Population health impacts from the taxation of salt and sugar in the United Kingdom

Patricia Eustachio Colombo[1,2], James Milner[1,3], Silvia Pastorino[1,3], Rosemary Green[1]

[1]Centre on Climate Change and Planetary Health, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, Keppel st, London WC1E 7HT, UK

[2]Department of Biosciences and Nutrition, Karolinska Institutet, 17177 Stockholm, Sweden

[3]Department of Public Health, Environments and Society, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, 15-17 Tavistock Place, London, WC1H 9SH, UK

***** Correspondence: Patricia Eustachio Colombo, Centre on Climate Change and Planetary Health, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, Keppel st, London WC1E 7HT, Assistant professor, patricia.eustachio-colombo@lshtm.ac.uk

Running title: Health impacts from taxing salt and sugar

Keywords: fiscal measures, health promotion, disease prevention, healthy eating, obesity reduction

Disclosure statements

Acknowledgements: We would like to thank Hannah Brinsden and Ria Saha at the Food Foundation for their important contributions to conceiving this research.

Financial support: This project received funding from Impact on Urban Health. PEC had financial support from the Swedish Research Council (VR, grant nr. 2022-00344) for the submitted work. Impact on Urban Health and the Swedish Research Council had no role in the design, analysis or writing of this article.

Conflict of Interests: The authors declare none.

Authorship: PEC conceived, conducted and interpreted the research, analysed the data, drafted the paper, and had primary responsibility for the final content. JM contributed to design of the methodology, interpreted the research, and critically revised the paper. SP interpreted the research, and critically revised the paper. RG conceived and interpreted the research, critically revised the paper and maintained study oversight. All authors have read and approved the final manuscript.

Abstract

Objective: To estimate the potential health benefits from the reduction in consumption of salt and sugar following the introduction of a proposed tax on salt and sugar in the United Kingdom (UK).

Design: Epidemiological modelling study. Life-table modelling was used to estimate the expected population health benefits from the reduction in consumption of salt and sugar for four scenarios, each reflecting different manufacturer and consumer responses the proposed tax. Relative risks for 24 disease-risk pairs were applied, exploring different pathways between salt and sugar consumption, and mortality and morbidity.

Setting: UK.

Participants: Population of the UK.

Results: The results show that life expectancy in the UK could be increased by 1.7 (0.3-3.6) to 4.9 (1.0-9.4) months, depending on the degree of industry and consumer response to the tax. The tax could also lead to up to nearly 2 (0.4-3.6) million fewer cases of preventable chronic diseases and an increase of as much as 3.5 (0.8-6.4) million years of life gained. The

largest health benefits would accrue from reduced mortality and morbidity from cardiovascular diseases.

Conclusions: Significant benefits to population health could be expected from extending the current tax on sugar sweetened beverages to other sugary foods and from adding a tax on foods high in salt. The proposed dietary changes are likely to be insufficient to reach national public health targets; hence, additional measures to reduce the burden of chronic disease in the UK will be equally critical to consider.

Abbreviations

AF	Atrial Fibrillation
BMI	Body mass index
DHSC	Department of Health and Social Care
GBD	Global Burden of Disease
IHD	Ischemic heart disease
NFS	National Food Strategy
NHS	National Health Services
RR	Relative Risk
SDIL	Sugary drinks industry levy
SSB	Sugar sweetened beverages
YLG	Years of Life Gained
YLL	Years of Life Lost

Introduction

Suboptimal diet, characterised by factors such as low intakes of fruits and vegetables and high intakes of salt and added sugars, contributes to an estimated 90,000 deaths every year in the UK [1]. More than half of over-45s are living with health conditions for which diet is a widely recognised contributing risk factor, including cardiovascular disease, type-2 diabetes, and obesity. As things stand, obesity is expected to continue increasing [2]. By 2035, type 2 diabetes is projected to cost the UK National Health Services (NHS) £15 billion a year, equivalent to one and a half times as much as cancer does today [3]. Halting this trajectory will be crucial for protecting the future of the UK's health service.

Limiting intakes of salt and added sugar is one important action to prevent diet-related disease [1]. Current intakes of added sugar in the UK are, on average, 55g/day (9.9 E%) in men and 44g (9.9E%) in women [4]. This represents nearly double the recommendation of no more than 30g/5E% from added sugars [5]. At the same time current average intakes of salt are 9.2g/ day for men and 7.6g/day for women [4], exceeding the daily recommendation of no more than 6g/day in adults [5].

Significant behaviour change would be needed to meet the recommendations for salt and added sugars in the UK. The limited success of the "5-a-day" campaign since 2003 suggests that information measures alone are not enough to change behaviour [6]. However, evidence from the implementation of the UK Soft Drinks Industry Levy (SDIL) [7] suggests that targeted fiscal measures could be effective in steering the consumption of specific foods among consumers. Since its introduction in 2018, this levy has reduced intake of sugar from sugar sweetened beverages (SSB) by an average of 10%, with greater reductions amongst people on lower incomes [8]. Recent poll-data shows that more than two thirds (68%) of the UK public support an extension of the SDIL to other food categories [9].

In 2021, the National Food Strategy: The Plan (NFS) [10] suggested extending the SDIL and proposed that the UK Government should introduce a £3/kg tax on sugar in foods not covered by the existing SDIL (and some ingredients used for sweetening, but not non-nutritive sweeteners) and a £6/kg tax on salt. This would impact all manufactured food categories in which sugar or salt is used as an ingredient. The report argued that this would generate an incentive for manufacturers to lower the sugar and salt content of their products, through reformulation of recipes or by reduction of portion sizes.

This study estimates the expected health benefits from the reduction in consumption of salt and sugar, and the associated reduction in energy intake, for four scenarios developed through previous work by Griffith et al [11], based on the proposed tax [10], each reflecting different manufacturer and consumer responses to a proposed extension of the SDIL to foods high in sugar and/or salt.

Material and methods

Scenarios

In this work, we adopted a methodology that combined elements of the Department of Health and Social Care (DHSC) calorie model [12] (i.e. the calculation of changes in body-mass index (BMI) across the population due to a hypothetical reduction in energy intake from sugar) with life table modelling to quantify health impacts from a reduced intake of sugar and salt in the UK. The potential sugar and salt reduction from the application of the levy proposed in the NFS has previously been calculated and described by Griffith et al. [11]. Briefly, purchase panel data from the 2019 Kantar Fast Moving Consumer Goods l (Take Home) and 2016-2019 Kantar Out of Home Purchase Panel data were used to estimate changes in intakes which depend on the degrees of reformulation by the industry and the

consumer response. There is considerable uncertainty about both of these aspects. Hence, four different scenarios defined by Griffith et al. [11] were tested, each reflecting different manufacturer and consumer responses to a proposed tax. Reformulation targets for different food groups set by Public Health England—i.e. a 20% reduction in sugar across all food groups [13], and food-group specific targets for salt [14]—were used to determine the four scenarios:

1. The **"Low-Low"** scenario: Low industry change (firms reformulate to 30% of PHE targets), and low consumer change (consumers substitute away from products by one third of the price increase)
2. The **"High-No"** scenario: High industry change (full reformulation to PHE targets), but no consumer change (consumers do not respond to price increases)
1. The **"High-Moderate"** scenario**:** High industry change (full reformulation to PHE targets), and moderate consumer change (consumers substitute away from products by 70% of the price increase)
2. The **"High-High"** scenario: High industry change (full reformulation to PHE targets), and high consumer change (consumers substitute away from products by the same amount as the price increase)

According to these previous calculations by the Institute for Fiscal Studies [10, 11] a reduction in sugar intake of 4.5-12.6g per day (a 10%-29% reduction [4]) in women and 5.3-15.0g (a 10-27% reduction [4]) in men could be achieved (**Table 1**). A reduction in salt intake of 0.2-0.7g per day (a 3-9% reduction [4]) in women and 0.3-0.9g per day (a 3-10% reduction[4]) in men could be achieved by introducing the levy. More details about how the scenarios were defined can be found in published reports [10, 11].

Based on previous evidence, changes in salt consumption were hypothesised to impact health outcomes directly (stomach cancer, [15]) and indirectly (ischemic heart disease (IHD) and stroke via hypertension [16]) (Figure 1). Changes in sugar consumption were hypothesised to impact health outcomes both directly (IHD,[15, 17]), and indirectly (through BMI [17]). Hence, like the DHSC model, our model also considered health impacts from changes in BMI resulting from a decreased intake of calories from sugar (Figure 1).

All the scenarios used the following input parameters for the health impact modelling:

- Policy lifetime and evaluation period = 25 years. The levy is implemented immediately and is active for 25 years, thus the health-related impacts of the levy are also evaluated over 25 years. This timeline was chosen to mirror that used for the NFS [10], but also because this is long enough to show significant health impacts from the policies in question. However, impacts are likely to continue beyond 25 years, so the net present value of these policies could increase further as more years are added to the model.
- The health impacts are quantified for the entire adult (18+) population in the UK.
- Scenarios have age and gender specific calorie reductions, based on previous work by the Griffith et al. [11] and given in Table 2.

The primary outcomes of the modelling were: i) changes in life expectancy and Years of Life Gained (YLG) from changes in mortality accumulated over 25 years and changes in morbidity (new cases of different diseases) accumulated over 25 years.

Quantifying reductions in kcal and BMI

In accordance with the DHSC calorie model, 1 gram of reduced sugar intake per day was translated to 4 kcal reduced energy intake from sugar. Each kcal reduction was in turn

assumed to correspond to a 0.042kg reduction in body weight using the steady-state models originally developed by Kevin Hall *et al* [18].

The UK National Diet and Nutrition Survey 2019 [4] was used to provide a nationally representative adult cohort (N=586) to which changes in body weight (and BMI) were applied. Each adult in the survey cohort was first assigned their (baseline) BMI based on their height and weight. Similar to the DHSC approach, new body weights (and thus new BMIs) resulting from a reduced energy intake from sugar were calculated. New bodyweights were calculated for adults considered overweight (defined as BMI ≥ 25 kg/m2) only. This is because we assumed that reductions in calorie intake would have minimal impact on the weight of healthy weight and underweight people as they are thought to generally be highly effective at maintaining weight stability, even with fluctuations in calorie intake [19]. The average BMI of the entire baseline adult population was then compared to the average BMI of the adult population after modifications to weights/BMIs were computed under each of the four scenarios. The difference between the average BMI of the total adult population at baseline and the average BMI of the total adult population when the BMI of overweight/obese adults was changed were used as inputs in the life table model.

Disease outcomes and relative risks

Dose-response relationships (i.e. relative risks per unit change in consumption) between dietary intake and chronic disease morbidity and mortality were obtained from the 2019 Global Burden of Disease (GBD) study [15]. The relative risk (RR) for a given dietary risk-disease pair estimates how much the risk of mortality (or morbidity) would change when the dietary risk changes. For example, the risk of IHD is reduced by 49% for each 6 g reduction in salt intake (Table 2). A total of 24 disease outcomes (Table 2) were considered for the modelling as they have been shown to be linked to sugar/salt consumption and/or BMI [15]. Further details regarding the relative risks may be found in the Supplementary Methods.

Health impact modelling

Health impacts were the main outcome of this study, and calculated on the basis of a previously applied methodology [20], using the life table model IOMLIFET [21], implemented in R [22]. Life tables were separately generated for males and females, due to their different underlying mortality and morbidity rates. The latest (2019) data on age-specific and sex-specific population-size estimates, and on age-specific and sex-specific all-cause mortality were obtained from the Office for National Statistics [23]. Data on disease-specific mortality (mortality rates) and morbidity (incidence rates) for relevant outcomes (Table 3) were downloaded from the GBD results tool [24]. Together, these data provided the baseline input data for the UK.

Life table models were used to quantify changes in life expectancy and Years of Life Lost (YLL) from changes in dietary risk exposures according to the four different reformulation scenarios. Briefly, the IOMLIFET model estimates survival patterns in the population over time based on age-specific mortality rates. Based on the information of a hypothetical change in diet (risk-exposure) and a known exposure-response function (i.e. relative risk), changes in survival rates can be quantified as e.g., YLL or changes to life expectancy. YLL can be explained as the years of life lost for an individual (or a population) as a result of premature avertable mortality, considering the age at which deaths occurred. Since the dietary modifications were expected to reduce mortality rates, YLL were translated to years of life gained (YLG).

Changes in salt and sugar consumption were assumed to be adopted instantly while underlying mortality and incidence rates remained constant for the duration of follow-up. Our modelling strategy also did not allow for general increases in BMI in the population over time, and we assumed the same number of new live births into the future. In cases where several dietary exposures affected the same disease, the risks were multiplied together as done

previously [20]. Changes in YLG were quantified as the additional number of years of life that individuals in the UK adult population would live as a result of reducing their risk of dying prematurely from disease outcomes relating to salt and sugar consumption. Changes in morbidity (new cases of disease) were quantified using the same principles. Morbidity calculations were performed using the output population from the life table as the baseline population, to which changes in risk exposures were applied. Each morbidity calculation was performed separately based on incidence rates, and summed over the UK adult population. Changes in life expectancy at birth were calculated as the difference between the baseline life expectancy (the expected life years divided by the starting population) and the impacted (modelled) life expectancy (the impacted expected life years divided by the impacted starting population).

Sensitivity analysis

To test the sensitivity of the results to key parameters, we generated upper and lower health impact estimates based on a dispersion measure of +/-1SD around the mean for reductions in salt and sugar (later translated to changes in BMI), (Table 1), combined with upper and lower 95% CIs for the RRs provided by the GBD (Supplementary Table 1). More information regarding data management and assumptions for the health impact modelling may be found in the Supplementary Methods.

Results

Changes in energy intake and BMI

Based on the four scenarios, and described assumption, the energy intake from sugar was translated to a change in body weight ranging from -0.8 to -2.1kg in men, and -0.9 to -2.5kg in women (Table 1) with half of the weight change being achieved in about 1 year and 95% of

the weight change in about 3 years [18]. BMI changes ranged from -0.17 to -0.48 amongst men and -0.19 to -0.53 amongst women (Table 3). Changes in the distribution of BMI across the adult population in the UK after the reduced consumption in sugar are displayed in Supplementary Figure 1.

In the High-High scenario, the prevalence of overweight and obesity dropped from 69 to 62 percent and from 54 to 49 percent from among males and females, respectively (no data shown).

Health impacts

The results of the health impact modelling show that average life expectancy in the UK could increase by up to 4.9 (1.0-9.4) months if there was both a high manufacturer and high consumer response to the proposed tax on salt and sugar (Table 4). Even with a minimal response from both manufacturers and consumers, the estimated gain in life expectancy would be 1.7 (0.3-3.6) months. Total YLG accumulated over 25 years from avoided deaths ranged from 1.2 (0.3-2.5) million in the Low-Low scenario to 3.5 (0.8-6.4) million in the High-High scenario, with similar numbers of QALYs being accumulated through reduced morbidity. The largest reductions in new cases of disease came from cardiovascular disease (up to 1.0 (0.2-1.9) million fewer cases), followed by type 2 diabetes, with smaller reductions in cancers and respiratory disease (Table 4).

Differences in YLG between the four scenarios show that the High-Moderate and High-High scenarios are relatively similar in terms of mortality impacts, and that even the scenario assuming no consumer response to the taxes would achieve around 75% of the benefit of the High-High scenario that assumes a high degree of consumer response (Figure 2). The Low-Low scenario assuming a low degree of manufacturer as well as consumer response would achieve less than half of the benefits of the other scenarios.

Slightly over half of the gains in YLG (48-54% depending on the scenario) can be attributed to the reduction in sugar consumption (both direct and indirect pathways) and more than half of those impacts can be ascribed to a reduced BMI in the UK population (Figure 3) with the remainder accruing from direct impacts of sugar consumption on YLG.

Discussion

The results of this modelling show that extending the current soft drinks levy to other foods high in sugar and adding a tax on salt could lead to significant health benefits for the UK. Life expectancy in the UK could be increased by between 1.7 months and nearly 5 months, depending on the degree of industry and consumer response to the tax. In the best-case scenario, with a high response from both consumers and industry, the total number of preventable cases of chronic disease could be reduced almost 2 million over 25 years, including reductions in CVD, type 2 diabetes, respiratory disease and cancer. The main part of these gains can be attributed to reduced mortality and morbidity from cardiovascular diseases, which remain the commonest causes of death and disability in the UK and are strongly associated with consumption of salt and sugar.

Our results show that a 29 and 27 percent reduction in sugar intake resulting from the tax among males and females, respectively, could reduce overweight and obesity by as much as 10.9 and 10.5 percent in males and females, respectively. This is similar to other research where the prevalence of obesity was reported to reduce by 1.5 to 10 percent when added sugar intake reduced by 10 to 20 percent [27, 28]. Our results are also consistent with previous modelling studies showing improved health outcomes from diets that better align with dietary recommendations [29–31], and tally with the findings of previous modelling studies that have shown health gains resulting from a reduced intake of added sugars specifically [32–34]. Health gains from modelling studies have also been reported as a result of the taxation of salt

or foods high in salt in other countries [35–37]. For example, taxation of sodium in the United States has been estimated to potentially reduce sodium intake by 9.5% in the population, and could avert nearly a million cardiovascular events over the lifetime of adults aged 40 to 85, increasing QALYs by 2.1 million [36]. Our findings add to this previous body of research, and thus reinforce arguments for why currently high intakes of salt and sugar should be targeted using fiscal policies.

The UK SDIL has already demonstrated its impact on reducing sugar intake at a national level [8]. Our findings further support global trends and recommendations regarding fiscal policies aimed at the taxation of foods. A recent WHO publication [38], reviewing the existent evidence on the taxation of foods, (conditionally) recommends the implementation policies to tax foods that do not contribute to a healthy diet. The recommendation is based on findings from countries such as Mexico [39] , Hungary [40], and Denmark [41], which have all suggested decreased purchases of taxed foods from food categories such as confectionery and ice cream. These international examples reinforce the potential impact of an expanded taxation strategy in the UK as a means to curb excessive salt and sugar intake and enhance overall public health.

To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study to explore the health effects of the salt and sugar tax proposed by the NFS. This analysis brings together different methods and data sources to explore co-benefits of various pathways of reduced salt and sugar consumption. An important strength is the ability to assess both direct and indirect pathways through which these consumption changes would lead to changes across time and dimensions of health and cost. Compared to looking at indirect vs. direct pathways in isolation, these analyses are therefore likely to capture a more complete picture of the possible health benefits of fiscal measures that reduce intakes of salt and of added sugars. UK dietary recommendations (the Eatwell Guide) recommend that adults limit intakes of salt and added sugars to no more than

6g/d and 30g/d, respectively [5]. Given the UK current average consumption being considerably higher than that, our modelled scenarios, leading to reductions of up to 10% in salt and 29% in sugar, while ambitious, are metabolically rational and concordant with governmental goals.

A limitation to our modelling is that we made no assumptions about possible dietary substitution in our analyses. The estimates of salt and sugar reductions by Griffith et al. [11] are not based on price elasticities or demand models and do, therefore, not take account of complex substitution behaviour. Removal of salt and added sugars in the diet could result in subsequent substitution with other foods that are instead high in e.g. other sweeteners or saturated fats. Unfortunately, there is currently no up-to date published data on substitution behaviour based on a demand model or estimates of price elasticities. The calculations on salt and sugar reductions by Griffith et al. [11] only assume different levels of the overall elasticity of sugar purchased to the tax. To date, evidence from intervention and modelling studies concerning what happens to consumption of other foods if intakes of salty and sugary foods reduce is sparse. To our knowledge, the only estimates based on a demand model that provide those are in Tiffin et al. [42], and Harding and Lovenheim [43]. However, the former are from 2011 and thus out of date, and the latter are based on the US context and are not representative for UK consumers. Recent analyses of food consumption trends in the UK show that intakes of sugar have declined while intakes of fruits, and vegetables in particular, have increased over the last 40 years [44]. Furthermore, several studies indicate that fruit consumption can replace consumption of sweet snacks [45, 46]. Therefore, our models are more likely to have underestimated the health impacts of the proposed tax due to substitution with healthy foods as opposed to overestimating them due to substitution with other unhealthy foods. Measures such as subsidies to reduce the cost of fruits and vegetables could be combined with a salt and sugar tax to facilitate and encourage health-promoting substitutions.

In fact, previous studies that explored the combined effects of taxes for unhealthy foods/food components with subsidies (vs. taxes only) reported larger health benefits [35, 47, 48]. Combining taxes with subsidies would also help avoid constraining the resources of the lowest-income households that already dedicate >15% of total budgets to food purchases [49]. The funds raised by the tax could be spent on complementary measures addressing current inequalities around food, such as e.g., an expansion of the free school meal scheme, public health initiatives, and subsidisation of, and increasing access to, health promoting foods.

Despite being adjusted for age, sex, smoking, and physical activity, using RRs in our modelling of health impacts is a limitation because of the possibility for residual confounding. In our case, we applied 95% CIs for the RRs to provide a measure of variation in the selected health outcomes, but these may overestimate the CI widths due to aggregation across disease endpoints. There are also uncertainties related to the survey data used to develop the scenarios. These data are based on purchases and do thus not necessarily accurately capture people's actual consumption. Moreover, we only modelled the adult population. Considering the rise in childhood obesity in the UK [50], it is likely that the inclusion of children with type-2 diabetes would have generated additional health benefits. Our model also does not take into consideration the effects of socioeconomic status or ethnic origin. Because dietary patterns and disease burdens vary across sociodemographic/economic groups in the UK [51], this could have influenced our final outputs. Lastly, the wide uncertainty intervals of our results indicate considerable variability in the estimates, which may affect the robustness and generalizability of our findings. However, they could help estimate the likely extent of health benefits from proposed interventions, providing essential information for health policymakers as they evaluate various options for reducing salt and sugar intake in the UK.

This study highlights the significant health benefits that could be achieved by a fiscal measure that reduces consumption of salt and added sugars in UK adults. Despite the potential

benefits, food taxes are complex and sometimes controversial, and it is important to consider possible barriers to implementation/effective implementation of any proposed tax. For example, a sugar tax may lead manufacturers to substitute fat for sugar which may have negative consequences for health. Furthermore, industry acceptability is likely to be crucial for avoiding increased costs to consumers, especially to low-income families. Combining taxes with subsidies could be a way to help avoid business losses and thus increase industry acceptability [52]. Equally important is consumer acceptability. Previous research shows that taxes are generally unpopular and seen as intrusive [53, 54]. However, it is promising that substantial public support seems to exist in the UK for an extension of the SDIL to other food categories [9]. Lastly, the success of the proposed tax is also likely to depend on the degree of the management, accountability and public resources available to enable its implementation [55].

By investigating the effects of a combined salt and sugar tax applied to a wide range of food categories, and through a range of different plausible scenarios of manufacturer and consumer response, our work adds new evidence to support the introduction of targeted fiscal measures to reduce both salt and sugar consumption in the UK. These benefit estimates are not definitive and carry significant uncertainty. Nevertheless, they should help determine the order of magnitude of health benefits that might be expected, and thus lend important weight to support health policy makers in their review of options to implement salt and sugar reduction.

References

1. Afshin A, Sur PJ, Fay KA, et al (2019) Health effects of dietary risks in 195 countries, 1990–2017: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2017. The Lancet. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(19)30041-8

2. Janssen F, Bardoutsos A, Vidra N (2020) Obesity Prevalence in the Long-Term Future in 18 European Countries and in the USA. Obes Facts 13:514–527

3. Hofmarcher T, Lindgren P, Wilking N, Jönsson B (2020) The cost of cancer in Europe 2018. Eur J Cancer 129:41–49

4. NDNS (2019): time trend and income analyses for Years 1 to 9. Public Health England

5. Buttriss JL (2016) The Eatwell Guide refreshed. Nutr Bull 41:135–141

6. O'Riordan T, Stoll-Kleemann S (2015) The Challenges of Changing Dietary Behavior Toward More Sustainable Consumption. Environ Sci Policy Sustain Dev 57:4–13

7. Scarborough P, Adhikari V, Harrington RA, Elhussein A, Briggs A, Rayner M, Adams J, Cummins S, Penney T, White M (2020) Impact of the announcement and implementation of the UK Soft Drinks Industry Levy on sugar content, price, product size and number of available soft drinks in the UK, 2015-19: A controlled interrupted time series analysis. PLOS Med 17:e1003025

8. Sugar reduction programme: industry progress 2015 to 2020. In: GOV.UK. https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/sugar-reduction-programme-industry-progress-2015-to-2020. Accessed 11 Sep 2023

9. Obesity polls & surveys | YouGov. https://d3nkl3psvxxpe9.cloudfront.net/documents/ObesityHealthAlliance_Results_230516_W.pdf. Accessed 19 Sep 2023

10. Dimbelby H (2021) The National Food Strategy: The Plan.

11. Griffith R, Jenneson V, James J, Taylor A (2021) The impact of a tax on added sugar and salt. Institute for Fiscal Studies, UKRI - Economic and Social Research Council

12. Department of Health and Social Care (DHSC) Calorie Model (2018). Global and Public Health Group/ Obesity Branch/Childhood Obesity Team/10800

13. Public Health England (2017) Sugar Reduction: Achieving the 20% A technical report outlining progress to date, guidelines for industry, 2015 baseline levels in key foods and next steps.

14. Public Health England (2018) Sugar reduction and wider reformulation programme: Report on progress towards the first 5% reduction and next steps.

15. Vos T, Lim SS, Abbafati C, et al (2020) Global burden of 369 diseases and injuries in 204 countries and territories, 1990–2019: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2019. The Lancet 396:1204–1222

411 16. Hendriksen MAH, van Raaij JMA, Geleijnse JM, Breda J, Boshuizen HC (2015) Health Gain by Salt
412 Reduction in Europe: A Modelling Study. PLOS ONE 10:e0118873

413 17. Stanhope KL (2016) Sugar consumption, metabolic disease and obesity: The state of the
414 controversy. Crit Rev Clin Lab Sci 53:52–67

415 18. Hall KD, Sacks G, Chandramohan D, Chow CC, Wang YC, Gortmaker SL, Swinburn BA (2011)
416 Quantification of the effect of energy imbalance on bodyweight. The Lancet 378:826–837

417 19. Gulick A (1922) A STUDY OF WEIGHT REGULATION IN THE ADULT HUMAN BODY DURING OVER-
418 NUTRITION. Am J Physiol-Leg Content 60:371–395

419 20. Milner J, Green R, Dangour AD, Haines A, Chalabi Z, Spadaro J, Markandya A, Wilkinson P (2015)
420 Health effects of adopting low greenhouse gas emission diets in the UK. BMJ Open 5:e007364

421 21. Miller BG (2003) Life table methods for quantitative impact assessments in chronic mortality. J
422 Epidemiol Community Health 57:200–206

423 22. R Core Team (2021) R: A language and environment for statistical computing.

424 23. Nomis - Official Labour Market Statistics - Nomis - Official Labour Market Statistics.
425 https://www.nomisweb.co.uk/query/construct/summary.asp?mode=construct&version=0&dat
426 aset=2002. Accessed 18 Apr 2020

427 24. GBD Results Tool | GHDx. http://ghdx.healthdata.org/gbd-results-tool. Accessed 18 Apr 2020

428 25. Methods for the development of NICE public health guidance, Third edition (2012). National
429 Institute for Health and Care Excellence, London

430 26. HM Treasury (2018) HM Treasury. The green book: central government advice on appraisal and
431 evaluation.

432 27. Mytton OT, Eyles H, Ogilvie D (2014) Evaluating the Health Impacts of Food and Beverage
433 Taxes. Curr Obes Rep 3:432–439

434 28. Wang YC, Coxson P, Shen Y-M, Goldman L, Bibbins-Domingo K (2012) A Penny-Per-Ounce Tax
435 On Sugar-Sweetened Beverages Would Cut Health And Cost Burdens Of Diabetes. Health Aff
436 (Millwood) 31:199–207

437 29. Eustachio Colombo P, Milner J, Scheelbeek PF, Taylor A, Parlesak A, Kastner T, Nicholas O,
438 Elinder LS, Dangour AD, Green R (2021) Pathways to "5-a-day": modeling the health impacts
439 and environmental footprints of meeting the target for fruit and vegetable intake in the United
440 Kingdom. Am J Clin Nutr 114:530–539

441 30. Scheelbeek P, Green R, Papier K, Knuppel A, Alae-Carew C, Balkwill A, Key TJ, Beral V, Dangour
442 AD (2020) Health impacts and environmental footprints of diets that meet the Eatwell Guide
443 recommendations: analyses of multiple UK studies. BMJ Open 10:e037554

444 31. Patterson E, Eustachio Colombo P, Milner J, Green R, Elinder LS (2021) Potential health impact
445 of increasing adoption of sustainable dietary practices in Sweden. BMC Public Health 21:1332

446 32. Basu S, Lewis K (2014) Reducing Added Sugars in the Food Supply Through a Cap-and-Trade
447 Approach. Am J Public Health 104:2432–2438

448 33. Mekonnen TA, Odden MC, Coxson PG, Guzman D, Lightwood J, Wang YC, Bibbins-Domingo K
449 (2013) Health Benefits of Reducing Sugar-Sweetened Beverage Intake in High Risk Populations
450 of California: Results from the Cardiovascular Disease (CVD) Policy Model. PLoS ONE 8:e81723

451 34. Vreman RA, Goodell AJ, Rodriguez LA, Porco TC, Lustig RH, Kahn JG (2017) Health and economic
452 benefits of reducing sugar intake in the USA, including effects via non-alcoholic fatty liver
453 disease: a microsimulation model. BMJ Open 7:e013543

454 35. Ni Mhurchu C, Eyles H, Genc M, Scarborough P, Rayner M, Mizdrak A, Nnoaham K, Blakely T
455 (2015) Effects of Health-Related Food Taxes and Subsidies on Mortality from Diet-Related
456 Disease in New Zealand: An Econometric-Epidemiologic Modelling Study. PLOS ONE
457 10:e0128477

458 36. Smith-Spangler CM (2010) Population Strategies to Decrease Sodium Intake and the Burden of
459 Cardiovascular Disease: A Cost-Effectiveness Analysis. Ann Intern Med 152:481

460 37. Nghiem N, Blakely T, Cobiac LJ, Pearson AL, Wilson N (2015) Health and Economic Impacts of
461 Eight Different Dietary Salt Reduction Interventions. PLOS ONE 10:e0123915

462 38. Fiscal Policies to Promote Healthy Diets: WHO Guideline, 1st ed (2024). World Health
463 Organization, Geneva

464 39. Batis C, Rivera JA, Popkin BM, Taillie LS (2016) First-Year Evaluation of Mexico's Tax on
465 Nonessential Energy-Dense Foods: An Observational Study. PLOS Med 13:e1002057

466 40. Bíró A (2015) Did the junk food tax make the Hungarians eat healthier? Food Policy 54:107–115

467 41. (July) Food taxes and their impact on competitiveness in the agri-food sector. ECSIP
468 Consortium, Rotterdam

469 42. Tiffin R, Balcombe K, Salois M, Kehlbacher A (2011) Estimating Food and Drink Elasticities.
470 University of Reading

471 43. Harding M, Lovenheim M (2017) The effect of prices on nutrition: Comparing the impact of
472 product- and nutrient-specific taxes. J Health Econ 53:53–71

473 44. Bentham J, Singh GM, Danaei G, et al (2020) Multidimensional characterization of global food
474 supply from 1961 to 2013. Nat Food 1:70–75

475 45. Alinia S, Lassen AD, Krogholm KS, Christensen T, Hels OH, Tetens I (2011) A workplace feasibility
476 study of the effect of a minimal fruit intervention on fruit intake. Public Health Nutr 14:1382–
477 1387

478 46. Toft U, Winkler LL, Mikkelsen BE, Bloch P, Glümer C (2017) Discounts on fruit and vegetables
479 combined with a space management intervention increased sales in supermarkets. Eur J Clin
480 Nutr 71:476–480

481 47. Cobiac LJ, Scarborough P (2019) Modelling the health co-benefits of sustainable diets in the UK,
482 France, Finland, Italy and Sweden. Eur J Clin Nutr 73:624–633

483 48. Nnoaham KE, Sacks G, Rayner M, Mytton O, Gray A (2009) Modelling income group differences
484 in the health and economic impacts of targeted food taxes and subsidies. Int J Epidemiol
485 38:1324–1333

486 49. Family Food 2017/18. In: GOV.UK. https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/family-food-
487 201718/family-food-201718. Accessed 23 Jul 2020

488 50. Significant increase in obesity rates among primary-aged children, latest statistics show. In: NHS
489 Digit. https://digital.nhs.uk/news/2021/significant-increase-in-obesity-rates-among-primary-
490 aged-children-latest-statistics-show. Accessed 27 Sep 2023

491 51. Health Disparities White Paper | London City Hall. https://www.london.gov.uk/who-we-
492 are/what-london-assembly-does/questions-mayor/find-an-answer/health-disparities-white-
493 paper. Accessed 11 Sep 2023

494 52. Gillison F, Grey E, Verplanken B, Barnett J, Baber F (2022) A rapid review of the acceptability
495 and impact of approaches to reduce the salt, fat and sugar content of people's diets on
496 consumers and industry. https://doi.org/10.46756/sci.fsa.ljo674

497 53. Frieden TR (2013) Government's Role in Protecting Health and Safety. N Engl J Med 368:1857–
498 1859

499 54. Hagmann D, Siegrist M, Hartmann C (2018) Taxes, labels, or nudges? Public acceptance of
500 various interventions designed to reduce sugar intake. Food Policy 79:156–165

501 55. UK Health Forum (2018) Public health and the food and drinks industry: The governance and
502 ethics of interaction. Lessons from research, policy and practice.

503 56. Bandy LK, Scarborough P, Harrington RA, Rayner M, Jebb SA (2020) Reductions in sugar sales
504 from soft drinks in the UK from 2015 to 2018. BMC Med 18:20

505

506

Table 1. Scenarios tested, based on previous work [11].

		Salt reduction (g)	SD	Sugar reduction (g)	SD	Kcal reduction	SD	Weight reduction[a] (kg)	SD
Low-Low	Males+18	-0.3	0.2	-5.3	3.6	-21.2	14.4	-0.9	0.6
	Females+18	-0.2	0.1	-4.5	3.2	-18.0	12.8	-0.8	0.5
High-No	Males+18	-0.7	0.5	-9.7	7.0	-38.8	28	-1.6	1.2
	Females+18	-0.6	0.5	-8.3	6.0	-33.2	24	-1.4	1.0
High-Moderate	Males+18	-0.8	0.6	-13.6	9.2	-54.4	36.8	-2.3	1.5
	Females+18	-0.7	0.4	-11.4	8.0	-45.6	32	-1.9	1.3
High-High	Males+18	-0.9	0.6	-15.0	10.2	-60.0	40.8	-2.5	1.7
	Females+18	-0.7	0.5	-12.6	8.7	-50.4	34.8	-2.1	1.5

[a]Assuming that 0.042 kg body weight is lost per calorie reduction [18].

Table 2. Disease outcomes used for the modelling.

Disease outcomes	Dietary risk	Relative risk	Change in units	Dose-response relationship
Ischemic heart disease[a]	Salt	0.510	-6	log-linear
Ischemic heart disease[b]	Sugar	0.982 to 0.941	-4.9 to -13.80	non-linear
Ischemic heart disease	BMI	0.587	-5	log-linear
Ischemic stroke	Salt	0.390	-6	log-linear
Ischemic stroke	BMI	0.556	-5	log-linear
Stomach cancer	Salt	0.976 to 0.924	-0.25 to -0.80	non-linear
Oesophageal cancer	BMI	0.730	-5	log-linear
Colorectal cancer	BMI	0.898	-5	log-linear
Type 2 diabetes	BMI	0.368	-5	log-linear
Gallbladder cancer	BMI	0.804	-5	log-linear
Pancreatic cancer	BMI	0.925	-5	log-linear
Breast cancer	BMI	1.124	-5	log-linear
Uterine cancer	BMI	0.628	-5	log-linear
Ovarian cancer	BMI	0.976	-5	log-linear
Kidney cancer	BMI	0.782	-5	log-linear
Thyroid cancer	BMI	0.850	-5	log-linear
Multiple Myeloma	BMI	0.917	-5	log-linear

Acute lymphoid leukaemia	BMI	0.902	-5	log-linear
Chronic lymphoid leukaemia	BMI	0.902	-5	log-linear
Chronic myeloid leukaemia	BMI	0.902	-5	log-linear
Other leukaemia	BMI	0.902	-5	log-linear
Intracerebral haemorrhage	BMI	0.470	-5	log-linear
Subarachnoid haemorrhage	BMI	0.470	-5	log-linear
Hypertensive heart disease	BMI	0.404	-5	log-linear
Atrial fibrillation and flutter	BMI	0.743	-5	log-linear
Asthma	BMI	0.712	-5	log-linear
Alzheimer	BMI	0.822	-5	log-linear

[a]RRs for ischemic heart disease (IHD) and stroke were derived from previous research [16].

[b]RRs for sugar sweetened beverages (SSB) from GBD [15] were used as a basis for the sugar-IHD relationship. Data from previous research [56] was used to estimate the average sugar content/100 ml of the SSB consumed in the UK. The average sugar content/100 ml of High-sugar, Mid sugar and Low-sugar beverages was used to compute a weighted average sugar content/100 ml of SSB. This weighted average (=7.86 g/100ml) was used as a proxy for sugar intake and was thus applied to model the reduction of sugar.

Table 3. Scenario specific reductions in calories, corresponding reductions in body weight, baseline BMI, average adult BMI resulting from a reduced energy intake from sugar and difference between baseline vs. modelled BMI, grouped by gender.

Average BMI baseline	BMI change	Uncertainty range[a]
27.61	-0.20	-0.06 to -0.34
27.15	-0.16	-0.04 to -0.27
27.61	-0.37	-0.1 to -0.64
27.15	-0.29	-0.08 to -0.51
27.61	-0.52	-0.17 to -0.87
27.15	-0.40	-0.12 to -0.69
27.61	-0.57	-0.18 to -0.97
27.15	-0.44	-0.14 to -0.75

[a]Range represents lower and upper estimates for changes in BMI based on a dispersion measure of +/-1SD around the mean for reductions in sugar consumption among males and females, respectively, combined with upper and lower 95% confidence intervals for relevant RRs provided by the Global Burden of Disease study [24].

530

Table 4. Results from life table modelling based on mortality and morbidity, combining health impacts from both reduced salt and sugar consumption.

Outputs	Low-Low	High-No	High-Moderate	High-High
	Central estimate (uncertainty range[d])	Central estimate (uncertainty range[d])	Central estimate (uncertainty range[d])	Central estimate (uncertainty range[d])
Changes in LE in months	1.7 (0.3-3.6)	3.6 (0.6-7.2)	4.5 (0.9-8.8)	4.9 (1.0-9.4)
Total YLG in millions[a]	1.2 (0.3-2-5)	2.6 (0.5-5.1)	3.2 (0.7-6.0)	3.5 (0.8-6.4)
Reduction in cases of disease[b]				
Cardiovascular disease[c]	-348 887 (-75 605 to -728 811)	-742 739 (-134 718 to -1 474 625)	-942 611 (-196 088 to -1 778 274)	-1 012 056 (-227 208 to -1 901 444)
Diabetes	-208 093 (-44 281 to -427 517)	-374 105 (-78 950 to -773 318)	-523 513 (-127 320 to -1 033 524)	-571 310 (-139 858 to -1 123 479)
Cancers	-4 271 (-732 to -12 468)	-6 837 (-1 157 to -25 422)	-10 459 (-1 568 to -37 304)	-11 812 (-1 864 to -41 360)
Respiratory disease	-90 605 (-18 043 to -195 572)	-165 521 (-33 291 to -355 432)	-230 354 (-53 183 to -492 122)	-249 126 (-59 122 to -538 795)

[a]Based on changes in mortality, accumulated over 25 years.
[b]Changes in incidence of disease, accumulated over 25 years.
[c]IHD, ischemic stroke, intracerebral/subarachnoid haemorrhage, hypertensive heart disease, atrial fibrillation and flutter.
[d]Range represents upper and lower health impact estimates based on a dispersion measure of +/-1SD around the mean for reductions in salt and sugar consumption among males and females, respectively, combined with upper and lower 95% confidence intervals for relevant RRs provided by the Global Burden of Disease study [24].
LE = Life expectancy.
YLG = Years of Life GainedQALY = Quality Adjusted Life Year.

Figure 1. Pathways through which sugar and salt intake affects disease outcomes directly and indirectly.

[a]Unregulated hepatic fructose metabolism leading to hepatic de novo lipogenesis which in turn promotes very low-density lipoprotein production [17]. [b]High fasting glucose levels from insulin resistance due to high free fatty acid levels (and the predominant utilisation of lipids by muscle and skeleton) leading to hyperinsulinemia and ultimately also impaired insulin secretion [17]. BMI, body-mass index; SBP, systolic blood pressure; LDL, low density lipoprotein; IHD, ischemic heart disease.

Figure 2. Years of life gained each year up to year 25 for the four modelled scenarios.

Figure 3. Share (%) of years of life gained attributed to each risk factor.


Sugar intake
Direct pathway[a] - IHD
Indirect pathway – high BMI
Cancers, astma, Alhsz.
High LDL
IHD
High SBP
Stroke
Diabetes[b]


Life years
300000
250000
200000
150000
100000
50000
0
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25
Low-Low
High-No
High-Moderate
High-High


%
100
80
60
40
20
0
Low-Low
High-No
High-Moderate
High-High
Salt
Sugar
BMI