1

**Title:** Sodium content of menu items in New York City chain restaurants following enforcement of the sodium warning icon rule, 2015-2017

Author Names: Julia S. Sisti, Divya Prasad\*, Sarah Niederman, Tamar Adjoian Mezzacca, Amaka V. Anekwe, Jenifer Clapp, Shannon M. Farley.

Author affiliations: All authors affiliated with: Bureau of Chronic Disease Prevention, New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene

\*Corresponding author E-mail: <u>dprasad2@health.nyc.gov</u> (DP)

#### 2

# 1 Abstract

2

In 2016, New York City (NYC) began enforcing a sodium warning regulation at chain 3 restaurants, requiring placement of an icon next to any menu item containing >2,300 mg sodium. 4 5 As menu labeling may improve menu nutritional composition, we investigated whether sodium content of menu items changed following enforcement of the sodium warning icon. All menu 6 7 offerings at 10 quick-service (QSR) and 3 full-service (FSR) chain restaurants were 8 photographed in 2015 (baseline) and 2017 (follow-up) and matched to nutritional information 9 from restaurant websites; items were categorized as being available at both baseline and follow-10 up, or at only one timepoint. Linear and logistic regression models, respectively, assessed 11 changes in calculated mean sodium-per-serving and the odds of an item containing  $\geq 2,300$  mg 12 sodium. At baseline, mean per-serving sodium content was 2,160 mg at FSR and 1,070 mg at QSR, and 40.6% of FSR items and 7.2% of QSR items contained  $\geq$ 2,300 mg sodium per serving. 13 Sodium content did not differ when comparing all items offered at follow-up to all offered at 14 15 baseline (21 mg, 95% CI: -60,101), or when comparing new versus discontinued items (17 mg, 95% CI: -154, 187). At follow-up, there was a non-significant increase in the overall likelihood 16 of items requiring a warning icon (OR=1.32, 95% CI: 0.97,1.79). When comparing new versus 17 discontinued items, there was a twofold increase in the odds of requiring a warning icon 18 19 (OR=2.08, 95% CI: 1.02, 4.24). Our findings both highlight high sodium content of menu items 20 at popular chain restaurants and underscore difficulties in motivating restaurants to reduce 21 sodium levels.

22

#### 3

# 24 Introduction:

25

26	High sodium intake is a well-established, modifiable risk factor for hypertension [1] and
27	a leading dietary contributor to cardiovascular mortality [2-3]. Food purchased outside the home
28	accounts for over two-thirds of dietary sodium intake [4-5], and frequency of dining out is
29	positively associated with high sodium intake among Americans [6]. In New York City (NYC),
30	average daily sodium intake is estimated to be about 3,200 milligrams (mg) per day [7],
31	approximately 40% higher than the daily recommended sodium limit for healthy adults (2,300
32	mg) [8].

In December 2015, in light of this landscape and in an effort to foster greater 33 34 transparency of excessive sodium in the food supply, NYC enacted regulation requiring chain restaurants to post a sodium warning icon depicting a saltshaker next to any menu item 35 containing  $\geq 2,300$  mg sodium [9]. In addition to standard menu items, customizable items 36 require a warning icon if any potential combination of components contains >2,300 mg sodium; 37 this also applies to combination meals with multiple components sold together at a fixed price. 38 39 Shareable items containing  $\geq 2.300$  mg sodium per serving must also display an icon. Warning icons must appear on all printed or electronic menus, menu boards and item tags; additionally, 40 restaurants must display a statement at the point of purchase which explains the meaning of the 41 42 icon and summarizes the association of high sodium intake with heart disease and stroke.

In addition to informing purchasing decisions, menu labeling at chain restaurants may lead to improvements in the nutritional composition of offered menu items. In an analysis of 59 national chain restaurants between 2012-2019, Grummon *et al.* reported that menu items newly introduced following implementation of calorie labeling, in accordance with the federal

4

47 requirement, were lower in calories than items newly introduced prior to calorie labeling [10].
48 We investigated whether the sodium content of menu items offered in NYC chain restaurants
49 changed following enforcement of the sodium warning rule in 2016.

50 Methods:

51

## 52 Study population:

53

The NYC Department of Health and Mental Hygiene (Health Department) maintains a 54 55 list of approximately 27,000 current restaurants licensed by the city; those with >15 locations nationwide are considered chains and covered by the sodium warning icon rule. In 2015, a total 56 of 182 NYC restaurant chains, representing 2,129 locations, were required to comply with the 57 rule. Of these, 50 chains had table service and were defined as 'full-service restaurants' (FSR); 58 the remainder were classified as 'quick service restaurants (OSR)'. We identified the 10 OSR 59 and 5 FSR chains with the greatest number of NYC locations in 2015; of these, two FSR were 60 missing sodium data for at least one study time point and were excluded from analyses. No 61 human subjects were involved in this research and therefore IRB review was not required. 62

#### 63 Data collection:

64

Baseline data collection occurred between November 2015 and January 2016, prior to enforcement of the warning icon rule by the Health Department in June 2016; follow-up data collection occurred in March-April 2017. Trained data collectors visited a single NYC location of each chain and photographed all printed menus, menu boards, signage, and display cases. At each time point, images were matched with nutritional information on restaurant websites. When

5

possible, the same location was visited at both time points, to reduce potential menu variation
across different locations of a single chain.

#### 72 Measures:

73

We calculated per-serving sodium content of menu items offered in each year. To reflect 74 rule enforcement, each customizable and combination meal was included as a single item, with 75 the highest sodium components included. When customizable options included different protein 76 bases (e.g. chicken, pork, beef), we created separate items for each protein that additionally 77 included the highest sodium options for all other components. For customizable pizzas, we 78 79 created separate items for each crust option (i.e. thin crust, regular) that included the three highest sodium toppings. Different sizes of single items (e.g., small, medium and large fries) 80 were entered as separate items. When sodium content for an item was presented as a range, we 81 used the maximum value. Sodium content was missing for a large proportion of beverages 82 (>35%); therefore, beverages were not examined individually but were included in combination 83 meals when sodium content was available. We additionally excluded items described as 84 'shareable', and for which per-serving sodium content could not be calculated. Toppings, 85 dressings, and dipping sauces were not analyzed except as part of customizable meals, as they 86 87 could not be ordered individually and thus were not eligible for a warning icon. Sodium 88 information was collected for a small number of children's menu items (33 at baseline; 35 at 89 follow-up); exclusion of these items did not change results and they were retained in final 90 analyses.

91 Menu items were classified as combination meals if they included two or more à la carte
92 items (e.g., a hamburger and fries), offered together at a fixed price. Side dishes included fries,

6

appetizers, salads and soups described as sides, baked goods, and desserts; main dishes included
entrées, pizza, sandwiches, hamburgers, and large salads and soups.

## 95 Statistical analysis:

96

We used two approaches to evaluate changes in sodium content between time points. 97 First, to test for differences in mean sodium content, we used linear regression models with per-98 serving sodium content (mg) as the outcome. Second, logistic regression models assessed 99 whether the odds of an item containing  $\geq 2,300$  mg sodium per serving differed between baseline 100 and follow-up. Models included a dichotomous indicator for time point, and adjusted for item 101 102 type (combination meal, main dish, side dish) and restaurant type (QSR, FSR). To account for correlation of sodium content within chains, models included random intercepts for restaurant 103 chain. 104

In addition to comparing all items offered at baseline to all items offered at follow-up, we separately compared 1) items that were available at both baseline and follow-up; and 2) items that were available at follow-up only versus those available at baseline only. Items that were offered at both time points were included if sodium information was available at either point; results were unchanged when restricting to those with complete data at both points.

## **Results:**

111

112 Our analysis includes 10 QSR chains (Baskin Robbins, Burger King, Chipotle,

113 Domino's, Dunkin' Donuts, McDonald's, Papa John's, Popeyes, Starbucks, Subway) with a total

of 2,045 NYC locations and three FSR chains (Applebee's, IHOP, TGI Friday's) with a total of

115 57 NYC locations, accounting for 64% and 24% of all NYC QSR and FSR chain locations,

7

116	respectively. Mean time between baseline and follow-up data collection was 15.6 months. At
117	baseline, one FSR chain (Applebee's) had voluntarily added the warning icon in advance of
118	enforcement. Analyses include a total of 840 menu items available at baseline and 887 items
119	offered at follow-up; descriptive statistics for items are shown in Table 1. At baseline, mean per-
120	serving sodium content was twofold higher among items offered at FSR (2,160 mg) compared to
121	those at QSR (1,070 mg). At baseline, 40.6% of FSR menu items had $\geq$ 2,300 mg sodium per
122	serving, compared to only 7.2% of QSR menu items (Table 2); five QSR had no items exceeding
123	this threshold at either time point.

# Table 1. Mean per-serving sodium content (mg) of food items offered at 13 NYC chain restaurants at baseline and follow-up

-	All Y1 items vs. all Y2 items		Items offered in both Y1 and Y2			Items offered in Y1 only vs. Y2 only			
	n (Y1/Y2) Y1 Y2			n (Y1/Y2) Y1 Y		Y2	n (Y1/Y2)	Y1	Y2
Overall	840/887	1444	1406	655/681	1414	1393	185/206	1550	1451
Main dish	340/362	1402	1372	268/279	1409	1393	72/83	1378	1299
Side dish	251/274	671	644	209/223	669	672	42/51	681	525
Combination meal	249/251	2280	2288	178/179	2296	2290	71/72	2237	2281
Quick service	552/612	1070	1023	437/464	1037	1020	115/148	1196	1034
Main dish	226/261	1160	1124	183/195	1160	1141	43/66	1159	1073
Side dish	182/212	412	404	157/171	415	432	25/41	392	287
Combination meal	144/139	1762	1778	97/98	1812	1803	47/41	1659	1719
Full service	288/275	2160	2258	218/217	2170	2190	70/58	2130	2514
Main dish	114/101	1883	2012	85/84	1944	1979	29/17	1703	2176
Side dish	69/62	1357	1465	52/52	1439	1458	17/10	1108	1502
Combination meal	105/112	2989	2920	81/81	2876	2879	24/31	3371	3025
126									
127									

128

8

- 130
  131
  132
  133
  134 Table 2. Proportion of food items containing ≥2.300 mg sodium.
- 134 Table 2. Proportion of food items containing ≥2,300 mg sodium/serving at 13 NYC chain restaurants at
- 135 baseline and follow-up

	All Y1 items vs. all Y2 items		Items offered in both Y1 and Y2		Items offered in Y1 only vs. Y2 only				
	n (Y1/Y2)	Y1	Y2	n (Y1/Y2)	Y1	Y2	n (Y1/Y2)	Y1	Y2
Overall	840/887	18.7	20.5	655/681	19.2	19.8	185/206	16.8	22.8
Main dish	340/362	14.4	15.5	268/279	14.9	16.1	72/83	12.5	13.3
Side dish	251/274	5.2	5.1	209/223	5.7	5.4	42/51	2.4	3.9
Combination meal	249/251	38.2	44.6	178/179	41.6	43.6	71/72	29.6	47.2
Quick service	552/612	7.2	7.7	437/464	7.8	7.5	115/148	5.2	8.1
Main dish	226/261	8.0	7.3	183/195	8.2	8.2	43/66	7.0	4.5
Side dish	182/212	0	0	157/171	0	0	25/41	0	0
Combination meal	144/139	15.3	20.1	97/98	20.0	19.4	47/41	6.4	22.0
Full service	288/275	40.6	49.1	218/217	42.2	46.1	70/58	35.7	60.3
Main dish	114/101	27.2	36.6	85/84	29.4	34.5	29/17	20.7	47.1
Side dish	69/62	18.8	22.6	52/52	23.1	23.1	17/10	5.9	20.0
Combination meal	105/112	69.5	75.0	81/81	67.9	72.8	24/31	75.0	80.6

<sup>136</sup> 

Table 3 presents unadjusted and multivariable-adjusted differences and 95% confidence intervals (95% CI) in mean per-serving sodium content of menu items between time points. No significant difference in sodium content was observed when comparing all items offered at follow-up to all offered at baseline (21mg, 95% CI=-60, 101). Similarly, no differences between follow-up and baseline sodium content were observed among items offered in both years (14mg, 95% CI=-79, 107) or comparing newly introduced versus discontinued items (17mg, 95% CI=-154, 187).

#### Table 3. Mean per-serving change in sodium content (mg) of food items comparing Y2 (follow up) vs. Y1 (baseline)\*

	All Y1 foo	d items v.	Food item	s offered	Food items offered in		
	all Y2 fo	od items	in both Y	1 and Y2	Y2 only v. Y1 only		
	Unadjusted	Adjusted	Unadjusted	Adjusted	Unadjusted	Adjusted	
Mean Change (95 % CI)	13 (-83, 109)	21 (-60, 101)	7 (-103, 117)	14 (-79, 107)	45 (-172, 262)	17 (-154, 187)	

\*Adjusted models include indicator for item type (non-entrée, entrée, combo meal) and restaurant type (full service, quick service); all models include random intercept for restaurant

#### 147 Table 4. Odds of food item requiring sodium warning icon (≥2,300 mg sodium/serving), comparing Y2 (follow-up) vs. Y1 (baseline)\*

	All Y1 foo	d items v.	Food item	ns offered	Food items offered in	
	all Y2 foo	od items	in both Y	1 and Y2	Y2 only v. Y1 only	
	Unadjusted	Adjusted	Unadjusted	Adjusted	Unadjusted	Adjusted
Odds Ratio (95% CI)	1.30 (0.99, 1.72)	1.32 (0.97, 1.79)	1.12 (0.82, 1.52)	1.15 (0.82, 1.63)	2.12 (1.14, 3.96)	2.08 (1.02, 4.24)

\*Adjusted models include indicator for item type (non-entrée, entrée, combo meal) and restaurant type (full service, quick service); all models include random intercept for restaurant

12

149	Odds ratios (OR) comparing the likelihood of an item meeting or exceeding the 2,300 mg
150	sodium threshold are shown in Table 4. Compared to baseline, there was a non-significant
151	increase in the overall likelihood of menu items at follow-up requiring a warning icon (OR=1.32,
152	95% CI=0.97, 1.79). When comparing new items to those that had been discontinued, there was
153	a statistically significant twofold increase in odds of requiring a warning icon (OR=2.08, 95%
154	CI=1.02, 4.24); conversely, no significant increase was observed when comparing items
155	available in both time points (OR=1.15, 95% CI=0.82, 1.63).
156	

## 157 **Discussion:**

158

In our analysis of 13 NYC chain restaurants, we observed no evidence that overall sodium content of menu items changed immediately following enforcement of the sodium warning rule; however, we found that newly introduced items were more likely to contain at least 2,300 mg of sodium and require a sodium warning icon compared to those that had been discontinued. Notably, sodium content of menu items was high in both time periods, particularly at FSR, where nearly half of menu items required a warning icon.

To our knowledge, only one previous analysis has examined the effect of mandatory 165 restaurant menu labeling on sodium content [11]. Eighteen months after King County, 166 167 Washington required chain restaurants to provide calorie, sodium and saturated fat content for menu items in 2009, sodium content was modestly lower among entrées served at sit-down, but 168 not quick-service, restaurants. However, the WA law only required restaurants to provide sodium 169 content (in mg) at point of purchase, including in brochures or menu appendices. Additionally, 170 baseline for this analysis was 6 months post-implementation of regulations; pre-implementation 171 172 sodium levels were not examined.

13

173	Overall trends in sodium content of restaurant food were examined by Wolfson et al.
174	[12], in an analysis of menu items at 66 large chain restaurants from 2012-2016. Decreased
175	levels of sodium were observed when comparing items added in subsequent years to those
176	available in 2012 only. No trends were observed for items offered in all study years, suggesting
177	that rather than reformulate existing menu items, restaurants may be introducing new, lower-
178	sodium options in addition to their standard offerings, a hypothesis supported by at least one
179	other analysis of 213 restaurants [13]. Other studies have included fewer restaurants; some [14-
180	15], but not all [16], have shown increases in sodium content over time.

181 A primary strength of our study is our in-store data collection, which allowed us to account for potential regional variation in menu offerings within a single chain, and to compute 182 sodium content for customizable and combination meals, which appear frequently on menus and 183 routinely exceed recommended sodium limits. However, limitations of our analysis must be 184 acknowledged. First, we examined a relatively small sample of restaurants, including several of 185 the largest national chains, which may be less likely than smaller chains to decrease sodium 186 content in response to local regulations. However, in selecting chains that account for a large 187 proportion of NYC chain restaurant locations, we were able examine those menu items that were 188 189 most readily available to consumers. Second, because we calculated sodium content of customizable meals by summing the highest-sodium components, our estimates for these meal 190 191 types only reflect changes to the highest-sodium containing versions and do not reflect the full scope of menu changes, for example the introduction of lower-sodium customizations (i.e. a 192 choice of apple slices or French fries as a side). This methodology was selected to mirror rule 193 enforcement and to assess whether restaurants would change their menus with the aim of 194 reducing the number of items requiring a warning icon, but may restrict comparability with other 195

14

published studies. Lastly, our follow-up window was relatively short; it is possible thatreductions in sodium may occur over a longer period.

198 Our findings highlight the high sodium content of menu items at popular chain 199 restaurants; they also underscore the difficulty of motivating restaurants to reduce sodium levels, though other efforts are underway. In addition to enacting the sodium warning rule, the Health 200 201 Department has also played a key role in the National Salt and Sugar Reduction initiative (NSSRI), a coalition of health organizations and state and local health authorities which 202 203 partnered with the food industry to reduce sodium content in packaged and restaurant food [17]. While the restaurant industry's progress toward NSSRI targets has not yet been assessed, some 204 improvements in packaged foods have been noted [18]. Further, in October 2021, in recognition 205 that most dietary sodium comes from processed, packaged, and prepared foods, the FDA 206 released voluntary sodium targets to encourage industry, including restaurants, to reduce sodium 207 208 across a wide range of their products. Our results, combined with those from NSSRI, suggest that 209 current approaches may need to be combined with consumer education and further engagement with industry to produce meaningful reductions in sodium intake and improvements in health 210 211 outcomes.

## 212 Acknowledgements

213

The authors would like to thank John Jasek for thoughtful review and revision of the manuscript.

# 216 **References**

218 219 220 221	1.	He FJ, Li J, Macgregor GA. Effect of longer term modest salt reduction on blood pressure: Cochrane systematic review and meta-analysis of randomised trials. <i>BMJ</i> . 2013;346:f1325. Published 2013 Apr 3. doi:10.1136/bmj.f1325
222 222 223 224 225	2.	Micha R, Peñalvo JL, Cudhea F, Imamura F, Rehm CD, Mozaffarian D. Association Between Dietary Factors and Mortality From Heart Disease, Stroke, and Type 2 Diabetes in the United States. <i>JAMA</i> . 2017;317(9):912-924. doi:10.1001/jama.2017.0947.
226 227 228 229	3.	Mozaffarian D, Fahimi S, Singh GM, et al. Global sodium consumption and death from cardiovascular causes. <i>N Engl J Med</i> . 2014;371(7):624-634. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1304127
230 231 232 233	4.	Harnack LJ, Cogswell ME, Shikany JM, et al. Sources of Sodium in US Adults From 3 Geographic Regions. <i>Circulation</i> . 2017;135(19):1775-1783. doi:10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.116.024446
234 235 236 237	5.	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). Vital signs: food categories contributing the most to sodium consumption - United States, 2007-2008. <i>MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.</i> 2012;61(5):92-98.
238 239 240	6.	An R. Fast-food and full-service restaurant consumption and daily energy and nutrient intakes in US adults. <i>Eur J Clin Nutr.</i> 2016;70(1):97-103. doi:10.1038/ejcn.2015.104
240 241 242 243 244	7.	Angell SY, Yi S, Eisenhower D, et al. Sodium intake in a cross-sectional, representative sample of New York City adults. <i>Am J Public Health</i> . 2014;104(12):2409-2416. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2013.301542
245 246 247 248	8.	U.S. Department of Agriculture and U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Dietary Guidelines for Americans, 2020-2025. 9th Edition. December 2020. Available at <u>http://DietaryGuidelines.gov</u> .
249 250 251 252	9.	Anekwe AV, Lent M, Farley SM, Kessler K, Kennelly MO, Angell SY. New York City's Sodium Warning Regulation: From Conception to Enforcement. <i>Am J Public Health</i> . 2019;109(9):1191-1192. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2019.305228
252 253 254 255 256	10.	Grummon AH, Petimar J, Soto MJ, et al. Changes in Calorie Content of Menu Items at Large Chain Restaurants After Implementation of Calorie Labels. JAMA Netw Open. 2021;4(12):e2141353. Published 2021 Dec 1. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.41353
257 258 259 260	11.	Bruemmer B, Krieger J, Saelens BE, Chan N. Energy, saturated fat, and sodium were lower in entrées at chain restaurants at 18 months compared with 6 months following the implementation of mandatory menu labeling regulation in King County, Washington. <i>J</i> <i>Acad Nutr Diet</i> . 2012;112(8):1169-1176. doi:10.1016/j.jand.2012.04.019
261 262 263	12.	Wolfson JA, Moran AJ, Jarlenski MP, Bleich SN. Trends in Sodium Content of Menu Items in Large Chain Restaurants in the U.S [published correction appears in Am J Prev

264 265	Med. 2019 Oct;57(4):576-578]. <i>Am J Prev Med</i> . 2018;54(1):28-36. doi:10.1016/j.amepre.2017.08.018
266 267 268	13. Wu HW, Sturm R. Changes in the energy and sodium content of main entrées in US chain restaurants from 2010 to 2011. <i>J Acad Nutr Diet</i> . 2014;114(2):209-219.
269 270	doi:10.1016/j.jand.2013.07.035
271 272 273 274	<ol> <li>Rudelt A, French S, Harnack L. Fourteen-year trends in sodium content of menu offerings at eight leading fast-food restaurants in the USA. <i>Public Health Nutr</i>. 2014;17(8):1682-1688. doi:10.1017/S136898001300236X</li> </ol>
275 276 277 278	<ol> <li>Jacobson MF, Havas S, McCarter R. Changes in sodium levels in processed and restaurant foods, 2005 to 2011. <i>JAMA Intern Med.</i> 2013;173(14):1285-1291. doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2013.6154</li> </ol>
278 279 280 281 282 283	<ol> <li>Urban LE, Roberts SB, Fierstein JL, Gary CE, Lichtenstein AH. Temporal trends in fast- food restaurant energy, sodium, saturated fat, and trans fat content, United States, 1996- 2013. <i>Prev Chronic Dis</i>. 2014;11:E229. Published 2014 Dec 31. doi:10.5888/pcd11.140202</li> </ol>
284 285 286 287	<ol> <li>New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene. National Salt and Sugar Reduction Initiative. <u>https://www1.nyc.gov/assets/doh/downloads/pdf/cardio/nsri-</u> <u>partners.pdf</u> Updated February 2022. Accessed July 26, 2022.</li> </ol>
288 289 290	<ol> <li>Moran AJ, Wang J, Sharkey AL, Dowling EA, Curtis CJ, Kessler KA. US Food Industry Progress Toward Salt Reduction, 2009-2018. <i>Am J Public Health</i>. 2022;112(2):325-333. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2021.306571</li> </ol>