

Title	Habitual protein intake, protein distribution patterns and dietary sources in Irish adults with stratification by sex and age
Authors	Hone, M.;Nugent, A. P.;Walton, Janette;McNulty, B. A.;Egan, B.
Publication date	2020-01-30
Original Citation	Hone, M., Nugent, A. P., Walton, J., McNulty, B. A. and Egan, B. (2020) 'Habitual protein intake, protein distribution patterns and dietary sources in Irish adults with stratification by sex and age', Journal of Human Nutrition and Dietetics, 33(4), pp. 465-476. doi: 10.1111/jhn.12736
Type of publication	Article (peer-reviewed)
Link to publisher's version	10.1111/jhn.12736
Rights	© 2020, The British Dietetic Association Ltd. © 2020, John Wiley & Sons Ltd. This is the peer reviewed version of the following item: Hone, M., Nugent, A. P., Walton, J., McNulty, B. A. and Egan, B. (2020) 'Habitual protein intake, protein distribution patterns and dietary sources in Irish adults with stratification by sex and age', Journal of Human Nutrition and Dietetics, 33(4), pp. 465-476, doi: 10.1111/jhn.12736, which has been published in final form at: https://doi.org/10.1111/jhn.12736 , This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Use of Self-Archived Versions.
Download date	2026-08-07 00:56:43
Item downloaded from	https://hdl.handle.net/10468/14706



UCC

University College Cork, Ireland
Coláiste na hOllscoile Corcaigh

ABSTRACT

Background: Given the importance of habitual dietary protein intake, distribution patterns and dietary sources in the etiology of age-related declines of muscle mass and function, this study examined these factors as a function of **sex** and age in Irish adults aged 18-90 years comprising The National Adult Nutrition Survey (NANS).

Methods: $n=1051$ (males, $n=523$; females, $n=528$) undertook a four-day semi-weighed food diary. Total, body mass relative intake, and percentage contribution to total energy intake of dietary protein were determined in addition to protein distribution scores (PDS), and contribution of food groups, animal- and plant-based foods to total protein intake.

Results: Total and relative protein intake were highest in those aged 18-35 y (96 ± 3 g per day, 1.32 ± 0.40 g/kg/d), with lower protein intakes with increasing age i.e. in adults aged ≥ 65 y (82 ± 22 g, 1.15 ± 0.34 g/kg/d, $P<0.001$ for both). Differences in protein intake between age groups were more pronounced in males compared to females. Protein distribution followed a skewed pattern for all age groups (breakfast, 15 ± 10 g; lunch, 30 ± 15 g; dinner, 44 ± 17 g). Animal-based foods were the dominant protein source within the diet ($63\pm11\%$ vs. $37\pm11\%$ plant protein, $P<0.001$).

Conclusions: Protein intake and the number of meals reaching the purported threshold for maximising postprandial anabolism were highest in young, and lower with increasing age. **For main meals, breakfast provided the lowest quantity of protein across all age categories, and may represent an opportunity for improving protein distribution, whereas in older adults, increasing the number of meals reaching the anabolic threshold regardless of distribution pattern may be more appropriate.**

KEYWORDS

ageing; animal; diet record; nutrition survey; plant;

INTRODUCTION

The age-related decline in skeletal muscle mass and function (e.g. gait speed, strength) is a fundamental threat to healthy ageing, and maintaining independence and functional capacity in later life ⁽¹⁾. Lifestyle factors including physical activity and diet are important determinants of the rate of decline, which for the latter has recently focussed on habitual protein intake, pattern and sources ⁽²⁻⁵⁾. The European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) population reference intake (PRI) for dietary protein is currently set at 0.83 g of protein per kg body mass per day (g/kg/d) ⁽⁶⁾. This is a recommended intake based around the criterion of nutrition adequacy, but re-evaluation of these guidelines now suggests as much ~1.2 g/kg protein per day ⁽⁷⁾. This is similar to recommendations for protein intake in older adults for the maintenance of lean body mass (LBM) and physical function ⁽⁸⁾.

Ingestion of dietary protein acts as an anabolic stimulus by resulting in the stimulation of muscle protein synthesis (MPS) ⁽⁹⁻¹¹⁾. The control of skeletal muscle mass explained by temporal fluctuations in MPS and muscle protein breakdown (MPB) in response to nutrient intake, exercise and inactivity ultimately dictating the net gain or loss of human muscle protein ⁽¹²⁾. If each eating occasion (EO) is considered as an opportunity to increase rates of MPS, the cumulative magnitude and duration of postprandial MPS after the ingestion of each protein-containing meal determines the daily and long-term likelihood of a positive net protein balance ⁽²⁻⁵⁾. Therefore, targeting ‘per meal’ protein recommendations is emerging as a potential strategy to favour maintenance or accretion of skeletal muscle mass.

Protein ingestion of 0.24g/kg and 0.4g/kg body mass in young and old, respectively, maximises MPS after a single meal ^(9,10,13,14). **These doses are considered the threshold to be met or exceeded in order to maximally stimulate anabolism in skeletal muscle, and therefore** often translated as a recommendation of an “anabolic threshold” of 20 to 30g protein per EO. However, daily protein intake **in Western societies** usually follows a ‘skewed’ pattern of distribution in which protein intake is highest at dinner, but lower, and often below the anabolic threshold, at other meals and snacks ⁽¹⁵⁻¹⁹⁾. The larger protein dose at dinner is unlikely to provide an additional anabolic response **in skeletal muscle** above that achieved by 20 to 30g of high quality protein ^(9,10), and the resultant lower protein intakes at breakfast, lunch and snack times are likely to be suboptimal protein intakes for maximising MPS ^(9,10,13,14). Importantly, a skewed protein distribution pattern has been associated with an increase in incidence of frailty ⁽²⁰⁾, while the daily consumption of one or two main meals over the 30g protein per meal threshold is positively associated with greater LBM and strength in older adults ⁽²¹⁾.

Whether such observations are due to the protein distribution pattern, or the number of EOs in a day that exceed an anabolic threshold regardless of distribution pattern, remains to be fully established. For example, modulating protein distribution to provide an even protein intake at each meal, for example ≥20g high quality protein ingested at three main meals, results in higher rates of

MPS over 12 h in young men and women^(22,23). This effect would, in theory, result in a greater cumulative anabolic response over an extended period of time compared to a skewed pattern of protein intake. However, when examined in older adults, rates of MPS do not differ between even compared skewed patterns of protein distribution⁽²⁴⁻²⁶⁾. One potential explanation for discrepant findings between young and old is that an even distribution of protein intake for older adults means that each EO then fails to reach the higher anabolic threshold that is required in this population^(4,27).

The source of dietary protein is also of relevance, since animal proteins produce a greater postprandial anabolic response per equivalent dose of protein when compared to plant-based proteins⁽²⁸⁻³²⁾. The greater anabolic response is most likely due to the higher essential amino acid (EAA) content, and in particular leucine, of animal-based protein sources^(33,34).

Habitual dietary protein intake, protein distribution patterns and dietary sources in Irish adults remains underexplored. The National Adult Nutrition Survey (NANS) investigated habitual food and beverage consumption, lifestyle and health indicators in 1500 adults aged 18-90 years in the Republic of Ireland between 2008 and 2010. The series of interrelated databases, which has been compiled from the data collected in this survey, provide the most complete and up-to-date collection of food consumption data available for adults in Ireland, therefore offering valuable information about the protein intake pattern across sex and ages. The aim of this current study was to examine habitual dietary protein intakes, the patterns of protein distribution and dietary sources of protein in Irish adults and explore whether these habits are influenced by age and sex.

METHODS

Study population

This study is based on secondary analysis of National Adult Survey (NANS), a cross-sectional food consumption survey in Irish adults. The surveys were carried out by the Irish Universities Nutrition Alliance (IUNA; www.iuna.net) in a sample of 1500 free-living adults aged 18-90 years (males, $n=740$; females, $n=760$), in the Republic of Ireland between 2008 and 2010. Ethical approval was obtained from University College Cork Clinical Research Ethics Committee of the Cork Teaching Hospitals and the Human Ethics Research Committee of University College Dublin [ECM 3 (p) 4 September 2008]. Written consent was obtained from all participants in accordance with the *Declaration of Helsinki*. Respondents were randomly selected from a database of names and address from Data Ireland (An Post). Exclusion criteria include pregnancy, lactation and inability to complete the survey due to disability. The final survey response rate was 59.6%. The final sample was representative of the Irish population with respect to sex, age, location, social class and geographical location when compared to the most recent Irish census at that time (2007).

Primary anthropometric measures and dietary assessment

Anthropometric measurements were carried out by the researcher in the respondent's home. Body mass (kg), fat-free mass (kg), fat mass (kg) and percentage body fat were assessed by bioelectrical impedance analysis using a Tanita BC-420MA Body Composition Analyzer (Tanita Corporation, Tokyo, Japan), with measurements made in adherence with the manufacturer's guidelines at a measurement frequency of 50 Hz. Body composition estimates are derived from total body water based on segmental resistance index, and making use of proprietary equations developed by the manufacturer. Height was assessed using a Leicester portable height measure to the nearest 0.1cm. Body Mass Index (BMI) was calculated as body mass (kg) divided by height (m²). A four-day semi-weighed food diary, at brand level where possible, was used to collect food, beverage and supplement intake. Participants were asked to report at least one weekend day. The researchers made three visits to the respondent's homes during the four days: A visit to demonstrate how to use a food weighing scales and log the food diary; a second visit to review the diary 24-36 hours into the recording process; and a final visit 1-2 days after the recording period to review the last recording days and collect the diary. Food and beverage consumption was quantified using a food weighing scales (46%), a photographic food atlas (16%), a food portion size guide (11%), household measurements such as teaspoons, tablespoons, etc. (11%), manufacturers weights (10%), IUNA weight guide (4%) and an estimate made by the researcher (2%). Food and beverage intake was assessed using WISP version 3.0 (Tinuviel Software, Anglesey, UK). This analysis was based on data from the McCance and Widdowson's, The Composition of Foods, 5th and 6th Editions, as well as nine supplementary volumes. Modifications to the food composition database was also performed to include commonly consumed Irish foods. The anthropometric and dietary assessment carried out is described in further detail elsewhere⁽³⁵⁻³⁷⁾. The final food database comprised of 133,068 rows of data, with each row representing each food or beverage item at every EO throughout the four days of recording.

Secondary data analysis

This secondary analysis was carried out using SPSS (IBM SPSS Statistics Version 24). Respondents who reported an energy intake <1.1 of basal metabolic rate (BMR)⁽³⁸⁾ were determined as under-reporters (*n*=449) and were excluded from the present analysis. The final sample size was *n*=1051 (males, *n*=523; females, *n*=528). New variables were computed to determine relative macronutrient intake on a gram per kg basis (g/kg). Protein Distribution Scores (PDS)⁽³⁹⁾ were calculated for the following: PDS²⁰, PDS³⁰, PDS^{0.24g/kg}, PDS^{0.3g/kg}, PDS^{0.4g/kg}. PDS²⁰ and PDS³⁰ represents the number of EOs per day containing greater than 20g and 30g of protein, respectively, averaged across the four days. PDS^{0.24g/kg}, PDS^{0.3g/kg}, PDS^{0.4g/kg} represents the number of EOs per day containing greater than 0.24g/kg, 0.3g/kg and 0.4g/kg body mass of protein, averaged over the 4 days. PDS is a scoring system adapted from MacKenzie et al. (2015)⁽³⁹⁾ with the 0.24g/kg, 0.3g/kg and

0.4g/kg values being representative of the recommended per meal protein target to maximise MPS in young^(9,10) and old^(13,14). 2,048 pre-existing food codes were aggregated into 16 food groups based on foods of similar type and protein content. The percentage contribution of these food groups to total protein intake was determined. These foods codes were further aggregated into two broad groupings described as either animal- or plant-based foods based on observation of the principal contributing protein source. The total and percentage contribution of animal- and plant-based foods to total protein intake, as well as per meal protein intake, was determined.

In general, the distribution of the data approximated normality, or was transformed as appropriate to approximate normality to allow detection of significant differences between groups using a two-way ANOVA allowing for main and interaction effects of **sex***age, in which four age groups were created (18-35 y, 36-50 y, 51-64 y and ≥ 65 y). When main effects were indicated, post-hoc analysis using multiple comparisons with Bonferroni's adjustment was used to assess the differences between age groups. Statistical significance was accepted at $P < 0.05$.

RESULTS

Anthropometric measures

Anthropometric measures for the total population, each age group 18-35 y, 36-50 y, 51-64 y and ≥ 65 y, and males and females are presented in Supplemental Table 1. There was a **sex***age interaction for body fat, body fat percentage and waist-to-hip ratio (WTHR) ($P < 0.01$ for all), in which there were greater differences between ages 18-35 y and 36-50 y in males, compared to females, who had smaller differences between the age ranges. There were main effects for **sex** for all anthropometric measures ($P < 0.01$ for all). Males tended to have higher measures in height, body mass, BMI, WTHR and **fat-free** mass, compared to females, while females tended to have higher values than males for body fat percentage and fat mass (Supplemental Table 1).

There were main effects for age for differences in all anthropometric measures ($P < 0.001$ for all). Body mass, BMI, WTHR, body fat percentage, fat mass tended to be greater with increasing age. However, there was a lower body mass in adults aged ≥ 65 y compared to 51-64 y ($P < 0.01$). Height and **fat-free** mass tended to be lower with increasing age. However, for height, fat mass and **fat-free** mass, there was no significant difference between adults aged 35-50 y and 51-64 y (Supplemental Table 1).

Energy and macronutrient intakes

Average total daily energy, protein, carbohydrates and fat; and percentage of total energy intake for each macronutrient are presented in Supplemental Table 2, with energy and macronutrient intake relative to body mass, and expressed in gram/kilogram body mass per day (g/kg), presented in Table 1. There was a **sex***age interaction for total energy, protein (g/d) and relative protein intake

(g/kg)($P<0.01$ for all). Energy intake was greater in males between ages 35-50 y compared to 51-64 y, while intake in females in these age categories were similar. Total and relative protein intake in males was greatest in young, and was lower with increasing age, while protein intake was similar between age groups for females. There were main effects for **sex** for total and relative calorie and macronutrient intakes ($P<0.001$ for all). There was a tendency for males to have higher intakes compared to females for all total and relative energy and macronutrient intakes.

There were main effects for age for differences in all total and relative calorie and macronutrient intakes ($P<0.001$ for all). Total energy, protein, carbohydrate and fat intakes were greatest in young, and tended to be lower with increasing age. However, there was no significant difference between intakes for total energy and macronutrient intakes in adults aged 35-50 y and 51-64 y. Relative protein, carbohydrate and fat intake, were greater in adults aged 18-35 y compared to 36-50 y, 51-64 y and ≥ 65 y ($P<0.01$ for all) (Table 1). Total protein intake in adults aged ≥ 65 y was 81.6 ± 22.3 g/d, which was significantly lower than that of adults aged 18-35 y (96.1 ± 32.4 g/d, $P<0.001$) (Supplemental Table 2). Relative protein intake in adults aged ≥ 65 y was 1.15 ± 0.34 g/k/d, which was significantly lower than intakes in adults aged 18-35 y (1.32 ± 0.40 g/kg/d, $P<0.001$) (Table 1).

Protein distribution scores

Protein distribution scores PDS^{20} , PDS^{30} , $PDS^{0.24\text{g/kg}}$, $PDS^{0.3\text{g/kg}}$, $PDS^{0.4\text{g/kg}}$ representing the number of EOs per day containing, respectively, over 20g, 30g, 0.24g/kg, 0.3g/kg and 0.4g/kg of protein, are presented in Table 2. There was a **sex*age** interaction for PDS^{20} , PDS^{30} and $PDS^{0.3\text{g/kg}}$ ($P<0.05$), in which there were greater differences between age groups for males, compared to females. There were main effects for **sex** for PDS^{20} , PDS^{30} , $PDS^{0.24\text{g/kg}}$, $PDS^{0.3\text{g/kg}}$ and $PDS^{0.4\text{g/kg}}$ ($P<0.05$ for all) in which males had higher scores than females for all PDS scores.

There were main effects for age in PDS^{20} , PDS^{30} , and $PDS^{0.4\text{g/kg}}$ and $PDS^{0.3\text{g/kg}}$ ($P<0.01$ for all). This revealed that the daily number of meals reaching these thresholds was lower with increasing age. However, for PDS^{30} , $PDS^{0.3\text{g/kg}}$ and $PDS^{0.4\text{g/kg}}$ there was no difference between ages 51-64 y and ≥ 65 y (Table 3).

Protein distribution represented by the average per meal protein intake, and the relative contribution of animal- and plant-based protein to total per meal protein intake are presented in Figure 1. Protein distribution followed a skewed pattern for all age groups (breakfast, 15 ± 10 g; lunch, 30 ± 15 g; dinner, 44 ± 17 g).

Contribution of food source to total calorie and protein intake

The contribution of animal- and plant-based proteins to overall protein and energy intake are presented in Table 3. There was a **sex*age** interaction for animal protein only ($P<0.001$) in which there were greater difference between age groups for males, compared to females. There were main effects for **sex** for all variables in Table 3 ($P<0.05$ for all), in which females tended to have a higher

percentage of protein and energy from plant-based foods compared to males, while males had a higher percentage of protein from animal-based foods compared to females. There were main effects for age for all variables in Table 3 ($P<0.05$ for all), in which total animal- and plant-based protein intake showed lower intakes with increasing age.

Percentage protein intake from animal-based protein was significantly greater in adults aged ≥ 65 y, while percentage protein intake from plant-based protein was significantly lower in adults aged ≥ 65 y (Table 3). The percentage contribution of sixteen food groups to total protein intake across each age group is presented in Figure 2. The composition of these food groups is described in Supplemental Table 3. In each age group, meat, dairy and breads were the predominant protein sources, accounting for $40\pm 15\%$, $15\pm 9\%$ and $12\pm 6\%$ in the total population, respectively.

DISCUSSION

The daily intake, per meal dose, distribution pattern and food source of dietary protein are critical determinants of the anabolic response to protein-containing meals, and potentially influence skeletal muscle health across the life course. The present study identifies that, in this Irish adult cohort, total protein intake, and protein intake relative to body mass are generally lower with increasing age, with males typically consuming more protein than females, and greater difference apparent between age groups for males. The average number of meals per day reaching purported per meal protein thresholds to maximise MPS is typically lower with increasing age, but with males achieving a higher PDS score compared to females across age groups. Protein distribution across the day follows a skewed pattern across each age group, in which dinner represents the highest per meal protein intake, followed by lunch and breakfast. Animal-based foods are the dominant source of protein with meat and dairy having the largest contribution to total protein intake in all age groups, but plant-based protein sources are the predominant protein source at breakfast.

The National Adult Nutrition Survey (NANS) from which the present data set is derived was a cross-sectional food survey completed between 2008 and 2010 by the Irish Universities Nutrition Alliance. The sample was representative of the Irish population with respect to sex, age, urban–rural continuum, and social class as per the 2006 Irish census. Previous outputs have focussed on dietary factors such as vitamin D, folate, vitamin B12 and whole grain intakes across the population⁽³⁵⁻³⁷⁾, whereas the present study focussed on the various aspects of habitual protein intake patterns.

In this Irish adult cohort, daily total and relative protein intakes are lower in older adults compared to younger adults, by an average of $\sim 13\%$ in terms of relative protein intake. For example, adults aged 18-35 y typically consume 96 ± 3 g (or 1.32 ± 0.40 g/kg) per day, while adults aged ≥ 65 y consume less at 82 ± 22 g (or 1.15 ± 0.34 g/kg). These averages exceed the EFSA PRI for dietary protein of 0.83 g/kg/d⁽⁶⁾, a recommended intake based on nutrition adequacy, but are closer to intakes $\sim 50\%$

236 higher per day at ~ 1.2 g/kg/d of protein proposed by authors focussed on optimal intakes for healthy
237 ageing ^(7,8). Lower daily protein intake with increasing age has been reported elsewhere in Western
238 populations ^(15,40,41). For example, in the USA, the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey
239 (NHANES) 2003-2004 reported daily protein intake in young adults aged 19-30 years was 91 ± 22 g/d
240 (or 1.3 ± 0.4 g/kg; $n=874$), and in older adults aged >71 years was 66 ± 17 g/d (or 1.0 ± 0.3 g/kg; $n=818$)
241 ⁽⁴⁰⁾. Despite the lower total and relative protein intake with increasing age, because energy intake was
242 lower with each age group increment, the percentage contribution of protein to total energy intake
243 was higher with increasing age. Energy intake is positively correlated with protein intake in older
244 adults, and therefore daily energy intake is an important determinant of habitual protein intake ⁽¹⁵⁾.
245 The decline in energy intake and increase in percentage contribution of protein have both been
246 previously observed in a European population ⁽⁴¹⁾. Several factors are likely to contribute to reduction
247 in energy intake in older adults including a decrease in appetite with age, the higher cost of more
248 nutrient-dense foods, difficulty chewing fibrous foods, perceived food intolerances and fear of eating
249 excessive fat and cholesterol in foods ⁽⁴²⁻⁴⁴⁾. However, the absence of difference between intakes for
250 total energy, carbohydrate, protein and fat in adults aged 35-50 y and 51-64 y suggests that adults in
251 these middle age groups tend to eat a similar overall energy and macronutrient profile.

252 In comparing by **sex**, Irish male adults typically consume more protein, by an average of
253 $\sim 11\%$ in terms of relative protein intake, than females across the whole population (105 ± 27 g and
254 1.31 ± 0.36 g/kg vs. 76 ± 19 g and 1.16 ± 0.33 g/kg, respectively). This **sex** effect is similar to the Italian
255 national food consumption survey, which reported that males aged 18-65 y consumed 93 ± 25 protein
256 per day, and females consumed 76 ± 20 protein per day ⁽⁴⁵⁾. However, in the present study, there was
257 **sex*age** interaction effect for total and relative protein intakes in which males had lower protein
258 intakes with each increment in age category, while there was no difference in protein intake between
259 females aged 35-50 y and 51-64 y. This lack of difference may be related to an increase in dairy
260 intake, which is often promoted by healthcare practitioners as females approach peri-menopausal age
261 as a prophylactic for osteoporosis ⁽⁴⁶⁾.

262 The protein distribution pattern over the course of a typical day **is a key determinant of**
263 cumulative rates of MPS ⁽²⁻⁵⁾. Furthermore, there is an increased recognition of importance of per
264 meal protein recommendations, with 20 to 30g of high quality protein, or 0.24-0.40g/kg protein per
265 meal, **proposed** as the dose needed to maximise MPS from young to old ^(9,10,13,14). The general pattern
266 of protein intake across this Irish adult cohort was skewed as evidenced by intakes of 15 ± 10 g, 30 ± 15
267 and 44 ± 17 g at breakfast, lunch and dinner, respectively. A skewed pattern of protein intake has been
268 widely-reported elsewhere in Western societies ⁽¹⁵⁻²¹⁾. For example, in the adults aged ≥ 65 y,
269 breakfast, lunch and dinner accounted for 15%, 29% and 37% of average daily protein intake, which
270 is similar to previous findings in a similar aged community-dwelling cohort, in which these meals

271 accounted for 16%, 31% and 38% of total protein intake respectively ⁽¹⁵⁾. While similar in protein
272 distribution, per meal protein intake in the present study is more optimal, as both lunch and dinner
273 potentially meet the 20 to 30g threshold (15 ± 7 g, 29 ± 14 g and 37 ± 16 g at breakfast, lunch and dinner,
274 respectively), due to a higher overall protein intake (82 ± 22 vs. 71 ± 18 g/d) compared to the previous
275 work ⁽¹⁵⁾. However, inevitably due to the large variability in protein intake for lunch and dinner, there
276 are people who still fell below these protein thresholds for those meal times. Regardless, breakfast in
277 the present study was representative of a suboptimal per meal protein intake, which is a worthy
278 consideration when designing strategies to minimise the decline in muscle mass with age. Indeed, a
279 nutrition intervention targeting supplemental dairy protein intake at breakfast and lunch (0.17g/kg
280 protein/ $\sim$ 12g protein per meal) was successful in increasing in LBM over 24 weeks in Irish adults
281 aged 50-70 y even in the absence of exercise training ⁽⁴⁷⁾.

282 While the distribution of protein across the day provides a useful perspective, the PDS has
283 been proposed as an objective measure to quantify protein distribution based on per meal thresholds
284 ⁽³⁹⁾. The PDS describes the number of EOs per day where protein intake meets or exceeds a pre-
285 defined threshold, **primarily with a focus on maximising the anabolic response in skeletal muscle to**
286 **an EO**. PDS²⁰ and PDS³⁰ (the number of EOs ≥ 20 g or ≥ 30 g per day, respectively) were generally
287 lower with increasing age. For example, adults aged 18-35 y had 1.73 ± 0.60 EOs containing 20g of
288 protein, whereas adults aged ≥ 65 y had less EOs providing ≥ 20 g protein (1.45 ± 0.51). Mirroring the
289 trend for daily protein intake, there were greater differences in PDS²⁰, PDS³⁰ and PDS^{0.3g/kg} between
290 age groups for males compared to females, who showed smaller differences between age groups.
291 Given that protein intake relative to body mass is the most appropriate metric for age-related
292 comparisons ⁽¹⁴⁾, PDS was determined on per meal protein intake based on EOs reaching 0.24g/kg,
293 0.3g/kg and 0.4g/kg. There was no difference in the number of EOs reaching 0.24g/kg protein across
294 age groups, which averaged ~ 1.8 EOs per day in the whole cohort. At the threshold of 0.4g/kg per
295 EO, young adults aged 18-35 y had a greater number of EOs (1.19 ± 0.51) than all other age groups.
296 In fact, for PDS^{0.4g/kg} many adults aged ≥ 65 y failed to meet or exceed this threshold even once on a
297 daily basis as evidenced by a group average of 0.98 ± 0.43 EOs. In contrast to the present findings, in
298 community-dwelling adults aged >70 y in United Kingdom, adults meeting the 0.4g/kg protein per
299 meal threshold for eating EO 1, 2 and 3 was 3%, 42% and 68% ⁽⁴⁸⁾. These are different protein
300 distribution trends to that found in the present analysis. However, that work ⁽⁴⁸⁾ assessed a cohort of
301 $n=38$, while the present analysis of ≥ 65 y was $n=144$, and was a nationally representative survey,
302 such that the dietary intakes reported therein are less likely to be representative of intakes for the
303 entire older population.

304 In any case, the **patterns of protein distribution and/or the numbers of meals reaching an age-**
305 **appropriate anabolic threshold** in this Irish cohort are representative of patterns that **are** suboptimal

306 compared to recent guidelines for healthy ageing ⁽²⁻⁵⁾. The **potential** importance of an even protein
307 distribution **as an influence on** skeletal muscle size and function **has been demonstrated**. For example,
308 **in older adults** while there was no difference frailty status (frail, pre-frail and non-frail) for total
309 protein intake, frail participants tended to have a more uneven protein distribution, with a lower intake
310 at breakfast and higher at lunch (11.9% and 61.4% of total protein consumed at breakfast and lunch
311 in frail), whereas more evenly distributed pattern of protein intake was prevalent in the non-frail older
312 adults ⁽²⁰⁾. Furthermore, there is a positive correlation between per meal protein with muscle size and
313 function ⁽²¹⁾. Based on data from NHANES 1999-2001, **middle-to-older aged** respondents who
314 consumed one or two main meals over the 30g protein per meal threshold had greater LBM and
315 strength. Indeed, there was a positive dose-response relationship between protein meal thresholds
316 (15g/meal, 20g/meal, 25g/meal) and leg LBM and strength, with this association plateauing at
317 30g/meal when two meals met this threshold and plateauing at 45g/meal when one meal met this
318 threshold ⁽²¹⁾. These data support the notion that a more evenly-distributed protein intake, one in
319 which per meal anabolic thresholds are met, could be more favourable for supporting healthy ageing
320 by augmenting or maintaining LBM and strength.

321 The source of protein (animal vs. plant) was the final focus of the present study, since animal-
322 based proteins have been reported to elicit a greater postprandial increase in MPS ⁽²⁸⁻³²⁾. In the present
323 analysis of Irish adults intakes, dietary protein is derived predominantly from animal sources (animal
324 protein, 63.1±10.8% vs. plant protein, 36.9±10.8%). Meat (39.8±14.5%) and dairy (15.0±8.5%) had
325 the largest percentage contribution to total protein intake across both **sexes** and all age groups. This
326 is similar to findings in an older Dutch population, in which 60% of dietary protein consumed
327 originated from animal sources, with meat and dairy as dominant sources ⁽¹⁵⁾, and ~70% protein intake
328 from animal protein and ~30% from plant protein, in adults aged 29-86 y in the USA ⁽⁴⁹⁾.

329 When assessed on a per meal basis, lunch (63±19%) and dinner (72±16%) had the greatest
330 animal protein contribution, whereas breakfast was predominantly plant protein (57±22%). The
331 divergent sources at morning versus afternoon and evening EOs have been reported in both Dutch
332 elderly and athletes ^(15,19), and were quantitatively similar to the present study. Breakfast, therefore,
333 is likely to contain a lower EAA content compared to lunch and dinner ^(33,34), and combined with the
334 lower total protein intake at breakfast described above, indicates a clear opportunity for improvement.
335 Emphasising adequate, high quality protein at breakfast is a necessary consideration when applying
336 the per meal protein targets in practice **across the life course** ^(33,34). That said, protein sources may
337 differentially affect LBM compared to strength as in cross-sectional data, animal protein intake in
338 associated with the former and plant protein intake is associated with the latter ⁽⁴⁹⁾. **However,**
339 **consideration must also be given to the ever-growing ecological debate around sustainable diets, and**
340 **in particular whether the emphasis on animal sources of protein will present greater environmental**

341 impacts compared to plant sources of protein. Exploring alternative protein sources and transitioning
342 towards greater contribution of plant protein may be encouraged on the assumption that these
343 approaches have less environmental impact, are more sustainable, and satisfy nutrition requirements
344 in relevant populations ^(2,34). That said, in older adults a priority could be placed on animal-based
345 protein sources because when equal but small portions of animal or plant-based proteins sources are
346 consumed, animal sources on average contain more protein per calorie than a similar portion of a
347 plant source of protein ^(33,34).

348 Moreover, recommendations to increase protein intake at breakfast should not be taken out of
349 context, and applied in a manner that may compromise the overall health of an individual's diet. For
350 example, the consumption of highly processed meats, which are associated with an increased risk of
351 heart disease, stroke, diabetes mellitus and cancers ^(50,51), should continue to be discouraged.
352 Similarly, consideration of the age-appropriateness of strategies is warranted. Unlike in young adults
353 ^(22,23), an even distribution of protein does not increase short-term MPS in older adults when compared
354 to a skewed distribution ⁽²⁴⁻²⁶⁾. Because of the generally lower daily intake of protein, and higher
355 anabolic threshold in older adults, prescribing an even distribution of protein may paradoxically result
356 in less EOs per day reaching the anabolic threshold for this population ^(4,27). The aforementioned data
357 indicate that the average number of EOs that meet or exceed the 0.4 g/kg threshold is <1 in those
358 aged >65 y in this Irish cohort. Advising this age group to increase the frequency of meals that exceed
359 this threshold may be more appropriate than focussing on achieving an even distribution pattern
360 throughout the day. Therefore, a more evenly-distributed protein intake may be a favourable strategy
361 for the maintenance of LBM and strength in early-to-middle age, which in turn would confer benefits
362 to skeletal muscle health across the life course, but may not be optimal as an intervention strategy in
363 older age. The feasibility of these potential strategies in older adults needs to be assessed, in particular
364 whether higher protein intakes at certain eating occasions will influence subsequent food intake, and
365 whether higher protein diets are feasible because of reduced appetite, dislike of certain protein-dense
366 foods, or the inability to masticate protein-rich foods such as meat ^(4,27).

367 In conclusion, this study is the first to report habitual protein intake patterns in Irish adults
368 using data from the national food survey, NANS. The trends for daily protein intake, protein
369 distribution pattern and dietary sources of protein are broadly similar to those reported by European
370 and north American food surveys. While daily protein intake is adequate to satisfy population
371 reference intake guidelines, the number of EOs reaching purported threshold for maximising
372 postprandial anabolism is lower with increasing age, and given the commensurate distribution pattern,
373 is likely to be suboptimal for healthy ageing for skeletal muscle health. For main meals, breakfast
374 provided the lowest quantity of protein across all age categories, and is the lowest animal protein-
375 containing main meal. Since both protein dose and protein source strongly dictate the postprandial

376 anabolic response to a meal, breakfast may represent an opportunity for improving overall protein
377 intake, and protein distribution. **Alternatively, in older adults increasing the number of meals reaching**
378 **an age-appropriate anabolic threshold, regardless of distribution pattern, may be a more efficacious**
379 **strategy.** These divergent, albeit related, approaches are important considerations both for public
380 health strategies that would target age-associated declines in skeletal muscle mass and function, and
381 for future research in the same paradigm.

382

383 TRANSPARENCY DECLARATION

384 The lead author affirms that this manuscript is an honest, accurate, and transparent account of
385 the study being reported. The reporting of this work is compliant with STROBE guidelines. The lead
386 author affirms that no important aspects of the study have been omitted.

387

388 REFERENCES

- 389 1. Wolfe RR. The underappreciated role of muscle in health and disease. Am. J. Clin. Nutr. 2006;84(3):475-482.
- 390 2. Lonnie M, Hooker E, Brunstrom JM, et al. Protein for Life: Review of Optimal Protein Intake,
391 Sustainable Dietary Sources and the Effect on Appetite in Ageing Adults. Nutrients. 2018;10(3):E360.
- 392 3. Layman DK, Anthony TG, Rasmussen BB, et al. Defining meal requirements for protein to
393 optimize metabolic roles of amino acids. Am J Clin Nutr. 2015;101(6):1330S-1338S.
- 394 4. Traylor DA, Gorissen SHM, Phillips SM. Perspective: Protein Requirements and Optimal
395 Intakes in Aging: Are We Ready to Recommend More Than the Recommended Daily
396 Allowance? Adv Nutr. 2018;9(3):171-182.
- 397 5. Paddon-Jones D, Campbell WW, Jacques PF, et al. Protein and healthy aging. Am J Clin Nutr. 2015;101(6):1339S-1345S.
- 398 6. EFSA. Scientific Opinion on Dietary Reference Values for Protein. EFSA Journal. 2012;10(2):2557.
- 399 7. Elango R, Ball RO, Pencharz PB. Individual amino acid requirements in humans: an update.
400 Curr. Opin. Clin. Nutr. Metab Care. 2008;11(1):34-39.
- 401 8. Deutz NE, Bauer JM, Barazzoni R, et al. Protein intake and exercise for optimal muscle
402 function with aging: Recommendations from the ESPEN Expert Group. Clin. Nutr. 2014;33(6):929-936.
- 403 9. Moore DR, Robinson MJ, Fry JL, et al. Ingested protein dose response of muscle and albumin
404 protein synthesis after resistance exercise in young men. Am. J Clin. Nutr. 2009;89(1):161-168.
- 405 10. Witard OC, Jackman SR, Breen L, Smith K, Selby A, Tipton KD. Myofibrillar muscle protein
406 synthesis rates subsequent to a meal in response to increasing doses of whey protein at rest
407 and after resistance exercise. Am J Clin Nutr. 2014;99(1):86-95.
- 408 11. Pennings B, Groen B, de Lange A, et al. Amino acid absorption and subsequent muscle
409 protein accretion following graded intakes of whey protein in elderly men. Am J Physiol
410 Endocrinol Metab. 2012;302(8):E992-999.
- 411 12. Rennie MJ, Wackerhage H, Spangenburg EE, Booth FW. Control of the size of the human
412 muscle mass. Annu. Rev. Physiol. 2004;66:799-828.
- 413
- 414
- 415
- 416
- 417
- 418

- 419 13. Symons TB, Sheffield-Moore M, Wolfe RR, Paddon-Jones D. A moderate serving of high-
420 quality protein maximally stimulates skeletal muscle protein synthesis in young and elderly
421 subjects. *J Am Diet Assoc.* 2009;109(9):1582-1586.
- 422 14. Moore DR, Churchward-Venne TA, Witard O, et al. Protein ingestion to stimulate
423 myofibrillar protein synthesis requires greater relative protein intakes in healthy older versus
424 younger men. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci.* 2015;70(1):57-62.
- 425 15. Tieland M, Borgonjen-Van den Berg KJ, Van Loon LJ, de Groot LC. Dietary Protein Intake
426 in Dutch Elderly People: A Focus on Protein Sources. *Nutrients.* 2015;7(12):9697-9706.
- 427 16. Tieland M, Borgonjen-Van den Berg KJ, van Loon LJ, de Groot LC. Dietary protein intake
428 in community-dwelling, frail, and institutionalized elderly people: scope for improvement.
429 *Eur J Nutr.* 2012;51(2):173-179.
- 430 17. Mathias KC, Almoosawi S, Karagounis LG. Protein and Energy Intakes Are Skewed toward
431 the Evening among Children and Adolescents in the United States: NHANES 2013-2014. *J*
432 *Nutr.* 2017;147(6):1160-1166.
- 433 18. Mishra S, Goldman JD, Sahyoun NR, Moshfegh AJ. Association between dietary protein
434 intake and grip strength among adults aged 51 years and over: What We Eat in America,
435 National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey 2011-2014. *PLoS One.*
436 2018;13(1):e0191368.
- 437 19. Gillen JB, Trommelen J, Wardenaar FC, et al. Dietary Protein Intake and Distribution Patterns
438 of Well-Trained Dutch Athletes. *Int J Sport Nutr Exerc Metab.* 2017;27(2):105-114.
- 439 20. Bollwein J, Diekmann R, Kaiser MJ, et al. Distribution but not amount of protein intake is
440 associated with frailty: a cross-sectional investigation in the region of Nurnberg. *Nutr. J.*
441 2013;12(1):109.
- 442 21. Loenneke JP, Loprinzi PD, Murphy CH, Phillips SM. Per meal dose and frequency of protein
443 consumption is associated with lean mass and muscle performance. *Clin Nutr.*
444 2016;35(6):1506-1511.
- 445 22. Areta JL, Burke LM, Ross ML, et al. Timing and distribution of protein ingestion during
446 prolonged recovery from resistance exercise alters myofibrillar protein synthesis. *J Physiol.*
447 2013;591(9):2319-2331.
- 448 23. Mamerow MM, Mettler JA, English KL, et al. Dietary Protein Distribution Positively
449 Influences 24-h Muscle Protein Synthesis in Healthy Adults. *J Nutr.* 2014;144(6):876-880.
- 450 24. Kim IY, Schutzler S, Schrader A, et al. Quantity of dietary protein intake, but not pattern of
451 intake, affects net protein balance primarily through differences in protein synthesis in older
452 adults. *Am J Physiol Endocrinol Metab.* 2015;308(1):E21-28.
- 453 25. Kim IY, Schutzler S, Schrader AM, et al. Protein intake distribution pattern does not affect
454 anabolic response, lean body mass, muscle strength or function over 8 weeks in older adults:
455 A randomized-controlled trial. *Clin Nutr.* 2018;37(2):488-493.
- 456 26. Murphy CH, Churchward-Venne TA, Mitchell CJ, et al. Hypoenergetic diet-induced
457 reductions in myofibrillar protein synthesis are restored with resistance training and balanced
458 daily protein ingestion in older men. *Am J Physiol Endocrinol Metab.* 2015;308(9):E734-743.
- 459 27. Kim IY, Deutz NEP, Wolfe RR. Update on maximal anabolic response to dietary protein.
460 *Clin Nutr.* 2018;37(2):411-418.
- 461 28. Tang JE, Moore DR, Kujbida GW, Tarnopolsky MA, Phillips SM. Ingestion of whey
462 hydrolysate, casein, or soy protein isolate: effects on mixed muscle protein synthesis at rest
463 and following resistance exercise in young men. *J. Appl. Physiol (1985.).* 2009;107(3):987-
464 992.
- 465 29. Hartman JW, Tang JE, Wilkinson SB, et al. Consumption of fat-free fluid milk after resistance
466 exercise promotes greater lean mass accretion than does consumption of soy or carbohydrate
467 in young, novice, male weightlifters. *Am J Clin Nutr.* 2007;86(2):373-381.
- 468 30. Yang Y, Churchward-Venne TA, Burd NA, Breen L, Tarnopolsky MA, Phillips SM.
469 Myofibrillar protein synthesis following ingestion of soy protein isolate at rest and after
470 resistance exercise in elderly men. *Nutr Metab (Lond).* 2012;9(1):57.

- 471 31. Gorissen SH, Horstman AM, Franssen R, et al. Ingestion of Wheat Protein Increases In Vivo
472 Muscle Protein Synthesis Rates in Healthy Older Men in a Randomized Trial. *J Nutr.*
473 2016;146(9):1651-1659.
- 474 32. Wilkinson SB, Tarnopolsky MA, Macdonald MJ, Macdonald JR, Armstrong D, Phillips SM.
475 Consumption of fluid skim milk promotes greater muscle protein accretion after resistance
476 exercise than does consumption of an isonitrogenous and isoenergetic soy-protein beverage.
477 *Am. J. Clin. Nutr.* 2007;85(4):1031-1040.
- 478 33. van Vliet S, Burd NA, van Loon LJ. The Skeletal Muscle Anabolic Response to Plant- versus
479 Animal-Based Protein Consumption. *J Nutr.* 2015;145(9):1981-1991.
- 480 34. Gorissen SHM, Witard OC. Characterising the muscle anabolic potential of dairy, meat and
481 plant-based protein sources in older adults. *Proc Nutr Soc.* 2018;77(1):20-31.
- 482 35. Cashman KD, Muldowney S, McNulty B, et al. Vitamin D status of Irish adults: findings from
483 the National Adult Nutrition Survey. *Br J Nutr.* 2013;109(7):1248-1256.
- 484 36. Hopkins SM, Gibney MJ, Nugent AP, et al. Impact of voluntary fortification and supplement
485 use on dietary intakes and biomarker status of folate and vitamin B-12 in Irish adults. *Am J*
486 *Clin Nutr.* 2015;101(6):1163-1172.
- 487 37. O'Donovan CB, Devlin NF, Buffini M, et al. Whole grain intakes in Irish adults: findings
488 from the National Adults Nutrition Survey (NANS). *Eur J Nutr.* 2019;58(2):541-550.
- 489 38. McGowan MJ, Harrington KE, Kiely M, Robson PJ, Livingstone MB, Gibney MJ. An
490 evaluation of energy intakes and the ratio of energy intake to estimated basal metabolic rate
491 (EI/BMR_{est}) in the North/South Ireland Food Consumption Survey. *Public Health Nutr.*
492 2001;4(5a):1043-1050.
- 493 39. MacKenzie K, Slater G, King N, Byrne N. The Measurement and Interpretation of Dietary
494 Protein Distribution During a Rugby Preseason. *Int J Sport Nutr Exerc Metab.*
495 2015;25(4):353-358.
- 496 40. Fulgoni VL, 3rd. Current protein intake in America: analysis of the National Health and
497 Nutrition Examination Survey, 2003-2004. *Am J Clin Nutr.* 2008;87(5):1554s-1557s.
- 498 41. Ruiz E, Avila JM, Valero T, et al. Energy Intake, Profile, and Dietary Sources in the Spanish
499 Population: Findings of the ANIBES Study. *Nutrients.* 2015;7(6):4739-4762.
- 500 42. Morley JE. Decreased food intake with aging. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci.* 2001;56 Spec
501 No 2:81-88.
- 502 43. Bauer J, Biolo G, Cederholm T, et al. Evidence-based recommendations for optimal dietary
503 protein intake in older people: a position paper from the PROT-AGE Study Group. *J Am Med*
504 *Dir Assoc.* 2013;14(8):542-559.
- 505 44. Malafarina V, Uriz-Otano F, Gil-Guerrero L, Iniesta R. The anorexia of ageing:
506 physiopathology, prevalence, associated comorbidity and mortality. A systematic review.
507 *Maturitas.* 2013;74(4):293-302.
- 508 45. Sette S, Le Donne C, Piccinelli R, Arcella D, Turrini A, Leclercq C. The third Italian National
509 Food Consumption Survey, INRAN-SCAI 2005-06--part 1: nutrient intakes in Italy. *Nutr*
510 *Metab Cardiovasc Dis.* 2011;21(12):922-932.
- 511 46. Munger RG, Cerhan JR, Chiu BC. Prospective study of dietary protein intake and risk of hip
512 fracture in postmenopausal women. *Am J Clin Nutr.* 1999;69(1):147-152.
- 513 47. Norton C, Toomey C, McCormack WG, et al. Protein Supplementation at Breakfast and
514 Lunch for 24 Weeks beyond Habitual Intakes Increases Whole-Body Lean Tissue Mass in
515 Healthy Older Adults. *J Nutr.* 2016;146(1):65-69.
- 516 48. Cardon-Thomas DK, Riviere T, Tieges Z, Greig CA. Dietary Protein in Older Adults:
517 Adequate Daily Intake but Potential for Improved Distribution. *Nutrients.* 2017;9(3):E184.
- 518 49. Sahni S, Mangano KM, Hannan MT, Kiel DP, McLean RR. Higher Protein Intake Is
519 Associated with Higher Lean Mass and Quadriceps Muscle Strength in Adult Men and
520 Women. *J Nutr.* 2015;145(7):1569-1575.
- 521 50. Chan DS, Lau R, Aune D, et al. Red and processed meat and colorectal cancer incidence:
522 meta-analysis of prospective studies. *PLoS One.* 2011;6(6):e20456.

- 523 51. Micha R, Wallace SK, Mozaffarian D. Red and processed meat consumption and risk of
524 incident coronary heart disease, stroke, and diabetes mellitus: a systematic review and meta-
525 analysis. *Circulation*. 2010;121(21):2271-2283.
526
527

Table 1. Overview of energy and macronutrient intake relative to body mass (grams per kilogram body mass) for all participants, across **sex and age groups.**

		All Ages mean±SD	18-35 y mean±SD	36-50 y mean±SD	51-64 y mean±SD	≥65 y mean±SD	Sex	P Value Age	S*A
Energy intake (kcal/kg/day)	All	30.7±7.6	34.0±8.1 ^{bcd}	29.8±6.3 ^{ad}	28.8±6.2 ^a	27.0±7.6 ^{ab}	<0.001	<0.001	0.571
	Males	32.6±7.6	35.8±7.7	31.4±6.1	30.0±6.2	28.6±7.7			
	Females	28.9±7.3	31.8±8.0	28.3±6.1	27.7±6.1	25.8±7.3			
Protein (g/kg/day)	All	1.23±0.35	1.32±0.40 ^{bcd}	1.21±0.31 ^a	1.18±0.30 ^a	1.15±0.34 ^a	<0.001	<0.001	0.01
	Males	1.31±0.36	1.43±0.42	1.28±0.27	1.20±0.30	1.16±0.32			
	Females	1.16±0.33	1.18±0.33	1.15±0.33	1.15±0.31	1.13±0.35			
Carbohydrate (g/kg/day)	All	3.49±0.98	3.78±1.01 ^{bcd}	3.39±0.92 ^a	3.35±0.92 ^a	3.16±0.94 ^a	<0.001	<0.001	0.86
	Males	3.65±1.03	3.93±1.03	3.53±1.01	3.46±0.93	3.29±1.00			
	Females	3.34±0.91	3.59±0.95	3.27±0.81	3.25±0.91	3.06±0.89			
Fat (g/kg/day)	All	1.17±0.37	1.28±0.37 ^{bcd}	1.14±0.32 ^a	1.09±0.34 ^a	1.06±0.43 ^a	0.001	<0.001	0.944
	Males	1.22±0.39	1.31±0.38	1.19±0.34	1.13±0.36	1.12±0.47			
	Females	1.13±0.35	1.24±0.37	1.10±0.31	1.06±0.31	1.01±0.39			

Values are expressed as mean±standard deviation. *n* =964 [18-35 y; 36-50 y; 51-64 y; ≥65 y, *n*=356; 279;185;144]; males, *n*=475 [18-35 y; 36-50 y; 51-64 y; ≥65 y, *n*=195; 128; 88; 64]; females, *n*=489 [18-35 y; 36-50 y; 51-64 y; ≥65 y, *n*=161; 151; 97; 80]. A two-way ANOVA was performed (**Sex***Age). When *P*<0.05, post-hoc analysis with Bonferroni's adjustment was used to determine where differences existed between age groups. Difference existing between age groups is indicated by: ^a *P*<0.05 vs. 18-35 years; by ^b *P*<0.05 vs. 36-50 years; ^c *P*<0.05 vs. 51-64 years; ^d *P*<0.05 vs. ≥65 years.

Table 2: Protein Distribution Scores (PDS) for all participants, across sex and age groups.

		All Ages mean±SD	18-35 y mean±SD	36-50 y mean±SD	51-64 y mean±SD	≥65 y mean±SD	Sex	P Value Age	S*A
PDS (20g)*	All	1.64±0.57	1.73±0.60 ^{cd}	1.64±0.57 ^d	1.61±0.51 ^{ad}	1.45±0.51 ^{abc}	<0.001	<0.001	0.003
	Males	1.88±0.56	2.01±0.55	1.91±0.54	1.79±0.51	1.62±0.56			
	Females	1.39±0.47	1.40±0.48	1.41±0.49	1.45±0.46	1.30±0.41			
PDS (30g)*	All	1.08±0.51	1.21±0.57 ^{bcd}	1.05±0.51 ^a	0.98±0.43 ^a	0.96±0.42 ^a	<0.001	<0.001	0.002
	Males	1.34±0.49	1.48±0.52	1.35±0.47	1.21±0.38	1.13±0.45			
	Females	0.82±0.39	0.87±0.42	0.79±0.38	0.78±0.37	0.81±0.33			
PDS (0.24g/kg)**	All	1.81±0.56	1.86±0.55	1.81±0.54	1.76±0.56	1.73±0.60	0.02	0.105	0.057
	Males	1.89±0.54	1.97±0.55	1.91±0.50	1.75±0.50	1.77±0.59			
	Females	1.73±0.57	1.74±0.53	1.72±0.56	1.78±0.61	1.70±0.61			
PDS (0.3g/kg)**	All	1.47±0.52	1.55±0.53 ^{cd}	1.45±0.50	1.42±0.49 ^a	1.39±0.53 ^a	<0.001	0.005	0.015
	Males	1.56±0.51	1.67±0.52	1.55±0.46	1.42±0.44	1.41±0.53			
	Females	1.39±0.51	1.41±0.49	1.37±0.51	1.41±0.53	1.37±0.52			
PDS (0.4g/kg)**	All	1.07±0.47	1.19±0.51 ^{bcd}	1.02±0.44 ^a	0.98±0.41 ^a	0.98±0.43 ^a	<0.001	<0.001	0.493
	Males	1.17±0.46	1.28±0.52	1.15±0.40	1.05±0.39	1.05±0.41			
	Females	0.97±0.45	1.07±0.47	0.91±0.45	0.92±0.42	0.93±0.43			

Values are expressed as mean±standard deviation. PDS²⁰ and PDS³⁰ represent the number of eating occasions per day containing over 20g and 30g of protein, averaged across the 4 days. PDS^{0.24g/kg}, PDS^{0.3g/kg}, PDS^{0.4g/kg} represent the number of eating occasions per day containing over the 0.24g/kg, 0.3g/kg and 0.4g/kg body mass of protein, averaged over the 4 days. *n values, total populations, n =1051 [18-35 y; 36-50 y; 51-64 y; ≥65 y, n=377; 308; 204; 162]; males, n=523 [18-35 y; 36-50 y; 51-64 y; ≥65 y, n=207; 143; 98; 75]; females, n=528 [18-35 y; 36-50 y; 51-64 y; ≥65 y, n=170; 165; 106; 87]. **n values, total populations, n =964 [18-35 y; 36-50 y; 51-64 y; ≥65 y, n=356; 279; 185; 144]; males, n=475 [18-35 y; 36-50 y; 51-64 y; ≥65 y, n=195; 128; 88; 64]; females, n=489 [18-35 y; 36-50 y; 51-64 y; ≥65 y, n=161; 151; 97; 80]. A two-way ANOVA was performed (Sex*Age). When P<0.05, post-hoc analysis with Bonferroni's adjustment was used to determine where differences existed between age groups. Difference existing between age groups is indicated by: ^a P<0.05 vs. 18-35 years; by ^b P<0.05 vs. 36-50 years; ^c P<0.05 vs. 51-64 years; ^d P<0.05 vs. ≥65 years.

Table 3: Percentage (%) and total (g) contribution of animal and plant protein to total protein intake, and percentage contribution (%) of animal and plant foods to total energy intake, for all participants, across **sex and age groups.**

		All Ages mean±SD	18-35 y mean±SD	36-50 y mean±SD	51-64 y mean±SD	65 y mean±SD	Sex	P Value Age	S*A
Percentage Protein Contribution	Animal Protein (%)								
	All	63±11	63±11 ^d	63±11 ^d	63±11 ^d	66±9	0.013	0.012	0.303
	Males	64±10	64±11	65±10	63±10	65±8			
	Females	62±11	61±12	61±12	62±11	66±9			
	Plant Protein (%)								
	All	37±11	37±11 ^d	37±11 ^d	37±11 ^d	34±9	0.013	0.012	0.303
Total Daily Protein Intake	Males	36±10	36±11	35±10	37±10	35±8			
	Females	38±11	39±12	39±12	38±11	34±9			
	Animal Protein (g)								
	All	57.9±23	61.2±27.1 ^c	57.2±22.2	56.0±18.7 ^a	53.9±17.3 ^a	<0.001	0.021	<0.001
	Males	68.3±24.5	73.2±28.1	68.8±23.2	64.0±18.9	59.5±19.3			
	Females	47.6±15.5	46.5±16.5	47.1±15.4	48.7±15.3	49.1±13.9			
Percentage Total Energy Contribution	Plant Protein (g)								
	All	32.6±12.4	34.9±13.7 ^{bd}	32.4±12.9 ^{ad}	32.4±10.2 ^d	27.7±9.2 ^{abc}	<0.001	<0.001	0.042
	Males	36.8±11.9	39.8±12.4	36.2±11.5	36.0±10.9	31.0±10.0			
	Females	28.4±11.4	28.9±12.8	29.2±13.1	29.1±8.2	25.0±7.3			
	Animal-Based Foods (%)								
	All	36±10	33±9 ^{bcd}	36±10 ^{ad}	36±10 ^{ad}	41±10 ^{abc}	0.008	<0.001	0.313
	Males	37±10	35±10	37±10	37±10	41±10			
	Females	35±10	32±8	34±10	35±10	42±10			
	Plant-Based Foods (%)								
	All	64±10	67±9 ^{bcd}	64±10 ^{ad}	64±10 ^{ad}	59±10 ^{abc}	0.008	<0.001	0.313
	Males	63±10	65±10	63±10	63±10	59±10			
	Females	65±10	68±8	66±10	65±10	58±10			

Values are expressed as mean±standard deviation. *n* =1051 [18-35 y; 36-50 y; 51-64 y; ≥65 y, *n*=377; 308; 204; 162]; males, *n*=523 [18-35 y; 36-50 y; 51-64 y; ≥65 y, *n*=207; 143; 98; 75]; females, *n*=528 [18-35 y; 36-50 y; 51-64 y; ≥65 y, *n*=170; 165; 106; 87]. A two-way ANOVA was performed (**Sex***Age). When *P*<0.05, post-hoc analysis with Bonferroni's adjustment was used to determine where differences existed between age groups. Difference existing between age groups is indicated by: ^a *P*<0.05 vs. 18-35 years; by ^b *P*<0.05 vs. 36-50 years; ^c *P*<0.05 vs. 51-64 years; ^d *P*<0.05 vs. ≥65 years.

FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1. Total protein intake at each eating occasion in males and females aged 18-35 years (A), 36-50 years (B), 51-64 years (C) and ≥ 65 years (D). Values are expressed as mean $\pm$ standard deviation.

Figure 2. Percentage contribution of food groups to total protein intake in males and females aged 18-35 years (A), 36-50 years (B), 51-64 years (C) and ≥ 65 years (D). Values are expressed as mean $\pm$ standard deviation.

SUPPLEMENTARY DATA

Supplemental Table 1. Anthropometric measures for all participants, across sex and age groups.

		All Ages		18-35 y		36-50 y		51-64 y		≥65 y		P Value		
		mean±SD	n	mean±SD	n	mean±SD	n	mean±SD	n	mean±SD	n	Sex	Age	S*A
Height (m)	All	1.69±0.10	966	1.73±0.10 ^{bcd}	357	1.68±0.09 ^{ad}	279	1.68±0.10 ^{ad}	186	1.65±0.09 ^{bc}	144	<0.001	<0.001	0.224
	Male	1.76±0.07	477	1.79±0.07	195	1.75±0.07	128	1.75±0.08	89	1.72±0.07	65			
	Female	1.62±0.07	489	1.65±0.05	162	1.62±0.07	151	1.61±0.06	97	1.59±0.06	79			
Body mass (kg)	All	75.1±14.6	964	73.7±14.1 ^{bc}	356	76.0±14.6 ^a	279	78.1±16.4 ^{ad}	185	72.9±12.2 ^c	144	<0.001	<0.001	0.270
	Male	82.6±12.8	475	80.2±12.8	195	85.1±11.8	128	86.5±14.3	88	79.6±10.6	64			
	Female	67.8±12.2	489	65.9±11.4	161	68.2±12.1	151	70.5±14.4	97	67.6±10.7	80			
BMI (kg/m ²)	All	26.2±4.3	905	24.5±3.6 ^{bcd}	341	26.8±4.2 ^{ac}	270	27.9±5.1 ^{ab}	170	26.9±3.6 ^a	124	0.002	<0.001	0.273
	Male	26.6±3.9	441	24.8±3.4	186	27.7±3.6	123	28.4±4.2	78	27.1±3.3	54			
	Female	25.8±4.6	464	24.2±3.8	155	26.0±4.5	147	27.4±5.7	92	26.8±3.9	70			
WTHR	All	0.87±0.08	856	0.84±0.07 ^{bcd}	321	0.88±0.08 ^{ac}	258	0.91±0.08 ^{ab}	163	0.90±0.08 ^a	114	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
	Male	0.91±0.08	408	0.86±0.07	168	0.93±0.07	116	0.96±0.07	75	0.95±0.07	49			
	Female	0.84±0.08	448	0.81±0.07	153	0.85±0.08	142	0.86±0.07	88	0.87±0.07	65			
Body fat (%)	All	27.9±8.9	870	23.3±8.8 ^{bcd}	339	29.9±7.8 ^{ac}	269	31.7±7.8 ^{ab}	163	31.8±6.8 ^a	99	<0.001	<0.001	0.002
	Male	22.4±7.3	431	17.6±5.8	185	25.0±6.4	123	26.8±6.4	76	27.3±4.7	47			
	Female	33.2±6.9	439	30.0±6.8	154	34.1±6.4	146	36.0±6.3	87	35.9±5.7	52			
Fat mass (kg)	All	21.3±9.4	864	17.2±7.9 ^{bcd}	336	23.5±9.9 ^a	268	25.1±10.0 ^a	161	23.3±6.3 ^a	99	<0.001	<0.001	0.003
	Male	19.5±10.0	427	14.6±6.8	183	22.8±11.2	122	24.6±11.1	75	22.5±5.8	47			
	Female	23.1±8.4	437	20.3±7.9	153	24.1±8.6	146	25.6±8.8	86	24.2±6.7	52			
Fat-free mass (kg)	All	51.1±10.7	864	53.2±11.1 ^{bcd}	336	50.3±10.3 ^{ad}	268	50.1±10.8 ^{ad}	161	47.4±9.5 ^{abc}	99	<0.001	<0.001	0.163
	Male	60.3±7.2	427	61.9±7.2	183	60.0±6.6	122	59.8±7.4	75	56.0±6.0	47			
	Female	42.1±3.7	437	42.9±3.2	153	42.3±3.8	146	41.7±3.9	86	39.7±3.5	52			

BMI, body mass index; WTHR, waist-to-hip ratio. Values are expressed as mean±standard deviation. A two-way ANOVA was performed (Sex*Age). When $P<0.05$, post-hoc analysis with Bonferroni's adjustment was used to determine where differences existed between age groups. Difference existing between age groups is indicated by: ^a $P<0.05$ vs. 18-35 years; by ^b $P<0.05$ vs. 36-50 years; ^c $P<0.05$ vs. 51-64 years; ^d $P<0.05$ vs. ≥65 years.

Supplemental Table 2. Average energy intake (kcal) and macronutrient intake (g and % of total energy intake) for all participants, across sex and age groups

		All Ages	18-35 y	36-50 y	51-64 y	≥65 y	P Value		
		mean±SD	mean±SD	mean±SD	mean±SD	mean±SD	Sex	Age	S*A
Energy intake (kcal/day)	All	2234±623	2457±663 ^{bcd}	2190±565 ^{ad}	2157±523 ^{ad}	1899±555 ^{abc}	<0.001	<0.001	0.006
	Males	2586±594	2816±556	2552±533	2475±510	2162±625			
	Females	1886±423	2020±501	1876±371	1862±327	1673±359			
Protein (g/day)	All	90.5±27.7	96.1±32.4 ^{bcd}	89.6±26.2 ^{ad}	88.4±21.4 ^{ad}	81.6±22.3 ^{abc}	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
	Males	105.2±27.4	113.1±30.5	105.0±24.6	99.9±19.9	90.4±24.7			
	Females	75.9±18.8	75.4±20.2	76.3±19.3	77.8±16.9	74.1±16.7			
Protein intake (% Energy Intake)	All	16.4±3.4	15.7±3.6 ^{bcd}	16.6±3.4 ^{ad}	16.7±3.0 ^a	17.6±3.2 ^{ab}	0.953	<0.001	0.08
	Males	16.5±3.5	16.2±4.0	16.7±3.1	16.4±2.7	17.2±3.5			
	Females	16.4±3.3	15.1±3.0	16.5±3.6	16.9±3.2	17.9±2.9			
Carbohydrate (g/day)	All	252.9±76.6	272.5±80.5 ^{bcd}	248.1±73.0 ^{ad}	249.1±71.2 ^{ad}	221.1±67.5 ^{abc}	<0.001	<0.001	0.079
	Males	287.9±79.4	308.3±76.5	283.7±78.7	282.6±75.3	246.6±76.5			
	Females	218.2±54.9	228.9±61.6	217.3±50.6	218.1±50.5	199.2±49.3			
Carbohydrate (% Energy Intake)	All	45.6±7.3	44.7±7.3 ^d	45.5±7.4	46±7.0	46.9±7.2 ^a	0.001	0.01	0.963
	Males	44.7±7.9	44.0±7.8	44.5±8.3	46±7.3	46.0±8.0			
	Females	46.4±6.5	45.6±6.5	46.4±6.5	47±6.7	47.7±6.4			
Fat (g)	All	84.9±28.5	91.7±28.3 ^{bcd}	84.0±27.7 ^{ad}	82.2±26.2 ^{ad}	74.3±29.3 ^{abc}	<0.001	<0.001	0.739
	Males	96.6±30.3	102.4±27.9	96.8±30.1	93.4±28.7	84.5±35.1			
	Females	73.3±20.9	78.7±22.9	72.8±19.5	71.9±18.6	65.5±19.5			
Fat (% Energy Intake)	All	34.2±6.3	33.8±6.1	34.4±6.0	34±6.4	34.9±6.9	0.04	0.367	0.291
	Males	33.5±6.4	32.7±6.2	33.8±5.8	34±6.8	34.7±7.3			
	Females	34.9±6.1	35.0±5.7	34.9±6.1	35±6.1	35.1±6.6			

Values are expressed as mean±standard deviation. N values, total populations, $n=1051$ [18-35 y; 36-50 y; 51-64 y; ≥65 y, $n=377$; 308; 204; 162]; males, $n=523$ [18-35 y; 36-50 y; 51-64 y; ≥65 y, $n=207$; 143; 98; 75]; females, $n=528$ [18-35 y; 36-50 y; 51-64 y; ≥65 y, $n=170$; 165; 106; 87]. A two-way ANOVA was performed (Sex*Age). When $P<0.05$, post-hoc analysis with Bonferroni's adjustment was used to determine where differences existed between age groups. Difference existing between age groups is indicated by: ^a $P<0.05$ vs. 18-35 years; by ^b $P<0.05$ vs. 36-50 years; ^c $P<0.05$ vs. 51-64 years; ^d $P<0.05$ vs. ≥65 years.

Supplementary Table 3. Food groups titles and their composition

Beverages	Beverages
Biscuits, Cakes and Sweets	Biscuits, cakes, sweets, pastries, sugars, confectionary, preserves and savoury snacks
Breads	Breads and rolls
Cereals	Breakfast cereals
Dairy	Milk, yoghurt, cheese, butter, spreading fats, oils, cream, ice-cream and desserts
Eggs	Eggs and egg dishes
Fish	Fish and fish dishes
Fruit and Vegetables	Vegetables, vegetable dishes, fruit, fruit dishes, potatoes and potato dishes
Grains	Grains, rice, pasta and savouries
Meat	Meat and meat products
Other	Soups, sauces, nuts, seeds herbs, spices and miscellaneous foods
Supplements	Nutritional supplements