were shown images of mock food packs featuring various health claims and FoPLs (including the Daily Intake Guide, the Multiple Traffic Lights and the Health Star Rating). All mock foods were designed to be unhealthy (i.e. with a Health Star Rating of 2). Participants were provided with broad discussion prompts to elicit their spontaneous thoughts about the products represented by the mock packs. The discrepancy between the unhealthy FoPL and the positive health claim was noted by many participants (including children), particularly when the Health Star Rating was applied. These results illustrate the important role of FoPLs in providing consumers with an objective indicator of product healthiness.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orcp.2016.10.089

89

Attributes used by consumers to assess alternative front-of-pack food labelling systems

Simone Pettigrew[1], Zenobia Talati[1], Caroline Miller[2,*], Helen Dixon[3], Bridget Kelly[4], Bruce Neal[5], Kylie Ball[6], Clare Hughes[7], Trevor Shilton[8]

[1] *Curtin University, Perth, WA, Australia*
[2] *South Australian Health and Medical Research Institute, Adelaide, Australia*
[3] *Cancer Council Victoria, Melbourne, Australia*
[4] *University of Wollongong, Wollongong, NSW, Australia*
[5] *George Institute, Sydney, NSW, Australia*
[6] *Deakin University, Melbourne, Australia*
[7] *Cancer Council NSW, Sydney, Australia*
[8] *National Heart Foundation, Perth, WA, Australia*

Governments are increasingly relying on population-level interventions such as food labelling to encourage individuals to make healthier food choices. Such interventions are employed in an attempt to address high and growing levels of obesity and the rapidly increasing prevalence of nutrition-related diseases. There are many front-of-pack labelling systems in existence, but there is inadequate evidence available for policy makers to make informed decisions about the most appropriate system for their national context. The aim of the present study was to explore Australians' front-of-pack label preferences and the criteria they use to determine these preferences. More than 2,000 consumers aged 10 years and older responded to a national online survey that invited them to choose between the daily intake guide (DIG), multiple traffic lights (MTL), and health star rating (HSR) systems. They were then asked to provide any reasons for their stated preference; they were able to state as many reasons as they wished. The most popular system by a substantial margin was the HSR, with this stronger preference being especially apparent among children. The next most preferred system was the MTL, followed by the DIG. The label attributes most commonly cited as determining respondents' preferences were (1) ease of understanding and use, (2) speed of use, and (3) salience. The HSR system was considered most effective in terms of ease and speed of use, while the MTL system was perceived to be most salient due to the inclusion of colours. These results provide further evidence of the potential positive impact of the HSR system on consumers' food choices and suggest that future research assessing front-of-pack labelling systems should ensure the variables of ease and speed of understanding/use and salience are included in study instruments.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orcp.2016.10.090

90

Comparison of an electronic versus traditional food diary for assessing dietary intake — A validation study

Nicholas Fuller*, Mackenzie Fong, James Gerofi, Fatima Ferkh, Chloris Leung, Lisa Leung, Shaoyu Zhang, Michael Skilton, Ian Caterson

The Boden Institute, The University of Sydney, Sydney, NSW, Australia

Background: Paper-based estimated food diaries are often used in research to collect dietary data, despite this method being burdensome for both participants and researchers. Such food diaries are often time consuming, labour intensive, and rely on participant literacy and therefore may lead to greater rates of under-reporting.

Methods: This study assessed the validity of the '*Boden Food Plate*', a novel web-based electronic application, compared to a paper-based three-day estimated food diary. Participants were also asked to rate their satisfaction with the new electronic diary. Sixty seven participants completed both the