

## Running Head: The Impact of Non-Price In-Premise Marketing

1 The Impact of Non-Price In-premise Marketing on Food and Beverage Purchasing  
2 and Consumer Behaviour: A Systematic Review

3

4 Whitehead, R<sup>1\*</sup>, Greci, S<sup>1</sup>., Thomson, H<sup>2</sup>, Armour, G<sup>1</sup>., Angus, K<sup>3</sup>. & Martin, L.<sup>1</sup>

5 <sup>1</sup> Place and Wellbeing Directorate, Public Health Scotland.

6 <sup>2</sup> MRC/CSO Social and Public Health Sciences Unit, University of Glasgow

7 <sup>3</sup> Institute for Social Marketing and Health, University of Stirling

8

9 \*Corresponding author: Dr Ross Whitehead, ross.whitehead1@phs.scot. Place  
10 and Wellbeing Directorate, Public Health Scotland, 1 South Gyle Crescent,  
11 Edinburgh, EH12 9EB. Tel: +447970286227

12

13 Keywords: obesity, promotion, in-store marketing, positional, systematic review

14

15 Acknowledgements: The authors would like to thank the following members of  
16 the review advisory group for their role in helping establish the scope and  
17 rationale of the present review and for helping interpret its findings: Professor  
18 Linda Bauld, Col Baird, Dr Nathan Critchlow, Dr Kathryn Waite, Emma Riches,  
19 Rebecca Craig, Dr Margaret Callaghan, Lynda Brown.

20

21 Conflicts of interest: None declared

22 HT is funded by the UK Medical Research Council (MC\_UU\_12017-15) and the  
23 Scottish Government Chief Scientist Office (SPHSU15). KA was funded by NHS  
24 Health Scotland (now Public Health Scotland) for conducting this work at the  
25 University of Stirling.

## The Impact of Non-Price In-Premise Marketing

26

### **Abstract**

27 In-premise marketing is commonly used to promote foods that are high in fat, sugar  
28 or salt. In order to inform development of public policy in this area, this systematic  
29 review sought to determine the quantity and quality of English-language evidence  
30 which examines the role and impact of in-premise advertising (e.g., signage, posters)  
31 and positional promotions (e.g., checkout displays) on consumer behaviour and diet-  
32 related outcomes in retail, out-of-home (i.e., cafés, restaurants, takeaways) and  
33 online purchasing environments. Sixty-two studies met inclusion criteria, of which  
34 69% (n=42) were identified as being methodologically weak. The best-available  
35 evidence constitutes findings from four methodologically strong studies, and ten  
36 moderate studies which are not confounded by additional promotions such as price  
37 or availability. These studies predominantly found evidence that in-premise  
38 marketing is likely to be successful in influencing consumer behaviour towards  
39 targeted items, across retail and out-of-home settings. These findings provide a  
40 basis for authorities to consider acting to restrict in-premise marketing of unhealthy  
41 foods and encouraging the in-premise marketing of healthier products. This review  
42 identified gaps in the evidence available on non-sales outcomes, and on online  
43 purchase environments. These gaps, and identified methodological limitations of the  
44 extant evidence remain to be addressed by future research.

## The Impact of Non-Price In-Premise Marketing

### 45 **Abbreviations**

46 HFSS - (foods) high in fat, sugar or salt

47 PRISMA - Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses

48 SWiM - Synthesis Without Meta-analysis

49 BMI - body mass index (kg/m<sup>2</sup>)

50 EPHPP - Effective Public Health Practice Project

51 UK - United Kingdom

52 GRADE - Grading of Recommendations, Assessment, Development and Evaluation

53

54

### **Introduction**

55 The World Health Organisation's 2004 global strategy on diet, physical activity and  
56 health<sup>1</sup> identified marketing within the food environment as one of the main  
57 determinants of food choice and dietary habits. This strategy recommended that  
58 national governments and the private sector act to implement responsible marketing  
59 practices of foods that are high in fat, sugar or salt (HFSS), in order to reduce the  
60 burden of disease attributable to obesity. In 2010 this was followed by specific  
61 recommendations to reduce children's exposure to marketing of less healthy foods.<sup>2</sup>  
62 However, despite these calls, obesity and marketing of unhealthy foods remain  
63 major challenges in high income countries.<sup>3,4</sup>

64

65 In-premise marketing seeks to elicit impulsive, preferential consumer responses  
66 towards targeted products. This is achieved by appealing to automatic information  
67 processing and disrupting more deliberative cognitive processing mechanisms. This

## The Impact of Non-Price In-Premise Marketing

68 can involve increasing visual salience, increasing perceived value, creating feelings  
69 of urgency and shifting consumers' reference frames.<sup>5</sup> There is also evidence that  
70 the pervasiveness of food marketing in this context may act to distort perceptions of  
71 normal food purchasing behaviour, by increasing the social acceptability of targeted  
72 items and normalising purchases of larger quantities of food and drink.<sup>6</sup> As these  
73 marketing approaches are widely utilised for unhealthy foods<sup>7-9</sup>, they can frequently  
74 act to disrupt individuals' capacity in their own long-term self-interests. As such,  
75 there is a strong argument to consider regulatory action, to make it easier for  
76 individuals to make intentional, rather than reflexive food choices.

77

78 Marketing strategies typically encompass a combination of four elements relating to  
79 the product, its price, promotion and placement.<sup>10</sup> The role of price in particular is  
80 well understood, with changes in price being reliably and quantifiably associated with  
81 the elasticity of demand.<sup>11</sup> Less clear, however, is the role and impact of in-premise  
82 advertising (e.g., in-premise signage and posters, shelf-edge signage, promotion of  
83 value, verbal prompts) and positional promotions (e.g., checkout displays, end-of-  
84 aisle displays, special island displays). These aspects of the marketing mix are often  
85 used to promote HFSS foods, with evidence suggesting they are particularly salient  
86 to young people.<sup>12</sup>

87

88 Review-level literature on the impact of in-premise marketing is sparse and has  
89 tended to focus on price and availability.<sup>13-15</sup> Whilst one recent systematic review<sup>13</sup>  
90 found moderate evidence that prominent positioning within a retail environment is  
91 associated with dietary outcomes, no prior systematic reviews have specifically  
92 investigated the impact of both in-premise advertising and positional promotion

## The Impact of Non-Price In-Premise Marketing

93 across the entirety of the commercial food environment, including retail, out-of-home  
94 (i.e., cafés, restaurants, takeaways) and online settings. The out-of-home  
95 environment is of particular interest in this context given evidence that up to 25% of  
96 caloric intake is consumed out of home<sup>16</sup> and findings from store audits<sup>17</sup> that  
97 promotions in this sector predominantly target discretionary (i.e., foods providing little  
98 or no nutritional benefit) and HFSS foods. Out-of-home marketing of unhealthy foods  
99 also stands to maintain socioeconomic health inequalities as deprived areas tend to  
100 have a greater density of, and easier accessibility to takeaway and fast-food  
101 restaurants.<sup>18</sup> The role of the online food environment is of increasing importance  
102 given secular trends in shopping habits,<sup>19</sup> which have been accelerated by the  
103 COVID-19 pandemic.<sup>20–23</sup> This review, therefore, aims to address the following  
104 questions across retail, out-of-home and online shopping environments, in order to  
105 inform the development of public policy:

106

107 1. What research evidence is available on non-price in-premise marketing (defined  
108 for this review as: positional promotions, in-store advertising and equivalent online  
109 promotions) of food and beverages?

110

111 2. What is the quality of the available evidence which has assessed the impact of  
112 non-price in-premise marketing of food and beverages on consumer behaviour or  
113 diet-related outcomes?

114

115 3. What is the impact of non-price in-premise marketing of food and beverages on  
116 consumer behaviour (including: consumer purchasing, consumer preferences,  
117 intention to purchase, consumer attention) or diet-related outcomes.

## The Impact of Non-Price In-Premise Marketing

118

119

120

### Methods

121 The protocol for this review was registered with the International Prospective

122 Register for Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO): CRD42020169720. The review

123 methods and findings are reported according to PRISMA<sup>24</sup> and synthesis without

124 meta-analysis (SWiM)<sup>25</sup> guidelines.

125

126 Studies were sought and included in this review where they examined an exposure

127 or intervention which altered in-premise positioning or advertising of any food or non-

128 alcoholic drink product in a retail, out-of-home or online setting. For the purposes of

129 this review, in-premise positional promotions included: checkout displays, end-of-

130 aisle displays, front of store displays and special island/bin displays. In-premise

131 advertising promotions include shelf edge signage, in-premise posters, branded

132 chillers, promotion of value, stand-alone offers and verbal prompts. Equivalent

133 promotions in an online environment were considered, including pop-up prompts,

134 front page placement and banner advertisements. Additional inclusion and exclusion

135 criteria are detailed in Table 1.

136

137

[Insert Table 1 about here]

138

139 Nine electronic databases were searched (Business Source Complete; Cochrane

140 Central Register of Controlled Trials; Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews;

141 EconLit; Emerald Insight; PsycINFO; SAGE Business Cases; Web of Science Core

142 Collection; World Advertising Research Centre). All databases were searched from

## The Impact of Non-Price In-Premise Marketing

143 inception to 01 May 2020. The search strategy was developed by experienced  
144 information scientists (GA & KA) and included terms relating to “marketing”,  
145 “advertising”, “promotion”, “retail”, “out of home”, “online”, “food” and “drink” were  
146 used to identify studies that described the association between in-premise marketing  
147 and outcomes such as sales, consumer preference, customer attention, dietary  
148 quality and/or body mass index (BMI). The full search strategies used for each  
149 database are presented as supporting information (S1).

150

151 Using Covidence ©,<sup>26</sup> all titles and abstracts were independently screened by two  
152 authors (LM, RW or SG) against inclusion criteria. Disagreement was resolved either  
153 via discussion or by a casting vote by a third reviewer. If it was unclear from the  
154 abstract alone whether a study was eligible for inclusion, the full text was reviewed.  
155 The full text of each potentially relevant study identified through title and abstract  
156 screening was then independently reviewed by two authors (LM, RW or SG), again  
157 with disagreement resolved via discussion or a casting vote. Exclusions at full-text  
158 review were hierarchically applied and are reported in the flow chart (Figure 1). If,  
159 following full-text review it was unclear whether a study met inclusion criteria, the  
160 corresponding author was emailed to ask for clarification. This was necessary in  
161 three cases, with two authors providing the information within four weeks. Studies  
162 were excluded as “unobtainable” where the requested information was not provided.  
163 Bibliographies of 37 existing systematic reviews were also screened for additional  
164 studies. This process identified one additional study for inclusion.

165

166 Details regarding included study characteristics (study setting, participant details,  
167 food/ drink type, exposures, outcomes) were independently extracted by two

## The Impact of Non-Price In-Premise Marketing

168 reviewers (LM & RW) and recorded using Covidence ©. Only results that were  
169 deemed to be relevant to the research question were extracted during the data  
170 synthesis process. Reviewers compared the data extracted for consistency and  
171 discussed to reach consensus.

172

173 Quality appraisal was completed independently in duplicate (LM & RW) to determine  
174 the risk of bias using the Effective Public Health Practice Project (EPHPP) tool.<sup>27</sup>  
175 This tool assesses eight bias domains including participant selection, study design,  
176 handling of confounders, blinding, data collection, drop-outs, intervention fidelity and  
177 statistical analyses. Studies were graded as either weak (two or more weak  
178 domains), moderate (one weak domain) or strong (no weak domains). Discrepancies  
179 in overall score between the two reviewers were discussed, with discussion of  
180 discrepant domain and individual item assessments as necessary until an overall  
181 quality score was agreed.

182

183 Synthesis was primarily conducted by grouping eligible studies by each permutation  
184 of setting (retail, out-of-home and online) and outcome category (sales, consumer  
185 preference, attention, dietary quality and health status). Where studies provide  
186 results pertinent to more than one setting, outcome, or intervention, they are  
187 considered independently in separate syntheses. A separate grouping was  
188 conducted on the basis of the directness of intervention evidence. This involved  
189 grouping studies which examine the impact of changes to promotional activity  
190 designed to actively *reduce* consumer responsiveness to less healthy foods. These  
191 reflect the most direct assessment of any policies that may be put in place to attempt  
192 to reduce population consumption of HFSS and discretionary foods. These more

## The Impact of Non-Price In-Premise Marketing

193 direct studies are prioritised in relation to the remaining studies which reflect a  
194 relatively indirect assessment of potential policy responses in this context. Within all  
195 groupings, where available, studies identified as being at lower risk of bias were also  
196 prioritised when drawing conclusions. Furthermore, it became clear that some  
197 studies allowed the examination of in-premise advertising and/or positional  
198 promotions in isolation, whereas others were confounded by concurrent use of  
199 promotions that are outside of the scope of this review (e.g., price and availability).  
200 The presence of these ‘confounding promotions’ means we can be less certain that  
201 promotions of interest are responsible for any observed association with outcomes,  
202 therefore, in addition to prioritisation on the basis of directness and methodological  
203 quality, studies were also grouped and additionally prioritised where they allow  
204 examination of in-scope promotions in isolation (either through the study design or  
205 statistical controlling). Prioritised studies are grouped and presented earlier, and in  
206 greater detail in syntheses and are given greater weight when reaching overarching  
207 conclusions.

208

209 A meta-analysis of standardized effect size estimates was not possible due to the  
210 heterogeneity of the study designs, interventions, statistical reporting and outcomes.  
211 As such, a vote counting method based on direction of effect (as recommended in  
212 the Cochrane handbook)<sup>28,29</sup> was used to summarise the effect direction and  
213 statistical significance of findings for each outcome and setting permutation on a per-  
214 study basis (i.e., if a study included multiple results for similar outcomes in the same  
215 setting, the results were aggregated). Per study, all relevant findings were  
216 aggregated and labelled as an increase or decrease where 70% or more were in the  
217 same direction, or inconsistent where this threshold was not met. Similarly, findings

## The Impact of Non-Price In-Premise Marketing

218 were labelled as statistically significant if 70% or more of the study's relevant findings  
219 were significant at  $p < .05$ , non-significant if 70% or more were non-significant at  
220  $p > .05$  and inconsistent in other cases. Where multiple results of interest are  
221 reported, only those allowing the most direct examination of in-scope promotional  
222 strategies were selected (i.e., as close as possible to a comparison between two  
223 groups or conditions where the sole difference is the presence or absence of in-  
224 premise marketing). Extracted data on effect direction are reported narratively and in  
225 effect direction plots (Supporting information S2-6). Effect direction but not statistical  
226 significance was used to reach conclusions across studies, in line with Cochrane  
227 guidance.<sup>29</sup>

228

229

### Results

#### 230 Characteristics of included studies

231 Search results and the screening process are presented in Figure 1. Sixty-two  
232 studies met inclusion criteria,<sup>30-91</sup> of which 33 present research conducted in a retail  
233 environment, 24 in an out-of-home environment and six in an online shopping  
234 environment. One study<sup>43</sup> examined the impact of an intervention based in both retail  
235 and out-of-home contexts and as such is considered in syntheses across each of  
236 these settings below. Additional characteristics of the included studies are presented  
237 in detail in supporting information (S2-6), and are briefly summarised below.

238

239

[Insert Figure 1 about here]

240

241 Half of the included studies (31/62) present research conducted in the United States,  
242 9 studies (15%) in the United Kingdom, 7 (11%) in the Netherlands. Eleven studies

## The Impact of Non-Price In-Premise Marketing

243 (18%) collected data from elsewhere in Europe, including one cross-national study.<sup>47</sup>

244 The remaining research was conducted in Australia (n=2, 3%) and Canada (n=2,  
245 3%).

246

247 The included studies were inconsistent in their provision of information on sample  
248 size, meaning formal comparison on this basis (in terms of either number of  
249 premises, transactions or participants) was not possible. Any pertinent information  
250 available in this regard is presented in supporting information (S2-6). Information on  
251 consumers' demographic characteristics was also inconsistently reported, with very  
252 few identified studies formally assessing differential impacts of in-premise marketing  
253 across demographic groups such as age, sex or socioeconomic status.

254

255 The methodological quality of the included literature was predominantly poor, with  
256 over two thirds of the included studies (43 of 62) being assessed as weak according  
257 to the EPHPP tool.<sup>27</sup> Fifteen studies (24%) were assessed as being of moderate  
258 quality, with the remaining four (6%) obtaining a strong rating. Twenty three (37%) of  
259 the included studies used a randomised, controlled design. Fifteen studies (24%)  
260 used a non-randomised controlled design, 15 (24%) an uncontrolled pre-post design  
261 and nine (15%) an observational design.

262

263 Included studies predominantly (n=48, 77%) assessed the association between in-  
264 premise marketing and sales outcomes, with these data chiefly being recorded  
265 electronically at point of sale (n=30). Other means of recording sales outcomes  
266 included participant self-report (n=7), researcher observation (n=6), collection of  
267 sales receipts (n=2), analysis of take-home panel data (n=2) and storeowner report

## The Impact of Non-Price In-Premise Marketing

268 (n=1). Ten studies (16%) measured consumer preferences for promoted items,  
269 including three recording purchase intentions. Five studies (8%) recorded outcomes  
270 relating to consumption, via self-report (n=3), researcher observation (n=1) and  
271 weighing of plate waste (n=1). Three studies (5%) estimated participants'  
272 macronutrient intake using self-reported food frequency questionnaires. One study  
273 (2%) assessed the association between in-premise marketing and BMI.<sup>59</sup> One study  
274 (2%) recorded the association between in-premise marketing and customers'  
275 attention.<sup>57</sup> Five studies collected data in more than one outcome category (4 with  
276 two types of outcome<sup>32,37,51,59</sup> one with three<sup>43</sup>), these studies are considered  
277 separately in each relevant synthesis below.

278

279 Twenty-three of the included studies (37%) evaluated the impact of positional  
280 promotions, with 44 (71%) evaluating types of in-premise advertising. Eleven (18%)  
281 of the included studies evaluated the impact of both of these types of promotion  
282 employed simultaneously. Six studies (10%) evaluated the impact of advertisements  
283 in an online shopping environment. The most commonly observed positional  
284 promotions include checkout placement (n=15), end-of-aisle displays (n=6) and  
285 special island displays (n=6). A wide range of in-premise advertising was observed  
286 including posters or signage (n=24), shelf labelling (n=10), text and formatting of  
287 menus (n=9) and table tents (n=3). In-premise marketing largely targeted healthier  
288 foods (n=48, 77%), with fewer included studies examining promotions targeting  
289 discretionary (n=12, 19%) or wider HFSS foods (n=8, 13%).

290

291 Eight studies were identified that explored interventions designed to reduce (rather  
292 than promote) the prominence of a product.<sup>44,46,54,60,71,74,86,91</sup> Four of these achieved

## The Impact of Non-Price In-Premise Marketing

293 this via the removal of a product from prominent locations (checkouts), whilst  
294 keeping it available elsewhere within the premises.<sup>44,54,71,74</sup> A further four studies  
295 used a displacement approach, whereby adding a product to a prominent position  
296 aims to reduce the salience of another within the display (for example aiming to  
297 reduce sales of confectionery at a checkout by introducing fruit to this  
298 location).<sup>46,60,86,91</sup> Six studies analysed the impact of both promotional interventions  
299 seeking to increase the sales of some products and reduce the prominence of other  
300 products.<sup>44,54,60,71,86,91</sup> Findings from these studies are considered separately in  
301 syntheses for both active promotion and restrictive or displacement interventions  
302 below.

303

304 Over half of the included studies (n=36, 58%) allowed examination of the impact of  
305 promotions included within the scope of this review in isolation from confounding  
306 promotions. In the remaining 26 studies (42%), the unique impact of in-scope  
307 promotions is impossible to examine in isolation from confounding promotions, the  
308 most commonly observed of which were increased product availability (12 studies),  
309 placement of a product within a shelf or aisle (7 studies), price (5 studies) and taste  
310 testing (5 studies).

311

### 312 **Association with outcomes**

313 ***Restrictive interventions*** Four studies<sup>44,54,71,74</sup> investigated physical removal of  
314 products from prominent positions in a retail setting (whilst maintaining their  
315 availability elsewhere in the premises), providing a direct examination of the potential  
316 impact of restricting positional promotions. These studies are detailed in supporting  
317 information (S2) and overall all found that removal of products from checkout

## The Impact of Non-Price In-Premise Marketing

318 displays was associated with a reduction in sales<sup>54,71,74</sup> or an increase in reported  
319 dietary quality,<sup>44</sup> with this association statistically significant in two studies.

320

321 The best available evidence of the impact of restrictive interventions comes from one  
322 methodologically strong study using an observational, interrupted time series  
323 design.<sup>74</sup> This study used a nationally representative panel of around 30,000 UK  
324 households to assess, in isolation of confounding interventions, the impact of  
325 changes in national supermarket policy. The introduction of policies to remove  
326 discretionary foods from checkout displays was found to be associated with a  
327 significant ~17% reduction in purchases of these items.

328

329 ***Displacement interventions*** Four studies assessed the impact of in-premise  
330 marketing on sales of items that themselves are not the target of promotion (i.e., a  
331 displacement effect, for example the effect of active promotion of fruit at a checkout  
332 on sales of confectionary sold in this location) in retail<sup>46,60</sup> and out-of-home<sup>86,91</sup>  
333 premises (supporting information, S3). Overall, three of these<sup>46,60,91</sup> found that  
334 prominent positioning or in-premise advertising of healthier products was associated  
335 with a reduction in sales of less healthy items (despite no change in the positioning  
336 or availability of the latter category of products). One study<sup>86</sup> found this approach to  
337 be associated with a non-significant increase in sales of confectionery. There is little  
338 evidence of these associations being statistically significant, with only one study<sup>91</sup>  
339 finding inconsistent evidence that an observed decrease in sales of confectionary  
340 and croissants (following promotion of fruit and bread products) was statistically  
341 significant.

342

## The Impact of Non-Price In-Premise Marketing

343 The best available evidence of displacement interventions' impact comes from one  
344 moderate quality study, without confounding promotions.<sup>46</sup> This study, using a non-  
345 randomised controlled design, found that supermarkets with checkout displays  
346 promoting fruit, vegetables, water, nut and cereal bars observed a non-significant  
347 reduction in confectionary sales, relative to control stores.

348

### 349 **Retail promotions**

350 Overall, evidence of in-premise marketing's positive influence on consumer  
351 behaviour (e.g., increased sales, consumption or preferences of targeted items) was  
352 seen in 26 of 35 observed outcomes (across 33 studies, see supporting information,  
353 S4) in a retail setting, with this association significant in 9 studies. One study<sup>58</sup> found  
354 evidence that a retail promotion had a non-significant negative influence on  
355 consumer behaviour (reduced sales), and eight found inconsistent evidence with  
356 respect to effect direction.

357

358 ***Retail promotions: Sales outcomes*** Twenty-seven studies examined the effect of  
359 in-premise marketing on sales in a retail environment (supporting information, S4).  
360 Overall, 21 (78%) of these found that in-premise marketing was associated with an  
361 increase in sales (7 of which were statistically significant, 3 provided inconsistent  
362 evidence of statistical significance). Five studies found inconsistent evidence on the  
363 direction of this association, and one weak study<sup>58</sup> found evidence that in-premise  
364 advertising was associated with a non-significant reduction in sales.

365

366 Two methodologically strong studies<sup>70,73</sup> were included which assess in-premise  
367 promotions' impact on sales in a retail setting, both allowing examination of

## The Impact of Non-Price In-Premise Marketing

368 positional promotions<sup>73</sup> or in-premise advertising<sup>70</sup> in isolation from confounding  
369 promotions. One of these<sup>70</sup> found that for two out of three products (olive oil and  
370 coffee) supermarket shelf labels were associated with a significant increase in sales,  
371 but for a third (flour) shelf labelling was associated with a non-significant decrease.  
372 The second study<sup>73</sup> found that end-of-aisle displays in supermarkets were  
373 associated with a significant increase in the sales of carbonated drinks, coffee and  
374 tea.

375

376 Three studies of moderate quality<sup>68,79,90</sup> allowed examination of positional  
377 promotions in isolation from confounding promotions. These each found that  
378 positional promotions were significantly associated with an increase in sales of  
379 promoted items. The remaining 22 studies were either of weak quality or included  
380 confounding promotions.

381

382 **Retail promotions: consumption outcomes** Three studies<sup>37,40,43</sup> of weak quality  
383 assessed the association between in-premise marketing and consumption-related  
384 outcomes in a retail environment (supporting information, S4). Two of these<sup>37,40</sup>  
385 yielded evidence that in-premise marketing was associated with an increase in the  
386 consumption of targeted fruit and vegetables, with the third<sup>43</sup> providing inconsistent  
387 evidence of effect direction. No evidence of statistical significance was observed in  
388 these studies, and all three included confounding promotions.

389

390 **Retail promotions: attention outcomes** One weak quality study without  
391 confounding promotions<sup>57</sup> found that colourful, branded shelf labelling promoting

## The Impact of Non-Price In-Premise Marketing

392 carbonated soft drinks was significantly associated with an increase in consumers'  
393 visual attention, compared to standard unbranded shelf labelling.

394

395 ***Retail promotions: Body Mass Index*** One moderate quality study without  
396 confounding promotions<sup>59</sup> found that participants' exposure to end-of-aisle displays,  
397 special floor displays and checkout displays was associated with an increase in body  
398 mass index. Inconsistent evidence of statistical significance was found, with this  
399 association significant for exposures to sugar sweetened beverage displays and  
400 displays of foods high in solid fats and added sugars when combined with sugar  
401 sweetened beverage displays. This association was non-significant for displays of  
402 foods high in solid fats and added sugars alone or fruit, vegetable and whole grain  
403 displays.

404

405 ***Retail promotions: dietary quality*** Three studies were included which examine the  
406 association between in-premise marketing and indices of diet quality.<sup>43,44,59</sup> One  
407 moderate quality study<sup>59</sup> without confounding promotions did not report effect  
408 direction, but found no significant association between end-of-aisle display, special  
409 floor display or checkout display exposure and an index of healthy eating. The  
410 remaining two studies<sup>43,44</sup> are both methodologically weak and included confounding  
411 promotions. One of these<sup>44</sup> observed that exposure to entrance and checkout  
412 displays was associated with a significant improvement in diet quality. The other<sup>43</sup>  
413 found that exposure to checkout placement, in-premise signage and leaflets was not  
414 consistently associated with dietary quality, with no evidence of statistical  
415 significance observed.

416

## The Impact of Non-Price In-Premise Marketing

### 417 **Out-of-Home Promotions**

418 Overall, evidence of in-premise marketing's positive influence on consumer  
419 behaviour (e.g., increased sales, consumption or preferences of targeted items) was  
420 seen in 20 of 28 observed outcomes (across 24 studies, see supporting information,  
421 S5) in an out-of-home setting, with this association being significant in 9 studies. Two  
422 studies found evidence of promotions being associated with a significant negative  
423 influence on consumer behaviour (reduced sales and consumer preference), and six  
424 found inconsistent evidence with respect to effect direction.

425

426 **Out-of-Home Promotions: Sales** Eighteen studies examined the effect of in-  
427 premise marketing on sales in an out-of-home setting (supporting information, S5).  
428 Overall 16 of these (89%) found that positional promotions and/or in-premise  
429 advertising are associated with an increase in sales of promoted foods. This  
430 association was significant in eight studies, with inconsistent evidence of significance  
431 found in three studies. One methodologically weak study<sup>69</sup> observed that checkout  
432 placement was associated with a significant decrease in sales of promoted foods.

433

434 The strongest evidence of the impact of in-premise marketing on sales in an out-of-  
435 home setting comes from one methodologically strong study<sup>67</sup>, which does not  
436 include confounding promotions. This study observed that verbal point-of-sale  
437 prompts were associated with significant increases in sales of pancakes, orange  
438 juice and fruit juice. Two additional studies of moderate methodological quality were  
439 conducted without confounding promotions.<sup>42,53</sup> These found that verbal prompts<sup>53</sup>  
440 and in-premise posters and table tents (self-standing folded flyers)<sup>42</sup> were associated

## The Impact of Non-Price In-Premise Marketing

441 with increases in sales of promoted items. This association was significant in one  
442 study<sup>53</sup> with no null hypothesis significance testing conducted in the other.<sup>42</sup>

443

444 ***Out-of-Home Promotions: Consumption*** Three methodologically weak studies  
445 examined the effect of in-premise marketing on consumption outcomes in an out-of-  
446 home environment.<sup>32,43,51</sup> Two of these were conducted in the absence of  
447 confounding promotions.<sup>32,51</sup> One of these<sup>51</sup> provided evidence that in-premise  
448 advertising was associated with increased consumption, with the remaining  
449 studies<sup>32,43</sup> both providing inconsistent evidence of the direction of effect. No  
450 evidence of statistical significance was found across these three studies.

451

452 ***Out-of-Home Promotions: Consumer preference*** Six studies assessed the  
453 association between in-premise advertising and consumer preferences in an out-of-  
454 home setting, all of which were conducted in the absence of confounding  
455 promotions. Overall, three of these<sup>47,51,81</sup> found evidence in-premise advertising  
456 (verbal prompts, text and images on menus) are associated with increased  
457 consumption of promoted items, however this was only statistically significant in one  
458 study.<sup>81</sup> One methodologically weak study<sup>31</sup> found that menu imagery was  
459 associated with a significant reduction in consumer preferences of burgers and  
460 salad. The remaining two studies<sup>41,56</sup> found inconsistent evidence of effect direction,  
461 with no indication of statistical significance.

462

463 The best available evidence of the impact of in-premise marketing on consumer  
464 preference in an out-of-home setting comes from one methodologically moderate

## The Impact of Non-Price In-Premise Marketing

465 study.<sup>47</sup> This found evidence that verbal prompts are associated with a non-  
466 significant increase in consumer preferences for vegetarian meatballs.

467

468 ***Out-of-Home Promotions: Dietary quality*** One methodologically weak study  
469 conducted in the presence of confounding promotions<sup>43</sup> found that exposure to  
470 checkout placement, in-premise signage and leaflets was not consistently associated  
471 with dietary quality, with no evidence of statistical significance observed.

472

### 473 **Online Promotions**

474 Overall, evidence of promotions' positive influence on consumer behaviour  
475 (increased sales and increased consumer preference) was seen in two (both  
476 consumer preference) of six observed outcomes (across 6 studies<sup>35,50,62,75,77,82</sup>, see  
477 supporting information, S6) in an online setting, with this association being significant  
478 in one (supporting information, S6). Three studies found inconsistent evidence of  
479 effect direction,<sup>35,50,77</sup> and one<sup>82</sup> found that online promotion was associated with a  
480 negative influence on consumer behaviour (reduced sales).

481

482 ***Online Promotions: Sales*** Two studies examined the impact of online promotions  
483 on sales.<sup>35,82</sup> One methodologically moderate study<sup>35</sup> found that positioning items on  
484 the first page of an online shopping environment (in the presence of other  
485 confounding promotions) was inconsistently associated with sales of targeted foods.  
486 One methodologically weak study<sup>82</sup> without confounding promotions found that text  
487 prompts advising other consumers' typical purchase quantity were associated with a  
488 reduction in sales of cookies, with inconsistent evidence of statistical significance.

489

## The Impact of Non-Price In-Premise Marketing

490 **Online Promotions: Consumer preference** Four studies examined the impact of  
491 online promotions on consumer preference, all in isolation from confounding  
492 promotions.<sup>50,62,75,77</sup> Two methodologically moderate studies<sup>62,75</sup> found that pop-up  
493 prompts offering healthier alternatives to chosen items were associated with an  
494 increase in the likelihood that promoted healthier items were chosen. This  
495 association was significant in one study.<sup>62</sup> Two methodologically weak studies found  
496 inconsistent evidence of effect direction,<sup>50,77</sup> with one finding inconsistent evidence of  
497 statistical significance.<sup>50</sup>

498

499

## Discussion

500 This systematic review investigated the impact of positional promotions and in-  
501 premise advertising implemented in retail, out-of-home and online environments  
502 upon consumer behaviour and diet-related outcomes. Three research questions  
503 were posed, relating to the quantity, quality and observations of the available  
504 evidence, in order to inform the development of public policy.

505

506 Overall, 62 research studies were identified, published over the period 1988 to 2020,  
507 with the majority of these being published in 2011 or later (84%). The included  
508 literature was not equally distributed across the settings considered in this review,  
509 with substantially fewer studies examining the impact of promotions in an online  
510 environment. Whilst a greater quantity of evidence focused on retail and out-of-home  
511 settings, this largely examined associations between promotions and sales  
512 outcomes, with a paucity of evidence on other outcome categories (particularly  
513 consumption, attention and health outcomes). As such, conclusions that can be  
514 made about the impact of promotions in an online environment, and on non-sales

## The Impact of Non-Price In-Premise Marketing

515 outcomes are limited. It was also not possible to identify any potential differential  
516 impact of in-premise marketing across demographic groups, due to sparse reporting  
517 of outcomes disaggregated by these characteristics.

518

519 The majority of the included literature was methodologically poor, with even the  
520 identified randomised controlled studies largely being at high risk of bias owing to  
521 potential selection biases, sparse information on randomisation processes, an  
522 inability to blind participants or researchers to exposure and high withdrawal rates.  
523 Whilst experimental studies typically offer better quality evidence, their utility in this  
524 context may be inappropriate due to inherent limitations. Three of the four studies  
525 identified as being methodologically strong utilised an observational design.<sup>70,73,74</sup>

526 These observational studies achieve this rating according to the EPHPP tool,<sup>27</sup> in  
527 part, owing to their use of large datasets pertaining to real-world customers, which  
528 helps circumvent potential issues around blinding and selection biases. The quality  
529 of these studies was further enhanced by the use of statistical adjustment of  
530 potential confounders such as demographic characteristics, time/season, and  
531 confounding promotional strategies such as price.

532

533 Four methodologically strong studies<sup>67,70,73,74</sup> represent the best available evidence  
534 of associations with consumer outcomes, across retail and out of home settings.  
535 These predominantly found evidence that in-premise marketing was associated with  
536 increased sales of targeted items (or reduced sales where such promotions are  
537 prohibited). These studies are strengthened by their examination of in-premise  
538 marketing in isolation from confounding promotions (e.g., price or availability) which  
539 could otherwise be responsible for driving observed associations.

## The Impact of Non-Price In-Premise Marketing

540

541 Further to these methodologically strong studies, the ten identified as being of  
542 moderate quality and without confounding promotions yielded similar findings. For  
543 ten of the 11 outcomes presented in these studies (6 relating to sales  
544 outcomes,<sup>42,46,53,68,79,90</sup> 3 consumer preference,<sup>47,62,75</sup> 1 BMI,<sup>59</sup> 1 diet quality<sup>59</sup>),  
545 evidence was found that is consistent with in-premise marketing being successful in  
546 impacting individuals' responses to targeted foods. These findings span the three  
547 settings considered in this review, with six outcomes examined in retail settings,  
548 three out-of-home and two in online environments. Evidence of statistical  
549 significance was found for five of these 11 outcomes.

550

551 The lower quality studies that were included tended to be less consistent with  
552 respect to the observed direction of effect, which may reflect that the reported  
553 research tended to utilise smaller samples of individuals, transactions and/or  
554 premises. However across the entirety of the included studies, few found internally  
555 consistent (i.e., with 70% or more of relevant results in the same direction) evidence  
556 that in-premise marketing is associated with reduction in sales, attention,  
557 consumption or preferences, with only four methodologically weak studies observing  
558 this.<sup>31,58,69,82</sup> One further weak study<sup>86</sup> found that a displacement intervention actively  
559 promoting fruit and vegetables was associated with a non-significant increase in  
560 confectionary sales.

561

562 Reporting of quantitative metrics including effect size and confidence intervals was  
563 sparse across the included literature. This limits the possibility to make formal  
564 judgements of the consistency, precision and magnitude of observed effects. As

## The Impact of Non-Price In-Premise Marketing

565 such, it is impossible to formally apply GRADE<sup>92</sup> criteria to assess the certainty of  
566 this body of evidence. The lack of sufficient information meant it was also not  
567 possible to formally assess publication bias. Very few of the included studies  
568 presented an assessment of any potential dose-response relationship between  
569 degrees of exposure to in-premise marketing and consumer outcomes, with the vast  
570 majority merely comparing the presence versus the absence of a promotional  
571 strategy. One exception in this regard is a study<sup>59</sup> which estimated the effect of  
572 cumulative individual exposures to displays of sugar sweetened beverages,  
573 discretionary and healthy foods on BMI and dietary quality. Given the high risk of  
574 bias for the majority of the included literature, the certainty of this body of evidence  
575 as a whole is likely to be low or very low. A greater degree of certainty, however,  
576 may apply to a subset of the included literature, particularly the four studies identified  
577 as being methodologically strong.

578

579 A limitation of the included literature is the lack of evidence across all of the setting  
580 and outcome permutations considered here. The best available evidence pertains to  
581 sales data, which are only a proximal target of policy intervention in this area, with  
582 improvements in consumption and ultimately health status being preferential targets.  
583 Evidence comparing in-store purchases against 24 hour dietary recalls, however,  
584 suggests that sales outcomes do constitute a reasonable proxy of consumption  
585 behaviour.<sup>93</sup> This may be particularly true for foods that are hedonistically  
586 pleasurable and/or convenient to consume on the go, like many discretionary  
587 products.

588

## The Impact of Non-Price In-Premise Marketing

589 A-priori sample size calculations were conducted in less than a quarter of the  
590 included studies, with fewer still reporting that an adequate sample size had been  
591 achieved (10 studies). This may mean that many of the included studies are  
592 underpowered to detect statistically significant associations between in-premise  
593 marketing and the outcomes considered. Whilst statistical significance was not used  
594 to form conclusions based on the included evidence, the utilised data on effect  
595 direction may also be compromised in terms of its precision and representativeness  
596 with smaller samples. It was also rare for the included research to make appropriate  
597 adjustments when conducting multiple tests of statistical significance, which  
598 increases the likelihood of making conclusions on the basis of spurious associations.  
599 A further limitation of the included evidence is that prospective trial registration is  
600 particularly rare. This can allow researchers' conscious or unconscious biases to  
601 manipulate the design, implementation and analyses of research studies, reducing  
602 the confidence that can be placed in the reported findings.<sup>94</sup>

603

604 Strengths of the methodology used to conduct this review include dual screening at  
605 all stages, and extraction of data and quality appraisal in duplicate, which increases  
606 accuracy and reduces bias in these stages. Prospective registration of the review  
607 protocol limits the extent to which the authors of this review could have introduced  
608 biases by making ad-hoc changes to the scope, methodology, synthesis or  
609 dissemination. Bibliographic databases were searched from their inception,  
610 minimising the potential for relevant literature to be omitted. Adherence to PRISMA,<sup>24</sup>  
611 SWIM<sup>25</sup> and Cochrane<sup>29</sup> guidance optimises the transparency, repeatability and  
612 rigour of this review.

613

## The Impact of Non-Price In-Premise Marketing

614 Limitations of this review include that the specific content of in-premise  
615 advertisements was not assessed (e.g., dish of the day promotion, price marking,  
616 social norms, health messages). It may be the case that specific messages, or  
617 particular features of in-premise advertisements such as colours/images/sounds are  
618 more effective in highlighting promoted products. It is also possible that there are  
619 differences between individuals in terms of perception and interpretation of these  
620 characteristics, as is the case for product packaging.<sup>95,96</sup> The precise positioning of  
621 placement interventions was also not considered, although it may be the case that  
622 displays in different locations have more reliable or larger effects on consumer  
623 behaviour. The interactive nature of the marketing mix was also not a focus of the  
624 present review. This constitutes a limitation as the impacts of a product's packaging,  
625 price, placement and promotion on consumer behaviour are potentially synergistic.  
626 For example a pricing intervention might be expected to have a greater effect if it is  
627 both in a prominent position and accompanied by in-store advertising to highlight its  
628 price. Including only English-language publications is a further limitation as any  
629 relevant studies published in other languages have not been incorporated into the  
630 synthesis presented here.

631

632 The vote counting methodology used was based on effect direction alone<sup>28,29</sup> and  
633 provides no information on the magnitude or precision of observed effects. Therefore  
634 it may be the case that whilst the best available evidence points to a positive  
635 influence of in-premise marketing, that these may be small effects with limited impact  
636 on population health. Contrary to this speculation, however, one of the included  
637 methodologically strong studies explicitly addresses this issue,<sup>73</sup> and presents effect  
638 size in terms of an equivalent price change. This study found that end-of-aisle

## The Impact of Non-Price In-Premise Marketing

639 displays of non-alcoholic beverages are associated with an increase in sales of  
640 these products equivalent to a reduction in price of between 22% and 62%.

641

642 It is key for further research in this area to address some of the chief methodological  
643 limitations of the extant evidence base, and to fill the knowledge gaps identified by  
644 the present review. Investigations are particularly needed to determine the role and  
645 impact of non-price promotions in online shopping environments due to the  
646 increasing importance of this purchasing setting. Research is also required which  
647 goes beyond sales data outcomes and examines associations between exposures to  
648 in-premise marketing and consumption of targeted items, and ultimately health  
649 endpoints. A salient absence in the included literature is investigation of potential  
650 demographic differences in susceptibility and exposure to in-premise marketing.  
651 Analysis of the impact of in-premise marketing by age, sex and socioeconomic  
652 status would inform efforts to narrow health inequalities.

653

654 Given the inherent difficulty with which randomised controlled trials can be  
655 conducted within commercial food environments, natural experiments of real-world  
656 policy changes likely constitute an optimal research design in these settings. With  
657 appropriate linkage of datasets, routinely collected information such as  
658 hospitalisation records may be used to determine the association between exposure  
659 to in-premise marketing and non-communicable disease morbidity and mortality.  
660 There would be value in supplementing such investigations with qualitative research  
661 and analysis of process variables such as consumers' attitudes towards targeted  
662 products and the promotions themselves to understand the mechanisms behind any  
663 changes in behaviour. In order to address the specific methodological issues in the

## The Impact of Non-Price In-Premise Marketing

664 extant literature, future research in this context should also prioritise prospective  
665 registration, appropriate sample size calculations and transparency of reporting.

666

### 667 **Implications for policy**

668 The included literature provides a basis for appropriate authorities to consider acting  
669 to restrict in-premise marketing of unhealthy foods, and encourage the marketing of  
670 healthier products. When considering the stronger available evidence, the observed  
671 promotional strategies appear to be successful in influencing consumer behaviour.  
672 Very little evidence was retrieved that in-premise marketing was associated with  
673 reductions in consumer response, with these findings restricted to methodologically  
674 weak studies. Where such promotions are targeting less healthy foods, this may lead  
675 to deterioration of population health, and vice-versa with foods that are more  
676 nutritionally beneficial.

677

678 One methodologically strong study<sup>74</sup> found evidence which is of direct relevance to  
679 the development of public policy as it examines the impact of a restrictive  
680 intervention to remove discretionary foods from supermarket checkout displays,  
681 mirroring the potential form of national regulation in this area. Using a nationally  
682 representative sample of around 30,000 UK shoppers, this study found evidence that  
683 sales of discretionary foods were subject to an immediate (4 weeks after  
684 implementation) and sustained (12 months after implementation) reduction within  
685 supermarkets implementing policies to remove discretionary products from checkout  
686 displays, compared to supermarkets that did not change their checkout display  
687 policy. One further moderate quality study<sup>46</sup> offers evidence that the prominent  
688 positioning of healthier foods is associated with a non-significant reduction in sales of

## The Impact of Non-Price In-Premise Marketing

689 sugar sweetened beverages. This represents a further direct test of a potential policy  
690 option to discourage population intake of less healthy products.

691

### 692 **Conclusion**

693 Whilst the methodological quality of the included English-language evidence was  
694 predominantly poor, the best available evidence points to non-price in-premise  
695 marketing's efficacy in eliciting the intended behavioural responses. The better-  
696 quality evidence predominantly pertains to sales outcomes in retail and out-of-home  
697 settings, with a relative paucity of evidence identified on the role of point-of-purchase  
698 promotions in online settings and for non-sales outcomes.

## The Impact of Non-Price In-Premise Marketing

699

### References

- 700 1. *Global Strategy on Diet, Physical Activity and Health*. World Health  
701 Organization; 2004.  
702 [https://www.who.int/dietphysicalactivity/strategy/eb11344/strategy\\_english\\_web](https://www.who.int/dietphysicalactivity/strategy/eb11344/strategy_english_web.pdf)  
703 [.pdf](https://www.who.int/dietphysicalactivity/strategy/eb11344/strategy_english_web.pdf). Accessed March 31, 2021.
- 704 2. *Set of recommendations on the marketing of ' ' foods and non-alcoholic*  
705 *beverages to children*. . World Health Organization; 2010.  
706 [https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/44416/9789241500210\\_eng.pdf](https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/44416/9789241500210_eng.pdf?sequence=1)  
707 [f?sequence=1](https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/44416/9789241500210_eng.pdf?sequence=1). Accessed March 31, 2021.
- 708 3. Blüher M. Obesity: global epidemiology and pathogenesis. *Nat Rev Endocrinol*.  
709 2019;15(5):288-298. doi:10.1038/s41574-019-0176-8
- 710 4. Garrido-Miguel M, Caverro-Redondo I, Álvarez-Bueno C, et al. Prevalence and  
711 Trends of Overweight and Obesity in European Children From 1999 to 2016: A  
712 Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *JAMA Pediatr*. August 2019:e192430.  
713 doi:10.1001/jamapediatrics.2019.2430
- 714 5. Cohen DA, Lesser LI. Obesity prevention at the point of purchase. *Obes Rev*.  
715 2016;17(5):389-396. doi:10.1111/obr.12387
- 716 6. Cairns GA. Is the Emperor Naked? Rethinking approaches to responsible food  
717 marketing policy and research. March 2016.  
718 <https://dspace.stir.ac.uk/handle/1893/23933#.YGSGga9KiMp>. Accessed March  
719 31, 2021.
- 720 7. Cairns G, Angus K, Hastings G, Caraher M. Systematic reviews of the evidence  
721 on the nature, extent and effects of food marketing to children. A retrospective  
722 summary. *Appetite*. 2013;62:209-215. doi:10.1016/j.appet.2012.04.017
- 723 8. Thornton LE, Cameron AJ, McNaughton SA, et al. Does the availability of  
724 snack foods in supermarkets vary internationally? *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act*.  
725 2013;10:56. doi:10.1186/1479-5868-10-56
- 726 9. Basch CH, Kernan WD, Menafro A. Presence of candy and snack food at  
727 checkout in chain stores: results of a pilot study. *J Community Health*.  
728 2016;41(5):1090-1093. doi:10.1007/s10900-016-0193-7
- 729 10. Chandon P, Wansink B. Does food marketing need to make us fat? A review  
730 and solutions. *Nutr Rev*. 2012;70(10):571-593. doi:10.1111/j.1753-  
731 4887.2012.00518.x
- 732 11. Andreyeva T, Long MW, Brownell KD. The impact of food prices on  
733 consumption: a systematic review of research on the price elasticity of demand  
734 for food. *Am J Public Health*. 2010;100(2):216-222.  
735 doi:10.2105/AJPH.2008.151415
- 736 12. Cairns G. *The ' ' Impact of Food and Drink Marketing on Scotland's*  
737 *Children and Young People: A report on the results of questions about*  
738 *exposure and purchase responses included in IPSOS - Mori's 2014 Young*

## The Impact of Non-Price In-Premise Marketing

- 739 *People in Scotland Survey*. University of Stirling, Institute of Social Marketing;  
740 2015. [https://www.stir.ac.uk/media/stirling/services/faculties/sport-and-health-](https://www.stir.ac.uk/media/stirling/services/faculties/sport-and-health-sciences/documents/Impact-of-Food-and-Drink-on-Scotlands-Young---Sept-15.pdf)  
741 [sciences/documents/Impact-of-Food-and-Drink-on-Scotlands-Young---Sept-](https://www.stir.ac.uk/media/stirling/services/faculties/sport-and-health-sciences/documents/Impact-of-Food-and-Drink-on-Scotlands-Young---Sept-15.pdf)  
742 [15.pdf](https://www.stir.ac.uk/media/stirling/services/faculties/sport-and-health-sciences/documents/Impact-of-Food-and-Drink-on-Scotlands-Young---Sept-15.pdf). Accessed March 31, 2021.
- 743 13. Shaw SC, Ntani G, Baird J, Vogel CA. A systematic review of the influences of  
744 food store product placement on dietary-related outcomes. *Nutr Rev*.  
745 2020;78(12):1030-1045. doi:10.1093/nutrit/nuaa024
- 746 14. Backholer K, Sacks G, Cameron AJ. Food and beverage price promotions: an  
747 untapped policy target for improving population diets and health. *Curr Nutr Rep*.  
748 2019;8(3):250-255. doi:10.1007/s13668-019-00287-z
- 749 15. Kaur A, Lewis T, Lipkova V, et al. A systematic review, and meta-analysis,  
750 examining the prevalence of price promotions on foods and whether they are  
751 more likely to be found on less-healthy foods. *Public Health Nutr*.  
752 2020;23(8):1281-1296. doi:10.1017/S1368980019004129
- 753 16. *Sugar Reduction: Achieving the 20% A technical report outlining progress to*  
754 *date, guidelines for industry, 2015 baseline levels in key foods and next steps*.  
755 Public Health England; 2017.  
756 [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/at](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/604336/Sugar_reduction_achieving_the_20_.pdf)  
757 [tachment\\_data/file/604336/Sugar\\_reduction\\_achieving\\_the\\_20\\_.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/604336/Sugar_reduction_achieving_the_20_.pdf). Accessed  
758 March 31, 2021.
- 759 17. Setterfield L, Eunson J, Murray L. *Marketing strategies used within premises by*  
760 *out of home businesses*. Food Standards Scotland; 2017.  
761 [https://www.foodstandards.gov.scot/downloads/lpsos\\_Mori\\_-](https://www.foodstandards.gov.scot/downloads/lpsos_Mori_-_marketing_strategies.pdf)  
762 [\\_marketing\\_strategies.pdf](https://www.foodstandards.gov.scot/downloads/lpsos_Mori_-_marketing_strategies.pdf). Accessed March 31, 2021.
- 763 18. Fleischhacker SE, Evenson KR, Rodriguez DA, Ammerman AS. A systematic  
764 review of fast food access studies. *Obes Rev*. 2011;12(5):e460-71.  
765 doi:10.1111/j.1467-789X.2010.00715.x
- 766 19. Jilcott Pitts SB, Ng SW, Blitstein JL, Gustafson A, Niculescu M. Online grocery  
767 shopping: promise and pitfalls for healthier food and beverage purchases.  
768 *Public Health Nutr*. 2018;21(18):3360-3376. doi:10.1017/S1368980018002409
- 769 20. Obesity Action Scotland. Obesity Action Scotland | Healthy Weight For All -  
770 Survey of Food and Drink Promotions in an Online Retail Environment.  
771 [https://obesityactionsotland.org/publications/reports/survey-of-food-and-drink-](https://obesityactionsotland.org/publications/reports/survey-of-food-and-drink-promotions-in-an-online-retail-environment/)  
772 [promotions-in-an-online-retail-environment/](https://obesityactionsotland.org/publications/reports/survey-of-food-and-drink-promotions-in-an-online-retail-environment/). Accessed March 31, 2021.
- 773 21. Gao X, Shi X, Guo H, Liu Y. To buy or not buy food online: The impact of the  
774 COVID-19 epidemic on the adoption of e-commerce in China. *PLoS One*.  
775 2020;15(8):e0237900. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0237900
- 776 22. Chang H, Meyerhoefer CD. COVID -19 and the Demand for Online Food  
777 Shopping Services: Empirical Evidence from Taiwan. *Am J Agric Econ*.  
778 2021;103(2):448-465. doi:10.1111/ajae.12170

## The Impact of Non-Price In-Premise Marketing

- 779 23. United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. COVID-19 has  
780 changed online shopping forever, survey shows | UNCTAD.  
781 [https://unctad.org/news/covid-19-has-changed-online-shopping-forever-survey-](https://unctad.org/news/covid-19-has-changed-online-shopping-forever-survey-shows)  
782 [shows](https://unctad.org/news/covid-19-has-changed-online-shopping-forever-survey-shows). Accessed March 31, 2021.
- 783 24. Liberati A, Altman DG, Tetzlaff J, et al. The PRISMA statement for reporting  
784 systematic reviews and meta-analyses of studies that evaluate healthcare  
785 interventions: explanation and elaboration. *BMJ*. 2009;339:b2700.  
786 doi:10.1136/bmj.b2700
- 787 25. Campbell M, McKenzie JE, Sowden A, et al. Synthesis without meta-analysis  
788 (SWiM) in systematic reviews: reporting guideline. *BMJ*. 2020;368:l6890.  
789 doi:10.1136/bmj.l6890
- 790 26. Covidence - Better systematic review management.  
791 <https://www.covidence.org/>. Accessed March 31, 2021.
- 792 27. Effective Public Healthcare Panacea Project. Quality Assessment Tool for  
793 Quantitative Studies. [https://www.ehphp.ca/quality-assessment-tool-for-](https://www.ehphp.ca/quality-assessment-tool-for-quantitative-studies/)  
794 [quantitative-studies/](https://www.ehphp.ca/quality-assessment-tool-for-quantitative-studies/). Accessed March 31, 2021.
- 795 28. Boon MH, Thomson H. The effect direction plot revisited: Application of the  
796 2019 Cochrane Handbook guidance on alternative synthesis methods. *Res*  
797 *Synth Methods*. 2021;12(1):29-33. doi:10.1002/jrsm.1458
- 798 29. Cochrane Collaboration. Chapter 12: Synthesizing and presenting findings  
799 using other methods | Cochrane Training.  
800 <https://training.cochrane.org/handbook/current/chapter-12>. Accessed January  
801 25, 2021.
- 802 30. Ayala GX, Castro IA, Pickrel JL, et al. A cluster randomized trial to promote  
803 healthy menu items for children: the kids' choice restaurant program. *Int J*  
804 *Environ Res Public Health*. 2017;14(12). doi:10.3390/ijerph14121494
- 805 31. Gala P, Rippé CB, Dubinsky AJ, Favia MJ. Effects of menu calorie information  
806 and product image on millennials' purchase intention. *Marketing Management*  
807 *Journal*. 2018;28(2):127-144.
- 808 32. Anzman-Frasca S, Braun AC, Ehrenberg S, et al. Effects of a randomized  
809 intervention promoting healthy children's meals on children's ordering and  
810 dietary intake in a quick-service restaurant. *Physiol Behav*. 2018;192:109-117.  
811 doi:10.1016/j.physbeh.2018.01.022
- 812 33. Dannefer R, Williams DA, Baronberg S, Silver L. Healthy bodegas: increasing  
813 and promoting healthy foods at corner stores in New York City. *Am J Public*  
814 *Health*. 2012;102(10):e27-31. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2011.300615
- 815 34. French SA, Jeffery RW, Story M, et al. Pricing and promotion effects on low-fat  
816 vending snack purchases: the CHIPS Study. *Am J Public Health*.  
817 2001;91(1):112-117. doi:10.2105/ajph.91.1.112

## The Impact of Non-Price In-Premise Marketing

- 818 35. Delaney T, Wyse R, Yoong SL, et al. Cluster randomized controlled trial of a  
819 consumer behavior intervention to improve healthy food purchases from online  
820 canteens. *Am J Clin Nutr.* 2017;106(5):1311-1320.  
821 doi:10.3945/ajcn.117.158329
- 822 36. Foster GD, Karpyn A, Wojtanowski AC, et al. Placement and promotion  
823 strategies to increase sales of healthier products in supermarkets in low-  
824 income, ethnically diverse neighborhoods: a randomized controlled trial. *Am J*  
825 *Clin Nutr.* 2014;99(6):1359-1368. doi:10.3945/ajcn.113.075572
- 826 37. Kristal AR, Goldenhar L, Muldoon J, Morton RF. Evaluation of a supermarket  
827 intervention to increase consumption of fruits and vegetables. *Am J Health*  
828 *Promot.* 1997;11(6):422-425. doi:10.4278/0890-1171-11.6.422
- 829 38. Fiske A, Cullen KW. Effects of promotional materials on vending sales of low-  
830 fat items in teachers' lounges. *J Am Diet Assoc.* 2004;104(1):90-93.  
831 doi:10.1016/j.jada.2003.10.011
- 832 39. Hua SV, Kimmel L, Van Emmenes M, et al. Health promotion and healthier  
833 products increase vending purchases: A randomized factorial trial. *J Acad Nutr*  
834 *Diet.* 2017;117(7):1057-1065. doi:10.1016/j.jand.2016.12.006
- 835 40. Ayala GX, Baquero B, Laraia BA, Ji M, Linnan L. Efficacy of a store-based  
836 environmental change intervention compared with a delayed treatment control  
837 condition on store customers' intake of fruits and vegetables. *Public Health*  
838 *Nutr.* 2013;16(11):1953-1960. doi:10.1017/S1368980013000955
- 839 41. Bacon L, Krpan D. (Not) Eating for the environment: The impact of restaurant  
840 menu design on vegetarian food choice. *Appetite.* 2018;125:190-200.  
841 doi:10.1016/j.appet.2018.02.006
- 842 42. Wagner JL, Winett RA. Prompting one low-fat, high-fiber selection in a fast-food  
843 restaurant. *J Appl Behav Anal.* 1988;21(2):179-185. doi:10.1901/jaba.1988.21-  
844 179
- 845 43. Trude ACB, Surkan PJ, Cheskin LJ, Gittelsohn J. A multilevel, multicomponent  
846 childhood obesity prevention group-randomized controlled trial improves  
847 healthier food purchasing and reduces sweet-snack consumption among low-  
848 income African-American youth. *Nutr J.* 2018;17(1):96. doi:10.1186/s12937-  
849 018-0406-2
- 850 44. Baird J, Crozier SR, Penn-Newman D, Cooper C, Vogel C. RF27 How does  
851 changing the placement of food products in supermarkets influence customers'  
852 diets? In: *Oral presentations.* BMJ Publishing Group Ltd; 2018:A55.2-A56.  
853 doi:10.1136/jech-2018-SSMabstracts.115
- 854 45. Sanchez-Flack J, Pickrel JL, Belch G, et al. Examination of the Relationship  
855 between In-Store Environmental Factors and Fruit and Vegetable Purchasing  
856 among Hispanics. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.* 2017;14(11).  
857 doi:10.3390/ijerph14111305

## The Impact of Non-Price In-Premise Marketing

- 858 46. Huitink M, Poelman MP, Seidell JC, et al. Can unhealthy food purchases at  
859 checkout counters be discouraged by introducing healthier snacks? A real-life  
860 experiment in supermarkets in deprived urban areas in the Netherlands. *BMC*  
861 *Public Health*. 2020;20(1):542. doi:10.1186/s12889-020-08608-6
- 862 47. Dos Santos Q, Perez-Cueto FJA, Rodrigues VM, et al. Impact of a nudging  
863 intervention and factors associated with vegetable dish choice among  
864 European adolescents. *Eur J Nutr*. 2020;59(1):231-247. doi:10.1007/s00394-  
865 019-01903-y
- 866 48. Pharis ML, Colby L, Wagner A, Mallya G. Sales of healthy snacks and  
867 beverages following the implementation of healthy vending standards in City of  
868 Philadelphia vending machines. *Public Health Nutr*. 2018;21(2):339-345.  
869 doi:10.1017/S1368980017001914
- 870 49. Collins EIM, Thomas JM, Robinson E, et al. Two observational studies  
871 examining the effect of a social norm and a health message on the purchase of  
872 vegetables in student canteen settings. *Appetite*. 2019;132:122-130.  
873 doi:10.1016/j.appet.2018.09.024
- 874 50. Breugelmans E, Campo K, Gijbrecchts E. Shelf sequence and proximity effects  
875 on online grocery choices. *Mark Lett*. 2007;18(1-2):117-133.  
876 doi:10.1007/s11002-006-9002-x
- 877 51. Schwartz MB. The influence of a verbal prompt on school lunch fruit  
878 consumption: a pilot study. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act*. 2007;4:6.  
879 doi:10.1186/1479-5868-4-6
- 880 52. Lee-Kwan SH, Bleich SN, Kim H, Colantuoni E, Gittelsohn J. Environmental  
881 Intervention in Carryout Restaurants Increases Sales of Healthy Menu Items in  
882 a Low-Income Urban Setting. *Am J Health Promot*. 2015;29(6):357-364.  
883 doi:10.4278/ajhp.130805-QUAN-408
- 884 53. Saulais L, Massey C, Perez-Cueto FJA, et al. When are “Dish of the Day”  
885 nudges most effective to increase vegetable selection? *Food Policy*.  
886 2019;85:15-27. doi:10.1016/j.foodpol.2019.04.003
- 887 54. Sigurdsson V, Larsen NM, Gunnarsson D. Healthy food products at the point of  
888 purchase: An in-store experimental analysis. *J Appl Behav Anal*.  
889 2014;47(1):151-154. doi:10.1002/jaba.91
- 890 55. Salmon SJ, De Vet E, Adriaanse MA, Fennis BM, Veltkamp M, De Ridder DTD.  
891 Social proof in the supermarket: Promoting healthy choices under low self-  
892 control conditions. *Food Qual Prefer*. 2015;45:113-120.  
893 doi:10.1016/j.foodqual.2015.06.004
- 894 56. Nazlan NH, Tanford S, Raab C, Choi C (CB). The influence of scarcity cues  
895 and price bundling on menu item selection. *Journal of Foodservice Business*  
896 *Research*. 2018;21(4):420-439. doi:10.1080/15378020.2018.1440129
- 897 57. Hurley RA, Rice JC, Koefeld J, Congdon R, Ouzts A. The role of secondary  
898 packaging on brand awareness: analysis of 2 L carbonated soft drinks in

## The Impact of Non-Price In-Premise Marketing

- 899 reusable shells using eye tracking technology. *Packag Technol Sci.*  
900 2017;30(11):711-722. doi:10.1002/pts.2316
- 901 58. Budd N, Jeffries JK, Jones-Smith J, Kharmats A, McDermott AY, Gittelsohn J.  
902 Store-directed price promotions and communications strategies improve  
903 healthier food supply and demand: Impact results from a randomized  
904 controlled, Baltimore City store-intervention trial. *Public Health Nutr.*  
905 2017;20(18):3349-3359. doi:10.1017/S1368980017000064
- 906 59. Cohen DA, Collins R, Hunter G, Ghosh-Dastidar B, Dubowitz T. Store impulse  
907 marketing strategies and body mass index. *Am J Public Health.*  
908 2015;105(7):1446-1452. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2014.302220
- 909 60. Gustafson A, Ng SW, Jilcott Pitts S. The association between the “Plate it Up  
910 Kentucky” supermarket intervention and changes in grocery shopping practices  
911 among rural residents. *Transl Behav Med.* 2019;9(5):865-874.  
912 doi:10.1093/tbm/ibz064
- 913 61. Broers VJV, Van den Broucke S, Taverne C, Luminet O. Default-name and  
914 tasting nudges increase salsify soup choice without increasing overall soup  
915 choice. *Appetite.* 2019;138:204-214. doi:10.1016/j.appet.2019.03.027
- 916 62. Koutoukidis DA, Jebb SA, Ordóñez-Mena JM, et al. Prominent positioning and  
917 food swaps are effective interventions to reduce the saturated fat content of the  
918 shopping basket in an experimental online supermarket: a randomized  
919 controlled trial. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act.* 2019;16(1):50. doi:10.1186/s12966-  
920 019-0810-9
- 921 63. Mistura M, Fetterly N, Rhodes RE, Tomlin D, Naylor P-J. Examining the  
922 Efficacy of a “Feasible” Nudge Intervention to Increase the Purchase of  
923 Vegetables by First Year University Students (17-19 Years of Age) in British  
924 Columbia: A Pilot Study. *Nutrients.* 2019;11(8). doi:10.3390/nu11081786
- 925 64. Chapman LE, Sadeghzadeh C, Koutlas M, Zimmer C, De Marco M. Evaluation  
926 of three behavioural economics “nudges” on grocery and convenience store  
927 sales of promoted nutritious foods. *Public Health Nutr.* 2019;22(17):3250-3260.  
928 doi:10.1017/S1368980019001794
- 929 65. Lopez NV, Folta SC, Glenn ME, Lynskey VM, Patel AA, Anzman-Frasca S.  
930 Promoting healthier children’s meals at quick-service and full-service  
931 restaurants: Results from a pilot and feasibility study. *Appetite.* 2017;117:91-97.  
932 doi:10.1016/j.appet.2017.06.015
- 933 66. Lawman HG, Vander Veur S, Mallya G, et al. Changes in quantity, spending,  
934 and nutritional characteristics of adult, adolescent and child urban corner store  
935 purchases after an environmental intervention. *Prev Med.* 2015;74:81-85.  
936 doi:10.1016/j.ypmed.2014.12.003
- 937 67. van Kleef E, van den Broek O, van Trijp HCM. Exploiting the Spur of the  
938 Moment to Enhance Healthy Consumption: Verbal Prompting to Increase Fruit

## The Impact of Non-Price In-Premise Marketing

- 939 Choices in a Self-Service Restaurant. *Appl Psychol Health Well Being*.  
940 2015;7(2):149-166. doi:10.1111/aphw.12042
- 941 68. Payne C, Niculescu M. Can healthy checkout end-caps improve targeted fruit  
942 and vegetable purchases? Evidence from grocery and SNAP participant  
943 purchases. *Food Policy*. 2018;79:318-323. doi:10.1016/j.foodpol.2018.03.002
- 944 69. Chapman K, Ogden J. Nudging Customers towards Healthier Choices: An  
945 Intervention in the University Canteen. *J Food Res*. 2012;1(2).  
946 doi:10.5539/jfr.v1n2p13
- 947 70. Daunfeldt S-O, Rudholm N. Does shelf-labeling of organic foods increase  
948 sales? Results from a natural experiment. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer  
949 Services*. 2014;21(5):804-811. doi:10.1016/j.jretconser.2014.06.009
- 950 71. Winkler LL, Christensen U, Glümer C, et al. Substituting sugar confectionery  
951 with fruit and healthy snacks at checkout - a win-win strategy for consumers  
952 and food stores? a study on consumer attitudes and sales effects of a healthy  
953 supermarket intervention. *BMC Public Health*. 2016;16(1):1184.  
954 doi:10.1186/s12889-016-3849-4
- 955 72. Wolfenden L, Kingsland M, Rowland BC, et al. Improving availability, promotion  
956 and purchase of fruit and vegetable and non sugar-sweetened drink products at  
957 community sporting clubs: a randomised trial. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act*.  
958 2015;12(1):193. doi:10.1186/s12966-015-0193-5
- 959 73. Nakamura R, Pechey R, Suhrcke M, Jebb SA, Marteau TM. Sales impact of  
960 displaying alcoholic and non-alcoholic beverages in end-of-aisle locations: an  
961 observational study. *Soc Sci Med*. 2014;108:68-73.  
962 doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2014.02.032
- 963 74. Ejlerskov KT, Sharp SJ, Stead M, Adamson AJ, White M, Adams J.  
964 Supermarket policies on less-healthy food at checkouts: Natural experimental  
965 evaluation using interrupted time series analyses of purchases. *PLoS Med*.  
966 2018;15(12):e1002712. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1002712
- 967 75. Forwood SE, Ahern AL, Marteau TM, Jebb SA. Offering within-category food  
968 swaps to reduce energy density of food purchases: a study using an  
969 experimental online supermarket. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act*. 2015;12:85.  
970 doi:10.1186/s12966-015-0241-1
- 971 76. Caspi CE, Lenk K, Pelletier JE, et al. Association between store food  
972 environment and customer purchases in small grocery stores, gas-marts,  
973 pharmacies and dollar stores. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act*. 2017;14(1):76.  
974 doi:10.1186/s12966-017-0531-x
- 975 77. Nederkoorn C. Effects of sales promotions, weight status, and impulsivity on  
976 purchases in a supermarket. *Obesity (Silver Spring)*. 2014;22(5):E2-5.  
977 doi:10.1002/oby.20621
- 978 78. Gamburzew A, Darcel N, Gazan R, et al. In-store marketing of inexpensive  
979 foods with good nutritional quality in disadvantaged neighborhoods: increased

## The Impact of Non-Price In-Premise Marketing

- 980 awareness, understanding, and purchasing. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act.*  
981 2016;13(1):104. doi:10.1186/s12966-016-0427-1
- 982 79. Van Gestel LC, Kroese FM, De Ridder DTD. Nudging at the checkout counter -  
983 A longitudinal study of the effect of a food repositioning nudge on healthy food  
984 choice. *Psychol Health.* 2018;33(6):800-809.  
985 doi:10.1080/08870446.2017.1416116
- 986 80. Ebster C, Wagner U, Valis S. The effectiveness of verbal prompts on sales.  
987 *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services.* 2006;13(3):169-176.  
988 doi:10.1016/j.jretconser.2005.08.003
- 989 81. Hou Y, Yang W, Sun Y. Do pictures help? The effects of pictures and food  
990 names on menu evaluations. *Int J Hosp Manag.* 2017;60:94-103.  
991 doi:10.1016/j.ijhm.2016.10.008
- 992 82. Jove“ Hou J. Can Interface Cues Nudge Modeling of Food Consumption?  
993 Experiments on a Food-Ordering Website. *J Comput-Mediat Comm.*  
994 2017;22(4):196-214. doi:10.1111/jcc4.12190
- 995 83. Fitzgerald CM, Kannan S, Sheldon S, Eagle KA. Effect of a promotional  
996 campaign on heart-healthy menu choices in community restaurants. *J Am Diet*  
997 *Assoc.* 2004;104(3):429-432. doi:10.1016/j.jada.2003.12.019
- 998 84. Garrido-Morgado Á, González-Benito Ó. Merchandising at the point of sale:  
999 differential effect of end of aisle and islands. *BRQ Business Research*  
1000 *Quarterly.* 2015;18(1):57-67. doi:10.1016/j.brq.2013.11.004
- 1001 85. Sigurdsson V, Larsen NM, Gunnarsson D. An in-store experimental analysis of  
1002 consumers' selection of fruits and vegetables. *The Service Industries Journal.*  
1003 2011;31(15):2587-2602. doi:10.1080/02642069.2011.531126
- 1004 86. Buscher LA, Martin KA, Crocker S. Point-of-purchase messages framed in  
1005 terms of cost, convenience, taste, and energy improve healthful snack selection  
1006 in a college foodservice setting. *J Am Diet Assoc.* 2001;101(8):909-913.  
1007 doi:10.1016/S0002-8223(01)00223-1
- 1008 87. Ensaff H, Homer M, Sahota P, Braybrook D, Coan S, McLeod H. Food Choice  
1009 Architecture: An Intervention in a Secondary School and its Impact on Students'  
1010 Plant-based Food Choices. *Nutrients.* 2015;7(6):4426-4437.  
1011 doi:10.3390/nu7064426
- 1012 88. Toft U, Winkler LL, Mikkelsen BE, Bloch P, Glümer C. Discounts on fruit and  
1013 vegetables combined with a space management intervention increased sales in  
1014 supermarkets. *Eur J Clin Nutr.* 2017;71(4):476-480. doi:10.1038/ejcn.2016.272
- 1015 89. Paine-Andrews A, Francisco VT. Health marketing in the supermarket: Using  
1016 prompting, product sampling, and price reduction to... *Health Marketing*  
1017 *Quarterly.* 1996;14(2):85.

## The Impact of Non-Price In-Premise Marketing

- 1018 90. L Harris J, Webb V, J Sacco S, L Pomeranz J. Marketing to children in  
1019 supermarkets: an opportunity for public policy to improve children's diets. *Int J*  
1020 *Environ Res Public Health*. 2020;17(4). doi:10.3390/ijerph17041284
- 1021 91. Cheung TTL, Gillebaart M, Kroese FM, Marchiori D, Fennis BM, De Ridder  
1022 DTD. Cueing healthier alternatives for take-away: a field experiment on the  
1023 effects of (disclosing) three nudges on food choices. *BMC Public Health*.  
1024 2019;19(1):974. doi:10.1186/s12889-019-7323-y
- 1025 92. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Vist GE, et al. GRADE: an emerging consensus on  
1026 rating quality of evidence and strength of recommendations. *BMJ*.  
1027 2008;336(7650):924-926. doi:10.1136/bmj.39489.470347.AD
- 1028 93. Appelhans BM, French SA, Tangney CC, Powell LM, Wang Y. To what extent  
1029 do food purchases reflect shoppers' diet quality and nutrient intake? *Int J Behav*  
1030 *Nutr Phys Act*. 2017;14(1):46. doi:10.1186/s12966-017-0502-2
- 1031 94. Wicherts JM, Veldkamp CLS, Augusteijn HEM, Bakker M, van Aert RCM, van  
1032 Assen MALM. Degrees of Freedom in Planning, Running, Analyzing, and  
1033 Reporting Psychological Studies: A Checklist to Avoid p-Hacking. *Front*  
1034 *Psychol*. 2016;7:1832. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2016.01832
- 1035 95. Mai R, Symmank C, Seeberg-Elverfeldt B. Light and pale colors in food  
1036 packaging: when does this package cue signal superior healthiness or inferior  
1037 tastiness? *Journal of Retailing*. 2016;92(4):426-444.  
1038 doi:10.1016/j.jretai.2016.08.002
- 1039 96. Bialkova S, Sasse L, Fenko A. The role of nutrition labels and advertising  
1040 claims in altering consumers' evaluation and choice. *Appetite*. 2016;96:38-46.  
1041 doi:10.1016/j.appet.2015.08.030
- 1042