

**Supplementary Materials: Table S1: Critical Appraisal** (Table Key: FW=Food Waste; HH=Household; No=N; Yes=Y; Unclear=U; Weight=W; Self-Report=SR; Observation=O)

Study & country	Topic + intervention	Sample size, design and outcome measure	Impact	Random or representative sample?	Clear methods of assessment?	Weight/ Self-Report/ Observation?	Was assessment reliable?	Precision of estimate?	Nudge
<b>Bernstad et al 2013</b> <b>Sweden</b> <b>[54]</b>	Food waste recycling nudge intervention Intervention: Group 1 - Written + oral info using disclosure, along with vessel for FW separation and first set of paper bags; Group 2 - written info only using disclosure. No control group.	Allocation: Convenience sample of household area. Participants self-selected. Design: Quantitative/Questionnaire Weekly Average of waste over 24 months: kilogram/household/week. Sample size: Group 1: 420; Group 2: 210.	No change in either group	N Detailed discussion of representative sample included.	U Drop out/loss to follow up not mentioned.	SR W	Y	N	<b>E: Disclosure:</b> Focus on environmental benefits of FW recycling. <b>D: Increase in ease &amp; convenience</b> via a vessel for FW separation and first set of paper bags
<b>Comber &amp; Thieme 2013</b> <b>UK</b> <b>[62]</b>	Food waste recycling nudge intervention Intervention: BinCam leveraged social influence through uploading photos to a Facebook photostream accessible to view by other participants. Feedback on FW reduction and recycling habits was offered similarly. No control group, all	Sample: Convenience. Participants self-selected. Sample size: 22 Design: Qualitative. Focus groups semi-structured. Allocation: Participants were all young adults chosen from households of people known to the researcher, 16 of whom were students.	Positive. Increased awareness of FW saving & recycling habits in the HH & re-evaluation of behaviour l control.	N	Y Drop out/loss to follow up not mentioned.	SR	U	N	<b>C: Use of social norms &amp; J: Informing people of the nature of their choices:</b> The Facebook BinCam photostream aimed to leverage social influence. Relative feedback of FW savings & recycling achievements were displayed similarly to motivate competition between Bincam HHs.

	participants experienced the intervention.								
<b>Linder et al 2018 Sweden [61]</b>	Food waste recycling nudge intervention Intervention: Information leaflet & recycling station Control group received no information leaflet & recycling station.	Sample: Convenience sample. Participants self-selected. Allocation was geographical for intervention and control. Design: Quantitative. Longitudinal Food waste weight data. Sample size (number of times rubbish is collected from sorting stations): Treatment 264 & control group 210. Kilogram/Group/Pre-& Post intervention	Positive. Increased food waste recycling.	N A city district in Stockholm.	Y No record of collection was Demograp recorded as hic data of missing data. compared to Stockholm average was included. Sample was an area-typical apartment complex of the district.	W	Y	Y	The leaflet used <b>C: Social Norms</b> , i.e. subtitle stated "Join your neighbours on Hovmästargatan, recycle your food waste"; attitudes of residents described as considering FW recycling as very important <b>E: Disclosure:</b> vivid & tangible info on benefits of recycling FW to biofuel. Recycling station used nudge <b>D: an increase in ease and convenience</b>
<b>Shearer et al 2017 UK [67]</b>	Food waste recycling nudge intervention Intervention included stickers, affixed to the lids of refuse bins, as a visual prompt to encourage the separate collection of household food waste for recycling.	Design: Quantitative. Randomised control trial. Unit of randomisation was waste collection round. Sample size: Treatment (33,716 households/29 collection rounds) and Control Group (30,568 households/26 collection rounds). Mean tonnage/Group/Week.	Positive. Increased food waste recycling & statistically significant	Y Broadly representa tive. Demograp hic described in detail.	Y Drop out/loss to follow up mentioned. Missing waste collection was	W	Y	Y	The nudge included was a <b>H:Reminder</b> i.e. a visual-prompt as a reminder to engage in a behaviour.

	Control: No sticker prompt on food recycling caddies.				accounted for.					
<b>Bernstad 2014</b>	Food waste recycling nudge intervention	Sample strategy: Unclear. Allocation: Campaign A – The case study area, both campaigns were performed in the same area.	Positive.	N	Y	W	U	Y		For Brochure: <b>E: Disclosure</b> of environmental gains to separate collection of FW. For recycling equipment: <b>A: Default rules</b> ; Installation of recycling equipment in HH kitchens <b>D: Increase in ease and convenience</b> , making HH FW separate collection more accessible.
<b>[53] Sweden</b>	Intervention: Campaign A – Brochure; Campaign B Recycling equipment - a metal hanger & a vessel for paper bags used for separate collection of FW. No control group.	Design: Quantitative. Cross Sectional Design at numerous time points. Food waste composition analyses; accuracy of ±10 kilogram. Sample size: 320 with 'weight compositional analysis' for Campaign A; Unclear for Campaign B. Pre- & Post Intervention.	Increased food waste recycling, not significant Campaign B – Positive change. Increased food waste recycling & statistically significant							
<b>Nomura et al 2011</b>	Food waste recycling nudge intervention.	Design: Quantitative. Randomised control trial; Sample size: Treatment (5009) & Control (4073) Group; Allocation: council area in local Manchester – randomly allocated by street Food recycling. Participation was measured by observing which households put out a food waste container for collection.	Positive. Increased food waste recycling & statistically significant	Y	Y	O	Y	Y		Appeals to collective norms by nudging with <b>C: use of social norms.</b>
<b>UK [64]</b>	Intervention: Households in the treatment group were sent two postcards that provided feedback on how their street performed on food waste recycling compared with the average for their neighbourhood.	Manchester – randomly allocated by street Food recycling. Participation was measured by observing which households put out a food waste container for collection.	statistically significant							

	Control group received no feedback cards on their street's food waste container recycling performance.								
<b>Shaw et al 2018</b> <b>UK [60]</b>	Food waste reduction nudge intervention Intervention: Three treatment groups were assessed contemporaneously; two groups received a leaflet highlighting either the economic costs or environmental impacts of avoidable food waste and a third group acted as an experimental control	Design: "before-after-control-impact" (BACI) Sample size: n=60 [Control (n=20) No intervention; Leaflet: financial costs of food (n=20); Leaflet: environmental impacts (n=20). Allocation: Specific locations for these groups were identified using Mosaic classifications supplied by Eastleigh Borough Council. Allocation: first 30 households in each of the survey areas that set out a food waste container were selected for monitoring. Sample was divided into low income and affluent (n=30 and n=30 respectively). Collection of food waste samples took place over four weeks (8th July to 2nd August) in 2012. Food waste compositional analysis and weight used.	No change	N	Y	W	Y	Y	<b>The nudge used was E: Disclosure</b> i.e. revealing environmental cost or financial costs associated with avoidable food waste.
				Sample includes deliberate inclusion of economically diverse participants.	Drop out/loss to follow up not mentioned.				
<b>Schmidt et al 2016</b> <b>Germany [65]</b>	Food waste reduction nudge intervention Intervention: individualised recommendations for	Sampling strategy: adverts sent to town of Madgeburg via social media/newspapers/ Newsletters. Convenience sample. Participants self-selected.	Positive. Increased food waste reduction	N	Y	SR	U	Y	The intervention incorporated 3 nudges. <b>G: Pre-commitment strategies</b> and goal setting i.e.
				Detailed discussion of representative	Drop out/loss to follow up not mentioned.				

	relevant FW reduction behaviours, a public commitment & goal setting measures were sent online to the treatment group. Control group: received no intervention measures.	Design: Quantitative. Sample size and allocation: Treatment (108) and control group (109) were randomly divided. Online survey. Pre & Post Test.		sample included.					<b>I: Eliciting implementation intentions.</b> Alongside individualised recommendations of FW reduction behaviours i.e. nudge <b>H: reminders.</b>
<b>Sainsbury's 2017. Waste less save more UK [56]</b>	Food waste reduction nudge intervention Six interventions -Winnow: Tool that calculates financial value of food wasted at home. -Council welcome pack: Tools to help reduce FW i.e. spaghetti measure. -Picnic rescue: Tools i.e. ice packs, cool bags & crisp bag clips. Tips to use leftovers & info on cash value of leftovers. -Innovation challenge: Various FW reduction tools, i.e. spiraliser, measurers, vacuum packing, food labels. -Zero waste kitchen challenge: tools i.e. sealable food containers, measurers, meal planners,	Swadlincote – a small market town in South Derbyshire – was chosen to receive a £1 million investment and as well as advice and support for an intense year of activity. Six interventions are reported in Appendix B.2. Other interventions are not included here as they contain no numeric results pertaining to food waste. In these 6 interventions quantitative questionnaires were used, however allocation of participants, sample sizes and strategy unstated and thus unclear.	Positive. Increase in food waste reduction for all six interventions except for the smart planner app which was unclear.	U	N	W	U	N	-Winnow: used <b>J: informing people of the nature and consequences of FW</b> costs in their own HH. -Council welcome pack: uses tools that <b>D: increase in ease and convenience</b> to prepare & store food well for FW. -Picnic rescue: uses tools that <b>D: increase in ease and convenience</b> to preserve food and leftovers. <b>H: Reminders</b> for leftover use. E: <b>Disclosure:</b> info on cash value of leftovers. -Innovation challenge: uses tools to reduce FW

kitchen scales. Facebook group to share ideas & experiences.  
-Sainsburys smart planner app: iPhone app that uses Nectar data to remind users of the food they may have in their cupboards/fridge & suggests recipes

that **D: increase in ease and convenience**  
-Zero waste kitchen challenge: uses tools to reduce FW that **D: increase in ease and convenience**. Uses C: social norms by social media.  
-Sainsburys smart planner app: uses nudge **H: Reminders**.

<b>Hubbu b &amp; Tesco 2020. No time for waste challenge UK [55]</b>	Food waste reduction nudge intervention Intervention: 3 weeks of accessible simple information, tools i.e. tip & hack sheets & meal planners; and activity challenges with prizes on FW themes. Participants joined a private Facebook group which acted as a social hub & peer support during the intervention No control group.	Sample self-selected from Tesco's customer base – convenience sample. Increased Sample size: 53 households. Study stated participants were from a range of demographics. Quantitative design. Survey and Food diary with weight of edible food waste. Pre-& Post intervention.	Positive. Increased food waste reduction	N Minimal detail on demographics.	Y Drop out/loss to follow up not mentioned.	W	U	U	The nudge <b>C: use of social norms</b> was used in the Facebook group by peer support and social interaction i.e. by encouraging social interactions around the activity challenges.  Tools used i.e. tip & hack sheets & meal planners pertaining to <b>H:reminders..</b>  There was also focus on positive communication & use of incentives to motivate behaviour change.
--	---	--	--	-----------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---

<b>Lim et al 2017</b>	Food waste reduction nudge intervention	Recruitment & Sample: Convenience sample by University - Facebook pages, letter & personal networks. Demographics. Self-selected	Mixed: Receiving eco-feedback increased food waste reduction; Social Recipes alone showed no change	N No attempt to discuss representative sample. Minimal demographic detail.	Y Drop out/loss to follow up mentioned.	SR W	N	N	Eco-feedback incorporated nudges of <b>C: use of social norms</b> and <b>J: informing people of the nature and consequences of their own past choices.</b> The participant's own servings of FW were visualised in comparison to others in the study.
<b>The Netherlands [57]</b>	Intervention Study: 15 Participants, split into 4 groups, received Social Recipes. This aimed to encourage food sharing by suggesting groups of related consumers recipes that are based on ingredients from different individuals or HHs. 2 of the 4 groups also received eco-feedback on servings of food wasted, the visualization showing negative feedback & positive feedback relatively to others.	Participants: all students/young professionals 20-28 years. Sample size: 15 Design: Quantitative. Cross sectional. 1 time point. Questionnaire Likert scale. Average weight of food waste in bin per person per week calculated. This paper also included two other studies: 1) Interviews on perceptions of social recipes concept; 2) Focus groups on perceptions of social recipes concept.							
	No control groups.								
<b>Van Dooren et al 2020</b>	Food waste reduction nudge intervention	Design: Quantitative. Sample: a) random selection from client panels at supermarket & b) convenience sample from visitors at a fair.	Positive. Increased food waste reduction	U Discussion of representative sample a) representative.	Y Drop out/loss to follow up mentioned.	SR	U	U	The Eetmaatje measuring tool for pasta and rice <b>increases the ease and convenience</b> of portion sizing meals accurately, i.e. <b>nudge D.</b>
<b>The Netherlands [66]</b>	Intervention: Eetmaatje – a measuring tool for pasta and rice portioning. No control groups.	• (a) Client Panel Albert Heijn supermarket survey February 2014 (n = 336) and October 2014 (n = 330). (the supermarket loyal client panel were randomly invited to participate in survey for consumer research)							

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (b) Online Facebook questionnaire visitors at 2018 edition of Huishoudbeurs, a large annual fair for household products in Amsterdam, where 60,000 visitors received an Eetmaatje for free. The questionnaire resulted in n = 445 responses, unrepresentative sample as mostly women of low socio-economic status</li> </ul>		b) not representative					
Young et al 2017 UK [58]	Food waste reduction nudge intervention	<p>Convenience sample from customer base (Asda magazine 1.9 million readers; Asda e-newsletter 1.4 million customers; Asda's Facebook 1.4 million 'likes'. Design: Quantitative. Allocation: Participants self-selecting. Sample size of each intervention group: None/Control 469 E newsletter 105 Facebook 510 Magazine 327 E newsletter and Facebook 134 E newsletter and magazine 116 Facebook and magazine 250 All interventions 107</p> <p>Method: Online questionnaire: 3 time points: at Time 1 (one month before intervention), Time 2 (two weeks after intervention) and Time 3 (five months after intervention).</p>	<p>Mixed. Social media, e-letter and control group all showed reduction in self reported FW.</p>	<p>U Description of demographics, no mention of representative sample.</p>	<p>Y Description of removal of cases with missing responses from 1 or more surveys. All analyses reported refer to participants who responded to all 3 surveys.</p>	SR	U	N	<p>The social influence intervention aimed to encourage discussion of FW reduction behaviours on Facebook incorporating nudge <b>C: use of social norms</b>. The e-letter and magazine aimed to offer FW reduction tips to consumers, encouraging nudge <b>H: reminders</b>.</p>



<b>Young et al 2018</b>	Food waste reduction nudge intervention	Convenience sample. Design: Quantitative. Online surveys sent to 20,000 customers on Asda's everyday experts' panel at 6 time points. Response rate 14-40%. Final sample included 631 matching responses across all six surveys.	Positive. C U ommunicatSome ion demograp channels hics combined described. & repeated No over time mention of responses. using representa standard tive messaging sample. had a significant effect on levels of reported FW of shoppers who say they saw a message	Y Description of removal of cases with missing responses. Results report matched responses for all 6 surveys.	SR	U	N	All 6 interventions use food waste tips consistent with the nudge <b>H: reminders</b> . Interventions 4, 5 and 6 use nudges of <b>C use of social norms</b> . Intervention 6 also uses <b>G: pre-commitment strategies</b> by prompting pledges to reduce FW.
<b>UK [59]</b>	Intervention: Food waste reduction campaign for ASDA, incorporating 6 interventions: 1/ASDA magazine 2014 – Tips to reduce HH FW 2/ASDA magazine 2015 = Tips to reduce HH FW 3/ASDA e-newsletter – Tips to reduce HH FW 4/ ASDA Facebook page – to encourage use of leftovers and facilitate discussion of this issue between consumers 5/ On-pack stickers- stickers on foods most often wasted with subjective norm messaging i.e. 75% of shoppers avoid wasting by storing in the fridge & tips for reducing FW 6/In store event: food waste tips, pledges and subjective norms messaging							

<b>Aschmann-Witzel 2018</b>	Perception of interventions using nudge techniques for food waste reduction	Sample & Design: Convenience sample. Quantitative. Danish online panel (of the market research agency 'user needs') that are representative of the Danish population were sampled according to age, gender, and region of residence. 10-minute online survey in September 2016. Sample size: 1(n = 251) 2 (n = 187) 3 (n = 182) 4 (n = 206). 16 participants were eliminated on basis of completing online survey in <3 minutes.	Mixed: Overall positive support of nudge interventions using default simplification and disclosure. There was some interest in Reminders. But Nudges involving social norms were less popular.	Y	Y	SR	U	N	<p><b>A: Default rules</b> - a service providing recipes with the food ingredients packed in just the right amounts.</p> <p><b>E: Disclosure</b> –food labels indicating the food was produced in a FW positive way.</p> <p><b>H: Reminders</b> – being offered tips and tricks to reduce FW</p> <p><b>C: Use of social norms</b> - discussing with friends about importance of reducing FW</p> <p><b>B: Simplification</b> - reduction of barrier to purchasing misshapen food items, dented items, food items close to expiry or with minor flaws,</p>
<b>Von Kameke &amp; Fischer 2018</b>	Perception of nudge intervention for food waste reduction	Participant recruitment: outside two food stores, one organic and one discount store via ad-hoc sampling. Sample size: 101	Mixed: Most support for nudges of social norms, disclosure & informing	U	Y	SR	U	N	<p><b>A: Default rules</b> – meal planning program/food ingredient delivery.; <b>H: Reminders:</b> Tips for FW reduction; <b>J: Informing people or E: Disclosure:</b> feedback on financial costs of FW/FW amounts of the</p>
<b>Germany [31]</b>	Interventions in question: - external meal planning and fee-based food ingredient delivery	Quantitative questionnaire design: Section of results relevant to this review included a rating of proposed nudges on a scale from 1 ("great support")to 5 ("no support at all").							

	<p>-Tips on shopping planning, suggestions for weekly meal planning</p> <p>-Feedback on financial costs of the individual food waste produced/ -</p> <p>Feedback on the actual FW amounts generated by the individual HH.</p> <p>-Pictures that demonstrate the extent of the FW amounts.</p> <p>-Regular exchange about personal experiences on the reduction of FW with friends.</p> <p>-A challenge on HH FW reduction with a friends</p>		<p>people of participant nature and s</p> <p>consequen</p> <p>ce of their</p> <p>own past</p> <p>choices</p> <p>and</p> <p>warnings.</p> <p>Least</p> <p>support for</p> <p>reminders</p> <p>and</p> <p>default</p> <p>rules.</p>						<p>individual/HH; <b>F:</b></p> <p><b>Warnings:</b> pictures that demonstrate the extent of FW; <b>C Social norms</b></p> <p>- regular exchange about personal experiences on the reduction of FW with friends/ a challenge on HH FW reduction with a friends</p>
<p><b>Wakefield &amp; Axon, UK 2020 [52]</b></p>	<p>Perception of nudge intervention for food waste recycling</p> <p>Interventions discussed</p> <p>-HH receiving FW bins</p> <p>-Government led FW recycling schemes</p> <p>-Education of FW in schools</p> <p>-Sharing about FW on social media to increase interest</p>	<p>Recruited on Facebook &amp; word of mouth. Facebook group "The Liverpool Vegetarian and Vegan Society". Convenience sample.</p> <p>Responses showed unrepresentative sample. Main age categories 18-24 and 25-34.</p> <p>Design: Mixed methods, but section of results relevant to this review were all qualitative.</p> <p>Q – questionnaire response (2 open ended questions) (100 Participants were recruited to take part via a web link distributed over social media &amp; e-mail]</p>	<p>Mixed: Default rules: recycling schemes = positive; concern remained</p> <p>instruction NA for s or raising qualitative awareness of FW. FW study in school &amp; sharing on</p>	<p>N</p> <p>No attempt to include</p> <p>representa</p> <p>tive sample in</p> <p>Column</p> <p>section of</p> <p>study.</p>	<p>Y</p> <p>Unclear description of how</p> <p>missing data were dealt with.</p>	<p>SR</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>N</p>	<p><b>A: default rules, i.e.</b> government led recycling food waste schemes, distribution of FW bins; <b>C: use of social norms i.e.</b> sharing about FW on social media to increase interest.</p>

		L / W – focus group response = 10.	social media was positive.						
<b>Metcalfe et al 2013 UK [63]</b>	Perception of nudge intervention for food waste recycling	Design: Qualitative; Interviews with 27 households. Allocation: research area = 1 local authority area Kingston upon Thames in South London. Surveys sent to 10% of resident's households followed by interviews of a cross section of respondents. Purposive Sampling: Potential participants were distinguished so that a range of social characteristics were covered such as age, household size, occupation, education, housing tenure, income, ethnicity and fundamentally their 'waste grouping', that is, 'composters', 'garden wasters', and so on.	Mixed: Some parts were accepted, some not. Some required individual flexibility to accommodate intervention	N	Y	SR	N	N	<b>A: default rules –</b> automatic enrolment in food waste caddy program.

Supplementary materials: Table S2, S3 and S4: Tables of quantitative results of studies in Table S1 that were not included in Table 4

Table S2

Food waste (FW) weight/household (HH) or individual/timeframe reported for food waste reduction

Study	Sample Size	Food Waste (FW) Weight/HH/Timeframe	Overall	Nudge (Table 1)
Sainsburys 2017 [56] (Winnow)	Not Known	During the trial average food waste fell from 16.6kilogram to 13kilogram. (22%) (No Time scale given; Participants by families or HH)  Kilogram/HH/total length of trial unspecified	Positive	J
Sainsburys 2017 [56] (Innovation Challenge)	50	Average food waste per day fell by 71g (a reduction of 18%).  Average: Grams/HH/Day	Positive	D
Sainsburys 2017 [56] (Zero waste kitchen)	50	The trial delivered an average waste reduction of 60g per household, per day) (20% reduction)  Average: Grams/HH/Day	Positive	D, C
Hubbub & Tesco 2020 [55]	53	Average decrease in edible food waste of 1.46kilogram per household (or 76%) across the cohort, between week 1 and 6.  KILOGRAM/HH/5 weeks	Positive	C, H
Bernstad 2014 [53]	320	Kilogram FW (sd) /HH/WK [amount of separately collected FW] Average Before: (-10 to 0 weeks) A: 0.61 (0.04) B: 0.66 (0.06) Average After: (11-20 weeks; 21-30 weeks) A: 0.68 (0.05); 0.66(0.06) B: 0.98 (0.06); 0.96 (0.05)	No change	E, A, D
Lim et al 2017 [57]	15	An average of 332 g of food waste went into the bin per person per week (excluding 2 participants who were only using the mobile application). Grams/Person/Week	Unclear. Only measured at one time point.	C, J

**Table S3: Percentages reported for food waste reduction**

Study	Sample Size	Percentage	Overall	Nudge (Table 1)
Sainsburys 2017 [56] (Winnow)	Not Known	During the trial average food waste fell by 22%. If excluding one anomaly though (one family saw an increase in food waste) this rises to 59%	Positive	J
Sainsburys 2017 [56] (Council Tenant Welcome Pack)	Not Known	66% of participants reported a reduction in the amount of food they waste	Positive	D
Sainsburys 2017 [56] Picnic rescue	Not Known	98% of respondents reported to have reduced their picnic waste by at least 75%	Positive	D, H, E
Sainsburys 2017 [56] Picnic rescue	Not Known	70% of respondents reported that following the trial they did not waste any picnic food	Positive	D, H, E
Sainsburys 2017 [56] (Innovation Challenge)	50	Average food waste per day fell by a reduction of 18%.	Positive	D
Sainsburys 2017 [56] Zero waste kitchen	50	The trial delivered an average waste reduction of 20%	Positive	D, C
Sainsburys 2017 [56] Zero waste kitchen	50	80% of respondents said they're wasting less food as a result.	Positive	D, C
Sainsbury's 2017 [56] (Smart Planner app)	Not Known	43% of users said the Smart Planner helped them reduce food waste; whilst 52% said it was too early to tell	Neutral	H
Sainsburys 2017 [56]	Not Known	Not included as there were no percentages of food waste reduction included in the results.	NA	NA

(All other interventions)				
Hubbub & Tesco 2020 [55]	53	Average decrease in edible food waste of 76% across the cohort, between week 1 and 6.	Positive	C, H
Hubbub & Tesco 2020 [55]	50	One-month post pilot surveyed for participant cohort: 94% said they were wasting less food than before the pilot	Positive	C, H
Bernstad 2014 [53]	B Unclear	Food waste separately collected increased by 49% in first two rounds (weeks 3-5 and 12-14 post B) and 44% in last round (week 23-25 post B). This was statistically significant (t-test, 2-tailed) ( $p < 0.01$ ).	Positive	E, A, D
Bernstad 2014 [53]	A 320	increase of 12% in the weekly collection of food waste over 10 weeks post campaign. This was not statistically significant.	No change	E, A, D
Van Dooren et al 2020 [66] (Albert Heijn's customers)	336	83% convinced about food waste reduction.	Positive	D
Van Dooren et al 2020 [66] (Albert Heijn's customers)	330	77% said they are convinced that it helps them reduce food waste	Positive	D
Van Dooren et al 2020 [66] (Huishoudbeurs large annual fair)	445	of 87% of the respondents was convinced that the tool helps them reduce their food waste in terms of pasta and rice	Positive	D

**Table S4: Likert scales measuring nudge intervention on food waste behaviour change**

Study	Sample size	Scale used	Scores	Overall	Nudge (Table 1)
Young et al 2017 [58]	469	5-point scale	Time 1 (M = 1.27, SD = 0.142) to Time 3 (M = 1.14, SD = 1.31); $t(2.32, p = < 0.05)$ .	NA	NA

(No intervention)					
Young et al 2017 [58] (E-Newsletters)	105	5-point scale	Time 2 (M = 2.47, SD = 0.910) to Time 3 (M = 2.41, SD = 0.910); t (2.19, p = < 0.05). No significant reduction from baseline to time 1.  Time 1 (M = 1.43, SD = 1.34) to Time 3 (M = 1.16, SD = 1.26); t (2.29, p = < 0.05).	Time 2 to time 3 & Time 1 to Time 3 = Positive  Baseline to Time 1: No change	H
Young et al 2017 [58] (Facebook)	510	5-point scale	Quantity of food waste from Time 2 (M = 1.36, SD = 1.49) to Time 3 (M = 1.17, SD = 1.33); t (3.47, p = < 0.05). Still significantly different at Time 3 (M = 1.17, SD = 1.33) when compared to their initial food waste quantity at Time 1 (M = 1.28, SD = 1.36); t (1.99, p = < 0.05)	Time 1 and Time 2 to time 3 = Positive	C
Young et al 2017 [58] (Magazine online and instore)	327	5-point scale	Reduction in reported food waste from Time 2 (M = 1.29, SD = 1.44) to Time 3 (M = 1.16, SD = 1.38); t (2.06, p = < 0.05). difference was not significant at baseline to Time 1.	Time 2 to time 3 = Positive  Baseline to Time 1: No change	C, H
Young et al 2017 [58] (Electronic newsletter and the Facebook interventions )	134	5-point scale	reported a significant difference in the quantity of food waste from Time 2 (M = 1.58, SD = 1.63) to Time 3 (M = 1.31, SD = 1.49); t (2.47, p = < 0.05). The change, however, was not significantly different from Time 1 to Time 3.	Time 2 to time 3 = Positive  Time 1 to Time 3: No change	C, H
Young et al 2017 [58] (Facebook intervention and the magazine)	250	5-point scale	significant difference in the quantity of food waste Time 2 (M = 1.43, SD = 1.31) to Time 3 (M = 1.22, SD = 1.24); t (3.20, p = < 0.05). The difference was not, however, significant across Time 1 and Time 3	Time 2 to time 3 = Positive  Time 1 to Time 3: No change	C, H
Schmidt 2016 [65]	217	6-point scale	Control Group: Time 1: 4.79 (1.11)	Positive	G, I, H



	Control N=109 Experimental N=108		Time 2: 4.77 (1.10) Difference: - 0.02  Experimental Group: Value (SD) Time 1: 4.56 (1.32) Time 2: 5.21 (0.95) Difference: 0.75		
Lim et al 2017 [57]	15	Likert scale: 7 to 1, very much to not at all respectivel y.  Survey administere d Post interventio n which lasted for 1 month	Do Social Recipe suggestions influence your individual behaviour regarding dealing with leftovers? (median 4.5) Do Social Recipe suggestions influence the group behaviour regarding dealing with leftovers? (median 5.0) How much is your level of motivation to change your behaviour around food practices at this point? (median 5.0) Does Eco-feedback provide an additional impact on the group behaviour? (median 5.0) Does Eco-feedback provide an additional impact on effectiveness? (median 5.0) Are social recipe suggestions efficient in reducing overall food waste? (Median 3.5.)	Positive for eco feedback  Neutral for social recipes	C, J