

# The 2023-2028 Outlook for Fat Replacers in the United States

<https://marketpublishers.com/r/2767F8EB58A5EN.html>

Date: October 2022

Pages: 502

Price: US\$ 595.00 (Single User License)

ID: 2767F8EB58A5EN

## Abstracts

This study covers the latent demand outlook for fat replacers across the states and cities of the United States. Latent demand (in millions of U.S. dollars), or potential industry earnings (P.I.E.) estimates are given across some 12,600 cities in the United States. For each city in question, the percent share the city is of its state and of the United States as a whole is reported. These comparative benchmarks allow the reader to quickly gauge a city vis-à-vis others. This statistical approach can prove very useful to distribution and/or sales force strategies. Using econometric models which project fundamental economic dynamics within each state and city, latent demand estimates are created for fat replacers. This report does not discuss the specific players in the market serving the latent demand, nor specific details at the product level. The study also does not consider short-term cyclicalities that might affect realized sales. The study, therefore, is strategic in nature, taking an aggregate and long-run view, irrespective of the players or products involved.

In this report we define the sales of fat replacers as including all commonly understood products falling within this broad category, such as carbohydrate-based fat replacers, protein-based fat replacers, and fat-based fat replacers, irrespective of product packaging, formulation, size, or form. Companies participating in this industry include ADM, Advanced Food Systems, Agritech Worldwide, Andeavor, Archer Daniels Midland, Ashland, Avebe, BDF Natural Ingredients, BENEEO, Cargill, ConAgra Foods, Corbion, CP Kelco, Del Monte Pacific, DKS Company, Dow, DSM, Du Pont, Fiberstar, FMC Corporation, Frito-Lay, Fuji Oil Europe, Grain Processing, Industries & services catered, Ingredient, IOC Group, J. Rettenmaier & Sohne, Kerry Group, Koninklijke DSM, Kraft Foods, Levaplan SA, Nestle, P&G Chemicals, Penford, Pfizer, PGP International, Royal DSM, RS Flavour Ingredients, Solvaira Specialties, Tate & Lyle, TIC Gums, Ulrick & Short, Unilever Inc., Mitsubishi Kaizen Food Corporation, and Z-Trim Holdings. In

addition to the sources indicated, additional information available to the public via news and/or press releases published by players in the industry was considered in defining and calibrating this category. All figures are in a common currency (U.S. dollars, millions) and are not adjusted for inflation (i.e., they are current values). Exchange rates used to convert to U.S. dollars are averages for the year in question. Future exchange rates are assumed to be constant in the future at the current level (the average of the year of this publication's release in 2022).

## Contents

### **1 INTRODUCTION**

#### 1.1 OVERVIEW

#### 1.2 WHAT IS LATENT DEMAND AND THE P.I.E.?

#### 1.3 THE METHODOLOGY

##### 1.3.1 STEP 1. PRODUCT DEFINITION AND DATA COLLECTION

##### 1.3.2 STEP 2. FILTERING AND SMOOTHING

##### 1.3.3 STEP 3. FILLING IN MISSING VALUES

##### 1.3.4 STEP 4. VARYING PARAMETER, NON-LINEAR ESTIMATION

##### 1.3.5 STEP 5. FIXED-PARAMETER LINEAR ESTIMATION

##### 1.3.6 STEP 6. AGGREGATION AND BENCHMARKING

#### 1.4 FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS (FAQ)

##### 1.4.1 CATEGORY DEFINITION

##### 1.4.2 UNITS

##### 1.4.3 METHODOLOGY

### **2 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS**

#### 2.1 LATENT DEMAND IN THE UNITED STATES

#### 2.2 LATENT DEMAND BY YEAR IN THE UNITED STATES

#### 2.3 TOP 100 CITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

### **3 FAR WEST**

#### 3.1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

#### 3.2 LATENT DEMAND BY YEAR - ALASKA

#### 3.3 CITIES SORTED BY RANK - ALASKA

#### 3.4 LATENT DEMAND BY YEAR - CALIFORNIA

#### 3.5 CITIES SORTED BY RANK - CALIFORNIA

#### 3.6 LATENT DEMAND BY YEAR - HAWAII

#### 3.7 CITIES SORTED BY RANK - HAWAII

#### 3.8 LATENT DEMAND BY YEAR - NEVADA

#### 3.9 CITIES SORTED BY RANK - NEVADA

#### 3.10 LATENT DEMAND BY YEAR - OREGON

#### 3.11 CITIES SORTED BY RANK - OREGON

#### 3.12 LATENT DEMAND BY YEAR - WASHINGTON

#### 3.13 CITIES SORTED BY RANK - WASHINGTON

## **4 GREAT LAKES**

- 4.1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
- 4.2 LATENT DEMAND BY YEAR - ILLINOIS
- 4.3 CITIES SORTED BY RANK - ILLINOIS
- 4.4 LATENT DEMAND BY YEAR - INDIANA
- 4.5 CITIES SORTED BY RANK - INDIANA
- 4.6 LATENT DEMAND BY YEAR - MICHIGAN
- 4.7 CITIES SORTED BY RANK - MICHIGAN
- 4.8 LATENT DEMAND BY YEAR - OHIO
- 4.9 CITIES SORTED BY RANK - OHIO
- 4.10 LATENT DEMAND BY YEAR - WISCONSIN
- 4.11 CITIES SORTED BY RANK - WISCONSIN

## **5 MID-ATLANTIC**

- 5.1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
- 5.2 LATENT DEMAND BY YEAR - DELAWARE
- 5.3 CITIES SORTED BY RANK - DELAWARE
- 5.4 LATENT DEMAND BY YEAR - DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
- 5.5 CITIES SORTED BY RANK - DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
- 5.6 LATENT DEMAND BY YEAR - MARYLAND
- 5.7 CITIES SORTED BY RANK - MARYLAND
- 5.8 LATENT DEMAND BY YEAR - NEW JERSEY
- 5.9 CITIES SORTED BY RANK - NEW JERSEY
- 5.10 LATENT DEMAND BY YEAR - NEW YORK
- 5.11 CITIES SORTED BY RANK - NEW YORK
- 5.12 LATENT DEMAND BY YEAR - PENNSYLVANIA
- 5.13 CITIES SORTED BY RANK - PENNSYLVANIA

## **6 NEW ENGLAND**

- 6.1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
- 6.2 LATENT DEMAND BY YEAR - CONNECTICUT
- 6.3 CITIES SORTED BY RANK - CONNECTICUT
- 6.4 LATENT DEMAND BY YEAR - MAINE
- 6.5 CITIES SORTED BY RANK - MAINE
- 6.6 LATENT DEMAND BY YEAR - MASSACHUSETTS

- 6.7 CITIES SORTED BY RANK - MASSACHUSETTS
- 6.8 LATENT DEMAND BY YEAR - NEW HAMPSHIRE
- 6.9 CITIES SORTED BY RANK - NEW HAMPSHIRE
- 6.10 LATENT DEMAND BY YEAR - RHODE ISLAND
- 6.11 CITIES SORTED BY RANK - RHODE ISLAND
- 6.12 LATENT DEMAND BY YEAR - VERMONT
- 6.13 CITIES SORTED BY RANK - VERMONT

## **7 PLAINS**

- 7.1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
- 7.2 LATENT DEMAND BY YEAR - IOWA
- 7.3 CITIES SORTED BY RANK - IOWA
- 7.4 LATENT DEMAND BY YEAR - KANSAS
- 7.5 CITIES SORTED BY RANK - KANSAS
- 7.6 LATENT DEMAND BY YEAR - MINNESOTA
- 7.7 CITIES SORTED BY RANK - MINNESOTA
- 7.8 LATENT DEMAND BY YEAR - MISSOURI
- 7.9 CITIES SORTED BY RANK - MISSOURI
- 7.10 LATENT DEMAND BY YEAR - NEBRASKA
- 7.11 CITIES SORTED BY RANK - NEBRASKA
- 7.12 LATENT DEMAND BY YEAR - NORTH DAKOTA
- 7.13 CITIES SORTED BY RANK - NORTH DAKOTA
- 7.14 LATENT DEMAND BY YEAR - SOUTH DAKOTA
- 7.15 CITIES SORTED BY RANK - SOUTH DAKOTA

## **8 ROCKIES**

- 8.1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
- 8.2 LATENT DEMAND BY YEAR - COLORADO
- 8.3 CITIES SORTED BY RANK - COLORADO
- 8.4 LATENT DEMAND BY YEAR - IDAHO
- 8.5 CITIES SORTED BY RANK - IDAHO
- 8.6 LATENT DEMAND BY YEAR - MONTANA
- 8.7 CITIES SORTED BY RANK - MONTANA
- 8.8 LATENT DEMAND BY YEAR - UTAH
- 8.9 CITIES SORTED BY RANK - UTAH
- 8.10 LATENT DEMAND BY YEAR - WYOMING
- 8.11 CITIES SORTED BY RANK - WYOMING

## **9 SOUTHEAST**

9.1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

9.2 LATENT DEMAND BY YEAR - ALABAMA

9.3 CITIES SORTED BY RANK - ALABAMA

9.4 LATENT DEMAND BY YEAR - ARKANSAS

9.5 CITIES SORTED BY RANK - ARKANSAS

9.6 LATENT DEMAND BY YEAR - FLORIDA

9.7 CITIES SORTED BY RANK - FLORIDA

9.8 LATENT DEMAND BY YEAR - GEORGIA

9.9 CITIES SORTED BY RANK - GEORGIA

9.10 LATENT DEMAND BY YEAR - KENTUCKY

9.11 CITIES SORTED BY RANK - KENTUCKY

9.12 LATENT DEMAND BY YEAR - LOUISIANA

9.13 CITIES SORTED BY RANK - LOUISIANA

9.14 LATENT DEMAND BY YEAR - MISSISSIPPI

9.15 CITIES SORTED BY RANK - MISSISSIPPI

9.16 LATENT DEMAND BY YEAR - NORTH CAROLINA

9.17 CITIES SORTED BY RANK - NORTH CAROLINA

9.18 LATENT DEMAND BY YEAR - SOUTH CAROLINA

9.19 CITIES SORTED BY RANK - SOUTH CAROLINA

9.20 LATENT DEMAND BY YEAR - TENNESSEE

9.21 CITIES SORTED BY RANK - TENNESSEE

9.22 LATENT DEMAND BY YEAR - VIRGINIA

9.23 CITIES SORTED BY RANK - VIRGINIA

9.24 LATENT DEMAND BY YEAR - WEST VIRGINIA

9.25 CITIES SORTED BY RANK - WEST VIRGINIA

## **10 SOUTHWEST**

10.1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

10.2 LATENT DEMAND BY YEAR - ARIZONA

10.3 CITIES SORTED BY RANK - ARIZONA

10.4 LATENT DEMAND BY YEAR - NEW MEXICO

10.5 CITIES SORTED BY RANK - NEW MEXICO

10.6 LATENT DEMAND BY YEAR - OKLAHOMA

10.7 CITIES SORTED BY RANK - OKLAHOMA

10.8 LATENT DEMAND BY YEAR - TEXAS

10.9 CITIES SORTED BY RANK - TEXAS

## **11 DISCLAIMERS, WARRANTIES, AND USER AGREEMENT PROVISIONS**

11.1 DISCLAIMERS & SAFE HARBOR

11.2 ICON GROUP INTERNATIONAL, INC. USER AGREEMENT PROVISIONS

## I would like to order

Product name: The 2023-2028 Outlook for Fat Replacers in the United States

Product link: <https://marketpublishers.com/r/2767F8EB58A5EN.html>

Price: US\$ 595.00 (Single User License / Electronic Delivery)

If you want to order Corporate License or Hard Copy, please, contact our Customer Service:

[info@marketpublishers.com](mailto:info@marketpublishers.com)

## Payment

To pay by Credit Card (Visa, MasterCard, American Express, PayPal), please, click button on product page <https://marketpublishers.com/r/2767F8EB58A5EN.html>

To pay by Wire Transfer, please, fill in your contact details in the form below:

First name:  
Last name:  
Email:  
Company:  
Address:  
City:  
Zip code:  
Country:  
Tel:  
Fax:  
Your message:

**\*\*All fields are required**

Customer signature \_\_\_\_\_

Please, note that by ordering from marketpublishers.com you are agreeing to our Terms & Conditions at <https://marketpublishers.com/docs/terms.html>

To place an order via fax simply print this form, fill in the information below and fax the completed form to +44 20 7900 3970