

1 **Food promotions and the cost of a healthy diet**

2

3 Short title: Food promotions and healthy diets

4

5 Author: Sinéad Furey<sup>1</sup>

6

7 <sup>1</sup> Department of Hospitality and Tourism Management, Ulster University Business School,  
8 Ulster University, UK.

9

10 Email address: ms.furey@ulster.ac.uk

11

12 \*Presenting author: Dr Sinéad Furey, Department of Hospitality & Tourism Management,  
13 Ulster University, Coleraine, County Londonderry, BT52 1SA, UK. Phone: +44 28 7012 3964;  
14 e-mail: ms.furey@ulster.ac.uk

15

16 **Abstract**

17 With approximately two in three UK adults overweight or obese, one in five living in poverty,  
18 and our emergence from the Covid-19 pandemic with implications for employment and income  
19 status there is an urgent need to understand what it costs to eat healthily and the role that  
20 promotions can play in helping householders manage food budgets. The literature suggests  
21 that, in affluent countries, price promotions appear to increase consumer food purchases and  
22 are applied more frequently to less healthy products than their healthy counterparts. This  
23 review discusses the cost of a healthy diet, identifies the prevalence of promotions in both the  
24 supermarket setting generally and a typical shopping basket specifically, and discusses the  
25 barriers to affording a healthy diet. Given the current policy focus on the cost of living and  
26 population health emphasising the need for food shopping to represent health and value for  
27 money for better public health outcomes, this review contributes to the evidence base for  
28 retailers' and policymakers' consideration as policy solutions are sought to reduce population  
29 obesity levels, while ensuring the affordability and accessibility of nutritious food. It is  
30 important, given the shift in consumer purchasing behaviour to online shopping as a result of  
31 self-isolating or reticence to physically access stores in response to the Covid-19 pandemic,  
32 that retail food promotions are available irrespective of the chosen mode of shopping (in-store  
33 or online).

34

35 **Keywords**

36 Retail food promotions; healthy eating; food budget

37

38 **Financial support**

39 This review received no specific grant from any funding agency, commercial or not-for-profit  
40 sectors.

41

42 **Conflict of interest**

43 None

44

45 **Introduction**

46 Recent data indicate that almost two thirds (63.3%) of the UK population is overweight or  
47 obese and more than one in four (26%) is obese <sup>(1)</sup>. Almost one in five (18%; 11.7 million  
48 people) was living in relative low income, meaning that these households had less than 60 per  
49 cent of the UK average income before housing costs were deducted in 2019/20, with children  
50 overrepresented in this category (23%) <sup>(2)</sup>. The statistics have remained steady in recent years,  
51 but this is an unacceptable outcome in the fifth richest world economy in 2021 <sup>(3)</sup>. Coupled  
52 with this is the population's emergence from the Covid-19 pandemic with implications for  
53 employment and income status and levels of indebtedness. There is an urgent need to  
54 understand what it costs to eat healthily and the role that retail food promotions can play in  
55 helping householders manage food budgets.

56

57 Retail food promotions are considered to be “*temporary changes to the price of foods and*  
58 *beverages, usually occurring in supermarkets and other food retail settings to increase*  
59 *customer purchases*” <sup>(4,5)</sup>. Price promotions can be classified as price-based discounts or multi-  
60 buy discounts, for example, buy one get one free (BOGOF) deals.

61

62 Supermarkets are significant gatekeepers of our food supply and what we eat in the home due  
63 to being a key source of fresh and unprocessed foods. To facilitate access to a choice of foods,  
64 supermarkets also offer high levels of availability of processed foods that are typically energy-  
65 dense and high in fat, sugar, and salt. A systematic literature review <sup>(5)</sup> suggests that, in affluent  
66 countries, price promotions appear to increase consumer food and beverage purchases and are  
67 applied more frequently to less healthy products than their healthy counterparts. This review

68 discusses the cost of a healthy diet, identifies the prevalence of promotions in both the  
69 supermarket setting generally and a typical shopping basket specifically and discusses the  
70 barriers to affording a healthy diet.

71

72 The literature recognises that a number of factors impact upon consumers' general food  
73 choices. Sobal *et al.* <sup>(6)</sup> conceptualise food choice as operating at physical, biological,  
74 psychological, and sociocultural levels. At the individual level, in recent years, the consumer  
75 has been impacted by a range of macro-issues; namely, the recent recession in terms of rising  
76 food, fuel and housing costs alongside decreasing wages and proposals for welfare reform <sup>(7)</sup>.  
77 A Department of the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs UK report (2010) <sup>(8)</sup> on people's  
78 reactions to rising food prices showed people noting and responding quite dramatically even  
79 before the introduction of austerity measures. Global food prices are rising and according to  
80 the United Nations' Food Price Index, food prices in May 2021 were 4.8% higher than in April  
81 - the biggest monthly rise since October 2010 - and 39.7% higher than May 2020 <sup>(9)</sup>.  
82 Furthermore, media reports present the inevitability of price rises as a result of the UK's exit  
83 from the European Union.

84

85 Rising food costs have implications for public health, whereby consumers for whom food  
86 becomes prohibitively expensive respond by reducing the nutritional quality and quantity of  
87 food they eat <sup>(10)</sup>. Such coping strategies may result in malnutrition, overweight and/or obesity.

88

89 At the population level, in Northern Ireland the direct and indirect costs of overweight and  
90 obesity in 2009 were estimated to be £369,799,820 <sup>(11)</sup>; the equivalent of more than £1 million  
91 per day highlighting that a great deal of attention in public spending is focused on public health.  
92 In attempting to reduce this public health spending burden, a cross-departmental policy  
93 imperative – *A Fitter Future for All: Framework for Preventing and Addressing Overweight  
94 and Obesity in Northern Ireland 2012-2022* – has focused the attention of relevant stakeholders  
95 to make a collective effort to combat the obesity epidemic. The Strategy recognises the  
96 importance of continuing to encourage Northern Ireland food manufacturers to reformulate  
97 their food and drink products to reduce saturated fat, sugar, salt, calorific value and provide  
98 smaller portion sizes of energy-dense foods and beverages. Further, the Strategy recognises the  
99 role of retail promotions in consumers' food and drink purchasing behaviour and has  
100 committed to encouraging and enabling food retailers to '*consider reducing point of sale  
101 placement of foods which are high in fat, salt, sugar and increasing exposure to promotion of*

102 *healthier foods*'<sup>(12)</sup>. Similarly, the Government in England recently confirmed its intention to  
103 impose a UK-wide pre-9pm ban on TV adverts for food high in sugar, salt and fat and new  
104 rules on online promotion. Additionally, the National Food Strategy (p.121)<sup>(13)</sup> outlines  
105 deliberative panel participants' *'overwhelming support for much stronger restrictions on the*  
106 *advertising and promotion of junk food'* with some wanting *'tougher regulations for retailers*  
107 *selling junk food'*.

108

109 Online grocery sales are particularly strong in the UK and online shopping for groceries was  
110 the fastest growing sector of the supermarket industry between 2010 and 2018 in the UK<sup>(14)</sup>.  
111 In the UK in 2018, 7% of supermarket shopping was conducted online, representing over £11  
112 billion annually<sup>(14)</sup>. Kantar Worldpanel data (2020)<sup>(15)</sup> indicate that the effects of the Covid-  
113 19 pandemic are likely to further support this trend. This review discusses the cost of a healthy  
114 diet, identifies the prevalence of promotions in both the supermarket setting generally and a  
115 typical shopping basket specifically, and discusses the barriers to affording a healthy diet.

116

117

## 118 **Literature review**

119 The integral relationship between diet, health and income is well known. Food poverty  
120 manifests itself as a short-term dilemma of putting food on the table alongside the long-term  
121 effects of food poverty including the habitual consumption of poor nutritional quality foods to  
122 the extent that lower income consumers are compromising food and nutritional quality to  
123 satiate hunger. The food budget has long been appreciated as being the flexible item in the  
124 household economy<sup>(16, 17, 18, 19, 20)</sup>. Consequently, food budgets are the most likely to be reduced  
125 during financial crisis<sup>(21, 22)</sup>. It is a fundamental human right that food is available and  
126 affordable, yet this moral is undermined when a basic healthy diet is out of reach of our most  
127 vulnerable citizens.

128

### 129 *UK population's spend on food and non-alcoholic beverages*

130 The *Living Costs and Food Survey*<sup>(23, 24)</sup> indicates how the average UK household spent £62.20  
131 per week on food which equates to 11% of total expenditure (2018-20 figures). Lower income  
132 households spent a higher proportion of their total expenditure on food and non-alcoholic  
133 drinks: households with the lowest income spent 14% of their total expenditure on food and  
134 non-alcoholic drinks, compared to their highest-income counterparts spending 8% of their total  
135 expenditure on this category. Therefore, *"efforts to effectively and equitably improve*

136 *population nutrition, the price and affordability of healthy foods and diets, relative to less*  
137 *healthy options, are increasingly being recognised as priority areas for policy intervention”*  
138 <sup>(25)</sup>.

139

#### 140 *Shopping basket research*

141 Shopping basket research is a longstanding methodology to investigate the affordability and  
142 availability of food given its utility in collating a depth and breadth of information using a  
143 formulaic structure to facilitate consistency of approach to data collection, and its relevance to  
144 the research objectives of ascertaining the availability and affordability of foodstuffs. The  
145 problems of devising a shopping basket and defining which foods should be included that are  
146 both typical and acceptable to consumers has been discussed elsewhere <sup>(26, 27, 18, 28)</sup>. Caraher  
147 and Furey <sup>(29)</sup> provides a useful overview of shopping basket studies.

148

149 Joint research by the FSA in NI, *safefood* (Republic of Ireland) and The Consumer Council in  
150 Northern Ireland <sup>(30)</sup> has developed standard weekly shopping baskets, by using the  
151 methodological approach of the consensual budget standards process where essential food  
152 items are specified by a majority opinion <sup>(31)</sup> achieving a social consensus of what everyone  
153 ‘*should be able to afford*’ <sup>(32)</sup>(p.3). This means that the food items contained within reflect local  
154 diets and realistic purchasing behaviours <sup>(33, 20)</sup>.

155

156 However, when analysed against the average UK household spend on food and non-alcoholic  
157 beverages, the cost of a healthy shopping basket appears prohibitively expensive. For example,  
158 the above shopping basket research <sup>(30)</sup> for four household types in Northern Ireland found that  
159 low-income families in Northern Ireland have to spend up to 46% of their weekly income to  
160 afford a healthy food basket. Specifically, a nutritionally adequate shopping basket of weekly  
161 food for a two-parent, two-child household type (primary-school and secondary-school age) is  
162 £162 (approximately £23.14 per day; 46% of household income if dependent on social  
163 security). The total weekly cost of a minimum essential food basket for a one-parent, two-child  
164 household type (pre-school and primary-school age) is £105 (approximately £15 per day; 34%  
165 of household income if dependent on social security). The total weekly cost of an equivalent  
166 food basket for a pensioner living alone household is £61; 32% of their household income, if  
167 dependent on a state pension (approximately £8.71 per day). Finally, a two-parent, two-child  
168 household (pre-school and primary-school age) dependent on state benefits would need to

169 spend 34% of their weekly income (£122, equivalent to £17.43 per day) to buy a minimum  
170 essential food basket.

171

172 The phenomenon is not particular to the UK. Barosh *et al.* <sup>(34)</sup> investigated the price differential  
173 of a healthy and sustainable shopping basket in Australia. They found that the cost of the  
174 healthy and sustainable basket was greater than the typical basket in all neighbourhoods,  
175 irrespective of socioeconomic status. However, households in the lowest income quintile  
176 would have to spend up to 48% of their weekly income to buy the healthy and sustainable  
177 basket, while households in the highest income quintile would have to spend significantly less  
178 (9%) of their weekly income.

179

180 Individuals on a low income therefore spend less money on food although they actually spend  
181 a greater percentage of their income on food products <sup>(35)</sup>. MacMahon and Weld's study <sup>(20)</sup>  
182 found the cost of minimum essential food baskets to be considerably greater for those in low-  
183 income households with many individuals having to relinquish '*necessary*' food items.

184

#### 185 *The role of promotions in managing the food budget*

186 Promotional activity is an important part of the food retail landscape for both consumers and  
187 retailers. Kantar World Panel data found that up to 83% of purchases made on price promotion  
188 are "*impulse purchases*", with only 17% "*planned purchases*" <sup>(36)</sup>. Consumers are 'value'  
189 conscious and demonstrate savviness in their shopping behaviours having come to expect  
190 reduced prices and are increasingly reliant on discounters <sup>(20)</sup>. Consumers can save money on  
191 their average shop by seeking out promotional in-store food offers – an aspect which is  
192 important given the relative cost of food in the current economic context <sup>(37, 38)</sup>. The British  
193 Retail Consortium (BRC) (2009) <sup>(39)</sup> commissioned consumer research and concluded 'price'  
194 to be the main barrier to eating a healthier diet for one-fifth (21%) of shoppers. Shoppers opined  
195 that healthy foods are too expensive and unhealthy foods are promoted more than their healthy  
196 counterparts.

197

198 For the purposes of this paper, retail food promotions will be defined as forms of promotion  
199 which are primarily associated with a temporary reduction in price <sup>(40)</sup>. A recent systematic  
200 review of the academic literature on retail food promotions has found some evidence that the  
201 purchasing of price-promoted foods and/or beverages was either similar across socio-economic  
202 groups or was greater for households with higher income - a finding that contrasts the literature

203 that suggests that those of a lower socioeconomic position are more price sensitive in terms of  
204 their grocery purchasing <sup>(5)</sup>.

205

206 *The healthfulness of food products on promotion*

207 An obesity epidemic and rising food prices have implications for health since dietary quality  
208 and dietary costs are positively related. Food and drink innovation through food manufacturers’  
209 product reformulation strategies has received significant attention in recent years <sup>(12, 13, 41)</sup> since  
210 product reformulation can support current strategies that align price-based promotions with  
211 prominent placement strategies to increase the availability, accessibility and affordability of  
212 food and drink choices to consumers. Given the considerable effort to reformulate the food and  
213 beverage retail product offering, it will be important that retailers utilise price-based  
214 promotions and prominent placement tactics to make these food and drink innovations  
215 available to the broadest number of consumers as possible. To do so will help to realise the  
216 population benefits that are possible, with the potential to influence supply and demand, and  
217 serve as a further catalyst for product reformulation.

218

219 The academic literature is clear that there is a dichotomy presented between the cost and  
220 healthfulness of food. For example, Waterlander *et al.* (2010) <sup>(42)</sup> cite several studies <sup>(43, 44, 45,</sup>  
221 <sup>46)</sup> confirming that lower-income consumers’ primary influencing factor when buying food is  
222 price. These studies explain how more price-sensitive consumers appear less concerned about  
223 the health aspects of food.

224

225 Retail food promotions have been attributed to support such consumers to afford food and drink  
226 products they may not otherwise be minded to purchase. Milliron *et al.* <sup>(47)</sup> identify that the  
227 average shopper arrives at the store undecided about what to buy and is influenced by other  
228 cues such as displays and packaging. Public Health England found that volume promotions  
229 such as BOGOFs increase purchases of a product by an average of 15% <sup>(48)</sup>. Martin *et al.* <sup>(36)</sup>  
230 found that the products most likely to be discounted through multi-buy promotions were  
231 unhealthy foods and that this type of discount drives the greatest increase in sales compared  
232 with temporary price reductions.

233

234 There is consensus among the literature that consumers’ responses to such sales promotions  
235 tactics have been found to have a significant impact on short term sales, due to brand switching,

236 product switching, category switching, and temporal switching (stockpiling) <sup>(49)</sup>, but do not  
237 shift dietary patterns <sup>(49, 50, 4)</sup>.

238

239 However, Hawkes<sup>(4)</sup> found that sales promotions of food contribute to increased consumption  
240 of food - a finding more recently corroborated by Martin *et al.*<sup>(36)</sup> which concluded that price  
241 promotions on unhealthy foods and beverages were ubiquitous and increased purchase volume  
242 of these products. Hawkes <sup>(4)</sup> tested the expectation that highly impulsive people are less  
243 resistant to sales promotions and found that sales promotion, weight status, and inhibitory  
244 control appeared to have an effect on participants' purchases of snack food. Using sales data  
245 as a proxy for dietary intake indicates that sales promotions have the potential to influence  
246 consumer purchasing and may encourage consumers to buy and eat more <sup>(51, 52, 4, 53, 54)</sup>. This  
247 further reinforces the merits of the food industry's investment in innovation to achieve product  
248 reformulation.

249

250 To develop this point further, Ni Mhurchu *et al.*, <sup>(53)</sup> evaluated the effect of price discounts and  
251 education (tailored to match participants' purchasing habits) on supermarket purchases. Sales  
252 data were again used to assess nutrients purchased and identify any change in the number of  
253 healthy food items purchased. The research concluded that while there was no difference  
254 attributed to energy intake as a result of price discounts, nutrition education, or both;  
255 participants who received price discounts on healthful foods bought significantly "more  
256 healthful" foods at six and 12 months. This indicates that there is merit in coupling price  
257 promotions to reformulated products to incentivise more healthful food purchasing and eating  
258 behaviours. The research <sup>(55, 56)</sup> confirms that pricing strategies hold more influence when  
259 focused on encouraging healthy eating than converse pricing strategies which focused on  
260 discouraging unhealthy eating.

261

262 A 2019 systematic review of the literature <sup>(5)</sup> found that 14 of the 16 included studies concluded  
263 that price promotions for unhealthy foods and beverages were either more frequent or had  
264 greater influence on purchasing compared with price promotions for healthy items.

265

266 Price promotions are widely used by supermarkets to encourage purchase of targeted products  
267 more quickly, more frequently, and/or in greater quantities <sup>(57)</sup>. Price promotions <sup>(58)</sup> have been  
268 shown to be extremely effective in altering consumer behaviour with a 200-1,000% uplift in  
269 product sales <sup>(59)</sup>, albeit in the short-term <sup>(43)</sup>. This behaviour change is evident particularly in



270 shoppers with a lower socioeconomic status, females aged 30-40 years, those with no shopping  
271 list and those who are more receptive to price promotions <sup>(60, 61)</sup>.

272

273 This responsiveness to food promotions has also been used successfully as a tool to increase  
274 the sales of healthier food <sup>(62, 55, 56, 63)</sup> suggesting the potential of pricing strategies to improve  
275 diets at the population level. However, a Public Health England evidence review <sup>(64)</sup> in relation  
276 to actions to reduce sugar consumption found that food retail price promotions are more  
277 widespread in Britain than anywhere else in Europe; that foods on promotion account for  
278 around 40% of all expenditure on food and drinks consumed at home and that higher sugar  
279 products are promoted more than other foods. The review also found that price promotions  
280 serve to augment the amount of food and drink people buy by around one-fifth (22%) and are  
281 purchases that people would not make if the price promotions did not exist.

282

283 Coker *et al.* <sup>(65)</sup> concluded that high promotional shoppers (upper quartile) purchased a greater  
284 quantity of unhealthy foods (higher in sugar and lower in fibre) and beverages and less fruits  
285 and vegetables compared with low promotion shoppers (lower quartile). Additionally, the  
286 prevalence of obesity for the main household shopper was found to be greater for high  
287 promotional shoppers (36%) compared with low promotional shoppers (28%).

288

289 English research <sup>(66)</sup> investigating whether food retailers' pricing techniques contribute to  
290 overbuying and obesity found that retailers offer a wide range of special offers. Dobson <sup>(66)</sup>  
291 concluded that there is a healthy choice of supermarket offers available and the onus was placed  
292 firmly on consumers to shop carefully and avoid overbuying less healthy food (particularly for  
293 very prominent offers, which can appear very tempting).

294

295 Prominence of retail food promotions receives much attention in the literature. In-store  
296 marketing strategies that draw attention to healthier products may be effective and sustainable  
297 for improving diet quality and health <sup>(67)</sup>. They found that "*straightforward placement*  
298 *strategies can significantly enhance the sales of healthier items in several food and beverage*  
299 *categories. Such strategies show promise for significant public health effects in communities*  
300 *with the greatest risk of obesity*" for reasons of their scalability <sup>(67)</sup>. Kerr *et al.* <sup>(68)</sup> agree and  
301 concluded that areas of high promotional prominence have an apparent power and the  
302 placement of healthy products in high-promotional-prominence areas is a more effective  
303 approach than simply increasing the number of locations for healthy products. Similarly,

304 University of Cambridge, University of East Anglia and MRC Human Nutrition Research  
305 recommended that prohibiting or limiting prominent placement strategies for less healthy  
306 options, or augmenting their use for healthier products, holds the promising possibility of  
307 encouraging healthier lifestyle choices <sup>(69)</sup>.

308

309 The literature is clear that there is merit in aligning price discounts and prominent promotional  
310 efforts to increase the availability, accessibility and affordability of food and drink choices to  
311 consumers. Waterlander *et al.*'s studies <sup>(42, 55, 56, 62)</sup>, when considered together, conclude that  
312 the experts and the consumers agree on the potential success of making healthy food and drinks  
313 cheaper by either discounts or price cuts, as well as offering little extras with healthy foods.

314

315

316

## 317 **Discussion**

### 318 *Promotions and product (un)availability*

319 Promotional strategies with their associated potential to result in a significant uplift in  
320 consumer purchasing necessitates there to be effective stock management. Product  
321 unavailability is considered to be a frequently occurring and universal issue, and a major  
322 concern for retailers and manufacturers alike <sup>(70)</sup>. Stockouts are considered to be a persistent  
323 problem in retailing and something that the supply chain is eager to avoid because of the  
324 widespread increase in retailers' and manufacturers' awareness of the sales, customer loyalty  
325 and market share losses induced by poor on-shelf-availability <sup>(71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76)</sup>.

326

### 327 *Promotions and the perception of 'price' and 'quality'*

328 McDonald and Milne <sup>(77)</sup> found that, per kilogramme of foods and beverages purchased,  
329 groceries that were price promoted were 30% more expensive, after discounts, compared with  
330 generic or low-cost brands that are typically not price promoted. McDonald and Milne suggest  
331 that consumers are not necessarily purchasing the cheapest item available when they purchase  
332 price-promoted products. This raises important questions regarding how consumers perceive  
333 and define value and quality across different income groups <sup>(5)</sup>.

334

335 The literature suggests that promotions were not readily available on retailers' own generic  
336 brands, possibly because they are already perceived as being lower-priced <sup>(25)</sup>. However, given  
337 the likely impact of the economic recovery from Covid-19 and the UK exit from the EU on

338 household budgets, it will be prudent for retailers to continue to monitor the availability,  
339 purchasing and promotion of generic brands into the future <sup>(25)</sup>, particularly given the research  
340 finding from a Northern Ireland study <sup>(78)</sup> that generic brands were often found to be superior  
341 to market brands with regards to overall healthfulness when measured using a score aligned to  
342 the Food Standards Agency's Front of Pack nutrient labelling system.

343

344 Importantly, the Bennett *et al.* <sup>(5)</sup> systematic review did not identify any studies that examined  
345 how shoppers may swap between stores in response to discounts and the impact this may have  
346 on their overall purchasing pattern. This is an important research topic for the future because it  
347 is well established that the '*discipline of poverty*' <sup>(79, 80)</sup> dictates that people shop around to  
348 secure the best deal and the best prices may be achieved across different stores and not by  
349 shopping from a single retailer <sup>(29)</sup>. The fierce competition between the supermarket chains is  
350 one thing that could insulate British households from food price inflation. At the moment, food  
351 prices are being pulled lower by the return of promotional deals which were dropped as food  
352 stores concentrated on keeping shelves full at the height of the health crisis <sup>(82)</sup>.

353

354 *Parity of esteem between in-store and online promotions*

355 Bhatnagar *et al.* <sup>(81)</sup> found in a general sample, 85 % (95 % CI 80, 90 %) of products found in  
356 physical stores could be matched with an online product, and prices were similar between  
357 online and physical stores making the online exercise a good proxy for product availability and  
358 prices. Therefore, while Bhatnagar *et al.* <sup>(81)</sup> found that online tools were good proxies for  
359 product availability and price, there was only fair agreement in the general sample for the  
360 presence of price promotions (Cohen's kappa = 0.40 (95 % CI 0.26, 0.55)). However, they  
361 found that there were more price promotions present in physical supermarkets (32% of  
362 products) compared with online supermarkets (24% of products) with potential for impacting  
363 on health inequalities for those reliant on online sources alone when grocery shopping in  
364 physical stores may represent an easier means to achieve better value for money. For this  
365 reason, and for reasons of parity of approach between physical stores and online shopping, the  
366 literature calls for further research into online promotions to better understand patterns in  
367 promotions, the impact on purchasing behaviour and the implications for policy. This is an area  
368 requiring additional investigation particularly in the UK context given the recent moves to ban  
369 food retail promotions on less healthy foods in support of the Childhood Obesity Plan and  
370 National Food Strategy.

371

372 **Conclusion**

373 Given the current policy focus on the cost of living and population health emphasising the need  
374 for food shopping to represent health and value for money for better public health outcomes  
375 and reduced morbidity, this review contributes to the evidence base for retailers' and  
376 policymakers' consideration as policy solutions are sought to reduce population obesity levels,  
377 while ensuring the affordability and accessibility of nutritious food. It makes some observations  
378 and recommendations that could helpfully inform retailers' promotional strategies in respect  
379 of the breadth of products to which promotional offers apply including manufacturers' and  
380 retailers' own brands. It is important, given the shift in consumer purchasing behaviour to  
381 online shopping as a result of reticence to go outside during the Covid-19 pandemic, that retail  
382 food promotions are available irrespective of the chosen mode of shopping (in-store or online).  
383 It is incumbent upon consumers, within their capabilities and interest, to shop around for the  
384 best deal. Finally, it would be beneficial if retailers kept apprised of healthy food basket  
385 research as they strive to ensure a balance of promotional activity against such popularly  
386 purchased products and produce.

387

388

389 **References**

- 390 1. OECD (2019) *Overweight or obese population*. Available from :  
391 <https://data.oecd.org/healthrisk/overweight-or-obese-population.htm> [accessed June  
392 2021)
- 393 2. House of Commons Library (2021) *Poverty in the UK: Statistics*. Available from:  
394 <https://commonslibrary.parliament.uk/research-briefings/sn07096/> [Accessed 20.06.21]
- 395 3. World Population Review (2021) *Richest countries in the world – 2021*. Available from:  
396 <https://worldpopulationreview.com/country-rankings/richest-countries-in-the-world>  
397 [Accessed June 2021]
- 398 4. Hawkes C (2009) Sales promotions and food consumption. *Nutrition Reviews*, **67**(6),  
399 333–342.
- 400 5. Bennett R, Zorbas C, Huse O et al. (2020) Prevalence of healthy and unhealthy food and  
401 beverage price promotions and their potential influence on shopper purchasing  
402 behaviour: A systematic review of the literature. *Obesity Reviews*, **21**(1) e12948.  
403 <https://doi.org/10.1111/obr.12948>
- 404 6. Sobal J, Bisogni C A, and Jastran M (2014) Food choice is multifaceted, contextual,  
405 dynamic, multilevel, integrated, and diverse. *Mind, Brain, and Education*. **8**(1), 6-12.

- 406 7. Dowler E A, Kneafsey M, Lambie H, et al. (2011) Thinking about ‘food security’:  
407 engaging with UK consumers. *Critical Public Health*. **21**(4), 403-416.
- 408 8. Department of the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (2010) *Food statistics*  
409 *pocketbook 2010*. Available from:  
410 [https://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20130103024812/http://www.defra.gov.uk/](https://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20130103024812/http://www.defra.gov.uk/statistics/foodfarm/food/pocketstats/)  
411 [statistics/foodfarm/food/pocketstats/](https://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20130103024812/http://www.defra.gov.uk/statistics/foodfarm/food/pocketstats/) [accessed July 2021]
- 412 9. BBC News (2021) UN: Cost of food rises at fastest pace in over a decade. *BBC News*  
413 *Online*. Available from: <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/business-57353624> [Accessed  
414 June 2021]
- 415 10. Griffith R, O’Connell M, and Smith K (2013) *Food expenditure and nutritional quality*  
416 *over the Great Recession*. London: Institute for Fiscal Studies.
- 417 11. Safefood (2012) *The cost of overweight and obesity on the island of Ireland*. Dublin:  
418 Safefood.
- 419 12. Department of Health, Social Services and Public Safety (2012) *A fitter future for all:*  
420 *framework for preventing and addressing overweight and obesity in Northern Ireland*  
421 *2012-2022*. Belfast: Department of Health, Social Services and Public Safety.
- 422 13. Dimpleby H (2021) *National food strategy: Independent review – The plan*. Available  
423 at: <https://www.nationalfoodstrategy.org/the-report/> [Accessed July 2021]
- 424 14. Statista (2019) *UK consumers: online grocery shopping*. London: Statista.
- 425 15. Kantar (2020) *UK grocery growth accelerates as retailers and shoppers look to next*  
426 *stage of lockdown*. Available from: [https://www.kantar.com/inspiration/fmcg/uk-](https://www.kantar.com/inspiration/fmcg/uk-grocery-growth-accelerates-as-retailers-and-shoppers-look-to-next-stage-of-lockdown)  
427 [grocery-growth-accelerates-as-retailers-and-shoppers-look-to-next-stage-of-lockdown](https://www.kantar.com/inspiration/fmcg/uk-grocery-growth-accelerates-as-retailers-and-shoppers-look-to-next-stage-of-lockdown)  
428 [Accessed June 2021].
- 429 16. Donkin AJM, Dowler EA, Stevenson SJ, et al. (2000) Mapping access to food in a  
430 deprived area: the development of price and availability indices. *Public Health Nutrition*,  
431 **3**, 32–34.
- 432 17. Dowler EA (1997) Budgeting for food on a low income in the UK: the case of lone-  
433 parent families. *Food Policy*, **22**(5), 405-417.
- 434 18. Lang T (1999) Social inclusion and health: the role of shopping supply and access to  
435 quality food. In *Local food retailing: delegate information*. Urban Environment Today,  
436 London.
- 437 19. Inglis V, Ball K, and Crawford D (2009) Does modifying the household food budget  
438 predict changes in the healthfulness of purchasing choices among low- and high-income  
439 women? *Appetite*, **52**(2), 273-279.

- 440 20. MacMahon B and Weld G (2015) *Cost of a healthy basket. A pilot study of two household*  
441 *types in Northern Ireland*. Belfast: Foods Standards Agency.
- 442 21. Joseph Rowntree Foundation (1994) *Eating on low income (summary)*. York: Joseph  
443 Rowntree Foundation.
- 444 22. Money Advice Trust (2014) *Changing household budgets: Supporting the UK's*  
445 *economic recovery*. London: Money Advice Trust. Available from:  
446 [https://www.pdfsearch.io/document/United+States+Consumer+Price+Index/1rdVL-](https://www.pdfsearch.io/document/United+States+Consumer+Price+Index/1rdVL-show/Changing+household+budgets+Supporting+the+UK%E2%80%99s+economic+recovery)  
447 [show/Changing+household+budgets+Supporting+the+UK%E2%80%99s+economic+re-](https://www.pdfsearch.io/document/United+States+Consumer+Price+Index/1rdVL-show/Changing+household+budgets+Supporting+the+UK%E2%80%99s+economic+recovery)  
448 [covery](https://www.pdfsearch.io/document/United+States+Consumer+Price+Index/1rdVL-show/Changing+household+budgets+Supporting+the+UK%E2%80%99s+economic+recovery) [Accessed July 2021]
- 449 23. Office for National Statistics (2021) *Family spending workbook 2: expenditure by*  
450 *income*. London: Office for National Statistics. Available from:  
451 [https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/personalandhouseholdfinance](https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/personalandhouseholdfinance/expenditure/datasets/familyspendingworkbook2expenditurebyincome)  
452 [/expenditure/datasets/familyspendingworkbook2expenditurebyincome](https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/personalandhouseholdfinance/expenditure/datasets/familyspendingworkbook2expenditurebyincome) [Accessed June  
453 2021].
- 454 24. Office for National Statistics (2021) *Family spending workbook 3: expenditure by*  
455 *region*. London: Office for National Statistics. Available from:  
456 [https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/personalandhouseholdfinance](https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/personalandhouseholdfinance/expenditure/datasets/familyspendingworkbook3expenditurebyregion)  
457 [s/expenditure/datasets/familyspendingworkbook3expenditurebyregion](https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/personalandhouseholdfinance/expenditure/datasets/familyspendingworkbook3expenditurebyregion) [Accessed June  
458 2021].
- 459 25. Zorbas C, Eyles H, Orellana L, et al. (2020) Do purchases of price promoted and generic  
460 branded foods and beverages vary according to food category and income level?  
461 Evidence from a consumer research panel. *Appetite*, **144**, 104481.
- 462 26. Leather S (1992) Less money, less choice: Poverty and diet in the UK today. In *Your*  
463 *food, whose choice?* (National Consumer Council), p. 75. HMSO, London.
- 464 27. Nelson MB, Mayer A and Manley P (1992) *Modest-but adequate budget standards- food*  
465 *budgets for six household types. Working paper no. 4 (revised)*. Family Budget Unit,  
466 York.
- 467 28. Anderson A S, Dewar J, Marshall D, et al. (2007) The development of a healthy eating  
468 indicator shopping basket tool (HEISB) for use in food access studies—identification of  
469 key food items. *Public Health Nutrition*: **10**(12), 1440–1447.
- 470 29. Caraher M and Furey S (2018) *The economics of emergency food aid provision: a*  
471 *financial, social and cultural perspective*. 1 edn, Palgrave Macmillan.  
472 <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-78506-6>

- 473 30. Safefood, Consumer Council and Food Standards Agency in NI (2021) What is the *cost*  
474 *of a healthy food basket in Northern Ireland in 2020?* Dublin: Safefood. Available from:  
475 [https://www.safefood.net/getattachment/dcaa7b5f-354b-41a0-bf57-](https://www.safefood.net/getattachment/dcaa7b5f-354b-41a0-bf57-80cc7387ac9e/Cost_of_a_healthy_food_basket_NI_Report.pdf?lang=en-IEf)  
476 [80cc7387ac9e/Cost\\_of\\_a\\_healthy\\_food\\_basket\\_NI\\_Report.pdf?lang=en-IEf](https://www.safefood.net/getattachment/dcaa7b5f-354b-41a0-bf57-80cc7387ac9e/Cost_of_a_healthy_food_basket_NI_Report.pdf?lang=en-IEf) [Accessed  
477 June 2021].
- 478 31. Mack J (2016) *Minimum budget standards*. London: Poverty and Social Exclusion.  
479 Available from: [https://www.poverty.ac.uk/definitions-poverty/minimum-budget-](https://www.poverty.ac.uk/definitions-poverty/minimum-budget-standards#:~:text=Consensual%20budget%20standards&text=Niemietz%20proposed%20(as%20in%20the,decisions)%20and%20their%20market%20prices.)  
480 [standards#:~:text=Consensual%20budget%20standards&text=Niemietz%20proposed%](https://www.poverty.ac.uk/definitions-poverty/minimum-budget-standards#:~:text=Consensual%20budget%20standards&text=Niemietz%20proposed%20(as%20in%20the,decisions)%20and%20their%20market%20prices.)  
481 [20\(as%20in%20the,decisions\)%20and%20their%20market%20prices.](https://www.poverty.ac.uk/definitions-poverty/minimum-budget-standards#:~:text=Consensual%20budget%20standards&text=Niemietz%20proposed%20(as%20in%20the,decisions)%20and%20their%20market%20prices.) [Accessed July  
482 2021].
- 483 32. Bradshaw J, Middleton S, Davis A et al. (2008) *A minimum income standard for Britain*.  
484 London: Universities of York and Loughborough.
- 485 33. Lee A, Mhurchu CN, Sacks G et al (2013) Monitoring the price and affordability of foods  
486 and diets globally. *Obesity Reviews*, **14**(1), 82-95.
- 487 34. Barosh L, Friel S, Engelhardt K et al. (2014) The cost of a healthy and sustainable diet –  
488 who can afford it? *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health*. **38** (1), 7–12
- 489 35. Shepherd R, Paisley C, Sparks, P, et al. (1996) Constraints on dietary choice: the role of  
490 income. *Nutrition and Food Science*, **96**, 21.
- 491 36. Martin L, Bauld L, and Angus K. (2017) *Rapid evidence review: The impact of*  
492 *promotions on high fat, sugar and salt (HFSS) food and drink on consumer purchasing*  
493 *and consumption behaviour and the effectiveness of retail environment interventions*.  
494 Edinburgh: NHS Scotland.
- 495 37. Dowler EA, O'Connor D. (2012) Rights-based approaches to addressing food poverty  
496 and food insecurity in Ireland and UK. *Social Science & Medicine*. **74**(1):44-51. 12.
- 497 38. Nielsen Global (2016) *Consumer confidence survey - ROI Q4*
- 498 39. British Retail Consortium (2009) *British retailing: a commitment to health*. London:  
499 British Retail Consortium.
- 500 40. Gedenk SA, Neslin KL, and Ailawadi KL (2006) Sales promotion. In Kraft M and  
501 Mantrala M K. (Eds) *Retailing in the 21st Century*, Heidelberg: Springer.
- 502 41. Department of Health, Food Standards Agency, Welsh Government and Scottish  
503 Government (2013) *Guide to creating a front of pack (FoP) nutrition label for pre-*  
504 *packed products sold through retail outlets*. Available from:  
505 [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/300886/](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/300886/2902158_FoP_Nutrition_2014.pdf)  
506 [2902158\\_FoP\\_Nutrition\\_2014.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/300886/2902158_FoP_Nutrition_2014.pdf) [Accessed July 2021]



- 507 42. Waterlander WE, de Mul A, Schuit AJ et al. (2010) Perceptions on the use of pricing  
508 strategies to stimulate healthy eating among residents of deprived neighbourhoods: a  
509 focus group study. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*.**7**,  
510 44.
- 511 43. Jetter KM and Cassady D L (2006) The availability and cost of healthier food  
512 alternatives. *American Journal of Preventative Medicine*. **30**(1), 38-44.
- 513 44. Drewnowski A, Monsivais P, Maillot, M et al. (2007) Low-energy-density diets are  
514 associated with higher diet quality and higher diet costs in French adults. *Journal of the*  
515 *American Dietetic Association*. **107**(6), 1028-1032.
- 516 45. Maillot M, Darmon N, Vieux F et al. (2007) Low energy density and high nutritional  
517 quality are each associated with higher diet costs in French adults. *American Journal of*  
518 *Clinical Nutrition*. **86**(3), 690-696.
- 519 46. Honkanen P and Frewer L (2009) Russian consumers' motives for food choice. *Appetite*.  
520 **52**, 363-371.
- 521 47. Milliron BJ, Woolf K and Appelhans BA (2012) A point-of-purchase intervention  
522 featuring in-person supermarket education affects healthful food purchases. *Journal of*  
523 *Nutrition Education and Behavior*. **44** (3), 225-232.
- 524 48. Smithson M, Kirk J, and Capelin C (2015) *An analysis of the role of price promotions on*  
525 *the household purchases of food and drinks high in sugar*. Public Health England.  
526 Available at:  
527 [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/470175/Annexe_4_Analysis_of_price_promotions.pdf)  
528 [\\_data/file/470175/Annexe 4. Analysis of price promotions.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/470175/Annexe_4_Analysis_of_price_promotions.pdf) [Accessed July 2021]
- 529 49. van Heerde H, & Neslin S (2008) Sales promotion models. In Wierenga B (Ed.)  
530 *Handbook of Marketing Decision Models*. New York, NY: Springer.
- 531 50. French S (2003) Pricing effects on food choices. *The Journal of Nutrition*, **133**(3), 841S–  
532 843S).
- 533 51. Ailawadi K & Neslin S (1998) The effect of promotion on consumption. Buying more  
534 and consuming it faster. *Journal of Marketing Research*, **35**, 390–398.
- 535 52. Chandon P & Wansink B (2002) When are stockpiled products consumed faster? A  
536 convenience-salience framework of post-purchase consumption incidence and quantity.  
537 *Journal of Marketing Research*, **39**, 321–335.
- 538 53. Ni Mhurchu C, Blakely T, Jiang Y, et al. (2010) Effects of price discounts and tailored  
539 nutrition education on supermarket purchases. A randomized controlled trial. *The*  
540 *American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*, **91**(3), 736–747.



- 541 54. Martin-Biggers J, Yorkin M, Aljallad C et al. (2013) What foods are US supermarkets  
542 promoting? A content analysis of supermarket sales circulars. *Appetite*. **62**, 160–165.
- 543 55. Waterlander WE, Steenhuis IH, de Boer MR et al. (2013) Effects of different discount  
544 levels on healthy products coupled with a healthy choice label, special offer label or both:  
545 results from a web-based supermarket experiment. *International Journal of Behavioral*  
546 *Nutrition and Physical Activity* **10**(1):59.
- 547 56. Waterlander WE, de Boer, MR, Schuit AJ et al. (2013) Price discounts significantly  
548 enhance fruit and vegetable purchases when combined with nutrition education: a  
549 randomized controlled supermarket trial. *American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*. **97**,  
550 886–95.
- 551 57. Martinez Steele E, Baraldi LG, Louzada ML et al. (2016) Ultraprocessed foods and added  
552 sugars in the US diet: evidence from a nationally representative cross-sectional study.  
553 *BMJ open*. **6**(3):e009892.
- 554 58. Competition Commission (1999) *Supermarkets: A report on the supply of groceries from*  
555 *multiple stores in the United Kingdom*. London: The Stationery Office; 1999.
- 556 59. Hamlin RP, Lindsay S, Insch A (2012) Retailer branding of consumer sales promotions.  
557 A major development in food marketing? *Appetite*. **58**(1):256-64. 18.
- 558 60. Kantar WorldPanel (2015) *Grocery market share*. Kantar WorldPanel.
- 559 61. Bogomolova S, Szabo M, Kennedy R. (2017) Retailers' and manufacturers' price-  
560 promotion decisions: Intuitive or evidence-based? *Journal of Business Research*. **76**:189-  
561 200.
- 562 62. Waterlander WE, Steenhuis IH, de Boer MR et al. (2012) Introducing taxes, subsidies or  
563 both: the effects of various food pricing strategies in a web-based supermarket  
564 randomized trial. *Preventive Medicine*. **54**(5):323-30.
- 565 63. Tedstone A, Targett V and Allen R (2015) *Sugar reduction: The evidence for action*.  
566 London: Public Health England; 2015.
- 567 64. Jahns L, Payne CR, Whigham LD et al. (2014) Foods advertised in US weekly  
568 supermarket sales circulars over one year: a content analysis. *Nutrition Journal*. **13**:95.
- 569 65. Coker, T, Runggay H, Whiteside E, et al. (2019) *Paying the Price. New evidence, the link*  
570 *between price promotions, purchasing of less healthy food and drink, and overweight*  
571 *and obesity in Great Britain*.
- 572 66. Dobson P (2011) *The lure of supermarket special offers: a healthy choice for shoppers?*  
573 *Inaugural lecture: 29.11.11*. University of East Anglia.

- 574 67. Foster GD, Karpyn A, Wojtanowski AC et al. (2014) Placement and promotion strategies  
575 to increase sales of healthier products in supermarkets in low-income, ethnically diverse  
576 neighborhoods: a randomized controlled trial. *American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*.  
577 **99**, 1359–68.
- 578 68. Kerr J, Sallis JF, Beomby E et al. (2012) Assessing reliability and validity of the  
579 gropromo audit tool for evaluation of grocery store marketing and promotional  
580 environments. *Journal of Nutrition Education and Behaviour*, **44**(6) 597–603.
- 581 69. Marteau T (2014) *Restricting displays could curb consumption without affecting price or*  
582 *availability*. Available from [www.cam.ac.uk/research/news/end-of-aisle-displays-](http://www.cam.ac.uk/research/news/end-of-aisle-displays-encourage-consumption-of-alcohol-and-fizzy-drinks#sthash.VV8CPAbP.dpuf)  
583 [encourage-consumption-of-alcohol-and-fizzy-drinks#sthash.VV8CPAbP.dpuf](http://www.cam.ac.uk/research/news/end-of-aisle-displays-encourage-consumption-of-alcohol-and-fizzy-drinks#sthash.VV8CPAbP.dpuf) Accessed  
584 July 2021]
- 585 70. Breugelmans E, Gijsbrechts E. and Campo K (2018) Product unavailability, in Gielens  
586 K and Gijsbrechts E. (Eds) *Handbook of research on retailing*. Gloucester: Edward Elgar  
587 Publishing Ltd.
- 588 71. Gruen TW, Corsten DS and Bharadwaj S (2002) *Retail out of stocks: a worldwide*  
589 *examination of extent, causes and consumer responses*, Grocery Manufacturers of  
590 America, Washington, DC.
- 591 72. Corsten D and Gruen T (2003) *Desperately seeking shelf availability: an examination of*  
592 *the extent, the causes, and the efforts to address retail out-of-stocks*, *International*  
593 *Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, **31**(12), pp. 605-17.
- 594 73. McKinnon AC, Mendes D and Nababteh M (2007) *In-store logistics: an analysis of on-*  
595 *shelf availability and stockout responses for three product groups*”, *International*  
596 *Journal of Logistics: Research and Applications*, **10**(3), pp. 251-68.
- 597 74. van Woensel T, van Donselaar K, Broekmeulen R et al. (2007) Consumer responses to  
598 shelf out-of-stocks of perishable products, *International Journal of Physical Distribution*  
599 *& Logistics Management*, **37**(9), p. 704.
- 600 75. Zinn W and Liu PC (2008) *A comparison of actual and intended consumer behaviour in*  
601 *response to retail stockouts*, *Journal of Business Logistics*, **29**(2), pp. 141-6.
- 602 76. Ettouzani Y, Yates N and Mena C (2012) Examining retail on shelf availability:  
603 promotional impact and a call for research. *International Journal of Physical*  
604 *Distribution & Logistics Management*, **42**(3).
- 605 77. McDonald A and Milne A (2018) *Monitoring retail purchase and price promotions in*  
606 *Scotland (2010 –2016)*. Aberdeen, Scotland.

- 607 78. Beacom, E., Hollywood, L., McLaughlin, C., Furey, S., Price, R., McMahon-Beattie, U.  
608 and Burns, A. (2021) Investigating the healthiness of food products on promotion: market  
609 brands and own brands. *British Food Journal*. ISSN: 0007-070X
- 610 79. Dobson B, Beardsworth A, Keil T et al. (1994) *Diet, choice and poverty: social, cultural*  
611 *and nutritional aspects of food consumption among low income families*. London: Family  
612 Policy Studies Centre.
- 613 80. Goode J (2012) Feeding the family when the wolf's at the door: the impact of over-  
614 indebtedness on contemporary foodways in low-income families in the UK, *Food and*  
615 *Foodways*, **20**(1), 2012, p24.
- 616 81. Bhatnagar P, Scarborough P, Kaur A et al. (2020) Are food and drink available in online  
617 and physical supermarkets the same? A comparison of product availability, price, price  
618 promotions and nutritional information. *Public Health Nutrition*, **24**(5), 819–825.  
619 doi:10.1017/S1368980020004346
- 620 82. Wood Z (2021) Recipe for inflation: how Brexit and Covid made tinned tomatoes a lot  
621 dearer. *The Guardian*, 26 June 2021.  
622  
623