

1 **Title:** Socioeconomic position and the influence of food portion size on daily energy intake
2 in adult females: two randomized control trials

3

4 **Author names and affiliations:**

5 Tess Langfield¹, Katie Clarke¹, Lucile Marty², Andrew Jones¹, Eric Robinson¹

6 ¹ Department of Psychological Sciences, University of Liverpool, Liverpool, UK

7 ² Centre des Sciences Du Goût et de l'Alimentation, CNRS, INRAE, Institut Agro, Université
8 Bourgogne Franche-Comté, F-21000 Dijon, France

9

10 **Conflicts of interests:** The authors report no conflicts of interests.

11

12 **Corresponding author:** Eric Robinson, Department of Psychological Sciences, University of
13 Liverpool, Liverpool, UK, eric.robinson@liverpool.ac.uk

14

15 **Running title:** Socioeconomic position and portion size reduction

16

17 **Abbreviations:** BMI – body mass index; PSE – portion size effect; SEP – socioeconomic
18 position

19

20

21 **Abstract**

22 **Background.** Large portions of energy-dense foods drive overconsumption and are more
23 readily available in socioeconomically deprived areas. Reducing portion sizes of
24 commercially available foods could be an effective public health strategy to reduce
25 population energy intake, but recent research suggests that the effect portion size has on
26 energy intake may differ based on socioeconomic position (SEP).

27 **Objective.** We tested whether the effect of reducing food portion sizes on daily energy intake
28 differed based on SEP.

29 **Methods.** Participants were served either smaller or larger portions of food at lunch and
30 evening meals (N = 50; Study 1) and breakfast, lunch and evening meals (N = 46; Study 2) in
31 the laboratory on two separate days, in repeated-measures designs. The primary outcome was
32 total daily energy intake (kcal). Participant recruitment was stratified by primary indicators of
33 SEP; highest educational qualification (Study 1) and subjective social status (Study 2).
34 Secondary indicators of SEP in both studies included household income, self-reported
35 childhood financial hardship and a measure accounting for total years in education.

36 **Results.** In both studies, smaller (vs larger) meal portions led to a reduction in daily energy
37 intake ($p < .02$). Smaller portions resulted in a reduction of 235kcal per day (95% CI: 134,
38 336) in Study 1 and 143kcal per day (95% CI: 24, 263) in Study 2. There was no evidence in
39 either study that effects of portion size on energy intake differed by SEP. Results were
40 consistent when examining effects on portion-manipulated meal (as opposed to daily) energy
41 intake.

42 **Conclusion.** Reducing meal portion sizes could be an effective way to reduce overall daily
43 energy intake and contrary to other suggestions it may be a socioeconomically equitable
44 approach to improving diet. These trials were registered at www.clinicaltrials.gov as
45 NCT05173376 and NCT05399836.

46 **Keywords:** portion size, portion control, food environment, socioeconomic position,
47 nudging, energy intake

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

61

62

63

64

65

66

67

68

69

70

71 **1. Introduction**

72 There are well observed socioeconomic inequalities in diet. In developed countries, people
73 from a lower socioeconomic position (SEP) are more likely to consume diets characterised by
74 nutrient-poor, energy-dense foods (1-3), and also have higher rates of obesity (4-6). One
75 potential explanation for socioeconomic disparities in diet and in rates of obesity is the food
76 environment. More deprived areas have a higher density of fast-food outlets in the US (7, 8),
77 and UK (8-10), meaning more widespread availability and ease of access to large portions of
78 energy-dense foods. An additional but related explanation is that the impact the food
79 environment has on diet may differ by SEP, a question we answer in the present research.

80

81 A key aspect of the food environment is food portion size. Portion sizes of commercially
82 available foods have increased over time in the US (11) and UK (12). This is concerning
83 given robust evidence that eating from larger compared to smaller portions increases energy
84 intake, a phenomenon known as the ‘portion size effect’ (PSE) (13, 14). A recent meta-
85 analysis revealed that individuals do not fully compensate for changes to portion size over the
86 course of a day (15) and therefore larger portion sizes likely promote increased weight gain
87 (16). Intriguingly, there is some preliminary evidence that the influence of portion size may
88 differ based on SEP, with one study finding that the PSE on hypothetical consumption of
89 unhealthy snacks was larger for participants of lower vs. higher SEP (17). In a different
90 study, lower participant subjective SEP was associated with increased likelihood of eating
91 beyond energy needs after being served a large meal (18), as opposed to eating less energy
92 after the large meal to compensate for increased energy intake. Collectively these studies
93 suggest that the influence of portion size on energy intake may differ by SEP. One
94 interpretation of these findings is that psychological experience of resource scarcity
95 associated with being of lower SEP drives behaviours that promote excess intake in the

96 absence of need, as an energy ‘insurance’ against periods of food scarcity (19-22). However,
97 in another study, participants that were experimentally manipulated to experience a lower
98 socioeconomic position showed a greater sensitivity to the energy content of food (23). This
99 finding was interpreted as being evidence that lower SEP may cause an increased vigilance to
100 the energy content of consumed meals in order to avoid being in energy deprivation. If true,
101 this instead suggests that lower SEP may be associated with an enhanced ability to detect
102 energy intake reductions (e.g., via portion size decreases) which promotes compensation by
103 eating more. Therefore, public health approaches designed to reduce food portion sizes would
104 inadvertently benefit the diet of people from higher SEP more than lower SEP.

105

106 As reducing portion size has been identified as a potential target for public health policy (13,
107 24) and it is critical that approaches do not widen existing dietary inequalities (25, 26), further
108 research is needed to understand whether the impact reducing portion sizes has on energy
109 intake differs based on SEP. The present research consists of two laboratory studies
110 examining if the effect of reducing portion size on total daily energy intake is determined by
111 SEP. Consistent with recent research (17, 18), the primary indicators of SEP were highest
112 educational qualification (Study 1) and subjective social status (SSS) (Study 2). Across both
113 studies, a measure accounting for years in higher education and highest educational
114 qualification, income, and self-reported financial hardship in childhood were also examined
115 as additional SEP measures. In both studies, the primary hypothesis was that smaller portions
116 would reduce total daily energy intake and that SEP would moderate the PSE.

117

118 **2. Methods**

119

120 **2.1 Participants**

121

122 The studies were advertised online and in the local community in Liverpool (England).
123 Recruitment materials described the study as investigating ‘mood, diet and sleep’ (cover
124 story). Both studies recruited females aged 18 or over, with a BMI between 18.5-32.5kg/m²
125 (Study 1) and 18.5-39.9kg/m² (Study 2; criteria widened from Study 1 to help boost
126 recruitment). Because of substantial sex differences in energy intake (27, 28), as in (29, 30)
127 we limited studies to females to minimize participant variability in energy intake and
128 therefore increase sensitivity to identify moderating effects of participant level SEP on energy
129 intake. In addition, previous research suggesting SEP moderation of the influence of portion
130 size sampled all (18) or predominantly females (17). Individuals with any dietary restrictions
131 including being vegetarian or dieting (Study 1; though vegetarians were eligible in Study 2
132 due to study foods), food allergies, self-reported dislike of the test foods, or a history of
133 eating disorders, on medication affecting appetite or pregnant were ineligible. Participants
134 scoring the middle response (‘5’) on the SSS measure were also excluded in Study 2 as this
135 denotes the midpoint of the SSS measure (i.e., neither high nor low SEP). Participants could
136 not participate in both studies. Recruitment was stratified by the primary SEP indicator for
137 each study (50% lower and higher), as well as by age (50% 18-25 years; 50% 26+ years) in
138 Study 1, and by education (50% <A level or equivalent; 50% >A level or equivalent) in Study
139 2, to ensure SEP groups differed on the primary SEP indicator but not on other
140 demographics. See Supplementary Materials for full methodological information.

141


142 **2.2 Design**

143

144 The studies used randomised crossover designs with two study days corresponding to two
145 conditions: smaller vs. larger portion sizes. Study days were on the same day of the week,

146 separated by a washout period of between 1 – 6 weeks. Participants were served all meals in
147 the laboratory and provided additional snacks to take away. Daily energy intake (kcal) was
148 the primary outcome (see **Figure 1** for overview). Participants were randomised to the
149 sequence of conditions using the Microsoft Excel (rand()) function, and were blinded to
150 condition.

151
152 **Figure 1. Assessment of daily energy intake (primary outcome) and its components**



153
154 Figure legend. Diagram adapted from (31) .

155 156 **2.3 Study foods**

157
158 All meal components and snacks were prepared for *ad libitum* consumption. The size of the
159 initial portions served at lunch and dinner (Study 1) and at breakfast, lunch and dinner (Study
160 2) were manipulated (see **Table 1**). Portion sizes were selected on the basis of previous data
161 (32), so that in both the smaller and larger conditions the amount of food provided appeared a
162 relatively normal meal size, but the larger portions were 50% larger than the smaller portions

163 in g/kcal. As in (31), participants could serve themselves more of the portion manipulated
 164 food from large serving bowls, if desired, or request additional servings. See Supplementary
 165 Materials for full study menus and macronutrient content of all study food. The dishware
 166 used to serve the meals was kept consistent across the two conditions, although in Study 1,
 167 the size of breakfast plate and bowl differed based on study day (for more information see
 168 Supplementary Materials).

169

170 **Table 1. Portion-manipulated meals**

		Portion (g)	Energy content (kcal)
Study 1	Lunch		
	Cheese and tomato pasta bake		
	SMALLER	375	544
	LARGER	563	816
	Dinner		
	Beef chilli with rice		
	SMALLER	291	339
LARGER	437	509	
Study 2	Breakfast		
	White toast		
	SMALLER (2 PIECES)	80	195
	LARGER (3 PIECES)	120	293
	Brown toast		
	SMALLER (2 PIECES)	80	185
	LARGER (3 PIECES)	120	277
	Cornflakes		
	SMALLER	30	116
	LARGER	45	174
	Yoghurt		
	SMALLER	100	95
	LARGER	150	143
	Lunch		
	Cheese and tomato pasta bake		
SMALLER	350	508	
LARGER	525	761	
Dinner			
Vegetarian chilli with rice			
SMALLER	291	296	
LARGER	437	444	

171 Notes. Total amount of food available per day including sides and other dishes: 6328kcal
172 (smaller); 6770kcal (larger), in Study 1 and 5040kcal (smaller); 5643kcal (larger), in Study 2.
173

174 **2.4 Participant measures**

175

176 **2.4.1 Highest education level.** In Study 1, highest educational qualification was the primary
177 SEP indicator. As in (17) participants with A-levels or less were categorised as lower SEP,
178 and those with higher education (e.g. degree level) as higher SEP.

179

180 **2.4.2 Subjective socioeconomic status (SSS).** In Study 2, SSS was the primary SEP
181 indicator. SSS was measured using the MacArthur Scale, which probes an individual's
182 perceived position in society relative to others in terms of money, education, and jobs.
183 Participants were asked: *“Think of a ladder as representing where people stand in society. At
184 the top of the ladder, are the people who are best off — those who have the most money, most
185 education, and the best jobs. At the bottom, are the people who are worst off—who have the
186 least money, least education and the worst jobs or no job. The higher up you are on this
187 ladder, the closer you are to people at the very top and the lower you are, the closer you are
188 to the bottom. Please select where best represents where you think you stand on the ladder.”*

189 The ladder scored from 1 – 10, with higher scores indicating higher perceived social status
190 (33). Participants scoring 1 – 4 were categorised as lower SEP and those scoring 6 – 10 as
191 higher SEP, with individuals scoring 5 excluded to ensure the two groups clearly differed in
192 SSS.

193

194 **2.4.3 Other socioeconomic indicators.** Additional measures of SEP were collected for use in
195 sensitivity analyses. To account for both education qualifications achieved and time in
196 education, ‘Level of education’ was calculated from the self-reported number of years spent

197 in higher education and highest educational qualification (coded 1 – 9), which were each z-
198 scored and averaged to produce a composite score. Equivalised household income was
199 derived from self-reported household income adjusted for household composition (34). Self-
200 reported financial hardship in childhood was measured using a 3-item resource availability
201 questionnaire (e.g. “My family had enough money for things growing up”), coded from 1
202 [strongly disagree] – 7 [strongly agree], with scores averaged, and lower scores indicating
203 greater financial hardship (lower resource availability) (35).

204

205 **2.4.4 Individual difference measures.** To potentially explain any SEP differences in
206 responsiveness to the portion-size effect we collected a range of trait measures. We measured
207 self-reported impulsivity, inhibition (Stroop task), health and weight control food choice
208 motives, satiety responsiveness, plate-clearing tendencies, perceived food insecurity,
209 compensatory health beliefs, and perceived ‘normal’ portion sizes. See Supplementary
210 Materials for full information.

211

212 **2.5 Study outcome measures**

213 **2.5.1 Daily energy intake.** Energy intake (kcal) was assessed by weighing study food before
214 and after consumption using digital scales ([Sartorius], measured to the nearest 0.1 g).
215 Consumed weight (g) was multiplied by energy density for each food item (kcal/g) derived
216 from the food packaging. Any energy intake (kcal) from self-reported non-study food energy
217 intake (kcal) was estimated using intake24, a validated online dietary assessment tool (36,
218 37).

219

220 **2.5.2 Energy intake from foods with portion manipulation.** Energy (kcal) from portion-
221 manipulated food items only (i.e., initial portion-manipulated servings).

222

223 **2.5.3 Energy intake from non-manipulated foods.** Energy (kcal) from food and drinks
224 which were not portion-manipulated (i.e., additional servings/seconds, sides, desserts, snacks,
225 and self-reported additional food/drink).

226

227 **2.5.4 Physical activity.** To assess compliance with study instructions (to avoid vigorous
228 physical exercise and to keep physical activity roughly consistent on both study days),
229 participants wore activity monitors on each study day (Fitbit Zip). Data on moderate-vigorous
230 activity (operationalised as total minutes of activity with a metabolic equivalent of ≥ 3) was
231 collected. Fitbit device active minute estimates have been validated against gold standard
232 research-grade physical activity monitoring devices (38).

233

234 **2.5.5 Hunger and fullness.** Pre- and post- meal hunger and fullness were assessed as part of
235 a battery of filler ‘mood’ measures using visual analog scales ranging from 0 (‘not at all’) to
236 100 (‘extremely’), with 12 measures in total: [breakfast, lunch, dinner] x [pre-meal, post-
237 meal] x [smaller portion study day, larger portion study day]. Hunger and fullness ratings
238 were plotted separately for each condition and the area under the curve (AUC) was calculated
239 using the trapezoid function (39).

240

241 **2.5.6 Liking, familiarity, normality.** For all study foods, participants rated liking (1 [not at
242 all] -7 [very much]), and familiarity (‘I would normally eat this type of food’; 1 [strongly
243 disagree] – 7 [strongly agree]). Participants were also shown images of each portion for the
244 portion-manipulated foods and asked how ‘normal’ it was (1 [not normal, it is far too small] –
245 7 [not normal, it is far too big]).

246

247 **2.5.7 Awareness of study aim and portion manipulation.** Participants described what they
248 believed the aim of the study was, in an open-ended text response, with two researchers
249 independently assessing awareness (i.e., the impact of portion size on energy intake).
250 Participants were then asked whether they noticed the difference in portion size between
251 study days, and which portion they had on each study day. Participants were coded as ‘aware’
252 of the portion size manipulation if they answered ‘yes’ to the first question, and correctly
253 identified the order in which they received smaller vs. larger portions.

254

255 **2.6 Procedure**

256 Participants completed a screening session in which eligibility was confirmed, weight and
257 height were measured, and two individual difference measures were completed (Stroop task
258 and perceived ‘normal’ portion size task). Prior to study days participants were asked to
259 avoid eating or drinking anything other than water before attending for breakfast, and to not
260 eat anything other than the provided study food (teas, coffees, water, soft drinks and up to 2
261 alcoholic beverages could be consumed as normal, but we asked that they recorded them as
262 additional food/drink). To bolster the cover story, participants completed filler mood
263 questions before and after eating each meal (with embedded hunger and fullness ratings), a
264 filler word-categorisation task relating to ‘mood’ words during lunch, and a questionnaire
265 about their sleep during breakfast. Meals were served onto a dining table, with non-
266 manipulated food (e.g., additional serving of the portion size manipulated food, sides,
267 dessert) placed on an adjacent serving table. All meals were served with 500ml chilled water,
268 and a choice of tea or coffee with breakfast. When being served each meal, participants were
269 told they could eat as much or as little as they would like, and that they were not time-limited.
270 At the end of each breakfast session, participants were provided with a snack box to take
271 away and consume food from when required, a Fitbit activity monitor, and food diary to

272 record any drinks or additional food consumed throughout the day. After attending both study
273 days participants attended a final session during which they completed a battery of
274 questionnaires (i.e., individual difference measures) and a study experience questionnaire
275 (i.e., probing awareness of the aim of the study), before being debriefed. Participants were
276 reimbursed for their time and any travel expenses. See Supplementary Materials for full
277 methodological information.

278

279 Study 1 was conducted between October 2021 and April 2022 and Study 2 was conducted
280 between June and October 2022. Both studies were conducted in line with institutional ethical
281 guidelines and received ethical approval (reference: 6154). Study protocols were pre-
282 registered on the Open Science Framework (Study 1: osf.io/gkrp7; Study 2: osf.io/hx75k) and
283 on ClinicalTrials.gov (Study 1: NCT05173376; Study 2: NCT05399836).

284

285 **2.7 Analysis plan**

286 All analyses were pre-registered unless stated. Analyses were conducted using SPSS version
287 26 (frequentist analyses) and JASP version 0.16.4 (Bayesian analyses). Main effects and
288 interactions were assessed against an alpha of $p < .05$ for primary and $p < .01$ for secondary
289 analyses to account for multiple comparisons. Bayes Factors were computed using default
290 priors; r scale fixed effects = 0.5, r scale random effects = 1, and r scale covariates = 0.353.

291 We report $BFincl$ and use conventional cut offs as evidence for the alternative hypothesis (1 –
292 3: anecdotal; 3 – 10: moderate; 10 – 30: strong; 30 – 100 very strong; > 100 extreme; with
293 inverse values indicative of the same degree of evidence for the null) (40).

294

295 **2.7.1 Sample size.** Power calculations were conducted using G*Power 3.1. For Study 1, we
296 calculated that a minimum sample of 46 participants was required to detect a small-to-

297 medium main effect of portion size or interaction with SEP on daily energy intake ($f=0.175$, p
298 $< .05$, 85% power, within-subject correlation of 0.7 estimated from (31)). We powered Study
299 2 to detect the same sized effects and interactions on daily energy intake ($f=0.175$, $p < .05$,
300 85% power, within-subject correlation of 0.75 (conservatively used given Study 1 $r = 0.84$]),
301 resulting in a minimum $N=40$. As specified in the protocol, we planned to recruit slightly
302 above minimum sample sizes (10-15%) to account for any missing data and maximise
303 statistical power. Recruited $n = 54$ (Study 1) and $n = 47$ (Study 2).

304

305 **2.7.2 Primary analyses.** The primary analyses were mixed ANOVA testing the within-
306 subjects effects of portion size (smaller, larger), between-subjects effects of SEP (lower vs
307 higher), and the interaction (portion size*SEP) on daily energy intake. Bayes Factors were
308 computed for all main effects and interactions.

309

310 **2.7.3 Sensitivity analyses.** We tested the sensitivity of the primary analyses by repeating the
311 analyses after: i) excluding participants guessing the aims of the study, ii) excluding outliers
312 (identified as those with a value $> 3SD$ from condition mean) and influential cases (identified
313 as those with a Cook's distance > 1 , indicating a multivariate outlier (41)), iii) adjusting for
314 portion size order (smaller first, larger first), and iv) substituting the primary socioeconomic
315 indicator with alternative measures: level of education, equivalised household income, SSS
316 (continuous measure), self-reported financial hardship in childhood (continuous measure,
317 pre-registered Study 2 only), and highest educational qualification (Study 2 only).

318

319 **2.7.4 Secondary analyses.** We ran four mixed ANOVAs testing the within-subjects effects
320 of portion size (smaller, larger), between-subjects effects of SEP (lower vs higher), and the
321 interaction (portion size*SEP) on i) energy intake from foods with portion manipulation, and

322 ii) energy intake from non-manipulated foods (analyses pre-registered for Study 2 only), iii)
323 AUC for hunger, and iv) AUC for fullness (to assess whether changes to portion size were
324 associated with changes in hunger and fullness). We also examined if minutes of moderate-
325 vigorous physical activity differed between SEP or portion size conditions (see
326 Supplementary Materials). Finally, liking, familiarity and normality ratings are reported for
327 each portion-manipulated dish.

328

329

330 **3. Results**

331

332 **3.1 Sample characteristics**

333 For Study 1, the final analysis sample was $N = 50$ and for Study 2 the final sample was $N =$
334 46; see **Figure 2** for participant flow diagram and exclusions. There was no evidence in
335 Study 1 or 2 that SEP groups differed in age ($p_s > .159$) or BMI ($p_s > .125$). In Study 1, the
336 higher SEP group had more current students (university) than the lower SEP. See **Table 2** for
337 summary participant characteristics.

338

339 **3.2 Effect of portion size on daily energy intake**

340 **3.2.1 Study 1.** In Study 1, when smaller portions were served, daily energy intake was
341 235kcal lower (95% CI: 134, 336) vs. larger portions. Higher SEP individuals ate 426kcal
342 more than lower SEP individuals (95% CI: 114, 739), but there was no evidence that SEP
343 moderated the portion size effect, see **Figure 3**. The Bayes factor for the main effect of
344 portion size was $BF_{10} > 100$, indicative of extreme evidence for the alternative hypothesis
345 (i.e., smaller meal portions decrease daily energy intake). The Bayes factor for the main
346 effect of SEP was $BF_{10} = 4.7$ indicative of moderate support for the alternative hypothesis

347 (i.e., daily energy intake higher among higher SEP vs lower SEP). The Bayes factor for the
348 portion size*SEP interaction was $BF_{10} = 1.01$, indicative of no clear evidence. When
349 statistically adjusting for student status the main effect of SEP was no longer significant
350 suggesting the main effect of SEP was being driven by student status (there were more
351 current students in the higher SEP group; see Supplementary Materials).

352

353 **3.2.2 Study 2.** The same pattern of results was observed in Study 2; when smaller portions
354 were served, daily energy intake was 143kcal lower (95% CI: 24, 263) vs. larger portions.
355 There was no evidence that SEP groups differed on energy intake, and no evidence that SEP
356 moderated the portion size effect, see Figure 3. The Bayes factor for the main effect of
357 portion size was $BF_{10} = 1.854$, indicative of anecdotal evidence for the alternative hypothesis
358 (i.e. smaller portions decrease energy intake). The Bayes factor for the main effect of SEP
359 was $BF_{10} = 0.308$ indicative of moderate support for the null hypothesis (i.e., no difference
360 in energy intake between higher SEP vs lower SEP). Critically, the Bayes factor for the
361 portion size*SEP interaction was $BF_{10} = 0.305$, indicative of moderate support for the null
362 hypothesis.

363

364 For energy intake data and full statistical models see **Tables 3 and 4** respectively. In all
365 sensitivity analyses the pattern of findings did not differ, whereby the interaction between
366 portion size and SEP on daily energy intake remained non-significant. See Supplementary
367 Materials for full results and Supplementary Table S6 for full ANOVA results for SEP
368 sensitivity analyses.

369

370 **3.3 Effect of portion size on energy intake from foods with portion manipulation**

371 In Study 1, there was a main effect of portion size condition on energy intake from portion-
372 manipulated foods, with 249kcal less eaten from smaller (vs larger) lunch and dinner portion-
373 manipulated servings (95% CI: 206, 292). There was no main effect or interaction with SEP
374 ($p > .151$). The same pattern of results was observed in Study 2; there was a main effect of
375 portion size condition on energy intake from portion-manipulated foods, with 202kcal less
376 eaten from smaller (vs larger) breakfast, lunch and dinner portion-manipulated servings (95%
377 CI: 144, 259). There was no main effect or interaction with SEP ($p > .222$).

378

379 **3.4 Effect of portion size on energy intake from non-manipulated foods**

380

381 In Study 1, there was no main effect of portion size condition on energy intake from non-
382 manipulated foods ($p = .772$), a main effect of SEP with higher SEP consuming 414kcal more
383 from non-manipulated foods than lower SEP (95% CI: 139, 688) ($p = .004$), and no
384 interaction between portion size and SEP ($p = .228$). In Study 2, there was no main effect of
385 portion size condition on energy intake from non-manipulated foods ($p = .228$), and no main
386 effect or interaction with SEP ($p > .228$).

387

Figure 2. CONSORT flowchart for participant enrolment, allocation, and analysis for Study 1 (left panel) and Study 2 (right panel).




Figure legend. Attention checks were included in online questionnaires (e.g., “When did you last visit the Moon”). Consistency checks were also included in online questionnaires (e.g., verifying highest educational qualification).

411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450

Figure 3. Daily energy intake by socioeconomic position (SEP) and portion size condition for Study 1 (left) and Study 2 (right).




Figure Legend. Boxplots with median (IQR), with means denoted by white diamonds.

451 **Table 2.** Summary participant characteristics split by SEP group and overall

	Study 1			Study 2		
	Lower SEP (n = 25)	Higher SEP (n = 25)	Overall (N = 50)	Lower SEP (n = 23)	Higher SEP (n = 23)	Overall (N = 46)
Age	46.36 (18.35)	38.20 (19.88)	42.28 (19.37)	50.00 (17.74)	53.13 (13.28)	51.57 (15.58)
Ethnic group						
White	24 (96%)	18 (72%)	42 (84%)	21 (91.3%)	22 (95.7%)	43 (93.5%)
Mixed or multiple	-	1 (4%)	1 (2%)	-	1 (4.3%)	1 (2.2%)
Asian or Asian British	-	6 (24%)	6 (12%)	1 (4.3%)	-	1 (2.2%)
Black, African, Caribbean, or Black British	1 (4%)	-	1 (2%)	1 (4.3%)	-	1 (2.2%)
Other ethnic group	-	-	-	-	-	-
Student or employment status						
Current student	3 (12%)	12 (48%)	15 (30%)	2 (8.7%)	1 (4.3%)	3 (6.5%)
Full or part time	10 (40%)	6 (24%)	16 (32%)	9 (39.1%)	12 (52.2%)	21 (45.7%)
Looking after home/family	-	1 (4%)	1 (2%)	3 (13%)	2 (8.7%)	5 (10.9%)
Retired	9 (36%)	6 (24%)	15 (30%)	5 (21.7%)	8 (34.8%)	13 (28.3%)
Unemployed/other	3 (12%)	-	3 (6%)	2 (8.7%)	-	2 (4.3%)
Temporary or permanently sick or disabled	-	-	-	2 (8.7%)	-	2 (4.3%)
Highest educational qualification achieved or currently working towards						
No formal qualifications	2 (8%)	-	2 (4%)	1 (4.3%)	1 (4.3%)	2 (4.3%)
1-3 GCSEs or equivalent – <i>US equivalent: High School Diploma/GED Certificate</i>	2 (8%)	-	2 (4%)	2 (8.6%)	1 (4.3%)	3 (6.5%)
4+ GCSEs or equivalent – <i>US equivalent: High School Diploma/GED Certificate</i>	9 (36%)	-	9 (18%)	4 (17.5%)	5 (21.7%)	9 (19.6%)
A level or equivalent – <i>US equivalent: Advanced Placement</i>	12 (48%)	-	12 (24%)	4 (17.4%)	4 (17.4%)	8 (17.4%)
Certificate of higher education (CertHE) or equivalent – <i>US equivalent: Associate degree</i>	-	2 (8%)	2 (4%)	1 (4.3%)	-	1 (2.2%)
Diploma of higher education (DipHE) or equivalent	-	4 (16%)	4 (8%)	-	2 (8.7%)	2 (4.3%)
Bachelor or equivalent	-	12 (48%)	12 (24%)	10 (43.5%)	6 (26.1%)	16 (34.8%)
Master's degree or equivalent	-	6 (24%)	6 (12%)	1 (4.3%)	4 (17.4%)	5 (10.9%)
Doctorate or equivalent	-	1 (4%)	1 (2%)	-	-	-
Years in higher education	1.20 (1.14)	4.80 (3.03)	3.00 (2.96)	2.83 (2.49)	3.39 (2.45)	3.11 (2.46)
Level of education (composite z score)	-.40 (.89)	.41 (.58)	.008 (.85)	-0.102 (0.973)	0.052 (0.998)	-0.025 (0.98)
Equalised household income (£)^a	14332.22 (8216.25)	20166.88 (15878.25)	17314.38 (12922.01)	14129.25 (7896.04)	25321.66 (14801.25)	19868.95 (13084.06)
Subjective socioeconomic status (1 – 10)	5.32 (1.65)	5.68 (1.11)	5.50 (1.40)	3.43 (0.662)	6.65 (0.775)	5.04 (1.78)
BMI (kg/m²)	26.50 (3.66)	25.18 (2.07)	25.84 (3.02)	27.65 (4.83)	28.30 (5.69)	27.98 (5.23)
Weight status						
Normal weight	10 (40%)	11 (44%)	21 (42%)	9 (39.1%)	7 (30.4%)	16 (34.8%)
Overweight	11 (44%)	13 (52%)	24 (48%)	7 (30.4%)	10 (43.5%)	17 (37.0%)
Class I obesity	4 (16%)	1 (4%)	5 (10%)	4 (17.4%)	2 (8.7%)	6 (13.0%)
Class II obesity	-	-	-	3 (13.1%)	4 (17.4%)	7 (15.2%)

452 Notes. Values are M(SD), or counts (%). SEP: socioeconomic position.^a Study 1 data from sample of n = 45 and Study 2 data from sample of n = 39
 453 (individuals with implausible or missing data excluded; n = 5 in Study 1 and n = 7 in Study 2). ^b higher scores indicate higher resource availability. Further
 454 educational equivalents are reported in the Supplementary Materials.

455

456

457 **Table 3.** Study outcome measures by portion size condition and SEP group (M, SD)

	Study 1				Study 2			
	Higher SEP		Lower SEP		Higher SEP		Lower SEP	
	Smaller	Larger	Smaller	Larger	Smaller	Larger	Smaller	Larger
Total daily energy intake (kcal)	2517.44 (641.12)	2724.83 (711.90)	2063.59 (397.32)	2326.05 (509.51)	2009.261 (438.11)	2099.951 (2099.95)	1935.548 (427.29)	2131.757 (506.51)
Energy intake from portion-manipulated food (kcal)	794.61 (98.81)	1074.74 (225.58)	813.08 (84.30)	1030.80 (187.18)	1013.52 (199.64)	1179.53 (262.32)	993.91 (176.28)	1230.96 (271.99)
Energy intake from non-manipulated foods (kcal)	1722.8 (595.17)	1650.10 (631.66)	1250.5 (361.19)	1295.24 (403.65)	995.74 (315.87)	920.42 (246.31)	941.63 (375.63)	900.79 (390.97)
Hunger^a	150.80 (62.14)	149.74 (61.89)	133.38 (47.81)	135.68 (53.21)	174.7 (54.6)	177.2 (67.8)	171.3 (71.9)	159.5 (67.0)
Fullness^a	273.10 (55.98)	287.40 (58.22)	270.66 (55.43)	277.86 (49.55)	267.0 (49.8)	274.7 (46.6)	267.5 (67.9)	276.8 (59.6)

458 Notes. Values are M(SD). SEP: socioeconomic position. Foods with portion manipulation for Study 1: lunch (initial portion), dinner (initial portion), for
 459 Study 2: breakfast (initial portions), lunch (initial portion), dinner (initial portion). ^a Area under the curve of meal ratings taken before and after each meal,
 460 across entire day.

461

462 **Table 4.** Mixed ANOVA results: portion size, SEP, portion size*SEP interaction, predicting primary and secondary energy intake outcomes

	Study 1			Study 2		
	Main effect portion size	Main effect SEP	Interaction	Main effect portion size	Main effect SEP	Interaction
Total daily energy intake	F(1,48) = 21.702, p < .001, partial Eta ² = .311	F(1,48) = 7.5, p = .009, partial Eta ² = .135	F(1,48) = 0.298, p = .588, partial Eta ² = .006	F(1,44) = 5.871, p = .02, partial eta ² = .118	F(1,44) = 0.036, p = .851, partial eta ² = .001	F(1,44) = 0.794, p = .378, partial eta ² = .018
Energy intake from portion-manipulated food	F(1,48) = 135.23, p < .001, partial Eta ² = .738.	F(1,48) = 0.101, p = .751, partial Eta ² = .002	F(1,48) = 2.124, p = .151, partial Eta ² = .042	F(1,44) = 49.385, p < .001, partial eta ² = .529	F(1,44) = 0.066, p = .798, partial eta ² = .002	F(1,44) = 1.534, p = .222, partial eta ² = .034
Energy intake from non-manipulated food	F(1,48) = 0.085, p = .772, partial Eta ² = .002	F(1,48) = 9.189, p = .004, partial Eta ² = .161	F(1,48) = 1.49, p = .228, partial Eta ² = .030	F(1,44) = 1.498, p = .228, partial eta ² = .033	F(1,44) = 0.179, p = .675, partial eta ² = .004	F(1,44) = 0.132, p = .718, partial eta ² = .003
Hunger^a	F(1,48) = 0.008, p = .931, partial Eta ² < .001	F(1,48) = 1.206, p = .278, partial Eta ² = .025	F(1,48) = 0.056, p = .815, partial Eta ² = .001	F(1,44) = 0.232, p = .633, partial eta ² = .005	F(1,44) = 0.391, p = .535, partial eta ² = .009	F(1,44) = 0.564, p = .457, partial eta ² = .013
Fullness^a	F(1,48) = 2.449, p = .124, partial Eta ² = .049	F(1,48) = 0.185, p = .669, partial Eta ² = .004	F(1,48) = 0.267, p = .608, partial Eta ² = .006	F(1,44) = 1.122, p = .295, partial eta ² = .025	F(1,44) = 0.008, p = .931, partial eta ² < .001	F(1,44) = 0.01, p = .921, partial eta ² < .001

463 Notes. SEP: socioeconomic position. Foods with portion manipulation for Study 1: lunch (initial portion), dinner (initial portion), for Study 2: breakfast
464 (initial portions), lunch (initial portion), dinner (initial portion). Non-manipulated foods: all other study food and self-reported food consumed. ^a Area under
465 the curve of meal ratings taken before and after each meal, across entire day. SEP: socioeconomic position.

466 **3.5 Additional analyses**

467 In Study 1, there was no evidence that portion size reduction impacted hunger or fullness
468 ratings (planned), nor any evidence of SEP differences or SEP*portion size interactions; $ps >$
469 $.124$. The same pattern of results was observed in Study 2, $ps > .295$. See Table 2 for
470 descriptive statistics, and Table 3 for full ANOVA results. In both studies, foods tended to be
471 well-liked and familiar to participants, with smaller and larger portions perceived to be
472 ‘normal’ in size, and there was no evidence that rated liking, familiarity, or perceived
473 normality of portions differed by SEP group in Study 1 or 2 ($ps > .057$). Less than half of
474 participants reported noticing the portion manipulation and could accurately distinguish the
475 portions they had on each day (Study 1: 44%; Study 2: 37%), with no evidence that this
476 differed by SEP group. As we found no evidence of moderation of the effect of portion size
477 on energy intake by SEP, we examined moderation by the measured individual difference
478 measures (e.g., health and weight control food choice motives, satiety responsiveness, BMI)
479 and found no evidence of moderation for any of the measures. See Supplementary Materials
480 for secondary analyses in full.

481

482 **4. Discussion**

483 In two experiments we examined the impact of reducing food portion size on energy intake
484 and found that when served smaller portions participants consumed less energy across the
485 course of a day. Importantly, there was no evidence of moderation by SEP. The effect portion
486 size had on energy intake was similar in participants from higher vs. lower SEP and findings
487 were consistent across a range of SEP measurements, including education level, household
488 income, childhood and self-perceived (subjective SEP).

489

490 Our findings are consistent with a large body of evidence showing that smaller portions
491 decrease energy intake (13, 14) and this is consistent with recent research which suggests that
492 changes to portion size are not fully compensated for over the course of a day (15, 31). The
493 present results are not – however – consistent with findings from a recent study which found
494 that lower SEP individuals were more susceptible to the portion size effect, intending to eat
495 more from large portions of unhealthy snacks than higher SEP individuals in a hypothetical
496 task (17). One limitation of this previous study is the use of hypothetical or ‘intended’
497 consumption and this may explain why our results differ. An additional explanation may be
498 that the previous study findings of SEP moderation are limited only to discretionary snack
499 foods and not meal energy intake, as examined in the present studies. In line with this, Best
500 and Papies only found evidence of socioeconomic differences in susceptibility to the portion
501 size effect for unhealthy (e.g., fries, cookies) but not healthy (e.g., carrot sticks, grapes)
502 snacks (17), but did not examine meal energy intake. Future research could explore SEP
503 differences in susceptibility to the portion size effect using a range of meals and snack foods
504 to determine whether findings differ depending on food type.

505

506 In the present studies there was no evidence that energy intake from non-manipulated study
507 foods (e.g., consuming more later in the day after receiving larger vs. smaller portions)
508 differed by SEP. This suggests that individuals with lower SEP are no more susceptible to
509 eating beyond energy needs after being served large meals than those with higher SEP,
510 contrary to recent suggestions (18). In their study, Wijayatunga and colleagues provided
511 participants with a very large lunch (60% of daily energy requirements) to be consumed in
512 full and measured post-lunch energy intake. Conversely, the present studies provided smaller
513 and larger portions deemed as ‘normal’ in size, and participants consumed as much as they
514 liked *ad libitum*, which we presume is more representative of real-world eating occasions. It

515 is worth noting, however, that (18) was a pilot study with a small sample and the authors note
516 that replication with larger samples would be required to verify findings. In addition, in [18]
517 there was no effect of SEP on daily energy intake, which makes it unclear to what extent SEP
518 was associated with a meaningful impact (i.e., sustained) on energy intake in the study.

519

520 It has been suggested that reducing portion sizes of commercially available food could be an
521 effective strategy to promote population health (13, 24). Our findings provide further support
522 for this. Given concerns that dietary interventions do not exacerbate health inequalities, these
523 findings support previous evidence that interventions which target the food environment (as
524 opposed to the individual) are less likely to widen health inequalities as they do not rely on
525 factors such as how motivated an individual is around their health to be effective (e.g., (25,
526 26)). In line with this, we collected a range of individual difference measures, including food
527 choice motivation by health, ability to inhibit impulsive responses (e.g., for tempting food),
528 and responsiveness to satiety signals. We reasoned these factors could moderate the influence
529 of portion size on energy intake given evidence relating to satiety responsiveness in children
530 (42, 43), and for impulsivity and perception of appropriate portion sizes in adults (17)).
531 However, we found no evidence that variation in any of these measures moderated the
532 influence of reducing portion size on energy intake, which is consistent with the proposal that
533 portion size may be a universal driver of human energy intake (44).

534

535 There are several strengths and limitations to note. Findings were replicated across two
536 studies, regardless of how SEP was measured, and were robust to a range of sensitivity
537 analyses. We recruited a diverse sample in terms of SEP and this provided a strong test of the
538 hypothesis that SEP moderates the influence of portion size on energy intake. The sample

539 was predominantly white and although this is consistent with population demographics in the
540 UK, our findings may not generalise to other ethnic groups. Importantly we only recruited
541 females across both studies which may limit generalisability. However, given evidence that
542 sex does not moderate the portion size effect (44) and studies providing evidence for potential
543 SEP moderation of the influence of portion size sampled all (17) or mostly females (18), we
544 presume that this exclusion criterion would not affect results. The controlled laboratory
545 conditions used enabled precise measurement of energy intake, but efforts to replicate these
546 findings in free-living conditions and in real-world food environments are now warranted, as
547 the influence of portion size may be larger in real-life vs laboratory settings, see (45). Energy
548 intake was measured for a day. Although the influence portion size has on daily energy intake
549 has been shown to be similar over time (i.e., effects when measured during a single day are
550 similar to longer durations) (15), confirming findings over longer duration would be valuable.
551 A small proportion of participants consumed non-study foods as in (42), but analyses
552 accounted for this as total daily energy intake included non-study foods. The present studies
553 were powered to detect small-to-medium effects and although the interaction between SEP
554 and portion size was not significant, if there is in fact a very small effect of SEP then we were
555 not powered to detect this and very large sample sizes would be required to do so.

556

557 **Conclusions**

558 Smaller meal portions reduced daily energy intake in both higher and lower SEP participants
559 similarly. Reducing meal portion sizes could be an effective way to reduce overall daily
560 energy intake and contrary to other suggestions it may be a socioeconomically equitable
561 approach to improving diet

562

563

564 **Acknowledgements**

565 The authors would like to thank Alexandra Cunningham and Ahmed A. Sadab for their
566 assistance with data collection.

567 **Statement of contributions:** The authors' responsibilities were as follows: For Study 1, TL,
568 LM, AJ and ER designed the research, and for Study 2, all authors designed the research. For
569 both studies, TL and KC conducted the research, and TL and AJ analysed the data. TL and
570 ER wrote the paper and had primary responsibility for final content and all authors have read
571 and approved the final manuscript.

572 **Data sharing:** Data described in the manuscript will be made publicly and freely available
573 without restriction at <https://osf.io/scjn6/> and <https://osf.io/hx75k/>.

574 **Funding:** This work was supported by funding from the European Research Council (ERC)
575 under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (Grant
576 reference: PIDS, 803194).

References

1. Pechey R, Monsivais P. Socioeconomic inequalities in the healthiness of food choices: Exploring the contributions of food expenditures. *Prev Med.* 2016;88:203-9. Epub 2016/04/21. doi: 10.1016/j.ypmed.2016.04.012. PubMed PMID: 27095324; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC4910945.
2. Darmon N, Drewnowski A. Does social class predict diet quality? *The American journal of clinical nutrition.* 2008;87(5):1107-17. doi: 10.1093/ajcn/87.5.1107.
3. Darmon N, Drewnowski A. Contribution of food prices and diet cost to socioeconomic disparities in diet quality and health: a systematic review and analysis. *Nutrition reviews.* 2015;73(10):643-60. doi: 10.1093/nutrit/nuv027.
4. Newton S, Braithwaite D, Akinyemiju TF. Socio-economic status over the life course and obesity: Systematic review and meta-analysis. *PloS one.* 2017;12(5):e0177151-e. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0177151.
5. Wardle J, Brodersen NH, Cole TJ, Jarvis MJ, Boniface DR. Development of adiposity in adolescence: five year longitudinal study of an ethnically and socioeconomically diverse sample of young people in Britain. *BMJ.* 2006;332(7550):1130-2. doi: 10.1136/bmj.38807.594792.AE.
6. McLaren L. Socioeconomic Status and Obesity. *Epidemiologic reviews.* 2007;29(1):29-48. doi: 10.1093/epirev/mxm001.
7. Pearce J, Blakely T, Witten K, Bartie P. Neighborhood deprivation and access to fast-food retailing: a national study. *Am J Prev Med.* 2007;32(5):375-82. Epub 2007/05/05. doi: 10.1016/j.amepre.2007.01.009. PubMed PMID: 17478262.
8. Burgoine T, Forouhi NG, Griffin SJ, Brage S, Wareham NJ, Monsivais P. Does neighborhood fast-food outlet exposure amplify inequalities in diet and obesity? A cross-sectional study. *The American journal of clinical nutrition.* 2016;103(6):1540-7. doi: 10.3945/ajcn.115.128132.
9. Cummins SCJ, McKay L, MacIntyre S. McDonald's Restaurants and Neighborhood Deprivation in Scotland and England. *American journal of preventive medicine.* 2005;29(4):308-10. doi: 10.1016/j.amepre.2005.06.011.
10. Macdonald L, Cummins S, Macintyre S. Neighbourhood fast food environment and area deprivation—substitution or concentration? *Appetite.* 2007;49(1):251-4. doi: 10.1016/j.appet.2006.11.004.
11. Young LR, Nestle M. Expanding portion sizes in the US marketplace: Implications for nutrition counseling. *Journal of the American Dietetic Association.* 2003;103(2):231-40. doi: 10.1053/jada.2003.50027.
12. Benson C. Increasing portion size in Britain. *Society, biology and human affairs.* 2009;74(2):4-20.
13. Hollands GJ, Shemilt I, Marteau TM, Jebb SA, Lewis HB, Wei Y, et al. Portion, package or tableware size for changing selection and consumption of food, alcohol and tobacco. *COCHRANE DATABASE OF SYSTEMATIC REVIEWS.* 2015(9):CD011045. doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD011045.pub2.
14. Zlatevska N, Dubelaar C, Holden SS. Sizing Up the Effect of Portion Size on Consumption: A Meta-Analytic Review. *Journal of marketing.* 2014;78(3):140-54. doi: 10.1509/jm.12.0303.

15. Robinson E, McFarland-Lesser I, Patel Z, Jones A. Downsizing food: A systematic review and meta-analysis examining the effect of reducing served food portion sizes on daily energy intake and body weight. *British journal of nutrition*. 2022;1-39. doi: 10.1017/S0007114522000903.
16. Hill JO, Wyatt HR, Peters JC. The Importance of Energy Balance. *Eur Endocrinol*. 2013;9(2):111-5. Epub 2013/08/01. doi: 10.17925/ee.2013.09.02.111. PubMed PMID: 29922364; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC6003580.
17. Best M, Papias EK. Lower socioeconomic status is associated with higher intended consumption from oversized portions of unhealthy food. *Appetite*. 2019;140:255-68. doi: 10.1016/j.appet.2019.05.009. PubMed PMID: S0195666318313862.
18. Wijayatunga NN, Ironuma B, Dawson JA, Rusinovich B, Myers CA, Cardel M, et al. Subjective social status is associated with compensation for large meals – A prospective pilot study. *Appetite*. 2019;132:249-56. doi: 10.1016/j.appet.2018.07.031.
19. Dhurandhar EJ. The food-insecurity obesity paradox: A resource scarcity hypothesis. *Physiology & behavior*. 2016;162:88-92. doi: 10.1016/j.physbeh.2016.04.025.
20. Nettle D, Andrews C, Bateson M. Food insecurity as a driver of obesity in humans: The insurance hypothesis. Cambridge University Press (CUP); 2017.
21. Maner JK, Dittmann A, Meltzer AL, McNulty JK. Implications of life-history strategies for obesity. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*. 2017;114(32):8517-22. PubMed PMID: edsjrs.26486915.
22. Hill SE, Prokosch ML, DelPriore DJ, Griskevicius V, Kramer A. Low Childhood Socioeconomic Status Promotes Eating in the Absence of Energy Need. *Psychological Science*. 2016;27(3):354-64. PubMed PMID: edsjrs.24763482.
23. Lim EX, Forde CG, Cheon BK. Low subjective socioeconomic status alters taste-based perceptual sensitivity to the energy density of beverages. *Physiology & behavior*. 2020;223:112989-. doi: 10.1016/j.physbeh.2020.112989.
24. Marteau TH, G; Shemilt, I; Jebb SA. Downsizing: policy options to reduce portion sizes to help tackle obesity. *BMJ (Online)*. 2016;352:i105-i. doi: 10.1136/bmj.i105.
25. Beauchamp A, Backholer K, Magliano D, Peeters A. The effect of obesity prevention interventions according to socioeconomic position: a systematic review. *Obes Rev*. 2014;15(7):541-54. Epub 2014/03/19. doi: 10.1111/obr.12161. PubMed PMID: 24629126.
26. Adams J, Mytton O, White M, Monsivais P. Why Are Some Population Interventions for Diet and Obesity More Equitable and Effective Than Others? The Role of Individual Agency. *PLoS medicine*. 2016;13(4):e1001990-e. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1001990.
27. Bennett E, Peters SAE, Woodward M. Sex differences in macronutrient intake and adherence to dietary recommendations: findings from the UK Biobank. *BMJ open*. 2018;8(4):e020017-e. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2017-020017.
28. Robinson E, Haynes A, Hardman CA, Kempes E, Higgs S, Jones A. The bogus taste test: Validity as a measure of laboratory food intake. *Appetite*. 2017;116:223-31. doi: 10.1016/j.appet.2017.05.002.
29. Tinsley GM, Moore ML, Graybeal AJ, Paoli A, Kim Y, Gonzales JU, et al. Time-restricted feeding plus resistance training in active females: a randomized trial. *The American journal of clinical nutrition*. 2019;110(3):628-40. doi: 10.1093/ajcn/nqz126.
30. Sheen F, Hardman CA, Robinson E. Plate-clearing tendencies and portion size are independently associated with main meal food intake in women: A laboratory study. *Appetite*. 2018;127:223-9. doi: 10.1016/j.appet.2018.04.020.

31. Haynes A, Hardman CA, Halford JCG, Jebb SA, Mead BR, Robinson E. Reductions to main meal portion sizes reduce daily energy intake regardless of perceived normality of portion size: a 5 day cross-over laboratory experiment. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition & Physical Activity*. 2020;17(1):1-13. doi: 10.1186/s12966-020-0920-4. PubMed PMID: 141726154. Language: English. Entry Date: 20200218. Revision Date: 20200218. Publication Type: Article.
32. Haynes A, Hardman CA, Makin ADJ, Halford JCG, Jebb SA, Robinson E. Visual perceptions of portion size normality and intended food consumption: A norm range model. *Food Quality and Preference*. 2019;72:77-85. doi: 10.1016/j.foodqual.2018.10.003. PubMed PMID: S0950329318306128.
33. Adler. N. E. & Stewart J. The MacArthur scale of subjective social status. MacArthur Research Network on SES and Health – Psychosocial Notebook. 2007.
34. Statistics OfN. Chapter 3: Equivalised income. UK: Compend Fam Spend. 2015.
35. Griskevicius V, Delton AW, Robertson TE, Tybur JM. Environmental Contingency in Life History Strategies: The Influence of Mortality and Socioeconomic Status on Reproductive Timing. *Journal of personality and social psychology*. 2011;100(2):241-54. PubMed PMID: edscal.23864190.
36. Bradley J, Simpson E, Poliakov I, Matthews J, Olivier P, Adamson A, et al. Comparison of INTAKE24 (an Online 24-h Dietary Recall Tool) with Interviewer-Led 24-h Recall in 11–24 Year-Old. MDPI AG; 2016.
37. Foster E, Delve, J., Simpson, E., & Breininger, S. P. Comparison study: INTAKE24 vs Interviewer led recall Final report. Food Standards Agency. 2014.
38. Evenson KR, Goto MM, Furberg RD. Systematic review of the validity and reliability of consumer-wearable activity trackers. *The international journal of behavioral nutrition and physical activity*. 2015;12:159. doi: 10.1186/s12966-015-0314-1. PubMed PMID: 26684758.
39. Pruessner JC, Kirschbaum C, Meinlschmid G, Hellhammer DH. Two formulas for computation of the area under the curve represent measures of total hormone concentration versus time-dependent change. 2003:916-31.
40. Stefan AM, Gronau QF, Schönbrodt FD, Wagenmakers E-J. A tutorial on Bayes Factor Design Analysis using an informed prior. *Behavior Research Methods*. 2019;51(3):1042-58. doi: 10.3758/s13428-018-01189-8. PubMed PMID: edssjs.5CBAE12D.
41. Stevens JP. Outliers and influential data points in regression analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*. 1984;95(2):334-44. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.95.2.334. PubMed PMID: edselc.2-52.0-0000402849.
42. Smethers AD, Roe LS, Sanchez CE, Zuraikat FM, Keller KL, Kling SMR, et al. Portion size has sustained effects over 5 days in preschool children: a randomized trial. *The American journal of clinical nutrition*. 2019;109(5):1361-72. doi: 10.1093/ajcn/nqy383.
43. Mooreville M, Davey A, Orloski A, Hannah EL, Mathias KC, Birch LL, et al. Individual differences in susceptibility to large portion sizes among obese and normal-weight children. *Obesity (Silver Spring, Md)*. 2015;23(4):808-14. doi: 10.1002/oby.21014.
44. Robinson E, Haynes A. Individual differences and moderating participant characteristics in the effect of reducing portion size on meal energy intake: Pooled analysis of three randomized controlled trials. *Appetite*. 2021;159. doi: 10.1016/j.appet.2020.105047. PubMed PMID: S019566632031669X.
45. Gough T, Haynes A, Clarke K, Hansell A, Kaimkhani M, Price B, et al. Out of the lab and into the wild: The influence of portion size on food intake in laboratory vs. real-world settings. *Appetite*. 2021;162. doi: 10.1016/j.appet.2021.105160. PubMed PMID: S0195666321000684.