

The nutritional profile of plant-based meat alternatives compared with meat products: an audit of products available in the UK and Ireland

L. Lindberg¹, S. Mulhall², J. Woodside¹, J. Walton² and A. Nugent³

¹Centre for Public Health, Queen's University Belfast, Institute of Clinical Science A, Belfast, Northern Ireland,

²Department of Biological Sciences, Munster Technological University, Cork, Republic of Ireland and

³School of Biological Sciences, Queens University Belfast, Technology Centre, Belfast, Northern Ireland.

A growing concern around animal welfare and the environmental impact of food production and consumption has resulted in an increased demand for plant-based meat alternatives (PBMA) in the UK and Ireland⁽¹⁾.

While the popularity of these products is increasing, little is known about their nutritional composition in comparison to equivalent meat products⁽²⁾. Therefore, objective of this study was to measure how the nutritional content of PBMA currently available in UK and Irish supermarkets compares with equivalent meat products. An online audit of PBMA available in Tesco and Sainsbury's was conducted between February and April 2021. PBMA were defined as products which aimed to imitate meat. On-pack information including nutritional content, claims, ingredients and packaging materials was extracted and organised into four interrelated Excel databases. Categories were used to group similar products together such as 'Burgers' and 'Sausages'. Nutritional data for meat products (per 100g) was sourced from Nutritics software⁽³⁾ and compared with PBMA using the one sample t-test to determine if differences in the mean nutrient contents for different categories of PBMA and equivalent meat products were statistically significant at the 5% level. 351 products were identified across 20 categories. Products included in the meat-free chicken (n = 71), sausages (n = 56), burgers (n = 49), beef (n = 30), mince (n = 13), pork (excluding sausages) (n = 13) and fish-free seafood (n = 9) categories accounted for ~70% of all the products and these seven categories were included in the current analysis. Per 100 g, PBMA had a significantly lower mean energy, protein, total fat, and saturated fat content than meat in $\geq 5/7$ categories. Mean salt, sugar and fibre content was significantly higher for PBMA in 4/7, 5/7 and 7/7 categories respectively. PBMA had a more favourable nutritional profile than meat for the burgers, sausages and pork categories. Meat-free chicken and fish-free fish performed worse when compared with chicken breast and cod fillets and better when compared with breaded/coated chicken and fish. On-pack labelling of micronutrient composition was limited. Across the categories, PBMA were lower in energy, protein, total fat and saturated fat content, and higher in fibre, sugar and salt content compared to meat products. Within the categories, PBMA designed to replace more processed meats such as burgers, sausages, pork and breaded chicken, performed better than their meat equivalents, whilst PBMA designed to replace less processed meats such as mince, beef and chicken breast performed worse than their meat equivalents. Therefore, the nutritional impact of substituting meat with PBMA depends on the meat product being replaced, its level of processing and the PBMA used in its place. With on-pack labelling of the micronutrient content of PBMA limited, a knowledge gap exists on how these products compare to meat in vitamin and mineral content.

References

1. Mintel (2020) *Plant-based push: UK sales of meat-free foods shoot up 40% between 2014-2019*. [Available at: <https://www.mintel.com/press-centre/food-and-drink/plant-based-push-uk-sales-of-meat-free-foods-shoot-up-40-between-2014-19>]
2. Hu FB, Otis BO & McCarthy G (2019) *JAMA* **322**, 1547–1548.
3. Nutritics (2021) [Available at: <https://www.nutritics.com/app/>].