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Abstract.

Online grocery shopping is an increasingly common part of the retail food environment. However, existing reviews have yet to synthesize the large swath of online grocery shopping research. We searched seven databases for studies reporting empirical data on online grocery retailing and shopping. Two reviewers screened search results and extracted information from 117 manuscripts containing 122 studies. Most studies were conducted in North America, Europe, and Asia. Younger, highly educated, and higher-income individuals were most likely to use online grocery and time savings, convenience, and website usability were the most common motivators for use. Common deterrents included the inability to pick perishable items and a lack of trust in the in-store shopper. Barriers included delivery and service fees, difficulty navigating online ordering, and limited availability. Individuals were more likely to purchase bulky/heavy items and less likely to purchase impulse items and perishables like fresh produce. The most common online retail promotion was price discounting. However, shoppers reported that marketing tactics seemed less noticeable online compared to brick-and-mortar stores. Online grocery has gained popularity; nevertheless, barriers may reflect inequities in access. Research is needed to further understand how shopping online influences overall food purchases and how to ensure equitable access.
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Introduction.

The context in which consumers buy food matters greatly for what they purchase. For decades, a large body of research on the retail food environment (with a particular focus on grocers and large supercenters) has shown that marketing-related elements, such as product availability, prices, promotions, and placement within the store influence what consumers purchase [1-3]. Additional research shows how the type of food retailer matters: different consumers shop at different store types (e.g., small stores vs. grocery stores vs. big box chains) and different store types are associated with more or less healthful purchases [4]. However, the vast majority of this research has focused on the physical food retail environment; in other words, brick-and-mortar stores where consumers can shop in-person.

Online grocery retailers (henceforth online grocers), have created an entirely new environment for people to purchase food in. Large brick-and-mortar stores with groceries, like Wal-Mart, also offer online grocery options with both delivery and click-and-collect (i.e., the shopper purchases food online and picks up the bundled groceries on-site) services. The online grocery sector has roots in the late 1990s and early 2000s with the online launches of ASDA and Tesco in the United Kingdom, Walmart in the United States (US), and Alibaba’s in China. However, it wasn’t until the COVID-19 pandemic that its popularity soared [5]. Though online grocers are often extensions of large brick-and-mortar chain grocers, they differ from their brick-and-mortar locations by offering the convenience of shopping from almost anywhere and freeing up the time previously spent in stores. Furthermore, in addition to “traditional” marketing elements, the online nature of online food retail also allows for unique promotional features, such as personalized banner adds or promotions [6,7], but what these consist of and how they influence the healthfulness of purchases is not well understood.
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The shift to online food retail has potential implications for disparities in the nutritional quality of what people purchase and eat. The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), the largest federal food assistance program in the US, expanded the implementation of its online purchasing pilot [8], and the US Department of Agriculture proposed a rule that would allow shoppers to use Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infant, and Children (WIC) benefits online [9]. However, prior research indicates that individuals with low incomes face barriers when grocery shopping online, namely high-cost delivery fees [10,11]. Thus, it is important to understand the extent to which populations with low incomes, who are at a disproportionate risk for diet-related diseases, are actually using online food retail, and whether and how these settings may be influencing the healthfulness of food purchases.

To our knowledge, no reviews have summarized the broad and growing body of research on the online food retail environment. Large-scale synthesis is needed to understand who shops in online stores, how food availability, accessibility, price, and promotional strategies differ in online compared to brick-and-mortar stores, and how the online food retail environment affects the nutritional quality of purchases. The objective of this scoping review is to understand the current landscape of online grocers, specific to online grocers, supermarkets, and mass merchandisers, in the real world. The current study complements other reviews on this topic that focus on specific aspects of the online food retail environment (such as marketing practices, healthfulness, and consumer uptake) [10,12-18] by broadly synthesizing a larger body of research. This review seeks to answer 1) Who uses online food retail and why do they use it? 2) What kinds of food products are sold in online food retail and how does the availability of different food products compare to brick-and-mortar stores? And 3) What pricing, promotion,
placement, and other marketing tactics are the food industry using to promote their products in
the online food retail landscape?

**Materials and Methods.**

To synthesize the existing literature on online grocers, we conducted a scoping review
through June 2021. We chose to conduct a scoping review because we aim to identify gaps and
understand the scope of the literature [19]. Following the PRISMA-ScR and Joanna Briggs
Institute’s recommendation, we utilized the scoping review framework proposed by Peters et al.
(2020) [20]. The protocol for this review is registered at Open Science Framework
(10.17605/OSF.IO/86D3T).

**Eligibility.**

We established initial inclusion and exclusion criteria based on the population, concept,
context categorizations [20], opting to include studies with any population, studies that focus on
online food retail, and studies from any country. We defined online grocers as grocery stores on
the internet that sell a wide variety of food products. We excluded studies on retailers that did not
sell a wide range of food items (i.e., online retailers that specialized in energy drinks, coffee,
etc.), did not have real-world data from online food retail (e.g., intervention studies in
experimental labs), or focused on online ordering from restaurants, worksite cafeterias, and
specialty stores rather than grocery stores. To be eligible, studies needed to be published in peer-
reviewed journals, so we also excluded conference papers and unpublished dissertations and
theses. Finally, we excluded studies published in languages other than English.

**Search and Screening.**

To develop a comprehensive search, we collaborated with a librarian on the search string
and relevant databases. The search string included the keywords/strings, “online grocery
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shopping”, “online food shopping”, “online grocery”, “online food store”, and “online food retailer”, and the search was performed in 7 databases: PubMed, Scopus, Web of Science, Business Source Premiere, ACM Digital Library, Google Scholar, and USDA Publications. A full list of search strings adapted to the language used in each database can be found in Supplementary Table 1.

One author (AER) imported the search results into the reference management software, Zotero (Corporation for Digital Scholarship, Vienna, Virginia, US), de-duplicated multi-occurring results, then imported the possibly relevant articles into the systematic review management platform, Covidence (Veritas Health Innovation, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia). Following the Institute of Medicine’s Guidelines [21], two reviewers screened each title and abstract in Covidence and voted to include or exclude the study. Studies in which the two reviewers did not agree (i.e., one reviewer said yes but the second reviewer said no) were discussed between the two reviewers, with a third reviewer available in case of sustained disagreement. The full text of each potentially relevant study was then screened in the same way.

**Extraction.**

The research team identified information to extract from each study before the review began. This list was discussed and revised as the team became aware of more relevant information and themes that surfaced from the included studies. The information extracted includes: study characteristic and methodology, characteristics of online grocery users, motivations and barriers to use, the online food retail landscape, and how online grocers changed during the COVID-19 pandemic. All co-authors reviewed and confirmed the information collected and presented.

**Data Synthesis.**
A Review of Online Food Retail

We identified themes and gaps in the literature consistent across the included studies. These themes include the availability of online grocery and internet access, who uses online grocers, how they use them, motivations for and barriers to using them, how online grocers compare to brick-and-mortar stores regarding product availability and pricing, how and who the food industry targets in the online food retail environment, and online grocery business models. While reviewing the literature, it became clear that barriers to online grocery use naturally split into deterrents and barriers. Deterrents (i.e., not wanting to purchase fresh produce without looking at it in person) discourage participants from using online grocers whereas barriers (i.e., high delivery fees and low income) prevent participants from using online grocers. After identifying themes, we then synthesized this data and describe it thematically.

Results.

We reviewed 787 studies in total. We excluded 296 during title and abstract screening and 374 during full-text screening. This resulted in a final sample of 117 relevant published manuscripts. Three manuscripts [22-24] included multiple studies within a single publication, resulting in 122 individual studies. Figure 1 portrays the search and screening process depicted by the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR) diagram. Study characteristics, methodology, results, and implications are synthesized below.
Figure 1. PRISMA diagram.

Records identified through database searching (n = 1,259) → Duplicates removed (n = 472)

Records screened (n = 787) → Abstracts excluded (n = 296)

Full-text articles assessed for eligibility (n = 488) → Full-text articles excluded (n = 371):
- Concept (n = 217)
- Publication type (n = 97)
- Context (n = 48)
- Language (n = 6)
- Other (n = 3)

Studies included (n = 117)
**Study Characteristics and Methodology.**

Our review represents global research over a twenty-year timespan between 2000 and 2021 (Table 1; Figure 2). Sixty-one studies were conducted in Europe, 35 in North America, 24 in Asia, three each in Africa and Oceania, one in South America, and one study [35] did not report a location. Though the oldest study included in our review was published in 2000 [25], the majority (63%) of included studies were published in the last six years of the study timespan (2016-2021). This was largely driven by the influx of 48 studies published in 2020 or later, 17 (35%) of which studied online food retail during the COVID-19 pandemic. Approximately two-thirds (64%) of included studies presented data from online food retail only (compared to both online and in-person). Authors used various methods to study online grocers including surveys (42%), consumer purchasing datasets (21%), interviews (12%), case studies (9%), store audits (8%), focus groups (4%), and content analyses (4%). Across these methods, only six (5%) studies used a mixed methods design, each of which were published in 2020 [70-75].
### Table 1. General study characteristics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>No. (n = 122)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
<th>Citations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2005</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>25–34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2010</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>22,35–50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2015</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>51–68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-2021</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
<td>23,24,69–138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COVID-19</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not assess</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>86.1%</td>
<td>22–68,71–77,83–92,94–98,100–117,119,121,125,126,128,129,132,133,135–139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessed in relation to online shopping</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>70,78–82,93,99,120,122–124,127,130,131,134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>44,112,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>24,43,55,66,68,77,80,82–84,90,93,101,106,110–112,114,115,122,127,133,137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
<td>22,23,26,27,29,32–34,36,37,39–42,45,46,49,52,54,56–58,60–63,65,67,70,72–74,76,78,81,85,91,92,94,96,100,102–104,107,113,116–121,125,126,129,138,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>31,33,105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. America</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retail type</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Methods</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>30,41,62,63,70,73–75,85,92,94,116,128,132,136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus groups</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case study</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store audit</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large purchasing data analysis</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content analysis</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Methods</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

References:

- 22, 27, 71, 97, 98
- 26, 28, 31-33, 39, 45, 47, 53, 126, 127
- 24, 43, 88, 89, 91, 95, 102, 112, 123, 138
- 23, 35, 48-52, 56-
- 58, 61, 64, 65, 70, 75, 86, 87, 90, 96, 100, 103, 109, 113, 120, 135, 139
- 42, 72, 73, 106, 117
- 70-75
**Figure 2.** Prevalence of studies published over time by continent, 2000-2020.

Note. The graph ends in 2020 instead of 2021 when the review was conducted. Because the review was conducted midway through 2021, the authors elected to include only years that can be fully represented. In 2021, 3 studies were conducted in Asia, 5 studies were conducted in Europe, and 10 studies were conducted in North America.
**Characteristics of Online Food Retail Users.**

Forty-one (39%) studies reported characteristics of the individuals and households that use online grocers. These studies were published in Europe (n=18), North America (n=13), and Asia (n=10). Studies often identified younger adults as the most common group of online grocery users. However, the group “younger adults” was not defined consistently across studies, ranging anywhere between 18 and 54 years old. Though they generally followed this trend, two studies found that within young adulthood, the youngest group of adults (18-25 years old [51] and 18-30 years old [76]) used online grocers less than slightly older adults (26-45 years old [51] and 31-40 years old [76]) indicating a peak in online grocery use in middle adulthood with lower rates of use in both younger and older adulthood. Fifteen studies found that the presence of children in the household, or generally larger households, were more likely to use online grocers. However, two studies [36,52] reported that greater household size was associated with lower online grocery use. While three studies [52-54] found that being employed was associated with using online grocers, one contradictory study [77] found that unemployment was associated with using online grocers. Female gender identity, higher income, higher education, living in an urban setting, disabilities that make it difficult to leave home, limited free time, living far from a preferred store, familiarity with online shopping, frequent shopping, and large orders were all associated with greater online grocery use.

Studies from each continent identified young adults as the most common users; however, other common characteristics varied by location. Having children and/or a larger household were the most prevalent characteristics of users in European and North American studies, but this was not a widespread finding in Asian studies. Asian and European studies found that higher education was a common characteristic of online grocery users, and Asian and North American
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studies identified higher income as a common characteristic. North American studies were the only ones to identify disability status as a common characteristic of online grocery users.

Nineteen (15%) studies reported the frequency of online grocery use, the majority of which (n=12) were published in 2020 or 2021. Studies reported the frequency of online grocery use inconsistently and often informally (i.e., using the terms “most” or “majority” of shopping trips). From the included studies, frequency was most often reported in relation to the COVID-19 pandemic; six studies found that shopping frequency increased during this time [36,78-82].

Reportedly, online grocery shopping frequency varied as some consumers used it as often as daily while others used it as little as once per year. A 2006 European study found that the majority of online grocery users purchased food online only one to two times each year and only 10% of users purchased food online more than five times each year [36]. On the other hand, more recent studies each reported a higher prevalence of online grocery use. A 2014 North American case study of an online grocer found that, on average, customers placed three orders per month [22] and studies conducted in Asian countries in 2015, 2018, and 2020 each found that the majority of online grocery users were, at minimum, utilizing the service on a monthly basis [55,83,84]. Online grocery shopping tended to complement brick-and-mortar grocery shopping trips rather than completely replacing them [22,36,56,57,85,86]. Two European studies conducted in 2012 and 2015, in particular, found that shoppers were more likely to visit grocers in-person with online trips accounting for less than half of all grocery shopping trips among those who shop both in-person and online [56,57].

When using online grocers, individuals use various devices including computers, smartphones, and tablets. Online grocery users were more likely to use a grocery shopping list, listen to promotions or suggestions (often to buy items they had previously purchased), and plan
their future meals when using online food retail as compared to in-person shopping. Studies using various methods all indicate that individuals and households tend to purchase fewer foods considered “unhealthy” or “impulse buys” when grocery shopping online [26,37,38,57,75,85,87].

Motivations and Barriers.

Studies most often reported on the motivations behind using online grocers, with almost half (49%) of the studies included in the review reporting this information (table 2). Table 3 displays specific motivations for using online grocers in detail. These motivations include time savings (n=27; 44% of studies reporting motivators) and convenience (n=24; 39% of studies reporting motivators) as the most prevalent followed by the ease of online grocery use (n=17; 28% of studies reporting motivators) and the unique variety of food products available (n=10; 16% of studies reporting motivators).
### Table 2. Frequency of study findings reported from most to least prevalent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finding category</th>
<th>No. of studies (n = 122)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motivations for using online grocers</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online grocers use and socioeconomic status</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barriers and deterrents to online grocers</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics of online grocery users</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of shoppers who use online grocers</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online grocery pricing, promotions, and placement</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online grocery personalization</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food products sold in online grocers</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of online grocery use</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online grocery availability</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online grocery business models</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online grocery user data purchasing and selling</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Motivations for, deterrents, and barriers to online food retail use reported from most to least prevalent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finding</th>
<th>No. of studies (n = 122)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motivations for online food retail use</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time savings</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website is easy to navigate / familiar / comfortable online</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique food available</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good service / fast delivery / reliable</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost efficient</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible hours / can shop when store is closed</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can avoid crowds / lines / parking</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good price / discounts / sales</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product quality / fresh products</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps avoid impulse and unplanned, unhealthy purchases</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical limitations (misc. health issues, mobility issues, cannot shop alone)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dislike the physical store</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclement weather (cold, rain)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live far from preferred food retailer / no transportation / cannot drive</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle changes (childbirth, moving, getting a dog, injury, divorce)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy / bulky / large number of items</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No childcare</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Busy schedule / provides structure</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns related to catching or spreading COVID-19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can shop around / compare prices</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas / travel cost savings</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online grocers are available</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referral from current user / retail chain reputation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curiosity / desire for a new experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepts EBT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deterrents to online food retail use</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to select own products</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of trust</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takes too much time</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference for in-person shopping</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher prices and lack of sales / discounts / deals</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sees in-person shopping as socialization and physical activity</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low perceived transaction security</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order and delivery problems</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low product assortment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult to return items</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stigmatized as lazy or dependent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requires planning / lack of spontaneity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Barriers to online food retail use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barrier</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delivery fees / minimum basket amount</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>51.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inexperience with online ordering / difficulty navigating</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online grocery / delivery availability</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No smartphone or computer access</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little to no guidance available online</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online platform does not indicate WIC items</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No internet or online payment access</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Category header percentages were calculated using n=123 as the denominator. Subcategory percentages were calculated using the category header n (e.g., n=60, 40, 29) as the denominator.
In order of frequency, between 10% and 15% of studies reported that motivators included good service, particularly fast and reliable delivery; cost efficiency; ability to grocery shop even when brick-and-mortar stores are closed; opportunity to avoid crowds, long lines, and difficult parking; competitive pricing, discounts, and sales; product quality and freshness; increased ability to avoid impulse, unplanned, unhealthy purchases; physical limitations including health and mobility issues as well as an inability to travel to or navigate brick-and-mortar stores alone; distaste for shopping in-person; inclement weather such as severe cold or rain; living far from preferred food retailers, no or limited transportation, or the inability to drive one’s self. Less frequently reported motivators included recent life changes including childbirth, relocating, adopting a pet, injury, or divorce; purchasing heavy, bulky, or a large number of items; no or limited childcare; busy schedules; concerns related to catching or spreading COVID-19; desire to shop around to compare prices; gas and travel cost savings; online grocers available; referral from current users and/or the retail chain’s reputation; general curiosity and the desire for a new grocery shopping experience; ability to use EBT at checkout.

Forty (33%) studies reported on deterrents to using online grocers. Deterrents can be described as variables factored into an individuals’ choice to shop online, rather than a barrier constraining them entirely. Twenty-three (58% of studies reporting deterrents) studies described the inability of individuals to select their own food items as the most common deterrent to online grocery use. This was largely in relation to perishable items (e.g., fresh produce, meat) and product substitutions (e.g., lemons substituted for oranges). One study specifically shared that while only 35% of their survey respondents had never purchased food online, the majority of respondents (77%) had never purchased fresh produce online [84]. A second study also found that some individuals purchase their groceries online but opt to pick them up so they can select
perishables in-store while saving time picking out their shelf-stable items [85]. Participants in ten (25% of studies reporting deterrents) studies shared that they did not trust stores to fulfill their orders correctly or to meet their preferences. When shopping for perishable items, individuals reported a desire to use their senses to select which items to purchase. By viewing, touching, and smelling, shoppers shared that they were more equipped to select high quality perishables that fit their preferences than store employees and were thus less inclined to purchase them online [57].

In addition to not being able to physically interact with food, other common deterrents (reported in between 10% and 15% of studies reporting deterrents) included the extra amount of time it takes to navigate online grocery platforms; general preferences for shopping in-person; higher prices and a perceived lack of discounts or deals online; viewing in-person shopping as socialization and physical activity; low perceived transaction security; and previous order and delivery issues. Additional deterrents (reported in less than 10% of studies reporting deterrents) included low product assortment; difficulty returning items; not wanting to be perceived as dependent, socially isolated, or lazy; and the planning that is often required to shop online rather than the spontaneity of stopping by a grocery store.

Twenty-nine (24%) studies reported barriers to using online grocers. Barriers, or factors outside of the shoppers’ control that keep them from using online grocers, most often included financial barriers related to delivery fees and minimum basket size requirements (n=15; 52% of studies reporting barriers), inexperience with online ordering or difficulties navigating the online food environment (n=9; 31% of studies reporting barriers) and limited availability of either online grocery or delivery (compared to click-and-collect models) (n=4; 14% of studies reporting barriers). Select studies (<10% of studies reporting barriers) additionally shared that limited smartphone or computer access, limited guidance on how to navigate online grocers, confusion
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around which food items are WIC approved, and limited internet access or ability to make
payments online were also barriers to online grocery use.

**The Online Food Retail Landscape.**

Forty (33%) studies reported information on pricing, promotion, and placement tactics
used in online retail or perceived by online grocery shoppers. Online grocers exhibited more
price variability such that product prices fluctuated often over time and by zip code, customer
demand, inventory, and both competitor and supplier pricing [88]. However, product price
fluctuations in the online channel were often small [89] and overall, prices were similar to those
in brick-and-mortar stores. Shoppers in one study even reported that their total basket cost when
shopping online was less expensive, even when accounting for the delivery and convenience
fees, largely because of the ability to easily shop around, compare prices, and find the best deals
[27]. Select online grocers offer free delivery for orders above certain price thresholds [28] but
this may be difficult to attain when shopping for small households or for specific items in
between larger shopping trips. Other online grocers alternatively charge a monthly subscription
fee that enables individuals to shop at high frequencies [28,90].

Online grocery is unique in its ability to directly attract shoppers into the store. One study
conducted in Europe found that the majority of shoppers for a top online grocer found the retailer
through promotions on search engines, social media, and email [120]. However, once in the
online grocery platform, studies suggested that promotions may be less common compared to in
brick-and-mortar stores. For example, one European study found that there were less price
promotions and front-of-pack nutrition labels in the online channel of a grocer [91]. Similarly, a
North American survey among online grocery shoppers found that participants wished that there
were the same store circulars and in-store sales in online grocery platforms [71]. Though limited,
promotional tactics included price promotions such as discounting [92] and buy-one-get-one [39]. These promotions changed weekly (as is typical in North America) or up to every eight weeks (as is more typical in Europe) [56]. Overall, online grocers are able to quickly adapt to competitively price and promote their products and retain customers in the online retail landscape.

**COVID-19 and Online Food Retail Use.**

Of all the studies included in this review, 17 (14%) specifically analyzed online grocery during, and/or in relation to, the COVID-19 pandemic. The COVID-19 pandemic influenced who purchased groceries online, how frequently they did it, and what they purchased. One European study found that the increase in online grocery use between January and June 2020 was larger than the increase in use in the 3 years between 2017 and 2020 [78], one North American study found that the proportion of survey participants who used online grocers almost doubled [79], and one Asian study found that one in three study participants increased their online grocery shopping during the COVID-19 pandemic [82]. Each of these studies indicate a pattern of growth in online grocery use during and/or due to the COVID-19 pandemic. An increase in online grocery use was reported across age groups; however, older individuals seemed to increase their use at a greater rate compared to younger individuals, potentially due to lower use historically. Though many studies reported a large increase in online food retail use and availability during the COVID-19 pandemic, one study in Russia found that a minority of households with high incomes were the only ones who could afford to order groceries online due to the high cost of the service [93]. Studies conducted in North America (n=6), Europe (n=5), Asia (n=5), and Africa (n=1) reported that online food retail was used during the COVID-19 pandemic due to fear of being exposed to the virus, feeling unsafe, reduced in-person retail
hours, lack of public transportation, and panic buying [70,79]. Due to the pandemic, select online
grocers expanded service areas; however, this growth did not significantly increase access in
rural areas [70]. Along with this increase in service area, wait times also increased during the
pandemic. Some online grocers implemented waitlists for new customers while others delayed
food delivery by roughly 1-2 weeks [70].

Discussion.

In this scoping review of 122 relevant studies, we found that online grocery has been
formally studied for over twenty years, with rapid increases at the beginning of the COVID-19
pandemic. This increase occurred as rates of online food retail availability, marketing, and use
increased. Broadly, our work found that online grocery is most often used by individuals with
time constraints (e.g., working parents) while other individuals face barriers to online grocery,
such as delivery fees. We also found that online grocery shopping can be beneficial in some
ways (i.e., fewer impulse purchases), but detrimental in others (i.e., fewer fruit and vegetable
purchases) to the nutritional quality of food purchased, but that more research is needed to
understand the mechanisms of how online retail influences overall food choices. Unique to this
review, compared to others on the topic [10,12-18], we include studies from a wider timeframe
and geography, highlighting variation in online grocery use across vast contexts.

Study Characteristics and Methodology.

Studies included in the review covered varying time periods, geographies, and
methodologies. With regard to geography, most studies researched the online food environment
in European countries, followed by North American, then Asian countries. This variation may
reflect the different online food retail environments in each region. Online food retail first
became available in Europe in 1997 with both UK-based ASDA and Tesco launching their
online grocery platforms. Since then, numerous European-based grocers have launched popular online platforms and, as of 2021, six of the top 25 online retailers in Europe were online grocers [140,141]. Though to a lesser extent, compared to Europe, researchers have published on online grocery retail in North America consistently since 2000. The smaller number of publications may be because online retailers were not widely accessible in the region until 2007, with the launch of both Walmart.com and Amazon Fresh as online retailers. Asian countries first published on this topic in 2007 but did not publish frequently until 2015, likely because major online grocery platforms such as JD.com and Alibaba’s in China and BigBasket in India, along with extensions of the US based Amazon Fresh in India, Japan, and Singapore, were not available before 2011. Limited studies in this review were conducted in African, Oceanic, or South American countries. With the availability of various online grocers and delivery services in each of these geographies, this review highlights the lack of research in these areas as a major gap to be filled.

Regarding study methodology, the majority of studies used surveys to capture consumer experiences, perceptions, and behaviors followed by interviews with shoppers and analysis of large purchasing datasets. Though 26 of the 122 included studies collected some form of qualitative data, there is a distinct lack of ethnographic research and in-depth qualitative analysis. These methods could tell us more about how online grocery retail assimilates into or possibly alters existing food purchasing behaviors, how online marketing influences choices, and how efforts to increase online grocery retail accessibility are perceived and influence purchasing patterns. This review highlights the need for a more in-depth understanding of the decision-making framework related to using online grocery platforms. In addition, this review points out the inconsistent measurement of online grocery use, nutritional quality of online purchases, and the share of total household purchases that are made through online grocers. This is likely driven
by researchers that primarily use surveys and interviews with self-reported measures and/or large purchasing datasets that chiefly capture data from individual retail chains. Furthermore, there is no published research leveraging multi-year longitudinal data and models that could identify changing trends in how shoppers use online grocery over time outside of the COVID-19 pandemic.

**Characteristics of Online Food Retail Users.**

This review revealed that young professionals, working moms, individuals with higher incomes and educational attainment, and individuals who generally want to save time are more likely to use online grocers. Each of these groups have limited time but also the financial resources or technological skills required to shop online. This generalization is supported by previous findings indicating there is a positive relationship between an individual’s perceived time pressure and their ability and willingness to pay for the convenience of online grocery shopping [142]. However, perceived time pressure is not the only reason shoppers may choose online grocers. For instance, individuals who want to avoid crowds, have disabilities that make visiting brick-and-mortar stores difficult, or want to protect themselves from getting sick particularly during the COVID-19 pandemic, are motivated to grocery shop online due to their health needs [22,25,94,95]. This motivation, combined with the increased availability of online food retail, may largely explain why the frequency of use increased over time.

The COVID-19 pandemic, as well as policy changes like the SNAP online purchasing pilot in the US, expanded online grocery use beyond individuals with higher incomes, removing some of the financial barriers to use [71]. This review, as well as other recent reviews, have highlighted barriers to equitable access to healthy foods online including high delivery fees, minimum order requirements, lack of availability of delivery services in rural areas, and inability
to use WIC benefits online [10,12]. Others have highlighted concerns related to marketplace discrimination and targeted marketing of unhealthy foods in online grocers to communities with low incomes and communities of color [143]. Ensuring equitable access to healthful food in the online retail space will require a variety of community, government, and industry-led solutions, such as community delivery hubs, expansion of government approved online grocers, rigorous privacy policies for online grocers that accept federal nutrition assistance dollars, and support for companies to conduct impact assessments of their unhealthy food and beverage marketing practices [10,143,144].

**Motivations and Barriers.**

In this review, we found that convenience, time savings, flexibility, preference, physical access, food availability and affordability, the diverse assortment of food options, and the COVID-19 pandemic were all motivating factors for people to use online grocers. These motivators are similar to the ones found in a previous review [11] and highlight how beneficial online food retail can be for those with limited time, flexibility, physical access to grocery stores, and in times of public health crisis.

While online grocery use has become more common in recent years, this review highlighted that there are still many deterrents and barriers that need to be addressed. Individuals with limited resources may not be able to afford the cost of delivery or convenience fees [71,97] and feel a lack of control even when these fees are waived [98]. Furthermore, in rural areas, many shoppers do not have online grocery delivery services available to them and internet access is known to be unreliable [99,100,145]. Finally, many older adults prefer to shop in brick-and-mortar stores to socialize with others [146,147] and may lack the technical skills necessary to
navigate online food retail websites and apps if poor health, difficulty traveling, or other situational factors lead them to need groceries delivered [146,147].

**The Online Food Retail Landscape.**

Studies in this review suggested that online food retail may be associated with fewer impulse food purchases. This could be due to increased meal planning when shopping online [85], the customers’ inability to interact with sensory products online [57], the delay in time between purchasing and receiving items [48,148,149], and/or marketing tactics being reportedly less salient online [57], and could have implications for both human and planetary health.

Specific to human health, impulse purchases are typically comprised of hedonic foods which often contain excessive nutrients of concern such as added sugar, sodium, and saturated fat, each of which are associated with chronic disease [150-153]. Thus, the potential reduction of impulse purchases through the use of online grocers may increase the overall healthfulness of the grocery basket, possibly improving diet and health status. Specific to planetary health, list making, meal planning, and reducing impulse buys are all associated with reduced food waste [154]. The US Environmental Protection Agency cites preventing food waste as one of the most powerful steps towards limiting a households climate change footprint [155]. Therefore, online grocery shopping may be a helpful tool in the fight to improve planetary health. Future research should continue to examine the prevalence of impulse purchases in online food retail and the implications for both human and planetary health.

Though shoppers are less likely to purchase impulse items when using online food retail channels, this review, along with other recent reviews [10,11], have highlighted that people are less also likely to purchase perishable items, including fresh produce and meat, online which may have important public health implications. Specific to the US, the majority of individuals
consume too few fruits, vegetables, and associated fiber, and too many ultra-processed foods high in sugar, sodium, and saturated fat [156-158]. These dietary risks are a leading cause of US deaths, decreased quality of life [159], and increased healthcare costs [160]. Further research is needed to understand the trade-offs of purchasing fewer impulse foods when shopping online at the cost of also purchasing fewer perishable foods and how this impacts overall food purchasing patterns across retailers and retail formats. For example, online grocery shopping is most often used to complement, rather than replace, brick-and-mortar grocery shopping [161,162], but limited research has studied how using online grocery platforms may change the characteristics of a shopper's total basket, from all retail sources. One study in this review analyzed spending changes once a household started shopping online [96], but none of the 122 studies compared the healthfulness of all purchases for households that shop online and in-person to the healthfulness of all purchases for households that grocery shop exclusively in-person. Studying how the healthfulness of all food purchases change once a household begins to incorporate online grocery shopping to their food purchasing habits could identify whether the shifts in purchasing patterns related to online grocery use also shift overall purchasing, possibly leading to fewer total impulse buys and perishable food purchases across retailers and retail formats. To fully understand the potential health implications of these shopping practices, future research needs to utilize datasets that capture food purchases, both in-person and online, from a wide range of food retailers.

Findings from this review suggest that online grocers tend to manipulate prices and promotions in response to shopper and market characteristics, making them as competitive and attractive as possible. This constant manipulation and the built in best-price-possible may be why shoppers perceive online grocers as having less promotions compared to brick-and-mortar stores. As previously stated, current online grocery retail marketing is reportedly less noticeable than in-
store marketing. As online grocers maintain their growth, continue to spread internationally, and discover more creative ways to market products, it will be necessary to keep monitoring their promotional activities to prevent aggressive food industry marketing of ultra-processed foods to consumers [163].

Existing reviews of marketing practices in online grocers suggests that nudging interventions related to marketing and promotion, such as suggested food swaps for products with healthier characteristics than the ones selected by the shopper, food labeling, and default options, may improve the healthfulness of online food purchases [12,17]. In a recent randomized trial, the default option of a prefilled shopping cart with fruit and vegetable items led to a significant increase in fruit and vegetable purchases made online [164]. However, further research is needed to test various nudging interventions in realistic online settings.

Limitations of this review include the exclusion of grey literature and heterogeneity of included studies. There may be relevant studies that were not peer-reviewed and thus not included in this review; however, by including only peer-reviewed studies, this search and review is highly replicable and likely includes higher quality studies. Because the purpose of this review was to assess the entire scope of literature on online grocers, the included studies vary widely in scope and research question, preventing us from meta-analyzing results.

Conclusions.

Our review indicated that research on online grocers is rapidly increasing concurrently with a global increase in online grocery availability, although deterrents and barriers to use persist. Existing studies found that individuals with higher education and income were most likely to use online food retail, largely for the convenience and time savings it provided. The most common deterrent was the inability to pick out perishable items like fresh produce and the
most common barriers included delivery and service fees and difficulty navigating online ordering. This review revealed major gaps in the existing research including: research in African, Oceanic, or South American countries; more in-depth qualitative research on decision-making in real-world online food retail platforms; the prevalence of impulse food purchases online and their implications for human and planetary health; how purchasing food online alters all food purchases; and evaluation of real-world efforts to reduce the barriers to use.

Policy- and decision-makers can play a role in improving online retail by increasing internet accessibility, incentivizing retailers to reduce delivery fees, and introducing food delivery options to rural areas. Future studies could examine whether these changes to reduce barriers would increase use of online grocers among these groups of public health importance.
**Supplementary Table 1.** Search strings adapted for each database searched.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Database</th>
<th>Search String</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pubmed</td>
<td>“online grocery shopping” OR “online food shopping” OR “online grocery” OR “online food store” OR “online food retail”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scopus</td>
<td>TITLE-ABS-KEY (“online grocery shopping” OR “online food shopping” OR “online grocery” OR “online food store” OR “online food retail”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web of Science</td>
<td>TS=(“online grocery shopping” OR “online food shopping” OR “online grocery” OR “online food retail”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Source Premier</td>
<td>AB “online grocery shopping” OR AB “online food shopping” OR AB “online grocery” OR AB “online food store” OR AB “online food retail”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACM Digital Library</td>
<td>[All: &quot;online grocery shopping&quot;] OR [All: &quot;online food shopping&quot;] OR [All: &quot;online grocery&quot;] OR [All: &quot;online food store&quot;] OR [All: &quot;online food retail&quot;]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Google Scholar</td>
<td>“online grocery shopping” OR “online food shopping” OR “online grocery” OR “online food store” OR “online food retail”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USDA Publications</td>
<td>“online grocery shopping” OR “online food shopping” OR “online grocery” OR “online food store” OR “online food retail”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** The Google Scholar search included only the first 100 results as advised by a research librarian.

Funding: This research was funded by Healthy Eating Research under Award Number 2834133. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of healthy Eating Research.

Acknowledgments: We thank Emily Jones for consultation while developing our search strategy and throughout this research. We also thank Catie Drawdy for assistance during the screening and extraction process.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.
References


A Review of Online Food Retail


52. İlhan BY, ioğlu TE. Effect of women’s labor market status on online grocery shopping, the case of Turkey. Eurasian Bus Rev. 2015;5(2):371-396. doi:10.1007/s40821-015-0029-x


A Review of Online Food Retail


A Review of Online Food Retail


A Review of Online Food Retail


94. Van Droogenbroeck E, Van Hove L. Triggered or evaluated? A qualitative inquiry into the decision to start using e-grocery services. *Int Rev Retail Distrib Consum Res*. Published online 2019. doi:10.1080/09593969.2019.1655085


102. Stones C. Online food nutrition labelling in the UK: how consistent are supermarkets in their presentation of nutrition labels online? *Public Health Nutr*. 2016;19(12):2175-2184. doi:10.1017/S1368980015003110


A Review of Online Food Retail


A Review of Online Food Retail


148. Peck J, Childers TL. If I touch it I have to have it: Individual and environmental influences on impulse purchasing. *J Bus Res.* 2006;59(6):765-769. doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2006.01.014


