

85

Impact of a sugar sweetened beverage price increase in a convenience store

Miranda R. Blake^{2,1,*}, Anna Peeters², Emily Lancsar³, Tara Boelsen-Robinson^{2,1}, Kirstan Corben⁴, Christopher Stevenson², Kathryn Backholer²

¹ School of Public Health and Preventive Medicine, Monash University, Melbourne, VIC, Australia

² Obesity and Population Health Unit, Deakin University, Geelong, VIC, Australia

³ Centre for Health Economics, Monash University, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia

⁴ Population Health and Health Promotion, Alfred Health, Melbourne, VIC, Australia

Background: Retailer-led price changes remain an underexplored avenue for changing beverage purchases in community retail settings. This study aimed to determine the changes in beverage purchases associated with a sugar sweetened beverage (SSB) price increase in a convenience store in Melbourne, Australia.

Methods: Beverages were classified using an existing traffic light system as 'red' ('limit', e.g. sugary soft drinks, juices over 250 mL), 'amber' ('choose carefully', e.g. diet soft drinks) and 'green' ('best choices', e.g. water). Prices of 'red' beverages were increased by 20% while 'amber' and 'green' beverage prices were unchanged. Weekly sales data were examined for 122 weeks before and 17 weeks post price change implementation. Time series segmented regression analyses compared volume sales of 'red', 'amber', 'green' and total beverages, and change in total beverage dollar sales post implementation with expected sales if no intervention had occurred.

Results: There was a significant reduction in the volume of 'red' beverages (−27.8%) and 'amber' beverages (−26.7%) sold and a significant 27.7% increase in volume of 'green' beverages sold in the 17th week post intervention compared to expected sales without an intervention. There were small significant reductions in total volume of beverages sold (−12.3%) and beverage dollar sales (−11.3%).

Conclusion: A 20% SSB price increase was associated with a reduction in their sales and an increase in sales of healthier alternatives. Community retail



settings present a key bottom-up approach to improving consumer beverage choices.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orcp.2016.10.086>

86

You wouldn't eat 16 teaspoons of sugar – So why drink it? Community response to the Aboriginal *Rethink Sugary Drink* advertisement



Catherine MacDonald, Jennifer Browne*, Robyn Delbridge, Mikaela Egan, Keith Morgan, Alison McAleese, Belinda Morley, Philippa Niven, Petah Atkinson

Background: The evaluation aimed to assess community response to the Aboriginal *Rethink Sugary Drink* (RSD) advertisement. The Aboriginal RSD advertisement launched online in April 2015 and aired on NITV in October/November 2015. The advertisement was developed in Victoria, and featured members of the Victorian Aboriginal community.

Methods: An online survey was completed by 156 Aboriginal adults nationally (Vic=90, other states=66) in November/December 2015. The survey was distributed via email to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander adults through the Victorian Aboriginal Community Controlled Health Organisations (VACCHO) distribution networks, including Aboriginal health services and mainstream partner organisations, and social media.

Results: Around half (49%; $n=76$) of respondents had viewed RSD (recall and recognition) and the proportion was significantly greater in Victoria compared with the other states (62% cf. 30%, $p<0.01$). RSD was seen to have an important message for the Aboriginal community (89%), while 69% agreed it was relevant to them and 62% agreed it motivated them to improve their health. Those who had viewed RSD ($n=76$) were somewhat more likely to identify the sugar content of regular soft drink, compared with those who had not ($n=80$) (63% cf. 49%, $p=0.07$). Just over half of those who viewed the campaign (55%) reported they drank less sugary drinks as a result. Somewhat more Victorians compared with respondents in the other states reported reduced sugary drink consumption (59% cf. 45%, $p>0.05$) and increased water consumption (46% cf. 35%, $p>0.05$) after viewing RSD.

Conclusions: These results provide some evidence RSD impacted knowledge about the content of sugary drinks and positively influenced sugary drink consumption among the Aboriginal

community, particularly in Victoria where the campaign originated. Overall, this suggests RSD resonated with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander adults and highlights the importance of Aboriginal-led health promotion campaigns and tailoring health messages to the local Aboriginal community.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orcp.2016.10.087>

87

Effects of interpretive front-of-pack nutrition labels on consumer food purchases: A randomized controlled trial



Cliona Ni Mhurchu^{1,*}, Ekaterina Volkova¹, Yannan Jiang¹, Bruce Neal², Helen Eyles¹, Tony Blakely³, Boyd Swinburn⁴, Mike Rayner⁵

¹ *National Institute for Health Innovation, University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand*

² *Food Policy Division, The George Institute for Global Health, Sydney, NSW, Australia*

³ *Department of Public Health, University of Otago, Wellington, New Zealand*

⁴ *The University of Auckland, Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand*

⁵ *Nuffield Department of Public Health, University of Oxford, Oxford, Oxfordshire, United Kingdom*

Publish consent withheld.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orcp.2016.10.088>

88

The potential of front-of-pack labels on unhealthy foods to counteract the misleading effects of health claims



Zenobia Talati^{1,*}, Simone Pettigrew¹, Clare Hughes², Helen Dixon³, Bridget Kelly⁴, Kylie Ball⁵, Caroline Miller⁶, Bruce Neal⁷, Trevor Shilton⁸

¹ *Curtin University, Bentley, WA, Australia*

² *Cancer Council NSW, Sydney, Australia*

³ *Cancer Council Victoria, Melbourne, Australia*

⁴ *Univeristy of Wollongong, Wollongong, Australia*

⁵ *Deakin University, Melbourne, Australia*

⁶ *South Australian Health and Medical Research Institute, Adelaide, Australia*

⁷ *George Institute, Sydney, Australia*

⁸ *Heart Foundation WA, Perth, Australia*

Health and nutrition claims on packaged food packs are an effective marketing tool as they emphasise one positive aspect of a food without mention of any potentially negative aspects (e.g. nutrient content claim: ‘‘High in calcium’’; general-level health claim: ‘‘Contains calcium for healthy bones and teeth’’; high-level health claim: ‘‘High in calcium to reduce the risk of osteoporosis’’). Health claims can create cognitive biases wherein consumers report stronger positive evaluations and purchase intentions for products with health claims compared to identical products without claims. This is concerning since studies have shown that the presence of a claim, and particularly nutrition claims, may have little relation to overall product healthiness. Recent studies suggest that front-of-pack labels (FoPLs) can attenuate the cognitive biases created by health claims. The aim of this qualitative study was to contribute to this small evidence base and explore how consumers trade-off between conflicting health claims and FoPLs, and assess whether certain FoPLs are more effective at eliminating the cognitive biases created by health claims. Eighty-five males and females, who ranged in age (from 10 to 46+) and socioeconomic status, took part in 10 focus groups in Perth, Western Australia. Participants