

Title: Changes in consumer purchasing patterns at New York City chain restaurants following adoption of the sodium warning icon rule, 2015-2017

Author names: Divya Prasad*, John P. Jasek, Amaka V. Anekwe, Christine Dominianni, Tamar Adjoian Mezzacca, Julia S. Sisti, Shannon M. Farley, Kimberly Kessler

Author affiliations: All authors affiliated with: Bureau of Chronic Disease Prevention, New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene

*Corresponding author

E-mail: dprasad2@health.nyc.gov (DP)

1 **Abstract**

2

3 In 2016, New York City (NYC) began enforcing a sodium warning regulation at chain
4 restaurants, requiring placement of an icon next to any menu item containing $\geq 2,300$ mg sodium.

5 As shifts in consumer purchases are a potential outcome of menu labeling, we investigated
6 whether high-sodium purchases from NYC chains changed following policy implementation.

7 Consumer purchases, using receipts for verification, were assessed at 2 full-service (FSR) and 2
8 quick-service (QSR) chain restaurants in NYC and Yonkers, NY, which did not have sodium
9 menu labeling, in 2015 (baseline) and 2017 (follow-up). Difference-in-difference regression

10 models, adjusted for demographic and location co-variates, tested whether the proportion of

11 NYC respondents purchasing high-sodium item(s) (containing $\geq 2,300$ mg sodium) or whether

12 mean sodium content of purchases changed, in FSR or QSR. Relative to Yonkers, the proportion

13 of NYC respondents purchasing 1 or more high-sodium items did not significantly differ from

14 baseline to follow-up at FSR (difference-in-difference: -4.6%, $p=0.364$) or QSR (difference-in-

15 difference: -8.9%, $p=0.196$). Among NYC FSR respondents, mean sodium purchased

16 significantly declined compared to Yonkers (difference-in-difference: -524 mg, $p=0.012$); no

17 changes in mean sodium were observed among QSR participants (difference-in-difference: 258

18 mg, $p=0.185$). While the reduction in mean sodium purchased among NYC FSR patrons after the

19 sodium warning implementation is encouraging, there was not a corresponding reduction in the

20 proportion of respondents purchasing high-sodium items. Further research that evaluates longer-

21 term changes in the restaurant environment, including menu offerings and consumer purchases,

22 following such policies is warranted.

23

24

25 **Introduction**

26

27 In 2016, New York City (NYC) began enforcing a sodium warning regulation. This novel
28 policy requires chain restaurants (those with 15 or more locations nationally) to display warning
29 icons next to high-sodium menu items and post a statement explaining the icon and associated
30 health risks [1] (S1 Fig) [2]. Sodium in the restaurant environment is problematic, given that
31 restaurant food constitutes more than a quarter of the sodium consumed by US adults [3], the
32 sodium content of restaurant offerings is often high [4-5], and between 2003-2016, the amount of
33 sodium consumed by adults from full-service restaurant (FSR) meals increased and the amount
34 from fast-food, or quick-service restaurant (QSR) meals, remained high [6]. Average sodium
35 consumption among both US [7] and NYC [8] adults far exceeds the 2,300 milligram (mg)
36 Chronic Disease Risk Reduction level established by the National Academies of Sciences [9] and
37 adopted by the Dietary Guidelines for Americans [7], and lowering sodium intake is associated
38 with reductions in hypertension and cardiovascular disease risk [10].

39 Prior to the passage of NYC's sodium warning regulation, numerical sodium content
40 labeling on menus was implemented in three other US jurisdictions: Philadelphia, PA [11], King
41 County, WA [12] and Pierce County, WA [13]. All three efforts also involved displaying other
42 nutrition information, such as calories and fat, alongside menu items. Though Philadelphia has
43 since adopted sodium warning icon labeling like NYC's [14], a consumer purchase evaluation of
44 its previous policy found that the sodium content of purchases at a subset of FSR chains subject
45 to Philadelphia's labeling policy was lower than that at control chains outside of Philadelphia [9].

46

47 We assessed consumer purchases at a subset of FSR and QSR chains in NYC and in
48 Yonkers, NY, a control city, before and after enforcement of NYC's sodium warning regulation,
49 with the objective of determining whether high-sodium items, sodium, and calories in purchases
50 changed in NYC.

51 **Methods**

52

53 **Study sample**

54

55 Baseline data were collected at chain restaurants in NYC and Yonkers between October
56 2015 and January 2016. Yonkers was selected as a control city for its similar demographic
57 profile and existing calorie labeling requirement at chain restaurants, which was also in effect in
58 NYC. Although the sodium warning regulation went into effect in December 2015, enforcement
59 did not begin until June 2016 and none of the chains included in the final analysis implemented
60 the regulation during the baseline data collection period. Follow-up data were collected in both
61 cities between April-June 2017.

62 Rationale and methods behind selection of restaurant chains and locations have been
63 previously described [15]. Briefly, FSR and QSR chains with the greatest number of NYC
64 locations and with at least one location in 3 out of the 5 NYC boroughs and Yonkers were
65 identified as: Applebee's, IHOP and TGI Friday's (FSR) and Burger King, McDonald's,
66 Popeyes and Subway (QSR). From these restaurant chains, at least one FSR and one QSR
67 location in each NYC borough was included. The final analytic sample of restaurants consisted
68 of 2 FSR chains: IHOP and TGI Friday's, and 2 QSR chains: Popeyes and Subway. Baseline
69 data collection at Applebee's was terminated early due to this chain's advance implementation of

70 the sodium warning regulation. Burger King and McDonald's were excluded from the analytic
71 sample because few or no items met criteria for the sodium warning icon.

72 At FSR, surveys were conducted at 9 NYC and 1 Yonkers IHOP locations, and at 4 NYC
73 and 1 Yonkers TGI Friday's locations. At QSR, surveys were conducted at 3 NYC and 1
74 Yonkers Popeyes locations, and at 6 NYC (5 at follow-up due to closure of 1 location) and 2
75 Yonkers Subway locations.

76 **Measures**

77

78 **Survey**

79

80 Surveys were conducted by trained interviewers between 5-9 pm at FSR locations on
81 weekdays and weekends, and between 12-3 pm at QSR on weekdays. All adult patrons leaving
82 locations were invited to participate in the survey for a \$5 incentive. Patrons without an itemized
83 receipt were ineligible. Participants were asked to identify items on their receipt that were
84 purchased for their own consumption, whether and how they modified default menu items (e.g.,
85 extra cheese, side salad instead of fries), and whether and how often they refilled a beverage. The
86 survey also collected respondents' demographic characteristics, including self-reported age
87 group, race/ethnicity, educational level and interviewer-observed gender. Collecting
88 demographic data by observation is not a best practice at the NYC Department of Health and
89 Mental Hygiene (DOHMH) and may have resulted in misclassification since gender cannot be
90 accurately determined by observation.

91 **Sodium and calories:**

92

93 Items listed on the receipt that the respondent verified as for their personal consumption
94 were included. Sodium and calorie values for these items were obtained from MenuStat.org
95 (MenuStat), a free, public database that publishes nutrition information from websites of the
96 largest US restaurant chains. This study used nutrition information collected in January 2015 for
97 items purchased at baseline and January 2017 for items purchased at follow-up. Nutrition
98 information could not be obtained for all purchased items, as menu offerings can fluctuate
99 throughout the year or by location, and as MenuStat does not include information for alcoholic
100 beverages. Participants missing nutrition information for their entire purchase were excluded
101 from analysis.

102 **High-sodium items:**

103
104 Baseline purchases were coded as “high-sodium items” (S1-4 Tables) if they met criteria
105 for displaying a warning icon – if the item itself had or could be customized to contain 2,300 mg
106 of sodium or more, or if a combination meal was purchased that had the potential to contain at
107 least 2,300 mg of sodium. Photos of menu boards and menu books were taken at a single NYC
108 location for each chain during both data collection periods. If an item purchased at follow-up
109 displayed a sodium warning icon in the restaurant’s follow-up menu photos, it was coded as a
110 high-sodium item. If, at follow-up, a purchased item was not shown on the menu photos, it was
111 coded using the same logic as baseline items.

112 The DOHMH’s IRB reviewed the study protocol and determined it to be exempt human
113 subjects’ research.

114

115 **Additional exclusions**

116

117 Prior to analysis, participants were excluded if their purchase could not be verified (e.g.,
118 items reported as being consumed did not match those listed on the receipt) or if only a beverage
119 was purchased. Extreme outliers, defined as purchases exceeding 12,000 mg of sodium, were
120 excluded. Daily purchases per location were also examined for unusual patterns; “outlier days,”
121 where most purchases were solely for a side item or a beverage, were identified at 1 NYC
122 Subway location, 1 Yonkers Subway location, and 1 Yonkers IHOP location, all at baseline. All
123 purchases made on these dates at these locations were excluded. Figs 1-2 show the numbers of
124 FSR and QSR participants excluded for each of these reasons.

125 **Fig 1. Participant Flow Chart, Full-Service Restaurants**

126 **Fig 2. Participant Flow Chart, Quick-Service Restaurants**

127 **Statistical analysis**

128

129 Sample characteristics were summarized and compared between cities and timepoints via
130 chi-squared tests.

131 Analyzed outcomes included number of high sodium items purchased, and sodium and
132 calorie content of purchases. Estimates and difference-in-differences between NYC and Yonkers
133 from baseline to follow-up were assessed via mixed-effects regression models. Mean high-
134 sodium items purchased were estimated by Poisson regression. The likelihood of purchasing at
135 least 1 (both FSR and QSR) and at least 2 (FSR only) high-sodium items was assessed using
136 logit regression. Purchases of 2 or more high-sodium items were extremely rare (among less than
137 1% of the sample) at QSR and therefore were not assessed. Mean sodium and calories purchased

138 were estimated via linear regression models. To reduce skewness and meet model residual
139 normality assumptions, sodium and calorie values were square-root-transformed to assess
140 differences. However, for ease of interpretation, least-squared means estimates from models
141 using non-transformed sodium and calories are reported here. Model estimates for both non-
142 transformed and transformed sodium and calories are shown in S5 Table.

143 All models included fixed effects for restaurant chain, gender, age group, race/ethnicity
144 and education, as these differed between cohorts, and random effects for restaurant street
145 address.

146 Data were analyzed in SAS Enterprise Guide 7.1 (SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC, USA).

147 **Results**

148

149 **Participants**

150

151 The final sample of respondents consisted of: at NYC FSR, 738 baseline, 923 follow-up;
152 at Yonkers FSR, 419 baseline, 544 follow-up; at NYC QSR, 341 baseline, 379 follow-up; at
153 Yonkers QSR, 317 baseline, 331 follow-up.

154 Restaurant chain, gender, age, race/ethnicity, and educational attainment of participants
155 are summarized for each year and city in Tables 1 (FSR) and 2 (QSR). Sample distribution
156 differed across most of these characteristics significantly between years within each city, and
157 between cities within each year.

158

159 **Table 1: Participant characteristics at baseline and follow-up, full-service restaurants**

	NYC			Yonkers			NYC vs Yonkers	
	Baseline n=738 n (%)	Follow-up n=923 n (%)	p value	Baseline n=419 n (%)	Follow-up n=544 n (%)	p value	p, 2015	p, 2017
Chain								
IHOP	631 (85.5)	633 (68.6)	<.001	146 (34.8)	495 (91.0)	<.001	<.001	<.001
TGI Friday's	107 (14.5)	290 (31.4)		273 (65.2)	49 (9.0)			
Gender								
Man	385 (52.2)	327 (35.4)	<.001	229 (54.7)	205 (37.7)	<.001	0.416	0.236
Woman	353 (47.8)	618 (64.6)		190 (45.3)	337 (62.0)			
Other/Unknown	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)		0 (0.0)	1 (0.2)			
Missing	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)		0 (0.0)	1 (0.2)			
Age (years)								
18-24	181 (24.5)	151 (16.4)	0.004	79 (18.9)	36 (6.6)	<.001	0.133	<.001
25-34	194 (26.3)	265 (28.7)		117 (27.9)	96 (17.6)			
35-44	199 (27.0)	276 (29.9)		115 (27.4)	238 (43.8)			
45-64	142 (19.2)	197 (21.3)		87 (20.8)	135 (24.8)			
65+	21 (2.9)	32 (3.5)		21 (5.0)	39 (7.2)			
Refused	1 (0.1)	2 (0.2)		0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)			
Race/Ethnicity								
Asian/Pacific Islander, non-Latino	46 (6.2)	18 (2.0)	<.001	12 (2.9)	6 (1.1)	0.270	<.001	<.001
Black, non-Latino	241 (32.7)	359 (38.9)		169 (40.3)	224 (41.2)			
Latino	264 (35.8)	314 (34.0)		100 (23.9)	130 (23.9)			
White, non-Latino	148 (20.1)	205 (22.2)		123 (29.4)	170 (31.3)			
Other, non-Latino	36 (4.9)	22 (2.4)		14 (3.3)	11 (2.0)			
Don't Know/Refused	3 (0.4)	5 (0.5)		1 (0.2)	3 (0.6)			
Education								
Less than HS	38 (5.2)	19 (2.1)	<.001	17 (4.1)	3 (0.6)	<.001	0.238	<.001
High School Grad	223 (30.2)	270 (29.3)		147 (35.1)	124 (22.8)			
Some College	268 (36.3)	280 (30.3)		153 (36.5)	234 (43.0)			
College Grad	209 (28.3)	353 (38.2)		102 (24.3)	182 (33.5)			
Refused	0 (0.0)	1 (0.1)		0 (0.0)	1 (0.2)			

160

161 **Bolded** p values indicate statistically significant differences (p < 0.05)

163 **Table 2: Participant characteristics at baseline and follow-up, quick-service restaurants**

	NYC			Yonkers			NYC vs Yonkers	
	Baseline n=341 n (%)	Follow-up n=379 n (%)	p value	Baseline n=317 n (%)	Follow-up n=331 n (%)	p value	p, 2015	p, 2017
Chain								
Popeyes	107 (31.4)	146 (38.5)	0.045	307 (96.8)	170 (51.4)	<.001	<.001	<.001
Subway	234 (68.6)	233 (61.5)		10 (3.2)	161 (48.6)			
Gender								
Man	189 (55.4)	178 (47.0)	0.040	145 (45.7)	150 (45.3)	0.914	0.026	0.660
Woman	151 (44.2)	201 (53.0)		172 (54.3)	181 (54.7)			
Other/Unknown	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)		0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)			
Missing	1 (0.3)	0 (0.0)		0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)			
Age (years)								
18-24	72 (21.1)	59 (15.6)	0.004	57 (18.0)	27 (8.2)	<.001	0.338	0.010
25-34	85 (24.9)	100 (26.4)		71 (22.4)	86 (26.0)			
35-44	66 (19.4)	118 (31.1)		83 (26.2)	133 (40.2)			
45-64	104 (30.5)	89 (23.5)		93 (29.3)	78 (23.6)			
65+	13 (3.8)	13 (3.4)		13 (4.1)	7 (2.1)			
Refused	1 (0.3)	0 (0.0)		0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)			
Race/Ethnicity								
Asian/Pacific Islander, non-Latino	12 (3.5)	11 (2.9)	<.001	1 (0.3)	2 (0.6)	0.048	<.001	0.158
Black, non-Latino	137 (40.2)	193 (50.9)		151 (47.6)	190 (57.4)			
Latino	104 (30.5)	125 (33.0)		121 (38.2)	104 (31.4)			
White, non-Latino	64 (18.8)	45 (11.9)		35 (11.0)	30 (9.1)			
Other, non-Latino	22 (6.5)	3 (0.8)		9 (2.8)	3 (0.9)			
Don't Know/Refused	2 (0.6)	2 (0.5)		0 (0.0)	2 (0.6)			
Education								
Less than HS	25 (7.3)	21 (5.5)	0.133	23 (7.3)	8 (2.4)	<.001	<.001	<.001
High School Grad	115 (33.7)	134 (35.4)		120 (37.9)	98 (29.6)			
Some College	82 (24.1)	118 (31.1)		112 (35.3)	156 (47.1)			
College Grad	118 (34.6)	105 (27.7)		62 (19.6)	69 (20.9)			
Refused	1 (0.3)	1 (0.3)		0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)			

164

165 **Bolded** p values indicate statistically significant differences (p < 0.05)

166 **High-sodium item purchases (Table 3)**

167

168 Among NYC FSR respondents, there was a significant decline from baseline to follow-up
169 in the mean number of high-sodium items purchased (0.83 vs 0.65 items/participant, $p < 0.001$)
170 and the proportion of respondents purchasing at least 2 high-sodium items (15% vs 3%,
171 $p < 0.001$). The proportion of respondents purchasing at least 1 high-sodium item did not differ
172 between baseline and follow-up (67% vs 65%, $p = 0.389$).

173 Among Yonkers FSR respondents, there was a significant decline from baseline to
174 follow-up in the proportion of respondents purchasing at least 2 high-sodium items (6% vs 2%,
175 $p = 0.014$). The mean number of high-sodium items purchased by Yonkers FSR respondents did
176 not differ between baseline and follow-up (0.67 vs 0.62 items/participant, $p = 0.309$), nor did the
177 proportion of respondents purchasing at least 1 high-sodium item (59% vs 62%, $p = 0.598$).

178 At FSR, there was no significant change from baseline to follow-up in NYC relative to
179 Yonkers (i.e., difference-in-difference) in the mean number of high-sodium items purchased
180 ($p = 0.120$) or in the proportion of respondents purchasing at least 1 ($p = 0.364$) or at least 2
181 ($p = 0.509$) high-sodium items.

182 Among NYC QSR respondents, there was no significant difference between baseline and
183 follow-up in the mean number of high-sodium items purchased (0.25 vs 0.27 items/participant,
184 $p = 0.603$), or in the proportion of participants purchasing at least one of these items (27% vs
185 30%, $p = 0.422$).

186

187 Among Yonkers QSR participants, there was a significant increase from baseline to
188 follow-up (25% vs 37%, $p=0.027$) in the proportion of participants purchasing at least one high-
189 sodium item. The mean number of high-sodium items did not significantly differ between
190 baseline and follow-up (0.25 vs 0.30 items/participant, $p=0.112$).

191 At QSR, there was no difference-in-difference between NYC and Yonkers in the mean
192 number of high-sodium items purchased ($p=0.463$) or in the proportion of respondents
193 purchasing at least 1 high-sodium item ($p=0.196$).

194

195 **Table 3: Purchases at full-service and quick-service restaurant chains, pre- (baseline) and post- (follow-up) implementation of the sodium**
 196 **warning icon in NYC**

	NYC vs Yonkers	NYC (intervention)				Yonkers (control)			
	Difference In Difference*	Baseline		Follow-up		Baseline		Follow-up	
Full-Service Restaurants		n=734		n=915		n=418		n=538	
# High sodium items purchased per participant, mean (95% CI)	-0.13	0.83	(0.74, 0.93)	0.65^a	(0.58, 0.73)	0.67	(0.59, 0.76)	0.62	(0.53, 0.71)
Participants purchasing at least 1 high-sodium item, % (95% CI)	-4.6	67.4	(61.1, 73.1)	65.0	(58.6, 70.8)	59.3	(51.5, 66.7)	61.5	(53.8, 68.7)
Participants purchasing at least 2 high-sodium items, % (95% CI)	-7.5	15.0	(9.9, 22.0)	3.1^a	(1.7, 5.4)	6.1	(3.6, 10.3)	1.7^b	(0.6, 4.4)
Quick-Service Restaurants		n=338		n=376		n=317		n=329	
# High sodium items purchased per participant, mean (95% CI)	-0.03	0.25	(0.19, 0.34)	0.27	(0.20, 0.36)	0.25	(0.19, 0.34)	0.30	(0.22, 0.41)
Participants purchasing at least 1 high-sodium item, % (95% CI)	-8.9	26.8	(18.2, 37.7)	30.3	(20.8, 41.9)	24.6	(16.3, 35.5)	37.0^b	(25.7, 50.0)

197

198 Models were adjusted for restaurant chain, gender, age group, education, and race/ethnicity, with random effects for restaurant location (street address)

199 Sample sizes for participants included in the models are shown. Due to missingness in fixed effects variables, 19 FSR and 8 QSR participants in the final analytic
 200 sample were not included in modeled estimates.

201 * all p values for difference-in-differences were greater than 0.05

202 **Bolded** estimates indicate statistically significant differences between baseline and follow-up

203 ^a 2017 vs 2015 p < 0.001

204 ^b 2017 vs 2015 p < 0.05

205 **Sodium and Calories:**

206
207 Mean sodium content of purchases declined significantly from baseline to follow-up at
208 both NYC FSR (3,245 mg vs 2,279 mg, $p < 0.001$) and Yonkers FSR (2,696 mg vs 2,254 mg,
209 $p = 0.016$). The decline in NYC was significantly greater than that in Yonkers ($p = 0.012$). Similar
210 patterns were present for the mean calorie content of purchases, with declines at both NYC
211 (baseline: 1,524 kcal; follow-up: 1,055 kcal; $p < 0.001$) and Yonkers (baseline: 1,259 kcal;
212 follow-up: 1,009 kcal; $p = 0.004$), and a significantly greater decline in NYC than in Yonkers
213 ($p = 0.02$). (Fig 3).

214 **Fig 3: Mean sodium and calorie content* of purchases at FSR chains, pre- (Baseline, 2015)**

215 **and post-(Follow-up, 2017) implementation of the sodium warning icon in NYC.** *Sodium

216 and calorie values were square-root-transformed during analysis to meet model normality
217 assumptions and to estimate differences (p values), but least-squared means estimates from
218 models using non-transformed variables are presented for ease of interpretation.

219 Full model estimates are shown in S5 Table. a) NYC vs Yonkers Difference-in-Difference p
220 value < 0.05 ; b) 2015 vs 2017 p value < 0.001 ; c) 2015 vs 2017 p value < 0.05 ; d) 2015 vs 2017
221 p value < 0.01 .

222 At QSR, mean sodium content of purchases did not significantly differ from baseline to
223 follow-up in NYC (1,977 mg vs 1,777 mg, $p = 0.162$) or in Yonkers (2,193 mg vs 1,735 mg,
224 $p = 0.064$), and there was no difference-in-difference between the two cities ($p = 0.570$). Mean
225 calories purchased declined from baseline to follow-up in both NYC (946 kcal vs 794 kcal,
226 $p = 0.013$) and in Yonkers (1,047 kcal vs 836 kcal, $p = 0.039$), with no difference-in-difference
227 between the two cities ($p = 0.768$). (Fig 4).

205 **Fig. 4: Mean sodium and calorie content* of purchases QSR chains, pre- (Baseline, 2015)**
206 **and post-(Follow-up, 2017) implementation of the sodium warning icon in NYC.** *Sodium
207 and calorie values were square-root-transformed during analysis to meet model normality
208 assumptions and to estimate differences (p values), but least-squared means estimates from
209 models using non-transformed variables are presented for ease of interpretation. Full model
210 estimates are shown in S5 Table. a) 2015 vs 2017 p value < 0.05

211 **Discussion**

212
213 Here, we find evidence of changes in purchasing patterns at NYC FSR following
214 implementation of the sodium warning icon. Although decreases in purchases of high-sodium
215 items among NYC FSR respondents were not significant relative to changes in purchases made
216 by Yonkers respondents, both the mean sodium and calorie content of purchases made at NYC
217 FSR declined significantly compared to Yonkers. This change may have been driven by the
218 substantial reduction in the mean number of high-sodium items purchased by NYC FSR patrons.
219 However, at baseline, FSR purchases of high-sodium items and mean sodium content were much
220 higher in NYC than in Yonkers for unknown reasons. Although these analyses accounted for
221 potentially confounding covariates such as demographic characteristics, which significantly
222 differed between cities/years, and excluded extreme outliers, other factors such as location-
223 specific promotions may have contributed to the baseline purchasing differences between NYC
224 and Yonkers.

225 At QSR, there were no observed changes in high-sodium item purchases or in the sodium
226 or calorie content of purchases in NYC compared to Yonkers. Assuming that the sodium
227 warning icon did play a role in the reductions observed at NYC FSR, it is possible that a parallel

205 impact was not seen in the QSR environment because of the differences in ordering method; at
206 FSR, patrons presumably spend a longer time reviewing the menu book than QSR patrons may
207 spend looking at the menu board.

208 While this study is, to our knowledge, the only real-world evaluation of consumer
209 purchases following implementation of the NYC sodium warning regulation, two studies of
210 hypothetical purchasing responses to sodium warning icons among online panels have been
211 conducted. Byrd et al. tested whether hypothetical meal choices, when presented with sodium
212 labeling, differed across taste preferences, with null findings for NYC's sodium warning icon
213 and mixed results for numeric sodium labeling [16]. Musicus et al. evaluated the effectiveness of
214 various sodium warning icon designs, with positive findings for icons that included "Sodium
215 Warning" text [17].

216 During data collection, NYC was the only jurisdiction in the United States with sodium
217 warning labeling in the restaurant environment. Since then, Philadelphia implemented a similar
218 sodium warning policy (their design informed by Musicus et al.'s research) in chain restaurants
219 in 2019 [13],¹³ although no subsequent evaluations have been published.

220 The present study has several limitations. Findings cannot be generalized, as the sample
221 was limited to patrons at 2 FSR and 2 QSR chains, and to those with an itemized receipt.
222 Although participants indicated which items were for their personal consumption, it is unknown
223 how much they consumed. While chain restaurants with consistent menus nationwide were
224 chosen, it is possible that promotions and pricing differed across locations. Baseline and follow-
225 up data were collected during different seasons, with baseline data collection occurring during
226 fall and early winter, and follow-up during spring; although conducting a difference-in-
227 differences analysis with a control city helps mitigate this limitation, changes from baseline to

205 follow-up may have been influenced by the seasonal change. Finally, we were not adequately
206 sampled to examine whether purchases differed by race, ethnicity, and other socio-demographic
207 factors.

208 **Conclusions**

209

210 While efforts like nutrient warnings aim to foster transparency about the food supply and
211 may contribute to health-promoting behaviors [18], commercial factors such as excessive
212 marketing, targeted marketing, and unhealthy food offerings can strongly influence health [19].
213 The accompanying menu evaluation by Sisti et al found no reduction in high-sodium offerings at
214 chain restaurants approximately 18 months following implementation of the sodium warning
215 icon; it may take additional time and action to reduce sodium in restaurant foods. Recently, the
216 US Food and Drug Administration released voluntary sodium reduction goals for the food
217 industry [20]. This, along with restaurant sodium labeling policies from additional jurisdictions,
218 may prompt reformulation and lower- sodium offerings in the restaurant environment, which
219 may have a larger effect on consumer purchasing. Further research on longer-term changes
220 following such policies is warranted. Additionally, as new menu labeling policies are debated
221 and passed (most recently, NYC's Sweet Truth Act [21]), ongoing evaluation of label designs
222 should be conducted to maximize the likelihood of their usefulness to consumers.

223 **Acknowledgements**

224

225 The authors thank the following colleagues for their thoughtful contributions: Aldo
226 Crossa and Sungwoo Lim for statistical guidance, Danielle Gurr, Elizabeth Kelman, and Lauren

205 Shiman for equity-focused review, Shadi Chamany and Hannah Helmy for comments on the
206 manuscript.

207 **References**

- 208 1. Anekwe AV, Lent M, Farley SM, Kessler K, Kennelly MO, Angell SY. New York City's
209 Sodium Warning Regulation: From Conception to Enforcement. *Am J Public Health*.
210 2019;109(9):1191-1192. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2019.305228
- 211 2. New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene. New Sodium (Salt)
212 Warning Rule: What Food Service Establishments Need to Know New Sodium (Salt)
213 Warning Rule: What Food Service Establishments Need to Know.
214 <https://www1.nyc.gov/assets/doh/downloads/pdf/cardio/sodium-warning-rule.pdf>
215 Published August 2016. Accessed July 25, 2022.
- 216 3. Quader ZS, Zhao L, Gillespie C, et al. Sodium Intake Among Persons Aged ≥ 2 Years -
217 United States, 2013-2014. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2017;66(12):324-238.
218 Published 2017 Mar 31. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm6612a3
- 219 4. Wu HW, Sturm R. What's on the menu? A review of the energy and nutritional content
220 of US chain restaurant menus [published correction appears in *Public Health Nutr*. 2012
221 Nov;15(11):2163]. *Public Health Nutr*. 2013;16(1):87-96.
222 doi:10.1017/S136898001200122X
- 223 5. Wolfson JA, Moran AJ, Jarlenski MP, Bleich SN. Trends in Sodium Content of Menu
224 Items in Large Chain Restaurants in the U.S [published correction appears in *Am J Prev*
225 *Med*. 2019 Oct;57(4):576-578]. *Am J Prev Med*. 2018;54(1):28-36.
226 doi:10.1016/j.amepre.2017.08.018
- 227 6. Liu J, Rehm CD, Micha R, Mozaffarian D. Quality of Meals Consumed by US Adults at
228 Full-Service and Fast-Food Restaurants, 2003-2016: Persistent Low Quality and
229 Widening Disparities. *J Nutr*. 2020;150(4):873-883. doi:10.1093/jn/nxz299
- 230 7. U.S. Department of Agriculture and U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
231 Dietary Guidelines for Americans, 2020-2025. 9th Edition. December 2020. Available at
232 <http://DietaryGuidelines.gov>.
- 233 8. Angell SY, Yi S, Eisenhower D, et al. Sodium intake in a cross-sectional, representative
234 sample of New York City adults. *Am J Public Health*. 2014;104(12):2409-2416.
235 doi:10.2105/AJPH.2013.301542
- 236 9. National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. 2019. Dietary Reference
237 Intakes for sodium and potassium. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. doi:
238 <https://doi.org/10.17226/25353>.
- 239 10. Newberry SJ, Chung M, Anderson CAM, et al. Sodium and Potassium Intake: Effects
240 on Chronic Disease Outcomes and Risks. Rockville (MD): Agency for Healthcare
241 Research and Quality (US); June 2018..doi:<https://doi.org/10.23970/AHRQEPCCER206>.
- 242 11. Auchincloss AH, Mallya GG, Leonberg BL, Ricchezza A, Glanz K, Schwarz DF.
243 Customer responses to mandatory menu labeling at full-service restaurants. *Am J Prev*
244 *Med*. 2013;45(6):710-719. doi:10.1016/j.amepre.2013.07.014
- 245 12. Bruemmer B, Krieger J, Saelens BE, Chan N. Energy, saturated fat, and sodium were
246 lower in entrées at chain restaurants at 18 months compared with 6 months following the

- 205 implementation of mandatory menu labeling regulation in King County, Washington. *J*
206 *Acad Nutr Diet.* 2012;112(8):1169-1176. doi:10.1016/j.jand.2012.04.019
- 207 13. Pulos E, Leng K. Evaluation of a voluntary menu-labeling program in full-service
208 restaurants. *Am J Public Health.* 2010;100(6):1035-1039.
209 doi:10.2105/AJPH.2009.174839
- 210 14. City of Philadelphia. Sodium Safety Warning Labeling for Chain Establishments.
211 [https://www.phila.gov/media/20181204132545/Sodium-Safety-Warning-Labeling-for-](https://www.phila.gov/media/20181204132545/Sodium-Safety-Warning-Labeling-for-Chain-Restaurants.pdf)
212 [Chain-Restaurants.pdf](https://www.phila.gov/media/20181204132545/Sodium-Safety-Warning-Labeling-for-Chain-Restaurants.pdf) Published June 2018. Accessed July 25, 2022.
- 213 15. Prasad D, Mezzacca TA, Anekwe AV, et al. Sodium, calorie, and sugary drink
214 purchasing patterns in chain restaurants: Findings from NYC. *Prev Med Rep.*
215 2020;17:101040. Published 2020 Jan 7. doi:10.1016/j.pmedr.2019.101040.
- 216 16. Byrd K, Almanza B, Ghiselli RF, Behnke C, Eicher-Miller HA. Adding sodium
217 information to casual dining restaurant menus: Beneficial or detrimental for consumers?
218 *Appetite.* 2018;125:474-485. doi:10.1016/j.appet.2018.02.025
- 219 17. Musicus AA, Moran AJ, Lawman HG, Roberto CA. Online Randomized Controlled
220 Trials of Restaurant Sodium Warning Labels. *Am J Prev Med.* 2019;57(6):e181-e193.
221 doi:10.1016/j.amepre.2019.06.024
- 222 18. Hall MG, Grummon AH. Nutrient Warnings on Unhealthy Foods. *JAMA.*
223 2020;324(16):1609-1610. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.18941
- 224 19. Hecht AA, Perez CL, Polascek M, Thorndike AN, Franckle RL, Moran AJ. Influence of
225 Food and Beverage Companies on Retailer Marketing Strategies and Consumer
226 Behavior. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.* 2020;17(20):7381. Published 2020 Oct 10.
227 doi:10.3390/ijerph17207381
- 228 20. US Food and Drug Administration. Guidance for Industry: Voluntary Sodium
229 Reduction Goals. [https://www.fda.gov/regulatory-information/search-fda-guidance-](https://www.fda.gov/regulatory-information/search-fda-guidance-documents/guidance-industry-voluntary-sodium-reduction-goals)
230 [documents/guidance-industry-voluntary-sodium-reduction-goals](https://www.fda.gov/regulatory-information/search-fda-guidance-documents/guidance-industry-voluntary-sodium-reduction-goals) Published October 2021.
231 Accessed July 25, 2022.
- 232 21. The New York City Council. A Local Law to amend the administrative code of the city
233 of New York, in relation to requiring added sugar notifications in chain restaurants.
234 [https://legistar.council.nyc.gov/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=3830892&GUID=F0188D46-](https://legistar.council.nyc.gov/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=3830892&GUID=F0188D46-4D9A-46C5-9AC9-F7B7A01DA689)
235 [4D9A-46C5-9AC9-F7B7A01DA689](https://legistar.council.nyc.gov/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=3830892&GUID=F0188D46-4D9A-46C5-9AC9-F7B7A01DA689) Updated January 2022. Accessed July 25, 2022.
236

237 **Supporting Information**

238

239 **S1 Fig: NYC chain restaurant sodium warning** icon (a), displayed next to all items containing
240 2,300 mg of sodium or more, and (b) sodium warning statement, posted in each restaurant at the
241 point of order.

242 **S1 Table: High-sodium items*, IHOP, 2015 and 2017** *Included items that either: 1) displayed
243 a warning icon in 2017 at the time of data collection, or 2) were not on the menu in 2017, but
244 were ordered in 2015 and contained \geq 2,300 mg sodium.

205 **S2 Table: High-sodium items*, TGI Friday's, 2015 and 2017** *Included items that either: 1)
206 displayed a warning icon in 2017 at the time of data collection, or 2) were not on the menu in
207 2017, but were ordered in 2015 and contained $\geq 2,300$ mg sodium.

208 **S3 Table: High-sodium items*, Popeyes, 2015 and 2017** *included items that either: 1)
209 displayed a warning icon in 2017 at the time of data collection, or 2) were not on the menu in
210 2017, but were ordered in 2015 and contained $\geq 2,300$ mg sodium.

211
212 **S4 Table: High-sodium items*, Subway, 2015 and 2017** *included items that either: 1)
213 displayed a warning icon in 2017 at the time of data collection, or 2) were not on the menu in
214 2017, but were ordered in 2015 and contained $\geq 2,300$ mg sodium.

215
216 **S5 Table: Square root-transformed sodium and calorie content of purchases at full-service**
217 **and quick-service restaurant chains, pre- (2015) and post- (2017) implementation of the**
218 **sodium warning icon in NYC**

Fig 1: Participant Flow Chart, Full-Service Restaurants





Figure 1


Fig 3: Mean sodium and calorie content* of purchases at FSR chains, pre- (Baseline, 2015) and post-(Follow-up, 2017) implementation of the sodium warning icon in NYC



*Sodium and calorie values were square-root-transformed during analysis to meet model normality assumptions and to estimate differences (p values), but least-squared means estimates from models using non-transformed variables are presented for ease of interpretation. Full model estimates are shown in S5 Table.
 a) NYC vs Yonkers Difference-in-Difference p value < 0.05; b) 2015 vs 2017 p value < 0.001; c) 2015 vs 2017 p value < 0.05; d) 2015 vs 2017 p value < 0.01

Figure 3

Fig 4: Mean sodium and calorie content* of purchases QSR chains, pre- (Baseline, 2015) and post-(Follow-up, 2017) implementation of the sodium warning icon in NYC



*Sodium and calorie values were square-root-transformed during analysis to meet model normality assumptions and to estimate differences (p values), but least-squared means estimates from models using non-transformed variables are presented for ease of interpretation.

Full model estimates are shown in Supplemental Table 5.

a) 2015 vs 2017 p value < 0.05

Figure 4

Fig 2: Participant Flow Chart, Quick-Service Restaurants




Figure 2