

Some of the scientific studies demonstrating the (bigger) positive impact of Nutri-Score's (especially vs other FOP schemes)

1. The FOP-CE study in 12 countries worldwide looking at the form of expression – M. Egnell, Z. Talati, S. Hercberg, S. Pettigrew and C. Julia

- Compares 5 different labels : the HSR, the Multiple Traffic Lights per 100g, the Nutri-Score, Reference Intakes and Warning Labels - across 12 countries (Argentina, Australia, Bulgaria, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Mexico, Singapore, Spain, the UK and the USA).
- ✓ **The Nutri-Score was the clear front-runner of the overall ranking of the FoPLs in terms of enhancing understanding of product healthiness.**

2. The benchmark with FBDGs in 8 European countries – L. Deano-Trécent, M. Egnell, S. Hercberg, P. Galan, J. Soudon, M. Fialon, M. Touvier . E. Kesse-Guyot and C. Julia

- Aimed to evaluate the applicability of the Nutri-Score in various European countries (Finland, France, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Slovakia, Sweden, and Switzerland), regarding its ability to discriminate the nutritional quality of foods and its consistency with national dietary recommendations.
- ✓ **It confirms the Nutri-Score's high discriminating ability for all food groups, with similar trends in the eight countries, and consistency with nutritional recommendations.**

3. The study estimating its impact using the PRIME model – M. Egnell, P. Crosetto, T. d'Almeida E, E. Kesse-Guyot and C. Julia, L. Muller

- Study's objective : assess the potential impact of FOP labels on reducing mortality from chronic diseases. 5 schemes (the Nutri-Score, the HSR, Multiple Traffic Lights per 100g, Reference Intakes and the SENS) evaluated. The use of FOPL substantially reduced mortality from chronic diseases.
- ✓ **When Nutri-Score was used, approx. 3.4% of all deaths from diet-related non-communicable diseases was estimated to be avoidable.**

4. The study on portion size selections – M. Egnell, E. Kesse-Guyot, P. Galan, M. Rayner, J. Jewell, J. Breda, S. Hercberg and C. Julia

- Study's objective : investigate the impact of 3 different labels (the Nutri-Score, Multiple Traffic Lights per 100g, and Multiple Traffic Lights per portion) on portion size selection, specifically for **less healthy products**.
- ✓ Compared to no label, the **Nutri-Score consistently lowered portion sizes**, followed by MTL per 100g. For MTL per portion, the effects differed depending on the food group : it lowered portion size selection for cheeses but increased it for spreads.

5. The study validating the long-term Nutri-Score M. Deschaseaux et al.

- Study's objective : demonstrate the association of the Nutri-Score's algorithm outputs with long term health outcomes in a cohort study in 10 European countries (Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, Netherlands, Norway, Spain, Sweden and the UK).
- ✓ Consuming foods with a higher FSAm-NPS score (lower nutritional quality) was associated with a higher mortality for all causes and for cancer and diseases of the circulatory, respiratory, and digestive systems, **supporting the relevance of FSAm-NPS to characterize healthier food choices in the context of public health policies (e.g. the Nutri-Score) for European populations.**



Published studies assessing the positive impact of Nutri Score on consumers's understanding and purchasing patterns

1. Santé publique's studies - *Pauline Ducrot et al. & Noel Renaudin et al.*

- Tests online, in lab settings, and in real shops show that the Nutri-Score's form of expression, compared to other schemes (Multiple Traffic Lights, Reference Intakes, others) has the best performance. It is well perceived (helpful, preferred, trustworthy, easy to identify, quick to process) and understood by consumers.
- It is the best performing system helping consumers classify food products correctly according to their nutritional quality.
 - In a first [on-line study](#) on five different food categories (fish dishes, pizzas, dairy products, breakfast cereals, and appetizers), 64.6% of consumers were able to classify correctly three products of the same category with the Nutri-Score vs 56.4% with Multiple Traffic Lights, 50.2% with GDAs and only 29.4% with Tick Labels.
 - In a second [study](#) achieved in real-conditions on four different food categories (industrial bakery, bread, canned and fresh ready-to-eat meals), 92.4% of consumer were able to classify three foods of the same category according to their nutrient profile with the Nutri-Score vs 29% only with Traffic Lights.
- ✓ **The Nutri-Score was particularly appealing and useful for people with low nutrition knowledge, low education level and the lowest adherence to nutritional recommendations.**

2. Leclerc's [study](#) (retailer) – *Stephan Arino, Quality and Sustainability director*

- Study's objective : study the impact of NutriMark & Nutriscore labels on consumer behaviour in real purchase conditions.
 - ✓ The [study](#) showed that shoppers exposed to the Nutri-Score bought foods which got an average score of 1.9, while those exposed to Nutrimark or not shown any label got an average score of 2.12. **It represents a 13% improvement in the nutritional quality of their purchases.**
 - ✓ **Young people under 30 were also strongly influenced by the Nutri-Score**, scoring 2.02 compared with 2.24 when not showing the logo – a 10% improvement.

3. The [impact](#) of Nutri-Score on perceived healthiness and purchase intentions – *J. De Temmerman, E.Heeremans, H.Slabbinck, I. Vermeir*

- This research investigates the impact of the presence of Nutri-score and its five icons on consumer's perception of the healthiness of products and their purchasing intents via EU consumers' online study.
- ✓ **The presence of Nutri-Score**
 - ✓ **enabled respondents to better assess the healthiness of products and**
 - ✓ **it offers the potential to boost sales of healthy products** without affecting sales of unhealthy products.
- ✓ **The findings suggest the need to embrace Nutri-Score as the standard FOP to help fighting against the increasing obesity pandemic.**

