

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
<b>PREGNANTS</b>			
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
<b>DIETARY PATTERNS</b>			
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