Comparing Nutri-score Algorithm Updates for Meat, Fish and Dairy Alternatives

Garay Buranakarl*

Department of Nutrition, Central South University, Changsha 410078, China

Introduction

In the pursuit of healthier dietary choices and transparent food labelling, the nutri-score algorithm has emerged as a prominent system for evaluating the nutritional quality of food products. Originally developed in France, Nutri-Score assigns a color-coded label to food items, ranging from A (green) for healthier options to E (red) for less nutritious choices. While the system was initially designed for traditional food categories, recent updates have aimed to accommodate the growing demand for plant-based alternatives, including meat, fish and dairy substitutes. This article delves into the intricacies of Nutri-Score algorithm updates concerning these alternative products, exploring their implications for consumer health and dietary decision-making. Before delving into the specifics of Nutri-Score updates for alternative products, it's essential to understand the foundational principles of the algorithm. Nutri-Score considers multiple nutritional factors, including energy content, saturated fat, sugars, sodium, protein, fiber and the proportion of fruits, vegetables, legumes, nuts and oilseeds. These components are weighted and combined to generate an overall score, which determines the assigned letter grade.

Initially, nutri-score primarily focused on traditional food items, such as packaged goods and processed foods commonly found in supermarkets. However, as consumer preferences shifted towards plant-based diets and alternative protein sources, there arose a need to adapt the algorithm to reflect these dietary choices more accurately [1,2].

Description

One of the significant challenges in updating Nutri-Score for meat alternatives lies in accounting for differences in nutritional composition compared to traditional meat products. While meat alternatives often boast lower levels of saturated fat and cholesterol, they may also contain higher levels of sodium and processed ingredients. Consequently, recalibrating the algorithm to accurately assess the nutritional quality of these products requires careful consideration. Recent updates to nutri-score for meat alternatives have involved refining the weighting of various nutritional components to better reflect the healthfulness of plant-based protein sources. For instance, greater emphasis may be placed on protein quality and fiber content while adjusting thresholds for sodium and additives commonly found in processed meat substitutes. By doing so, Nutri-Score aims to provide consumers with a clearer understanding of the relative nutritional merits of meat alternatives compared to their animal-derived counterparts [2].

Fish alternatives pose another unique challenge for the Nutri-Score algorithm due to the diverse array of products available, ranging from plant-based seafood substitutes to lab-grown fish proteins. Unlike traditional fish,

which are renowned for their omega-3 fatty acid content and lean protein profile, fish substitutes may vary significantly in nutritional composition. To address this variability, Nutri-Score updates for fish alternatives focus on distinguishing between products that replicate the nutritional benefits of fish, such as omega-3 enrichment in algae-based alternatives and those that rely heavily on processed ingredients and added fats. By incorporating specific criteria for evaluating omega-3 content and protein quality, the algorithm strives to guide consumers towards healthier fish alternatives that align with dietary recommendations for cardiovascular health and sustainability [3].

Dairy alternatives, including plant-based milks, cheeses and yogurts, have witnessed a surge in popularity among consumers seeking lactose-free and vegan-friendly options. However, the nutritional profiles of these products can vary widely depending on factors such as fortification, processing methods and ingredient composition. Nutri-Score updates for dairy alternatives aim to address these discrepancies by reassessing the weighting of key nutritional components and incorporating criteria tailored to plant-based dairy substitutes. For example, while dairy milk is valued for its calcium and vitamin D content, plant-based alternatives may require additional fortification to match these nutritional benefits adequately. By adjusting scoring parameters to account for fortification levels and protein quality in dairy alternatives, Nutri-Score endeavours to provide consumers with comprehensive guidance when choosing plant-based dairy substitutes [4].

As Nutri-Score continues to evolve to encompass a broader range of food categories, consumers must understand the limitations and nuances of the algorithm when evaluating alternative products. While the system offers a valuable tool for comparing the nutritional quality of foods within a given category, it cannot replace individual dietary preferences, cultural considerations, or ethical beliefs. Moreover, the efficacy of Nutri-Score updates for alternative products hinges on consumer awareness and engagement. Manufacturers play a crucial role in transparently disclosing nutritional information and adhering to standardized guidelines for calculating Nutri-Score ratings. Likewise, consumer education initiatives are essential for promoting informed decision-making and empowering individuals to navigate the evolving landscape of food labelling. Consumer response to Nutri-Score updates for alternative products has been mixed, reflecting the complexity of dietary preferences and nutritional considerations. While some individuals welcome the expanded scope of the algorithm, others express concerns about its ability to accurately assess the healthfulness of plant-based options and the potential for oversimplification. One area of contention surrounds the treatment of processed alternatives within the Nutri-Score system. Critics argue that certain plant-based substitutes, particularly those high in sodium, additives and refined ingredients, may receive favourable ratings despite being less nutritious than whole-food alternatives. Addressing this issue requires ongoing refinement of Nutri-Score criteria to prioritize whole-food sources and encourage consumers to scrutinize ingredient lists and processing methods [5].

Conclusion

Furthermore, the cultural and socioeconomic factors influencing dietary choices cannot be overlooked. While Nutri-Score provides a standardized framework for comparing nutritional quality, it may not fully capture the diverse dietary patterns and culinary traditions of different populations. Efforts to promote dietary diversity and inclusion should complement Nutri-Score initiatives, emphasizing the importance of culturally relevant nutrition education and access to affordable, nutritious foods for all communities. In

conclusion, Nutri-Score algorithm updates for meat, fish and dairy alternatives represent a significant step towards promoting healthier dietary choices and enhancing transparency in food labelling. By refining scoring criteria to account for the unique nutritional profiles of alternative products, Nutri-Score aims to empower consumers to make informed decisions that align with their health and sustainability goals. However, on-going research and collaboration between stakeholders are essential to ensure the accuracy and relevance of Nutri-Score evaluations in an ever-changing food landscape. Ultimately, by leveraging Nutri-Score as a tool for promoting dietary diversity and nutritional awareness, we can strive towards a healthier and more sustainable future for all.

Acknowledgement

None.

Conflict of Interest

There are no conflicts of interest by author.

References

1. Huang, Tao, Bin Yang, Jusheng Zheng and Guipu Li, et al. "Cardiovascular disease mortality and cancer incidence in vegetarians: A meta-analysis and systematic review." *Ann Nutr Metab* 60 (2012): 233-240.

2. Simonson, Mathilde, Yves Boirie and Christelle Guillet. "Protein, amino acids and obesity treatment." *Rev Endocr Metab Dis* 21 (2020): 341-353.

3. Najjar, Rami S. and Rafaela G. Feresin. "Plant-based diets in the reduction of body fat: Physiological effects and biochemical insights." *Nutrients* 11 (2019): 2712.

4. Turner-McGrievy, Gabrielle M., Charis R. Davidson, Ellen E. Wingard and Deborah L. Billings. "Low glycemic index vegan or low-calorie weight loss diets for women with polycystic ovary syndrome: A randomized controlled feasibility study." *Nutr Res* 34 (2014): 552-558.

5. Ivanova, Stanislava, Cédric Delattre, Diana Karcheva-Bahchevanska and Niko Benbasat, et al. "Plant-based diet as a strategy for weight control." *Foods* 10 (2021): 3052.

How to cite this article: Buranakarl, Garay. "Comparing Nutri-score Algorithm Updates for Meat, Fish and Dairy Alternatives." *Vitam Miner* 13 (2024): 299.