



Garcia, A.L., Curtin, L., Ronquillo, D., Parrett, A. and Wright, C.M. (2020) Changes in the UK baby food market surveyed in 2013 and 2019: the rise of baby snacks and sweet/savoury foods. *Archives of Disease in Childhood*, (doi: [10.1136/archdischild-2020-318845](https://doi.org/10.1136/archdischild-2020-318845))

There may be differences between this version and the published version. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from it.

<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk/214881/>

Deposited on 27 May 2020

Enlighten – Research publications by members of the University of Glasgow  
<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk>

## **Changes in the UK baby food market surveyed in 2013 and 2019: the rise of baby snacks and sweet/savoury foods**

Garcia AL<sup>1\*</sup>; Curtin L<sup>1</sup>, Ronquillo D<sup>1</sup>, Parrett A<sup>1</sup>, Wright CM<sup>2</sup>

Affiliations for all authors

<sup>1</sup>Human Nutrition, School of Medicine, Dentistry and Nursing, College of Medical, Veterinary & Life Sciences, University of Glasgow, Glasgow G31 2ER, UK

<sup>2</sup>Child Health, School of Medicine, Dentistry and Nursing, College of Medical, Veterinary & Life Sciences, University of Glasgow, Glasgow G51 4TF, UK

### **\*Corresponding author**

Ada L Garcia

Human Nutrition, School of Medicine, College of Medical, Veterinary & Life Sciences, University of Glasgow

New Lister Building, Glasgow Royal Infirmary,

10-16 Alexandra Parade, Glasgow, G31 2ER, UK

Tel +44(0)141 201 8687

Email: Ada.Garcia@glasgow.ac.uk

**Word count (main body): 2497**

### **Conflict of interest statement**

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest

### **Contributor statement**

ALG conceived the study design and supervised data collection and analysis. LC collected data, undertook analyses, and produced the first draft of the paper. DR collected data and undertook initial analysis. AP, CMW and ALG helped plan the study and supervised the analyses and write up. All authors contributed to successive drafts, and have approved the final draft.

### **Key words**

Sugar, snacks, infants, food policy, food marketing, complementary feeding

## Abstract

### Objective

To assess how the baby food market in the UK has changed between 2013 and 2019.

Setting: United Kingdom

Design: A cross sectional survey of all infant food products available to buy in the UK, online and in-store collected in 2019 to record nutritional content and product descriptions and compared to existing 2013 data base.

Main outcome measures: change in proportion of products marketed to infants aged 4 months, proportion classified as sweet versus savoury, spoonable versus dry (snacks), average sugar content.

### Results:

Fewer products were described as suitable for infants aged 4 months in 2019 (201, 23%) compared to 2013 (178, 43%;  $p < 0.001$ ), while the proportion for children in the 6-7 month age range increased (2013: 135, 33%; 2019: 369 43%;  $P = 0.001$ ).

The proportion of sweet and savoury products was unchanged; sweet spoonable products showed a small but significant decrease in sugar content (6%) between 2013 and 2019, but savoury spoonable products showed a 16% increase. Sweet snacks remained very sweet (~20g/100 g median sugar at both time points) In the 2019 dataset concentrated juice was added to 29% ( $n = 253$ ) of products and 18% (86) 'savoury' products comprised more than 50% sweet vegetables or fruit.

The number and proportion of snacks increased markedly in 2019 (185, 21%) compared with 2013 (42, 10%;  $P = 0.001$ ) while the proportion of wet, spoonable foods decreased (2013 326, 79%; 2019 611 71%;  $P = 0.001$ ).

### Conclusions

Fewer foods are now marketed to infants aged four months, but there has been no overall reduction in sweetness of products and the increase in snack foods and the sweetness of savoury foods is a concern.

#### What is already known

- In 2013 many commercial baby foods were marketed to infants from age 4 months, despite recommendations to defer solids feeding till 6 months, and nearly half the products were sweet.
- Most of the available products were wet spoonable foods provided in jars.

#### What this study adds

- In 2019 the proportion of foods marketed to infants from age 4 months had dropped
- There was no change in the proportion of sweet foods which had a slightly lower sugar content, but the sugar content of savoury products has increased.
- Baby snack products are now much more widespread and a majority of wet foods are now supplied in pouches.

## Introduction

The transition from an exclusively milk-based diet to solid foods, should be a gradual process whereby suitable and nutritious family foods are introduced to the infant <sup>1</sup>. If done appropriately, this will enable growth and development, while promoting future healthy eating habits. Amongst guidelines on complementary foods, parents are encouraged to offer home-made baby foods <sup>2</sup> but 58% of UK babies received commercial baby foods (CBFs) between 6 and 12 months <sup>2-4</sup>. The food environment has a prominent influence on parental food choice from an early age. Therefore, monitoring the marketing and the nutritional quality of CBF is important for promoting infant health <sup>4</sup>, while an understanding of the types of products available is important for clinicians who are advising individual families.

In 2013 and 2016 we reported concerns on the nutrition quality and recommendations in food labels of CBF. Major issues were the recommended age of 4 months displayed on packaging, the large proportion of sweet products, and the large proportion of smooth purees <sup>5,6</sup>. Recently other important surveys of the CBF market reported similar concerns <sup>4,7</sup>. In our previous survey few of the products were baby snacks, but high consumption has been reported <sup>3,8</sup>. More recently there has been an increase in CBFs packaged in pouches, which are mostly fruit based and high in sugar and in dry foods, advertised as baby snacks <sup>4,5,7,9</sup>. Concerns exist on the implications these products might have for the development of feeding skills <sup>10,11</sup>.

The dynamics of the CBF market are of interest to health practitioners, consumers, industry and public health bodies. In 2019 Public Health England <sup>4</sup> and WHO <sup>7</sup> called for an improvement in the quality and marketing of CBFs and WHO drafted a baby food profiling system to guide legislation and implementation of their recommendations at European level <sup>12</sup>. Given the changing nature of CBF market, increased scrutiny, expansion and presence of CBF's in the food environment, we hypothesised that the CBF market would have evolved after our initial report in 2013 <sup>5</sup>. Therefore, the aim of this study was to describe characteristics of baby food products available within the UK market in 2019 compared to 2013 to establish whether there had been (1) a reduction in the proportion of products marketed to infants below 6 months; (2) a reduction in the proportion of sweet based products and sugar content; (3) an increase in the proportion of snack products.

## Methods

### *Data collection*

Information was gathered on all infant food products available to buy in the UK online and in-store by two researchers at two time points, January 2019 and September 2019. Online searches of baby foods in large UK supermarkets Morrisons, Sainsbury's, ASDA, TESCO and Waitrose were conducted at the two time points. Other online retailers consulted were Ocado and Amazon. Online searches were made using the key word "baby food" and by consulting the baby food section in the supermarkets and online retailer websites. Data collection was completed with in-store searches of the baby food aisle of each supermarket to corroborate products and for missing items. In store visits only were used to collect information of products sold in Aldi and Lidl. For in store visits the largest supermarkets in Glasgow were selected.

Products assessed included wet and dry foods. Wet were ready-made wet, spoonable foods and dry were dry powders, snacks (e.g. biscuits, dry fruit, crisps) and dry finger foods. For simplicity snacks and dry finger foods will be referred as snacks. Information collected included: product name and brand, product type, packaging, recommended age, portion size, and nutritional information per 100 grams (energy (kcal); carbohydrates, protein, fat, sugar, salt (g). Iron content could not be included in the current analysis due to lack of information on food labels. Milks, formulas, products not for babies but in the baby food section (e.g. toddler meals), and products not in English were excluded. Products only available in Amazon were excluded due to incomplete nutritional information (n=48).

The survey methodology used in 2019 was the same used in our 2013 survey<sup>5</sup> except that in 2019 all baby food brands available in the UK were included.

### *Data analysis*

Products were classified into sweet and savoury as described previously<sup>5</sup>. In short, taste classification was based on name and ingredients reported in food packaging. Savoury foods were meals or snacks containing meat, poultry, fish or vegetables, cheese, pulses or carbohydrate-based foods, or a combination of these. Sweet foods were fruit-based meals, deserts, puddings, rusks, dairy products (e.g custard, yogurt) or fruit containing foods such as breakfast cereals and dry snacks. Ingredient lists were consulted to confirm classifications and products which were difficult to classify were also tasted (n=12). Root vegetables are a popular ingredient in CBFs and are mainly sweet and<sup>6</sup> so in 2019 savoury products were additionally classified by fruit and root vegetable content, whereby, if the product contained greater than 50% fruit or root vegetable, they were considered sweet/savoury.

The nutritional content of all wet ("spoonable") and dry, finger foods ("snacks") available in 2013 and 2019 were compared. Differences between 2013 to 2019 values were analysed by Mann-Whitney test. Brands identified in 2019 were divided into two categories, those also present in the 2013 dataset and additional brands only available in the 2019 dataset. Chi-square tested if differences exist between 2013 and 2019 in the proportion of products between the same and additional brands. Significance was determined at a level of 0.05. All analysis was conducted using SPSS V.26 data software.

## **Results**

### *General characteristics*

Thirty-two brands selling baby foods were identified including 27 brands not included in 2013 (referred to as "additional brands"). In 2019 a total of 898 CBFs were identified. Of these 611 (68%) were spoonable products, mostly packed in pouches (54%) while 253 (28%) were dry products. The types of products are shown in table 1. %. Other products were miscellaneous items such as drinks (1.8%), sauces (0.7%), stock cubes (0.7%) and dry pasta (0.3%). In line with our 2013 survey, pasta sauce, dry pasta, drinks, and stock cubes were excluded from all analysis, leaving 865 products in the 2019 data set. Furthermore, dry powders and breakfast cereals were excluded from nutritional analysis only because the total nutrient content when adding liquid cannot be estimated .

Combining the 2013 and 2019 databases resulted in 1327 products. General characteristics of the 2013 database have been reported elsewhere<sup>5</sup>. Five brands in 2013<sup>5</sup> are still available to purchase

in the UK, constituting 55.7% of the total 2019 dataset, these are presented in the results as “same brands”. Portion sizes for spoonable foods ranged from 120 to 250g in 2013 compared with 50 to 250g in 2019. Snack serving sizes range from 5 to 50g in 2013 compared with 3 to 55g in 2019.

#### Age recommendations

The proportion of CBFs marketed to 4 months in 2019, both in the same brands as surveyed previously and in the new ones, was lower than for products in 2013 but a larger number of CBF's were marketed at 6-7 months in 2019 (Table 2).

#### Sweet versus savoury products

There was no change in the proportion of sweet and savoury products over time (Table 3). In the 2019 dataset concentrated juice was added to 29% (n=253) of products. In 2019 we identified 72 (16%) savoury products that contained more than 50% sweet root vegetables, as well as 8 (2%) which contained more than 50% fruit, in addition to vegetables. This results in 80 “sweet/savoury” products, representing 18% of all savoury products.

#### Nutrient content

For all sweet, spoonable products there was a small but significant decrease in sugar content (6%) between 2013 and 2019 and a more substantial relative reduction in salt (60%) (Table 4), but savoury, spoonable products showed a 16% increase in sugar and only a 30% reduction in salt.

The sweet products contained a median (Q1, Q3) of 10.5g sugar /100g (8.5, 18), compared to 2.2g/100g (1.6, 2.1) in the wholly savoury products, but the sweet savoury products contained a median 5g/100g (3.5, 7.5) of sugar; (max: 11.2g/100g)..

Sweet snacks were very similar in nutrient composition between 2013 and 2019, remaining very sweet (Table 5).

We conducted a separate nutrient content analysis for same brands for both wet and dry foods (Supplementary Table 1 and 2) and compared them against 2019 data set. Compared with the 2013 database, nutrient content has not changed but for very small reductions (<1g) in sugar and salt content in wet foods.

#### Product types

Compared with 2013, the number and proportion of snacks increased markedly, particularly in the additional brands, while the proportion of spoonables decreased (Table 3). In 2013 specific pouch use was not recorded, but in 2019 this is the most common way to sell wet baby food (74%).

Snack products were made up of dry corn snacks flavoured with fruit or vegetables (40.5%, 12.3% fruit flavoured), dried fruit only (14.8%), fruit or vegetable mixed with cereals (22.3%, 88.1% fruit based%), biscuits (18.4%), and rice cakes flavoured with fruit or vegetables (8.1%).

## Discussion

Scrutiny of the baby food environment is important to invoke changes in policy. An example has been the progress made surrounding the discrepancy between WHO recommended age of solid food introduction<sup>13</sup> versus the current food labelling directive, EC 2006/125/EC directive in Europe<sup>14</sup>. Following an expert report from EFSA a change in the recommended age for 4 vs 6 months is expected. This change is to ensure a unified message to promote breastfeeding recommendations and avoid confusion<sup>15</sup>.

In this study we set out to analyse what changes have occurred in the UK CBF market in the past 7 years. The current study demonstrates an increase in CBF products with 84% more brands and double the products compared to 2013.

Both the WHO<sup>16</sup> and a UK expert committee<sup>1</sup> recommend that the initiation of complementary feeding should not begin until 6 months, as did a recent European report<sup>15</sup> although reluctant to specify an exact minimum age for starting solid foods. In our 2013 survey, a major concern was that 44% percent of CBF's<sup>5</sup> were targeted at infants below 6 months. In 2019 the proportion of CBF's targeted at this age had substantially reduced. Similar proportions were also recently observed by Public Health England (PHE) (36%)<sup>4</sup>. This is a positive development, but efforts to formally change the labelling regulations are still needed.

Excess sugar intake in infancy may disrupt taste preferences in the future, contribute to higher energy consumption and poor dental health<sup>4</sup>. Most evidence on health effects of CBF consumption is observational, but a longitudinal study comparing growth and development of infants age 6 to 36 months (n=132) consuming commercial or homemade baby foods, found the infants consuming homemade products had reduced adiposity at 12 months which persisted to 3 years<sup>17</sup>. Even though concern has been expressed over the past decade about sugar consumption in general<sup>18</sup> and the sugar content of CBF in particular<sup>4,7</sup>, we found no difference in the proportion of sweet products between the two time points. A small reduction (<1g) in sugar content was observed in sweet products between 2013 and 2019, but a similar increase was observed in savoury products. This suggests that companies are not consistently reformulating to reduce sugar content, as has also been found in the USA<sup>19</sup>. Thus new regulations and enforcement to achieve the suggested thresholds for sugar content in baby foods as proposed by WHO baby food nutrient profiling system<sup>12</sup> will be needed for see effective change in sugar content of CBF's.

The use of sweet vegetables and fruit juice in savoury foods is a concern in the US and Europe<sup>20,21</sup>. In 2016 our study on fruit and vegetables in baby foods found that those savoury CBF's with higher fruit and vegetable content, had significantly higher sugar content<sup>6</sup>; in this survey in 2019 18% of 'savoury' products contained more than 50% fruit or sweet vegetables. In addition 29% of all products had added fruit juice concentrate. This is higher than we reported in 2016 (18%)<sup>6</sup> although then we only examined products with fruits and vegetables mentioned in the name. In the current study, if we reclassified "sweet/ savoury" foods to be as sweet, the proportion of sweet products in the 2019 database would be 57%.

An important finding in this survey is the growth in availability of commercial baby snacks<sup>13</sup>. Infants under 12 months do not need snacks<sup>1</sup>, but consumer research has indicated that most parents use ready-made snacks, viewing them as acceptable or desirable<sup>4</sup>. Recent surveys found that 30% of



mothers of 8-12 month infants were giving 'treats' that include corn snacks and confectionary<sup>8</sup>, and 60% of 7 to 11 month olds were reported to have eaten snacks<sup>3</sup>. There have been few studies of snack intake in infants, but a US study, using 24 hour recall, found that snacking frequency was positively associated with energy intake and this association became stronger with age<sup>22</sup>. It is thus concerning that highly processed snacks are now an emerging feature of the baby food market. The PHE report found that snacks made up 22% of infant products, but 35% of sales spend and 59% of portions purchased<sup>4</sup>. It is not clear whether this shift is simply meeting, or actually driving demand.

Snacks are defined by PHE<sup>4</sup> as 'bite-size, easy-to-eat pieces of food babies can pick up and eat by themselves' and the promotion of baby snacks seems to be linked by manufacturers to the growing popularity of baby-led weaning<sup>23</sup>. From our observations (data not reported here) the CBF manufacturers are tending to market snacks as beneficial to feeding skills and helpful for 'baby-led' complementary feeding. This has also been highlighted in the PHE and WHO Europe<sup>12</sup> reports calling for ethical and responsible marketing. The rise of baby food snacks is a worrying development as it is well established that repeated exposure shapes eating behaviour in early years. Thus, if infants habitually eat "crisp" like foods at an early stage, this behaviour is likely to persist. Snacks in the baby food aisle are visually appealing, and appear to be "healthy foods", as they consist of dried fruit or dry cereals flavoured with fruit or vegetables. Although clinical evidence is not currently available, the health consequences of snacking for baby feeding skills, liquid/milk intake and continued exposure to sugars in the oral cavity are likely to have implications for healthy eating guidelines.<sup>25</sup> Further research on the prevalence and extent of these marketing strategies is required and there may be a need for tighter regulations on packaging to discourage the use of baby snacks.

## **Conclusions**

The product range of commercial infant foods has expanded dramatically in the last 7 years, both in number of brands and types of products. Fewer foods are now marketed to infants aged four months, but the increase in snack foods and the sweetness of savoury foods is a concern.

## References

1. Scientific Advisory Committee on Nutrition. Feeding in the First Year of Life. In: The Stationary Office, ed., 2018.
2. McAndrew F, Thompson J, Fellows L, et al. Infant feeding survey 2010. 2012
3. Department of Health. Diet and Nutrition Survey of Infants and Young Children, 2011.
4. Public Health England. Foods and drinks aimed at infants and young children: evidence and opportunities for action. 2019
5. Garcia AL, Raza S, Parrett A, et al. Nutritional content of infant commercial weaning foods in the UK. *Archives of Disease in Childhood* 2013;98(10):793-97. doi: 10.1136/archdischild-2012-303386
6. Garcia AL, McLean K, Wright CM. Types of fruits and vegetables used in commercial baby foods and their contribution to sugar content. *Maternal and Child Nutrition* 2016;12(4):838-47. doi: 10.1111/mcn.12208
7. World Health Organisation. Commercial foods for infants and young children in the WHO European Region, 2019.
8. Wolfson L. Scottish maternal and infant nutrition survey 2017. Edinburgh: Scottish Government, 2018.
9. First Steps Nutrition Trust. Baby foods in the UK 2017
10. Koletzko B, Buhner C, Ensenauer R, et al. Complementary foods in baby food pouches: position statement from the Nutrition Commission of the German Society for Pediatrics and Adolescent Medicine (DGKJ, e.V.). *Molecular and cellular pediatrics* 2019;6(1):2-2. doi: 10.1186/s40348-019-0089-6
11. Demonteil L, Ksiazek E, Marduel A, et al. Patterns and predictors of food texture introduction in French children aged 4-36 months. *British Journal of Nutrition* 2018;120(9):1065-77. doi: 10.1017/s0007114518002386
12. World Health Organisation. Ending inappropriate promotion of commercially available complementary foods for infants and young children between 6 and 36 months in Europe. 2019
13. World Health Organisation. Guidance on ending the inappropriate promotion of foods for infants and young children. 2017
14. European Food Safety Authority. Commission Directive 2006/125/EC of 5 December 2006 on processed cereal-based foods and baby foods for infants and young children, 2006.
15. European Food Safety Authority. Outcome of a public consultation on the Scientific Opinion of the EFSA Panel on Nutrition, Novel Foods and Food Allergens (NDA) on the appropriate age range for introduction of complementary feeding into an infant's diet. 2019
16. World Health Organisation. Complementary feeding: report of the global consultation, and summary or guiding principles for complementary feeding of the breastfed child. . 2002
17. Mok E, Vanstone CA, Gallo S, et al. Diet diversity, growth and adiposity in healthy breastfed infants fed homemade complementary foods. *International Journal of Obesity* 2017;41(5):776-82. doi: 10.1038/ijo.2017.37
18. Scientific Advisory Committee on Nutrition. Carbohydrates in Health. In: The Stationary Office, ed. London, 2015.
19. Maalouf J, Cogswell ME, Bates M, et al. Sodium, sugar, and fat content of complementary infant and toddler foods sold in the United States, 2015. *American Journal of Clinical Nutrition* 2017;105(6):1443-52. doi: 10.3945/ajcn.116.142653
20. Moding K, Ferrante M, Bellows L, et al. Nutritional Content and Ingredients of Infant and Toddler Food Pouches Compared to Traditional Packaging (P11-081-19). *Current developments in nutrition* 2019;3(Suppl 1) doi: 10.1093/cdn/nzz048.P11-081-19

21. Mesch CM, Stimming M, Foterek K, et al. Food variety in commercial and homemade complementary meals for infants in Germany. Market survey and dietary practice. *Appetite* 2014;76:113-19. doi: 10.1016/j.appet.2014.01.074
22. Xue H, Maguire RL, Liu J, et al. Snacking frequency and dietary intake in toddlers and preschool children. *Appetite* 2019;142:104369-69. doi: 10.1016/j.appet.2019.104369
23. Erickson LW, Taylor RW, Haszard JJ, et al. Impact of a Modified Version of Baby-Led Weaning on Infant Food and Nutrient Intakes: The BLISS Randomized Controlled Trial. *Nutrients* 2018;10(6) doi: 10.3390/nu10060740
24. Garcia AL, Morillo-Santander G, Parrett A, et al. Confused health and nutrition claims in food marketing to children could adversely affect food choice and increase risk of obesity. *Archives of Disease in Childhood* 2019;104(6):541-46. doi: 10.1136/archdischild-2018-315870
25. Garcia AL, Looby S, McLean-Guthrie K, et al. An Exploration of Complementary Feeding Practices, Information Needs and Sources. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 2019;16(22) doi: 10.3390/ijerph16224311

Table 1. General characteristics of 2019 baby food products.

<b>General Characteristic</b>		<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Brands	Same as in 2013	5	16
	Additional	27	84
	Total	32	
Product type	Wet Spoonable	611	68
	<i>Purees</i>	495	81 <sup>#</sup>
	<i>Tray meals</i>	116	19 <sup>#</sup>
	Dry	253	28
	<i>Snacks</i>	185	73 <sup>*</sup>
	<i>Powders/cereals</i>	68	27 <sup>*</sup>
	Other	34	4
Packaging	Total	898	
	Pouches	329	38 <sup>#</sup>
	Jars	166	19 <sup>#</sup>
	Trays	116	13 <sup>#</sup>
	Other	287	30 <sup>#</sup>
	Total	898	

<sup>#</sup> % from total wet spoonable products \* % from total dry products

Table 2. The number and proportion of total products per same brands (2013 and 2019) and additional brands (2019) according to age group. Proportions indicate the percentage of products within each dataset. (95% confidence interval (CI), bold format displaying significant difference between 2013 and all 2019 products)

Age group	Same Brands (n=5)				Additional Brands (n=27)		Combined (n=32)		P $\chi^2$
	2013		2019		2019		2019		
	n	% (CI)	n	% (CI)	n	% (CI)	n	% (CI)	
4+	178	43.2 (36-51)	146	<b>30.3</b> <b>(23-38)</b>	55	<b>14.4</b> <b>(5.1-24)</b>	201	<b>23.2</b> <b>(17-29)</b>	<0.001 <sup>#</sup>
6-7+	135	32.8 (25-41)	208	<b>43.2</b> <b>(37-50)</b>	161	<b>42</b> <b>(34-50)</b>	369	<b>42.7</b> <b>(38-48)</b>	
10+	52	12.6 (3.6-22)	50	10.4 (1.9-10)	47	12.3 (2.9-22)	97	11.2 (4.9-18)	<0.001 <sup>+</sup>
12+	47	11.4 (2.3-21)	78	16.2 (8.0-24)	120	<b>31.3</b> <b>(23-40)</b>	198	<b>22.9</b> <b>(17-29)</b>	
Total	412	100	482	100	383	100	865	100	

<sup>#</sup> Same brands <sup>+</sup>2013 brands vs additional 2019 brands

Table 3. The number and proportion of total products per the same brands (2013 and 2019) and additional brands (2019) according to flavour profile and product type. Proportions indicate the percentage of products within each dataset. (95% confidence interval (CI), bold format displaying significant difference between 2013 and all 2019 products)

	Same brands (n=5)		Additional brands (n=27)		Combined Total (n=32)		P $\chi^2$		
	2013		2019		2019				
Flavour profile	n	% (CI)	n	% (CI)	n	% (CI)	n	% (CI)	
Sweet	195	47.3 (40-54)	245	50.8 (45-57)	165	43.1 (36-51)	410	47.4 (43-52)	NS #
Savoury	217	52.7 (46-59)	237	49.2 (43-56)	218	56.9 (50-64)	455	52.6 (48-57)	NS <sup>+</sup>
Total	412	100	482	100	383	100	865	100	
<b>Product Type</b>									
Spoonable	326	79.1 (75-84)	350	<b>72.6</b> <b>(68-77)</b>	261	<b>68.1</b> <b>(62-74)</b>	611	<b>70.6</b> <b>(67-74)</b>	0.0012 <sup>#</sup>
Dry, snacks	42	10.2 (1.0-19)	84	17.4 (9.3-26)	101	<b>26.4</b> <b>(18-35)</b>	185	<b>21.4</b> <b>(16-27)</b>	
Other	44	10.7 (1.6-20)	48	10.0 (1.5-19)	21	5.5 (-4.3-15)	69	8.0 (1.6-14)	<0.001 <sup>+</sup>
Total	412	100	482	100	383	100	865	100	

# Same brands + 2013 brands vs additional 2019 brands

Table 4. Nutrient content for all sweet and savoury spoonable products in 2013 and 2019.

Spoonable	Sweet		MedD	Savoury		
	2013	2019		2013	2019	MedD
Energy (kcal)	67.0 (56.3, 79)	64.0 (54,77)	-3 p=0.2	66.0 (61, 70)	67.0 (56, 75)	1 p=0.9
Protein (g)	0.9 (0.5, 1.7)	0.8 (0.4,1.5)	-0.1 p=0.1	2.9 (2.6, 3.4)	3.0 (2.3, 3.5)	0.1 p=0.7
Carbohydrate (g)	13.9 (12.2, 15.5)	12.6 (11.1, 14.1)	<b>-1.3</b> <b>P&lt;0.001</b>	8.8 (8, 9.9)	8.5 (7, 9.8)	-0.3 p=0.05
Sugar (g)	10.4 (9, 12.1)	9.8 (8.2, 11.3)	<b>-0.6</b> <b>p=0.006</b>	2.0 (1.5, 2.7)	2.4 (1.7, 3.3)	<b>0.4</b> <b>p=0</b>
Fat (g)	0.4 (0.1, 1.4)	0.4 (0.14, 1.4)	0.05 p=0.9	2.0 (1.6, 2.5)	1.9 (1.1, 2.5)	-0.1 p=0.1
Saturated fat (g)	0.1 (0, 1.4)	0.1 (0.01, 0.8)	0 p=0.4	0.5 (0.3, 0.8)	0.5 (0.2, 1)	0 p=0.4
Salt (g)	0.05 (0.03, 0.1)	0.02 (0.009, 0.045)	<b>-0.03</b> <b>p=0</b>	0.1 (0.05, 0.2)	0.07 (0.04, 0.1)	<b>-0.03</b> <b>p=0</b>

Values are median (Q1, Q3) and median difference (MedD). P values were calculated using Mann Whitney test for mean differences

Table 5. Nutrient content for all sweet and savoury dry snacks in 2013 and 2019.

Snacks	Sweet			Savoury		
	2013	2019	MedD	2013	2019	MedD
Energy (kcal)	392.5 (361, 418.3)	401 (367, 426)	8.5 p=0.4	434.0 (424, 445.5)	433.5 (422.3, 446.3)	-0.5 p=0.5
Protein (g)	7.0 (5.9, 8.2)	6.9 (5.1, 7.7)	-0.1 p=0.4	8.2 (7.4, 11.2)	8.2 (7.1, 12.4)	0 p=0.7
Carbohydrate (g)	69.5 (66.2, 76.9)	70.5 (62.2, 74.8)	1 p=1	72.7 (69.9, 78.7)	67.1 (61.1, 71.9)	<b>-5.6</b> <b>p=0.002</b>
Sugar (g)	20.6 (17.9, 28.3)	20.3 (11.9, 29)	-0.3 p=0.4	2.8 (1.2, 6.2)	3.5 (1.9, 5.1)	0.7 p=0.6
Fat (g)	10.8 (7.5, 13.9)	11.0 (1.1, 14)	0.2 p=0.7	11.9 (2.9, 14)	13.6 (11.1, 15.1)	<b>1.7</b> <b>p=0.04</b>
Saturated fat (g)	4.0 (2.1, 4.5)	1.6 (0.3, 3.7)	<b>-2.4</b> <b>p=0.002</b>	1.3 (0.9, 4.1)	1.5 (1.1, 2.1)	0.2 p=0.6
Salt (g)	0.2 (0.006, 0.5)	0.05 (0.009, 0.2)	-0.15 p=0.08	0.3 (0.2, 0.6)	0.1 (0.04, 0.3)	-0.2 p=0.1

Values are median (Q1, Q3) and median difference (MedD). P values were calculated using Mann Whitney test for mean differences



Supplementary Table 1. Median (Q1, Q3) and median difference (MedD) nutritional values of sweet and savoury spoonable products for brands in both 2012; and 2019 databases (same brands). Median (Q1, Q3) and median difference (MedD) (2012 v additional brands) nutritional values of sweet and savoury spoonable products for the additional brands identified in 2019 (additional brands).

Spoonable	Sweet			Savoury						
	Same brands (n=5)			Additional brands (n=27)			Same brands (n=5)		Additional Brands (n=27)	
	2012	2019	MedD	2019	MedD	2012	2019	MedD	2019	MedD
Energy (kcal)	67.0 (56.8, 79.0)	64.0 (54.0, 76.0)	-3 p=0.1	64.0 (55.5, 77.5)	-3 p=0.5	66.0 (61.0, 70.0)	64.5 (55.3, 71.0)	-1.5 p=0.07	70.0 (58.3, 85.0)	<b>4.0</b> <b>p=0.007</b>
Protein (g)	1.0 (0.5, 1.7)	0.75 (0.4, 1.5)	-0.3 p=0.07	0.8 (0.4, 1.7)	-0.2 p=0.2	2.9 (2.6, 3.5)	2.8 (2.4, 3.3)	<b>-0.1</b> <b>p=0.02</b>	3.0 (2.3, 4.2)	0.1 p=0.1
Carbohydrate (g)	13.9 (12.2, 15.7)	12.8 (11.2, 14.2)	<b>-1.1</b> <b>p=0.0</b>	12.1 (11.0, 14.1)	<b>-1.8</b> <b>p=0.0</b>	8.8 (8.0, 10.0)	8.1 (6.9, 9.3)	<b>-0.7</b> <b>p=0.0</b>	9.0 (7.0, 11.0)	0.2 p=0.3
Sugar (g)	10.5 (9.0, 12.4)	9.8 (7.9, 11.2)	<b>-0.7</b> <b>p=0.004</b>	9.8 (8.3, 11.6)	-0.7 p=0.09	2.0 (1.5, 2.7)	2.2 (1.7, 3.1)	0.2 p=0.07	2.7 (1.9, 3.7)	<b>0.7</b> <b>p=0.0</b>
Fat (g)	0.4 (0.1, 1.4)	0.4 (0.1, 1.3)	0.0 p=0.7	0.4 (0.2, 1.8)	0.0 p=0.7	2.0 (1.5, 2.4)	2.0 (1.3, 2.5)	0.0 p=0.8	1.8 (1.0, 2.6)	-0.3 p=0.2
Saturated fat (g)	0.1 (0.0, 0.8)	0.1 (0.0, 0.7)	0.0 p=0.9	0.1 (0.1, 0.8)	0.0 p=0.2	0.5 (0.3, 0.8)	0.4 (0.2, 0.8)	<b>-0.1</b> <b>p=0.04</b>	0.7 (0.2, 1.3)	0.2 p=0.1
Salt (g)	0.05 (0.03, 0.1)	0.03 (0.01, 0.04)	<b>-0.02</b> <b>p=0.0</b>	0.01 (0.01, 0.1)	<b>-0.04</b> <b>p=0.0</b>	0.13 (0.05, 0.2)	0.06 (0.04, 0.1)	<b>-0.01</b> <b>p=0.0</b>	0.08 (0.05, 0.1)	<b>-0.05</b> <b>p=0.0</b>

Supplementary Table 2. Median (Q1, Q3) and median difference (MedD) nutritional values of sweet and savoury snack products for brands in both 2012 and 19 databases (same brands). Median nutritional values of sweet and savoury snack products for the additional brands identified in 2019 (additional brands).

Dry, snacks	Sweet					Savoury				
	Same Brands (n=5)			Additional brands (n=27)		Same brands (n=5)			Additional Brands (n=27)	
	2012	2019	MedD	2019	MedD	2012	2019	MedD	2019	MedD
Energy (kcal)	391.0 (361.0, 414.0)	410.0 (389, 426.0)	<b>19</b> <b>p=0.01</b>	381.5 (339.0, 430.5)	-9.5 p=0.7	433.5 (424, 447)	433 (422, 447)	-0.5 p=0.6	434.0 (420.5, 446.0)	0.5 p=0.7
Protein (g)	7.0 (5.6, 8.2)	7.0 (6.1, 7.9)	0 p=1	6.2 (4.0, 7.4)	-0.8 p=0.2	8.5 (7.6, 11.8)	7.5 (7.2, 10.5)	-0.95 p=0.3	8.8 (7.0, 13.8)	0.3 p=0.8
Carbohydrate (g)	69.4 (66.1, 74.6)	70.9 (60.3, 74.5)	1.5 p=0.6	69.9 (62.2, 75.4)	0.5 p=0.9	72.7 (69.7, 79.2)	67.4 (61.3, 71.0)	<b>-5.3</b> <b>p=0.002</b>	67.0 (61.1, 73.0)	<b>-5.7</b> <b>p=0.015</b>
Sugar (g)	21.3 (17.7, 28.6)	21.0 (15.7, 26.0)	-0.3 p=0.3	19.4 (8.8, 37.2)	-1.9 p=0.4	3.2 (1.4, 6.7)	4.0 (3.0, 5.1)	0.8 p=0.6	2.6 (1.6, 5.1)	-0.6 p=0.8
Fat (g)	11.5 (8.7, 14.0)	12.1 (4.6, 14.0)	0.6 p=0.9	11.0 (0.8, 13.2)	-0.5 p=0.2	12.0 (2.8, 14.3)	14.0 (12.5, 15.0)	<b>2.0</b> <b>p=0.03</b>	12.1 (1.0, 15.6)	0.1 p=0.3
Saturated fat (g)	4.0 (3.1, 4.6)	1.9 (0.8, 4.0)	<b>-2.1</b> <b>p=0.01</b>	1.2 (0.2, 1.9)	<b>-2.8</b> <b>p=0.0</b>	1.3 (0.8, 4.8)	1.5 (1.2, 2.6)	0.2 p=0.6	1.4 (1.0, 2.0)	0.1 p=1.0
Salt (g)	0.2 (0, 0.5)	0.03 (0.01, 0.3)	-0.2 p=0.3	0.07 (0.01, 0.1)	-0.2 p=0.08	0.3 (0.2, 0.6)	0.1 (0.01, 0.2)	-0.2 p=0.2	0.2 (0.1, 0.8)	-0.05 p=0.4