

Lacey C, Clark B, Frewer L, Kuznesof S.

"Reaching its limits": Industry perspectives on salt reduction.

British Food Journal 2016, 118(7), 1610-1624.

Copyright:

This is the authors' accepted manuscript of an article that was published in its final definitive form by Emerald, 2016.

DOI link to article:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/BFJ-01-2016-0027>

Date deposited:

08/04/2016

Embargo release date:

01 July 2017



This work is licensed under a

[Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International licence](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/)

1 **“Reaching its limits”: Industry perspectives on salt reduction**

2 **Abstract**

3 **Purpose:** This study explores the barriers to, and implications of, salt reduction initiatives
4 within the UK food manufacturing industry.

5 **Methodology:** Thirteen technical and new product development managers were purposefully
6 sampled from businesses supplying foods within the chilled convenience food sector. Data
7 were generated using semi-structured interviews incorporating the critical incident technique.
8 Thematic and comparative analyses identified similarities and differences in the challenges
9 facing different product categories within the sector.

10 **Findings:** Barriers to further salt reduction included: manufacturing limitations; new product
11 development constraints; food safety, quality and shelf-life trade-offs; and organoleptic
12 acceptance. No single barrier dominated industry concerns and many barriers were
13 interlinked. Overarching issues of competitive inequality between signatories and non-
14 participants to voluntary salt reduction agreements, and the experience of product
15 reformulation having reached its limits were prevalent.

16 **Originality:** This research provides a food industry perspective on the identifies-barriers
17 faced by UK food processors and manufacturers in advancing salt reduction within the
18 chilled convenience sector.the necessity for successful salt alternatives and technological
19 solutions to support further reduced salt product reformulation.—As salt reduction is a social
20 good, there is justification for Government investment to fund ‘pre-competitive’ research and
21 development in this area.

24 **1. Introduction**

25 **The UK Salt Reduction Policy Context**

26 Sodium requirements are met solely through the diet (Durack *et al*, 2008), with salt being the
27 major contributor (Jebb, 2005). Its presence in the body is essential in maintaining osmotic
28 pressure in the blood and tissue (Lean, 2006). An intake of 2.6g/day of sodium, equivalent to
29 6g/day of salt is the reference nutrient intake (RNI) for the UK (SACN, 2003). However, this
30 RNI is exceeded across all ages and genders, with average adult intakes currently at 8.1g/ day
31 (Sadler *et al*, 2011). High salt intakes are associated with elevated blood pressure which is a
32 risk factor in stroke and cardiovascular disease (Doyle & Glass, 2010) and other conditions,
33 such as kidney disease, osteoporosis and stomach cancer (NHS, 2012; 2011, Durack *et al*,
34 2008). A decreased salt intake is therefore considered a key preventative measure against
35 coronary heart disease and strokes (WASH, 2012). The social benefits of reducing average
36 salt intakes by 1g per person per day include the prevention of 4147 premature deaths per
37 year and UK National Health Service (NHS) savings of £288 million (Department of Health,
38 2014a). Further reducing salt intakes to the 6g/day target could prevent an estimated 17,500
39 premature deaths and a £4 billion saving for the economy, £1.6 million of which would be
40 direct savings to the NHS (WASH, 2012). Given these health and economic impacts reducing
41 salt intake is considered a policy priority to support the prevention of non-communicable
42 diseases (Asaria *et al*, 2007).

43 Although foods contain salt at low levels in their natural state, approximately 60-90% is
44 added to many foods during manufacture (i.e. non-discretionary salt) (WASH, 2012; NICE,
45 2010), with the remaining discretionary amounts being added to food whilst cooking or at the
46 table (Lean, 2006). Given the critical role of the food industry in reducing the public's salt

47 intake, Government policies have focussed on developing voluntary industry salt reduction
48 targets.

49 The first salt reduction targets were set by the Food Standards Agency (FSA) in 2005 (FSA,
50 2008) and covered 85 product categories, with further targets (following stakeholder
51 consultation in 2008) set in 2010. The transfer of nutrition policy from the FSA to the
52 Department of Health (DH) in October 2010, led to the ‘Public Health Responsibility Deal’, a
53 voluntary agreement between the industry and the DH to improve public health and tackle
54 health inequalities through product reformulation and efficient labelling (Wyness *et al*, 2012).
55 As part of this Deal, pledging companies were asked to commit to the collective delivery of a
56 further 15% reduction on 2010 targets (Department of Health, 2012). The anticipated
57 benefits of this target were estimated as reducing 1g/of salt per person per day, or the removal
58 of approximately 19 million kg of salt from foods sold within retail establishments, or 30% of
59 salt that needs removing from the UK population’s diet to achieve the 6g/day target
60 (Department of Health, 2012). However, many of the 77 partners who signed up to the
61 pledge (DH), 2012) voiced their concerns about the targets, in terms of safety, quality and
62 sensory acceptance of products such as meat, cheese, pizza, canned fish, cakes, pesto and pies
63 (Consensus Action on Salt & Health (CASH), 2012). Notwithstanding the DH’s recognition
64 of the need for investments into technical solutions for salt replacement, a revised set of
65 targets were launched in March 2014 to be achieved by December 2017 across 76 product
66 categories (Department of Health, 2014a).

67 This research therefore aimed to: 1) explore the barriers to further salt reduction; 2) identify
68 new technologies, production techniques and products that industry are exploring to support
69 further salt reduction; and 3) discuss the implications of increased salt reduction for the UK
70 food industry.

71 In particular, the research aimed to explore two specific issues from a commercial
72 perspective. First, the assumption that incremental salt reductions over a prolonged time will
73 lead to a ‘palate adjustment’ as consumers’ become more tolerant of and begin to prefer
74 lower salt foods (Bertino *et al.*, 1982; Mitchell *et al.*, 2011), thereby suggesting no
75 commercial benefit to companies continuing to supply foods with high salt contents as
76 consumers would experience them as ‘too salty’ (Wyness *et al.*, 2012). Second, the potential
77 technical barriers to salt-reducing reformulations which are linked to the preservation and
78 antimicrobial qualities of salt. These properties are a consequence of salt’s ability to lower
79 water activity in foods, thus ensuring the optimum developmental requirements of many
80 bacteria are not met (Albarracín *et al.*, 2011).

81

82 **2. Methods**

83 To explore a range of salt reduction barriers both experienced and perceived by food industry
84 actors, a qualitative research approach typified by open questioning techniques was adopted
85 (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). Interviews were identified as the most appropriate data
86 generation technique with alternative approaches such as focus groups discounted due to
87 concerns that interviewees may not speak candidly to protect company confidentiality and/or
88 to preserve potential competitive rivalries, and the impracticalities of assembling
89 geographically dispersed interviewees. Early in the development of the research design, the
90 principle researcher (the first author) assumed the role of ‘qualified naïvité (Kvale, 2007), in
91 which she sought to learn from the interviewees’ knowledge and experiences to understand
92 the practicalities of salt reformulation. This approach required the researcher to be informed
93 of potential barriers and facilitators to food reformulation issues, to enable probing on the
94 subject, whilst also being open to unexpected and new information. Entrée into the domain
95 of salt reduction policy and food industry concerns about product reformulation to lower salt

96 content included both a literature review for the former, and an analysis of responses to the
97 FSA's 2008 salt reduction consultation for the latter. In this consultation (FSA, 2008), 60
98 self-selecting participants predominantly industry based (n=42) responded to questions
99 relating to product specific feedback, proposed new targets and general comments.
100 Representations were from manufacturing (n=18), retailing (n=4), trade associations (n=20)
101 as well as various consumer and health related organisations (FSA, 2009). Using a thematic
102 analysis, key barriers facing specific product areas were identified (Table 1). These barriers
103 were then compared across the cohort to identify category specific and generalised concerns.
104 INSERT TABLE 1 HERE

105 The analysis of 2008 consultation responses also informed the sampling selection of food
106 manufacturing experts and retailer stakeholders in four ways. First, to capture the two
107 functional areas most affected by salt reduction and product reformulation initiatives,
108 interviewees were required to be employed within the food industry either in technical or
109 new product development roles. Second, the interviewees were required to work within at
110 least one of following three food categories that are associated with significant barriers to
111 further salt reduction initiatives: 1) cooked and sliced meats; 2) ready meals (inclusive of
112 pizza, pies, soups, sauces and quiches); and 3) sandwiches and salads. Specifically, these
113 'chilled, convenience foods' require manufacturing in high-risk or high-care facilities,
114 denoting strict and high levels of hygiene, working practices, fabrication, facility design and
115 equipment needed to produce food-safe products. Third, expert informants should represent
116 a range of both branded and own-label chilled, convenience foods. Fourth, experts should be
117 drawn from both small to medium sized enterprises with < 250 employees, and large
118 enterprises \geq 250 employees. These selection criteria required a purposeful sampling
119 technique and this was achieved through use of a gatekeeper, the technical manager of a
120 multiple retailer, who used knowledge of their supply base to identify potential interviewees

121 and a route for introductions. Potential interviewees were provided with information about
122 the research and a list of the 5 open-ended questions that would form the basis of the
123 interview. Thirteen experts participated in the study, ten food manufacturers and three
124 employees of a multiple retailer. The sample description is provided in Table 2.

125

126 INSERT TABLE 2 HERE

127

128 Participants were asked questions relating to: 1) their role and product category
129 responsibilities; 2) the main impacts of salt reduction on their business; 3) what, if any,
130 barriers they were facing whilst reducing salt in their product categories; 4) activities the
131 company were undertaking to overcome these; and 5) novel technologies or products they
132 had explored to facilitate salt reduction. The critical incident technique (CIT) was used
133 throughout the interviews to attain context-rich, first hand perspectives on salt reduction
134 initiatives and the associated challenges (Flanagan, 1954). Analytically, CIT supports the
135 identification of differences and similarities that are attached to specific events or ‘critical
136 incidents’ such as salt reduction experiences, whilst also identifying emerging trends. The
137 interviews, which were conducted by telephone, lasted approximately 30 minutes and were
138 digitally recorded and transcribed *verbatim*. The fieldwork was conducted during January
139 and February 2013.

140 The data analysis utilised a thematic approach (Braun &Clarke, 2006). Each interview
141 transcript was manually open-coded. These codes were then sorted and compiled into topical
142 categories that explained them (Charmaz, 2006), which were then compared and contrasted
143 (see Table 3).

144 INSERT TABLE 3 HERE

145

146 **3. Results**

147 Product reformulation to reduce salt content had been trialled by all the experts' companies
148 with varying degrees of success. Generalised and product specific barriers to salt reduction,
149 and the tensions and trade-offs relating to strategies to address these barriers were identified
150 and are now discussed.

151

152 *Salt reduction in simple foods:*

153 *Food safety versus shelf-life*

154 The pivotal role of salt in contributing to the production of safe food, by hindering the growth
155 of potentially harmful microorganisms, was implicitly acknowledged by all the interviewees,
156 irrespective of company size. Some food safety concerns were product specific. For
157 example, cooked meat manufacturers were concerned about the mis-curing of cooked meats
158 in brine (a salt based solution), and there were specific concerns about *Clostridium botulinum*
159 and *Listeria monocytogenes* control. Manufacturer response to addressing such food safety
160 concerns is to shorten use-by dates with concomitant impacts on manufacturer's planning,
161 ordering and logistical systems:

162 *"My biggest concern is that such a significant salt reduction will undoubtedly have a*
163 *marked effect on the shelf-life of all cooked meat products. Most concerning of all this*
164 *may result in a higher proportion of mis-cures which could present a food safety risk"*
165 (Participant A).

166 *"During trialling of reduced salt products it has become apparent that there is an*
167 *increased risk of Listeria monocytogenes associated with the incremental reductions*
168 *in salt content. This has been overcome through the reduction of internal shelf life of*

169 *high risk ingredients by one day and also the incorporation of more checks and*
170 *testing procedures throughout manufacture" (Participant I).*

171 ***Functionality and manufacturing process efficiency***

172 The functionality of salt in relation to manufacturing process efficiency was also identified as
173 a challenge by some food manufacturers. For example, within dough-based product
174 categories, salt reduction had a negative impact on yeast function, and for comminuted meat
175 products (e.g. burgers and sausages produced by processes including the crushing and
176 grinding of meat muscle and fat) impaired slicing:

177 *"Too little salt can result in some particularly active doughs to become too elastic as*
178 *there is no inhibitive effect on the yeast. On a sheet and cut line this can cause major*
179 *issues with weight control and transfer through the process" (Participant B).*

180 *"When producing comminuted meats the reduction in sodium content will affect the*
181 *binding of proteins, resulting in increased muscle separation and hence reduced*
182 *slicing yields and creating poor quality slice." (Participant A).*

183

184 ***Salt reduction in complex compound foods:***

185 Salt reduction in some complex compound foods was accommodated by process
186 modifications, including the manufacturing point at which salt was added as a seasoning,
187 which was typically moved to the end of the manufacturing process:

188 *"We have also reviewed our process, especially with cooked products such as soups*
189 *and sauces, we now add seasoning at the end of the process to give maximum flavour*
190 *impact with the minimum level of addition" (Participant F).*

191 *“We haven’t had to develop new processes to overcome salt reduction as of yet*
192 *however there has been a need to modify existing processes such as vacuum tumbling*
193 *to offset any yield and textural implications from salt reduction” (Participant H).*

194

195 However, there were significant barriers to salt reduction associated with altering the salt
196 profile of ingredients or reducing the quantity of highly salted ingredients which caused
197 problems in recipe authenticity and new product development (NPD).

198

199 ***Authenticity***

200 Restrictions to NPD arising from the salt reduction agenda were noted by more than half of
201 the interviewees as being a major concern, particularly in multi-component food categories.

202 Within the NPD discussions, salt reduction requirements were causing industry problems
203 associated with the ability to produce foods using authentic recipes, which for example may

204 require specific textures and/or flavour profiles associated with particular cuisines.

205 Moreover, using authentic ingredients also limited the scope for reformulation when the
206 ingredients are made to specific recipes with protected geographical indications (PDI) or

207 designations of origin (PDO) such as *Prosciutto di Parma*:

208 :

209 *“One of the biggest challenges faced is the development and reformulation of meal*
210 *centres – especially Chinese/Thai/Indian. It is impossible to truly replicate the*

211 *authentic flavours associated with these cuisines due to the naturally high sodium*
212 *contents of these foods and the restrictions imposed on the use of authentic*

213 *ingredients such as soy sauce” (Participant D).*

214 *“Reformulation in some cases has been deemed impossible for some products due to*
215 *their authentic nature and processes of manufacture. A good proportion of*
216 *international cooked meats are produced to specific, protected recipes resulting in no*
217 *leeway being available for reformulation” (Participant L).*

218

219 Strategies to address such NPD barriers generally required a trade-off between authentic
220 ingredients and food quality (as perceived by consumers). For example, reducing the
221 quantity of high salt containing ingredients, particularly cured meats, would reduce salt
222 content. However, the quantity of meat (or protein content) in compound foods is often a
223 factor in consumers’ purchasing decisions and a potential unique selling proposition (USP)
224 for specific brands. Therefore reducing meat or fish content in a compound food could lead
225 to a reduction in customers’ perceived quality and associated loss in competitiveness:

226 *“Development of products to meet the salt reduction targets can be difficult with*
227 *products containing ham, bacon, cheese, smoked salmon or prawns – all of which are*
228 *consumer favourites for sandwich fillings. All of these ingredients are high in salt but*
229 *are also high in the customer purchasing decision. Reduction or replacement of these*
230 *ingredients would result in a significant decrease in customer satisfaction”*
231 *(Participant I).*

232 *“Many cooked meat products ... contain Wiltshire cured trim, which is the main*
233 *source of salt within the recipe. We will struggle to meet the target without reducing*
234 *the meat content or significantly changing the recipes, and this would affect the*
235 *flavour, character and USP of these lines” (Participant A).*

236

237 **Organoleptic Acceptability**

238 Irrespective of the complexity of a food, the organoleptic factors of taste/flavour and texture
239 were identified as barriers to continued salt reduction by most of the interviewees. Concerns
240 about organoleptic factors were not product or company specific. Flavour-compromise
241 barriers were a concern to a high proportion of the interviewees, with a number of
242 manufacturers reporting an increase in consumer complaints about product flavour following
243 salt reformulation.

244 *“In order to balance out the use of ingredients that require salt as part of their food*
245 *safety controls/ functionality, and that are pivotal to the product, many of the other*
246 *ingredients i.e. tomato sauce are developed with considerably reduced salt level. For*
247 *efficiency reasons these sauces are used on many pizzas within the range. This can*
248 *and historically has had a damaging effect on complaint levels with customers stating*
249 *that the products (not containing the high salt ingredients) are bland and tasteless”*
250 *(Participant B).*

251 *“The addition of salt to the sauce helps bring out the overall tomato and herb notes.*
252 *The reduction of salt in this component would be possible; however if you were to*
253 *remove all of the salt, the sauce would become less flavoursome and would have*
254 *detrimental effects on the overall product” (Participant E).*

255 Texture-compromise barriers arising from salt reduction were also significant for dough-
256 rheology and protein based ingredients. Other texture (and perceived quality) changes
257 resulting from salt reduction included product degradation over the shelf-life. Ready meals,
258 quiche and dips suppliers referred to salt reduction causing free water leeching, and sauce
259 separation over shelf-life, leading to customer dissatisfaction:

260 *“The biggest challenge we have faced so far has been organoleptically in terms of*
261 *flavour and texture. We have had to be very aware regarding texture of delicate*
262 *protein – i.e. prawns. If the salt level is reduced too much then the texture can become*

263 *too firm once cooked, perhaps even tough at further reduction levels. This means it is*
264 *in our best interest to keep salt at an optimum level which we are nearing the lower*
265 *end of now so texture isn't compromised" (Participant H).*

266 *"Reduction in salt from the quiche pastry case has led to an increased water activity*
267 *within the product hence resulting in water migration from filling to pastry. This*
268 *leads to soggy pastry towards the end of shelf-life and increased customer*
269 *dissatisfaction and complaint" (Participant J).*

270

271 **Novel Technological Investment**

272 Salt alternatives had not been commonly and successfully used by industry to date and the
273 main salt alternatives being explored by companies are noted in Table 4.

274

275 INSERT TABLE 4 HERE

276 A consistent view expressed amongst interviewees was that some product and process
277 modifications had been pushed to their salt reduction limits, requiring significant investments
278 in manufacturing plant and equipment to permit further salt reduction. Interviewees believed
279 that these cost implications would most likely be borne by businesses, irrespective of
280 company size. Furthermore, novel technological development was identified as a necessity to
281 facilitate further salt reduction through reformulation.

282 *"When looking for example, at cooked meats there is a need to significantly change*
283 *production facilities/factories to meet current and any future targets. These changes*
284 *would have huge costs to the business and as a result further investment incentives*
285 *are needed if salt reduction is to be pushed further" (Participant K)*

286 *"There are quite a lot of salt replacers on the market however they are very expensive*
287 *when compared to salt. Salt currently costs approximately 20p/kg and many salt*
288 *replacers cost £2-3/kg which is a huge on cost for the manufacture" (Participant J).*

289 *"In upcoming years there is going to be a need for significant changes to production*
290 *facilities and factories to allow the food industry to meet any further targets the*
291 *Department of Health sets. Salt reduction is reaching its limits at the moment and*
292 *without new emerging technologies or restructuring of manufacturing plants, any further*
293 *advance will come at great expense to the food industry" (Participant K)*

294 **Competitive parity**

295 A consistent tension underpinning the above discussion was competitive parity. Interviewees noted
296 that, although all retailers had signed up to the voluntary salt reduction targets within their own-label
297 products, branded manufacturers and the takeaway market were slower signatories. This had led to
298 significant underperformance of own-label foods when benchmarked against branded foods.

299 *"There is a struggle to meet targets when products are benchmarked against branded*
300 *products. Brands haven't moved as quickly as retailers to meet targets so their*
301 *products tend to contain high levels of salt and are favoured by consumers due to*
302 *their higher levels of perceived flavour" (Participant K).*

303 *"Meat feast pizzas and products that are benchmarked against takeaway offerings*
304 *such as [...] etc. will never truly be able to be developed as a match due to the salt*
305 *guideline restrictions placed on the supermarkets that are not currently imposed on*
306 *the takeaway market" (Participant B).*

307

308 Moreover, most salt reduction signatories are UK based, compounding the industry
309 perception of an uneven competitive environment. One strategic option for manufacturers

310 with overseas production sites was to move production outside the UK to meet consumer
311 perceptions of quality and authenticity:

312 *“There are worries within the UK food industry that UK manufacturing will get*
313 *undermined and production will get moved overseas in upcoming years if salt*
314 *reduction through reformulation continues. Overseas suppliers do not have to comply*
315 *with the salt reduction initiatives, especially if the products are branded. On the other*
316 *hand the sourcing of low salt raw materials may end up being restricted to UK*
317 *suppliers if other countries do not follow suit soon” (Participant M).*

318 **4. Discussion**

319 For most countries, implementing a national salt reduction programme is likely to be one of
320 the simplest and most cost-effective ways of improving public health (Webster *et al*, 2012).
321 This requires consumers to reduce their salt consumption; either through the development of
322 consumer education programmes to reduce discretionary intake (see *inter alia*, He
323 &McGregor, 2008; WHO, 2012); and/or the selection of low salt processed foods (indicating
324 the need for the development of an effective salt labelling policy); and/or reducing the salt
325 content of foods available to the consumer (WHO, 2010). Although examination of
326 consumer education and taxation policies are beyond the scope of the current analysis (but
327 see, *inter alia*, Grimes *et al*, 2009; Mytton, *et al*, 2012; Letegic & Campbell, 2011 for further
328 discussion of this issue), it should be noted that consumers concerned about the potential
329 risks of salt consumption may drive demand for processed foods with a reduced salt content,
330 at least for a proportion of the market (Mohan, Campbell & Willis, 2009). Industry responses
331 to such demand may conceivably result in reformulated foods being promoted with a reduced
332 salt unique selling proposition in parallel with ‘conventional’ foods. However, the intended
333 “stealth reduction” (Wilson *et al.*, 2012) of the present salt reduction policy assumes that

334 gradual reductions will not be identified by consumers (Doyle & Glass, 2010) and that
335 consumers' palates will change to prefer less salty foods (Bertino *et al.*, 1982; Mitchell *et al.*,
336 2011). While it is possible that healthier consumer choices may be facilitated by “nudging”
337 sensory preferences for salt content downwards through reducing the salt content of
338 processed foods (e.g. He &McGregor, 2008; Dötsch *et al.*, 2009), this requires widespread
339 adoption of initiatives such as the UK DH Responsibility Deal. However, as fewer branded
340 manufacturers than retailer own-label produces (Department of Health, 2012) and restaurants
341 and takeaway establishments have signed up to the salt reduction pledge, (Department of
342 Health, 2014b), the palate adjustment theory is less likely to be realised. Additionally, the
343 reduced sensory acceptability of reformulated foods compared to non-modified foods in
344 benchmarking tests represents a competitive barrier to continued salt reduction. Other
345 competitive barriers are now discussed.

346 Potential unintended consequences of salt reduction include increased production costs and
347 food waste. Although the due diligence defence in food law (Food Safety Act 1990, as
348 amended) has made food safety a non-competitive issue in the UK, the heightened risk of
349 microbial growth for some food categories caused by salt reduction, may require increased
350 microbial testing, with adherent costs borne by the food manufacturing and distributive
351 industries and/or consumers. The additional commercial strategic option of reducing the
352 shelf-life of reformulated foods may also conflict with sustainability goals to reduce food
353 waste. Exploiting technological innovation to extend shelf life (for example through
354 investment in food research), may be one mechanism to address this barrier, although the
355 application of some (novel) food technologies may not be accepted by all consumers. Such
356 tensions associated with harmonising health and sustainability policies suggests the need to
357 ensure maximum public good results from policies. In the case of the latter, due
358 consideration needs to be given to socio-economic and ethical impacts, as well as those

359 associated with health and the environment (see König *et al*, 2010, for a similar example
360 relating to food risk analysis).

361 Although the majority of organoleptic barriers identified within this study related to the
362 known palatability of foods through salt's own textural and taste properties (Liem *et al.*,
363 2011) and influence on the flavours of other foods (Desmond, 2006), consumers' preferences
364 for authentic ingredients and flavours from different cultural cuisines present a significant
365 barrier when they are naturally high in salt e.g. soy sauce or cured meats. This is
366 compounded when raw materials may be subject to PDO or PGI status, which precludes
367 change to a historically or geographically authentic recipe with protected intellectual property
368 rights. Although reducing the quantity of authentic ingredients is a strategic option, this risks
369 rejection by consumers when evaluated against competing food products. Competitive
370 implications of this unequal playing field including companies considering moving
371 manufacturing to plants outside the UK, requires Governmental policy consideration.
372 Mandatory rather than compulsory salt reduction is one such option, but on the grounds of
373 commercial interference and choice, may be opposed by both industry and consumers
374 respectively. A more realistic policy goal is the inclusion of mandatory "warning" salt
375 labelling for ALL products within the EU where salt levels are very high to support consumer
376 informed choice, although this would require further investigation. Investments into the
377 development of technological solutions to support further salt reduction could also be
378 considered. [Here, the industry could input into the future research funding landscape via](#)
379 [organisations such as the Knowledge Transfer Networks, which connect businesses,](#)
380 [academics and funders to develop new products, processes and services](#)
381 [\(https://connect.innovateuk.org/knowledge-transfer-networks\).](https://connect.innovateuk.org/knowledge-transfer-networks)

382 To date, much salt reduction has focussed on the removal of free salt within products. Salt
383 substitutes can be used in combination with additives to suppress the notable absence of salt,
384 as well as flavour intensifiers to enhance the perceived salinity of the product (Doko Jelinić *et*
385 *al.*, 2010). Although this research has highlighted that salt alternatives are not currently
386 commonly used, there is potential for future facilitation of further salt reduction (Wilson *et*
387 *al.*, 2012). For example, technologies to redistribute salt crystals to the product's exterior
388 opposed to its interior promises a rapid salt sensation, initiating a heightened salt perception
389 by the consumer, with the added bonus of reducing the overall content of salt. Another
390 approach is exploring the engineering of salt with lower solubility, allowing the crystals to
391 travel through the gastrointestinal tract without entirely dissolving. This allows for a
392 sufficient salty taste to be experienced on the tongue, whilst limiting the overall ingestion of
393 salt. These novel technologies are all still at concept or trial stage and so may take years to
394 come to market. As salt reduction has 'reached its limits' investment in technological
395 solutions is vital for future salt reduction. As such technologies are 'pre-competitive', are
396 likely to contribute to public health and may assuage competitive barriers to present salt
397 reduction, public funding of technological interventions to support further salt reduction is an
398 obvious policy route which may support food industry resilience.

399

400 **Conclusions**

401 This study has shown that salt reduction (to meet salt targets) solely through reformulation
402 has reached its limit in a number of products, and is approaching its limitation in others.
403 Industry experts expressed grave concern regarding the setting of additional, more stringent,
404 salt targets, following the challenging 2012 targets set by the DH. A number of barriers to
405 further salt reduction were identified, some of which were apparent during the 2008 FSA salt

406 reduction consultation process and remain unresolved, whilst others have emerged since. It is
407 apparent that there is not one single barrier preventing further salt reduction, but a number of
408 barriers encompassing different parts of the manufacturing process. These barriers, including
409 food safety, manufacturing, development, organoleptic and quality concerns, all have a
410 potentially negative impact on consumer acceptance of reduced salt products. If the UK
411 wishes to achieve its target salt intake of 6g/day, notice and action needs to be taken in light
412 of these concerns. These include investment into pre-competitive R&D to support the
413 development of novel ingredients and technologies that could facilitate further salt reduction,
414 policies to support an equitable competitive environment to maintain the resilience of the UK
415 food industry to prevent it leaving the UK, and continued salt reduction public health
416 campaigns. Thus collaboration between Government, industry and the public is required to
417 share in the challenge to significantly lower the UK populations' salt intake and in turn
418 improve the health of the nation.

419

420

421 **References**

422 Albarracín, W., Sánchez, I.C., Grau, R. and Barat, J.M. (2011). 'Salt in food processing;
423 usage and reduction: A review', *International Journal of Food Science and Technology*,
424 46(7), pp. 1329-1336.

425 Asaria, P., Chisholm, D., Mathers, C., Ezzati, M. and Beaglehole, R. (2007). 'Chronic disease
426 prevention: health effects and financial costs of strategies to reduce salt intake and
427 control tobacco use', *Lancet*, 370(9604), pp. 2044-2053.

428 Bertino, M., Beauchamp, G.K. and Engelman, K. (1982). 'Long-term reduction in dietary
429 sodium alters the taste of salt', *American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*, 36(6), pp. 1134-
430 1144.

431 Bidlas, E. and Lambert, R.J.W. (2008). 'Comparing the antimicrobial effectiveness of NaCl
432 and KCl with a view of sodium replacement', *International Journal of Food
433 Microbiology*, 124, pp. 98-102.

434 Braun, V. and Clarke, V. (2006). 'Using thematic analysis in psychology', *Qualitative
435 Research in Psychology*, 3, pp. 77-101.

436 Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing Grounded Theory A practical guide through qualitative
437 analysis*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.

438 Consensus Action on Salt & Health (CASH) (2012). *Technical solutions to salt reduction
439 across 8 categories of food*. Available at:
440 <http://www.actiononsalt.org.uk/news/Salt%20in%20the%20news/2012/79220.pdf>
441 (Accessed: 30th September 2012).

442 Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) (2011). *Government review*
443 *of waste policy in England 2011*. Available at:
444 [https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/government-review-of-waste-policy-in-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/government-review-of-waste-policy-in-england-2011)
445 [england-2011](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/government-review-of-waste-policy-in-england-2011) (Accessed: 12th August 2014).

446 Denzin, N.K. and Lincoln, Y.S. (2005). *The SAGE handbook of Qualitative Research*. Third
447 edn. London Sage Publications.

448 Department of Health (2014a). *F9. Salt Reduction 2017*. Available at:
449 <https://responsibilitydeal.dh.gov.uk/pledges/pledge/?pl=49> (Accessed: 4th July 2014).

450 Department of Health (2014b). *Responsibility Deal Food Network – New salt targets: F9*
451 *Salt Reduction 2017 pledge & F10 Out of Home Salt reduction pledge*. Available at:
452 [https://responsibilitydeal.dh.gov.uk/responsibility-deal-food-network-new-salt-targets-](https://responsibilitydeal.dh.gov.uk/responsibility-deal-food-network-new-salt-targets-f9-salt-reduction-2017-pledge-f10-out-of-home-salt-reduction-pledge/#sthash.JA270AUK.dpuf)
453 [f9-salt-reduction-2017-pledge-f10-out-of-home-salt-reduction-](https://responsibilitydeal.dh.gov.uk/responsibility-deal-food-network-new-salt-targets-f9-salt-reduction-2017-pledge-f10-out-of-home-salt-reduction-pledge/#sthash.JA270AUK.dpuf)
454 [pledge/#sthash.JA270AUK.dpuf](https://responsibilitydeal.dh.gov.uk/responsibility-deal-food-network-new-salt-targets-f9-salt-reduction-2017-pledge-f10-out-of-home-salt-reduction-pledge/#sthash.JA270AUK.dpuf) (Accessed: 4th July 2014).

455 Department of Health (DH) (2012). *F2. Salt Reduction* Available at:
456 <http://responsibilitydeal.dh.gov.uk/2012/02/03/f2-factsheet/> (Accessed: 30th September
457 2012).

458 Department of Health (DH) (2012). *F2. Salt Reduction Signatories*. Available at:
459 <http://responsibilitydeal.dh.gov.uk/f2-salt-reduction/> (Accessed: 25th November 2012).

460 Desmond, E. (2006). 'Reducing salt: A challenge for the meat industry', *Meat Science*, 74(1),
461 pp. 188-196.

462 Doko Jelinić, J., Nola, I.A. and Andabaka, D. (2010). 'Food processing industry - The salt
463 shock to the consumers', *Prehrambena industrija - Udar soli na potrošače*, 64(2), pp.
464 97-103.

465 Dötsch, M., Busch, J., Batenburg, M., Liem, G., Tareilus, E., Mueller, R., and Meijer, G.
466 (2009). 'Strategies to reduce sodium consumption: a food industry perspective',
467 *Critical Reviews in Food Science and Nutrition*, 49(10), 841-851.

468 Doyle, M.E. and Glass, K.A. (2010) 'Sodium Reduction and Its Effect on Food Safety, Food
469 Quality, and Human Health', *Comprehensive Reviews in Food Science and Food Safety*,
470 9(1), pp. 44-56.

471 Doyle, M. E. (2011) Understanding Sodium Replacements from a Food Safety and Health
472 Risk Perspective. Available at: <http://www.namif.org/wp-content/uploads/09-406.pdf>

473 Durack, E., Alonso-Gomez, M. and Wilkinson, M.G. (2008). 'Salt: A review of its role in
474 food science and public health', *Current Nutrition and Food Science*, 4(4), pp. 290-297.

475 Flanagan, J.C. (1954). 'The Critical Incident Technique', *Psychological Bulletin* 51(4), pp.
476 327-358.

477 Food Standards Agency (FSA) (2005). *FSA Salt Model. UK Salt intakes: Modelling Salt*
478 *Reductions*. London.

479 Food Standards Agency (FSA) (2008). *Proposals to revise the voluntary salt reduction*
480 *targets*. [Online]. Available at:
481 [http://tna.europarchive.org/20120102091535/http://www.food.gov.uk/multimedia/pdfs/](http://tna.europarchive.org/20120102091535/http://www.food.gov.uk/multimedia/pdfs/consultationresponse/saltreductiontargetresponse.pdf)
482 [consultationresponse/saltreductiontargetresponse.pdf](http://tna.europarchive.org/20120102091535/http://www.food.gov.uk/multimedia/pdfs/consultationresponse/saltreductiontargetresponse.pdf).

483 FSA (2009). Proposals to revise the voluntary salt reduction targets: Consultation response
484 summary. Available at
485 [http://collections.europarchive.org/tna/20100927130941/http://food.gov.uk/multimedia/](http://collections.europarchive.org/tna/20100927130941/http://food.gov.uk/multimedia/pdfs/consultationresponse/saltreductiontargetresponse.pdf)
486 [pdfs/consultationresponse/saltreductiontargetresponse.pdf](http://collections.europarchive.org/tna/20100927130941/http://food.gov.uk/multimedia/pdfs/consultationresponse/saltreductiontargetresponse.pdf) accessed 3.10.14

487 Fuller G.W. (2005). *New Food Product Development* (2nd Ed.). London: CRC Press.

488 Gibney, M.J., Lanham-New, S.A., Cassidy, A. and Vorster, H.H. (2009) *Introduction to*
489 *Human Nutrition*. (2nd Ed.). Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

490 Grimes, C. A., Riddell, L. J., and Nowson, C. A. (2009). ‘Consumer knowledge and attitudes
491 to salt intake and labelled salt information’, *Appetite*, 53(2), 189-194.

492 Guinee, T.P. (2004). ‘Salting and the role of salt in cheese’, *International Journal of Dairy*
493 *Technology*, 57, pp. 99-109.

494 He, F. J., and MacGregor, G. A. (2008). ‘A comprehensive review on salt and health and
495 current experience of worldwide salt reduction programmes’, *Journal of Human*
496 *Hypertension*, 23(6), 363-384.

497 Henderson, L., Irving, K., Gregory, J., Bates, C.J., Prentice, A., Perks, J., Swan, G., and
498 Farron, M. (2003). *National Diet and Nutrition Survey: adults aged 19-64 years.*
499 *Volume 3: Vitamin and mineral intake and urinary analytes*. London: TSO.

500 Jebb, S. (2005) *Why 6g? A summary of the scientific evidence for the salt intake target*.

501 Jungbunzlauer (2008) *Sub4Salt: Low Salt - Full Taste*. [Online]. Available at:
502 [http://www.jungbunzlauer.com/media/uploads/pdf/Specialties/sub4salt_low_salt_-](http://www.jungbunzlauer.com/media/uploads/pdf/Specialties/sub4salt_low_salt_-_full_taste_Apr08.pdf)
503 [_full_taste_Apr08.pdf](http://www.jungbunzlauer.com/media/uploads/pdf/Specialties/sub4salt_low_salt_-_full_taste_Apr08.pdf) (Accessed: 22 February 2013).

504 König, A., Kuiper, H. A., Marvin, H. J., Boon, P. E., Busk, L., Cnudde, F., ... & Wentholt, M.
505 T. (2010). ‘The SAFE FOODS framework for improved risk analysis of foods’, *Food*
506 *Control*, 21(12), 1566-1587.

507

508 Lean, M.E.J. (2006). *Food Science, Nutrition & Health*. (7th Ed.). London: Hodder Arnold.

509 Legetic, B., & Campbell, N. (2011). 'Reducing salt intake in the Americas: Pan American
510 Health Organization actions', *Journal of Health Communication*, 16(sup2), 37-48.

511 Liem, D.G., Miremadi, F. and Keast, R.S.J. (2011). 'Reducing sodium in foods: The effect on
512 flavor', *Nutrients*, 3(6), pp. 694-711.

513 Mhurchu, C.N., Capelin, C., Dunford, E.K., Webster, J.L., Neal, B.C. & Jebb, S.A. (2011).
514 'Sodium content of processed foods in the United Kingdom: analysis of 44,000 foods
515 purchased by 21,000 households', *American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*, 93(3),
516 pp.594-600.

517 Mitchell, M., Brunton, N.P. and Wilkinson, M.G. (2011). 'Current salt reduction strategies
518 and their effect on sensory acceptability: a study with reduced salt ready-meals',
519 *European Food and Research Technology*, 232, pp. 529-539.

520 Mohan, S., Campbell, N. R., and Willis, K. (2009). 'Effective population-wide public health
521 interventions to promote sodium reduction', *Canadian Medical Association Journal*,
522 181(9), 605-609.

523 Mytton, O. T., Clarke, D., and Rayner, M. (2012). 'Taxing unhealthy food and drinks to
524 improve health', *British Medical Journal*, 344, e2931.

525 NHS (2011) *Salt: the facts*. Available at:
526 <http://www.nhs.uk/Livewell/Goodfood/Pages/salt.aspx> (Accessed: 20th September
527 2012). NHS (2012) *Stroke*. Available at:
528 http://www.nhs.uk/conditions/Stroke/Pages/Introduction.aspx?WT.mc_id=110901
529 (Accessed: 21st November 2012). NICE (2010) *Prevention of Cardiovascular Disease*.
530 [Online]. Available at: www.nice.org.uk/guidance/PH25.

531 Proudlove, R.K. (2009). *The Science and Technology of Foods*. (5th Ed.). Odiham: Forbes
532 Publications.

533 Rulikowska, A., Kilcawley, K.N., Doolan, I.A., Alonso-Gomez, M., Nongonierma, A.B.,
534 Hannon, J.A. and Wilkinson, M.G. (2012). 'The impact of reduced sodium chloride
535 content on Cheddar cheese quality', *International Dairy Journal*, 28: 2, pp45-55.

536 Sadler, K., Nicholson, S., Steer, T., Gill, V., Bates, B., Tipping, S., Cox, L., Lennox, A. and
537 Prentice, A. (2011). *National Diet and Nutrition Survey - Assessment of dietary sodium
538 in adults (aged 19 to 64 years) in England*. London TSO

539 Scientific Advisory Committee on Nutrition (SACN) (2003). *Salt & Health*. London TSO.

540 Stringer, S.C. and Pin, C. (2005). *Microbial risks associated with salt reduction in certain
541 foods and alternative options for preservation*. Norwich.

542 Tate & Lyle (2013) *Soda-Lo Salt Microspheres*. Available at:
543 <http://www.tateandlyle.com/ingredientsandservices/chooseaningredientorservice/europemiddleeastandafrika/pages/soda-lo%E2%84%A2saltmicrospheres.aspx> (Accessed: 22
544 February 2013).

545
546 Teas, J., Braverman, L.E., Kurzer, M.S., Pino, S., Hurley, T.G. and Hebert, J.R. (2007).
547 'Seaweed and soy: Companion foods in Asian cuisine and their effects on thyroid
548 function in American women', *Journal of Medicinal Food*, 10(1), pp. 90-100.

549 Technical Strategy Board (TSB) (2011). *New research will help make foods healthier, safer
550 and more nutritious*. Available at: [http://www.innovateuk.org/content/competition-
551 announcements/new-research-will-help-make-foods-healthier-safer-1.ashx](http://www.innovateuk.org/content/competition-announcements/new-research-will-help-make-foods-healthier-safer-1.ashx) (Accessed:
552 23 February 2013).

553 Wilson, R., Komitopoulou, E. and Incles, M. (2012). *Evaluation of Technological*
554 *Approaches to Salt Reduction*, Surrey.

555 Webster, J. L., Dunford, E. K., Hawkes, C., & Neal, B. C. (2011). Salt reduction initiatives
556 around the world. *Journal of hypertension*, 29(6), 1043-1050.

557 World Action on Salt & Health (WASH) (2012). *UK leading the world in salt reduction*
558 Available at: <http://www.worldactiononsalt.com/news/saltnews/2012/78091.html>
559 (Accessed: 1st October 2012).

560 World Health Organization. (2010). *Creating an enabling environment for population-based*
561 *salt reduction strategies: report of a joint technical meeting held by WHO and the Food*
562 *Standards Agency*, United Kingdom, July 2010.

563 Wyness, L.A., Buttriss, J.L. and Stanner, S.A. (2012.) 'Reducing the population's sodium
564 intake: the UK Food Standards Agency's salt reduction programme', *Public Health*
565 *Nutrition*, 15(2), pp. 254-261.

566 Young, J. and Callaghan, J. (2012). *Chemical Analysis of Seagreens Arctic Wild Wrack*
567 *Seaweed*. [Online]. Available at:
568 <http://www.seagreens.co.uk/Documents/SheffChemicalAnalysis.pdf> (Accessed: 22
569 February 2013).

570

571 **Table 1: Concerns arising from 2008 FSA Salt Reduction Consultation**

Product	Consultation Concerns
Meat products	Increased customer complaints received over taste/texture – increased costs involved with additional flavourings; Shelf life reduction – poses operational difficulties in supply chain; Food safety risks - <i>Listeria monocytogenes</i> , <i>Clostridium botulinum</i> , Authentic nature of some meats poses problems, Increased food borne illness & bacterial growth; Major impact on NPD – inclusion of other ingredients i.e. in sausages and burgers reduced and restricted.
Bread	Flavour affected – risk all bread tasting the same; Reduced shelf life due to increased mould growth; Inferior loaves and more variability due to yeast functionality being affected; Poor crust colour; Main raising agent (sodium bicarbonate) contains sodium – no alternatives.
Cheese	Moisture levels affected; Emulsifying salts necessary for manufacture – high sodium content; Reduced shelf-life – spoilage and off notes present; <i>Clostridium butyricum</i> prevention reduced – blowing; Increased mould and bacterial growth.
Butter	Increased bacterial growth; Difficulties achieving uniform distribution of salt; Increased <i>Listeria monocytogene</i> ; Reduced shelf-life – 14 day reduction already observed.
Ready meals & meal centres	Reduced shelf-life; Increased addition of sugar to enhance flavour; Increased customer complaints over flavour; NPD restriction.
Pizza	Bland; Reduced shelf-life; Increased food safety risk.
Buns, cakes, pastries & fruit pies	Increased use of additives; Main raising agent (sodium bicarbonate) contains sodium – no alternatives; Reduced shelf-life; Denser texture due to loss of aeration.
Sandwiches	NPD restriction; Increased customer complaints about blandness; Reduced shelf-life; Food safety concerns.
Pasta sauces, thick sauces & pastes	Authentic recipes often high in salt; Flavour impacted; Sauce stability reduced; May lead to increased use of additives and artificial preservatives.
Biscuits	Organoleptic limitations; Household favourites – reduced customer satisfaction; Increased customer complaints.
Quiches	Depreciation of texture over shelf-life; Increased customer complaints about blandness; Reduced shelf-life; NPD restriction.

572

573

574

575 **Table 2: Sample Description**

	Products category	Contact	Company information
A	Cooked and sliced meats	Group Technical Manager	Manufacturer, large company
B	Chilled ready meals: pizza	Technical Manager	Manufacturer, large company
C	Chilled ready meals	Technical Manager	Manufacturer, large company
D	Chilled ready meals	New Product Development Manager	Multiple retailer
E	Chilled ready meals: pizza	New Product Development Manager	Manufacturer, large company
F	Dips, sandwiches, soups and sauces	New Product Development Manager	Manufacturer, large company
G	Chilled ready meals	Technical Manager	Manufacturer, large company
H	Chilled ready meals	Technical and NPD Managers	Manufacturer, SME company
I	Sandwiches and salads	Technical and NPD Managers	Manufacturer, large company
J	Chilled ready meals: pies, quiche and savouries	New Product Development Manager	Manufacturer, large company
K	Chilled ready meals; cooked and sliced meats; and sandwiches and salads	Trading Law and Technical Manager	Multiple retailer
L	Cooked and sliced meat	Technical Manager	Manufacturer, large company
M	Chilled ready meals; cooked and sliced meats; and sandwiches and salads	Category Technical Manager	Multiple retailer

576

Table 3: Barriers to further salt reduction specified by industry experts

Participant → Salt Reduction Concern ↓	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
Manufacturing													
New technology required	✓	✓			✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Reduced Consistency	✓	✓			✓					✓	✓	✓	✓
UK vs. Overseas manufacture		✓			✓			✓			✓		✓
Reduction of shelf life of raw materials internally		✓	✓		✓	✓	✓		✓				✓
Production of raw materials affected	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓
Functional properties of ingredients affected	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓		✓		✓	
Organoleptic													
Flavour compromise	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Texture compromise		✓	✓		✓			✓	✓	✓			✓
Enhance flavour of other ingredients					✓	✓		✓					✓
Food Safety													
Higher proportion of mis-cures	✓											✓	✓
Increased risk of <i>Listeria monocytogenes</i>	✓	✓			✓		✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Increased risk of <i>Clostridium botulinum</i>	✓										✓	✓	
Increased risk of spoilage micro-organisms	✓	✓			✓	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Reduced shelf-life	✓			✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Development													
Made to specific, protected recipe	✓		✓	✓			✓					✓	✓
Restriction		✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓		✓
Use of authentic ingredients		✓		✓	✓			✓			✓		✓
Quality													
Meat content reduction	✓	✓	✓		✓		✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Aesthetic properties affected	✓	✓			✓			✓		✓	✓	✓	✓
Balance – compromise salt in one component to allow use of another			✓							✓			✓
Sauce splitting over shelf life			✓			✓	✓		✓				✓
Water migration over shelf life	✓		✓			✓	✓			✓		✓	
Consumer													
Characteristic features affected	✓							✓				✓	✓
Customer acceptance/expectations		✓	✓				✓	✓		✓	✓		✓
Business related													
Waste increases	✓							✓		✓		✓	✓
Underperformance vs. benchmark		✓					✓	✓		✓	✓		✓
Own brand vs. branded products											✓		✓
Salt alternatives													
Difficult to find acceptable flavoured alternatives	✓		✓				✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Difficult to source clean declaration alternatives	✓		✓						✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

579 **Table 4: Salt alternatives explored by interviewees**

Salt Alternative	Description
Nu-Tek Potassium Chloride	Single embedded micro-crystal KCl that significantly reduces any bitter/metallic note associated with straight KCl.
Mycoscent®	A natural flavouring derived from mycoprotein. Has the ability to impart a salty taste without the addition of sodium. Mycoscent has a synergistic effect and characteristics such as sweetness and spice are lifted with its use.
SODA-LO® (Salt Microspheres)	Salt encapsulated within a dextrin shell resulting in free flowing crystalline microspheres that deliver a salty taste through the maximisation of surface area relative to volume.
Seagreens®	Human food quality, nutritious, brown wrack seaweed.
Sub4Salt®	Consists of NaCl, KCl & sodium gluconate. Can replace salt without sacrificing taste. 1:1 substitute with much lower sodium content than natural salt, does not give rise to side effects such as off/bitter/metallic tastes.

580