

Supplementary Table 1 –Level of consumption of ultra-processed foods (UPF) expressed as % energy provided by UPF intake with respect to total energy intake (TEI) in pregnant women and following different dietary patterns

Author (year)	Country	Study population	UPF consumption and statistics
PREGNANTS			
Silva et al., (2021) [37]	Brazil	n = 42 pregnant women with pregestational diabetes mellitus (100% F) (mean age 31.5 ± 5.8 y; mean BMI: nd)	Second trimester = 16.9 ± 7.7% of TEI Third trimester = 15.2 ± 10% of TEI No difference between trimesters
Gomes et al. (2019) [34]	Brazil	n = 353 pregnant women (100% F) (mean age: nd; mean BMI: nd)	First trimester = 23.9% vs. 26% of TEI (intervention group vs control group, respectively) No difference between group Second trimester = 20.6% vs 27.3% of TEI (intervention group vs control group, respectively) Significantly different (p<0.001) between groups Third trimester = 22.8% vs. 26.7% of TEI (intervention group vs control group, respectively) Significantly different (p=0.022) between groups
SD or SEM nor reported			
DIETARY PATTERNS			
Gehring et al., (2020 and 2021) [64,65]	France	n = 21212 subjects (73.1% F) (mean age 56.3 ± 13.8 y; mean BMI: nd) 19812 meat eaters 646 pesco-vegetarians 500 vegetarians 254 vegans	Meat eaters = 33% of TEI Pesco-vegetarians = 32.5% of TEI Vegetarians =37% of TEI Vegans = 39.5% of TEI SD or SEM not reported. Significantly (p<0.001) higher in vegetarian and vegans compared to the other dietary patterns

Data are reported as mean ± standard deviation (SD) or standard error of the mean (SEM)*

CI, confidence interval; BMI: body mass index; ND, not determined; UPF, ultra-processed food and drink products; y: year; TEI, total energy intake