

**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: [dprasad2@health.nyc.gov](mailto:dprasad2@health.nyc.gov) (DP)

## 1 **Abstract**

2

3 In 2016, New York City (NYC) began enforcing a sodium warning regulation at chain

4 restaurants, requiring placement of an icon next to any menu item containing  $\geq 2,300$  mg sodium.

5 As menu labeling may improve menu nutritional composition, we investigated whether sodium

6 content of menu items changed following enforcement of the sodium warning icon. All menu

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

13 QSR, and 40.6% of FSR items and 7.2% of QSR items contained  $\geq 2,300$  mg sodium per serving.

14 Sodium content did not differ when comparing all items offered at follow-up to all offered at

15 baseline (21 mg, 95% CI: -60,101), or when comparing new versus discontinued items (17 mg,

16 95% CI: -154, 187). At follow-up, there was a non-significant increase in the overall likelihood

17 of items requiring a warning icon (OR=1.32, 95% CI: 0.97,1.79). When comparing new versus

18 discontinued items, there was a twofold increase in the odds of requiring a warning icon

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

23

## 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].

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

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

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

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

### 63 **Data collection:**

64

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

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

## 72 **Measures:**

73  
74 We calculated per-serving sodium content of menu items offered in each year. To reflect  
75 rule enforcement, each customizable and combination meal was included as a single item, with  
76 the highest sodium components included. When customizable options included different protein  
77 bases (e.g. chicken, pork, beef), we created separate items for each protein that additionally  
78 included the highest sodium options for all other components. For customizable pizzas, we  
79 created separate items for each crust option (i.e. thin crust, regular) that included the three  
80 highest sodium toppings. Different sizes of single items (e.g., small, medium and large fries)  
81 were entered as separate items. When sodium content for an item was presented as a range, we  
82 used the maximum value. Sodium content was missing for a large proportion of beverages  
83 (>35%); therefore, beverages were not examined individually but were included in combination  
84 meals when sodium content was available. We additionally excluded items described as  
85 ‘shareable’, and for which per-serving sodium content could not be calculated. Toppings,  
86 dressings, and dipping sauces were not analyzed except as part of customizable meals, as they  
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,

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

## 95 **Statistical analysis:**

96

97 We used two approaches to evaluate changes in sodium content between time points.

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

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

## 110 **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  
114 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,

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.

124 **Table 1. Mean per-serving sodium content (mg) of food items offered at 13 NYC chain restaurants at baseline**  
 125 **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
<b>Overall</b>	<b>840/887</b>	<b>1444</b>	<b>1406</b>	<b>655/681</b>	<b>1414</b>	<b>1393</b>	<b>185/206</b>	<b>1550</b>	<b>1451</b>
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
<b>Quick service</b>	<b>552/612</b>	<b>1070</b>	<b>1023</b>	<b>437/464</b>	<b>1037</b>	<b>1020</b>	<b>115/148</b>	<b>1196</b>	<b>1034</b>
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
<b>Full service</b>	<b>288/275</b>	<b>2160</b>	<b>2258</b>	<b>218/217</b>	<b>2170</b>	<b>2190</b>	<b>70/58</b>	<b>2130</b>	<b>2514</b>
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

129

130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135

**Table 2. Proportion of food items containing  $\geq 2,300$  mg sodium/serving 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	Y2	n (Y1/Y2)	Y1	Y2
<b>Overall</b>	<b>840/887</b>	<b>18.7</b>	<b>20.5</b>	<b>655/681</b>	<b>19.2</b>	<b>19.8</b>	<b>185/206</b>	<b>16.8</b>	<b>22.8</b>
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
<b>Quick service</b>	<b>552/612</b>	<b>7.2</b>	<b>7.7</b>	<b>437/464</b>	<b>7.8</b>	<b>7.5</b>	<b>115/148</b>	<b>5.2</b>	<b>8.1</b>
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
<b>Full service</b>	<b>288/275</b>	<b>40.6</b>	<b>49.1</b>	<b>218/217</b>	<b>42.2</b>	<b>46.1</b>	<b>70/58</b>	<b>35.7</b>	<b>60.3</b>
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

136  
  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143

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).





145

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

	All Y1 food items v. all Y2 food items		Food items offered in both Y1 and Y2		Food items offered in 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 ( $\geq 2,300$  mg sodium/serving), comparing Y2 (follow-up) vs. Y1 (baseline)\***

	All Y1 food items v. all Y2 food items		Food items offered in both Y1 and Y2		Food items offered in 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

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

159 In our analysis of 13 NYC chain restaurants, we observed no evidence that overall  
160 sodium content of menu items changed immediately following enforcement of the sodium  
161 warning rule; however, we found that newly introduced items were more likely to contain at least  
162 2,300 mg of sodium and require a sodium warning icon compared to those that had been  
163 discontinued. Notably, sodium content of menu items was high in both time periods, particularly  
164 at FSR, where nearly half of menu items required a warning icon.

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

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

196 published studies. Lastly, our follow-up window was relatively short; it is possible that  
197 reductions 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,  
200 though other efforts are underway. In addition to enacting the sodium warning rule, the Health  
201 Department has also played a key role in the National Salt and Sugar Reduction initiative  
202 (NSSRI), a coalition of health organizations and state and local health authorities which  
203 partnered with the food industry to reduce sodium content in packaged and restaurant food [17].  
204 While the restaurant industry's progress toward NSSRI targets has not yet been assessed, some  
205 improvements in packaged foods have been noted [18]. Further, in October 2021, in recognition  
206 that most dietary sodium comes from processed, packaged, and prepared foods, the FDA  
207 released voluntary sodium targets to encourage industry, including restaurants, to reduce sodium  
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  
210 with industry to produce meaningful reductions in sodium intake and improvements in health  
211 outcomes.

## 212 **Acknowledgements**

213

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

## 216 **References**

217

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

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