](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/front-of-pack-nutrition-labelling-guidance)
- 619 7. NHS. The Eatwell Guide [Internet]. [cited 2021 Oct 11]. Available from:  
620 <https://www.nhs.uk/live-well/eat-well/the-eatwell-guide/>

- 621 8. Donini LM, Berry EM, Folkvord F, Jansen L, Leroy F, Şimşek Ö, et al. Front-of-pack labels:  
622 “Directive” versus “informative” approaches. *Nutrition*. 2023 Jan 1;105:111861.
- 623 9. Packer J, Russell SJ, Ridout D, Hope S, Conolly A, Jessop C, et al. Assessing the Effectiveness  
624 of Front of Pack Labels: Findings from an Online Randomised-Controlled Experiment in a  
625 Representative British Sample. *Nutrients*. 2021 Mar 10;13(3):900.
- 626 10. Monteiro CA, Cannon G, Levy RB, Moubarac JC, Louzada ML, Rauber F, et al. Ultra-  
627 processed foods: what they are and how to identify them. *Public Health Nutr*. 2019  
628 Apr;22(5):936–41.
- 629 11. Martini D, Godos J, Bonaccio M, Vitaglione P, Grosso G. Ultra-Processed Foods and  
630 Nutritional Dietary Profile: A Meta-Analysis of Nationally Representative Samples.  
631 *Nutrients*. 2021 Oct;13(10):3390.
- 632 12. Madruga M, Steele EM, Reynolds C, Levy RB, Rauber F. Trends in food consumption  
633 according to the degree of food processing among the UK population over 11 years. *Br J*  
634 *Nutr*. 2022 Oct 19;1–8.
- 635 13. Dicken SJ, Batterham RL. The Role of Diet Quality in Mediating the Association between  
636 Ultra-Processed Food Intake, Obesity and Health-Related Outcomes: A Review of  
637 Prospective Cohort Studies. *Nutrients*. 2022 Jan;14(1):23.
- 638 14. Hall KD, Ayuketah A, Brychta R, Cai H, Cassimatis T, Chen KY, et al. Ultra-Processed Diets  
639 Cause Excess Calorie Intake and Weight Gain: An Inpatient Randomized Controlled Trial  
640 of Ad Libitum Food Intake. *Cell Metab*. 2019 Jul 2;30(1):67-77.e3.

- 641 15. Bonaccio M, Castelnuovo AD, Ruggiero E, Costanzo S, Grosso G, Curtis AD, et al. Joint  
642 association of food nutritional profile by Nutri-Score front-of-pack label and ultra-  
643 processed food intake with mortality: Moli-sani prospective cohort study. *BMJ*. 2022 Aug  
644 31;378:e070688.
- 645 16. Forde CG, Mars M, de Graaf K. Ultra-Processing or Oral Processing? A Role for Energy  
646 Density and Eating Rate in Moderating Energy Intake from Processed Foods. *Curr Dev*  
647 *Nutr*. 2020 Mar;4(3):nzaa019.
- 648 17. Rolls BJ. Dietary energy density: Applying behavioural science to weight management.  
649 *Nutr Bull*. 2017 Sep;42(3):246–53.
- 650 18. Gearhardt AN, Schulte EM. Is Food Addictive? A Review of the Science. *Annu Rev Nutr*.  
651 2021 Oct 11;41:387–410.
- 652 19. Steele EM, Raubenheimer D, Simpson SJ, Baraldi LG, Monteiro CA. Ultra-processed foods,  
653 protein leverage and energy intake in the USA. *Public Health Nutr*. 2018 Jan;21(1):114–  
654 24.
- 655 20. Gupta S, Hawk T, Aggarwal A, Drewnowski A. Characterizing Ultra-Processed Foods by  
656 Energy Density, Nutrient Density, and Cost. *Front Nutr*. 2019 May 28;6:70.
- 657 21. Romero Ferreiro C, Lora Pablos D, Gómez de la Cámara A. Two Dimensions of Nutritional  
658 Value: Nutri-Score and NOVA. *Nutrients*. 2021 Aug 13;13(8):2783.
- 659 22. Dickie S, Woods JL, Lawrence M. Analysing the use of the Australian Health Star Rating  
660 system by level of food processing. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act*. 2018 Dec 13;15(1):128.

- 661 23. Machado P, Cediel G, Woods J, Baker P, Dickie S, Gomes FS, et al. Evaluating intake levels  
662 of nutrients linked to non-communicable diseases in Australia using the novel  
663 combination of food processing and nutrient profiling metrics of the PAHO Nutrient  
664 Profile Model. *Eur J Nutr.* 2022 Jun 1;61(4):1801–12.
- 665 24. Dickie S, Woods J, Machado P, Lawrence M. Nutrition Classification Schemes for Informing  
666 Nutrition Policy in Australia: Nutrient-Based, Food-Based, or Dietary-Based? *Curr Dev*  
667 *Nutr.* 2022 Aug;6(8):nzac112.
- 668 25. Valenzuela A, Zambrano L, Velásquez R, Groff C, Apablaza T, Riffo C, et al. Discrepancy  
669 between Food Classification Systems: Evaluation of Nutri-Score, NOVA Classification and  
670 Chilean Front-of-Package Food Warning Labels. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.* 2022 Nov  
671 8;19(22):14631.
- 672 26. Lorenzoni G, Di Benedetto R, Silano M, Gregori D. What Is the Nutritional Composition of  
673 Ultra-Processed Food Marketed in Italy? *Nutrients.* 2021 Jul 10;13(7):2364.
- 674 27. NDNS: results from years 9 to 11 (2016 to 2017 and 2018 to 2019) [Internet]. GOV.UK.  
675 [cited 2021 Nov 30]. Available from: [https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/ndns-](https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/ndns-results-from-years-9-to-11-2016-to-2017-and-2018-to-2019)  
676 [results-from-years-9-to-11-2016-to-2017-and-2018-to-2019](https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/ndns-results-from-years-9-to-11-2016-to-2017-and-2018-to-2019)
- 677 28. Public Health England. Evaluation of change in dietary methodology in NDNS rolling  
678 programme: Stage 1 [Internet]. GOV.UK. [cited 2022 Nov 21]. Available from:  
679 [https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/evaluation-of-change-in-dietary-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/evaluation-of-change-in-dietary-methodology-in-ndns-rolling-programme-stage-1)  
680 [methodology-in-ndns-rolling-programme-stage-1](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/evaluation-of-change-in-dietary-methodology-in-ndns-rolling-programme-stage-1)

- 681 29. Bradley J, Simpson E, Poliakov I, Matthews JNS, Olivier P, Adamson AJ, et al. Comparison  
682 of INTAKE24 (an Online 24-h Dietary Recall Tool) with Interviewer-Led 24-h Recall in 11-  
683 24 Year-Old. *Nutrients*. 2016 Jun 9;8(6):E358.
- 684 30. Rauber F, Louzada ML da C, Steele EM, Rezende LFM de, Millett C, Monteiro CA, et al.  
685 Ultra-processed foods and excessive free sugar intake in the UK: a nationally  
686 representative cross-sectional study. *BMJ Open*. 2019 Oct 1;9(10):e027546.
- 687 31. Scarborough P, Matthews A, Eyles H, Kaur A, Hodgkins C, Raats MM, et al. Reds are more  
688 important than greens: how UK supermarket shoppers use the different information on a  
689 traffic light nutrition label in a choice experiment. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act*. 2015 Dec  
690 12;12(1):151.
- 691 32. Balcombe K, Fraser I, Falco SD. Traffic lights and food choice: A choice experiment  
692 examining the relationship between nutritional food labels and price. *Food Policy*. 2010  
693 Jun 1;35(3):211–20.
- 694 33. Fazzino TL, Rohde K, Sullivan DK. Hyper-Palatable Foods: Development of a Quantitative  
695 Definition and Application to the US Food System Database. *Obesity*. 2019;27(11):1761–  
696 8.
- 697 34. Teo PS, Lim AJ, Goh AT, R J, Choy JYM, McCrickerd K, et al. Texture-based differences in  
698 eating rate influence energy intake for minimally processed and ultra-processed meals.  
699 *Am J Clin Nutr*. 2022 Mar 14;116(1):244–54.

- 700 35. Fazzino TL, Courville AB, Guo J, Hall KD. Ad libitum meal energy intake is positively  
701 influenced by energy density, eating rate and hyper-palatable food across four dietary  
702 patterns. *Nat Food*. 2023 Jan 30;1–4.
- 703 36. Robinson E, Khuttan M, McFarland-Lesser I, Patel Z, Jones A. Calorie reformulation: a  
704 systematic review and meta-analysis examining the effect of manipulating food energy  
705 density on daily energy intake. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act*. 2022 Apr 22;19:48.
- 706 37. Klos B, Cook J, Crepaz L, Weiland A, Zipfel S, Mack I. Impact of energy density on energy  
707 intake in children and adults: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized  
708 controlled trials. *Eur J Nutr*. 2022 Dec 2;
- 709 38. Lemos TC, Coutinho GMS, Silva LAA, Stariolo JB, Campagnoli RR, Oliveira L, et al. Ultra-  
710 Processed Foods Elicit Higher Approach Motivation Than Unprocessed and Minimally  
711 Processed Foods. *Front Public Health*. 2022 Jun 21;10:891546.
- 712 39. Micha R, Shulkin ML, Peñalvo JL, Khatibzadeh S, Singh GM, Rao M, et al. Etiologic effects  
713 and optimal intakes of foods and nutrients for risk of cardiovascular diseases and  
714 diabetes: Systematic reviews and meta-analyses from the Nutrition and Chronic Diseases  
715 Expert Group (NutriCoDE). *PLOS ONE*. 2017 Apr 27;12(4):e0175149.
- 716 40. Afshin A, Sur PJ, Fay KA, Cornaby L, Ferrara G, Salama JS, et al. Health effects of dietary  
717 risks in 195 countries, 1990–2017: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease  
718 Study 2017. *The Lancet*. 2019 May 11;393(10184):1958–72.

- 719 41. Sacks FM, Lichtenstein AH, Wu JHY, Appel LJ, Creager MA, Kris-Etherton PM, et al. Dietary  
720 Fats and Cardiovascular Disease: A Presidential Advisory From the American Heart  
721 Association. *Circulation*. 2017 Jul 18;136(3):e1–23.
- 722 42. Scrinis G, Monteiro CA. Ultra-processed foods and the limits of product reformulation.  
723 *Public Health Nutr*. 2018 Jan;21(1):247–52.
- 724 43. Derbyshire E. Are all ‘ultra-processed’ foods nutritional demons? A commentary and  
725 nutritional profiling analysis. *Trends Food Sci Technol*. 2019 Dec 1;94:98–104.
- 726 44. Astrup A, Monteiro CA. Does the concept of “ultra-processed foods” help inform dietary  
727 guidelines, beyond conventional classification systems? Debate consensus. *Am J Clin*  
728 *Nutr*. 2022 Oct 17;nqac230.
- 729 45. Croker H, Packer J, Russell SJ, Stansfield C, Viner RM. Front of pack nutritional labelling  
730 schemes: a systematic review and meta-analysis of recent evidence relating to objectively  
731 measured consumption and purchasing. *J Hum Nutr Diet*. 2020;33(4):518–37.
- 732 46. Vandevijvere S, Vermote M, Egnell M, Galan P, Talati Z, Pettigrew S, et al. Consumers’  
733 food choices, understanding and perceptions in response to different front-of-pack  
734 nutrition labelling systems in Belgium: results from an online experimental study. *Arch*  
735 *Public Health Arch Belg Sante Publique*. 2020;78:30.
- 736 47. Egnell M, Galan P, Farpour-Lambert NJ, Talati Z, Pettigrew S, Hercberg S, et al. Compared  
737 to other front-of-pack nutrition labels, the Nutri-Score emerged as the most efficient to  
738 inform Swiss consumers on the nutritional quality of food products. *PLoS One*.  
739 2020;15(2):e0228179.



740 48. Juul F, Deierlein AL, Vaidean G, Quatromoni PA, Parekh N. Ultra-processed Foods and  
741 Cardiometabolic Health Outcomes: from Evidence to Practice. *Curr Atheroscler Rep.* 2022  
742 Nov 1;24(11):849–60.

743

744

745

746

747

748

749

750

751

752

753

754

755

756

757

758

759

760

761

762

763

764

765 **Table 1: Fat, saturated fat, total sugar, salt and energy content per 100g by NOVA group**

Nutrient	Total (n=2,980)		MPF (n=986)		PCI (n=61)		PF (n=283)		UPF (n=1650)		p-value
	Median	IQR	Media n	IQR	Media n	IQR	Media n	IQR	Median	IQR	
<b>Fat (g/100g)</b>	5.1	0.8, 13.5	1.5 (a)	0.3, 6.5	19.1 (b)	0.0, 98.3	8.4 (b)	0.3, 16.4	7.4 (b)	2.1, 15.8	<0.001
<b>Saturated fat (g/100g)</b>	1.3	0.2, 4.2	0.3 (a)	0.07, 1.9	12.0 (b)	0.0, 32.5	2.7 (b)	0.1, 5.9	1.9 (b)	0.6, 5.7	<0.001
<b>Total sugar (g/100g)</b>	3.2	1.1, 11.1	2.3 (ab)	0.4, 5.1	0.0 (a)	0.0, 2.9	2.5 (b)	0.7, 9.7	4.2 (c)	1.7, 18.9	<0.001
<b>Salt (g/100g)</b>	0.27	0.05, 0.86	0.07 (a)	0.01, 0.2	0.03 (a)	0.0, 0.12	0.56 (b)	0.11, 1.05	0.58 (b)	0.18, 1.07	<0.001
<b>Energy (kcal/100g)</b>	181.0	77, 320	94.0 (a)	36.0, 180.3	378.0 (b)	181.0, 885.0	178.0 (c)	84.0, 290.0	243.0 (d)	121.8, 371.0	<0.001

766 *Unlike letters indicates significantly different  $p < 0.05$*

767 *Pairwise comparisons conducted using Kruskal-Wallis ANOVA with Bonferroni correction for multiple comparisons.*

768 *IQR: inter-quartile range; MPF: minimally processed food; PCI: processed culinary ingredient; PF: processed food; UPF: ultra-*  
 769 *processed food;*

770

771 **Table 2: Binary regression modelling the association between NOVA group and the presence**  
 772 **of one or more red/green FOPL traffic lights vs no red/green FOPL traffic lights**

	Exp(Beta)	95% Confidence Interval		p-value
		Lower	Upper	
<b>One or more red vs. no red FOPL traffic lights</b>				
UPF	4.593	3.788	5.569	<0.001
PF	3.690	2.765	4.924	<0.001
PCI	28.541	13.795	59.047	<0.001

One or more green vs. no green				
FOPL traffic lights				
UPF	0.050	0.025	0.102	<0.001
PF and PCI	0.083	0.038	0.182	<0.001

773 Reference = MPF

774 Higher score indicates greater odds of having red or green FOPL traffic lights vs. no red or green FOPL traffic lights

775 FOPL: front of package label; IQR: inter-quartile range; MPF: minimally processed food; PCI: processed culinary ingredient;

776 PF: processed food; UPF: ultra-processed food

777

778

779 **Table 3 Ordinal regression modelling the association between NOVA group and the**

780 **presence of an increasing number of red/green FOPL traffic lights.**

	Exp(B)	95% Confidence Interval		p-value
		Lower	Upper	
<b>Red FOPL traffic lights</b>				
UPF	4.842	4.002	5.857	<0.001
PF and PCI	5.461	4.212	7.079	<0.001
<b>Green FOPL traffic lights</b>				
UPF	0.137	0.117	0.160	<0.001
PF and PCI	0.212	0.169	0.266	<0.001

781 Reference = MPF

782 Higher score indicates greater odds of having an increasing number of red/green FOPL traffic lights

783 FOPL: front of package label; IQR: inter-quartile range; MPF: minimally processed food; PCI: processed culinary ingredient;

784 PF: processed food; UPF: ultra-processed food

785

786

787

788 **Table 4 Ordinal regression modelling the association between NOVA group and the**  
789 **presence of an increasing FOPL MTL score**

	Exp(B)	95% Confidence Interval		p-value
		Lower	Upper	
UPF	7.063	6.055	8.238	<0.001
PF and PCI	5.947	4.742	7.460	<0.001

790 *Reference = MPF*

791 *Higher score indicates greater odds of having an unhealthier FOPL MTL score*

792 *FOPL: front of package label; IQR: inter-quartile range; MPF: minimally processed food; MTL: multiple traffic light; PCI:*

793 *processed culinary ingredient; PF: processed food; UPF: ultra-processed food*

794

795

796

797

798

799

800

801

802

803

804

805

806

807


808

809

810

811

812 **Figure 1. Average fat (1a), saturated fat (1b), total sugar (1c), salt (1d) and energy (1e)**  
813 **content across NOVA food groups (n=2980)**



814

815 *Median with 95%CI.*

816 *\*\*\* denotes significance at  $p < 0.001$  conducted from Kruskal-Wallis ANOVA with Bonferroni correction for multiple*  
817 *comparisons.*

818 *MPF: minimally processed food; PF: processed food; UPF: ultra-processed food*

819

820


821

822

823

824 **Figure 2. Percentage of red, amber, and green FOPL traffic lights across fat (2a), saturated**  
825 **fat (2b), total sugar (2c) and salt (2d) by NOVA group (PCI not shown).**

826



827

828

829 *MPF n = 986; PF n = 283; UPF n = 1650*

830 *FOPL: front of package label; MPF: minimally processed food; PF: processed food; UPF: ultra-processed food*

831

832


833

834

835

836

837 **Figure 3. The number (3a and 3b) and percentage (3c and 3d) of total red (3a ad 3c) or green**  
 838 **(3b and 3d) FOPL traffic lights for fat, saturated fat, total sugar, and salt, stratified by NOVA**  
 839 **group**



840

841

842 *MPF n = 986; PF n = 283; UPF n = 1650*

843 *Numbers above columns in figures 3c and 3d denote the number of items*


844 *FOPL: front of package label; MPF: minimally processed food; PF: processed food; UPF: ultra-processed food*

845

846

847 **Figure 4. Profile of FOPL MTLs stratified by NOVA group**

848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877




MPF n = 986; PF n = 283; UPF n = 1650

FOPL: front of package label; MPF: minimally processed food; MTL: multiple traffic light; PF: processed food; UPF: ultra-processed food


**Figure 5. Proportions of food items meeting criteria for hyper-palatability based on: (1) fat and sodium (5a) (2) fat and simple sugars (5b) (3) carbohydrates and sodium (or any of the three clusters (5d) (PCI not shown)**



5a. % HPF FSOD (Fat and salt)




5b. % HPF FS (Fat and sugar)




878

5c. % HPF CSOD (Carbohydrate and salt)



5d. % HPF Overall (FSOD and/or FS and/or CSOD)



879

880 (1) fat and sodium (> 25% kcal from fat,  $\geq 0.30\%$  sodium content by weight) hyperpalatable  $n = 642$ ; (2) fat and simple sugars

881 (> 20% kcal from fat, > 20% kcal from sugar) hyperpalatable  $n = 421$ ; (3) carbohydrates and sodium (> 40% kcal from

882 carbohydrates,  $\geq 0.20\%$  sodium by weight) hyperpalatable  $n = 365$ ; any of the three clusters hyperpalatable  $n = 1246$

883 CSOD: carbohydrate and salt; FOPL: front of package label; FS: fat and sugar; FSOD: fat and salt; HPF: hyper-palatable food;

884 MPF: minimally processed food; MTL: multiple traffic light; PF: processed food; UPF: ultra-processed food

885